

LANGSIDE & BATTLEFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD

1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE

(Sources: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles and 2014 Population Estimates by Neighbourhood)

2011 CENSUS		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,350	10,092	1,430	12,872
	N/hood %		10.49%	78.40%	11.11%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		1,460	10,381	1,560	13,401
	N/hood %		10.89%	77.46%	11.64%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 529 (4.1%)

Much higher proportion of working age population than the city average in a popular area whose population continues to grow. There has been a slight increase in the over 65 population

Housing Policy Implications

Population growth is likely to continue provided that there is sufficient housing supply

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	7,527	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	509	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.23%	
Proportion of all households	6.76%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	289	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.09%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	56.78%	64.17%
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	0.70%	
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	938	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.43%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	12.46%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	970	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.00%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	12.89%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	799	36,508
---	-----	--------

(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.19%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	10.62%	12.78%

E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	3,237	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	43.01%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The N/hood has a significantly lower percentage of **A** lone parent households compared to the city average

The number of lone parent households with dependent children is much lower than the city **B** average

The proportion of households in the N/hood with dependent children is also much lower than the city **C** as a whole

The proportion of households over 65 in the N/hood
D is slightly under the city average

The proportion of single person households under 65
E is much higher than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

It is likely that demand for larger properties
 would rise if there was more supply

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

(Specific Source: Census Table QS406SC Household Size by Neighbourhood)

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	4,036	53.62%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2,396	31.83%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	641	8.52%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	303	4.03%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	102	1.36%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	23	0.31%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	14	0.19%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	12	0.16%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	7,527		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Significantly higher than city average proportion of one person households in the N/hood

Housing Policy Implications

Demand for all house sizes is likely to be high. The question to be asked is are there sufficient sites and is the cost of land acquisition prohibitive?

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	4,259	3,022	688			7,969
	53.44%	37.92%	8.63%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	4,514	2,304	629	21	59	7,527
	59.97%	30.61%	8.36%	0.28%	0.78%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate)	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
	43.40%	20.40%	36.39%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	128,436	48,019	104,811	1,781	2,646	285,693
	44.95%	16.80%	36.68%	0.62%	0.93%	

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

Commentary

Significantly higher proportion of home ownership in the area than in the city as a whole, however it has dropped in recent years.

Increase in the number of households in the private rented sector, which is higher than the city average and seen an increase of just over 7% in this 3 year period

Housing Policy Implications

The proportion of social rented properties is low in likely comparison to the demand. Additional social rented housing would go some way to meeting demand.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	40	0.53%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	79	1.05%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	322	4.28%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	6,936	92.15%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	132	1.75%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	9	0.12%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	9	0.12%	630	0.22%
	7,527		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Almost all households in the N/hood live in tenemental properties (92%), which is significantly higher than the city average. This may include some multi storey and deck access properties

Housing Policy Implications

The dominance of smaller tenement flats may be the reason for the absence of family households. Where possible, the provision of lower density accommodation should be encouraged

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
1.68	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

Occupied Household count

Up to 0.5 persons per room

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

Over 1.5 persons per room

	N/hood	City
	6,065	202,466
5,954	98.17%	96.5%
82	1.35%	2.52%
29	0.48%	0.95%
6,065		

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

NEIGHBOURHOOD	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	7527	855	2263	3118	41.42	3210	1199	15.93
Owned	4535	705	1571	2276	50.18	1752	507	11.17
Private rented or living rent free	2363	113	555	668	28.27	1164	531	22.47
Social rented	629	37	137	174	27.66	294	161	25.6
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Average household size is substantially below

A the city average

Higher proportion of households in the N/hood

B not sharing bedrooms

Overcrowding is more evident in social rented stock. However there is much less underoccupation suggesting that household sizes

C and stock are a good match

Housing Policy Implications

The provision of additional larger family social rented housing would provide more balance and meet a clear housing need

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		7,527		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	467	6.20%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Proportion of households without central heating is higher than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

High probability that pre 1919 tenements are less likely to have central heating and be insulated. This should be verified and proposals put forward to find a solutions. Private landlords should be incentivised to install central heating

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		7,750	293,876
Vacant household spaces	212	2.74%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	11	0.14%	0.19%
Occupied	7,527	97.12%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES**Commentary**

Vacancy rates are similar to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None. Most properties appear to be in good demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)**Total Residents in neighbourhood****12,872****A Long term health/disability in a household**

	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	969	7.53%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,073	8.34%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	10,830	84.14%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household

	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	9,588	74.49%	69.01%
Physical disability	616	4.79%	7.82%
Mental health condition	675	5.24%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	621	4.82%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	255	1.98%	2.49%
Learning disability	19	0.15%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	209	1.62%	2.14%
Development disorder	59	0.46%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	658	5.11%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	161	1.25%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	183	1.42%	2.88%

Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household

431	3.35%	8.43%
-----	-------	-------

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have better mobility than the

A city average

N/hood residents typically have less long term

B conditions compared to the rest of the city

N/hood residents affected more likely to require

C shorter term unpaid care of 1 to 19 hours a week

The proportion of the population which is reported as being long term sick or disabled is

D well under half of the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The analysis suggests a young and relatively fit population. No recommendations.

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
A Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	11,158	86.68%	84.56%
White Other	474	3.68%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	110	0.85%	0.48%
Indian	145	1.13%	1.46%
Pakistani	604	4.69%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	5	0.04%	0.08%
Chinese	94	0.73%	1.79%
Other Asian	78	0.61%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	140	1.09%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	64	0.50%	0.64%
	12,872		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	1,331	10.34%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	184	1.43%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

With the exception of the Pakistani community, most ethnic groups are under-represented in the

A neighbourhood

Lower proportion of residents born outside UK than

B rest of city

The proportion of non-English speakers is lower than

C the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood has the potential to become more ethnically diverse

OTHER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS RELATED TO HOUSING COSTS AND THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)	N/Hood %	City%
Economically active	80.17%	64.49%
Economically inactive	19.83%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	4.56%	9.05%
Full time students	6.96%	13.73%
Retired	8.07%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	58.96%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has one of the highest proportions of its population in employment. There is a lower proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of retired persons under 74 years. There is also a significantly higher level of car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is around half of the city average

