

NORTH CARDONALD & PENILEE 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		2,699	8,657	2,405	13,761
	N/hood %		19.61%	62.91%	17.48%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,790	8,763	2,255	13,808
	N/hood %		20.21%	63.46%	16.33%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **increase** of 47

Higher proportion of over 65s compared to the city average. Below average proportion of working age households but higher than average child population

Housing Policy Implications

Signs of an ageing population, likely to require housing-related support but also a possible need to meet family accommodation needs

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	6,229	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,199	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.90%	
Proportion of all households	19.25%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	736	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.78%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	61.38%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,781	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.71%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	28.59%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1407	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.90%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	22.59%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	1053	36,508
---	------	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.88%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	16.90%	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	1328	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	21.32%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has an above average proportion
A of single parent households

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of lone
 parent households with dependent children
B compared to the city average

The overall proportion of households with dependent
C children is higher than the city average

The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of single
D households over 65 than the city average

The neighbourhood also has a much lower proportion of single under 65s than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is characterised by an aging population but also a high proportion of households with dependent children

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2,381	38.22%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	1,800	28.90%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1,011	16.23%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	650	10.44%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	297	4.77%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	57	0.92%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	21	0.34%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	12	0.19%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	6,229		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Higher than average proportion of 3-5 person households in the N/hood

Housing Policy Implications

There may be a need to balance the population by attracting smaller working age households

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)	3,285	864	2,192			6,341
	51.81%	13.63%	34.57%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	3,387	600	2,177	15	50	6,229
	54.37%	9.63%	34.95%	0.24%	0.80%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	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

High levels of home ownership in the area. Higher than in the city as a whole

Similar levels of social rented to city average, however private rented is lower than other parts of the city even although there has been recent expansion

Housing Policy Implications

None

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	208	3.34%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	650	10.43%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,213	19.45%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,133	66.29%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	24	0.38%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	5	0.08%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	1	0.00%	630	0.22%
	6,235		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Highest proportion of households in the area living in tenements, which is similar to the city average. However this may include some multi storey properties

Much higher proportion of households living in terraced properties than the city as whole

Housing Policy Implications

None

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

A Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.2	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
Occupied Household count	4,288	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	4,139 96.53%	96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	124 2.89%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	25 0.58%	0.95%

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	6229	1614	2078	3692	59.27	1776	761	12.22
Owned	3402	1286	1213	2499	73.45	635	268	7.88
Private rented or living rent free	650	98	230	328	50.46	214	108	16.61
Social rented	2177	230	635	865	39.73	927	385	17.68
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 greater than the city

A average

Occupied household count is similar to the city

B average

There is less overcrowding compared to city averages across the board. However there is

C higher underoccupation in all tenures

Housing Policy Implications

The ageing population is likely to be underoccupying properties built as family homes. The question is - To what extent can older residents be encouraged to free up these properties assuming that alternative supply to meet retirement and medical condition needs can be found

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		6,229		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	149	2.39%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Those living without central heating in the area is lower than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

Properties in the area are likely to require insulation and there may well be hidden fuel poverty especially among elderly households finding it difficult to affordably heat larger properties

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		6,372	293,876
Vacant household spaces	138	2.17%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	5	0.08%	0.19%
Occupied	6,229	97.76%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rate is similar to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None. Area seems to be in sufficient demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood **13,761**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,946	14.14%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,570	11.41%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	10,245	74.45%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	9,016	65.52%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,199	8.71%	7.82%
Mental health condition	832	6.05%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	1,037	7.54%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	381	2.77%	2.49%
Learning disability	103	0.75%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	307	2.23%	2.14%
Development disorder	113	0.82%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	642	4.67%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	330	2.40%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	559	4.06%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	858	8.74%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

N/hood residents have worse mobility compared

A to the city as a whole

N/hood residents have more long term

B conditions compared to other parts of the city

N/hood residents affected are more likely to

C require more long term unpaid care

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

D lower than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There may be a requirement to provide additional social and housing related support to the population

Local providers should work with health and social care professionals to provide enhanced support for carers, and make homes more accessible in terms of mobility, particularly residents requiring to be discharged from hospital

		CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY		N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census A Neighbourhood Profiles)					
Ethnic Origin					
Frequency					
White British or Irish	12,684	92.17%			84.56%
White Other	196	1.42%			3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	37	0.27%			0.48%
Indian	292	2.12%			1.46%
Pakistani	222	1.61%			3.78%
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%			0.08%
Chinese	18	0.13%			1.79%
Other Asian	77	0.56%			0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	147	1.07%			2.40%
Other ethnic group	87	0.63%			0.64%
	13,761				
B Country of Birth					
Born outside UK	877	6.37%			12.24%
C Spoken English					
Does not speak English well or at all	212	1.54%			2.59%

10. ETHNICITY**Commentary**

Vast majority of households are White (British) or White (Irish), most other ethnicities are largely

A unrepresented

The proportion of the N/hood born outside of the UK

B is much less than the city as a whole

The N/hood has a much lower proportion of those who do not speak English well or at all than in other

C parts of the city**Housing Policy Implications**

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities. Providers should consider marketing of properties for a wider diversity of ethnic groups

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	65.79%	64.49%
Economically inactive	34.21%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	8.99%	9.05%
Full time students	7.83%	13.73%
Retired	14.12%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	50.52%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a slightly higher proportion of its population in employment. There is a lower proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of retired persons under 74 years. There is also a slightly higher level of car ownership than the city average

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

