

SPRINGBOIG & BARLANARK 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		2,993	9,275	2,188	14,456
	Neibhd %		20.70%	64.16%	15.14%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,903	9,310	2,155	14,368
	N/hood %		20.20%	64.79%	15.00%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 88

Housing Policy Implications

In housing needs terms, it appears that there is less of a demand for larger family dwellings than was previously the case. However there remains a large child population to be cared for.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **6,642**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,584	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	4	
Proportion of all households	23.85%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,057	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.98%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	66.72%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	2,048	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.12%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	30.83%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,207	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.49%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	18.17%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	882	36,508
-----------------------------------------	------------	---------------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.41%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	13.28%	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	1658	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	24.96%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

The neighbourhood has one of the highest rates of

A lone parenthood in the city

The neighbourhood has a slightly above average of

B lone parent households with dependent children

There is well above average proportion of households with dependent children in spite of the

C apparent absolute fall in child numbers

The neighbourhood has a higher than average

D proportion of households over the age of 65

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of single person households under 65 compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The high levels of lone parenthood and child dependency, coupled with the higher proportionate elderly population and low rates of new single working age household formation suggests a lack of balance in letting or house purchase, which could mean that the housing stock does not match the demand or that there are specific issues associated with housing particular groups

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	2,540	38.24%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2,000	30.11%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1,094	16.47%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	686	10.33%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	232	3.49%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	52	0.78%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	23	0.34%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	15	0.22%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	6,642		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Household sizes tend to be larger than the city average. This may be a reflection of the available stock particularly in the social rented sector where 4 apartment tenements were originally provided to meet the needs of the early to mid 1950s

Housing Policy Implications

Should local housing providers attempt to better balance demand against supply?

4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD	2,325	809	3706			6,840
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	33.95%	11.81%	54.11%			
	2,418	504	3,636	37	47	6,642
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	36.40%	7.58%	54.74%			
CITY	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate)	43.40%	20.40%	36.39%			
Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	128,436	48,019	104,811	1,781	2,646	285,693
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	44.95%	16.80%	36.68%	0.62%	0.93%	

4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

Commentary

The number of owner occupied dwellings has fallen most likely as a result of owner occupied properties converting to the private rented sector. The number of social rented units has increased.

Housing Policy Implications

There has been a slowdown in the number of available dwellings for sale, which makes it more difficult for new younger households in employment to settle in the area

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	172	2.58%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,416	21.32%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	1,266	19.06%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,711	55.87%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	28	0.42%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	2	0.03%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	47	0.71%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	6,642		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a reasonable supply of non-tenemental properties. However the majority of these are located at the Springboig end of the neighbourhood, resulting in a split within the neighbourhood which then creates issues of meeting the need of families with children outwith current tenemental stock

Housing Policy Implications

Should the future of tenemental stock be reviewed in the light of changing demographics in this neighbourhood. Should there be more low density family accommodation?

6

A UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

B Average Household size

N/hood	City
2.16	2.02

Dwelling Occupancy Rates

Occupied Household count

Up to 0.5 persons per room

Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room

C Over 1.5 persons per room

	As a proportion of households counted	
	N/hood	City
4,289	4,477	202,466
147	95.80%	96.5.%
41	3.28%	2.52%
	0.91%	0.95%

Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy ²

(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	6642	1121	2044	3165	47.65	2415	1062	15.99
Owned	2455	720	850	1570	63.95	615	270	11
Private rented or living rent free	551	48	148	196	35.57	258	97	17.6
Social rented	3636	353	1046	1399	38.47	1542	695	19.11
CITY								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137,085	47.98	98916	49692	17.39
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84,630	64.99	32838	12749	9.79
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16,246	32.07	21132	13287	26.23
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36,209	34.54	44946	23656	22.57

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION

Commentary

Household size is higher than the city average reflecting the higher child population in the

A neighbourhood

B Density per room is higher than the city average

In spite of the above, overcrowding is less prevalent in the social rented sector than the city average, and is generally lower than the city average. There is a higher level of underoccupation in the rented sectors

C across the board.

Housing Policy Implications

There may be a mismatch of household size and property. Larger dwellings appear to be underoccupied and yet there is probably a degree of overcrowding in some property types. This suggests the need to carry out research to determine whether or not households are in the most appropriate form of housing or whether mismatch is a consequence of the form of housing provided in the past.

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		6,642		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	150	2.26%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

There is a smaller proportion of occupied housing without central heating compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There is likely to be a high level of fuel poverty in this neighbourhood which requires a concerted effort by all landlords operating in the neighbourhood to improve insulation, provide modern efficient heating and apply high standards of energy efficiency in any new build

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties

	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		6,758	293,876
Vacant household spaces	114	1.69%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	2	0.03%	0.19%
Occupied	6642	98.28%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a very low vacancy rate, suggesting no real demand issues

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	14,386		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,481	17.24%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,730	12.02%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	10,175	70.73%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	9,051	62.91%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,432	9.95%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,172	8.14%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	991	6.88%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	427	2.97%	2.49%
Learning disability	127	0.88%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	359	2.49%	2.14%
Development disorder	130	0.90%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	602	4.18%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	345	2.40%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	665	4.62%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,370	13.10%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A significantly higher proportion of households contain a family member who suffers from a long

A term health or disability issue

A higher proportion of residents suffer some form of long term illness or disability in all

B categories, than the city averages

A significantly higher proportion of residents require unpaid care of between 20 and 50+

C hours per week compared to the city average

The neighbourhood has a very high proportion of the working age population who are classified

D as long term sick or disabled

Housing Policy Implications

The health picture in the neighbourhood is poor by comparison with the city averages. A high proportion of residents need some form of ongoing health care which may require a focus by the Health & Social Care Partnership particularly in areas of the neighbourhood where there has been little change to the housing form

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
A Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	13,665	94.99%	84.56%
White Other	360	2.50%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	23	0.16%	0.48%
Indian	47	0.33%	1.46%
Pakistani	56	0.39%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	0.08%
Chinese	48	0.33%	1.79%
Other Asian	36	0.25%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	128	0.89%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	22	0.15%	0.64%
	14,386		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	614	4.26%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	236	1.64%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

White British or Irish account for the vast majority of the population with all other groups under

A represented

A lower proportion of residents were born out with

B the UK than the city average

The proportion of residents who do not speak English

C well or at all is below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood does not appear to be attracting a reasonable proportion of diverse ethnic settlers. Could the area benefit from having a broader ethnic mix?

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	59.61%	64.49%
Economically inactive	40.39%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	12.00%	9.05%
Full time students	7.00%	13.73%
Retired	13.41%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	42.47%	49.18%

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of its population in employment, a low student population living at home, a higher proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age and lower levels of car ownership

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

