## SPRINGBURN 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 | 2,616 | 9,353 | 2,220 | 14,189 |
| N/hood % | 18.44% | 65.92% | 15.65% | |
| cf city % | 16.12 | 70.03 | 13.85 | |

| 2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES Age band | 0 - 15 | 16 - 64 | 65+ | TOTAL POP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frequency | 2,432 | 9,339 | 2,177 | **13,948** |
| N/hood % | 17.44% | 66.96% | 15.61% | |
| cf city % | 16.13 | 69.94 | 13.93 | |

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Total population **decrease** of 241 (-1.7%)
No change in cohort proportions and higher proportions of children

**Housing Policy Implications**
The neighbourhood would benefit from an influx of newly formed households to encourage population growth.

## 2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source:  2011  Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**Total Households in neighbourhood** 7,371

| **A** LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|
| In Neighbourhood | 1,438 | 41,315 |
| % of city total in this Neighbourhood | 3.48% | |
| Proportion of all households | 19.50% | 14.46% |

| **B** LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|
| In Neighbourhood | 987 | 26,513 |
| % of city total in this Neighbourhood | 3.72% | |
| As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD | 68.63% | |
| As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households | | 64.17% |

| **C** HOUSEHOLDS WITH  DEPENDENT CHILDREN | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|
| In Neighbourhood | 1,806 | 65,612 |
| % of city total in this Neighbourhood | 2.75% | |
| As a percentage of Households with dependent children | 24.50% | 22.96% |

| **D** HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|
| In Neighbourhood | 1,401 | 48,451 |
| % of city population all over 65  in Neighbourhood | 2.89% | |
| **Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s** | 19.00% | 16.96% |
| **Single person households over 65** | 1069 | 36,508 |

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

| | N/hood | |
|---|---|---|
| % of city population single over 65  in Neighbourhood | 2.93% | |

| % of households single person over 65  as a proportion of all households | 14.50% | 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 | 2477 | 86,728 |
|---|---|---|
| Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD | 33.60% | 30.35% |

**2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

**Commentary**

A  The neighbourhood has one of the highest rates of lone parenthood in the city

B  The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of lone parent families containing dependent children

C  The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of households with dependent children

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

E  The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of single person households under 65

**Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood is uncharacteristic in that it has high levels of lone parenthood, higher proportions of single elderly and single working age households. This suggests some imbalance in terms of household types within the  area.

## 3  HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

| | Frequency | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|---|
| Occupied by One person | 3,546 | 48.10% | 43.13% |
| Occupied by Two people | 2,162 | 29.33% | 30.35% |
| Occupied by Three people | 888 | 12.04% | 13.71% |
| Occupied by Four people | 489 | 6.63% | 8.41% |
| Occupied by Five people | 205 | 2.78% | 3.16% |
| Occupied by Six people | 56 | 0.76% | 0.73% |
| Occupied by Seven people | 16 | 0.22% | 0.26% |
| Occupied by Eight or more people | 9 | 0.12% | 0.16% |
| **ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES** | **7,371** | | |

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

**Commentary**

The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of single person households and a lower than average proportion of 2 - 5 person households.

**Housing Policy Implications**

The neighbourhood appears to be have a shortage of two or more person households. Consideration could be given to the impact on the sustainability of the area as a preferred residential destination for newly forming households of two persons or more.

## 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) | 2,230 | 953 | 3956 | | | 7,139 |
| | 31.23% | 13.34% | 55.41% | | | |
| **TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)** | 2,345 | 801 | 3,974 | 67 | 184 | 7,371 |
| | 31.81% | 10.87% | 53.91% | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| **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**
Apart from an increase in the proportion of privately rented properties, the tenure pattern has not changed a great deal

**Housing Policy Implications**

Lack of tenure choice, particularly in terms of lack of opportunities for home ownership may be preventing population growth within the neighbourhood. Overall stock may be in line with current local demand, however, for the population to grow there needs to be a boost in the numbers of properties available to meet projected city wide demand across all tenures.

## 5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source:  2011  Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

| | N/hood | % of stock | City | % of stock |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Detached | 85 | 1.15% | 11,167 | 3.91% |
| Semi detached | 544 | 7.38% | 36,522 | 12.78% |
| Terraced | 618 | 8.38% | 33,423 | 11.70% |
| Tenement | 6,028 | 81.78% | 197,146 | 69.00% |
| Conversion (within an original property) | 37 | 0.50% | 5,540 | 1.90% |
| Within a commercial building | 23 | 0.31% | 1,017 | 0.35% |
| Caravan/mobile structure | 2 | 0.03% | 348 | 0.12% |
| Shared dwelling | 34 | 0.46% | 630 | 0.22% |
| | **7,371** | | **285,793** | |

**5. HOUSE TYPE**
**Commentary**
The neighbourhood is dominated by the tenement /multi storey form.  There are very low proportions of houses.
**Housing Policy Implications**

Whilst traditionally a high density community, the extent of demolition and new build over a long number of years together with the topography and industrial heritage appear to have limited variation.  The area could benefit from a more varied provision of house types to meet a range of needs, and it suggested that vacant sites be considered for the provision of lower density residential accommodation

**6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**  (Source:  2011  Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

|  | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|
| **A Average Household size** | 1.9 | 2.02 |

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**          **As a proportion of households counted**

|  |  | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Occupied Household count* |  | 5,408 | 202,466 |
| Up to 0.5 persons per room | 5,163 | 95.47% | 96.5.% |
| Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room | 163 | 3.01% | 2.52% |
| Over 1.5 persons per room | 82 | 1.51% | 0.95% |
|  | **5,408** |  |  |

**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 | 7371 | 763 | 2539 | 3302 | 44.8 | 2699 | 1370 | 18.59 |
| Owned | 2412 | 453 | 1039 | 1492 | 61.86 | 654 | 266 | 11.03 |
| Private rented or living rent free | 985 | 74 | 316 | 390 | 39.59 | 344 | 251 | 25.48 |
| Social rented | 3974 | 236 | 1184 | 1420 | 35.73 | 1701 | 853 | 21.46 |
| **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**

**A** Average household size is well below the city average

**B** In spite of the above, there is higher household density relative to the size of properties

**C** There is a slightly higher rate of overcrowding in the owner occupied sector than the city average and there is greater underoccupation in the rental sectors.

**Housing Policy Implications**

Whilst the current housing stock appears to fit the current population, the problem of depopulation remains an issue to be addressed, particularly the need to attract in more families with children.

(Source:  2011  Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

| | N/hood | N/hood | City | City |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **7 HEATING TYPE** (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles) | | | | |
| Occupied household spaces | | 7,371 | | |
| **Occupied household spaces with no central heating** | 283 | 3.83% | 11,379 | 3.98% |

**7. HEATING TYPE**
**Commentary**
The proportion of dwellings without central heating is in line with the city average. However, this may belie the extent of fuel poverty in the area

**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** | | **7,629** | **293,876** |
| Vacant household spaces | 253 | 3.32% | 2.59% |
| Second residence/holiday home | 5 | 0.06% | 0.19% |
| Occupied | 7371 | 96.62% | 97.21% |

**8. VACANCIES**
**Commentary**

At the time of the Census, the neighbourhood had one of the highest vacancy rates in the city

**Housing Policy Implications**

The vacancy rate may have reduced, however, there may be an underlying problem of demand which is likely to be linked to the availability of certain property types

## 9  HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Total Residents in neighbourhood**          **14,189**

| **A Long term health/disability in a household** | **N/hood** | **N/hood** | **City** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Day to day activity limited a lot | 2,270 | 15.99% | 11.37% |
| Day to day activity limited a little | 1,597 | 11.25% | 9.20% |
| Day to day activity not limited | 10,322 | 72.74% | 79.43% |

| **B Long term health condition in a household** | **N/hood** | **N/hood** | **City** |
|---|---|---|---|
| No condition | 9,202 | 64.85% | 69.01% |
| Physical disability | 1,336 | 9.41% | 7.82% |
| Mental health condition | 1,129 | 7.95% | 6.51% |
| Deafness or partial hearing loss | 966 | 6.81% | 6.08% |
| Blindness of partial sight loss | 426 | 3.00% | 2.49% |
| Learning disability | 90 | 0.63% | 0.58% |
| Learning difficulty | 299 | 2.10% | 2.14% |
| Development disorder | 113 | 0.79% | 0.64% |

**C Provision of Care in a household**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week | 487 | 3.43% | 4.29% |
| 20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week | 307 | 2.16% | 1.92% |
| 50 or more hours unpaid care per week | 445 | 3.13% | 2.88% |

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1,219 | 11.58% | 8.43% |

**9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME**

**Commentary**

A The neighbourhood has a higher than average population whose day to day activity is severely limited

B Across the board, there is a higher than average proportion of the population with significant health condition

C Slightly higher levels of unpaid care are required at the 20 - 49 hours per week level

D The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of residents of working age who have a long term sickness or disability

**Housing Policy Implications**

It would be useful to housing providers to measure the extent to which they can adapt existing properties to ensure that residents, particularly ageing residents can maintain independence and sustain tenancies. In this regard, joint working with heath care providers may be relevant

|  | CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|---|

### A  ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

| Ethnic Origin | Frequency | N/hood | City |
|---|---|---|---|
| White British or Irish | 11,710 | 82.53% | 84.56% |
| White Other | 278 | 1.96% | 3.87% |
| Mixed or multiple ethnic groups | 45 | 0.32% | 0.48% |
| Indian | 116 | 0.82% | 1.46% |
| Pakistani | 236 | 1.66% | 3.78% |
| Bangladeshi | 31 | 0.21% | 0.08% |
| Chinese | 422 | 2.97% | 1.79% |
| Other Asian | 232 | 1.63% | 0.94% |
| African, Caribbean or Black | 1,000 | 7.04% | 2.40% |
| Other ethnic group | 119 | 0.84% | 0.64% |
| **14,189** | | | |

### B  Country of Birth

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Born outside UK | 1,936 | 13.64% | 12.24% |

### C  Spoken English

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not speak English well or at all | 566 | 3.98% | 2.59% |

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

A The neighbourhood appears to have a higher proportion of non-native residents. At the time of the Census there is likely to have been a high proportion of overseas students and workers and asylum seekers living in the multi storey flats and other properties in the area, which may explain the significant variation from neighbourhoods with similar tenure characteristics

B The above is reflected in the higher than average proportion of the population born outside the UK

C The higher than average proportion of residents who do not speak English well or at all reflects the nature of the those ethnic groups who were settled temporarily or permanently in the neighbourhood at the time of the Census

**Housing Policy Implications**

Proposals for the redevelopment of those parts of the neighbourhood where demolition has taken place should take into account the context of change in the area and the possibility that certain ethnic groups may want to remain or be rehoused in the redeveloping parts of the neighbourhood

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

**11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)**

Economically active

Economically inactive

| | N/Hood % | City% |
|---|---|---|
| Never worked and long term unemployed | | |
| Full time students | **58.34%** | 64.49% |
| Retired | **41.66%** | 35.51% |
| | **14.33%** | 9.05% |
| **12 Car Ownership** | **8.83%** | 13.73% |
| Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va | **13.02%** | 11.32% |

| **Commentary** | **N/Hood** | **City** |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | **37.49%** | 49.18% |
| From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or are long term unemployed is substantially above the city average | | |

**Springburn with RSL Stock**

**Legend**

- RSL Stock
- Neighbourhood Boundary