

TOLLCROSS & WEST SHETTLESTON 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		2,607	10,675	2,184	15,466
	N/hood %		16.86%	69.02%	14.12%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES		Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency		2,689	10,856	2,182	15,727
	N/hood %		17.10%	69.03%	13.87%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**Commentary**Total population **increase of 261 (1.68%)**

Higher proportion of children in the N/hood than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood appears balanced, however the higher proportion of children may have some implications in terms of housing need.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood **7,804**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,443	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.49%	
Proportion of all households	18.49%	14.46%

LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
B In Neighbourhood	972	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	3.66%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	67.35%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,951	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.97%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	25.00%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1349	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.78%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	17.28%	16.96%

Single person households over 65 1042 36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	2.85%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	13.35%	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	2482	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	31.80%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

There is a higher proportion of single parent families **A** in the neighbourhood compared to the city average

There is a higher proportion of lone parent families **B** with dependent children than the city average

The neighbourhood has one of the highest rates of **C** households with dependent children in the city

The proportion of single person households over 65 **D** is in line with the city average

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

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is characterised by a younger population with current and potential specific child-related housing need

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	3,524	45.16%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	2,183	27.98%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	1,239	15.87%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	605	7.75%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	200	2.56%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	39	0.50%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	11	0.14%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	3	0.04%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	7,804		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

There is above average representation of one and three person households but this is not matched by two person households suggesting a predominance of singles and small families

Housing Policy Implications

There is scope for more two person and larger family provision

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)	2,973	1,360	3,668			8,234
	36.10%	16.51%	44.52%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,964	1,040	3,666	86	48	7,804
	37.98%	13.32%	46.97%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimate Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	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

The share of private rented housing has increased mainly at the expense of owner occupation

Housing Policy Implications

There may be management implications in respect of common property maintenance in mixed tenure areas

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	232	2.97%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,181	15.13%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	661	8.47%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	5,603	71.79%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	52	0.66%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	40	0.51%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	33	0.42%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	2	0.02%	630	0.22%
	7,804		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Nearly three quarters of stock is in tenement form, reflecting the older suburban parts of Shettleston and Tollcross. The area contains a higher than average proportion of tenements, though it is likely that this includes 4 in a block flatted stock.

Housing Policy Implications

Where sites are available and could be built upon, consideration could be given to increasing the number of low density family houses, which may allow more tenement stock to take two person households.

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	1.97	2.02

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	5,388	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	5,203	96.56%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	138	2.56%
Over 1.5 persons per room	47	0.87%

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	7804	942	2262	3204	41.05	3114	1486	19.04
Owned	3050	673	1110	1783	58.45	908	359	11.77
Private rented or living rent free	1088	49	273	322	29.59	493	273	25.09
Social rented	3666	220	879	1099	29.98	1713	854	23.29
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** Household size is lower than the city average
- B** Room density is close to the city average

There is less underoccupation across all tenures in the neighbourhood compared to the city

- C** average, but slightly more overcrowding overall

Housing Policy Implications

The higher levels of overcrowding suggest the need to provide some additional family accommodation

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Occupied household spaces

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
Occupied household spaces		7,804		
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	295	3.78%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

Uptake of central heating in the neighbourhood is in line with the city average

Housing Policy Implications

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

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		7,996	293,876
Vacant household spaces	189	2.36%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	3	0.03%	0.19%
Occupied	7804	97.60%	97.21%
	7996		

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

Vacancy rates are very close to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	15,466		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	2,586	16.72%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	1,704	11.01%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	11,176	72.26%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	10,103	65.32%	69.01%
Physical disability	1,487	9.61%	7.82%
Mental health condition	1,165	7.53%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	1,078	6.97%	6.08%
Blindness or partial sight loss	447	2.89%	2.49%
Learning disability	126	0.81%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	371	2.40%	2.14%
Development disorder	91	0.59%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	666	4.30%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	364	2.35%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	556	3.59%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	1,386	11.73%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A higher than average proportion of residents

A have difficulty with day to day activity.

A higher proportion of the population have some

B limiting condition across the board

There is a higher proportion of residents

requiring all three categories of care time, which

C may reflect the elderly population profile

There is a higher average incidence of long term

D sickness and disability

Housing Policy Implications

There is clearly a need to address disability, lack of mobility and care support. It would be worth carrying out local assessments to determine the locus and nature of any housing related care provision required

		CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY		N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census A Neighbourhood Profiles)					
Ethnic Origin					
Frequency					
White British or Irish	14,150	91.49%			84.56%
White Other	786	5.08%			3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	28	0.19%			0.48%
Indian	73	0.50%			1.46%
Pakistani	85	0.59%			3.78%
Bangladeshi	4	0.02%			0.08%
Chinese	87	0.60%			1.79%
Other Asian	49	0.33%			0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	168	1.16%			2.40%
Other ethnic group	36	0.24%			0.64%
	15,466				
B Country of Birth					
Born outside UK	1,127	7.28%			12.24%
C Spoken English					
Does not speak English well or at all	427	2.76%			2.59%

10. ETHNICITY**Commentary**

The neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion of White British or Irish, but also a higher proportion of 'White Other' possibly reflecting an

A influx of Eastern European (mainly Polish) population

This is reflected in the relatively high proportion of residents born outwith the UK, in comparison with neighbourhoods with similar demographic and

B housing stock and tenure characteristics

The proportion of residents who do not speak English well or at all is very slightly higher than the city

C average.

Housing Policy Implications

The area is likely to continue to be attractive to Eastern European settlers, possibly because of the house types available in the area. Housing costs may also be a factor but this would need to be tested. The implication is that demand for housing in all tenures may rise in the neighbourhood, therefore local providers should consider planning for population increase on the assumption that new two person households will form leading to a demand for larger family accommodation in the area if these new families are to settle permanently.

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	64.16%	64.49%
Economically inactive	35.84%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	10.25%	9.05%
Full time students	7.27%	13.73%
Retired	12.08%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	42.99%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a similar proportion of its population in employment to the city average, 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 just above the city average

