

**NEWLANDS & CATHCART NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE**

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

<b>2011 CENSUS</b>		<b>Age band</b>	<b>0 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>TOTAL POP</b>
	Frequency		1,117	4,560	1,141	6,818
	N/hood %		16.38%	66.88%	16.74%	
	cf city %		16.12	70.03	13.85	
<b>2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES</b>		<b>Age band</b>	<b>0 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 64</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>TOTAL POP</b>
	Frequency		1,121	4,507	1,210	6,838
	N/hood %		16.39%	65.91%	17.70%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Total population **increase** of 20

Higher proportion of over 65s than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

Very little change in population distribution. No obvious implications

**2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**Total Households in neighbourhood** **2,948**

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022 : NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	253	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.61%	
Proportion of all households	8.58%	14.46%

<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	130	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.49%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	51.38%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

<b>C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	730	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.11%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	24.76%	22.96%

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	600	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.24%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	20.35%	16.96%

<b>Single person households over 65</b>	382	36,508
---	-----	--------

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.05%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	12.96%	12.78%

<b>E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
---	---------------	-------------

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

ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	668	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	22.66%	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 proportion of lone parent households with  
 dependent children is much lower than the city  
**B** average

Proportion of households in the N/hood with  
**C** dependent children is higher than the city as a whole  
 The proportion of households over 65 in the N/hood  
**D** is much higher than the city average  
 The proportion of single person households under 65  
**E** is much lower than the city average

### Housing Policy Implications

There are no obvious housing policy implications.

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Occupied by One person	1,050	35.62%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	901	30.56%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	415	14.08%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	382	12.96%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	134	4.55%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	34	1.15%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	20	0.68%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	12	0.41%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>2,948</b>		

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

**Commentary**  
 There is a much higher proportion of three and over person households in the N/hood compared to the city as a whole, suggesting this area is popular with families

**Housing Policy Implications**  
 None

## 4 HOUSING TENURE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimates)	2,307 75.02%	548 17.82%	220 7.15%			3,075
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	2,328 78.97%	355 12.04%	222 7.53%	6 0.20%	37 1.26%	2,948
CITY						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimate)	128,641	60,465	107,167	N/A	N/A	296,273
Stock Change Comparator 2009/2014)	<b>43.40%</b>	<b>20.40%</b>	<b>36.39%</b>			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	128,436 44.95%	48,019 16.80%	104,811 36.68%	1,781 0.62%	2,646 0.93%	285,693

### 4. HOUSING TENURE CHANGE

#### Commentary

The biggest proportion of properties in the N/hood are owner occupied, far higher than the city average. Relatively low levels of social rented and private rented, however the proportion of those living in private rented properties has increased over recent years.

#### 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?

	2,307	548	0	220	<b>220</b>	3,075
--	-------	-----	---	-----	------------	-------

## 5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>% of stock</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>% of stock</b>
Detached	256	8.68%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	752	25.51%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	611	20.73%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	1,231	41.76%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	93	3.15%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	4	0.14%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.03%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	<b>2,948</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

**5. HOUSE TYPE**

**Commentary**  
 Highest proportion of households in the N/hood living in detached, semi-detached and terraced properties

**Housing Policy Implications**  
 None

## 6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>A Average Household size</b>	2.29	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

As a proportion of households counted

	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	2,239	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	2,232	99.69%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	33	1.47%
Over 1.5 persons per room	6	0.27%
<b>2,271</b>		

**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	2948	1472	649	2121	71.95	521	306	10.38
Owned	2334	1371	522	1893	81.1	301	140	5.99
Private rented or living rent free	392	62	77	139	35.46	161	92	23.47
Social rented	222	39	50	89	40.09	59	74	33.33
<b>CITY</b>								
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

Proportion of those not sharing bedrooms is

**B** higher than the city average

There is significant underoccupation. However, there also appears to be above average over crowding in the social rented sector

**Housing Policy Implications**

The relatively small number of social rented units and the overcrowding within these units suggests that additional family sized accommodation is required in the area

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
<b>7 HEATING TYPE</b> (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		2,948		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	123	4.17%	11,379	3.98%

**7. HEATING TYPE**

**Commentary**

Percentage of those without central heating in the N/hood is just above than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

It would be useful to determine which property types/tenures lack central heating



**8 VACANT PROPERTIES** (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>All Household spaces</b>		<b>3,037</b>	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	84	2.77%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	5	0.16%	0.19%
Occupied	2,948	97.07%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

Vacancy rate reflects the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

None. Housing seems to be in demand in the area

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

<b>Total Residents in neighbourhood</b>	<b>6,818</b>
---	--------------

<b>A Long term health/disability in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Day to day activity limited a lot	557	8.17%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	578	8.48%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	5,683	83.35%	79.43%

<b>B Long term health condition in a household</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
No condition	5,028	73.75%	69.01%
Physical disability	356	5.22%	7.82%
Mental health condition	241	3.53%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	403	5.91%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	144	2.11%	2.49%
Learning disability	30	0.44%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	100	1.47%	2.14%
Development disorder	34	0.50%	0.64%
<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	444	6.51%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	91	1.33%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	159	2.33%	2.88%
<b>D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	206	4.03%	8.43%

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

**Commentary**

N/hood residents have better mobility

**A** compared to the city as a whole

N/hood residents appear to 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

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**

None

**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS** (Source: Census

**A** Neighbourhood Profiles)

**Ethnic Origin**

White British or Irish

White Other

Mixed or multiple ethnic groups

Indian

Pakistani

Bangladeshi

Chinese

Other Asian

African, Caribbean or Black

Other ethnic group

CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
Frequency		
5,985	87.78%	<b>84.56%</b>
128	1.88%	<b>3.87%</b>
39	0.57%	<b>0.48%</b>
89	1.31%	<b>1.46%</b>
444	6.51%	<b>3.78%</b>
2	0.03%	<b>0.08%</b>
37	0.54%	<b>1.79%</b>
36	0.53%	<b>0.94%</b>
41	0.60%	<b>2.40%</b>
17	0.25%	<b>0.64%</b>
<b>6,818</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK	518	7.60%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all	84	1.23%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	----	-------	--------------

**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 in the

**B** N/hood compared to the rest of city

The proportion of non-English speakers is much

**C** lower than 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**

<b>11 Economic activity (All people aged 16 -74)</b>	<b>N/Hood %</b>	<b>City%</b>
Economically active	<b>70.72%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>29.28%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>4.79%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>8.98%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>14.40%</b>	11.32%

**12 Car Ownership**

	<b>N/Hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or va	<b>74.08%</b>	49.18%

**Commentary**

The neighbourhood has a high 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 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

