# POLLOKSHIELDS EAST NEIGHBOURHOOD

#### **1 POPULATION PROFILE 3-YEAR CHANGE**

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

2011 CENSUS Ag	ge band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Fri	equency	1,792	5,623	678	8,093
N/	/hood %	22.14%	69.48%	8.38%	
cf	city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES Ag	ge band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Fro	equency	1,758	5,558	640	7,956
N/	/hood %	22.10%	69.86%	8.04%	
cf	city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

3,384

#### **1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

#### Commentary

Total population **decrease** of 137 (-1.72%) Higher than average child population, much lower over 65 years of age population

#### Housing Policy Implications

The reasons for the fall in population need to be explored

# **2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	351	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.85%	
Proportion of all households	10.37%	14.46%

<b>B</b> LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILD	N/hood	City	

In Neighbourhood	244	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.92%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in		
N/HOOD	69.52%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households	7.21%	64.17%

<b>C</b> HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City	
In Neighbourhood	959	65,612	
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.46%		
As a percentage of Households with dependent			
children	28.34%	22.96%	

<b>D</b> HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	361	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood Proportion of all households which contain only	0.75%	
over 65s	10.67%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	282	36,508	
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by N	leighbourhoo	d)	
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood % of households single person over 65 as a	0.77%		
proportion of all households	8.33%	12.78%	
		<b>.</b>	
E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City	
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by N	-	· ·	
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	1,085	86,728	
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	32.06%	30.35%	
2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION			
Commontany			
<b>Commentary</b> The neighbourbood has a lower than average			
<b>Commentary</b> The neighbourhood has a lower than average <b>A</b> proportion of single parent households			
The neighbourhood has a lower than average <b>A</b> proportion of single parent households			
The neighbourhood has a lower than average			
The neighbourhood has a lower than average A proportion of single parent households The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone			
<ul> <li>The neighbourhood has a lower than average</li> <li>A proportion of single parent households</li> <li>The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone parent households with dependent children</li> <li>B compared to the city average</li> <li>The overall proportion of households with dependent</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>The neighbourhood has a lower than average</li> <li>A proportion of single parent households</li> <li>The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone parent households with dependent children</li> <li>B compared to the city average</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>The neighbourhood has a lower than average</li> <li>A proportion of single parent households</li> <li>The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone parent households with dependent children</li> <li>B compared to the city average</li> <li>The overall proportion of households with dependent</li> <li>C children is higher than the city average</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>The neighbourhood has a lower than average</li> <li>A proportion of single parent households</li> <li>The neighbourhood has a higher proportion of lone parent households with dependent children</li> <li>B compared to the city average</li> <li>The overall proportion of households with dependent</li> </ul>			

The neighbourhood a slightly higher proportion of single person under 65 households compared to the **E** city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications

None

#### **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	1,367	40.40%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	900	26.60%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	397	11.73%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	286	8.45%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	231	6.83%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	96	2.84%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	57	1.68%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	50	1.48%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	3,384		

#### **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

#### Commentary

Largest proportion of residents in the N/hood are single person householders, which is slightly below the city average.

Much higher proportion of five person+ households than the city average, suggesting larger family units in the area

# Housing Policy Implications Housing needs of larger families should be reviewed to determine if housing supply reflects that need

#### **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)	1,426	1183	865			3,474
	41.05%	34.05%	24.90%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,445	1003	866	26	44	3,384
	42.70%	29.64%	25.59%	0.77%	1.30%	
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 Higher proportion of the area in the private rented sector compared to the city average Housing Policy Implications The level of overcrowding should be considered in relation to both renting tenures

#### **5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	55	1.63%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	47	1.39%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	107	3.16%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,046	90.01%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	110	3.25%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	10	0.30%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.03%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	8	0.24%	630	0.22%
	3,384		285,793	

#### 5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Highest proportion of households living in tenemental stock, far exceeding the city average. A proportion of these are mini multi storey blocks of eight storeys and deck access maisonettes

#### Housing Policy Implications

The high proportion of tenements is likely to discourage growth of family households seeking low density living

# UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

#### **6** Average Household size

В

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Dwelling Occupancy Rates	2.38	2.02

		N/hood	City		
Occupied Household count			202,466		
Up to 0.5 persons per room	1,998	86.05%	96.5.%		
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	231	9.95%	2.52%		
Over 1.5 persons per room	93	4.01%	0.95%		
	2,322				

# As a proportion of households counted

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy 🛙		(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)						
		Occupanc						
		y rating	Occupanc	Total			Occupanc	
	All	+2 or	y rating	Underoccup	Underocc	Occupanc	y rating -1	Overcrow
NEIGHBOURHOOD	households	more	+1	ation	upied %	y rating 0	or less	ded %
All households	3384	456	856	1312	38.77	1169	903	26.68
Owned	1471	318	421	739	50.23	430	302	20.53
Private rented or living rent free	1047	82	243	325	31.04	342	380	36.29
Social rented	866	56	192	248	28.63	397	221	25.52
СІТҮ								
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 higher than the city

A average

Much higher proportion of those sharing bedrooms in the area compared to the city average, suggesting large family units living in

### ${\boldsymbol{\mathsf{B}}}$ tenements

As expected, there is substantially greater overcrowding in the neighbourhood in all tenures and correspondingly less

**C** underoccupation

# **Housing Policy Implications**

There is a need to alleviate overcrowding through a combination of providing larger family dwellings in the area and elsewhere in the city and dealing with individual properties where overcrowding is resulting in management problems and a fall in property value. However given the slight fall in population, as much of this new provision as possible should be located in the neighbourhood

	•		ghbourhood	Profiles unless oth	nerwise stated)
	N/hood	N/hood	City	City	
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profil	les)				
Occupied household spaces		3,384			
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	181	5.35%	11,379	3.98%	
	7				
7. HEATING TYPE					
Commentary					
Larger proportion of householders living without					
central heating in the area					
Housing Policy Implications					
The high incidence of properties with no central					
heating may reflect the proportion of					
unimproved private sector tenemental stock in					
the area. Action is required to identify affordable					
solutions to heat loss					

# 8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		3,481	293,876
Vacant household spaces	94	2.70%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	3	0.09%	0.19%
Occupied	3,384	97.21%	97.21%

8. VACANCIES
Commentary
Vacancy rate is in line with the city average
Housing Policy Implications
None

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

J TEAETT & DISADETT (Source: census weighbourhood Fromes)				
Total Residents in neighbourhood	8,093			
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City	
Day to day activity limited a lot	759	9.38%	11.37%	
Day to day activity limited a little	702	8.67%	9.20%	
Day to day activity not limited	6,632	81.95%	79.43%	
<b>B</b> Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City	
No condition	6,097	75.34%	69.01%	
Physical disability	465	5.75%	7.82%	
Mental health condition	420	5.19%	6.51%	
Deafness or partial hearing loss	305	3.77%	6.08%	
Blindness of partial sight loss	149	1.84%	2.49%	
Learning disability	43	0.53%	0.58%	
Learning difficulty	151	1.87%	2.14%	
Development disorder	32	0.40%	0.64%	
<b>C</b> Provision of Care in a household				
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	363	4.49%	4.29%	
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	159	1.96%	1.92%	
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	204	2.52%	2.88%	
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a				
D household	371	4.58%	8.43%	

А	<b>9. HEALTH &amp; DISABLITY IN THE HOME</b> <b>Commentary</b> N/hood residents have less mobility issues compared to the city as a whole			
	N/hood residents have less long-term conditions			
В	than the city average			
	N/hood residents affected are less likely to			
C	require shorter 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			
	None			
		CENSUS		
		PROFILE		
		SUMMARY	N/hood	City
۸	ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
~	Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
	White British or Irish	3,508	43.35%	84.56%
	White Other	316	3.90%	3.87%
	Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	81	1.00%	0.48%
	Indian	400	4.94%	1.46%
	Pakistani	3,055	37.75%	3.78%
	Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	0.08%
	Chinese	66	0.82%	1.79%
	Other Asian	172	2.13%	0.94%
	African, Caribbean or Black	343	4.24%	2.40%
	Other ethnic group	151	1.87%	0.64%
		8,093		

#### **B** Country of Birth

Born outside UK	2,586	31.95%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	657	8.12%	2.59%

# 10. ETHNICITY Commentary

# -

Very high proportion of Indian and Pakistani residents

- **A** in the N/hood, far exceeding the city average Proportion of residents born outside the UK is much
- B higher than the city as a whole
  Much larger proportion of individuals who do not speak English well or at all in the N/hood compared
  C to the city average

# **Housing Policy Implications**

The housing needs of the population should be assessed to identify housing requirements in all sectors

In housing terms, communication may be the main challenge for housing providers in terms of assessing and meeting housing need and addressing specific property related issues arising within the tenement stock.

#### 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	64.20%	64.49%
Economically inactive	35.80%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	16.09%	9.05%
Full time students	15.30%	13.73%
Retired	6.85%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City

	F3 F30/	40 4 00/
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or val	53.5/%	49.18%

#### Commentary

The Neighbourhood has around the average proportion of its population in employment. There is a significant student population resident in the neighbourhood, but a much lower proportion of retired persons under 74 years. There is also a 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 higher than the city average

