# SHAWLANDS & STRATHBUNGO 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	1,135	6,899	1,020	9,054
	N/hood %	12.54%	76.20%	11.27%	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,205	6,930	1,088	9,223
	N/hood %	13.07%	75.14%	11.80%	
	cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

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

Commentary

Total population increase of 169 (1.87%)

High working age population in the N/hood

Slightly lower proportion of children and people over 65

## **Housing Policy Implications**

Appears to be an area of modest growth Provision of new supply to meet demand may be a consideration

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

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood 4,784

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	323	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.78%	
Proportion of all households	6.75%	14.46%
<b>B</b> LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	168	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.63%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in	52.040/	
N/HOOD	52.01%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%
<b>C</b> HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	744	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.13%	03,012
	1.1370	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	15.55%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	518	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.07%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	10.83%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	458	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neigl	nbourhood)	
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood % of households single person over 65 as a proportion of	1.25%	
all households	9.57%	12.78%
E ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	N/hood	City
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neigl	nbourhood)	
ONE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER 65	1,795	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	37.52%	30.35%
	_	
2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION		
Commentary		
The neighbourhood has a significantly lower proportion		
<b>A</b> of single parent households than in the city as a whole		

The neighbourhood has a lower proportion of lone parent households with dependent children than the city **B** average

The overall proportion of households with dependent **C** children is much higher than the city average

The neighbourhood has a similar proportion of over 65 **D** year old households compared to the city average

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

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

Clearly there is demand from young and newly forming household to buy or rent a tenement within the neighbourhood. Additional provision is likely to be taken up. However the needs of family households also need to be considered

#### **3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

	Frequency	N/hood	City	
Occupied by One person	2,253	47.09%	43.13%	
Occupied by Two people	1,626	33.99%	30.35%	
Occupied by Three people	451	9.43%	13.71%	
Occupied by Four people	277	5.79%	8.41%	
Occupied by Five people	131	2.74%	3.16%	
Occupied by Six people	25	0.52%	0.73%	
Occupied by Seven people	9	0.19%	0.26%	
Occupied by Eight or more people	12	0.25%	0.16%	
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	4,784			

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE** Commentary Higher proportion of one and two person households **Housing Policy Implications** Many of the traditional tenements are likely to be suited to one and two person households

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

4 HOUSING TENURE (Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless of						stated)
				Shared		
	Owner	Private	Social	ownershi		
	Occupied	Rented	Rented	р	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	2,751	1882	356			4,989
	55.14%	37.72%	7.14%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	2,822	1,477	434	9	42	4,784
	58.99%	30.87%	9.07%	0.19%	0.88%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates ar	n 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 proportions of owner occupiers and private renters in the N/hood. Very low level of social rented provision Housing Policy Implications Area traditionally associated with first time buyers market. However there is likely to be demand for some additional social rented housing given the rise in PRS accommodation whose occupants might otherwise have opted for social rented housing

## **5 HOUSE TYPE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	41	0.86%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	192	4.01%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	487	10.18%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	3,802	79.47%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	249	5.20%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	6	0.13%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.02%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	6	0.13%	630	0.22%
	4,784		285,793	

# 5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

Very high proportion of householders living in tenement stock.

## Housing Policy Implications

Provision of more varied and larger dwellings may have the effect of accelerating local demand

## **6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

		N/hood	City
A Average Household size		1.87	2.02
<b>B</b> Dwelling Occupancy Rates		As a propo	rtion of households counted
		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		3,608	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,522	97.62%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	68	1.88%	2.52%

18 **3,608** 

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy 2

Over 1.5 persons per room

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

0.95%

		(5601661 661			eignoeume	84)		
		Occupanc						
		y rating	Occupanc	Total			Occupanc	
	All	+2 or	y rating	Underocc	Underocc	Occupanc	y rating -1	Overcrow
NEIGHBOURHOOD	households	more	+1	upation	upied %	y rating 0	or less	ded %
All households	4784	875	1422	2297	48.01	1797	690	14.42
Owned	2831	766	905	1671	59.02	911	249	8.79
Private rented or living rent free	1519	89	388	477	31.4	713	329	21.66
Social rented	434	20	129	149	34.33	173	112	25.8
СІТҮ								
All households	285693	53242	83843	137085	47.98	98916	4969 <b>2</b>	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

0.50%

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION					
Commentary					
Average household size is lower than the city					
A average					
Lower proportion of those sharing bedrooms in the					
<b>B</b> area compared to city average					
There are lower levels of underoccupation.					
Overcrowding appears to be an issue only in the					
C social rented sector					
Housing Policy Implications					
The provision of some new social rented housing to					
meet a range of need should be considered					
	(Source: 2011	Census Neig	hbourhood F	Profiles unless of	otherwise sta
	(Source: 2011 N/hood	Census Neig <b>N/hood</b>	hbourhood F <b>City</b>	Profiles unless o <b>City</b>	otherwise sta
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)					otherwise sta
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles) Occupied household spaces					otherwise sta
		N/hood			otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary Higher proportion of residents living without central	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary Higher proportion of residents living without central	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary Higher proportion of residents living without central heating compared to the city average	N/hood	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta
Occupied household spaces Occupied household spaces with no central heating 7. HEATING TYPE Commentary Higher proportion of residents living without central heating compared to the city average Housing Policy Implications	N/hood 265	<b>N/hood</b> 4,784	City	City	otherwise sta

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

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		4,912	293,876
Vacant household spaces	124	2.52%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	4	0.08%	0.19%
Occupied	4,784	97.39%	97.21%

# 8. VACANCIES

**Commentary** Vacancy rate is similar to the city average

Housing Policy Implications None

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

Total Residents in neighbourhood	9,054		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	637	7.04%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	773	8.54%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,644	84.43%	79.43%

<b>B</b> Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6,825	75.38%	69.01%
Physical disability	409	4.52%	7.82%
Mental health condition	462	5.10%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	420	4.64%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	151	1.67%	2.49%
Learning disability	25	0.28%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	166	1.83%	2.14%
Development disorder	31	0.34%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	427	4.72%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	101	1.12%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	150	1.66%	2.88%
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a D household	281	3.79%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME

N/hood residents have less mobility issues compared

N/hood residents have less long-term conditions

N/hood residents affected are less likely to require

Commentary

A to the city as a whole

**B** compared with the city average

**C** longer long term unpaid care

The proportion of the population which is reported as being long term sick or disabled is much lower **D** than the city average

#### **Housing Policy Implications**

Older residents living on their own are likely to require some social care provision or adaptation in the near to medium term

#### CENSUS

PROFILE

SUMMARY N/hood City

# ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	7,288	80.49%	84.56%
White Other	401	4.43%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	79	0.87%	0.48%
Indian	165	1.82%	1.46%
Pakistani	791	8.74%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	11	0.12%	0.08%
Chinese	53	0.59%	1.79%
Other Asian	94	1.04%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	137	1.51%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	35	0.39%	0.64%
	9,054		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	1,261	13.93%	12.24%

# C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all

224	2 F 00/
/ 34	2.30%
	2.00/0

2.59%

.

	10. ETHNICITY			
	Commentary			
	Majority of the N/hood made up of White (British) and			
	White (Irish), also a large proportion of Pakistani			
Α	residents			
	Larger proportion of residents born outside the UK than			
В	in the city as a whole			
-	Slightly lower proportion of residents who do not speak			
r				
L	English well or at compared to the city average			
	Housing Policy Implications			
	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	77.00%	64.49%
Economically inactive	23.00%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	5.33%	9.05%
Full time students	8.34%	13.73%
Retired	9.65%	11.32%
12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	59.99%	49.18%

#### Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a very high proportion of its population in employment. There is a lower proportion of students living at home. The neighbourhood has a lower 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

