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	1,816	5,063	675	**7,554**
N/hood %	24.04	68.34	8.93	
cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	

2014 POPULATION ESTIMATES Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
Frequency	1,875	5,375	751	**8,001**
N/hood %	23.43	67.18	9.39	
cf city %	16.13	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT
Commentary
Population **increase** of 447 (5.92%)

Growth in older households, but very high proportion of children living in the neighbourhood

Housing Policy Implications
Growing area may attract a range of age groups and household sizes

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood   **2,811**

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	392	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.95%	
Proportion of all households	13.94%	14.46%

B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	286	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.08%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	72.96%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households		64.17%

C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,199	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.83%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	42.65%	22.96%

D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS

	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	272	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.56%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	9.67%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	486	36,508

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

% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.33%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	17.29%	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	752	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	26.75%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

A The neighbourhood has a significantly lower proportion of single parent households compared to the city as a whole

B Conversely there is a higher proportion of lone parent households with dependent children

C There is a higher proportion of households with dependent children

D The proportion of older households is lower than the city average, however single households over 65 are higher than average

E There is a lower proportion of singles under 65

Housing Policy Implications
The neighbourhood has a more mixed age and household type composition than other neighbourhoods in the city. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from the analysis

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	730	25.96%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	772	27.46%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	552	19.64%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	493	17.54%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	185	6.58%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	48	1.71%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	18	0.64%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	13	0.46%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	**2,811**		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE
Commentary
Household size pattern does not reflect city wide picture

Housing Policy Implications
The area looks to be shaping into an outer suburb suited to families

4 HOUSING TENURE

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	1,919	398	652			2,969
	64.63%	13.40%	21.96%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,886	254	631	30	10	2,811
	67.09%	9.03%	22.44%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014)(Housing Stock Estimates and 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
Neighbourhood is largely owner occupied. There has been a recent rise in the numbers and proportions of rented properties

Housing Policy Implications
None

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	667	23.73%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	1,079	38.38%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	379	13.48%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	656	23.33%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	25	0.89%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	2	0.07%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.03%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	2	0.07%	630	0.22%
	2,811		**285,793**	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary
The proportion of low density housing reflects the shift towards the n/hood becoming a largely owner occupied suburb

Housing Policy Implications
None

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.62	2.02

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

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		1,705	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	1,614	94.66%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	64	3.75%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	27	1.58%	0.95%

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	2811	873	788	1661	59.09	813	337	11.99
Owned	1916	797	546	1343	70.09	408	165	8.61
Private rented or living rent free	264	33	83	116	43.94	101	47	17.8
Social rented	631	43	159	202	32.01	304	125	19.81

CITY

	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
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

A Higher average household size

B Density per room is higher than city average

There is little evidence of overcrowding in any tenure compared to the city average. Underoccupation is
C slightly higher in the private sector

Housing Policy Implications

No significant issues identified

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces				
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	59	2.09%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE
Commentary
The proportion of those living without central heating in the area is lower than the city as a whole

Housing Policy Implications
None

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		**2,849**	**293,876**
Vacant household spaces	18	0.63%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	20	0.70%	0.19%
Occupied	2811	98.67%	97.21%

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ 8. VACANCIES                                    │
│ Commentary                                      │
│ Very low vacancy rate                           │
│                                                 │
│ Housing Policy Implications                     │
│ None                                            │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood   **7,554**

A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	715	9.46%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	544	7.33%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	6,295	83.33%	79.43%

B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	5,717	75.68%	69.01%
Physical disability	402	5.32%	7.82%
Mental health condition	319	4.22%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	291	3.85%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	112	1.48%	2.49%
Learning disability	25	0.33%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	114	1.51%	2.14%
Development disorder	50	0.66%	0.64%

C Provision of Care in a household

1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	319	4.22%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	117	1.55%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	165	2.18%	2.88%

Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a
D household   296   5.47%   8.43%

---

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

A A much lower proportion of the population have problems or disabilities which limit day to day activities

B The proportion of all specifically identified medical conditions are below the city average

C Apart from higher unpaid care needs limited to less than 20 hours per week, demand on unpaid carers appears to be lower than the city average

D The proportion of the population with a long term sickness or disability is considerably below the city average

Housing Policy Implications

None

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City

ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census

A Neighbourhood Profiles)

Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	5,724	75.77%	**84.56%**
White Other	70	0.92%	**3.87%**
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	33	0.44%	**0.48%**
Indian	222	2.94%	**1.46%**
Pakistani	1,161	15.36%	**3.78%**
Bangladeshi	1	0.01%	**0.08%**
Chinese	214	2.83%	**1.79%**
Other Asian	54	0.71%	**0.94%**
African, Caribbean or Black	42	0.55%	**2.40%**
Other ethnic group	33	0.43%	**0.64%**
	7,554		

B Country of Birth

Born outside UK	864	11.43%	**12.24%**

C Spoken English

Does not speak English well or at all	266	3.52%	**2.59%**

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

A With the exception of a substantial Pakistani community and a small but growing Chinese community, the area is mainly populated by white British or Irish

B The proportion of residents born outwith the UK is just below the city average

C A higher proportion of residents do not have a English as a first language compared to the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There are no obvious policy issues. It is possible that
the area could attract more minority ethnic residents

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	73.24%	64.49%
Economically inactive	26.76%	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	7.72%	9.05%
Full time students	9.44%	13.73%
Retired	8.80%	11.32%

12 Car Ownership	N/Hood	City
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or vans	72.99%	49.18%

Commentary

The Neighbourhood has a higher than average proportion
of its population in employment. There is a slightly higher
than expected proportion of students living at home. The
neighbourhood has a lower than average proportion of
retired persons under 74 years. There is also a higher level
of car ownership compared to the city average
From a housing affordability perspective, the proportion of
residents who have never worked or who are long term
unemployed is lower than the city average

South Nitshill & Darnley with RSL Stock

Waterside

South Nitshill

Nitshill and Darnley

Kenn

Carnwadric

Salterland Road

Bowerwalls

Darnley Road

Dovecothall

Glen Moriston Road

Nitshill Road

B773 Parkhouse Road

A726

Darnley

Arden

Brock Burn

Waulkglen Road

Aurs Burn

HEAD

back

Jenny
Lind

B769

3

M77

Lyoncross

Waukmill Glen

Waulkmill
Glen
Reservoir

Patterton
Farm Cottages

nsba
urs

Legend

- RSL Stock
- Neighbourhood Boundary

0   125   250   500   750
                                              Mtr