

**CROFTFOOT 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		1,298	4,437	703	6,438
	N/hood %		20.16%	68.92%	10.92%	
	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		1,245	4,356	781	<b>6,382</b>
	N/hood %		19.51%	68.25%	12.24%	
	cf city %		16.13	69.94	13.93	

**1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT**

**Commentary**

Population has **decreased** by 56  
 Higher proportion of children compared to the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

No obvious implications

**2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

**Total Households in neighbourhood**                      **2,716**

<b>A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	536	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.29%	
Proportion of all households	19.73%	14.46%

<b>B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	380	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.43%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	70.89%	
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	925	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.41%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children	34.05%	22.96%

<b>D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
In Neighbourhood	400	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.70%	
<b>Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s</b>	14.72%	16.96%

<b>Single person households over 65</b>	256	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.70%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	9.42%	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	494	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD	18.18%	30.35%

## 2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

### Commentary

**A** There is a very high level of lone parenthood

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

Overall, there is a higher proportion of households  
**C** with dependent children than the city average

Despite the slight shift in age cohorts by 2014 older  
**D** households are under-represented

There is a very low rate of single households under  
E 65

**Housing Policy Implications**

The composition of the population probably reflects the mixed tenure nature of the neighbourhood, so caution should be exercised in identifying clear housing policy implications

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	750	27.61%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	915	33.68%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	555	20.43%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	340	12.52%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	123	4.52%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	24	0.88%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	5	0.18%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	4	0.15%	0.16%
<b>ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES</b>	<b>2,716</b>		

**3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE**

**Commentary**

The neighbourhood has higher than average proportions of 2, 3 and 4 person households probably reflecting the suburban nature of the neighbourhood

**Housing Policy Implications**

There is clearly high demand for family accommodation in this area

**4 HOUSING TENURE**

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	Owner Occupied	Private Rented	Social Rented	Shared ownership	Rent free	Total
<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD</b>						
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (2014)</b> (Housing Stock Estimate)	1,963	715	73			2,751
	71.35%	25.99%	2.65%			
<b>TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)</b>	2,057	527	104	4	24	2,716
	75.73%	19.40%	3.83%			
<b>CITY</b>						
<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	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 neighbourhood has one of the highest concentrations of private rented property in the city. It suggests both owner occupied properties and social rented properties have been purchased for private renting since 2011, in what was already an area with an established market in private renting.

**Housing Policy Implications**

There may be a need to monitor the registration of landlords and the adherence to regulations in what was a traditionally an area with a market for first, second and third time home owners, and also the limited options for would-be home owners. The decline in the proportion of social rented housing coupled with already low numbers is a cause for concern.

**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>
<b>Detached</b>	185	6.81%	11,167	3.91%
<b>Semi detached</b>	158	5.82%	36,522	12.78%
<b>Terraced</b>	67	2.47%	33,423	11.70%
<b>Tenement</b>	2,260	83.21%	197,146	69.00%
<b>Conversion (within an original property)</b>	38	1.40%	5,540	1.90%
<b>Within a commercial building</b>	1	0.04%	1,017	0.35%
<b>Caravan/mobile structure</b>	1	0.04%	348	0.12%
<b>Shared dwelling</b>	6	0.22%	630	0.22%
	<b>2,716</b>		<b>285,793</b>	

**5. HOUSE TYPE**

**Commentary**

Four in a block properties are classed as tenements. The neighbourhood has a very high proportion of this particular house type.

**Housing Policy Implications**

The area is likely to continue to attract family households

**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>	2.37	2.02

**B Dwelling Occupancy Rates**

As a proportion of households counted

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	1,726	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	1,665	96.46%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	46	2.66%
Over 1.5 persons per room	15	0.86%
	<b>1,726</b>	

**C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy** (Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD</b>	All households	Occupancy rating +2 or more	Occupancy rating +1	Total Underoccupation	Underoccupied %	Occupancy rating 0	Occupancy rating -1 or less	Overcrowded %
All households	2716	884	961	1845	67.93	602	269	9.9
Owned	2061	778	709	1487	72.15	408	166	8.05
Private rented or living rent free	551	91	224	315	57.17	150	86	15.61
Social rented	104	15	28	43	41.35	44	17	16.34
<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**

There is a slightly higher than average

**A** household size

Densities are in line with city average and

**B** stock profile

At the time of the Census, there was very little evidence of overcrowding and

**C** underoccupancy rates were high.

**Housing Policy Implications**

None at time of Census

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>N/hood</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>City</b>
<b>7 HEATING TYPE</b> (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces		2,716		
<b>Occupied household spaces with no central heating</b>	67	2.46%	11,379	3.98%

**7. HEATING TYPE**

**Commentary**

Neighbourhood has higher than average proportion of properties with central heating.

**Housing Policy Implications**

Some investigation in to the thermal efficiency of properties should be considered, given the age and nature of the main stock types



**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>2,760</b>	<b>293,876</b>
Vacant household spaces	44	1.59%	2.59%
Second residence/holiday home	0	0.00%	0.19%
Occupied	2716	98.41%	97.21%

**8. VACANCIES**

**Commentary**

There appear to be no issues with demand

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

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

**Total Residents in neighbourhood** 6,438

<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	508	7.89%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	555	8.62%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	5,375	83.48%	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	4,740	73.62%	69.01%
Physical disability	326	5.06%	7.82%
Mental health condition	244	3.79%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	305	4.74%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	79	1.22%	2.49%
Learning disability	22	0.34%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	127	1.97%	2.14%
Development disorder	36	0.56%	0.64%

<b>C Provision of Care in a household</b>			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	305	4.73%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	127	1.97%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	173	2.68%	2.88%

<b>Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household</b>	234	4.84%	8.43%
---	-----	-------	-------

## 9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

### Commentary

There is a lower proportion of the population  
**A** with a limiting condition than the city average

On all major disabilities, the proportion of the population stating that they suffer from any of  
**B** these conditions is lower than the city average

In relation to unpaid care, only the 1 - 19 and 20-49 hours per week category are slightly **C** above the city average

There is a lower proportion of the working age population with a long term sickness or **D** disability compared to the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

None

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMAR Y	N/hood	City
<b>ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS</b> (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)			
<b>Ethnic Origin</b>	Frequency		
White British or Irish	6,039	93.80%	<b>84.56%</b>
White Other	129	2.00%	<b>3.87%</b>
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	20	0.31%	<b>0.48%</b>
Indian	42	0.65%	<b>1.46%</b>
Pakistani	140	2.17%	<b>3.78%</b>
Bangladeshi	0	0.00%	<b>0.08%</b>
Chinese	23	0.35%	<b>1.79%</b>
Other Asian	11	0.17%	<b>0.94%</b>
African, Caribbean or Black	29	0.45%	<b>2.40%</b>
Other ethnic group	5	0.07%	<b>0.64%</b>
	<b>6,438</b>		

**B Country of Birth**

Born outside UK	348	5.40%	<b>12.24%</b>
-----------------	-----	-------	---------------

**C Spoken English**

Does not speak English well or at all	68	1.05%	<b>2.59%</b>
---------------------------------------	----	-------	--------------

**10. ETHNICITY**

**Commentary**

- Higher proportion of White (British or Irish) than **A** city as a whole
- Lower proportion of residents born outside UK **B** than rest of city
- The proportion of non-English speakers is lower **C** than the city average

**Housing Policy Implications**

Neighbourhood appears to be less attractive to ethnic minority communities. Providers should consider marketing of properties for a wider diversity of ethnic groups

**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>74.21%</b>	64.49%
Economically inactive	<b>25.79%</b>	35.51%
Never worked and long term unemployed	<b>4.86%</b>	9.05%
Full time students	<b>8.87%</b>	13.73%
Retired	<b>9.95%</b>	11.32%

**12 Car Ownership**

	<b>N/Hood</b>	<b>City</b>
Proportion of Households with one or more cars or	<b>66.49%</b>	49.18%

**Commentary**

The neighbourhood has a high proportion of its population in employment and has a lower proportion of students living at home. However, the neighbourhood also has a lower proportion of retired persons under 74 years of age compared to the city average. There is a high level of car ownership

From a housing affordability perspective, those residents who have never worked or who are long term unemployed is half the city average

