SIGHTHILL, ROYSTONHILL & GERMISTON NEIGHBOURHOOD

1 POPULATION PROFILE 5-YEAR CHANGE

(Sources: 2009 and 2014 Population Estimates by Neighbourhood; 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

2009	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	2,001	6,848	1,125	9,974
	N/hood %	20.06	68.65	11.27	
	cf city %	16.6	69.17	14.22	
2011 CENSUS	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	2,003	6,737	1,046	9,786
	N/hood %	20.46	68.84	10.68	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,696	5,880	963	8,539
	N/hood %	19.86	68.86	11.27	
	cf city %	16.12	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Population has fallen by 1435 over 5 years (14%). There has been no significant change in the proportions of age cohorts within the population, although the proportion of children remains higher than the city average, and the proportion of over 65s consistently lower.

Housing Policy Implications

The fall in population may be directly related to the reduction in housing stock arising from regeneration programmes in the neighbourhood, particularly at the Sighthill end of the Neighbourhood

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood 5,007

A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	956	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.31%	
Proportion of all households	19.09%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	668	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.52%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	69.87%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in City	03.0770	64.17%
,		
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	1,346	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	2.05%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in		
City	26.88%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL DESIDENTS OVER SE VEARS	NI/baad	Cit.
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	661	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	1.36%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	13.20%	16.96%

GLASGOW'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2017 - 2022: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILES

Single person households over 65	540	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighb	oourhood)	
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood % of households single person over 65 as a proportion of	1.48%	
all households	10.78%	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 1852 86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOOD 36.99% 30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

There is a higher proportion of single parent families in the **A** neighbourhood compared to the city average

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

There is a higher proportion of families with dependent **C** children than the city average

There is a lower proportion of single person households **D** over 65 than the city average

There is a higher proportion of single households under 65 **E** in the neighbourhood compared with the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood is characterised by a younger population with specific child-related housing need This may be reflected in local providers proposals to boost population by providing new supply.

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Occupied by One person
Occupied by Two people
Occupied by Three people
Occupied by Four people
Occupied by Five people
Occupied by Six people
Occupied by Seven people
Occupied by Eight or more people
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES

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

Frequency	N/hood	City
2,392	47.77%	43.13%
1,366	26.68%	30.35%
685	13.68%	13.71%
351	7.01%	8.41%
169	3.37%	3.16%
29	0.58%	0.73%
11	0.22%	0.26%
4	0.08%	0.16%
5,007		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

Household size is similar to the city average. However, given the location of the neighbourhood and the fall in population, there may be a case for increasing the supply of larger dwellings

Housing Policy Implications

Local housing providers could give some consideration to increasing the supply of larger family accommodation, and encouraging more in migration

4 HOUSING TENURE

((Source: 2	2011	Census	Neighbou	ırhood	Profiles	unless	otherwise	stated)

	Owner	Private	Social	Shared ownershi		
	Occupied	Rented	Rented	р	Rent free	Total
NEIGHBOURHOOD						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates)	862	454	3,295			4,611
	18.69%	9.84%	71.45%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	939	380	3,619	41	28	5,007
	18.75%	7.59%	72.28%			
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Estimates and	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

In spite of the fact that nearly 400 properties appear to have been demolished since 2011, there has been no change in tenure other than a slight increase in the proportion of stock which is classified as private rented

Housing Policy Implications

Housing providers should consider further diversification of tenure and the development of vacant residential sites to meet a range of needs across the whole neighbourhood and not just in Sighthill

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	53	1.05%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	324	6.47%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	199	3.97%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	4,322	86.32%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	32	0.64%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	23	0.46%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	0	0.00%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	54	1.08%	630	0.22%
	5,007		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood is overwhelmingly tenemental/multi storey in built form in spite of recent clearance and demolitions of multi story blocks

Housing Policy Implications

The area requires diversification of house type. There is a clear shortage of family homes

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS

A Average Household size

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Cit
2.0

B Dwelling Occupancy Rates

As a proportion of households counted

		N/hood	City
Occupied Household count		3,459	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	3,239	93.64%	96.5.%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	145	4.19%	2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	75		0.95%

3,459

C Estimated rates of overcrowding and underoccupancy 2

(Source: Census Table LC4106SC by Neighbourhood)

%

							, •	, .	
		Occupanc					Overcrow	Underocc	
	All	y rating	Occupanc	Total		Occupanc	ded by at	upied by	
	househol	+2 or	y rating	underoccup	Occupanc	y rating -1	least 1	1 or 2	
NEIGHBOURHOOD	ds	more	+1	ied	y rating 0	or less	room	rooms	
All households	5007	372	1259	1631	2141	1235	24.66	32.57	
Owned	980	140	402	542	331	107	10.92	55.31	
Private rented or living rent free	408	24	108	132	191	85	20.83	32.35	
Social rented	3619	208	749	957	1619	1043	28.82	26.44	
CITY									
All households	285693	53242	83843	137085	98916	49692	17.39	47.98	
Owned	130217	41005	43625	84630	32838	12749	9.97	64.99	
Private rented or living rent free	50665	4029	12217	16246	21132	13287	26.22	32.06	
Social rented	104811	8208	28001	36209	44946	23656	22.57	34.54	

6. OVERCROWDING AND UNDER OCCUPATION Commentary

The neighbourhood has a lower than average household size reflecting depopulation on the Sighthill **A** part of the neighbourhood

Average household size is lower than the city average reflecting the dominance of younger single

B households

Underoccupation levels remain below the city average as a whole but are higher in the social rented sector. Paradoxically, there is evidence that overcrowding

C was an issue in 2011.

Housing Policy Implications

There is an opportunity to balance housing needs in the neighbourhood through a programme of targeted new build to address the dwelling type and size mismatch

7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)
Occupied household spaces
Occupied household spaces with no central heating

N/hood	N/hood	City	City	
	5247			
199	3.97%	11,379	3.98%	

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

The proportion of properties with lack of central heating mirror the city average

Housing Policy Implications

There is likely to be a high level of fuel poverty in this neighbourhood which requires a concerted effort by all landlords operating in the neighbourhood to improve insulation, provide modern efficient heating and apply high standard of energy efficiency in any new build

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		5,247	293,896
Vacant household spaces	235	4.48%	2.66%
Second residence/holiday home	5	0.10%	0.19%
Occupied	5007	95.42%	97.20%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a vacancy rate double that of the city average, so there appears to be a problem of low or falling demand

Housing Policy Implications

Lack of demand may reflect an area in transition

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	9,786		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	1,411	14.42%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	929	9.49%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	7,446	76.08%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	6,823	69.85%	69.01%
Physical disability	807	8.24%	7.82%
Mental health condition	782	7.99%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	527	5.38%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	223	2.28%	2.49%
Learning disability	48	0.49%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	220	2.25%	2.14%
Development disorder	54	0.55%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	313	3.20%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	210	2.14%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	232	2.37%	2.88%
Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a D household	812	11.07%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABLITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

The neighbourhood has a slightly higher than average population whose day to day activity is severely

A limited

There is a higher than average proportion of the population with physical disability or mental health

B condition

Slightly higher levels of unpaid care are required at

C the 20 - 49 hours per week level The neighbourhood has a high proportion of residents

of working age who have a long term sickness or

D disability

Housing Policy Implications

The heath picture in the neighbourhood is mixed but it suggests that though not an ageing population, a high proportion of residents need some form of ongoing health care which may require a focus by the Health & Social Care Partnership particularly in areas of the neighbourhood where there has been little change to the housing form

	CENSUS		
	PROFILE		
	SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census			
A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	6,486	66.27%	84.56%
White Other	408	4.17%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	34	0.35%	0.48%
Indian	131	1.34%	1.46%
Pakistani	117	1.20%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	93	0.95%	0.08%
Chinese	507	5.18%	1.79%
Other Asian	219	2.24%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	1,625	16.60%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	166	1.70%	0.64%
	9,786		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	2,610	26.67%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	606	6.19%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY Commentary

White Scottish population is much lower than the average with a very high representation of African, Caribbean or Black residents. This relates strongly to the housing of asylum seekers in the 2000s by the City Council especially in Sighthill, and it is possible that this population has reduced considerably following demolition and other

A resettlement decisions

The above is reflected in the high proportion of residents at **B** the time living in the area who were born outside the UK The proportion of non English speakers at 2011 is likely to reflect the nature of the residents as asylum seekers or

C refugees

Housing Policy Implications

Proposals for the redevelopment of Sighthill should take into account the context of change in the area and the possibility that certain ethnic groups may want to remain or be rehoused in the redeveloping parts of the neighbourhood

