

ROBROYSTON & MILLERSTON 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	1,168	3,890	386	5,444
	N/hood %	21.45	71.45	7.09	
	cf city %	16.6	69.17	14.22	
2011 CENSUS	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,153	3,902	423	5,478
	N/hood %	21.04	71.23	7.72	
	cf city %	16.12	70.03	13.85	
2014	Age band	0 - 15	16 - 64	65+	TOTAL POP
	Frequency	1,140	4,013	481	5,634
	N/hood %	20.23	71.22	8.53	
	cf city %	16.12	69.94	13.93	

1. POPULATION BY AGE COHORT

Commentary

Population has increased by 192 over 5 years (3.5%). The proportion of children has fallen slightly but working age adult and over 65 age populations have increased.

Housing Policy Implications

Housing provision for older age groups may require review. However, this neighbourhood has a comparatively young population.

2 2011 CENSUS HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION IN ACCOMMODATION

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

Total Households in neighbourhood	2,076	
A LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	228	41,315
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.55%	
Proportion of all households	10.98%	14.46%
B LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	162	26,513
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	0.61%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in N/HOOD	71.05%	
As a percentage of ALL Lone Parent Households in City		64.17%
C HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	822	65,612
% of city total in this Neighbourhood	1.25%	
As a percentage of Households with dependent children in City	39.59%	22.96%
D HOUSEHOLDS WITH ALL RESIDENTS OVER 65 YEARS	N/hood	City
In Neighbourhood	174	48,451
% of city population all over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.36%	
Proportion of all households which contain only over 65s	8.38%	16.96%

Single person households over 65	110	36,508
(Specific Source: Census Table QS113SC Household Type by Neighbourhood)		
% of city population single over 65 in Neighbourhood	0.30%	
% of households single person over 65 as a proportion of all households	5.29%	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	378	86,728
Proportion of one person HH under 65 in N/HOC	18.21%	30.35%

2. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Commentary

Neighbourhood has a comparatively low proportion of lone parent families compared to **A** the city average

Neighbourhood has a comparatively low proportion of lone parent families with dependent children compared to the city **B** average

Neighbourhood has a higher proportion of households with dependent children which reflects the nature of the population structure **C** and the nature of the housing stock

Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of single households over 65 which reflects the nature of the population structure and the nature of the housing stock

Neighbourhood has a lower proportion of single households which reflects the nature of the population structure and the nature of the housing stock

Housing Policy Implications

None of significance

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

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

	Frequency	N/hood	City
Occupied by One person	488	23.50%	43.13%
Occupied by Two people	584	28.13%	30.35%
Occupied by Three people	455	21.91%	13.71%
Occupied by Four people	415	19.99%	8.41%
Occupied by Five people	112	5.39%	3.16%
Occupied by Six people	19	0.91%	0.73%
Occupied by Seven people	3	0.14%	0.26%
Occupied by Eight or more people	0	0.00%	0.16%
ALL OCCUPIED HOUSEHOLD SPACES	2,076		

3 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Commentary

The neighbourhood has much higher than average proportions of 3, 4 and 5 person households

Housing Policy Implications

None

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 Esti	1,748	363	1			2,112
	82.76%	17.18%	0.00%			
TENURE COMPARISON (Census 2011)	1,820	178	55	4	19	2,076
	87.65%	8.57%	2.65%	0.19%	0.91%	
CITY						
TENURE COMPARISON (2014) (Housing Stock Est	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

The neighbourhood is overwhelmingly dominated by the owner occupied sector reflecting the suburban residential nature of the neighbourhood and the fact that it was developed as a large private sector brownfield site on the grounds of the former Robroyston Hospital for owner occupation. However it is significant that social renting has all but been eliminated and that many properties have converted to the private rented sector

Housing Policy Implications

The growth of the private rented sector suggests a change in the housing market. This may be the result of private landlords buying up properties and/or the inability of potential owner occupiers to obtain access to mortgages.

5 HOUSE TYPE

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	% of stock	City	% of stock
Detached	829	39.93%	11,167	3.91%
Semi detached	838	40.36%	36,522	12.78%
Terraced	160	7.70%	33,423	11.70%
Tenement	241	11.60%	197,146	69.00%
Conversion (within an original property)	7	0.34%	5,540	1.90%
Within a commercial building	0	0.00%	1,017	0.35%
Caravan/mobile structure	1	0.05%	348	0.12%
Shared dwelling	0	0.00%	630	0.22%
	2,076		285,793	

5. HOUSE TYPE

Commentary

The neighbourhood is characterised as essentially a dormitory suburb providing family accommodation in the private sector

Housing Policy Implications

There is little scope for the provision of specialist accommodation for elderly and other special needs groups. In order to cope with projected changes in population, additional or new provision may be required

6 UNDER AND OVER OCCUPATION OF DWELLINGS (Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	City
A Average Household size	2.59	2.02
B Dwelling Occupancy Rates	As a proportion of households counted	
	N/hood	City
<i>Occupied Household count</i>	1,181	202,466
Up to 0.5 persons per room	1,134	96.02% 96.5%
Over 1.0 and up to 1.5 persons per room	34	2.88% 2.52%
Over 1.5 persons per room	13	1.10% 0.95%
	1,181	

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 underoccupied	Occupancy rating 0	% Overcrowded by at		% Underoccupied by 1 or 2 rooms
						Occupancy rating -1 or less	least 1 room	
All households	2076	972	549	1521	373	182	8.77	73.26
Owned	1824	901	497	1398	300	126	6.91	76.64
Private rented or living rent free	197	62	43	105	56	36	18.27	53.3
Social rented	55	9	9	18	17	20	36.36	32.72
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

Household size is higher than the city

A average

Densities are in line with the population

B structure and house size configuration

There is little overcrowding in the owner occupied sector but higher than average levels of reported overcrowding in the private rented sector and in social rented accommodation. Underoccupation is much higher than the city average across all tenures, with the exception of the social rented tenure, which according to the 2014 stock estimates has reduced to practically

C zero supply.

Housing Policy Implications

Overcrowding in the private rented sector requires to be investigated and action taken to minimise the problem. The lack of any social rented accommodation is of major concern, given that a proportion of this population will require affordable accommodation and accommodation which meets specific needs which is not otherwise available in the private sector.

(Source: 2011 Census Neighbourhood Profiles unless otherwise stated)

	N/hood	N/hood	City	City
7 HEATING TYPE (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)				
Occupied household spaces				
Occupied household spaces with no central heating	35	1.69%	11,379	3.98%

7. HEATING TYPE

Commentary

A very small proportion of stock has no central heating

Housing Policy Implications

No obvious issues. It is expected that energy ratings of the properties in the neighbourhood would reach the required standard. However, this needs to be tested given the period when these properties were built.

8 VACANT PROPERTIES (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

<i>Vacant properties at a proportion of all properties</i>	N/hood	N/hood	City
All Household spaces		2,101	293,896
Vacant household spaces	18	0.85%	2.66%
Second residence/holiday home	7	0.33%	0.19%
Occupied	2076	98.81%	97.20%

8. VACANCIES

Commentary

There is a very low level of empty properties in the neighbourhood, which suggests that it remains a popular residential area of the city

Housing Policy Implications

None in terms of demand

9 HEALTH & DISABILITY (Source: Census Neighbourhood Profiles)

Total Residents in neighbourhood	5,478		
A Long term health/disability in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
Day to day activity limited a lot	358	6.53%	11.37%
Day to day activity limited a little	349	6.37%	9.20%
Day to day activity not limited	4,771	87.09%	79.43%
B Long term health condition in a household	N/hood	N/hood	City
No condition	4,325	78.95%	69.01%
Physical disability	244	4.45%	7.82%
Mental health condition	178	3.24%	6.51%
Deafness or partial hearing loss	177	3.23%	6.08%
Blindness of partial sight loss	61	1.11%	2.49%
Learning disability	15	0.27%	0.58%
Learning difficulty	58	1.06%	2.14%
Development disorder	31	0.56%	0.64%
C Provision of Care in a household			
1 to 19 hours unpaid care per week	311	5.67%	4.29%
20 - 49 hours unpaid care per week	87	1.59%	1.92%
50 or more hours unpaid care per week	114	2.08%	2.88%
D Long term sick or disabled 16 - 74 years of age in a household	144	3.50%	8.43%

9. HEALTH & DISABILITY IN THE HOME

Commentary

There are lower than average rates of

A dependency in this neighbourhood

Health conditions are far better than the

B city averages across the board

With the exception of a higher than average rate of individuals requiring up to 19 hours of unpaid care per week, the

C extent of unpaid care is below city averages

The neighbourhood has a much smaller proportion of the 16 - 74 age group with a

D long term health or disability issue

Housing Policy Implications

There is no obvious requirement to provide specialist accommodation at the present time. However this could change as the population ages

	CENSUS PROFILE SUMMARY	N/hood	City
ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS (Source: Census)			
A Neighbourhood Profiles)			
Ethnic Origin	Frequency		
White British or Irish	4,709	85.96%	84.56%
White Other	66	1.20%	3.87%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	16	0.29%	0.48%
Indian	141	1.28%	1.46%
Pakistani	105	1.91%	3.78%
Bangladeshi	4	0.07%	0.08%
Chinese	269	4.91%	1.79%
Other Asian	60	1.10%	0.94%
African, Caribbean or Black	50	0.91%	2.40%
Other ethnic group	58	1.06%	0.64%
	5,478		
B Country of Birth			
Born outside UK	439	8.07%	12.24%
C Spoken English			
Does not speak English well or at all	105	1.92%	2.59%

10. ETHNICITY

Commentary

Although the proportion of white British or Irish is similar to city averages, there is a better spread of ethnic groups across the city. Notable

A is the growth in the Chinese population

In spite of this, a lower than average proportion

B of the population were born outwith the UK

C Spoken English is better than the city average

Housing Policy Implications

The neighbourhood may see a growth in ethnic populations in the coming years.

