

2011 Census profile of Upper Liddesdale and Hermitage Community council Area

The Upper Liddesdale and Hermitage Community Council area counted 218 people and 97 households in 2011. This is still the best estimate of the Community Council area we have available, as the area is too small to have its own Datazone.

New figures from the 2022 Census will be available in autumn 2024.

Population – breakdown and comparison with Scottish Borders

Indicator, 2011 Census	ULHCC	Scottish Borders
Number of children 0-15	36	19,341
Number working-age* 16-64	147	70,710
Number pensioners age 65+	35	23,818
% children	16.4	16.2
% working-age	68.0	62.0
% pensioner	15.6	21.7
Average (mean) age	44.1 yrs	44.0 yrs
Average (median) age	49.0 yrs	46.5 yrs

*“Working age” is demographic shorthand for people aged 16-64, which is an important marker for population sustainability. In reality, the state retirement age is no longer 65 years and many people at either end of the working-age spectrum are not economically active anyway.

What do these stats tell us?

- the 2011 Census counted **36 children aged 0-15** in ULHCC area. If the birth rate stays the same, we will expect a similar number in the 2022 Census.
- the proportion of children in ULHCC was **similar to the Scottish Borders average**
- the proportion of “**working-age**” people in ULHCC was **higher than the Scottish Borders average** and the **proportion of pensioners was lower**, which is a good marker for demographic sustainability
- However, the **median age of the population in ULHCC is higher than average**. This shows that average age of most of working-age adults in ULHCC was older than average in 2011 and some of these will have reached retirement age by now
- This indicates that, although the population of ULHCC area is sustainable, **the area could benefit from some younger families moving in** to balance out the ageing population

Ethnic identity

Out of the **218 people** in ULHCC in 2011:

- **Over 99% identified as White**, compared with **99%** in Scottish Borders and **96%** in Scotland
- **62% identified as White Scottish**, compared with **79%** in Scottish Borders and **84%** in Scotland
- **37% identified as White Other British**, compared with **16%** in Scottish Borders and **8%** in Scotland
- **Less than 1% identified as Other White**, e.g. Irish, Gypsy/Traveller, Polish or Other White European, compared with **4%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland
- **Less than 1% identified as belonging to any White or Non-White ethnic minority**, compared with **5%** in Scottish Borders and **8%** in Scotland

Religion and Place of Worship

Out of the **218 people** in ULHCC in 2011:

- **48% said they were Christian**, compared with **53%** in Scottish Borders and **54%** in Scotland
- **33% identified with Church Of Scotland**, compared with **39%** in Scottish Borders and **32%** in Scotland
- **5% identified with the Roman Catholic Church**, compared with **6%** in Scottish Borders and **16%** in Scotland
- **11% identified with another Christian Church**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and **6%** in Scotland
- **Less than 1% said their religious identity or place of worship was Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh or other**, compared with **1%** in Scottish Borders and **3%** in Scotland
- **40% said they had no religion or place of worship**, compared with **38%** in Scottish Borders and **37%** in Scotland
- **11% did not state their religion or place of worship**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and **7%** in Scotland

What do these stats tell us?

ULHCC is almost completely ethnically homogeneous, with **little or no ethnic diversity**.

There is a **stronger English-British community** in ULHCC than elsewhere in Scottish Borders, which is to be expected, given its **location on the Scotland-England Border**.

Likewise, there was almost **no ethnic diversity among religious identity or places of worship, except for "other Christian church"** which includes Church of England.

For the first time, **Christianity is a minority faith in ULHCC**, with over half of people stating or presumed to be belonging to no established faith or church. This is a continuation of a **long-term demographic decline of traditional Christianity** in Scottish society.

Marital status

Out of the **182 people aged over 16** in ULHCC in 2011:

- **56% were married**, compared with **52%** in Scottish Borders and **45%** in Scotland
- **28% were single** (never married), compared with **27%** in Scottish Borders and **35%** in Scotland
- **10% were separated or divorced**, compared with **12%** in Scottish Borders and **11%** in Scotland*
- **6% were widowed**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland*
- **1.1% were in a same-sex civil partnership**, compared with **0.2%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland

*these proportions include same-sex civil partnerships

Household Structure

Out of the **97 households** in ULHCC area in 2011:

- **38% of households were one-person households**, compared with **34%** in Scottish Borders and **35%** in Scotland
- **29% had one couple only**, compared with **26%** in Scottish Borders and **24%** in Scotland
- **24% had no children**, compared with **21%** in Scottish Borders and **18%** in Scotland
- **22% had dependent children**, compared with **24%** in Scottish Borders and **26%** in Scotland
- **18% were households where all householders** (couples or lone residents) **were aged over 65**, compared with **25%** in Scottish Borders and **21%** in Scotland
- **6.6% had children who were non-dependent** compared with **8.3%** in Scottish Borders and **10%** in Scotland

What do these stats tell us?

Households with an **under-65 couple** or a **singleton without children** were **proportionally more common** in ULHCC than elsewhere in Scottish Borders and Scotland.

Pensioner households were **proportionally less common**.

Household tenure

Out of the **97 households** in ULHCC in 2011:

- **33% were owned outright**, compared with **33%** in Scottish Borders and **28%** in Scotland
- **22% were owned with a mortgage or loan**, compared with **28%** in Scottish Borders and **34%** in Scotland
- **20% were private-rented**, compared with **12%** in Scottish Borders and **11%** in Scotland
- **2% were rented through a social landlord**, compared with **22%** in Scottish Borders and **24%** in Scotland
- **21% lived “rent-free”*** (e.g. “tied” accommodation, living with family or friends), compared with **3%** in Scottish Borders and **1%** in Scotland.

*This option may also have been used by a small number of respondents who did not know how their accommodation had been paid for.

What do these stats tell us?

ULHCC has a **high dependency on private rented and “tied” accommodation** compared with other parts of the region. This is a cause of **housing insecurity**, as the tenant is more likely to be evicted for reasons that are not their fault.

The **proportion of owner-occupiers is slightly lower** than average, although those who do occupy their own property are more likely to have paid off their mortgage

There is **less support for vulnerable tenants in isolated rural areas** than those in the main towns, due to a lack of housing options in rural parts of the region.

Health

Out of the **97 households** in ULHCC in 2011, **28% had one or more person in the household with a long term health problem or disability**, compared with **28%** in Scottish Borders and **29%** in Scotland

Out of the **218 people in ULHCC** in 2011:

- **4%** said **their day-to-day activities were limited a lot by a long-term health problem or disability** , compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and **10%** in Scotland
- **12%** said **their day-to-day activities were limited a little**, compared with **11%** in Scottish Borders and **10%** in Scotland
- **84%** said their day-to-day activities were **not limited at all by any health problem or disability**, compared with **81%** in Scottish Borders and **80%** in Scotland
- **88%** said their **general health was good or very good**, compared with **84%** in Scottish borders and **82%** in Scotland
- **3%** said their **general health was bad or very bad**, compared with **4%** in Scottish Borders and **6%** in Scotland
- **10%** said they **provided unpaid care** for a friend or relative, compared with **9%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland.
- **6%** said they provided **up to 19 hours per week of unpaid care**, compared with **6%** in Scottish Borders and **5%** in Scotland
- **4%** said they provided **over 20 hours per week of unpaid care**, compared with **3%** in Scottish Borders and **4%** in Scotland

Out of the **147 working-age people in ULHCC** in 2011:

- **3%** said their **day-to-day activities were limited a lot by a long-term health problem or disability**, compared with **5%** in Scottish Borders and **7%** in Scotland
- **10%** said their day-to-day activities were **limited a little**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland
- **87%** said their day-to-day activities were **not limited at all by any health problem or disability**, compared with **87%** in Scottish Borders and **85%** in Scotland

What do these stats tell us?

Overall, people in ULHCC enjoy better health for longer than those elsewhere in Scottish Borders and Scotland.

Despite this, the **proportion of households who are affected** by long-term health problems or disabilities is **about the same as average**.

This impacts the most on the handful of **unpaid care providers** in ULHCC, who sacrifice their working life or retirement in order to care for their friends or family and are **more vulnerable to poverty and social isolation** because of it.

Economic Activity and Inactivity

Out of the **97 households in ULHCC** in 2011, **30%** had **no adults in employment in the household**, compared with **37%** in Scottish Borders and in Scotland

Out of the **165 people age 16-74 in ULHCC** in 2011:

- **71%** were **economically active** and **29%** were **economically inactive**, compared with **67%/33%** in Scottish Borders and **69%/ 31%** in Scotland
- **33%** were **“Economically Active - Self-employed”**, compared with **6%** in Scottish Borders and **7%** in Scotland
- **27%** were **“economically active – full-time employees”**, compared with **40%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland
- **18%** were **“Economically inactive – retired”**, compared with **16%** in Scottish Borders and **15%** in Scotland
- **10%** were **“economically active – part-time employees”**, compared with **13%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland
- **3%** were **“economically inactive – looking after home or family”** compared with **4%** in Scottish Borders and Scotland
- **2%** were **“ economically inactive students”**, compared with **4%** in Scottish Borders and **6%** in Scotland
- **2%** were **“economically inactive – long term sick or disabled”**, compared with **6%** in Scottish Borders and **5%** in Scotland
- **Less than 1%** were **“economically active – unemployed”**, compared with **6%** in Scottish Borders and **5%** in Scotland
- **Less than 1%** were **“economically active students”**, compared with **3%** in Scottish Borders and **4%** in Scotland

What do these stats tell us?

ULHCC has a **relatively high proportion of people aged 16-74 who are economically active**, with fewer unable to work because they are sick or disabled and a very low unemployment rate

Around a third of 16-74 year olds are **self-employed**, which is a **very high proportion**. Correspondingly fewer work as employees.

The **main reason for economic inactivity is retirement**, which affects a **higher proportion** of under 75s in this area than average

Only a small proportion are students, or looking after home or family.

Occupational status (National Statistics Standard Occupational Classification)

Out of the **116 people in ULHCC who were aged 16-74 and in employment** in 2011:

- **12%** were **managers, directors and senior officials**, compared with **10%** in Scottish Borders and **8%** in Scotland
- **8%** had **professional occupations**, compared with **15%** in Scottish Borders and **17%** in Scotland
- **16%** had **associate professional or technical occupations**, compared with **11%** in Scottish Borders and **13%** in Scotland
- **5%** had **administrative and secretarial occupations**, compared with **9%** in Scottish Borders and **11%** in Scotland
- **4%** had **Caring, Leisure and other service occupations**, compared with **10%** in Scottish Borders and in Scotland
- **Less than 1%** had **Sales and Customer Service occupations**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and **9%** in Scotland
- **3%** had **Process, Plant and Machine Operative occupations**, compared with **8%** in Scottish Borders and **9%** in Scotland
- **21%** had **elementary occupations**, compared with **12%** in Scottish Borders and in Scotland

What do these stats tell us?

The area had a **very high proportion of employment in elementary occupations**, characterised as relatively low-paid, involving physical labour and not requiring particular qualifications. A society needs these occupations to keep production of goods and services running smoothly and the need for labour provides an entry point into the workplace for new workers.

The area also has a **relatively high proportions of associate professional and technical occupations**, characterised as skilled professional occupations that provide direct support to senior management and corporate objectives. Many of these will be in the public sector, such as NHS Borders or Scottish Borders Council.

There is also a **relatively high proportion of managers, directors and senior officials**. Combined with the high level of **self-employed people**, this would suggest many of these are **micro-businesses**.

Other occupations are under-represented in the area, suggesting a **lack of attractive, well-paid job opportunities** to encourage skilled and qualified people to remain in the area, unless they are prepared to commute long distances or become self-employed.