



Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and
2011 GoWell community surveys

March 2013



Lyndal Bond, Ade Kearns, Carol Tannahill
Matt Egan, Phil Mason

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Executive summary

Background

This report presents the cross-sectional findings from GoWell's community surveys for the years 2006, 2008 and 2011. The report compares residents' perceptions of housing improvements, satisfaction with the condition of the home and psychosocial factors related to the home across GoWell's five intervention area types: Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs), Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs), Peripheral Estates (PEs), Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs) and Wider Surrounding Areas around multi-storey flat redevelopments (WSAs). Percentage changes between waves are presented as absolute (rather than relative) increases or decreases. So, for example, if the prevalence of a particular outcome halves over time from 10% to 5%, we would describe this as a fall of 5% rather than a 50% reduction.

Satisfaction with the home

- Generally overall satisfaction with the home has improved over all time periods, but satisfaction is lowest for the Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs) and Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs). However, even in the non-regeneration areas, the numbers of people who are 'very satisfied' with their homes is slightly lower than found in a recent national survey.
- The vast majority of residents in the Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs), Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs) and Peripheral Estates (PEs) rated the overall condition of their homes as fairly or very good, and there has been little change over time.
- In all areas other than the Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs) there have been substantial increases in the percentage of respondents rating the external appearance of their homes as fairly or very good since 2006, indicating that housing improvement works have a positive impact.

Housing empowerment – satisfaction with overall housing service provided by factor or landlord

- It would appear that TRA and LRA residents are receiving the same or better levels of services from their factors or landlords than in the other areas. About two-thirds of residents in the TRAs, LRAs and PEs were satisfied with factor/landlord services. This was a substantial increase from 2006 for the TRA and LRA residents.
- Satisfaction with landlord or factor services decreased over the time period in the WSAs and HIAs. In these two intervention area types, there appears to be considerable scope for improvement in order that resident ratings of landlord or factor services matches national rates of satisfaction.

Psychosocial benefits of the home

- Over time, there has been an increase in the proportion of respondents reporting that their home brings them psychosocial benefits. The biggest increase has been in feeling safe in the home, with a 20% increase in the TRAs, LRAs and WSAs from 2006 to 2011.
- Nevertheless, comparison with national figures indicates scope for improvement in feelings of safety at home in the regeneration areas and in the peripheral estates.

Overall, there are strong indications of improvements over time in many of the housing outcomes, both in terms of the physical condition and the psychosocial benefits.

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Background

Urban regeneration includes a range of interventions that may potentially improve the interlinked dimensions of household, dwelling, community and neighbourhood environment in urban areas. As poor health is associated with poorer living circumstances, there is a policy expectation that regeneration and housing improvement strategies in disadvantaged urban areas will contribute to health improvement and reduced social inequalities in health.

GoWell is a research and learning programme that aims to investigate the impact of investment in housing, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and communities over a ten-year period. GoWell is focusing on a large, multi-faceted programme of housing investment and area regeneration across the city of Glasgow¹. The programme aims to establish the nature and extent of these impacts and the processes that have brought them about, to learn about the relative effectiveness of different approaches, and to inform policy and practice. It is a multi-component study with a comparative design.

This report summarises GoWell's findings from a repeat cross-sectional study that recently completed its third wave of data collection. This Community Health and Wellbeing Survey collected baseline data in 2006, conducted the first follow-up survey in 2008 and a second follow-up in 2011. These surveys are carried out in 15 neighbourhoods that have been categorised by into five different GoWell intervention area types (IATs), as detailed in Box 1 below.

The report presents descriptive comparisons of the different area types, in terms of residents' perceptions of their homes. Responses from residents in the GoWell study areas are compared over the three surveys (2006, 2008 and 2011). This timeframe allows us to begin to look at short and medium term impacts of regeneration, although it should be noted that it will take years for the full effects of many of the interventions to be felt.

This report covers three areas about housing:

- **Housing quality and satisfaction with the home**
 - How satisfied are people with their homes and their landlords/factors?
 - Have housing conditions, or residents' perceptions of the quality of their homes, improved over time?
- **Housing empowerment**
 - Do residents feel informed and consulted by those responsible for their housing (landlords and factors)?
- **Psychosocial benefits of the home**
 - Do residents derive mental wellbeing that might be associated with their housing and social environments: e.g. the extent to which people's homes give them a sense of empowerment, control, safety, etc.

Box 1. GoWell intervention area types.

Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)

Places where major investment is underway, involving a substantial amount of demolition and rebuilding over a long period. Many residents who remained in these neighbourhoods during the study period were waiting to relocate while nearby properties were cleared for demolition.

Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)

Places where a more limited amount and range of restructuring is taking place, and on a much smaller scale than in TRAs.

Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)

Places of mixed housing types surrounding areas of multi-storey flats subject to transformation plans, and being used for decanting purposes from the core investment sites. These areas also receive substantial amounts of core housing stock investment.

Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)

Places which are considered to be popular and functioning successfully, but where significant improvements are required to dwellings, both internally and externally. Extensive property improvement works take place in these areas.

Peripheral Estates (PEs)

Large-scale housing estates on the city boundary where incremental changes are taking place, particularly in terms of housing. These estates were originally entirely social rented but, as a result of the Right-To-Buy scheme and private developments in recent years, there is now a significant element of owner-occupied as well as rented housing. Private housing development and housing association core stock improvement works both take place on these estates.

We are aware that the implementation of regeneration plans has been affected by macro-level circumstances, with private sector developments appearing to be the most significantly affected by the economic recession. Therefore, while social housing new build programmes are well underway and housing improvement programmes are in an advanced stage of implementation, the development of mixed tenure communities involving private sector new builds has largely stalled as macro-economic conditions impact upon private housing developments. Furthermore, some types of intervention take longer to deliver than others: for example, some of the large-scale clearance and demolition programmes will take many more years to complete. Some respondents may therefore have experienced completed interventions but others are living in areas in which regeneration is underway but not completed, and still others are living in areas where some aspects of regeneration may be considered to have barely begun^a.

^aNew build development by private contractors have slowed. This affects different types of GoWell area to different degrees but we believe the most affected area types are likely to be the Transformational Regeneration Areas and the Peripheral Estates.

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Sample and methods

GoWell uses a prospective quasi-experimental design to evaluate the effects of regeneration on a broad range of housing, neighbourhood and health outcomes. A major component of the evaluation is the GoWell repeat cross-sectional community survey. We have undertaken three waves of data collection: in 2006 (wave 1), 2008 (wave 2) and 2011 (wave 3), with a fourth wave planned for 2014. The aim of this survey is to describe changes in GoWell areas and the residential, neighbourhood and health changes for individuals living in these areas.

Sampling

The sampling frames differed for the three waves of data collection, reflecting changes in population size in some of these areas (e.g. due to demolition plans, populations in regeneration areas have decreased from wave 1 to the next two waves) and to further develop a nested longitudinal cohort (details of which will be reported elsewhere).

Table 1. Sampling for the three survey waves.

Year and wave	Sampling
2006 – wave 1	All areas: random property selection
2008 – wave 2	Regeneration areas: all properties Other areas: random selection
2011 – wave 3	Regeneration areas: all pre-existing properties, plus all new builds Other areas: return to all previous interview addresses, plus all new builds.

Samples and response rates

Table 2 provides information on the sample size and response rates for each wave.

Table 2. Achieved samples and response rates for the GoWell cross-sectional surveys.

Year and wave	Sample size	Response rate %
2006 – wave 1	6,016	50.3
2008 – wave 2	4,657	47.5
2011 – wave 3	4,063	45.4

Results

Housing satisfaction and housing quality

We asked residents about their satisfaction with their homes, with the housing services provided by their landlord or factor and with any housing improvement works which had been carried out.

Overall satisfaction with the home

The percentage of residents who reported being very satisfied with the home increased in all areas between 2006 and 2008 with the largest improvement during this period being in the WSAs (16% increase). In 2011 satisfaction remained at the same levels as 2008 or increased, except for residents living in the WSAs. The 6% drop in the percentage of residents being very satisfied with their home in the WSAs from 2008 to 2011 may either reflect differences in the samples for these waves or be a real decrease^b. Overall satisfaction with the home remains lowest for TRAs and LRAs.

To put these findings in context, the English Housing Survey 2010-11 reported that the number of people in England who were 'very satisfied' with their accommodation was 44% for social renters and 69% for owner occupiers², so there may still be some room for improvement within the GoWell study areas given that average rates of 'very satisfied' are less than 40% in all IATs.

Table 3. Satisfaction with home.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents very satisfied with their home		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	7	14	14
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	8	15	19
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	26	42	36
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	26	37	37
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	25	34	39

Residents were also asked to rate the overall condition of their home and the external appearance. These findings are summarised in the next two tables. As would be expected, fewer residents in the TRAs or LRAs than in the other area types gave an overall rating of fairly or very good for either item. The proportion giving this rating to their homes in the TRAs decreased from 67% to 55% between 2006 and 2011, possibly reflecting negative effects of the processes of demolition experienced by these residents.

^b This will be explored in later analyses (not the subject of this report) where: using the repeat cross-sectional data we will adjust for resident characteristics; and using the longitudinal data (i.e. same residents) we will see whether these results are replicated.

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

In the WSAs, HIAs and PEs a large majority of residents rated the overall quality of their home as fairly or very good, but there were fluctuations over the three survey periods whereby ratings were highest for WSAs and HIAs in 2008, and for PEs in 2011. However, these differences are not large (approximately 3%). It is unclear why we are seeing this slight reduction in WSAs and HIAs across the second survey interval period.

Table 4. Overall condition of home.

Intervention area type	Percentage of homes rated as fairly good or very good		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	67	55	55
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	65	57	69
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	85	92	89
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	85	88	85
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	82	82	85

Fewer than 50% of those living in the TRAs rated the external appearance of their home as fairly or very good at each wave of the survey. Given the nature of the regeneration being undertaken in these areas we would not have expected these ratings to have increased. There has been a substantial increase in the percentage of residents in the LRAs (+14%) and WSAs (+15%) rating the external appearance of their homes as fairly or very good. This probably reflects the extent of housing improvement work in these areas, with external fabric works having been undertaken to the majority of properties in these areas by the time of our wave 3 survey. Ratings for the other area types are higher with an increase of about 10% from 2006 to 2011 indicating that housing improvement work in these areas has also had a positive effect.

Table 5. External appearance of home.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who rated the external appearance of their home as fairly good or very good		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	49	47	48
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	50	46	64
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	71	85	86
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	72	81	84
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	75	72	86

Housing empowerment – satisfaction with overall housing service provided by factor or landlord

Participants were asked about their satisfaction with the service provided by their factor or landlord at both wave 2 and wave 3. This question was not asked in wave 1. Table 6 shows that satisfaction has remained the same for those living in the PEs, has improved for the TRAs and LRAs, and decreased for the WSAs and HIAs. Except for the WSAs, about three-in-five of all residents are satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by their landlord or factor.

The most positive findings in Table 6 are comparable to those found among residents in England who were asked about their level of satisfaction with repairs and maintenance services carried out by their landlords or freeholders (factors). Across England in 2010-11, 66% of owners and 70% of social renters were satisfied with these landlord/factor services³, figures comparable to the GoWell findings in the LRAs and PEs, indicating that there is scope for improvement in the other IATs.

The lower satisfaction rates found in the WSAs and HIAs may reflect the presence of owner occupiers to a greater degree in these areas. In the 2011 survey for example, owners made up 39% of the weighted sample in the WSAs and 22% in the HIAs, compared with less than 10% in the other IATs. There may be particular issues relating to factoring arrangements for owners which cause lower satisfaction levels with services in these areas. However, we should also note that in the national survey results for England, the rates of satisfaction were not very different between owners and social renters, so whether or not tenure structure variations constitute an acceptable reason for any differences is open to debate.

Table 6. Satisfaction with factor/landlord housing service.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents satisfied or very satisfied with the overall housing service provided by factor or landlord	
	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	50	61
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	53	66
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	57	43
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	61	55
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	66	66

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Psychosocial benefits of the home

Housing and neighbourhoods form part of the residential psychosocial environment and this environment affects how people view themselves. A good psychosocial environment is one that promotes a positive experience or a positive view of oneself in relation to others, for example in terms of trust, control, confidence, self-esteem and status. All of these can be considered as psychosocial benefits. To assess the psychosocial benefits of the home and any likely changes in these, residents were asked to what extent they agreed with the following three statements:

- I feel in control of my home
- I feel safe in my home
- My home makes me feel I am doing well in my life.

Tables 7 to 9 show the percentages of residents who agreed or strongly agreed with each of these statements.

I feel in control of my home

In 2006, the area type with the lowest percentage of residents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this item was the LRAs, where only two-thirds of respondents indicated that they felt in control of their own home. Between 2006 and 2011 the percentage of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement rose substantially in the LRAs and WSAs, with marginal changes in other areas. However, we saw decreases in the proportion of residents who felt this way in the HIAs and PEs between 2006 and 2008.

Table 7. Resident feelings of control.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that they feel in control of their home		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	74	69	75
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	66	71	82
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	81	93	92
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	90	85	91
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	87	83	91

I feel safe in my home

There have been substantial increases in the percentage of respondents in all area types who agreed or strongly agreed that they felt safe in their homes over the three waves (Table 8). Even in the regeneration areas where demolition activity has been taking place, there have been large increases in feelings of safety in the home. In these areas, typically three-quarters or more of GHA tenants have received new front doors over the study period, which may have had a positive impact on feelings of security. By wave 3, more than 90% of those living in HIAs, WSAs and PEs reported feeling safe or very safe.

The best GoWell results on feelings of safety in the home, in WSAs, HIAs and PEs, are comparable with national findings. The English Housing Survey 2010-11 reported that 97% of owners and 90% of social renters felt 'very safe' or 'fairly safe' at home alone⁴. Our results at wave 3 in the TRAs and LRAs are at least ten points lower than the national norms, suggesting that improvements in community relations and safety services in these areas may be desirable.

Table 8. Resident feelings of safety.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that they feel safe in their home		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	58	70	79
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	55	73	81
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	70	89	94
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	82	85	92
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	78	86	92

My home makes me feel I am doing well in my life

Overall fewer residents responded positively to this question compared with the other two psychosocial items, but there was generally an increase in positive responses over the years for residents in the WSAs, HIAs and PEs. Only about 50% of residents in the TRAs agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, which probably reflects the quality of the housing stock in which they live. Given that buildings in these areas are in the process of being cleared and demolished, it would perhaps be surprising if we had found higher rates of agreement in this type of area.

Table 9. Psychosocial benefits of the home.

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that their home makes them feel they are doing well in their life		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	55	50	51
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	51	55	56
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	61	84	78
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	75	79	83
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	70	75	76

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Summary

Generally, overall satisfaction with the home has improved since 2006 in all area types, with the exception of residents in the WSAs. Across all survey waves, satisfaction was lowest for respondents in the TRAs and LRAs. In 2011, more than twice as many residents in the WSAs, HIAs and PEs were very satisfied with their homes compared with those living in TRAs or LRAs. We see this pattern by IAT for all aspects of the home except for satisfaction with factor/landlord services, where about two-thirds of residents in the TRAs and LRAs were satisfied, as were those in the PEs, whereas a lower proportion of residents in WSAs and HIAs responded positively about these services.

While it is perhaps to be expected, given the nature of the homes and the reason these areas have been designated for transformational or local regeneration, that residents in the TRAs and LRAs would be least satisfied with their homes, it is striking that they report higher levels of satisfaction with the services provided by their factors or landlords. These survey data do not allow us to explore the reasons for this, but other components of GoWell are looking in detail at some of the tenant engagement processes taking place and are highlighting processes that are particularly valued by residents. For example, tenants have generally been very happy with how their needs have been addressed within the clearance process and this may be partly reflected in the positive views about landlords' services found in the regeneration areas^c.

A large majority of residents in the WSAs, HIAs and PEs rated the overall condition of the homes as fairly or very good, but there has been little change over time. However, there have been substantial increases in the percentages of respondents rating the external appearance of their homes as fairly or very good since 2006, indicating that housing improvement works have had a positive impact.

In terms of the psychosocial benefits of the home, the biggest increase over time is seen in relation to respondents' feeling safe in the home, with a 20% increase in the TRAs, LRAs and WSAs from 2006 to 2011. Feeling in control has also increased, especially in the LRAs and WSAs. Although smaller proportions responded positively for the third psychosocial indicator (my home makes me feel I am doing well in life), there was generally an increase over time except, again, in the TRAs.

The differences in housing satisfaction, quality and the psychosocial benefits of the home reported here reflect the housing and neighbourhood conditions and the associated regeneration and improvement activities in the different study areas, but they may also partly reflect sample characteristics. For example, people of different ages, cultural backgrounds or abilities will have different expectations, aspirations and requirements – and these will affect their answers to the survey questions. Future reports will look in more detail at the changes that have taken place in our study areas, as well as incorporating new analyses that account for sample characteristics.

^cThere are two forthcoming GoWell reports on both the tenants' and the staffs' views of the clearance process.

References

1. Egan M, Beck S, Bond L, Coyle J, Crawford F, Kearns A, Lawson L, Mason M, Tannahill C, Sautkina E, Thomson H, Walsh D, on behalf of the GoWell Team. Protocol for a mixed methods study investigating the impact of investment in housing, regeneration and neighbourhood renewal on the health and wellbeing of residents: the GoWell programme. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2010;10:41.
2. Department of Communities and Local Government. *English Housing Survey: Households, 2010-11; Annex Table 7.6*. London: National Statistics; 2012.
3. Department of Communities and Local Government. *English Housing Survey: Households, 2010-11; Annex Table 7.7*. London: National Statistics; 2012.
4. Department of Communities and Local Government. *English Housing Survey: Households, 2010-11; Table 7.4a*. London: National Statistics; 2012.

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys

Acknowledgements

This report has been produced on behalf of the GoWell team. The current GoWell team is as follows:

Sheila Beck (Ecological Monitoring Team)
Lyndal Bond (Principal Investigator)
Julie Clark (Researcher)
Jennie Coyle (Communications Manager)
Fiona Crawford (Ecological Monitoring Team)
Angela Curl (Researcher)
Matt Egan (Researcher)
Ade Kearns (Principal Investigator)
Kenny Lawson (Health Economist)
Louise Lawson (Researcher)
Mark Livingston (Researcher)
Phil Mason (Researcher)
Martin McKee (Researcher)
Jennifer McLean (Ecological Monitoring Team)
Kelda McLean (Programme Administrator)
Carol Tannahill (Principal Investigator)
Hilary Thomson (Researcher)
David Walsh (Ecological Monitoring Team)

This report may be cited as:

Bond L, Kearns A, Tannahill C, Egan M, Mason P. Housing outcomes over time: a comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys. Glasgow: GoWell; 2013.

Author contact details

Prof Ade Kearns
Professor of Urban Studies
Urban Studies
The University of Glasgow
Glasgow
G12 8RS
Email: Ade.Kearns@glasgow.ac.uk
Tel: 00 44 (0)141 330 5049

Housing outcomes over time

A comparison across the 2006, 2008 and 2011 GoWell community surveys



GoWell is a collaborative partnership between the Glasgow Centre for Population Health, the University of Glasgow and the MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, sponsored by Glasgow Housing Association, the Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde.