



# Neighbourhood 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

# Neighbourhood 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' satisfaction with their neighbourhood, perceptions of neighbourhood improvements and attractiveness, local facilities and the environment, antisocial behaviour, levels of empowerment and the psychosocial benefits of the neighbourhood across GoWell's five intervention area types (IATs): Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs), Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs), Peripheral Estates (PEs), Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs) and wider areas surrounding 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.

### Neighbourhood satisfaction

- The proportion of residents 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live is highest in the HIAs, but is relatively low (a quarter or less) in all other types of area.
- Between 2006 and 2008, the proportion of residents 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood increased in all area types; and although the extent of improvement slowed from 2008 to 2011 improvement was nonetheless sustained in all area types except the WSAs.
- The rate of increase in the size of the 'very satisfied' group exceeded the equivalent national rate of increase for four out of five of the IATs.

### Perceptions of neighbourhood change

- Across most of the area types there is a growing proportion of residents who believe that their neighbourhood is improving. Substantial increases were evident between 2006 and 2008 and, except for the PEs, these were maintained or continued to increase by 2011.
- The number of people reporting neighbourhood improvement in the LRAs and PEs far exceeds the equivalent national figure for deprived areas.

### Perceptions of neighbourhood attractiveness

- Views about the attractiveness of the neighbourhood showed a mixed pattern across area types and time.
- Levels of perceived attractiveness are lowest in the regeneration areas, and these areas have seen a decline over the period of the study.
- In the non-regeneration areas, perceived neighbourhood attractiveness has increased over time, and levels in these areas compare favourably with national figures for resident appreciation of a 'pleasant environment'.

### Perceptions of local facilities and the environment

- Ratings of local shops improved between 2006 and 2011, in all types of area. In 2011, shops were rated least positively in the PEs.

- In contrast, ratings of youth and leisure services declined everywhere over time. Youth and leisure services were rated least positively in the TRAs and WSAs. The PEs were the only areas in 2011 where a majority of respondents rated youth and leisure services as good or fairly good.

### **Perceptions of antisocial behaviour as a serious problem**

- The proportion of respondents regarding vandalism/graffiti and teenagers hanging around as serious problems has declined or stayed the same over time in all types of area. The decline in the reporting of these problems mirrors national trends on these issues.
- The perception that local drug dealing is a serious problem has increased in all IATs. This finding runs counter to the national trend where the identification of local drug problems has remained static over time.
- Overall, the HIAs stand out as having the lowest levels of concern about all three of these antisocial behaviours.

### **Psychosocial benefits of the neighbourhood**

- Over time more people are deriving a sense of personal progress from where they live, regardless of the type of area they live in. There appears to be a slow and steady improvement in the regeneration areas but a recent slowing down or reversal of past improvements in the other areas (WSAs, HIAs, PEs).
- The reversal in feelings of progress is particularly striking in the WSAs, where 2011 levels are comparable to those of 2006 despite a significant peak in 2008.

### **Neighbourhood empowerment**

- Residents' perceptions of the ability to influence decisions affecting the local area increased in all types of area between 2006 and 2008. These early improvements have been maintained in the TRAs, LRAs and PEs but not in the HIAs or WSAs.
- The trend in GoWell IATs towards an increasing sense of empowerment over time compares with a static level of local empowerment for England over the same period.
- Related indicators about the responsiveness of service providers, and the ability of local people to find ways to improve things in the area show some marginally positive change in most areas, but not in the WSAs, where the sense of empowerment (as measured by these indicators) has declined considerably between 2008 and 2011.

### **Conclusion**

In most areas, people think their neighbourhoods are becoming better places to live and there are steady improvements in perceptions of the environment, local shops and resident empowerment, and perceptions of lower levels of antisocial behaviour.

However, other problems persist and are perceived to be getting worse, most notably related to the provision of youth facilities, and to the problem of drug dealing. In general there are a series of contrary results across many of the domains for the WSAs that need further investigation.

# Neighbourhood 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 Glasgow<sup>1</sup>. 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 intervention into five different GoWell area types, as detailed in Box 1 below.

The report presents descriptive comparisons of the different area types, in terms of residents' perceptions of their neighbourhood. 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.

## **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 driven by 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<sup>a</sup>.

---

<sup>a</sup>New 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.

# Neighbourhood 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.

### 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

This report presents summary findings relating to respondents' perceptions of the quality of the neighbourhoods in our intervention areas, and how these have changed over time. We then consider other aspects of the neighbourhood: the facilities and amenities within the local area; behaviours that impact on neighbourhood quality; and the psychosocial benefits that residents gain from living in their neighbourhoods. Taken together, this raft of indicators provides a good sense of how the physical, aesthetic, service and behavioural features of local areas are changing – and of what people feel about them.

### Neighbourhood satisfaction

In most of the area types, the majority of residents said they were 'fairly satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. In the regeneration areas (TRAs and LRAs) around two-thirds of respondents were satisfied with their neighbourhood, whereas in other types of area (WSAs, HIAs and PEs) the rate of satisfaction was four-fifths or more.

The percentage of residents 'very satisfied' with the neighbourhood increased in most area types between 2006 and 2011, with the largest increase being in the HIAs (+17%) which had the highest proportion 'very satisfied' in 2011 by a considerable amount. The trend in the WSAs is contrary to the other area types: the proportion 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood dropped between 2008 and 2011. Whereas in 2006 the WSAs had the highest proportion of 'very satisfied' respondents, by 2011 the level was comparable to the regeneration areas (and much lower than the PEs and HIAs).

These improvements in the GoWell study areas, apart from the WSAs, are better than the national trends over this period. The Scottish Household Survey (SHS) reports that the proportion of people rating their neighbourhood as 'very good' as a place to live increased by 5% between 2006 and 2011<sup>2</sup>, whereas the improvement in our 'very satisfied' category was at least twice this amount in four of the five IATs. However, nationally in 2011, 94% of people rated their neighbourhood as a good place to live and 6% rated it as poor. Amongst our IATs, only the HIAs matched this 94%:6% balance between those who were satisfied or neutral about their neighbourhood and those who were dissatisfied. In other IATs, the satisfied/neutral group was 6-10 points lower than the national norm, but at or above the national rate for the most deprived areas (80%).

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

**Table 3. Neighbourhood satisfaction.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)			
Very satisfied	4	15	15
Fairly satisfied	63	49	50
Total satisfied	67	64	65
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)			
Very satisfied	3	14	17
Fairly satisfied	67	52	51
Total satisfied	70	66	68
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)			
Very satisfied	25	32	19
Fairly satisfied	58	51	57
Total satisfied	83	83	76
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)			
Very satisfied	24	35	41
Fairly satisfied	64	54	46
Total satisfied	88	89	87
Peripheral Estates (PEs)			
Very satisfied	18	26	28
Fairly satisfied	61	55	53
Total satisfied	79	81	81



### Perceptions of neighbourhood change

We asked residents whether in general their neighbourhood had ‘got better’, ‘stayed the same’ or ‘got worse’ over the past two years. In all area types, an increasing proportion of respondents felt that their neighbourhoods were improving. There were substantial increases between 2006 and 2008 in the proportions saying their neighbourhood had ‘got better’; and except in the PEs, this was maintained or continued to increase in 2011 (Table 4).

The number of people identifying neighbourhood improvements compares favourably with national findings for perceptions of change in deprived areas. The Scottish Household Survey 2011 reported that 12% of all people in Scotland and 22% of those in the most deprived areas said their neighbourhood had got ‘much better’ or ‘a little better’ in the past three years<sup>3</sup>. The LRAs and PEs are well above the national norm for deprived areas on this indicator, and the other IATs are marginally above the national norm.

**Table 4. Neighbourhood change.**

Intervention area type	Year	Percentage of residents describing how their neighbourhood has changed over the last two years		
		Better	Same	Worse
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	2006	7	77	17
	2008	24	44	33
	2011	23	54	23
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	2006	9	73	18
	2008	31	41	28
	2011	42	37	20
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	2006	10	74	16
	2008	21	61	17
	2011	25	58	17
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	2006	6	81	13
	2008	19	67	14
	2011	25	59	15
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	2006	15	71	14
	2008	33	48	19
	2011	29	52	19

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

## Perceptions of neighbourhood attractiveness

Residents were also asked to rate the attractiveness of their neighbourhood environment. Table 5 shows the percentage who rated their neighbourhood environment as very or fairly good. There is a mixed pattern for this item between area types and across time. In the TRAs and LRAs there is a decline in perceptions of attractiveness between 2006 and 2008, with a partial reversal to this by 2011. In the TRAs, 2011 levels are still 15 percentage points lower than in 2006. This decline in perceived neighbourhood attractiveness might be expected given the advent of clearance and demolition in these areas.

For the other areas there is an increase in perceived attractiveness when 2011 responses are compared with those from 2006 with the largest improvement being in the PEs, and occurring since 2008. During this latter period, the residents in the WSAs have experienced a considerable decline in the perceived attractiveness of their neighbourhoods. In the non-regeneration areas (WSAs, HIAs and PEs), the number of people who rated the attractiveness of their neighbourhood environment as good in 2011, 63-76%, compares favourably with the number of people nationally who say the 'pleasant environment' is something they particularly like about their neighbourhood, which in 2011 was 60% of all people in Scotland, and 49% of those people living in the most deprived areas<sup>4</sup>.

**Table 5. Perceived neighbourhood attractiveness.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents rating their neighbourhood as very attractive or fairly attractive		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	50	25	35
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	51	41	49
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	59	71	63
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	70	78	76
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	55	55	64

## Perceptions of local facilities and amenities

We asked residents to rate the quality of their local services and amenities, including local shops and youth and leisure services. Table 6 shows the percentage who rated their shops as very or fairly good. The rating of local shops has improved over time in all area types. The percentage of residents rating shops as very or fairly good was lowest in the PEs, and these areas also showed the smallest improvements over time. Ratings of the local shops in the WSAs declined between 2008 and 2011.

**Table 6. Resident ratings of local shops.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents rating their local shops as very or fairly good		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	56	61	72
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	53	63	77
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	58	81	66
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	62	77	78
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	48	52	51

As can be seen from Table 7, unlike the ratings of shops, in all areas ratings of youth and leisure services declined over time. Youth and leisure services were rated most positively in the PEs and better than local shops in these areas. Whereas ratings in the WSAs improved between 2006 and 2008 (the only area type seeing an improvement during this period), they fell considerably in 2011.

**Table 7. Resident ratings of youth and leisure services.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents rating their youth and leisure services as very or fairly good		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	52	21	29
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	53	26	32
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	40	47	29
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	40	34	34
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	62	57	56

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

## Perceptions of serious antisocial behaviour problems

Residents were asked on all three occasions about a number of antisocial behaviours and whether they thought that these were 'not a problem', 'a slight problem', or 'a serious problem' in their area. We report on three aspects of antisocial behaviour here: vandalism/graffiti/deliberate damage to property (Table 8), dealing drugs (Table 9) and teenagers 'hanging around' (Table 10).

The HIAs stand out as having the lowest levels of concern about all of these three issues, and although there is an increase in the proportion of residents reporting that drug dealing is a serious problem in these areas (as in all the area types), overall levels of concern remain much lower than in the other area types.

In 2011, the LRAs had the highest levels of concern for all three issues. Looking at the trends over time, this seems to reflect smaller reductions in concern between 2008 and 2011 than were seen in other areas. For example, whereas in 2008 similar proportions of respondents in the TRAs and LRAs reported concern about drug dealing and about youths hanging around, by 2011 there were considerable improvements in the TRAs (-8% for drug dealing; -14% for youths) but much smaller declines in the LRAs (-3% for drugs; -3% for youths).

**Table 8. Vandalism and graffiti.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents reporting vandalism/graffiti/deliberate damage to property is a serious problem		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	17	26	14
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	17	38	21
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	13	14	11
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	8	7	8
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	18	22	12

**Table 9. Perception of teenagers as a serious neighbourhood problem.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents reporting that teenagers hanging around is a serious neighbourhood problem		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	29	33	19
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	27	30	27
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	20	19	17
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	16	11	11
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	20	30	19

**Table 10. Neighbourhood drug dealing.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents reporting that dealing drugs is a serious problem in the neighbourhood		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	21	36	28
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	23	36	33
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	13	21	24
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	6	9	12
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	13	27	22

For the first two items examined here, vandalism and groups in public space, our findings of reductions in perceptions of problems over time between 2006 and 2011 mirror, and in some cases exceed, national trends, albeit the LRAs are an exception to this comparison.

We report a reduction by IAT of between -3% and -6% in the number of people identifying vandalism as a serious problem in their neighbourhood, whilst nationally, there has been a -5% reduction in the number of people saying vandalism is a very or fairly common problem in their neighbourhood over the same time period<sup>5</sup>.

Similarly, we report reductions by IAT of between -1% and -10% in the number of people identifying teenagers hanging around as a serious problem, whilst nationally there has been a -3% reduction in the number of people reporting 'groups or individuals harassing others' as very or fairly common in their neighbourhood.

On the other hand, drug problems are getting worse. Apart from the TRAs, we report increases over time from 2006 to 2011 by IAT of between +6% and +11% in the number of people identifying drug using or dealing as a serious

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

problem in their neighbourhood. Over the same period, the national rates of identifying drug dealing or misuse as very or fairly common in the neighbourhood have remained unchanged, as well as being much lower at 12%<sup>5</sup>. Except for the HIAs, at least twice as many people in GoWell in 2011 identify drugs as a serious local problem as identify drugs as a common issue across all Scotland’s neighbourhoods.

## Psychosocial benefits of the neighbourhood

To gauge whether residents receive any psychosocial benefits from living in their neighbourhoods we asked them whether living in the neighbourhood contributed to their perception that they are doing well in their lives. It appears that over time more people are deriving a sense of personal progress from where they live, regardless of the type of area they live in. Steady, slow improvements are evident in the TRAs and LRAs but in the other areas significant improvements between 2006 and 2008 were reversed or only just sustained by 2011 (Table 11). Between 2008 and 2011 in the WSAs, there was a large decline in the proportion of respondents feeling that living in their neighbourhood helps make them feel that they are doing well in life – resulting in the 2011 levels being comparable to those of 2006 despite a significant peak in 2008.

**Table 11. Psychosocial benefits of the neighbourhood.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that living in their neighbourhood helps them feel they are doing well in their life		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	31	34	40
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	35	43	46
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	48	72	49
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	59	73	73
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	45	62	54

## Neighbourhood empowerment

In all surveys we asked residents whether they felt they had the ability to influence decisions affecting their local area. In 2008 and 2011 we included two more indicators of neighbourhood empowerment: whether residents could find ways to improve things when they wanted and the responsiveness of service providers to the views of local people.

Table 12 shows that residents’ perceptions of their ability to influence decisions affecting the local area improved in all area types between 2006 and 2008. These early improvements have been maintained in the TRAs, LRAs and PEs but not to the same degree in the HIAs or WSAs, although all the 2011 percentages remain higher than in 2006. In 2011, the HIAs had the highest proportion of respondents agreeing that they could influence decisions affecting their area – but this was still only half of all respondents from these areas.



Increases over time across all the GoWell IATs compares with a static picture over the same period in feelings of local empowerment across England. The Citizenship Survey 2010-11 in England reported that 38% of people felt able to influence decisions affecting their local area, largely unchanged from 39% in 2005<sup>6</sup>. Three of the GoWell IATs – WSAs, HIAs and PEs, but especially the latter two – reported much higher levels of empowerment than the norm for England in 2011. GoWell regeneration areas lie below the national norm on this indicator, but by less than they did previously.

**Table 12. Ability to influence neighbourhood decisions.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that 'on your own, or with others, you can influence decisions affecting your local area'		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	18	29	32
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	24	30	32
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	38	54	41
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	34	54	49
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	28	45	46

Tables 13 and 14 show the percentage of residents who 'agree' or 'strongly agree' in response to the two new indicators of neighbourhood empowerment introduced into the survey in 2008. These show mixed findings across the areas. For all areas except the WSAs, percentages remained about the same or had increased in 2011 compared with 2008. For the WSAs, however, in 2011 a lower proportion of residents than in 2008 agreed that service providers are responsive or that people can find ways to improve things if they want to.

**Table 13. Ability to improve things.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that people in the area can find ways to improve things if they want to		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	-	27	30
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	-	36	36
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	-	60	46
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	-	56	57
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	-	48	56

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

**Table 14. Service providers and their responsiveness to the views of local people.**

Intervention area type	Percentage of residents who agree or strongly agree that providers of local services, like the council and others, respond to the views of local people		
	2006	2008	2011
Transformational Regeneration Areas (TRAs)	-	31	40
Local Regeneration Areas (LRAs)	-	40	43
Wider Surrounding Areas (WSAs)	-	55	36
Housing Improvement Areas (HIAs)	-	52	55
Peripheral Estates (PEs)	-	45	54

Overall, respondents in the HIAs reported the highest levels of neighbourhood empowerment across this set of indicators.

## Summary

The various aspects of 'neighbourhood' described in this report impact on the day-to-day quality of life of residents in a range of ways. We found that neighbourhood satisfaction (as measured by the proportion of respondents who are 'very satisfied') is improving in most types of area. We also found that over time, a growing proportion of respondents in all areas report that their neighbourhood is becoming a better place to live in, and fewer people are reporting serious antisocial behaviour problems. Ratings of shops are improving everywhere; more people are deriving a sense of personal progress from where they live; and in many areas there is a growing proportion of residents who feel they can influence decisions and find ways to improve things. Overall, therefore, these are encouraging findings.

Across the indicators reported here, the position of the HIAs emerges as being particularly positive. These are the areas with the highest levels of neighbourhood satisfaction and perceived neighbourhood attractiveness; the lowest levels of concern about antisocial behaviour; the greatest sense of personal progress associated with living in the area; and the highest levels of neighbourhood empowerment. In the HIAs, between 75% and 100% of the GHA social housing stock had received external improvements by the time of our wave 3 survey, and this may to some extent have influenced people's views about their neighbourhood.

In contrast, the WSAs seem to be experiencing either very small improvements over time, or a decline in respondent ratings on a number of the indicators, particularly between 2008 and 2011. Progress made in the early years of our study have not been sustained in these areas, and in the case of some indicators have dramatically reversed. In these areas, slightly less of the GHA social rented housing stock than in the HIAs had been improved externally by the time of our wave 3 survey (between 66% and 86%), which may help explain the lower ratings of attractiveness in these areas. The other notable feature of the WSAs is the fact that they have received a large number of the Outmovers from the TRAs as newly relocated residents over time. This phenomenon may have impacted upon other residents' ratings of neighbourhood satisfaction, sense of personal progress through residence in the area, and feelings of local empowerment, all of which have declined in the WSAs in contrast to other non-regeneration areas.

The findings for regeneration areas (TRAs and LRAs) are an interesting mix. On the one hand, residents appear to perceive positive change going on. Measures of neighbourhood satisfaction, neighbourhood improvement, sense of personal progress through residence and feelings of empowerment have all improved over time, although the empowerment indicators are still relatively low compared to other IATs. On the other hand, ratings of the attractiveness of the local environment and of the quality of local youth and leisure services have declined, as we might have expected at this stage of the regeneration process when redevelopment of the cleared areas has only just begun. The fact that ratings of local shops have improved in regeneration areas as in other places probably reflects developments in nearby areas.

Two trends which are shared across all IATs are of concern. There is a general decline in residents' ratings of youth and leisure services; with the exception of the PEs, only a third or less of respondents in all the other area types rated these as very or fairly good. There are also increasing concerns about drug use and dealing, with up to twice as many people identifying this as a serious local problem in 2011 as did so in 2006. These are recognised problems in the city, but our findings once again highlight the need for an improved response by the public agencies responsible for these services and issues.

# Neighbourhood outcomes over time

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

## 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. Scottish Government. *Scotland's People. Annual Report: Results from 2011 Scottish Household Survey; Table 4.1*. Edinburgh: National Statistics; 2012.
3. Scottish Government. *Scotland's People. Annual Report: Results from 2011 Scottish Household Survey; Table 4.9*. Edinburgh: National Statistics; 2012.
4. Scottish Government. *Scotland's People. Annual Report: Results from 2011 Scottish Household Survey; Tables 4.4 and 4.5*. Edinburgh: National Statistics; 2012.
5. Scottish Government. *Scotland's People. Annual Report: Results from 2011 Scottish Household Survey; Table 4.10*. Edinburgh: National Statistics; 2012.
6. Department of Communities and Local Government. *Citizenship Survey 2010-11 (April 2010-March 2011), England; Figure 1*. London: Cohesion Research, Statistical Release Number 16; 2011.

## 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. Neighbourhood 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

# Neighbourhood 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.