

Gorbals Riverside

At-a-glance summary

2006-2015

We have conducted four repeat resident surveys in Gorbals Riverside over our ten-year study: the first in 2006 in which 84 residents took part; the second in 2008 in which 68 residents took part; the third in 2011 in which 71 residents took part; and the last survey in 2015 in which 73 residents were interviewed. These surveys included a whole range of questions about how people feel about their homes, their neighbourhood, services in the area, their lifestyle and circumstances and their health and wellbeing.

Over time, this has helped us understand more about the process of neighbourhood regeneration, and to highlight what is working well for communities and what needs more attention.

A selection of the findings for Gorbals Riverside from the four surveys is summarised below.

Health	Wave 1 (2006)	Wave 2 (2008)	Wave 3 (2011)	Wave 4 (2015)
Residents who felt they had good, very good or excellent general health	76.2%	72.1%	76.1%	69.9%
Residents reporting they regularly experienced stress, anxiety or depression over the last 12 months	n/a *	21.7%	15.5%	28.8%
Residents who felt optimistic about the future	n/a *	88.4%	85.9%	84.9%
Residents who currently smoke	51.8%	43.5%	48.5%	42.5%
Residents who currently drink alcohol	32.1%	58.8%	66.7%	61.6%
Residents who had at least one fast food main meal in the last week	44.6%	40.6%	60.6%	43.8%
Residents who walked in the neighbourhood most days	n/a *	38.2%	43.7%	60.3%

* Note: question introduced from 2008 onwards

Housing	Wave 1 (2006)	Wave 2 (2008)	Wave 3 (2011)	Wave 4 (2015)
Residents very or fairly satisfied with their home	79.5%	88.2%	85.9%	85.1%
Residents rating the external appearance of their home as very good	4.8%	23.9%	39.4%	27.4%
Residents who strongly agreed they felt safe in their home	4.8%	13.2%	35.2%	45.9%
Residents very or fairly satisfied with landlords/factors taking account of residents' views when making decisions	36.5%	64.7%	71.9%	87.7%
Residents very or fairly satisfied with the way landlords/factors keep residents informed	78.4%	69.6%	86.2%	94.1%

Neighbourhoods	Wave 1 (2006)	Wave 2 (2008)	Wave 3 (2011)	Wave 4 (2015)
Residents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood	82.1%	79.4%	90.1%	86.3%
Residents reporting that the neighbourhood has got better	11.3%	58.0%	76.6%	60.3%
Residents rating the attractiveness of the environment as very or fairly good	75.9%	65.2%	70.4%	83.6%
Residents rating the local shops as very or fairly good	57.1%	40.6%	57.7%	83.6%
Residents rating the local parks as very or fairly good	50.0%	61.8%	78.9%	94.5%
Residents rating the local youth and leisure services as very or fairly good	65.5%	30.4%	38.0%	72.2%
Residents rating drunkenness or rowdiness in public places as a serious or slight local problem	46.4%	86.8%	59.2%	39.7%
Residents rating drug use/drug dealing as a serious or slight local problem	41.0%	70.6%	39.4%	32.9%
Residents who felt very or fairly safe walking alone in the neighbourhood after dark	76.2%	52.2%	54.9%	63.0%

Community	Wave 1 (2006)	Wave 2 (2008)	Wave 3 (2011)	Wave 4 (2015)
Residents who felt part of the community	n/a *	83.9%	84.6%	76.9%
Residents who felt someone was likely to intervene in cases of public harassment (informal social control)	78.3%	8.7%	45.1%	53.4%
Residents who speak to neighbours at least once a week	69.9%	71.6%	85.9%	72.6%
Residents who met up with friends at least once a week	82.1%	60.3%	77.5%	77.0%
Residents who could rely on people to go to the shops for them if they were unwell (practical social support)	50.6%	67.2%	95.8%	90.5%
Residents who could rely on one or more people for advice and support in a crisis (emotional social support)	42.2%	73.1%	90.3%	91.7%
Residents who felt they have the ability to influence decisions in the local area	35.7%	50.0%	26.8%	55.9%

Household finances	Wave 1 (2006)	Wave 2 (2008)	Wave 3 (2011)	Wave 4 (2015)
Residents with difficulties meeting the cost of the rent/mortgage	26.2%	7.2%	5.7%	11.0%
Residents with difficulties meeting the cost of gas, electricity or other fuel bills	36.1%	26.5%	30.4%	31.5%
Residents with difficulties meeting the cost of food	10.8%	17.6%	13.2%	20.5%