

REPORT TO: PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE – 26 AUGUST 2002

REPORT ON: SOCIAL INCLUSION PARTNERSHIPS 1 (SIPs) SOCIAL SURVEY

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION

REPORT NO: 479-2002

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Committee that the Social Inclusion Partnership 1 (SIP 1) socio-economic survey, initially undertaken in 1995 and repeated in 2001 is now complete. (Refer Committee Report No 15-2001 of January 2001).
- 1.2 To notify the Committee of the key results of the survey and highlight any implications arising from these.
- 1.3 To inform the Committee that further analysis of the survey results will be carried out over the next few months. Any policy implications arising from this will be highlighted to communities and delivered through the Dundee Partnership.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Committee note the results of the survey and implications arising.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 There are no financial implications arising for the City Council as a result of this report.

4 LOCAL AGENDA 21 IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Social Survey addresses issues such as poverty, crime, health, education and community involvement and examines the change in the SIP 1 neighbourhoods. This reflects the nature and extent of the impact the SIP 1 programme has had on these issues. It also highlights elements of best practice, which are sustainable for the remaining funding period of the programme.

5 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The SIP programme forms the core of the Scottish Executive policy on regeneration in Scotland and along with the “Social Justice a Scotland where EVERYONE matters” the report is one of the key initiatives of the Ministerial Taskforce on Poverty led by Margaret Curran, Minister for Social Justice. The SIP Programme aims to tackle the problems of poverty, deprivation and social exclusion.

6 BACKGROUND

- 6.1 The 2001 Social Survey is a repeat of the 1995 socio-economic survey, both of which were carried out on behalf of the Dundee Partnership by the Consultant firm TL Dempster. The survey focused on each of the Social Inclusion Partnership 1 targeted communities – Hilltown, Mid Craigie and Linlathen, Ardler and Kirkton and was designed to cover a broad range of issues such as :-

- a Perception of Community,
- b Housing Profile,
- c Attitudes toward current property,
- d Information tools,
- e Housing Migration,
- f Local Environment,
- g Safety and Security,
- h Local Services,
- i Education and Employment,
- j Health

6.2 The survey was timed in part to coincide with the SIP1 mid term evaluation although it was also focused towards the following broader main objectives:

- Monitor the baseline established in the previous 1995 Survey.
- Provide a detailed profile of and address up to date need in the SIP communities.
- Provide qualitative research of issues arising from the Scottish Executive, Partnership and Council Strategies.
- Feed into the mid term evaluation process of SIP.

7 METHODOLOGY

7.1 A working group was formed to oversee the design of the survey, its delivery, appropriate consultation with stakeholders and other aspects relating to policy and funding. The group consisted of representatives from Communities Scotland, Scottish Enterprise Tayside, Dundee University and relevant Council departments.

7.2 The core component of the research was a series of in-depth interviews with residents across the four SIP1 areas. In total 1005 door-to-door interviews, which took a maximum duration of 45 minutes each, were carried out. This compares with a sample of 853 in the 1995 survey. The sample is broken down by area as follows :

Area	Residents
Ardler	128
Kirkton	184
Hilltown	467
Mid Craigie/Linlathen	<u>226</u>
	1,005
	=====

These interviews were carried out over an eight week period in October and November of 2001. A complete household profile outlining age and gender of the sample is given in Section 10 of the main report for 2001.

8 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

8.1 A summary of the key findings follows, copies of the full results' reports; main report for 2001 survey, comparison report showing comparisons between 1995 and 2001, area reports for the four SIP1 areas are available for viewing in the members' lounge. A summary of neighbourhood area results is provided in Appendix A.

8.2 Education and Employment

In relation to education, non-certificated courses were undertaken by 7% of residents resulting in the attainment of, in the main, new skills in computer use (38%).

On employment, one in three head of households was in full or part-time employment at the time of the survey. A further 25% were retired, 6% were unemployed and 8% were unable to work due to sickness or disability. 25% of respondents refused to disclose the employment status of their household head. Of those in employment 6% earn less than the minimum wage of £4.10/hour. Nearly 2/3 of unemployed respondents felt their employment prospects to be either "poor" or "very poor". The perceived barriers to employment are "lack of local job opportunities", "long term sickness/disability" and "caring for children".

Compared to 1995, there has been an increase in the proportion of residents who feel "very confident" that training courses will improve their employment prospects, 33% in 2001 compared to 25% in 1995. However, a significant decrease (-16% points) in those who describe themselves as "fairly confident". Comparisons also reveal an increase in the proportion of residents who consider that wage rates are too low relative to the opportunities for employment. However, "lack of jobs in Dundee" has apparently declined as a barrier to employment dropping from 47% of residents in 1995 to 38% of residents in 2001.

Other issues covered in the survey include vocational/academic qualifications, employment prospects, long-term unemployment, awareness of local learning/neighbourhood centres and employment assistance services, and employment and training opportunities.

8.3 Housing and SIP 1 Areas

Aspects of the local area that are most liked by residents are the "quietness of the area" and "good neighbours". While aspects that are least liked by residents are those related to the behaviour of children and teenagers (ie gang activity, noise and vandalism). Residents were generally satisfied with the quality of their housing and the provision of local facilities. The only local facility that residents expressed notable dissatisfaction with was children's play facilities.

Housing improvements are considered to be the main change for the better whilst vandalism and anti-social neighbours (and children) represent the main changes for the worse. When asked how their neighbourhood had changed over the past five years, 37% of residents indicated it had changed for the worst; 38% experienced no change; 19% felt their area had improved; and 7% did not know.

In comparison to 1995, the 2001 results indicate an increase in the proportion of residents who like the local area (+3% points). Increases are also evident in the share of residents who express positive views regarding "good neighbours" (+5% points), housing improvements (+4% points), and the general "quietness" of the area (+4% points).

Other issues covered in the survey include residency, home ownership, Council waiting lists, housing and the provision of local facilities, housing migration, and specific concerns of local people.

8.4 Community Activities

40% of residents considered that opportunities for involvement in neighbourhood community activities were either "quite good" or "very good", but the majority (63%) had never attended any community activities in the local area. The main reasons given for this include "lack of interest", "too busy", and "disability/health restrictions".

Nearly 60% of residents stated they were "very/fairly well" informed about local services. Newspapers (local and Council) are the preferred form of media for communicating local services and facilities.

The comparative data suggests an overall improvement since 1995 in the degree to which residents feel informed about local services and facilities. In 2001 (48%) felt that they were "fairly well informed", in comparison to (37%) in 1995.

8.5 Health

Almost 40% of residents report either themselves or someone else in the household has a long standing illness. 25% of residents are not registered with a dentist.

More than 3 out of 4 residents expressed satisfaction with the standard of their community health services.

8.6 Services

Survey residents were broadly satisfied with the quality of the local environment and related services. The area of greatest dissatisfaction is related to the suitability of places for children to play.

Based on the information collated, the following services/facilities have achieved an increased level of satisfaction, since 1995: local dentist (+13% points); community centre (+7% points); local health clinic (+15% points); arts, sports and social facilities (+9% points).

8.7 Community Safety

Overall, the responses given to the community safety questions suggest an increased feeling of security amongst the 2001 survey residents. 81% of residents felt either "very secure" or "fairly secure" about living in the local area. This compared with 75% of the residents of the 1995 survey.

Over half the residents (60%) stated that they felt "less concerned" or "the same" with regard to the "fear of being a victim of crime" in comparison to five years ago. 36% of residents stated that they were "more concerned".

30% of residents stated that they had been a victim of crime over the past year. Within this group, the main form of crime has been housebreaking.

Other issues covered in the survey include the causes of local crime and what would make residents feel safer in their home at night.

9 IMPACT OF SOCIAL SURVEY

9.1 The survey findings provide the partnership and its associated council departments with the opportunity to monitor change in the SIP1 neighbourhoods.

9.2 Where appropriate, it will inform policy and practice for progressing the Partnership's strategies. Further, the survey provides information that can be used to inform the development of service delivery, at a local level. As such, patterns of Partnership and Council activities and deployment of resources to improve its regeneration work can be evaluated and shaped by the survey conclusions.

9.3 The survey also has implications for SIP1 monitoring and evaluation as it provides both a monitor of change and detailed information at a small geographical area level. The survey data will be used to prepare comprehensive area profiles, which cover a broad range of issues that link to, for example, the themes of the SIP1 strategy, community planning and the Scottish Executive's Social Justice Milestones. Area profiles will be used to:

- highlight the extent of poverty, disadvantage and exclusion in the SIP1 neighbourhood areas,
- highlight resident's view and attitudes about their homes, neighbourhood environment, and services in their areas,
- highlight the social, economic and physical needs of the residents in the SIP1 areas,

- provide a detailed reference source, based on the above, for a broad range of organisations.
- track the changes over time.

This provides agency and Council department policy makers with a focus, in which to address service provision and allocate resources.

10 CONSULTATIONS

- 10.1 The Chief Executive, Director of Finance, Director of Support Services, Director of Corporate Planning, Director of Education, Director of Housing, Director of Economic Development, Director of Leisure & Arts, Director of Neighbourhood Resources and Development and Director of Public Relations have been consulted and are in agreement with the contents of this report.

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 None

Mike Galloway
Director of Planning & Transportation

Keith Winter
Policy & Regeneration Manager

2 August 2002

KW/JB/EJ

Dundee City Council
Tayside House
Dundee

APPENDIX 1

1. SIP1 NEIGHBOURHOOD AREAS

1.2 Housing and SIP Areas

Aspects of the local area most liked by all the neighbourhoods include the quietness of the area and good neighbours. Differences that are highlighted are the 'central location' for Hilltown and 'new and improved housing' for the Ardler neighbourhood.

Aspects least liked are consistently those that relate to the behaviour of children and teenagers, including noise and vandalism. Likewise problem issues across all areas centre on youth disturbance.

The following table compares the areas on a selection of other questions:

Table 1

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Home ownership (in ex Council)	47%	23%	34%	26%
Resident in neighbourhood for more than 6 years	80%	81%	79%	70%
Wishing to remain in home (2 years ahead)	78%	92%	84%	73%
Like to move but remain in the area (2 years ahead)	6%	2%	5%	8%

The redevelopment work of the New Housing Partnership has a particular bearing on the Ardler figures. At the time when the survey was undertaken, there was significant physical change in the area, which has probably influenced resident's perceptions of their neighbourhood. Questions that address the physical aspects of the area including housing and services may be less suitable in Ardler at this time, given the extent of redevelopment, not least the construction work involved in this.

1.2 Community Activities

The range of community activities accessed by residents varies between the areas and very much depends on what exists locally. Residents across the SIP1 neighbourhoods considered that opportunities for involvement in neighbourhood community activities were either "quite good" or "very good". That said, the percentage of residents who had never attended any community activities in their area were clearly in the majority (see following table).

Table 2

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Never attended any community activities	74%	36%	59%	68%
Very/fairly well informed about community services	52%	86%	66%	53%

Although reasonably well informed (see table above), usage of local community services was low across the four SIP1 neighbourhoods.

1.3 Health

The following table compares the areas on specific health related criteria:

Table 3

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Residents very/fairly satisfied with Community Health Services	60%	67%	78%	86%
Residents registered with a dentist	92%	85%	69%	62%
Householder with long- standing illness	35%	35%	37%	45%

1.4 Education

Undertaking non-certified courses resulted in the attainment of different new skills, although the highest, across all the areas, was in computer use. A significant percentage of residents were either "very confident" or fairly confident" that training (undertaken in IT and non-IT subjects) would improve their employment prospects (see table below).

Table 4

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Undertaking non-certificated courses	5%	15%	5%	6%
Confident training would improve their employment prospects	75%	50%	43%	71%

1.5 Employment

The main barriers to employment, that are consistent across the SIP1 neighbourhoods, are "lack of local job opportunities", "long term sickness/disability" and "caring for children". Of the unemployed residents, there is, generally, a high level of awareness of local learning/ neighbourhood centres as a possible source of help (see table below).

Table 5

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Local learning/neighbourhood centres as a source of help	67%	29%	70%	50%

The following table compares the areas on specific criteria:

Table 6

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Head of Household in full or part time employment	38%	38%	20%	22%
Earning less than the minimum wage (£4.10 per hour)	6%	0%	10%	6%
Household income less than £199 per week	41%	60%	51%	64%
Unemployed who felt their employment prospects were poor or very poor	80%	78%	70%	57%

% of unemployed having 2 spells of unemployment in last 5 years	27%	29%	10%	19%
Access to home computer/use the internet	34%	31%	40%	16%

1.6 Services

The overall picture that emerges in terms of resident's attitudes to a range of local services is one of satisfaction. They were also broadly satisfied with the quality of the local environment. The level of suitable places related to the lack of "suitable places for children to play" in most of the areas, although, in Ardler there was also dissatisfaction with "access to financial services (52%)" and a "post office (61%)".

1.7 Community Safety

On the measure of fear of being a victim of crime, residents across the SIP1 neighbourhoods mostly felt no difference than they did five years ago (see table 7 below).

Between 25% and 33% of the residents have been a victim of crime over the past year. Within this group the main form of crime has been:- Mid Craigie – abusive behaviour (29%), Ardler – theft from a vehicle (33%), Kirkton – house breaking (39%) and Hilltown – house breaking (36%).

Table 7

	Hilltown	Mid Craigie/ Linlathen	Kirkton	Ardler
No difference/Less concerned about being a victim of crime than 5 years ago.	58%	56%	72%	50%
More concerned about being a victim of crime.	39%	39%	27%	31%

Residents across the SIP1 neighbourhoods considered the following main causes of local crime to be:

Table 8

	Mid Craigie & Linlathen	Ardler	Kirkton	Hilltown
Drug related activity	40%	50%	51%	70%
Drink related activity	31%	41%	30%	36%
Unemployment	21%	10%	29%	26%
Poverty	22%	6%	23%	19%
Poor facilities	24%	13%	26%	14%

While "drug" and "drink" related criminal activities feature prominently in all areas, peer group pressure is also highlighted for the Hilltown area (46%).