

**Glasgow Community Planning Partnership
Residents' Survey**

Summary Report

**Final
February 2008**

**ODS Consulting
(in partnership with MRUK)
2 Myrtle Park
Glasgow
G42 8UQ**

**Tel 0141 424 3765
Fax 0141 423 9997
Email: john.scott@odsconsulting.co.uk**



Contents

List of Tables.....i
Executive Summary.....ii

Section	Page
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Differences across the ten LCPP areas	6
3 Contrasting experiences in two neighbourhoods	23

Appendix 1: Summary of the ten LCPP areas
Appendix 2: Residents' Survey Questionnaire

List of Tables

- Table 2.1: Youth disorder by LCPP area
- Table 2.2: Road safety by LCPP area
- Table 2.3: Problems with dogs by LCPP area
- Table 2.4: Litter in the street by LCPP area
- Table 2.5: Graffiti by LCPP area
- Table 2.6: Untidy gardens by LCPP area
- Table 2.7: Untidy communal areas by LCPP area
- Table 2.8: Children's play areas by LCPP area
- Table 2.9: Parks and open spaces by LCPP area
- Table 2.10: Youth and leisure services by LCPP area
- Table 2.11: Policing by LCPP area
- Table 2.12: Quality of life by LCPP area
- Table 3.1: Problems raised on Community Safety
- Table 3.2: Number of concerns – Security and community safety
- Table 3.3: Change in Community Safety in past year
- Table 3.4: Number of concerns – Security and community safety in the past year
- Table 3.5: Problems raised on Cleansing / Local environment
- Table 3.6: Number of concerns – Cleansing / Local environment
- Table 3.7: Views on overall quality of neighbourhood
- Table 3.8: Problems raised on Cleansing / Local environment
- Table 3.9: Number of concerns – Quality of neighbourhood
- Table 3.10: Quality of services in the local area
- Table 3.11: Number of concerns – Quality of services in local area

Executive Summary

Introduction

- In July 2007 Glasgow Community Planning Partnership Ltd commissioned ODS Consulting and MRUK to conduct a survey of 10,000 households in Glasgow to establish residents' views, perceptions and expectations of issues relating to their neighbourhoods.
- There are ten Local Community Planning Partnerships (LCPPs) in Glasgow. A separate report has been prepared for each area, based on a survey of 1,000 residents per partnership area. This report provides an overview, and compares and contrasts some of the key findings.
- Overall, respondents were happy with their neighbourhoods and the local services they receive. Although our findings highlight issues raised and areas for improvement, the vast majority of responses were positive in relation to community safety, cleansing / environment, local neighbourhood services and the general quality of life.

Security and Community Safety

- The three most commonly reported community safety concerns across the ten LCPP areas were:
 - youth disorder;
 - road safety; and
 - problems with dogs.
- In addition to these issues, residents were concerned about street drinking, vandalism / graffiti and problems with drug / alcohol misuse and drug dealing.

Cleansing and Environment

- Across all ten areas the top issue for residents in relation to their local environment was:
 - litter in the street.

- Other problems that were raised by significant numbers of residents were graffiti; untidy gardens and untidy communal areas.
- However, residents were positive about maintenance of properties and public areas in their neighbourhood. Across the ten areas between 69 and 87 per cent said that maintenance was either 'good' or 'very good'.

Quality of Neighbourhood

- The main issue for residents in relation to the quality of their neighbourhood was concern about:
 - children's play areas.
- Residents across the city also raised concerns about the quality of parks and open spaces in their local area.

Quality of Local Service Provision

- Across the ten areas the main concerns for residents in relation to local services were the quality of:
 - youth and leisure services; and
 - policing.
- When asked what they would change to improve their neighbourhood, the most common response from residents across the city was:
 - 'more police on the streets'.
- Across Glasgow, residents were very positive about the quality of health services and refuse collection with typically between 80 and 90 per cent stating that these services were either 'good' or 'very good'. There were also high levels of satisfaction with public transport in the city.

Quality of Life

- In each of the ten areas respondents expressed high levels of satisfaction with their neighbourhood. Across the city, between 87 and 95 per cent stated that

they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live.

Communication / Participation

- Generally, residents would prefer to be kept informed about their local area through newsletters and through information posted in health centres and local housing offices.

1. Introduction

About this Report

- 1.1 In July 2007 Glasgow Community Planning Partnership Limited commissioned ODS Consulting and MRUK to conduct a survey of 10,000 households in Glasgow to establish residents' views, perceptions and expectations of issues relating to their neighbourhoods.
- 1.2 There are ten Local Community Planning Partnerships in Glasgow. A separate report, based on a survey of 1,000 residents has been prepared for each. This report provides an overview, and compares and contrasts some of the key findings. Appendix One contains a summary of the findings in each of the ten LCPP areas. A full report on the findings for each area is available separately.

Background to the Study

- 1.3 The Glasgow Community Planning Partnership (CPP) brings key public, private, community and voluntary representatives together with the aim of delivering better, more joined-up public services in the City. Ten Local Community Planning Partnerships (LCPP) have been established which have co-terminus boundaries with a range of other service providers. They are also aligned with the 56 neighbourhoods agreed through the Local Housing Forums.
- 1.4 From the outset Glasgow Community Planning Partnership has committed itself to facilitating the co-ordination of public services at a neighbourhood level in order to bring about real and meaningful benefits for local communities.
- 1.5 In order to test how this might work in practice, Glasgow Community Planning Partnership selected the Glasgow North East (formerly Springburn and Western Glasgow North East) LCPP area as a pilot project on Neighbourhood Management

- 1.6 The pilot was initiated in May 2006 and led by Glasgow Community Planning Partnership Limited through its North Area Team. A seconded staff member from Glasgow Housing Association (GHA) provided project management and operational support.
- 1.7 A survey of 1,000 residents was undertaken to inform the development of Action Plans for each of the neighbourhoods being targeted. These reflected the issues that had been identified by residents as causes of concern, and the actions service providers had agreed to address them.
- 1.8 Implementation commenced in December 2006, overseen by a multi agency Steering Group. An independent review of the early stages of the pilot indicated that the process was resulting in new ways of thinking and working on the part of those involved, and had resulted in early and tangible achievements on the ground.
- 1.9 Glasgow Community Planning Partnership therefore wishes to roll out the pilot across the City. This survey is intended to provide baseline information to inform the development of Action Plans within individual neighbourhoods.

The Wider Context

- 1.10 Neighbourhood management seeks to tailor services to local areas by recognising local concerns and priorities. It requires a collaborative approach between residents and service providers. This often requires new ways of working, with greater focus on partnership working.
- 1.11 Whilst neighbourhood management may encompass a range of services, its focus generally includes:
- cleanliness of public space;
 - safety and security; and
 - safeguarding the environment.
- 1.12 Across the UK, there has been increasing interest in the role Neighbourhood Management has to play in improving the quality of neighbourhoods. A variety of approaches and structures have been tested.

1.13 In England a Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme has led to around 35 schemes being supported through targeted funding. The lessons to be learnt are the subject of ongoing evaluation. However, an evaluation of the initial pathfinder programme¹ identified the considerable benefits that had accrued,

“... The main benefits so far have been to make the deprived pathfinder neighbourhoods safer and cleaner and help shape services that are better joined up, more accessible and more responsive to local needs...

... What is striking about these changes is that relatively modest shifts in resources seem to be able to produce relatively significant changes in resident perceptions of their areas”.

1.14 Such is the level of interest that Neighbourhood Management schemes are now being developed on a significant scale across England.

1.15 In Scotland the approach has been a more “bottom up” one, with local authorities and their partners adopting a variety of approaches. Some have focussed on specific areas of activity. For example, being linked to an anti-social behaviour strategy. Others have been initiated as a result of national funding, such as the Better Neighbourhood Services Fund. Increasingly, however, the trend is to plan Neighbourhood Management services – whether focussed on more deprived neighbourhoods or across an entire local authority area - under the auspices of Community Planning structures.

1.16 Given the way in which Neighbourhood Management services have been developing in Scotland, there is a lack of empirical evidence as to its effectiveness. However, anecdotal and local research points to the benefits that can be derived.

¹ Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, Evaluation of the National Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder Programme, 2005-06

1.17 The North Glasgow pilot was the subject of an external review² after its first year of operation. It reported that,

“From the perspective of those directly involved, the Neighbourhood Management Pilot is already proving a major success ...

... For operational staff, the process has fostered new ways of thinking and working locally. They have reported: new contacts within related service departments and agencies; a growing awareness of the agenda and constraints of partners; more productive working relationships between staff; a newfound willingness to share information and resources; and a personal sense of satisfaction at being able to make things happen.

... Staff have also suggested that new ways of working have begun to take hold, and to good effect within the target neighbourhoods.”

Glasgow Community Planning & Neighbourhood Planning

1.18 As we have already highlighted, Community Planning structures in Glasgow encompass ten LCCPs which are aligned to 56 neighbourhoods. In rolling out Neighbourhood Management across the City, the intention is to mainstream the concept to public services being delivered to all neighbourhoods. It will therefore not just be focussed on more disadvantaged communities. Adopting this approach will however inevitably highlight where readjustments are required in services and resources to meet the relative needs of different areas.

1.19 This survey is intended to provide a baseline position for nine of the LCCP areas and an update for Glasgow North East. It will provide an evidence base for LCCPs to develop Neighbourhood Action Plans, which incorporate the priority issues identified by residents and the actions agreed to address them.

² EKOS. Review of the Glasgow Neighbourhood Management Initiative, March 2007

The Survey and Methodology

- 1.20 The survey was designed to present residents' views, perceptions and requirements at a neighbourhood level in three key areas:
- security (control of nuisance and general supervision);
 - environmental (maintenance and repair of damage to public areas); and
 - cleansing (street cleaning, refuse collection and rubbish removal).
- 1.21 The survey also asked what residents thought about the quality of their neighbourhood (in terms of facilities and the environment), the quality of services provided locally and perceptions of the general 'quality of life' in the area. In addition, respondents were asked how they would like to be kept informed about their neighbourhood – and what methods they thought were most effective for community participation in neighbourhood management.
- 1.22 The questionnaire was developed in consultation with representatives from Glasgow Community Planning Partnership, Glasgow Housing Association, the Community Health and Care Partnerships and Strathclyde Police. The survey questionnaire is included as Appendix Two.
- 1.23 One thousand interviews were undertaken in each of the ten LCPP areas across the city. The interviews were conducted 'door to door' between October and December 2007. The interviews took place on weekdays and at weekends between the hours of 10am and 8pm in order to maximise participation. Procedures were put in place for the provision of interpreting where participants did not speak English.
- 1.24 In order to make the survey as representative as possible, targets were agreed with Glasgow Community Planning Partnership to achieve a demographic and geographic balance of those to be surveyed within each of the LCPP areas.

2. Differences Across the Ten LCPP Areas

Security and Community Safety

- 2.1 Security and Community Safety, as a category, was the area of most concern to residents. The three most commonly reported community safety concerns across the ten LCPP areas were youth disorder, road safety and problems with dogs.
- 2.2 Youth disorder was the security and community safety issue of greatest concern in four LCPP areas. These were Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse, East Centre / Calton, Govan / Craigton and Central / West. Problems with youth disorder were among the top three concerns in all LCPP areas.
- 2.3 Road safety was the top community safety issue in Pollokshields and Southside Central, Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn and Langside and Linn. Problems with dogs were of the issue of most concern for residents in the West, Maryhill / Kelvin and Canal and North East LCPP areas.
- 2.4 In all areas a majority of respondents to the survey felt that all security and community safety issues were either 'not much of a problem' or 'not a problem at all'.

Youth Disorder

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	3%	16%	5%	20%	57%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	7%	26%	4%	23%	39%	0%
E. Centre & Calton	6%	16%	4%	17%	57%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	7%	17%	3%	14%	59%	0%
Langside & Linn	5%	20%	6%	20%	50%	0%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	4%	9%	3%	15%	69%	0%
Govan & Craigton	7%	22%	3%	13%	56%	0%
Central & West	4%	12%	2%	16%	66%	0%
West	5%	9%	4%	22%	60%	0%
North East	3%	6%	3%	29%	59%	0%

Table 2.1: Youth disorder by LCPP area

- 2.5 Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse residents reported the most problems with youth disorder. Thirty-three per cent of residents in this area considered youth disorder to a 'problem' (26%) or a 'serious problem' (7%).
- 2.6 Glasgow North East saw the smallest number of residents concerned over youth disorder. Just six per cent of residents considered youth disorder to be a 'problem', while three per cent considered the issue a 'serious problem'. In the same area, 88 per cent of residents felt that youth disorder was either 'not much of a problem' (29%) or 'not a problem at all' (59%).
- 2.7 A majority of residents in all areas felt that problems with youth disorder had stayed the same over the past year. Residents in Langside and Linn (18%); Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse (17%); Govan and Craigton (16%); and East Centre and Calton (15%) reported that problems with youth disorder had got 'slightly worse' or 'much worse' over the past year.

Road Safety

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	5%	15%	5%	21%	54%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	5%	23%	3%	21%	57%	1%
E. Centre & Calton	3%	15%	4%	16%	61%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	7%	18%	3%	15%	56%	0%
Langside & Linn	8%	24%	6%	18%	44%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	4%	10%	3%	12%	71%	1%
Govan & Craigton	7%	18%	3%	8%	63%	0%
Central & West	4%	9%	2%	13%	71%	0%
West	3%	13%	5%	17%	61%	1%
North East	2%	7%	3%	28%	61%	0%

Table 2.2: Road safety by LCPP area

- 2.8 The issue of road safety was of greatest concern in the Langside and Linn LCPP. Twenty four per cent of residents considered road safety to be a 'problem', with a further eight per cent considering the issue to be a 'serious problem' in the area.
- 2.9 In Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal a fifth of residents considered road safety to be either a 'problem' or a 'serious problem'. In Baillieston / Shettleston / Greater Easterhouse, Pollokshields / Southside Central and Govan / Craigton over a quarter of residents reported road safety as a problem to some degree.
- 2.10 Road safety was reported in the top three most serious community safety issues in nine of the ten LCPP areas. However, in all areas, majorities of residents considered road safety to be either 'not much of a problem' or 'not a problem at all'.
- 2.11 Road safety was considered to have deteriorated in all LCPP areas. However, there were particularly high numbers of people in Langside and Linn (23%), Govan and Craigton (17%) and Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal (16%) that felt road safety had deteriorated over the past year.

2.12 For respondents that mentioned road safety as a problem in their local area, the most common concern was in relation to 'cars driving too fast through the area'. Respondents in Govan and Craigton were particularly concerned about this with 93 per cent of respondents stating that this was a 'problem'.

Dogs Roaming, Fouling and Barking

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	5%	18%	5%	19%	53%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	8%	23%	4%	20%	44%	1%
E. Centre & Calton	7%	14%	5%	16%	57%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	4%	11%	4%	16%	64%	1%
Langside & Linn	4%	14%	5%	22%	54%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	5%	8%	2%	14%	71%	1%
Govan & Craigton	7%	15%	3%	11%	64%	0%
Central & West	3%	6%	2%	15%	73%	0%
West	6%	12%	4%	20%	58%	1%
North East	6%	10%	3%	16%	55%	0%

Table 2.3: Problems with dogs by LCPP area

2.13 Problems with dogs were reported most often in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse. Thirty-one per cent of respondents reported dog roaming / fouling / barking as either a 'problem' (23%) or a 'serious problem' (8%).

2.14 In the Central / West LCPP dogs were less of a concern with 88 per cent of residents reporting that dogs were either 'not much of a problem' (15%) or 'not a problem at all' (73%).

2.15 Problems with dogs were reported in the top five most serious community safety issues in nine of the ten LCPP areas. However, in all LCPP areas majorities of residents considered problems with dogs to be either 'not much of a problem' or 'not a problem at all'.

2.16 A majority of residents in all areas felt that problems with dogs had stayed the same over the past year. However, across all areas significant minorities felt that problems with dogs had got worse in the previous year. Residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse, East Centre / Calton and Langside and Linn were most concerned about problems with dogs getting worse.

Other Issues

2.17 Street drinking was one of the top five community safety issues in all the LCPPs. The issue was of greatest concern to residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse, where five per cent considered the issue a 'problem' and 21 per cent a 'serious problem'.

2.18 Street drinking was not considered to be a significant community safety issue in the Glasgow North East LCPP. In this area 27 per cent said the issue was 'not much of a problem' and 64 per cent said it was 'not a problem at all'.

2.19 Vandalism / graffiti was also considered a serious community safety issue in eight LCPP areas. In these areas the issue was among the top five most serious community safety problems. Concern was greatest in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse with 21 per cent of residents stating that the issue was a 'problem' and five per cent saying it was a 'serious problem'.

2.20 Problems with drug dealing and drug and alcohol abuse were reported most often in the Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse LCPP. Fourteen per cent of residents reported drug dealing as a 'problem' with an additional four per cent as a 'serious problem'. While 15 per cent of residents felt that drug and alcohol abuse was a 'problem' in the area, four per cent of residents considered the issue a 'serious problem'.

Number of Concerns

2.21 In six LCPP areas more than half of residents had at least one community safety concern. The highest level of concern was reported in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse where 65 per cent of residents raised

concerns over community safety. Conversely, in the Glasgow North East LCPP area 69 per cent of respondents raised no concerns in terms of community safety issues.

Antisocial Behaviour

- 2.22 Majorities of residents in all areas reported that they had not been subjected to any form of anti social behaviour in the past year. Residents in Glasgow North East were most positive about this issue with 92 per cent of respondents stating that they had not been subjected to anti social behaviour. Experiences of anti social behaviour were most common in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse with 27 per cent of residents having been subjected to some form of anti social behaviour.
- 2.23 Across all ten LCPP areas the most common incidence of anti social behaviour is in relation to youth disorder, problems with neighbours / noisy neighbours or vandalism and graffiti.

Safety at Night

- 2.24 Large majorities of residents in each LCPP area stated that they felt safe walking alone in their local area after dark. Seventy five per cent of residents in Langside and Linn and in Greater Pollok, Newlands / Auldburn felt safe walking alone at night. In Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse less than two thirds of residents felt safe walking at night.

Cleansing and Environment

- 2.25 Litter in the street was the top cleansing and environmental issue in each LCPP area. Graffiti was the second most serious issue in eight LCPP areas and the third most serious in two. Across all LCPP areas untidy gardens and communal areas were also an area for concern for residents.
- 2.26 Across each LCPP area all cleansing and environmental issues were considered to be 'not much of a problem' or 'not a problem at all' by a majority of the respondents to the survey.

Litter in the street

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	5%	16%	4%	20%	54%	0%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	5%	28%	5%	22%	40%	0%
E. Centre & Calton	7%	22%	7%	26%	39%	0%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	5%	25%	4%	18%	48%	1%
Langside & Linn	2%	21%	6%	23%	48%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	2%	10%	3%	23%	62%	0%
Govan & Craigton	5%	23%	5%	15%	51%	1%
Central & West	4%	20%	3%	20%	53%	0%
West	4%	13%	6%	29%	48%	0%
North East	3%	10%	3%	28%	56%	0%

Table 2.4: Litter in the street by LCPP area

- 2.27 Problems with litter in the street are most common in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse. Twenty-eight per cent of respondents felt that litter in the street was a 'problem' in the local area while an additional five per cent felt it was a 'serious problem'. Approximately a third of residents in East Centre / Calton and Pollokshields / Southside Central reported that litter in the street was either a 'problem' or 'serious problem'.
- 2.28 Problems with litter in the street were least apparent in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn followed by Glasgow North East. In Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn twenty-three per cent of residents considered litter in the street to be 'not much of a problem' with a further 62 per cent stating that it was 'not a problem at all'. In Glasgow North East 28 per cent said it was 'not much of a problem' while 56 per cent said it was 'not a problem at all'.

Graffiti

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	3%	16%	3%	19%	58%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	3%	26%	5%	17%	49%	1%
E. Centre & Calton	3%	17%	5%	20%	54%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	2%	18%	7%	19%	54%	1%
Langside & Linn	1%	10%	6%	22%	57%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	1%	5%	3%	18%	72%	1%
Govan & Craigton	2%	11%	5%	11%	69%	0%
Central & West	3%	10%	3%	21%	62%	0%
West	2%	9%	6%	22%	60%	1%
North East	1%	6%	3%	26%	64%	0%

Table 2.5: Graffiti by LCPP area

- 2.29 Problems with graffiti were reported most often by residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse. Twenty-six per cent of residents felt that graffiti was a 'problem' in the local area and three per cent felt it was a 'serious problem'.
- 2.30 Approximately a fifth of residents in Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal, East Centre / Calton and Pollokshields and Southside Central also considered graffiti to be a 'problem' or a 'serious problem' in the local area.
- 2.31 Graffiti was less of a concern in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn. Eighteen per cent of residents considered graffiti to be 'not much of a problem', with 72 per cent stating this issue was 'not a problem at all' in the local area.

Untidy Gardens

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	3%	11%	4%	21%	61%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	3%	16%	5%	21%	53%	1%
E. Centre & Calton	4%	11%	7%	26%	52%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	3%	15%	6%	20%	56%	1%
Langside & Linn	1%	10%	5%	25%	59%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	1%	4%	3%	18%	73%	0%
Govan & Craigton	1%	12%	5%	17%	65%	0%
Central & West	1%	5%	2%	16%	74%	1%
West	1%	7%	3%	26%	57%	1%
North East	2%	4%	3%	25%	65%	0%

Table 2.6: Untidy gardens by LCPP area* some properties have been excluded from this table as they have no garden. As a result percentages may not add up to 100%

2.32 Problems with untidy gardens were reported most often by residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse. Sixteen per cent of residents felt that untidy gardens were a 'problem' in the area and a further three per cent felt they were a 'serious problem'. Problems with untidy gardens were less common in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn and Glasgow North East. In both of these areas over 90 per cent of residents felt that problems with gardens were either 'not much of a problem' or 'not a problem at all'.

Untidy Communal Areas

	Serious problem	Problem	Neutral	Not much of a problem	Not a problem at all	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	2%	13%	3%	17%	57%	1%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	2%	16%	5%	20%	51%	2%
E. Centre & Calton	3%	10%	6%	24%	55%	1%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	3%	15%	6%	17%	57%	1%
Langside & Linn	0%	8%	5%	20%	54%	2%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	0%	3%	3%	19%	71%	2%
Govan & Craigton	1%	7%	4%	10%	63%	2%
Central & West	1%	8%	3%	15%	72%	1%
West	2%	9%	3%	20%	52%	1%
North East	2%	4%	2%	22%	58%	1%

Table 2.7: Untidy communal areas by LCPP area* some properties have been excluded from this table as they have no communal area. As a result percentages may not add up to 100%

2.33 Complaints about untidy communal areas were most common in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse. Sixteen per cent of local residents considered untidy communal areas to be a 'problem', while another two per cent consider them to be a 'serious problem'. Untidy communal areas were of least concern in Langside and Linn and Glasgow North East. This may be a result of a low level of flatted accommodation in these areas.

Other Issues

2.34 Dirty stairs and closes were of greatest concern to residents in Pollokshields and Southside Central. Twelve per cent of residents considered this to be a problem with another two per cent considering it a serious problem.

2.35 Fly tipping was a concern in some areas with residents in six LCPP areas highlighting this as one of the top five most serious environmental issues in the area.

2.36 Residents in Langside and Linn and Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse were most concerned about fly-tipping in their area. In Langside

and Linn 16 per cent of residents considered this issue a 'problem' while four per cent considered it a 'serious problem'. Fourteen per cent of residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse felt fly tipping was a 'problem' and an additional three per cent felt it was a 'serious problem'.

- 2.37 Very low numbers of people considered abandoned cars to be a problem or a serious problem in any LCPP area.

Number of Concerns

- 2.38 More than two thirds of residents reported no concerns in relation to cleansing and environmental issues in five LCPP areas. Residents were most satisfied with their local environment in the Glasgow North East LCPP where 83 per cent of residents reported no concerns in relation to their local environment. There were similar levels of satisfaction in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn and the West LCPP with 82 and 78 per cent of residents reporting no concerns.
- 2.39 The highest number of concerns were reported in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse LCPP area. Here just 52 per cent of respondents reported that they had no concerns in relation to cleansing and environmental issues.

Quality of Neighbourhood

- 2.40 Across all LCPP areas the main concerns in terms of the quality of the local neighbourhood were in relation to children's play areas and parks and open spaces. In eight LCPP areas the quality of children's play areas was the issue of greatest concern. In the remaining two areas the quality of parks and open spaces was the greater concerns to local residents in relation to the quality of the neighbourhood.

Children's Play Areas

	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	23%	23%	14%	23%	6%	10%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	15%	26%	17%	30%	5%	6%
E. Centre & Calton	9%	16%	26%	31%	6%	9%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	11%	20%	24%	32%	6%	7%
Langside & Linn	12%	17%	22%	31%	7%	11%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	7%	10%	18%	44%	15%	6%
Govan & Craigton	9%	17%	20%	34%	7%	13%
Central & West	4%	8%	14%	32%	27%	13%
West	9%	15%	19%	41%	10%	6%
North East	11%	16%	22%	38%	5%	9%

Table 2.8: Children's play areas by LCPP area

2.41 Children's play areas were felt to be poorest in the Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal LCPP. Twenty-three per cent of respondents felt that children's play areas in the area were 'poor', while another 23 per cent felt that children's play areas were 'very poor'. Over two fifths of residents in the Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse LCPP thought that children's play areas were either poor or very poor. Just less than a third of residents in Pollokshields and Southside Central, Langside and Linn and Glasgow North East also felt children's play areas were 'either poor' or 'very poor'.

2.42 Residents in the Central / West LCPP were most positive about children's play areas. Thirty-two per cent of resident thought that play area were 'good' and 27 per cent 'very good'. Residents in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn were also positive about children's play areas with 44 per cent rating play areas as 'good' and 15 per cent as 'very good'.

Parks and Open Spaces

	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	14%	17%	16%	33%	14%	2%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	7%	17%	14%	51%	10%	1%
E. Centre & Calton	5%	10%	23%	50%	10%	2%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	6%	12%	21%	52%	9%	1%
Langside & Linn	8%	14%	17%	49%	12%	1%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	3%	4%	15%	59%	18%	1%
Govan & Craigton	3%	8%	19%	52%	13%	5%
Central & West	3%	7%	10%	45%	33%	2%
West	6%	8%	20%	53%	12%	1%
North East	5%	10%	18%	54%	12%	1%

Table 2.9: Parks and open spaces by LCPP area

2.43 In each LCPP area significant numbers of people had a neutral opinion of the condition of parks and open spaces in the area. In Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal area 17 per cent of residents felt that local parks in the area were 'poor' while another 14 per cent thought they were 'very poor'.

2.44 Residents in the Central West LCPP were most positive about parks in their area. Forty-five per cent of residents felt that local parks were 'good' and 33 per cent 'very good'. Similar levels were reported by residents in Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn. Fifty-nine per cent of residents thought local parks were 'good' and 18 per cent said they were 'very good'.

Number of Concerns

2.45 In nine out of ten areas over half of the respondents did not report any concerns in relation to the quality of the neighbourhood. In Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal just 46 per cent of residents reported no problems in terms of the quality of their neighbourhood. In the Central / West LCPP 83 per cent of residents reported no concerns with the quality of the neighbourhood.

Quality of Service Provision

2.46 The main concerns raised by residents are in relation to youth and leisure services and the quality of policing. The quality of youth and leisure service was of greater concern for residents in six LCPP areas. In the other four LCPP areas, policing was the issue of greatest concern.

Youth and Leisure Services

	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	24%	24%	11%	16%	1%	21%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	16%	22%	11%	19%	3%	28%
E. Centre & Calton	9%	12%	17%	25%	7%	26%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	8%	16%	16%	23%	4%	30%
Langside & Linn	13%	20%	19%	21%	4%	22%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	11%	15%	13%	28%	11%	22%
Govan & Craigton	9%	14%	13%	30%	7%	26%
Central & West	4%	8%	12%	36%	18%	20%
West	5%	9%	18%	38%	9%	19%
North East	11%	15%	13%	34%	2%	25%

Table 2.10: Youth and leisure services by LCPP area

2.47 Residents were most critical about the quality of youth and leisure services in Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal. Twenty-four per cent of residents felt that youth and leisure services in the area were 'poor' while another 24 per cent thought they were 'very poor'.

2.48 Residents in the Central / West LCPP were most positive about youth and leisure services. Thirty-six per cent of residents thought youth and leisure services in the area were 'good' and 18 per cent 'very good'.

Policing

	Very poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very good	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	15%	21%	21%	26%	2%	13%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	12%	16%	22%	30%	4%	13%
E. Centre & Calton	11%	14%	27%	32%	10%	7%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	9%	15%	22%	38%	6%	10%
Langside & Linn	10%	17%	28%	32%	5%	8%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	13%	15%	20%	35%	12%	6%
Govan & Craigton	10%	18%	25%	30%	9%	8%
Central & West	4%	8%	18%	41%	22%	7%
West	4%	7%	25%	44%	13%	6%
North East	6%	12%	21%	39%	6%	15%

Table 2.11: Policing by LCPP area

- 2.49 Residents in Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal LCPP were most negative about policing across the LCPP area. Twenty-one per cent of residents felt that policing was 'poor' in the area and another 15 per cent of residents felt it was 'very poor'.
- 2.50 Over a quarter of residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse, East Centre and Calton, Langside and Linn, Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn and Govan / Craigton felt that policing in their areas was either 'poor' or 'very poor'.
- 2.51 Residents in the Central / West LCPP and the West LCPP were the most positive about the quality of policing. Forty-four per cent of residents in the West LCPP felt policing in their area was 'good' while 13 per cent felt it was 'very good'. In the Central / West LCPP, 41 per cent of residents felt policing was 'good' and 22 per cent said it was 'very good'.

Quality of Life

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Neutral	Fairly Dissatisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal	49%	40%	5%	3%	3%	0%
Baillieston, Shettleston and G. Easterhouse	47%	40%	6%	4%	3%	0%
E. Centre & Calton	44%	44%	7%	4%	2%	0%
Pollokshields & Southside Central	44%	44%	7%	3%	1%	0%
Langside & Linn	44%	47%	6%	3%	1%	0%
Greater Pollok & Newlands / Auldburn	59%	36%	3%	1%	1%	0%
Govan & Craigton	43%	49%	5%	2%	1%	0%
Central & West	67%	28%	3%	1%	0%	0%
West	42%	45%	6%	3%	2%	0%
North East	52%	38%	5%	2%	2%	0%

Table 2.12: Quality of life by LCPP area

2.52 In all LCPP areas, respondents demonstrated high levels of satisfaction with their area as a place to live. Residents in Central / West LCPP were the most satisfied with their area as a place to live. Sixty-seven per cent of residents were 'very satisfied' with the area and a further 28 per cent were 'fairly satisfied'.

2.53 Residents in Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse were the most dissatisfied with their area as a place to live. Four per cent of residents were 'fairly dissatisfied' with the area with another three per cent being 'very dissatisfied'.

2.54 When asked if there was anything residents wanted to change about their area, the most common response in all LCPP areas was to have more police on the streets.

Communication

2.55 Residents in nine LCPP areas felt that newsletters were the most effective way to keep local people informed about their area. Information provided

through health centres and local housing offices was also popular across the ten LCPPs.

- 2.56 Large majorities of people in all areas felt that local people should be asked their opinion on the management of their neighbourhood. However, lower numbers of people thought that the local community should be actively involved in the management of their community. The most popular forms of feedback among residents were regular surveys and feedback slips in newsletters.

General Trends

- 2.57 While road safety was a serious concern for those living in all tenures, the issue was of particular concern for owner occupiers. Youth disorder was also a concern for residents living in all tenures. However, tenants living in social rented and private rented accommodation tended to be more concerned about this issue. Litter tended to be the main environmental concern for people living in all tenures.
- 2.58 People over retirement age were less likely to support the use of email updates or a community website to provide them with information about their neighbourhood. Residents under 30 years of age were more likely to highlight problems with youth disorder and street drinking than the older age groups.

3. Contrasting Experiences in Two Neighbourhoods

Introduction

- 3.1 The study demonstrated significant differences in the views of residents living in the 56 neighbourhoods in Glasgow. Detailed results for each neighbourhood are given in each of the reports for the ten LCPPs.
- 3.2 This section looks at two neighbourhoods in different parts of Glasgow in order to illustrate the contrasting experience of residents across the city. The neighbourhoods of Pollokshaws / Mansewood and Ruchill / Possilpark have been chosen due to the different levels of satisfaction and the number of concerns raised.

Security and Community Safety

- 3.3 Generally, residents were far more concerned about issues of security and community safety in Ruchill / Possilpark than in Pollokshaws / Mansewood. In Pollokshaws / Mansewood for each community safety issue no more than ten per cent said that they were a 'problem' or 'serious problem'. However, in Ruchill / Possilpark six of the issues were felt to be a problem by more than 20 per cent of respondents. These issues were: 'problems with dogs'; 'drug / alcohol / substance abuse'; 'drug dealing'; 'road safety'; 'vandalism / graffiti'; and 'problems with neighbours'.

Issue	Problem / Serious problem	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Problems with dogs	10%	36%
Road safety	7%	24%
Drug / alcohol / substance abuse	4%	29%
Drug dealing	4%	27%
Vandalism / graffiti	1%	23%
Problems with neighbours	2%	22%

Table 3.1: Problems raised on Community Safety

- 3.4 As Table 3.1 shows, while problems with dogs was the top issue in both areas it was only stated as a problem / serious problem by ten per cent of

respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood compared with 36 per cent in Ruchill / Possilpark.

- 3.5 Road safety was a concern in both areas. However, while only a concern for seven per cent in Pollokshaws / Mansewood, nearly a quarter of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said it was a problem / serious problem.
- 3.6 Issues relating to drugs and alcohol were far more of a concern for residents in Ruchill / Possilpark. While drug dealing was stated to be a problem by four per cent of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood, this was raised as an issue by 29 per cent in the other area. Similarly, drug dealing was only viewed as a problem by four per cent of Pollokshaws / Mansewood respondents, while 27 per cent said it was an issue in Ruchill / Possilpark.
- 3.7 While vandalism / graffiti and problems with neighbours were issues for between a fifth and a quarter of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark, very few people felt they were issues in Pollokshaws / Mansewood. For both issues, less than one per cent of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood said that they were a 'serious problem'.

Number of concerns (Serious problem or problem)	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
	%	%
None	77%	33%
1	11%	12%
2	2%	12%
3	4%	12%
4	3%	12%
5+	2%	21%

Table 3.2: Number of concerns – Security and community safety

- 3.8 There was a stark contrast in the number of residents stating that the issues raised in relation to security and community safety were a 'problem' or 'serious problem'. While 77 per cent of respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood felt that none of the issues were a problem, just one third were in the same position in Ruchill / Possilpark. More than a fifth of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark felt that five or more of the issues were a problem / serious problem in their neighbourhood – this compares to just two per cent for Pollokshaws / Mansewood.

- 3.9 There was a similar contrast in views on whether security and community safety had got better or worse in the previous year. Table 3.3 shows the contrast in the number of residents feeling that a particular issue had got 'slightly' or 'much worse'.

Issue	Much / slightly worse	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Problems with dogs	6%	28%
Road safety	3%	19%
Drug / alcohol / substance abuse	3%	26%
Drug dealing	3%	26%
Vandalism / graffiti	2%	14%

Table 3.3: Change in Community Safety in past year

- 3.10 There was a far greater perception in Ruchill / Possilpark that problems of community safety had got worse in the previous year. For example, while six per cent of Pollokshaws / Mansewood respondents felt that problems with dogs had got worse, the figure was 28 per cent for Ruchill / Possilpark.
- 3.11 In relation to both drug dealing and drug / alcohol / substance abuse just three per cent of Pollokshaws / Mansewood residents were worried about the situation getting worse, compared with 26 per cent for Ruchill / Possilpark.

Number of concerns (Much or slightly worse)	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
	%	%
None	88%	42%
1	6%	9%
2	1%	12%
3	1%	11%
4	1%	10%
5+	4%	18%

Table 3.4: Number of concerns – Security and community safety in the past year

- 3.12 As Table 3.4 shows, 88 per cent of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood were not concerned that any of the community safety issues had got worse in the past year. This compares to 42 per cent for Ruchill / Possilpark. Nearly a fifth of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that five or more of the issues

had got worse in the previous year compared to just four per cent for Pollokshaws / Mansewood.

Cleaning and Environment

3.13 Residents in Ruchill / Possilpark were far more likely to experience problems relating to cleansing and the local environment than their counterparts in Pollokshaws / Mansewood. The survey also showed that while particular issues were a problem for people living in Ruchill / Possilpark, these issues concerned very few people (or none at all) living in Pollokshaws / Mansewood.

Issue	Problem / Serious problem	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Dirty stairs and closes	1%	32%
Untidy communal areas	0%	28%
Graffiti	0%	22%
Litter in the street	3%	21%
Fly tipping / dumping	0%	13%
Untidy gardens	1%	11%
Abandoned vehicles	0%	3%

Table 3.5: Problems raised on Cleansing / Local environment

3.14 The top two issues for residents in Ruchill / Possilpark were those most likely to affect people living in flatted accommodation. While nearly a third of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that 'dirty stairs and closes' was a 'problem' or 'serious problem' this was only an issue for one per cent of respondent in Pollokshaws / Mansewood. Untidy communal areas were a problem for 28 per cent of residents in Ruchill / Possilpark. In Pollokshaws / Mansewood no respondents said this was a problem.

3.15 There was also a stark contrast for issues which are unrelated to housing tenure. More than a fifth of Ruchill / Possilpark respondents said that graffiti and litter in the street were problems. Just three per cent of respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood said that litter in the street was a problem and no respondents said that graffiti was a problem in the local area.

Number of concerns (Serious problem or problem)	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
	%	%
None	95%	53%
1	4%	18%
2	1%	8%
3	0%	5%
4	0%	7%
5+	0%	10%

Table 3.6: Number of concerns – Cleansing / Local environment

3.16 As Table 3.6 shows, 95 per cent of respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood had no concerns about cleansing and the local environment in their area. No residents in the area had more than two concerns on this theme. Just 53 per cent of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that there were no problems in relation to cleansing and the local environment. One in ten respondents said that five or more of the issues were a problem.

Quality of the Neighbourhood

3.17 The contrast between the two neighbourhoods was also reflected in views about the quality of the local neighbourhood. Residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood were significantly more positive when asked about the 'overall quality' of their neighbourhood.

	Poor / Very poor		Good / Very good	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Overall quality of neighbourhood	0%	24%	89%	65%

Table 3.7: Views on overall quality of neighbourhood

3.18 None of the respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood said that the quality of their neighbourhood was 'poor' or 'very poor' and 89 per cent said that it was either 'good' or 'very good'.

3.19 Although generally giving a more negative response than the other area, most residents in Ruchill / Possilpark were positive about their neighbourhood.

While a quarter of residents said that their area was 'poor' or 'very poor' most people (65%) said that it was 'good' or 'very good'.

- 3.20 Table 3.8 shows the different views of residents in the two neighbourhoods on the features and facilities in the local area.

Feature / facility	Poor / Very poor	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Children's play areas	4%	66%
Parks / open spaces	5%	56%
Attractive buildings	5%	43%
Attractive environment	3%	37%
Quiet and peaceful environment	2%	24%

Table 3.8: Problems raised on Cleansing / Local environment

- 3.21 While two-thirds of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that children's play areas in the neighbourhood were poor / very poor, just four per cent of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood had the same view.
- 3.22 More than half of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that parks / open spaces were poor / very poor, compared to just five per cent in Pollokshaws / Mansewood.
- 3.23 Residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood were also more positive about the attractiveness of the buildings and general environment in their neighbourhood. They were also more likely to feel that their neighbourhood is quiet and peaceful.

Number of concerns (Poor or very poor)	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
	%	%
None	89%	21%
1	7%	15%
2	1%	28%
3	1%	7%
4	1%	8%
5+	0%	23%

Table 3.9: Number of concerns – Quality of neighbourhood

3.24 As Table 3.9 shows, 89 per cent of respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood had no concerns in relation to the quality of their neighbourhood. Just 21 per cent of Ruchill / Possilpark residents were in the same position. While nearly a quarter of respondents in Ruchill / Possilpark had five or more problems, none of the respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood had this number of concerns.

Quality of services

3.25 Residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood had far fewer concerns about the quality of local services than residents in Ruchill / Possilpark. However, more than a quarter of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood said that policing in their local area was poor / very poor.

Service	Poor / Very poor	
	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
Policing	26%	67%
Youth and leisure services	12%	67%
Health centre / GP	2%	15%
Public transport	6%	7%
Rubbish collection	3%	6%

Table 3.10: Quality of services in the local area

3.26 Comparatively high proportions of residents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood were concerned with the quality of policing (26%) and, to a lesser extent, youth and leisure services (12%). However, in Ruchill / Possilpark these services were described as poor / very poor by more than two thirds of respondents (67% respectively).

3.27 In both areas residents were more positive about the other services provided locally. However, higher percentages in Ruchill / Possilpark said that health services and rubbish collection were poor / very poor. There was no significant difference in residents' views of public transport across the two neighbourhoods.

Number of concerns (Poor or very poor)	Pollokshaws / Mansewood	Ruchill / Possilpark
	%	%
None	60%	13%
1	34%	32%
2	5%	41%
3	1%	12%
4	0%	3%
5+	0%	0%

Table 3.11: Number of concerns – Quality of services in local area

3.28 As Table 3.11 shows, 60 per cent of respondents in Pollokshaws / Mansewood felt that none of the services in their local areas were poor / very poor. Just 13 per cent of Ruchill / Possilpark respondents were in the same position. Fifty-six per cent of residents in Ruchill / Possilpark said that two or more of the local services were poor / very poor, compared with just six per cent in Pollokshaws / Mansewood.

Appendix One – Summary of the Ten LCPP Areas

Introduction

1. Glasgow's ten LCPPs belong to five geographical areas:
 - North – Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal LCPP; North East LCPP
 - West – West Area LCPP; Central and West LCPP
 - East – East Centre and Calton LCPP; Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse LCPP
 - South West – Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn LCPP; Govan and Craigton LCPP
 - South East – Pollokshields and Southside Central LCPP; Langside and Linn LCPP
2. This section outlines the main findings of the residents' survey in the ten areas.

Maryhill, Kelvin and Canal LCPP

3. This area has a population of 57,800 (10% of the city population) and includes five local neighbourhoods:
 - Lambhill and Milton;
 - North Maryhill and Summerston;
 - Ruchill and Possilpark;
 - Kelvindale and Kelvinside; and
 - Maryhill Road Corridor.
4. The area faces a number of key issues. Joblessness is a particular issue. Three quarters of the local population live in a neighbourhood which is one of the 15 per cent most deprived Data Zones in relation to housing according to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD). The area also has levels of drug and alcohol misuse which are above the city average. Local crime rates are below the city average although there are particular problems with vandalism, drugs and the carrying of weapons.
5. When asked about **security and community safety** in their area, the most frequently raised concerns were 'dog roaming, fouling and barking', road

safety, youth disorder and street drinking. There were also high proportions of people stating that they are concerned about vandalism and graffiti and drug and alcohol misuse.

6. Just less than half of the respondents (48%) felt that none of the community safety issues raised in the survey were a 'problem' or 'serious problem' locally. Generally, residents did not feel that community safety issues had got worse over the previous year although higher percentages felt that the situation with road safety and problems with dogs had deteriorated. Sixty-one per cent of respondents felt that none of the community safety issues had got worse in the past year.
7. Twenty-two per cent of residents said that they had experienced some form of anti-social behaviour in the previous year. In terms of perceived safety, two-thirds of respondents said that they feel 'very' or 'fairly' safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark. However, 23 per cent said that they feel unsafe.
8. In terms of **cleanliness and the local environment**, the most commonly raised issues were litter in the streets and graffiti. Nearly two-thirds of respondents (63%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Most residents (77%) felt that maintenance of properties and public spaces in the area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
9. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** residents raised most concern about children's play areas, which 46 per cent described as either 'poor' or 'very poor'. Nearly a third of respondents said that the quality of parks and open spaces in the area was 'poor' or 'very poor'. Forty-six per cent of respondents had no concerns about the quality of the neighbourhood.
10. When asked about the **quality of local services** nearly half (48%) felt that youth and leisure services were 'poor' or 'very poor'. There were mixed views on policing with 36 per cent stating it was poor / very poor and 28 per cent saying that the service was good / very good. Of those that had reported issues to the police, equal numbers were satisfied and dissatisfied with the response they received. Respondents were most positive about rubbish collection which 87 per cent described as 'good' or 'very good'. There were

also high levels of satisfaction with public transport and the provision of health services.

11. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 89 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-four per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 89 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, nearly two-thirds (64%) felt that there had been no change. However, while 15 per cent said that the area had got better, 18 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more play areas for younger children'; and 'more sports areas for teenagers'.

Glasgow North East LCPP

12. This area has a population of 42,021 (7% of the city population) and includes five local neighbourhoods:
 - Springburn;
 - Sighthill, Roystonhill and Germiston;
 - Blackhill & Hogganfield;
 - Balornock & Barmulloch;
 - Robroyston and Millerston.
13. Three key issues facing the area are: unemployment; health; and education, skills and training. Overall, crime rates are below the city average although drug-related crime has been highlighted as a particular problem.
14. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as a problem were: problems with dogs; youth disorder; road safety; street drinking; and vandalism and graffiti. Most respondents (69%) did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
15. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although eight per cent felt that problems with dogs had got worse. Most people (92%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. More than two-thirds of respondents (69%) felt

safe walking alone after dark in their area although 17 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.

16. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; untidy communal areas; and untidy gardens. A significant majority (83%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Eighty-six per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
17. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas and the quality of parks and open spaces. However, 71 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
18. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was most concern about youth and leisure services which 26 per cent said was either 'poor' or 'very poor'. Significant minorities said that policing (18%) and public transport (14%) were poor / very poor although responses were mainly positive with higher percentages stating that the services were good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection, with 84 per cent and 91 per cent respectively stating that the services were good / very good.
19. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 90 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Eighty-one per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 90 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, 72 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while ten per cent said that the area had got better, 17 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more leisure facilities'; and 'more play areas for younger children'.

West Area LCPP

20. This area has a population of 56,987 (10% of the city population) and includes five local neighbourhoods:

- Yoker and Scotstoun;
 - Knightswood;
 - Temple and Anniesland;
 - Blairdardie; and
 - Drumchapel.
21. Key issues facing the area are: income, unemployment; health; and housing. Drug and alcohol misuse are concerns in some neighbourhoods. Overall, crime rates are below the city average although house-breaking and vandalism have been highlighted as particular problems.
22. In terms of **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as a problem were: problems with dogs; road safety; youth disorder; vandalism and graffiti; and street drinking. There were also concerns about drug / alcohol / substance misuse in the local area. More than half of respondents (57%) did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
23. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year, although 11 per cent felt that problems with dogs had got worse and ten per cent felt that youth disorder and road safety had got worse locally. Most people (85%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Most people (71%) felt safe walking alone after dark in their area although 16 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
24. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; untidy communal areas; and untidy gardens. Seventy-eight per cent of respondents felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Seventy-eight per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
25. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas and the quality of parks and open spaces.

However, 72 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.

26. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was most concern about youth and leisure services which 14 per cent said was either 'poor' or 'very poor'. Overall respondents were positive about policing in their neighbourhood. While 11 per cent said that policing in the local area was poor / very poor, 57 per cent said that it was good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with rubbish collection, health care provision and public transport in the local area.
27. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 87 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-three per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 89 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years two-thirds felt that there had been no change. However, while ten per cent said that the area had got better, 21 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more speed restrictions on roads'; and 'reduce youth misbehaviour'.

Central and West LCPP

28. This area has a population of 76,973 (13% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:
 - City Centre and Merchant City;
 - Yorkhill and Anderston;
 - Hillhead and Woodlands;
 - Broomhill and Partick West
 - Hyndland, Downanhill and Partick East; and
 - Anniesland, Jordanhill and Whitehill.
29. Housing deprivation is the main issue for the area although deprivation is on a relatively small scale compared with other areas. There is a vibrant private rental market and a high percentage of students living in the area. Drug and

alcohol related crime is relatively low although in the City Centre the level is three times the city average. Overall, crime rates are twice the city average although the City Centre has a significant impact on this.

30. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as a problem were: youth disorder; vandalism and graffiti; road safety; street drinking; and damage to vehicles / theft. Just over half of respondents (55%) did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
31. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although more than eight per cent felt that youth disorder and street drinking had got worse. Most respondents (82%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Most people (71%) felt safe walking alone after dark in their area although 18 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
32. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street which 24 per cent felt was a 'problem' or 'serious problem'. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; untidy communal areas; and untidy gardens. A significant majority (69%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Eighty-six per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
33. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas and the quality of parks and open spaces. However, 83 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
34. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was most concern about policing and youth and leisure services. In both cases 12 per cent of respondents said the services were either 'poor' or 'very poor'. However, responses were mainly positive with higher numbers stating that the services were either 'good' or 'very good'. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 90 per cent and 89 per cent, respectively, stating that the services were good / very good.

35. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 95 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Sixty-nine per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 94 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years 71 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while seven per cent said that the area had got better, 17 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'cleaner streets' and 'reduce youth misbehaviour'.

East Centre and Calton LCPP

36. This area has a population of 49,718 (9% of the city population) and includes five local neighbourhoods:
- Dennistoun;
 - Haghill and Carntyne;
 - Riddrie and Cranhill;
 - Parkhead and Dalmarnock;
 - Calton and Bridgeton.
37. Significant issues facing the area are: health; housing; unemployment and income deprivation. Overall, crime rates are higher than the city average with sexual assault and prostitution three times the level for the city. Vehicle crime and violent crime are also high compared with the city average.
38. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as problems were: youth disorder; problems with dogs; vandalism and graffiti; road safety; street drinking; and drug dealing. Less than half of the respondents (49%) did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
39. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year, although 15 per cent felt that youth disorder had got worse. A large majority (86%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Most people (73%) felt safe walking alone after dark in their area, although 15 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.

40. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street which 29 per cent felt was either a 'problem' or 'serious problem'. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; fly tipping and dumping; and untidy gardens. Sixty-one per cent felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Seventy-five per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
41. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas (which 25% said were poor / very poor) and the quality of parks and open spaces. However, 69 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
42. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services**. However, there was concern about policing and youth and leisure services which were described as 'poor' or 'very poor' by 25 per cent and 21 per cent respectively. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 83 per cent and 92 per cent respectively stating that the services were good / very good. Seventy-five per cent said that public transport was good / very good.
43. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 88 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-nine per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 86 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, 69 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while nine per cent said that the area had got better, 21 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'cleaner streets; and 'reduce youth misbehaviour'.

Baillieston, Shettleston and Greater Easterhouse LCPP

44. This area has a population of 77,838 (13% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:
- Ruchazie and Garthamlock;
 - Easterhouse;

- Baillieston and Garrowhill;
 - Mount Vernon and East Shettleston;
 - Tollcross and West Shettleston; and
 - Springboig and Barlanark.
45. Health is a key issue facing the area. Overall, crime rates are below the city average although drug and alcohol related crime has been highlighted as a particular problem.
46. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as problems were: youth disorder; problems with dogs; road safety; vandalism and graffiti; street drinking; safety of children and drug / alcohol / substance misuse. Just 35 per cent of respondents did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
47. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although 17 per cent felt that youth disorder had got worse. Most people (73%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Sixty-one per cent of respondents felt safe walking alone after dark in their area, although 23 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
48. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issues for residents were litter in the street and graffiti . There were also some concerns raised about: untidy gardens; untidy communal areas; and fly tipping / dumping. Just over half (52%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Seventy per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
49. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas (which 41% said were poor / very poor) and the quality of parks and open spaces. Fifty-two per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
50. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was most concern about youth and leisure services which 38

per cent said was either 'poor' or 'very poor'. Overall, respondents were positive about policing locally. While 28 per cent said that policing was poor / very poor, 34 per cent said that it was good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 81 per cent and 90 per cent respectively stating that the services were 'good' or 'very good'.

51. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 87 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Eighty-two per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 87 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, 60 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while 17 per cent said that the area had got better, 20 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'reduce youth misbehaviour'; and 'more play areas for younger children'.

Greater Pollok and Newlands / Auldburn LCPP

52. This area has a population of 53,852 (9% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:
- Pollok;
 - Newlands and Cathcart;
 - Pollokshaws and Mansewood;
 - Priesthill and Househillwood;
 - Arden and Carnwadric; and
 - South Nitshill and Darnley.
53. Unemployment, housing and alcohol misuse have all been identified as issues for the area. Overall, crime rates are below the city average although rates of drug and alcohol related crime and vandalism are higher.
54. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as a problem were: road safety; problems with dogs; youth disorder; street drinking; and drug / alcohol / substance misuse. Sixty-one per cent of respondents did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.

55. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although some respondents felt that road safety, problems with dogs and youth disorder had got worse. Most people (89%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. While 75 per cent felt safe walking alone after dark in their area just 13 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
56. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street which 12 per cent felt was a problem / serious problem. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; fly tipping and dumping; and untidy gardens. A significant majority (82%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Eighty-seven per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
57. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas (which 17% said were poor / very poor) and the quality of parks and open spaces. However, 79 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
58. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was some concern about the quality of policing and youth and leisure services. Significant minorities said that policing (28%) and youth / leisure services (26%) were poor / very poor, although responses were mainly positive with higher percentages stating that the services were good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 89 per cent and 93 per cent respectively stating that the services were good / very good. Seventy-five per cent said that public transport was good / very good.
59. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 95 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-one per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 92 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, 73 per cent felt that there had been no change. While 12 per cent said that the area had got better, 13 per cent felt that it had got

worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more play areas for younger children'; and 'more speed restrictions'.

Govan and Craigton LCPP

60. This area has a population of 61,504 (11% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:
- Ibrox and Kingston;
 - Greater Govan;
 - Bellahouston, Craigton and Mosspark;
 - North Cardonald and Penilee;
 - Crookston and South Cardonald;
 - Corkerhill and Pollok.
61. Three key issues facing the area are: unemployment; health; and housing. Drug and alcohol misuse are problems affecting some sections of the community. Overall, local crime rates are slightly higher than the city average.
62. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as problems were: youth disorder; road safety; street drinking; problems with dogs; drug / alcohol / substance misuse and vandalism and graffiti. Less than half of respondents (46%) felt that none of the community safety issues raised in the survey were a 'problem' or 'serious problem' locally.
63. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although significant numbers felt that youth disorder and road safety had got worse. Most people (83%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Nearly two-thirds (65%) felt safe walking alone after dark in their area, although 21 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
64. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street, which 28 per cent said was a problem /

serious problem. There were also some concerns raised about: graffiti; untidy gardens; and fly tipping / dumping. Sixty-three per cent felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Eighty-six per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.

65. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas which was raised as a problem / serious problem by 26 per cent of respondents. There was also some concern about the quality of parks and open spaces and the lack of a quiet and peaceful environment. However, 67 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
66. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was concern about the quality of policing and youth and leisure services. Significant minorities said that policing (28%) and youth / leisure services (23%) were poor / very poor. However, the overall picture was positive with higher percentages stating that these services were good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection, with 85 per cent and 94 per cent respectively stating that the services were good / very good. Sixty-seven per cent said that public transport was good / very good.
67. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area 92 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-nine per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 90 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years nearly two-thirds (64%) felt that there had been no change. While 15 per cent said that the area had got better, 16 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more speed restrictions on roads'; and 'clean streets'.

Pollokshields and Southside Central LCPP

68. This area has a population of 49,434 (9% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:

- Pollokshields West;
 - Pollokshields East;
 - Greater Gorbals;
 - Shawlands and Strathbungo;
 - Toryglen; and
 - Govanhill.
69. Key issues facing the area include health and housing deprivation. Overall, crime rates are 15 per cent above the city average. Housebreaking, road traffic offences and other crimes relating to drugs or carrying offensive weapons are particularly prevalent.
70. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as problems were: road safety; youth disorder; vandalism and graffiti; problems with dogs; street drinking; and damage to property. Forty-two per cent of respondents felt that none of the community safety issues raised in the survey were a 'problem' or 'serious problem' locally.
71. The majority of respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year although comparatively higher proportions felt that youth disorder and road safety had got worse. Most people (86%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. While 62 per cent of respondents said that they felt safe walking alone after dark in their area, 21 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
72. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street which 30 per cent said was either a 'problem' or 'serious problem'. There were also some concerns raised about fly tipping / dumping and graffiti. More than half (56%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Sixty-nine per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
73. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas which 31 per cent said were either 'poor' or 'very poor'. There was also concern about the quality of parks and open spaces

and the lack of a quiet / peaceful environment. However, 71 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.

74. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was concern about the quality of policing and youth and leisure services. For both policing and youth / leisure services 24 per cent said that the services were poor / very poor. However, higher percentages were happy with these services and said that they were good / very good. Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 87 per cent and 84 per cent respectively stating that the services were good / very good. Seventy-seven per cent said that public transport was good / very good.
75. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 88 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-five per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 88 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years 62 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while just six per cent said that the area had got better, 27 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more speed restrictions on roads'; and 'cleaner streets'.

Langside and Linn LCPP

76. This area has a population of 51,700 (9% of the city population) and includes six local neighbourhoods:
- Langside and Battlefield;
 - King's Park and Mount Florida;
 - Cathcart and Simshill;
 - Croftfoot;
 - Castlemilk;
 - Carmunnock.
77. Generally, the area performs better than the city average on a range of social issues although one neighbourhood faces a number of issues. The most

significant problems in the area relate to health and housing deprivation. Crime rates for the area are generally below the city average. However, statistics relating to drug and alcohol misuse show that this is a significant problem in some parts of the area.

78. In relation to **security and community safety** the issues most frequently raised as problems were: road safety; youth disorder; street drinking; problems with dogs; and vandalism and graffiti. Forty-one per cent of respondents did not raise any concerns about security or community safety.
79. Most respondents felt that community safety had stayed the same over the previous year, although road safety and youth disorder were the two issues that were most commonly felt to have deteriorated. Most people (79%) had not experienced any form of antisocial behaviour in the past year. Seventy-five per cent felt safe walking alone after dark in their area, although 13 per cent said that they felt either 'fairly' or 'very unsafe'.
80. When asked about **cleanliness and the local environment** the biggest issue for residents was litter in the street which 23 per cent said was a problem / serious problem. There were also some concerns raised about: fly tipping and dumping; graffiti; and untidy gardens. More than two-thirds (68%) felt that none of the issues relating to the local environment were a particular problem. Eighty per cent said that maintenance of the properties and public spaces in their area was either 'good' or 'very good'.
81. In terms of the **quality of the neighbourhood** there was greatest concern about children's play areas (which 29% said were poor / very poor) and the quality of parks and open spaces (considered to be poor / very poor by 22%). However, 64 per cent of respondents did not have any concerns about the quality of the local neighbourhood.
82. Residents were generally positive about the **quality of local services** although there was most concern about youth and leisure services which 33 per cent said was either 'poor' or 'very poor' – just 25 per cent felt that the service was 'good' or 'very good'. Twenty-seven per cent said that policing was poor / very poor although a higher percentage said that the service was good / very good (37%). Residents were most satisfied with health centres / GPs and rubbish collection with 77 per cent and 91 per cent respectively

stating that the services were good / very good. Seventy-three per cent said that public transport was good / very good.

83. In respect of the general **quality of life** in the area, 91 per cent said that they were either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their neighbourhood as a place to live. Seventy-four per cent of the respondents had lived in the area for four years or more and 92 per cent said that they wished to continue living in the area. When asked whether the area had changed for the better or worse in the previous two years, 67 per cent felt that there had been no change. However, while eight per cent said that the area had got better, 20 per cent felt that it had got worse. When asked what they would change to improve the quality of life locally, the most common responses were: 'more police on the street'; 'more speed restrictions on roads'; and 'reduce youth misbehaviour'.

Appendix Two – Residents' Survey Questionnaire
