



# GLASGOW'S HEALTHIER FUTURE FORUM 6

Wednesday 28 November 2007

## REPORT



This report is a summary of the presentations and discussions from the GHFF6 event and does not necessarily represent the views of the GCPH

## **BACKGROUND**

The sixth meeting of Glasgow's Healthier Future Forum was held on the afternoon of Wednesday 28 November 2007 in the Trades Hall, Glassford Street, Glasgow.

A series of new findings from GoWell – Glasgow's Community Health and Wellbeing Research and Learning Programme – provided the focus for this meeting of the Forum and participants were offered the opportunity to consider the implications of these findings for regeneration and health. Two new reports were launched at the event with copies made available to all participants:

- 'Will Glasgow Flourish? Learning from the past, analysing the present and planning for the future'; and
- 'The Regeneration Challenge in Transformation Areas: Evidence from the GoWell Baseline Survey 2006'.

Taking the form of a round table discussion event, GHFF6 was attended by 91 participants from diverse backgrounds including health, academia, local authority, voluntary sector, employment, and think tanks / futures organisations. As this event concentrated on issues concerning housing and regeneration a high percentage of participants were from organisations for which these issues are central concerns (e.g. planners, members of local housing organisations and GHA staff). Each round table seated up to ten people, one of whom acted as a facilitator, and participants spent the duration of the event within the same group.

## **PROGRAMME**

Prof Carol Tannahill welcomed participants to the event and talked through the planned structure of the afternoon which included presentations interspersed with round table discussion sessions. The programme can be found in Appendix One. The content of each presentation is summarised below.

### ***'Will Glasgow Flourish?'***

Sheila Beck (NHS Health Scotland), Fiona Crawford (GCPH) and Phil Hanlon (University of Glasgow)

The ecological team<sup>1</sup> set out to place the regeneration activity being researched by GoWell into its current context. The output from this work was the report 'Will Glasgow Flourish? Learning from the past, analysing the present and planning for the future', launched at this event.

This presentation focussed on prominent themes discussed in the report. The presenters began by reflecting on Glasgow's historical context. This section of the report charted key events and issues which influenced the health and quality of life of Glasgow citizens and which shaped the City in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The first Medical Officers for Health, active in Glasgow at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, did have a holistic understanding of the relationship between the physical and social environment and health and did their best to stimulate action in this respect. However, other factors also exerted a powerful influence and Glasgow's fortunes declined. Manifestations of this decline included degraded physical environments, wide and widening inequalities in health and quality of life for different sectors of the population, unemployment and social fracture. Arguably, City leaders spent much of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century attempting to address the consequences of rapid industrialisation and economic boom at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century followed by equally rapid de-

---

<sup>1</sup> The ecological arm of the GoWell programme aims to monitor city wide changes from a socioecological perspective and to provide a contextual backdrop to the main study. The ecological team is addressing this in a variety of ways and the 'Will Glasgow Flourish?' report provides one important component.

industrialisation and economic recession during the following decades. External influences such as changing political priorities accompanied by a fast growing, global, market economy also played an important part. A snapshot of Glasgow today illustrates that these inequalities persist and new health challenges are emerging.

Previous waves of regeneration were then outlined. The ecological team's assessment of these previous waves concluded that they were constrained by crisis management, short termism, lack of funds, changing political landscapes, fashions and conflicting agendas. Notwithstanding, there were local examples of success in the form of the establishment of housing schemes that were well resourced and where attention was paid to the inclusion of a high quality physical and social infrastructure. As a whole though, it was argued that Glasgow's enduring inequalities in health and its economic, physical and social environment bear testament to the limited success of these previous waves of regeneration.

Next, the presenters considered how current regeneration activity compares with previous approaches. They explored a range of policies and strategies to investigate the reasons articulated for regeneration, the vision for how regeneration would take place and what it thought it would achieve. In contrast to earlier approaches, they found a clear recognition of the complexity of the problem and a holistic partnership response. However, on the ground, there was evidence of much greater private than public sector investment, particularly in the provision of housing in certain areas. Also, the bulk of physical, social and economic regeneration activity across the City appeared to be predicated on growth and investment in service and retail sectors with a lack of consideration of the importance of community participation and empowerment. Looking to the future, questions were raised regarding how these approaches could:

- respond to the challenges of climate change and peak oil which may limit travel?
- result in wealth transfer to the less economically successful areas of Glasgow?
- reduce health inequalities?

To summarise some of the learning points:

- At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century there was recognition of the importance of housing and the surrounding environment for health.
- There were political/economic conflicts and vested interests between high level aspirations for regeneration and renewal and the way these were played out.
- Negative events, beyond Glasgow's or Scotland's control, have in the past disrupted or completely negated regeneration efforts – war, economic recession, loss of jobs are all examples. These events are likely to happen in the future.
- Money matters as does the quality of the neighbourhoods which are produced.
- 'Fashions' have played a major role in the on-going development of the City – high rise flats, peripheral housing schemes, and more recently the introduction of mixed tenure and small housing associations.
- It all matters – houses, places, people, jobs, structure, connections – our modern philosophy should be one of holism.
- We have learned much from history, at least at a theoretical level and from our policy analysis. We are now taking a much broader view of regeneration.
- However, inequalities persist as data from 'Let Glasgow Flourish' and other sources demonstrates.
- We have an imbalance in thinking, investment and resources (staff) for social regeneration in comparison to physical regeneration, despite the identified importance of community engagement and participation.
- Much of our current regeneration activity is based on perceived needs of a consumerist society. There is little evidence that this makes people happier. In addition, what happens when our consumerist bubble bursts?

- Glasgow's investment in social housing, although large, is dwarfed by investment in private sector – this is bound to have an effect on inequalities.

The presentation concluded with some questions for discussion:

1. Have we learned the lesson of holism?
2. Have we moved beyond political infighting?
3. Have we learned that quality and money matter?
4. Are current actions going to reduce inequalities?
5. Are we still the victims of fashion?
6. How well does Glasgow respond to external forces?
7. Is Glasgow different to other cities with a similar economic and social history?

### **Discussion and feedback session 1**

The first discussion and feedback session was led by Phil Hanlon with participants asked to consider the questions set out above. Discussion took place at round tables before the room heard feedback from each table in turn. The discussion is summarised, along with an account of written feedback from the facilitators, under 'Review and feedback' below.

### **'Transforming Neighbourhoods'**

Taroub Zahran (Glasgow Housing Association)

The second presentation was given by Taroub Zahran, the Chief Executive of Glasgow Housing Association, and focused on the work of GHA in transforming neighbourhoods. In terms of the stock transfer, over 86,000 homes were transferred to GHA following a ballot of all tenants in 2003. The transfer allowed access to private finance of £750m and enabled a capital investment programme of £1.7b over 10 years. There is now an established network of LHOs across the city and Taroub stressed these changes bring with them real opportunities to improve people's quality of life and wellbeing.

External investment in housing has included 14,681 new roofs and over-cladding 17,485 homes to date. New bathrooms have been fitted in 16,834 homes along with 16,993 new kitchens. However, Taroub discussed the need to see less intentional damage to housing including graffiti, and the requirement to continue to demolish the poorest quality housing and build good quality housing in its place.

She went on to discuss the characteristics of regeneration areas:

- Single tenure estates with high concentrations of multi-storey flats
- Poor condition of housing requiring significant investment
- Lack of connectivity to surrounding areas
- Low demand and high levels of short term tenancies
- Poor environment and lack of quality greenspace
- Higher than average levels of poverty, poor health and incidences of mortality.

The regeneration areas are joint priority areas with Glasgow City Council and development studies on the areas have been completed. Indicative programmes have been developed with local communities and with stakeholders who acknowledge the challenge and complexity to deliver these programmes. There is a continued need for engagement with the private sector. Strategic priorities for delivering regeneration include:

- Models for delivery - GHA/RSL/GCC land assets
- Discussions ongoing with GCC and Government
- Approach to drive both Quality and Value
- Mixed tenure neighbourhoods more than housing

- Realising wider economic and social benefits
- Place making.

Demolition and re-provisioning programmes, retaining core communities, and effective and ongoing community engagement are on-going priorities for GHA.

To conclude, Taroub spoke of GHA's role in delivering for projects across the city. She stressed that their work is long term and the scale and complexity of the challenge should be appreciated. GHA is attempting to reverse the historical decline of areas and to push for physical, social and economic renewal – the GoWell study is significant to this work.

### ***'Transformational Regeneration Areas – the Council's Plans'***

David Webster (Glasgow City Council)

David outlined the nature and potential of the eight Transformational Regeneration Areas, showing a map of their locations in relation to the spatial priorities and development opportunities identified in City Plan 2.

The areas add up to a very substantial development project, totalling 268 hectares with capacity for some 9,000 new homes. The nature of the development challenge they pose goes back to their origins. For the most part they are areas of multi-storey housing built in the 1960s as part of a conscious programme by the then Glasgow Corporation to try to maintain the city's population in the face of the drive to promote new and expanded towns.<sup>2</sup> They are not suburban areas. They are inner city sites with existing high density, in locations which often lend themselves to redevelopment for a variety of uses. They have very high potential to create an attractive and exciting urban environment through ambitious remodelling. Most are also located in or adjacent to important development zones including the Clyde Waterfront, M74 Completion, East End Regeneration Route and Canal Corridor. At the same time it is essential that as future residential areas they should be mixed tenure, sustainable communities. Broadening out their tenure mix will be made easier by the general context of falling citywide demand for social housing.

There are a number of problems or issues in relation to delivery. These include high infrastructure costs, the inadequacy of the unit cost allowed for new build houses within the GHA Business Plan, the potential implications of transfer of ownership of existing houses to smaller housing associations under GHA Second Stage Stock Transfer, and the current Scottish Government review of the GHA's grant funding.

Clearance and re-housing of existing tenants are well advanced in several areas, with demolitions imminent, and Development Studies have been completed for all the areas and Local Strategy Groups set up. But the Council is keen to establish an effective framework to ensure that the best outcome is achieved by unlocking the latent value of the areas.

A Council Executive Committee report, 'Priority Regeneration Areas: A New Approach to Delivery' (30 March 2007), set out the Council's desire to bring to bear the latest thinking in urban regeneration, and this has led to discussions with the new Scottish Government on the financial and organisational framework. The approach would be modelled on that developed by English Partnerships and the European Investment Bank. It would involve the creation of a 'Local Asset Backed Vehicle' (LABV) in which the public sector would contribute its land assets while the private sector would raise up-front financing and contribute technical and financial expertise. To make this work, one of the key requirements

---

<sup>2</sup> The background is very well explained in Miles Horsey's 'Tenements & Towers: Glasgow Working-Class Housing 1890-1990', Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, HMSO, 1990.

would be to relax the 'land protocol' which was agreed at the time of stock transfer to the GHA, in order to enable cleared GHA sites to be transferred to the LABV without clawback of their value by the Scottish Government.

Assuming agreement on the framework, the total timescale for delivery of full regeneration of these areas would be 10 to 15 years. But delivery of demolition and new build social housing is needed on a shorter timescale in order to meet a number of other obligations, in particular the target that all social housing should meet the Scottish Housing Quality Standard by 2015, the GHA's own promises to tenants on delivery of improved houses by 2013, and the financial requirements of the GHA Business Plan, which assumes completion of improvement and new build by 2013.

David concluded by making the point that we need to get decisions soon on the approach to be taken, but we must not be over-hasty as we also need to get a really good result on the ground.

***'The Regeneration Challenge in Transformation Areas'***

Ade Kearns (University of Glasgow)

The final presentation was given by Ade Kearns, a Principal Investigator within the GoWell Programme team. Ade began by setting GoWell in context: eight large estates (Transformation Areas) plus seven smaller areas (Local Regeneration Projects) are subject to multi-dimensional change over the next 10 to 15 years. Together they cover 6% of Glasgow's population, or 35,000 people. In the Transformation Areas, there will be large-scale demolition of the existing housing stock. Glasgow Housing Association (the owner of much of the stock in the areas) is working closely with Glasgow City Council to plan and deliver change in these areas. The areas will become more mixed-tenure, mixed-income communities in the future. Ade then gave some brief information on GoWell:

- GoWell is a longitudinal study of change in Glasgow, at the city and neighbourhood level.
- Fourteen communities are being studied over the next ten years, including three of the eight Transformation Areas and three of the Local Regeneration Projects, as well as a range of other areas of predominantly social housing.
- At the heart of the study lies a community survey to be carried out in the 14 areas every two years. (Ade's presentation was based on the first survey carried out in 2006.)
- There is also to be a tracking study of people who move home, either voluntarily or as a result of the process of change.

This presentation reached six conclusions at key stages throughout, as summarised below:

1. Social mix: the social composition of these communities needs more consideration and this is more than simply a matter of housing-tenure mix.
2. Environments: it is essential that environments are of high quality which means being well designed and well maintained.
3. Psychosocial goals: regeneration can be viewed as a psychosocial intervention and has the potential to influence people's mental health and wellbeing. Residential objectives should go beyond mere satisfaction targets.
4. Social and economic regeneration: social and economic regeneration is needed as well as physical change. The involvement of educational and employment agencies is crucial. Community development work is necessary, and a strategy may be required to identify appropriate activities and resources.
5. Health: residents in Transformation Areas have a relatively positive view of their health, given the deprivation of the areas. Ethnic minority residents (including asylum seekers and refugees) have better health than Scottish people, and may be a positive resource for the communities in this respect. Whilst a positive view of health is better than feeling

unwell, we wonder whether 'normative adjustment' has led people to perceive their health, and health-related behaviours, to be better than in fact they are.

6. Community engagement: community engagement is a crucial part of the process of change, especially when that change takes a long time and is delivered in a complex manner. Present levels and methods of community engagement could be improved.

Ade closed the presentation by touching on future engagement, asking: how soon can answers be provided to residents' concerns, about timing, allocations, decanting, etc.? He stated that there is a need for more regular two-way communication with communities, even when there is not much to report, otherwise worries emerge and rumours spread quickly. He also asked how engagement can involve more people and whether it is possible for a creative, problem-solving approach to community engagement to be maintained. Further, can this be done at key points in the process, when decisions have to be made? Four questions were posed in conclusion:

- How can it be made clear to communities who is doing the regeneration?
- Who is responsible?
- How are decisions made? And will communities be confused about this?

### ***Discussion and feedback session 2***

The second discussion and feedback session was led by Carol Tannahill. Following the three presentations summarised above, Carol asked participants to make general comments about the presentations. She then asked each table to formulate key messages for the presenters to take back to Glasgow Housing Association, Glasgow City Council and GoWell.

### **REVIEW AND FEEDBACK**

Feedback was collected in three ways:

- recording verbal feedback from tables during the discussion sessions;
- via a short write up from each table facilitator which covered the main issues raised at their table; and
- all participants were asked to complete a feedback sheet which asked for the following:
  - general comments about their experience of GHFF6;
  - an indication as to whether they'd previously attending a Forum meeting;
  - their view on the usefulness of the Forum;
  - which points made during the meeting they considered to be most pertinent; and
  - thoughts on how we might improve future meetings of GHFF?

### **Feedback from discussion sessions and facilitators written accounts**

The first set of questions discussed were those set out at the end of the 'Will Glasgow Flourish?' presentation, given by Fiona Crawford, Sheila Beck and Phil Hanlon.

1. Have we learned the lesson of holism?
2. Have we moved beyond political infighting?
3. Have we learned that quality and money matter?
4. Are current actions going to reduce inequalities?
5. Are we still the victims of fashion?
6. How well does Glasgow respond to external forces?
7. Is Glasgow different to other cities with a similar economic and social history?

Participant views, as expressed verbally and via facilitators' written feedback, are summarised below:

### *Holism*

Participants felt that lessons had been learned from the past but these were not yet being put into practice – this came through strongly from the vast majority of the facilitators' notes. One table felt that “*we seem to have learned to talk the talk on holism but it is empty rhetoric to some extent*”. Dominant political timelines were raised by one table as a hurdle in this regard. Overall, history has showed different responses in different periods of change but no one period put together all that was known to create a comprehensive approach - at different periods in time good things have happened but such achievements have not occurred simultaneously and thus the net outcome has not been great enough. The questions were raised: why aren't things improving, and what is social regeneration, and whose job is it? In response it was put forward that vulnerable people are not given priority and that public health needs to look more widely than it does. Below high-level strategy are small victories and these need to be cultivated as small victories are not always well scaled-up. It was thought to be important to hang on to some of the good things we're doing and getting right. Holism was thought to be made more difficult by infighting.

### *Political infighting*

Although political infighting was felt to exist (“*local level politics may impede progress*”) it was not viewed as wholly negative due to the improved quality of debate found within the City Council. However, one table in particular commented on infighting and mistrust evident outside party politics, for example in relationships between statutory and voluntary sectors, and the resulting barriers in terms of power, intention, purpose and values. Examples of successful joint working and training such as suicide prevention training were put forward nonetheless and it was stressed that small victories should not be underestimated in terms of the impact they have on encouraging individuals and groups to lead and develop things in their own communities.

There was a prevailing point about the lack of synergy between ‘construction’ and broader health and regeneration issues: some areas have been enhanced aesthetically through housing improvement, but the social problems associated with multiple-deprivation in these areas remain unchanged. Further, another table recognised that the ‘social’ and ‘health/wellbeing’ aspects of regeneration are viewed as separate and thus, in terms of accountability there is no shared ownership. Short termism, working towards targets and insecurity in terms of funding were recurrently identified as issues in the facilitators’ feedback.

### *Quality and money*

Commitment to quality in social housing was felt to exist by some but the dominant view from other tables was that developments continue to be dictated by money with quality being compromised. Thus whether the houses now being built will be ‘housing for a lifetime, not a lifestyle’ was less clear to participants.

In terms of money, it was felt that some areas are doing better than others and this is what lies at the heart of current political infighting – it is less about party politics and more about local perceptions of particular areas i.e. that some are ‘favourite’ areas. Further, whilst the importance of quality and money are recognised there needs to be a joined up approach to budgets (for example, we should not have separate budgets for housing and health). One table questioned that level of commitment by the local government to these issues, given a reduction of resources on the ground.

Another table discussed the quality of the wider environment in which housing regeneration is taking place. The surrounding environment (greenspace etc) was thought to be just as important as the housing quality with concern raised about access to quality and connected greenspaces with a range of functions that could significantly alter people’s perceptions of their area and encourage healthier lifestyles.

It was felt that an awareness of what might be the ingredients of success exists but there is also a degree of frustration around the difficulties in delivering these.

### *Inequalities*

Most feedback suggested that inequalities appear to be increasing and will continue to do so without particular focussed attention. One table expressed the view that it is perhaps more realistic to attempt to maintain the current level of inequality rather than seeking to reduce inequalities. It was suggested that physical health is no longer the main concern as mental health problems are now most prominent. It was highlighted that *“creating wealth does not mean that health improves for all and that inequalities automatically decrease”*. Thus, the approach must be broad – dealing with the physical nature of housing is not enough – and should involve communities for greatest meaningful and lasting effect. Lastly, there was concern that the primary goal of economic regeneration was not having the ‘trickle down’ effect intended with real danger that only those on the middle and higher incomes would benefit thereby widening the inequality gap further.

### *Fashion*

It was felt that the current fashion is about shopping and consumption (*“fad for materialism”*) which translates into economic priorities. Comments were made that *“the economy overrides other things”* and *“regeneration might not now be the top priority for Glasgow City Council”*. This economic focus, one table argued, makes the city and its people vulnerable to inevitable change. Further, there was concern that health improvement was viewed as a by-product of economic regeneration instead of a primary driver. It was overwhelmingly argued that there is a need to avoid the problems of short-termism, for example, via local employment.

### *External forces*

In terms of environmental sustainability participants expressed the view that the current approach does not appear to be environmentally sustainable. There was some discussion of the current knowledge economy with the view that diversification may help to deal with the future: *“development of a skills base in the population which thrives on change would help”*. Participants asked, taking into account inequalities and external forces (and add economic crash and debt), what are we to do?

The question was raised: what is socially rented housing for? Is it for choice, or is it a last resort option? It was felt that current tenancy is a quite different mix than in the past and this brings a different type of challenge. The ‘Glasgow effect’ is maintaining the problem – i.e. culture and long-standing issues (legacy) – and involvement of people in a hands-on way would help.

To begin the second discussion session, Carol asked participants to make general comments about the presentations they had heard. She then asked each table to formulate key messages for the presenters to take back to Glasgow Housing Association, Glasgow City Council and GoWell.

### *General comments*

The comments made focused largely on community engagement and social exclusion:

- Social exclusion and isolation are key factors. There is a need to involve local people as the lack of community development is very marked. Disempowerment of local people and a lack of engagement will lead to less improvement from regeneration. A whole engagement and inclusion infrastructure must be developed.
- The lack of activity in these communities is striking.
- Positive perceptions of the areas influences community engagement / social exclusion.

- There is clear evidence of the necessity of mental health flourishing. The high number of young people is notable. Being able to walk in one's area and feel comfortable is important. Mental health needs to be a priority.
- There was surprise amongst participants at the level of satisfaction with neighbourhoods amongst those living there. This illustrates the extent and depth of resources present in people in these neighbourhoods. Linked to issues of community development, child learning resources are required.
- The presence of criminality/gang culture is striking. Are more police required? In terms of demography, the predominance of the young comes through strongly, whilst perhaps it is older people who are better 'organisers' in a community. Young people need to feel engaged and involved.

*Key messages for the presenters*

GoWell:

- Use health records and other social data.
- It is good to provide results but also need remedial action.
- External evaluation of the GoWell programme suggested.
- 'Twinning' with other cities?

GHA/GCC:

- More profound way to integrate city's aspirations reflected through different strategies. Not conflicting.
- Use imagination and practical ways to engage with communities such as holding events at different times, near schools, etc.
- Communities facing upheaval for 10 to 15 years need a lot of support.
- Regeneration should be delivered as a psycho-social intervention.
- Learn lessons from the past.
- Remember people/human face.
- Imagination – not anonymised estates. Individuality in architectural design and environment.
- Cultural diversity – issue of self-reporting by BME communities suggests these measures may not be accurate
- Private sector delivery of psycho-social outcomes.
- Mentally ill population – provide appropriate housing.
- Housing Associations linked to employability and education. Need more people in employment.
- Greenspace is about quality not quantity and safety is important.
- Anticipatory – think ahead.

### Individual participant feedback forms

A total of 38 feedback forms were received and the contents are summarised below.

#### **General comments**

The general comments were almost exclusively positive and collectively demonstrate that participants valued the Forum as a vehicle for information provision, networking, discussion and reflection.

Interestingly, the word 'informative' was recurrent in responses to this question. One participant's statement captures well the general view: *"Very interesting with some information which did not surprise but other data which was completely unexpected"*.

In terms of negative remarks, one participant felt that the venue was poor due to the acoustics, whilst two others commented that more discussion time would have been useful.

#### **Attended previous meeting(s)?**

This question was un-answered on six feedback forms. Of the remaining 32, 12 had attended a previous Forum.

#### **Usefulness of the Forum**

All those providing feedback on the usefulness of the Forum made positive statements covering aspects such as the ability to share view and ideas, to network, to learn and to reflect. A selection of the comments is shown in Box 2.

#### Box 1: Examples of general comments

"Extremely positive. A good mix of knowledge, information and discussion."

"Very informative. Good to network with others and focus on these communities."

Excellent afternoon.

"Managed very well for time."

"Well organised, well paced, informative and interesting presentations."

"Extremely interesting findings so far – food for thought."

"Enjoyed it – very informative and thought provoking."

"Interesting presentations, good turnout and mix of participants."

"Very positive – an excellent event."

"The round table format and multi-disciplinary mix of delegates helped ideas to flourish."

"The event itself was very well organised. Thank you everyone involved!"

"Found it to be a very useful and stimulating discussion."

"Good mix of professional people with helpful input on subject matter."

"Excellent. Found it extremely interesting and informative."

"Very interesting new insights. Liked the mix of presentation and discussion."

#### Box 2: Examples of comments on the usefulness of the Forum

"Excellent food for thought."

"It's a very useful vehicle for people working in the public sector to learn more about key issues and developments in Glasgow."

"Very useful forum for sharing views and opinions."

"Very useful. Brings together range of people who don't normally meet."

"The events are useful and very interactive."

"Stimulated lots of ideas."

"This type of event is always useful because of the provision of opportunities to present and reflect on ongoing work."

"Hearing the comments and responses from the general audience is helpful in addition to hearing about GoWell study results."

"One of the few forums which allows conversations of this depth and interconnectedness. Always very interesting and thought provoking."

"From my point of view, good chance to catch up with people, learn about current activity, and widen knowledge."

"A very good cross section of agencies involved in the round table discussions."

"Excellent. The multi-disciplinary approach and opportunity to express and hear many different points of view."

"Beneficial to many organisations."

"Good both for updating and networking."

### **Most pertinent points made during meeting**

The responses to this question are categorised and summarised below.

#### GoWell findings / evidence:

- Progress of GoWell.
- Findings from GoWell study.
- Evidence of impact of regeneration on health.
- Issues about satisfaction and sense of achievement linked to local areas (based on stats from Ade Kearns).
- Ade Kearns' presentation.
- Really enjoyed Ade Kearns' presentation.
- Changes in the population of GoWell areas; prospect of changes in approach to procuring the master schemes.
- People wanting to stay in their community regardless of poor conditions

#### Mental health:

- Mental health implications i.e. the web of people's lives
- Links between housing, regeneration and mental health and wellbeing.
- Be aware to use regeneration for psychological change
- attention to mental health.
- Mental health flourishing; lack of activity by people; level of engagement; perceptions of individuals; ratio of adults to children.

#### Community engagement:

- Community engagement
- Need to engage with communities experiencing deprivation.
- Importance of communities/community involvement. Half of community is under 18!
- Need special creative measures.
- Discussion around the need for effective community engagement.
- The need for decentralisation and increased specialist knowledge/engagement of the local community.
- Need for strong community engagement; need to put lessons from the past into practice.
- The importance of the difficulties with taking a community development approach
- Importance of community engagement

#### Partnership:

- Integrating the aspirations of the different partnerships
- The need to integrate housing, health and employment
- The need to engage the private sector finance in these findings ASAP
- Partnership is about sharing responsibility for psychosocial outcomes, not just delivering housing units
- Difficulty in balancing growth in economy / sustainability

#### Social mix:

- Social mix of housing and lack of social involvement of people in transformation areas
- Increase in young people / anti social behaviour in social housing
- The mix of housing provision is important and the mix of ages of residents important
- Importance of mix along all dimensions in communities and challenges faced by lack of community development funding
- Creating new communities is not just about housing mix
- Considering the demographics of the populations concerned, especially the proportion of young people

It all matters:

All of them!

Too many to choose from!

Housing => health => inequalities; last presentation very interesting

Misc:

The reminder of how we got where we are

Considering the past to improve the quality of today

Maximising opportunities to create housing (social) that is pertinent to the needs of local communities

Importance of greenspace

Issues raised on inequalities

Positives which can be developed

Concerns about needs for further expansion of employment markers, housing development, community involvement...

Time spans – running too fast vs sustaining communities (driven by Government / Council)

The lack of activity within the neighbourhood

Sustainable employment

**Suggestions to improve GHFF**

The most popular suggestion for improvement was to build more time for discussion and feedback into the programme. Further comments were made on the diversity of participation and, more specifically, the need to ensure the private sector is represented and that community members are included.

A further suggestion was to give participants the opportunity to prepare by sending material out in advance and also to disseminate the material from the event to a wide audience. Lastly, one participant remarked: *"Don't change a thing!"*.

Appendix One – GHFF6 programme



**12:00 – 16:30**  
**Wednesday 28 November '07**  
**The Trades Hall,**  
**85 Glassford Street, Glasgow G1 1UH**

**PROGRAMME**

<b>12:00</b>	Registration and buffet lunch	
<b>12:30</b>	Welcome and introduction	<i>Prof Carol Tannahill, Director, Glasgow Centre for Population Health (GCPH)</i>
<b>13:00</b>	'Will Glasgow Flourish?' Presentations, questions and discussion	<i>Prof Phil Hanlon, Professor of Public Health, University of Glasgow</i>
		<i>Fiona Crawford, Public Health Programme Manager, GCPH</i>
		<i>Sheila Beck, Principal Public Health Adviser, NHS Health Scotland</i>
<b>14:20</b>	Coffee break	
<b>14:40</b>	'Transforming Neighbourhoods'	<i>Taroub Zahran, Chief Executive, Glasgow Housing Association</i>
<b>14:50</b>	'Transformational Regeneration Areas – The Council's Plans'	<i>David Webster, Housing Strategy Manager, Glasgow City Council</i>
<b>15:00</b>	'The Regeneration Challenge in Transformation Areas'	<i>Prof Ade Kearns, Prof of Urban Studies, University of Glasgow</i>
<b>15:25</b>	Discussion and feedback	
<b>16:00</b>	Summing up	
<b>16:30</b>	Close	