

**Table wi: Details of specific health or social impacts included and reported in national evaluation**

| <b>ABI programme</b><br><b>Years of programme</b> | <b>Description of evaluation (estimated year(s) of evaluation): methods used to evaluate impacts, data sources and impacts on health and social determinants of health reported</b>  |
|---|--|
| <b>Urban Programme</b><br><b>1969-1980s</b>       | <p><b>174 projects located in 5 areas and representing 6 categories of environmental improvement (1985):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts based on residents perceptions of impacts of various environmental improvement projects (structured interviews with residents) <sup>[15]</sup></p> <p><b>Landscaping projects (n=162, 38/38 projects):</b> 28% residents reported 'increased use of public space', 53.3% residents reported 'improved view of area as a place to live'</p> <p><b>Improved and new recreational spaces and walkways (18/40 projects):</b> %age of residents reporting 'improved view of area as a place to live' across 3 project categories- (i) improved recreational space 58% (n=59), (ii) new recreational space 68% (n=193), (iii) new walkways 70% (n=27)</p> <p><b>General environmental improvement (17/17 projects):</b> %age residents reporting 'increased use of public space' 70% (n=36, 9/17 projects), 'improved view of area as a place to live' 52.3% (n=59, 17/17 projects), 'perceived visual improvement' 52.6% (n=59, 17/17 projects)</p> <p><b>10/212 industrial and commercial improvement areas initiated from 1979 onwards (1983/4):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts based on local project reports and discussion with key stakeholders. <sup>[16]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> analysis of available documentation from Department of Environment and local authorities found mixed reports of effects, claims around employment gains in half of case study areas outweigh losses in other half. No clear comparison before and after. One survey was carried out but findings were withheld from evaluation consultants.</p> <p><b>Residents' perceptions of neighbourhood</b> (structured interviews with residents, n=59, 6/10 case study areas): value of improvements 'great' 7 (12%), 'some' 19 (32%), 'none' 30 (51%) (missing=3), area as a place to live and shop 'better' 11 (17%), 'same' 34 (58%), 'worse' 12 (20%) (missing=2)</p> <p><b>41(16 industrial, 9 business expansion, 16 commercial development)/113 Urban Development Grant funded projects (1986):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts drawing on project monitoring documentation. <sup>[17]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> Reported modest positive impacts on permanent employment opportunities in the local area but less than expected. No actual impact data available, reported estimates of 1,543 jobs attributable to investment compared to 4,281 attributable jobs originally anticipated by policy makers and funders.</p> <p><b>2 target areas in inner London (1981-1991):</b> retrospective evaluation of employment impacts of assistance to small businesses drawing on questionnaire to 82 local managers of ABI programmes, examination of project documentation and routine employment data. <sup>[18]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> %age unemployed 1981/82 v 1991 8.25% v 11.5% compared to London 7% v 7.5% and UK 10.5% v 7.5%</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Urban<br/>Developm<br/>ent<br/>Corporatio<br/>ns<br/>1981-1998</p> | <p><b>8/11 target areas (1997/8):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts based on estimates of key outputs e.g. jobs created, routine data and views of stakeholders and community groups. Evaluation authors were unable to draw conclusions about impacts due to limitations of the data. <sup>[19]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> 'UDCs may have reduced local unemployment, but on too small a scale to register given the crude level of analysis and the impact of external factors'. <sup>[19]</sup></p> <p><b>11/11 target areas (1988/9):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts based on routine data and key stakeholder assessments of impacts. <sup>[20]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> mixed impacts reported by local authority stakeholders.</p> <p><b>2/11 target areas (1988):</b> retrospective evaluation of employment impacts using oral and written evidence presented to House of Commons Employment Committee. <sup>[21]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> unemployment 1986 v 1988 London Docklands 5000 v 4065, Merseyside estimated 1700 jobs created plus 1000 jobs safeguarded, stakeholders perceive increased employment.</p> <p><b>3/11 target areas (unclear):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts drawing on house purchase data, programme monitoring data, semi-structured interviews with regeneration policy makers (n=90), and questionnaire survey of local businesses (n=211), employees and householders. Authors report very limited interest from UDC stakeholders in housing, employment or training benefits for residents of deprived areas bordering the commercial UDC areas. <sup>[22]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> new companies supported by UDC investment provide employment for residents in target area assessed by %age of employees drawn from 'local deprived' areas (assessed by post-code district area) amongst new v pre-existing companies in target UDC area 39.7% v 31.9%.</p> <p><b>Housing:</b> (2/3*) 42.5% of residents from local target areas now living in new/improved housing supported by UDC investment.</p>   |
| <p>Estate<br/>Action<br/>1985-1995</p>                                | <p><b>6/7 target areas (1989-1993):</b> prospective evaluation of impact using routine data, area surveys, resident survey, interviews with residents panels, local authorities, local agencies and government department officials. <sup>[23]</sup> **</p> <p><b>Crime:</b> (4/6*) crime reduction -5.2% (range -8% to 0%) * (estimated from various outcomes, stakeholders and residents views, and routine data)</p> <p><b>Economic:</b> residents' economic circumstances- improved in 2/6 areas *</p> <p><b>Housing &amp; neighbourhood:</b> housing satisfaction (5 point scale) (before v after) 3.6 v 3.9, +0.3 (range -0.37 to +0.6), estate satisfaction (5 point scale) 3.3 v 3.8, +0.5 (range +0.2 to +1.2), residential quality- improved (range +7% to +29%) * (estimated from various outcomes, stakeholders and residents views, and routine data)</p> <p><b>Other:</b> homelessness- reduced in 3/6 areas *, empowerment- improved in 2/6 areas *</p> <p><b>5/7 target areas (1989-unclear):</b> prospective evaluation of impacts based on various indicators included in residents survey before and 12 months after regeneration activity completed. <sup>[24]</sup> **</p> <p><b>Health:</b> self-reported health &amp; health service use- no effect.*</p> <p><b>Crime &amp; incivility:</b> reduced crime- no effect,* fear and incidence of crime and incivilities- partial positive effect.*</p> <p><b>Social fabric &amp; community control:</b> social control- partial positive effect,* sense of community- partial negative effect.*</p> <p><b>Upbringing &amp; control of children:</b> parental control &amp; awareness- no effect.*</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood:</b> neighbourhood satisfaction partial positive effect,* satisfaction with local environment- partial positive effect.*</p> <p><b>Housing:</b> housing management unimproved,* housing satisfaction partial positive effect. *</p> <p><b>7 case study areas in north east England (1998):</b> retrospective evaluation of impacts using range of routine data and monitoring data from local housing providers. <sup>[25]</sup></p> <p><b>Employment:</b> Change in number of unemployment claimants in target area between v changes in local district areas (1991-1997/98) (6/7*), -29.5% (range -11% to -48%) v -36.9% (range -22% to -42.2%)</p> <p><b>Housing:</b> 1990/91-1997/8 Changes in average weekly rent for Local Authority housing, (6/7*) +99.3% (range +8.9% to +324%) Housing association average weekly rent compared to previous LA average weekly rent (4/7*) +116.8% (range +83.7% to +162.5%). Various measures reported across case study areas to assess changes in desirability of residential area- typical measures used were requests for transfers, rent arrears, difficult to let houses. However, set in the context of large stock transfer from local authority to housing association it is difficult to interpret these data. Baseline data for the housing association was unavailable and the transfer resulted in substantial change in socio-demographic composition of remaining local authority tenants.</p> <p><b>Crime:</b> (1/7*) 1994-1997 Change in total reported crime (beat area v district) -20% v -28%, change in number of 'other incidents' requiring police involvement (beat area v district) 0% v -6%</p> <p><b>Other:</b> (1/7*) Reports by tenancy enforcement officers of incidents involving vandalism, threatening and anti-social behaviour fell (1995-1997)</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>New Life for Urban Scotland 1988-1998</b></p>     | <p><b>All 4 target areas (1988-1998):</b> prospective evaluation of impacts based on routine data (education, health board, police) and before (1988), during (1994) and after (1998) household questionnaire survey (1988 v 1998, n=3400 v 2004).<sup>[26]</sup> No indication of response rates, absolute numbers or missing data in findings.</p> <p><b>Quality of life indicators</b> (as defined by project) <b>1988 v 1994:</b> <b>Poverty-</b> social tenants receiving housing benefit 63.5% v 57.2%, -6.3% (range -24% to +12%), households with incomes below £100/week 65.3% v 48.8%, -16.5% (range -34% to +3%) <b>Health-</b> working age reported to be permanently sick 10.5% v 8.8%, -1.7% (range -5% to +1%), standardised mortality rates (3/4<sup>+</sup>) 131 v 114, -17 (range -29 to +12), satisfied with health service provision 59% v 85.5%, +26.5% (range +23% to +29%) <b>Education-</b> attendance rates at secondary school (2/4<sup>+</sup>) 74% v 82.5%, +9% &amp; +14%, obtaining 3+ standard grades (2/4<sup>+</sup>) 69% v 79%, (+4% &amp; +16%), obtaining 1+ highers (2/4<sup>+</sup>) 12.5% v 15% (+2% &amp; +3%), school leavers entering employment (1/4<sup>+</sup>) 38% v 42%, +4% <b>Crime-</b> recorded crime per 1000 population (1/4<sup>+</sup>) 118 v 107, -11%, afraid of leaving home at night (3/4<sup>+</sup>) 40.3% v 52.3%, +12% (range +7% to +21%) <b>Shopping-</b> satisfied with local corner shops 48.2% v 54.2%, +6% (range -5% to +23%), satisfied with local shopping centre (3/4<sup>+</sup>) 45.6% v 66.6%, +21% (range -6% to +39%) <b>Transport-</b> using buses 5+ days per week 33.5% v 27.2%, -6.3% (range -13% to +3%) <b>Leisure-</b> residents who go swimming in local area 9.5% v 15.8%, +6.3% (range -3% to +11%) <b>Community-</b> attendance at a community group/meeting 29.5% v 20.5%, -9% (range -13% to -3%), very satisfied with area 10.5% v 24.8%, +14.3% (range +8% to +19%), very dissatisfied with area 18% v 6%, -12% (range -8% to -17%) <b>Employment:</b> % of working age registered unemployed or economically inactive 1988 v 1998, 58.5% v 53.2%, -5.3% (range -20% to +9%), %age of working age in employment 1988 v 1998, 41% v 47%, +6% (range -9% to +20%) <b>Housing:</b> very dissatisfied with housing 1988 v 1998, 11% v 10%, (range -9% to 0%), %age of housing rented from local authority 96.5% v 53%, -43.5% (range -53% to -33%) <b>Population:</b> rate of population change in past 10 years 1988 v 1998, -38% v -23% (range of rate change -17% to -8%)</p>  |
| <p><b>Small Urban Renewal Initiatives 1990-2003</b></p> | <p><b>6/15 target areas included in evaluation (1993-1998) findings of additional data collection in 2003 not yet reported:</b><sup>[27]</sup> prospective evaluation of impacts using routine and housing association data sources</p> <p><b>Employment</b> (routine data from Scottish Continuous Recording based on housing association data on new tenants): No of households with at least one person economically active (1993/94 v 1997/98), SURI area 23% v 32%, non-SURI area 32% v 27%</p> <p><b>Income:</b> mean household income of new housing association tenants (1993/4 v 1997/8) SURI area £95 v £120 non-SURI area £89 v £107</p>  |
| <p><b>City Challenge 1992-1998</b></p>                  | <p><b>14/31 target areas (1993-1995):</b> prospective evaluation of impacts based on changes in routine data before and during programme activity and retrospective evaluation of perceived changes among stakeholders in partner agencies using postal questionnaire. Small number of CC areas conducted residents' survey-range of incomparable measures used prevented presentation of findings.<sup>[28]</sup></p> <p><b>Quality of life:</b> perceived changes reported by stakeholders in partner agencies- overall 'a lot of improvement' reported across areas including housing, jobs, sports/leisure opportunities, &gt;50% of respondents attributed 'quite a lot' or 'all' improvement to CC investment. Mixed views on amount of improvement in crime/fear of crime, educational provision and attainment, opportunities for young people and health care.</p> <p><b>Routine data</b></p> <p><b>Crime</b> (1991 v 1994): all reported crime range of change (3/14<sup>+</sup>) -36.1% to +28.5%</p> <p><b>Welfare:</b> children receiving free school meals (2/14<sup>+</sup>) +3%, recipients of housing benefit (1/14<sup>+</sup>) +1.8%, income support data not available.</p> <p><b>Education</b> (1992 v 1994): (4/14<sup>+</sup>- overlap in data from neighbouring areas) pupils achieving &gt;4 GCSE pass grade A-C 16.3% v 20.8%, +4.5% (range +1.6% to +10.4%), school leavers with no GCSEs 14.8% v 14.2%, +0.6% (range -8.3% to +3.8%)</p> <p><b>Employment</b> (1992 v 1994): unemployment rates (7/14<sup>+</sup>) 21.9% v 21.6%, -0.3% (range -2.4% to +3.0%), long term unemployed (5/14<sup>+</sup>) 40.9% v 42.8%, +2.9% (range -4.1% to +5.8)</p> <p><b>Housing:</b> owner occupiers (1/14<sup>+</sup>, unclear if includes new residents) +0.7%</p> <p><b>16/31 target areas plus 219 individual projects from 31 areas (1997-1998):</b> retrospective evaluation with limited analysis of routine data before and after (1992-1998). Evaluator's assessments of impacts draw on range of data sources, including beneficiaries' perceptions of primary impacts of individual projects, project monitoring data, discussions with key stakeholders- data presented unclear.<sup>[29]</sup></p> <p><b>Health project:</b> overall assessment one of positive impact *</p> <p><b>Training &amp; education project:</b> improvement in relations with parents and pupils, confidence in school.</p> <p><b>Community &amp; Social project:</b> little or no improvement in childcare provision, shops, leisure &amp; community facilities, crime and youth activities</p> <p><b>Crime project:</b> conflicting assessment of impact on perceptions of crime, recorded burglary and car crime decreased *</p> <p><b>Environment project:</b> improvements in local area</p> <p><b>Transport project:</b> improvements in public transport and accessibility</p> |

Single  
Regenerati  
on Budget  
1995-2001

**Three SRB target areas:** <sup>[30]</sup> \*\* prospective evaluation of impacts on national and local routine data and a survey of local residents before and after.

**Brent & Harrow**

**Education** (1994-1997): pupils achieving >4 GCSEs grade A-C 41.6% v 45.8%, +5% & +3.4%, (English data 43.3% v 45.1%)

**Limes Farm** (baseline v end of scheme of 4 year duration, dates of data collection not stated)

**Crime & safety:** total reported crime 155 v 114, -26.5%, residents views- estate lighting inadequate 49% v 69%, +20%, security inadequate 22% v 62% +40%, feel unsafe in stairwell of multi-storey 74% v 16%, -58%

**Employment:** unemployment rate -10.8%, unemployed >12 months -17%

**Housing:** no of local authority dwelling in need of improvement (absolute numbers) 275 v 94, -65%

**Northumbria Community Safety**

**Crime** (1995-1997): total recorded crime 171.6 v 127.2, -44.4%

**Two SRB target areas (1994-1999):** <sup>[31]</sup> \*\* prospective evaluation of impacts on national and local routine data.

**West Cornwall** (changes in standardised rates are relative to standardised English rates, unless stated, where England=100 at both points)

**Health** (1994 v 1998): crude mortality rates (%per 1000) 12.5% v 13.1%, -0.6% (range -1% to -0.2%). Standardised rates 122 v 118 (range -7 to -1) compared to all Cornwall 116 v 111

**Crime & community safety** (1994-1999): total reported crime- figures unclear, reported crime relative to all Cornwall (where Cornwall=100) 127 v 105 (range -15 to -8)

**Welfare** (1993 v 1999): % of total population receiving income support 17% v 10.7%, -6.3% (range -7% to -6%), standardised rates 113 v 118 (range -2 to +17) standardised rates for all Cornwall 116 v 111

**Education** (1994 v 1999): obtaining 5 GCSEs 50.3% v 56.1%, +5.8% (range +4.3% to +7.3%) standardised rate 116 v 117 (range -2 to +3) standardised rates for all Cornwall 106 v 108

**Employment** (1995 v 1997): % of population unemployed 4.5% v 3.2%, -1.3% (range -1.5% to -1.2%) standardised rate 120 v 133 (range +6 to +23) standardised rates for all Cornwall 108 v 112, %age of unemployed + employed who are unemployed > 12 months 4.4% v 2.8%, -1.6% (range -2.3% to -1.3%), standardised rate 129 v 167 (range +15 to +71) standardised rates for all Cornwall 112 v 124

**Engineering in education**

**Education** (1995/6-1997): 16yr olds entering full-time education or training 67% v 73%, +6% (range -1.2% to 18.1%)

**Three SRB target areas (1996-1999):** prospective evaluation using structured interview panel survey of residents before and after investment (n= 1329 v 527). Due to sample attrition at time-point II further recruitment was undertaken to gather additional cross-sectional data- these data did not substantially alter the findings from the panel survey. <sup>[32]</sup><sup>[33]</sup> Data reported below from panel survey, no indication given of missing data for specific variables.

**Health** (1996 v 1999): Self-reported good health 44% v 40%, -4% (range -6% to +2%) (overall fall attributed to ageing) (improvement, +2%, in cross-sectional sample), those reported health 'not good' 26% v 28%, +2% (range -7% to +8%), health improved in past 3 years 7% v 10%, +3% (range +2% to +4%) health worse in past 3 years 29% v 35%, +6% (range 0% to +13%)

**Community** (1996 v 1999): feel closely involved in community 28% v 31%, +3% (range -2% to +8%), satisfied with local area 72% v 70%, +2% (range -4% to +1%, England data 1996-1999 87% v 87%), area a bad place to bring up children (*cross sectional data*) 30% v 21% -9% (range -19% to -2%, England data 1996-1999 14% v 12%)

**Crime** (1996 v 1999): area safe to walk alone at night 37% v 40%, +3% (range 0% to +7%, England data 1996-1999 68% v 68%), more safe than 3 years ago 16% v 14%, -4% (range -15% to +14%) \*\*

**Income & welfare** (1996 v 1999): income below £100/wk 30% v 26%, -4% (range -10% to -3%, England data 1996-1999 19% v 16%), receiving income support 26% v 19%, -7% (range -11% to -3%, England data 1996-1999 19% v 17%),

**Education** (1996 v 1999): taken part in training in last 3 years 22% v 29%, +7% (range- not reported), any member of household with CSE/GCSE/O'level 53% v 54%, +1% (range -10% to +3%)

**Employment** (1996 v 1999): working age economically inactive 29% v 25%, -4% (range-7% to -4%, England data 1996-1999 10% v 10%), employment rate 56% v 60%, +4% (range +3% to +5%, England data 1996-1999 78% v 82%)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Regeneration Partnerships (now known as Social Inclusion Partnerships-SIPs) 1996-ongoing</p> | <p><b>All nine target SIP areas:</b> evaluation of impacts drawing on changes in outcomes collected from various sources at two time points (1996 v 1999). Data sources include residents' survey, SIP monitoring data and routine data. <sup>[34]</sup></p> <p>Overall assessment of impact on key indicators and the contribution of SIP activities on these. Inconsistent data availability and data type presented for each case study area. Final assessment made by authors based on available data (fully detailed in evaluation document) and includes consideration of wider area trends for similar indicators. (1996-1999)</p> <p><b>Population &amp; households:</b> (6/9<sup>+</sup>) 4 SIP area populations fell relative to wider area. Unable to assess contribution of SIP in context of housing renewal in wider area.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> (3/9<sup>+</sup>) compulsory health indicators included limiting long term illness, low birth weight babies, coronary heart disease, cancer, stroke, smokers, access to health services but insufficient data available to assess trends. Examples of impacts reported in absolute numbers from individual projects: teenage pregnancies 2 v 2, deaths from coronary heart disease 13 v 10, suicides and self inflicted deaths 3 v 2, babies with mothers who smoke 41 v 16, registered with a GP +8%, limiting long term illness +14% (data from single SIPs). Contribution of SIP judged to be low.</p> <p><b>Community:</b> community involvement: no quantitative trend data available, but thought to be some improvements in local participation with SIP organisation.</p> <p><b>Crime:</b> (5/9<sup>+</sup>) in 3 areas where crime reduction prioritised by SIP, crime rates fell faster than in the wider area. SIP activities thought to contribute to this.</p> <p><b>Poverty:</b> no trend data available.</p> <p><b>Access to information:</b> no trend data available.</p> <p><b>Physical transformation:</b> no baseline data available. Minimal contribution by SIP.</p> <p><b>Employment &amp; training:</b> (6/9<sup>+</sup>) Positive impact on short term and long term unemployment. SIP made important contribution to reduced employment often in context of enhanced economic conditions.</p> <p><b>Education:</b> (4/9<sup>+</sup>) Some improvements in secondary education attainment, data not reported in comparable format. Unable to assess contribution of SIP due to lack of trend data and other educational initiatives coinciding with SIP activities. SIP activities more likely to impact on lifelong learning but no impact data on this is available.</p> <p><b>Housing:</b> (6/9<sup>+</sup>) Some improvement in satisfaction. SIPs not directly involved in housing improvement so unlikely to contribute to improvements in housing satisfaction.</p> |
|---|---|

\* no data presented to support reported findings

\*\* summary of main impacts reported here, other similar outcomes assessed and reported in evaluation document

\* number of areas in evaluation which presented data/total number of case study areas included in evaluation