



Communities in *Focus*

**A study of the housing and
related needs of the Black and
Minority Ethnic communities
in South Nottinghamshire**

By

Andy Steele
Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit
University of Salford

April 2004



South Notts
Black and Minority Ethnic
Housing Needs Study



Acknowledgements

The researchers are indebted to the Selection and Monitoring Panel (SMP, a sub-group of the project Steering Group established to oversee the recruitment of a consultant to undertake the study and provide advice and guidance during the study period) for their contribution to the development of the study. The fact that monthly formal meetings were held with the researchers and SMP is a testament to their commitment of the individuals concerned. The involvement of the SMP in all aspects of the study further reinforces this.

Members of the Steering Group also took an active role in assisting with the study.

The Selection & Monitoring Panel comprised:

Delores Price:	Tuntum Housing Association – Chair
Lynda Kelly:	Nottingham & District Race Equality Council
Julie Gosling:	Gosling Advocacy in Action and FIANN
Paulette Francique:	Azuka Befriending Scheme
Anil Ghelani:	Indian Community Centre Association
Ceri Victory:	Nottingham City Supporting People
Chris Read:	Nottingham City Council
Richard Buckwell:	Ashfield District Council
Richard Baldwin:	Broxtowe Borough Council
Charlotte Jones	Rushcliffe Borough Council
Jo Dean	Gedling Borough Council
Jill Jeffries	Supporting People Team

The Steering Group comprised:

Delroy Brown:	African Caribbean National Artistic Centre
Mr M G Khan:	Afro-Caribbean and Asian Forum
Issan Ghazni:	AROOJ
Dave Guilding:	Ashfield LINKS Forum
Christine Bell:	Association of Caribbean Families and Friends
Mahfooz Hussain:	Azadi
David Guilding:	Broxtowe and Hucknall Primary Care Trust
Kenny Dunkwu:	Build
Rober Spencer:	Build
Michael Henry:	Build – Nottingham Mentor Programme
Jean Wu:	Chinese Women’s Association
Heather Bowler:	Derwent Housing Association
Phil Whitehead:	East Midlands Housing Association
Sarinder Bawa:	EKTA
David Tate:	English Churches Housing Group
Ajit Gill:	Family First
Keith Clarke:	Family First Trust
Maria Ward:	Framework
Juliet Daniel:	Hanover Housing Association
Claire Grainger:	Hostel Liaisons Group (HLG)

Antonio Pennacchia:	Italian Comities
Thair Khan:	Karimia Institute
Dr Musharaf:	Karimia Institute
Mark Mansfield:	Legal Services Commission
Tim Clarke:	Leicester Housing Association
Paul Scholey:	Longhurst Housing Association
Mark Lowthian:	Metropolitan Housing Trust
Mrs S Mahmood:	Muslim Women's Organisation
Maria Postolan:	Nene Housing Society
Linda Button:	Networking Action with Voluntary Organisation (NAVO)
Peter Foster:	North British Housing Association
Amanda Allan:	Nottingham Community Housing Association
Robin Lund:	Nottinghamshire County Council
Al Kestenbaum:	Nottinghamshire County Council
Carol Turner:	Nottinghamshire Rural Community Council
Mr Dai Linh Au:	Nottinghamshire Vietnamese Community Project
Shaheen Muwir:	Pakistani Asian Forum
David Hall:	Raglan Housing Association
Caron McLoughlin:	Refugee Housing Association
Rahni Kaur Binjie:	Roshni NAWA
Mrs Bilasha Phakey:	Sahara Broxtowe Asian Elders Group
Damien Mason:	Salvation Army Housing Association
Lucy Cox:	Shelter
Sue Warriner:	Sherwood Rise Health Centre
Steve Williams:	Sherwood Rise Health Clinic
Sarah Howarth:	Supporting People
Tracey Montgomery:	Supporting People Team
Kirsty Everson:	Supporting People Team
Shahnaz Aziz:	The Beacon Project
Tony Graham:	The Black Partnership
Kevin Potts:	The Guinness Trust
Judith Whistler:	The Guinness Trust
Purnima Wilkinson:	The Housing Corporation
Sandhya Patel:	The Housing Corporation
Paul Matthew:	Time Out Respite Care Project
Steve White:	Tuntum Housing Association
Brenda Deakin:	UMUADA
	Caribbean African Group
Talib Hussain:	Union of Pakistani and Kashmiri Organisations

FIANN

De Montford Housing Society
Mansfield Road (Nottingham) Baptist Association Ltd
Pakistan Centre
Second Base/NACRO
Stonham Housing Association
The William Sutton Trust

The success of this study is a direct result of the involvement of representatives of a wide range of agencies within South Nottinghamshire from the statutory, voluntary and community sectors as well as the Community Interviewers and those members of the B&ME community who agreed to the interview. We extend our appreciation to all of the above.

The study was part funded by a Community Training and Enabling Grant from the Housing Corporation.

Contents

Tables	12
Introduction	15
Study aims	15
Report structure	16
Chapter I: Background Information	17
Introduction	17
Ethnic profile	17
Chapter II: General Approach & Methodology	19
Introduction	19
Stage I: Interviews with BME Households	19
Interviewer training	20
Sample selection	21
Interviewer support	22
Selection of respondents	23
Review of approach adopted	23
Stage II: Survey of BME Homeless People	23
Stage III: Focus Group Discussions	24
Chapter III: Findings from Main Household Survey	25
Introduction	25
Ethnicity of respondents	25
Section I: Respondents and Household Characteristics	31
Introduction	31
Gender and age of respondent	31
Size of household	33
Economic and financial information	35
Language	39
Religion	42
Summary	42
Section II: Current Property	45
Introduction	45
Tenure and type of property	45
Size of property occupied	48
Length of residency	51
Facilities available	51
Views on the size of the home	54
State of repair of property	57
Energy saving initiatives	60
Double-glazing	60
Central heating	60

Loft insulation	60
Previous housing circumstances	63
Level of satisfaction with current home	65
Views on potential improvements to their housing situation	65
Summary	69
Section III: Views on the Area	71
Introduction	71
Reasons for moving to the area	71
Rating of aspects of the area of residence	73
Access to housing services	78
Views on potential problems in the area	80
Level of satisfaction with the area	85
Changing nature of the area	87
Importance of locational factors	88
BME community facilities	91
Views on equality of access to housing	95
Access to financial advice	96
Summary	97
Section IV: Support, Health and Social Care	99
Introduction	99
Prevalence of health problems and disabilities	99
Specialist accommodation requirements	101
Support received	104
Summary	104
Section V: Future Intentions	105
Introduction	105
Likelihood of moving	105
Important factors when choosing a new home	110
Preferred property type and tenure	110
Size of property and facilities required	118
Purchase of next property	118
Inter-generational housing	120
Summary	121
Section VI: Views on Consultation	123
Introduction	123
Views on amount of consultation	123
Preferred method of consultation	126
Summary	127
Chapter IV: Findings from the Other Household Member Interviews	129
Introduction	129

Young people	129
Introduction	129
Planning on moving to own accommodation	129
Issues influencing choice of new home	130
Preferred property type and tenure	130
Size of property required and facilities	132
Purchasing a property	132
Summary	132
Women	135
Introduction	135
Level of satisfaction with the home	135
Views on facilities for children	135
Additional services	136
Support needs	136
Facilities for BME women	137
Summary	137
Older People	139
Introduction	139
Views on need for own accommodation	139
Support needs	139
Facilities for older people	139
Summary	139
Chapter V: Asylum Seekers and Refugees	141
Introduction	141
The study findings	141
Summary	142
Section I: Personal and Household Characteristics	143
Introduction	143
Gender and age	143
Household size and composition	143
Economic status	143
Language	145
Religion	145
Summary	145
Section II: Housing Circumstances	147
Introduction	147
Current tenure and property type	147
Size of property and amenities	147
Satisfaction with current property	149
Summary	149

Section III: Views on the Area of Residence	151
Introduction	151
Reasons for moving to the area	151
Satisfaction with the area	151
Access to housing	152
Access to financial advice	152
Summary	153
Section IV: Support, Health and Social Care	155
Introduction	155
Incidence of health problems	155
Support services	155
Summary	155
Section V: Moving Intentions	157
Introduction	157
Likelihood of moving	157
Preferred property type and tenure	157
Size of property and amenities required	158
Consultation	158
Summary	158
Chapter VI: Findings from the Homelessness Survey	161
Introduction	161
Young people	161
Older people	161
Study findings	162
Personal characteristics	162
Previous housing circumstances	163
Reason for homelessness	165
Informal support	166
Access to and knowledge of housing options	166
Future preferences	169
On-going support provision	170
Comments	173
Summary	174
Chapter VII: Emerging Themes and Action Plan	177
Introduction	177
Diversity of the BME community	177
Poverty and welfare dependency	178
Housing needs	178
Access to services	178
Cohesive and stable communities	179
BME facilities	179
Support services	180
Consultation	180

Future needs	180
Homeless	181
Action Plan	182
Tackling housing needs	182
Increasing the economic and financial circumstances of household and communities	184
Encouraging community cohesion	184
Social and housing related support	185
Future consultation with BME communities	185
Homelessness	186
Information needs	186
References	187
Appendix 1: Questionnaires	189

Tables

Chapter I: Background Information

Table 1: Ethnic break down of local authority population

Chapter II: General Approach and Methodology

Table 1: Ethnicity of community interviewers

Table 2: Required and achieved sample

Chapter III: Findings for Main Household Survey

Table 1: Ethnicity of respondents

Table 2: Ethnicity of local authority area

Table 3: Local authority area by ethnic group

Table 4: Gender of respondents

Table 5: Age of respondents

Table 6: Size of household

Table 7: Household composition

Table 8: Economic status of respondent

Table 9: Length of time unemployed

Table 10: Have right to work in this country

Table 11: Welfare benefits received

Table 12: Monthly household net income

Table 13: Proportion who read and speak in English

Table 14: Current tenure

Table 15: Type of property occupied

Table 16: Size of property

Table 17: Number of bedrooms

Table 18: Length of time at current address

Table 19: Facilities shared with another household

Table 20: Views on size of home in comparison to needs of household

Table 21: Views on overcrowding

Table 22: Level of satisfaction with state of repair of property

Table 23: Views on whether outstanding repairs have impacted on health of household

Table 24: Views on whether support required to carry out minor repairs

Table 25: Availability of double-glazing

Table 26: Availability of central heating

Table 27: Availability of loft insulation

Table 28: Proportion of properties without energy saving initiatives

Table 29: Previous housing circumstances

Table 30: Previous location

Table 31: Level of satisfaction with current home

Table 32: Views on potential improvements to housing circumstance

Table 33: Reason for moving to the area

Table 34: Rating of aspects and facilities in the area

Table 35: Rating of aspects of the area of residence: Nottingham

Table 36: Rating of aspects of the area of residence: Rushcliffe

Table 37: Rating of aspects of the area of residence: Broxtowe

Table 38: Rating of aspects of the area of residence: Ashfield

Table 39: Rating of aspects of the area of residence: Gedling

Table 40: Views on access to housing services
 Table 41: Views on access to housing-related support services
 Table 42: Views on potential problems in the area (All)
 Table 43: Rating of potential problems in the area: Nottingham
 Table 44: Rating of potential problems in the area: Rushcliffe
 Table 45: Rating of potential problems in the area: Broxtowe
 Table 46: Rating of potential problems in the area: Gedling
 Table 47: Rating of potential problems in the area: Ashfield
 Table 48: Level of satisfaction with the area
 Table 49: Level of satisfaction with the area by location
 Table 50: Level of satisfaction with the area by ethnic group
 Table 51: Changing nature of the area within the last three years
 Table 52: Views on whether area is improving
 Table 53: Relative importance of locational factors
 Table 54: Proportion of each ethnic group who rated each aspect as being very important
 Table 55: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities
 Table 56: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities by location
 Table 57: Views on equality of opportunity by location
 Table 58: Views on equality of opportunity
 Table 59: Views on access to financial
 Table 60: Adaptations already have in home
 Table 61: Adaptations required
 Table 62: Specialist accommodation requirements
 Table 63: Planning to move by ethnicity
 Table 64: Planning to move by location
 Table 65: Time frame for moving
 Table 66: Action taken in preparation for moving
 Table 67: Most important aspect when choosing a new home
 Table 68: Type of property would consider
 Table 69: Type of property preferred
 Table 70: Type of property would consider and prefer
 Table 71: Preference for new building or improved property
 Table 72: Tenure of property would consider
 Table 73: Preferred tenure of property
 Table 74: Preferred tenure of property by location
 Table 75: Views on likelihood of getting preferred tenure choice
 Table 76: Size of property required
 Table 77: Views on how a property would be purchased
 Table 78: Views on where children will live upon marriage
 Table 79: Views on amount of consultation with BME community
 Table 80: Views on amount of consultation according to location
 Table 81: Preferred method of consultation

Chapter IV: Findings from the Other Household Member Interviews

Table 1: Property type would consider and first choice
 Table 2: Preferred type of home
 Table 3: Tenure would consider and first choice
 Table 4: Level of satisfaction with home

Table 5: Level of satisfaction with facilities and service for children

Chapter V: Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Table 1: Background of Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Table 2: Have the right to work in this country

Table 3: Employment status of respondent

Table 4: Welfare benefits received

Table 5: Views on the size of property

Table 6: Living in overcrowded conditions

Table 7: Level of satisfaction with home

Table 8: Level of satisfaction with area of residence

Table 9: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities

Table 10: Views on equal access to housing

Table 11: Moving intentions

Table 12: preferred methods of consultation

Chapter VI: Findings from the Homelessness Survey

Table 1: Ethnic group

Table 2: How long have you lived in your current area

Table 3: Where did you spend last night?

Table 4: What was your most recent home

Table 5: Tenure of your recent home

Table 6: How long did you live at most recent home

Table 7: Reasons for leaving accommodation

Table 8: What type of support did you receive

Table 9: Rate of difficulty in finding housing

Table 10: Did you contact anyone for help finding present accommodation

Table 11: What problems did you experience in finding accommodation in the private sector

Table 12: Have you tried to find council or housing association housing

Table 13: Do you have a tenancy

Table 14: Do you want somewhere to live permanently now or in the future

Table 15: First choice of type of accommodation

Table 19: Usefulness of following services if had own home

Introduction

Approaches to housing needs assessments have predominantly been undertaken at the individual local authority level. However, it has recently been recognised that housing studies which incorporate a number of local authority areas and a range of providers enable a more comprehensive appreciation of the range of needs across a diverse BME community to be highlighted. In addition, this relatively new approach has important resource implications as well as recognising that BME groups and their formal and informal relationships are not co-terminous with local authority administrative boundaries. For example, some ethnic groups may routinely visit a place of worship which is in an adjacent local authority.

This study represents a partnership approach to BME housing and social care assessment by the five local authorities in South Nottinghamshire (Nottingham City Council, Rushcliffe, Broxtowe and Gedling Borough Councils and Ashfield District Council, together with a range of social housing and social care providers and representatives of community groups providing a range of services to the BME community.

Study aims

The main aims of the study were:

- To undertake an assessment of the nature and extent of housing needs among the BME communities, across all tenures and addressing the issues of homelessness, support and special needs;
- To document the changing patterns in demand and aspirations across the different sections of the BME community (gender and age specific);
- To document any social issues which affect housing choice;
- To identify any barriers or other factors which exclude BME households from accessing services;
- To evaluate existing methods of consultation, identifying preferred methods and how these can be developed in the future;
- To document the needs of specific sub-groups, such as women, older people, people with disabilities, refugees and asylum seekers; and
- To provide an action plan with key priorities based on the findings of the study.

The ultimate aim of the study was to inform the strategic development of services which meet the needs of the individual communities and reflect the heterogeneity of these communities.

Report structure

The first chapter of this report provides an overview on the BME communities resident in the South Nottinghamshire area, drawing predominantly on the 2001 Census of Population. The second chapter outlines the main methodological approach adopted for the study and in particular discusses the recruitment and role of the BME community interviewers. This is followed by chapter three which provides a detailed overview of the findings to the main household interview. The findings from the supplementary interviews then follow this in chapter 4. In view of the relatively large number of Asylum Seekers and Refugees which were interviewed as part of the household interview, the findings relating specifically to this section of the BME community are presented in chapter 5. The penultimate chapter (6) describes the findings from the homelessness survey. The final chapter summarises the main issues arising from the study and provide a discussion of the implications for service providers within the study area.

The findings from the focus groups discussions have been incorporated within the main body of the text where appropriate.

Chapter I: Background Information

Introduction

A question on ethnicity was asked for only the second time in the 2001 census of Population. The categories were expanded from the 1991 Census to include people of mixed ethnicity. However, it is still not possible to identify some ethnic groups separately, especially white minority groups, such as Italians, Polish, etc. Similarly, there is a wide range of ethnic groups that are included in the Other Black category and the same in relation to the Asian Other group. Hence, very little is known about these more 'hard to reach' BME communities. Comparison of the ethnic profile of the resident population between 1991 and 2001 is problematic due to the use of different ethnic origin categories in these two exercises.

Ethnic profile

The County is predominantly composed of people of White British origin, who at 95.7% of the County's population make up a higher percentage than the national average of 87%. Ethnic minority groups are largely concentrated in Nottingham City. Within the County, the districts with the highest ethnic minority groups tend to be those that fall within the Greater Nottinghamshire conurbation, i.e. Broxtowe, Rushcliffe and Gedling. People of Indian origin in Broxtowe and Rushcliffe combined make up more than half of the Indian population of the County. Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe account for over three-quarters (78%) of the County's total population of Pakistani origin. There is also a concentration of people of Chinese origin living in Broxtowe, accounting for 40% of the County's total population of people of Chinese origin.

In relation to Nottingham City, non-white ethnic groups make up 15.1% of the City's population with all non-white groups showing an increase since 1991. The largest non-white groups were Pakistani (3.6%), Caribbean (3.4%) and Indian (2.3%). The percentage of people of mixed ethnicity was 3.1%.

The table below shows the ethnicity of the resident population for each of the five local authority areas covered by the study.

Table 1: Ethnic break down of local authority population

Ethnic Group	Nottingham %	Rushcliffe %	Broxtowe %	Ashfield %	Gedling %
White	84.91	95.90	95.45	98.94	96.18
White & Black	2.18	0.49	0.47	0.25	0.62
White & Asian	0.47	0.29	0.23	0.07	0.27
White & Other	0.48	0.24	0.18	0.06	0.13
Indian	2.28	1.41	1.25	0.21	0.82
Pakistani	3.64	0.52	0.42	0.05	0.42
Bangladeshi	0.20	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.03
Black	4.34	0.45	0.56	0.16	1.00
Chinese	0.64	0.25	0.75	0.12	0.28
Others (Mixed)	0.84	0.39	0.61	0.11	0.25

Chapter II: General Approach and Methodology

Introduction

In order to meet the study objectives, a three-phase research programme was developed. The first stage involved a household survey of BME households living in the South Nottinghamshire area. The second involved a survey of homeless BME people living in the South Nottinghamshire area at the time of the study, while the third consisted of a series of focus group discussions with specific sections of the BME community.

Stage 1: Interviews with BME Households

The traditional approach to BME housing needs studies where the emphasis is upon a more quantitative approach, is to employ the services of a specialist market research agency with fully trained bi-lingual interviewers to undertake the personal interviews. However, more recently, the benefits of using BME people from the local community, who receive training in interviewer techniques, has received wide-spread support due to the benefits it brings to the communities themselves. This latter approach was initially adopted for the study on the basis that it provided:

- The opportunity for non-economic members of the community, such as those with child care/family responsibilities or those who are currently unemployed to be engaged in flexible employment;
- The opportunity for members of the BME community to acquire new skills or to update existing skills which could lead to new employment or training opportunities;
- The potential to increase the capacity of the community to participate in similar research ventures in the future and especially their possible future involvement in any formal consultation with service providers; and
- The opportunity for individual members to be paid for their time which contributes directly to the financial and economic stability of the community.

In addition, this study also highlighted two other inter-related and indirect benefits of employing community interviewers:

- The potential for increasing social integration within and between BME communities; and
- The opportunity for people from different communities to appreciate issues of culture and tradition relevant to specific community groups.

As well as benefiting the individual interviewers and their community, their involvement, it has been argued, engenders a greater sense of ownership of the study and its findings by the BME communities. In this sense, the research represents a true partnership between the research commissioners, the consultants and the BME communities. In this way the research is undertaken in conjunction with the communities rather than

them being seen as passive research subjects, in other words, '*research is done with them and not to them.*' Furthermore, this approach can often result in the views of the more 'hard to reach' BME groups being included in the study.

Given the spatial distribution of the BME communities throughout South Nottinghamshire and the lack of formal or even informal networks among some of the communities, a publicity strategy was developed to target as many BME communities as possible. This strategy had a number of elements:

- A study launch event took place at the commencement of the project to explain the purpose of the research and to advertise the necessity for recruiting community interviewers. A range of community group and statutory service representatives attended the event.
- Posters advertising the need for community interviewers were sent to all the main service providers (statutory and community) within the five local authority areas who were subsequently asked to display the posters in a range of local public venues, including post offices, health centres/GP surgeries, community centres, libraries and local housing offices.
- Advertisements were placed in Local Authority and Housing Association Tenants Newsletters; and
- A Community Interviewer information pack, together with an application form was distributed to all known BME community and voluntary groups in South Nottinghamshire

Although prospective community interviewers had to complete an application form there was no formal selection procedure. Rather it was decided that the potential to be a community interviewer should be open to all, provided they had the necessary literacy skills and that once they had completed the interviewer training programme their role in the study would be discussed on an individual basis. A total of 65 people took part in the training days which were held at two central venues in Nottingham.

Interviewer training

The programme for the interviewer training was similar to that advocated by the Market Research Society and included the following topics: aims and purpose of the study; the role of the interviewer, interview techniques, issues of confidentiality and personal security, sample identification and selection techniques and recording information. The participants were also introduced to the interview schedule and given the opportunity to practice using it within the group setting. All those who completed the training were awarded a Certificate of Attendance by the University of Salford.

The interviewers were recruited from a range of ethnic groups as shown below:

Table 1: Ethnicity of community interviewers

Ethnic group	Number
Indian	9
African	8
Pakistani	4
Caribbean	4
Mixed origin	4
Bangladeshi	3
Iranian	2
Chinese	1
Romany	1
Kashmiri	1
Total	37

Note: the above include only those who returned completed questionnaires as opposed to simply attending the training sessions

While interviewers from a number of important ethnic groups were recruited, they did not represent the full range of ethnic groups resident within South Nottinghamshire, for example, no Irish community interviewers were engaged, despite attempts to the contrary.

Sample selection

In the absence of any comprehensive sampling frame for BME households in the study area, quota sampling was used on the basis of the 2001 Census. In this way, specific targets were given to each interviewer in terms of the ethnicity of the household to be interviewed and the location (i.e. Local Authority area which was identified via the relevant postcodes).

Based on the weekly-completed interview returns from the community interviewers, the decision was taken to engage a market research agency to assist in completing the required number of interviews. Within the timescale allocated for the fieldwork only 1,439 of the required 2000 interviews had been achieved by the community interviewers. The final sample size was 1987. Hence, the majority of the household interviews were completed by the recruited community interviewers.

The table below highlights the percentage of the BME population for the five local authority areas, the required sample size and the achieved sample size

Table 2: Required and achieved sample

Local authority	%of BME population	Sample size required (adjusted)	Sample size achieved	difference between required & achieved
Ashfield	2.1	50	58	+ 8
Broxtowe	6.7	134	86	- 48
Gedling	7.3	146	80	- 66
Nottingham	77.6	1,544	1,657	+ 113
Rushcliffe	6.3	126	86	- 40
Travellers	-	-	-	+ 20
Total	100.0	2,000	1987	- 13

As the table above shows, while in Ashfield and Nottingham a greater sample size was achieved than the target set, this was at the expense of an under-representation from the remaining three areas. To a large extent, this reflected the geographical location of the interviewers recruited and their lack of familiarisation with the location of BME groups in other parts of South Nottinghamshire.

Travellers and Gypsies are generally regarded as a 'hard to reach' group, reflecting that transient lifestyle and reluctance to engage with official agencies. The fact that twenty interviews were secured with such families, emphasises the underlying purpose of the study to be inclusive of all BME community groups. However, due to the small sample size, it would be inappropriate to consider this community as a specific group within this study. Rather, based on their own definition of their ethnicity (predominantly Irish and Romany), they have been included within the groups ethnicity categories used throughout this report. Feedback from the community interviewer who undertook these interviews (being herself from a traveler family) suggested that this group had particular needs relating primarily to the availability of recognized traveler sites and access to support services.

Interviewer support

A range of mechanisms were put in place to support the community interviewers in the field including:

- Initial briefing session following the completion of the first two or three interviews to identify and discuss any problems encountered;
- Accompanied interviews with an experienced interviewer where requested/required;
- On-going telephone contact to review progress; and
- Final debriefing session.

Selection of respondents

Interviewers were advised to interview the head of household, although this was largely left up to the householder to decide who, in their opinion was the head of household. This constituted the main household questionnaire. In addition and in recognition that the housing and social care needs of individual household members may differ quite markedly, supplementary interviews were undertaken, where possible, with one of the following groups: young people aged 16-25; women who had not been interviewed as the head of household and who were aged 24-54; and any older household member aged 55 or over.

Review of approach adopted

The engagement of BME community interviewers is a relatively new approach and while there are undoubted benefits for the individual and community, there are also potential problems for the research programme.

First, there was a relatively high dropout rate among the community interviewers and an additional recruitment campaign had to be implemented. This had an impact on the timescale for the fieldwork and the study per se. This also had an influence on the range of ethnic groups represented among the interview field force and therefore, access to specific community groups. In this way, some of the ethnic groups in the final sample are under-represented, for example the Chinese.

The decision was taken approximately half way through the allocated fieldwork period to recruit a field force supervisor from among the interviewers. The primary role of the individual was:

- To have regular telephone/personal contact (at least once a week) with the interviewers to identify any issues which prevented them from undertaking the interviews;
- To offer advice and guidance where required.

The creation of this role was welcomed by the Community Interviewers and had a direct, positive impact on the final sample size achieved.

Second, it was found to be difficult to encourage some of the interviewers to identify households to be interviewed in locations, which were not part of their own community area. This was compounded by the fact that travel expenses were not offered due to the financial restrictions on the project. This further explains the under-representation of BME households within some of the local authority areas other than Nottingham.

Stage II: Survey of BME Homeless People

As a complementary element of the study, a survey was conducted among BME homeless people. A self-completion questionnaire was sent to all those agencies who provided services to homeless people. The questionnaires were distributed by Hostels Liaison Group, which has a directory of projects providing services to BME Homeless people. Hence, this element of the study was reliant upon a third party. The response

rate was quite poor and this may reflect the difficulties of engaging this particular client group given the general over-exposure to research. For example, prior to this research being conducted, Ashfield Borough Council had already undertaken its own homelessness study.

Stage III: Focus group discussions

In order to supplement the information derived from stages I and II and to provide more qualitative information, focus group discussions were undertaken with the following groups:

- Chinese older people;
- BME homeless people and specifically young people;
- Black and African Caribbean respondents to the main household survey; and
- Pakistani women.

In the case of the discussion group with Chinese Older people, this was held during a regular meeting of these individuals at the Chinese Community Centre. An interpreter was employed. An interpreter was also engaged (one of the Community Interviewers) for the focus group with Pakistani women as some of the women had only a rudimentary understanding of English.

In addition, a focus group was convened with a selection of the community interviewers to gauge their views on the main issues arising from the interviews they had undertaken and specifically, the main messages that they would want to see highlighted within the report about the housing and social care needs of BME people in South Nottinghamshire.

Chapter III: Findings from Main Household Survey

Introduction

This chapter reports the findings from the main household survey. Grouped ethnic origins have been used, as opposed to individual ethnic classifications due to the sample sizes involved for some of the communities. The results are described according to these ethnic groups where relevant. The decision to undertake a South Nottinghamshire wide study, as opposed to separate studies being commissioned by individual agencies, such as the five local authorities, is reflected in the fact that location (i.e. local authority area) is only included with the findings, where it is deemed to be directly relevant. The intention was not, in presenting this chapter, to produce the findings in an authority-by-authority basis, but rather to identify issues relevant to the BME communities across South Nottinghamshire. The first part of this chapter describes the ethnic origin of those who took part in the interviews, with subsequent sections focusing on: the respondent and household characteristics of the sample; their current housing situation; their views on their area of residence, support, health and social care needs and their future housing intentions and aspirations.

Ethnicity of respondents

Through the use of a combination of Community Interviewers and a market research company a total of 1987 BME household interviews were completed. The question concerning ethnicity was open-ended with individuals being given the opportunity to describe their ethnic origin. However, for presentation purposes, these individual ethnic groups have been re-categorised according to the 2001 Census of Population classification of ethnicity. As table 1 reveals, the largest group consisted of those from the Pakistani community (19.5%), followed by similar proportions who were either Caribbean or Indian (16.0% and 15.3% respectively). Africans also comprised a relatively large group (13.0%). The other notable features in the table are the quite large group of Iranians in the sample (6.9%) which, in part, reflects the ethnic origin of some of the Community Interviewers and the inclusion of travelers (only some of whom described themselves as being Romany (0.5%) or a Gypsy (0.1%).

Table 1: Ethnicity of respondents

Ethnic group	No.	%
Irish	73	3.7
Any other white background	58	2.9
White & Caribbean	84	4.2
White & African	12	0.6
White & Asian	74	3.7
Any other mixed background	56	2.8
Indian	304	15.3
Pakistani	387	19.5
Bangladeshi	33	1.7
Any other Asian background	48	2.4
Caribbean	317	16.0
African	258	13.0
Any other Black background	68	3.4
Chinese	13	0.7
Any other background	10	0.5
Iranian	138	6.9
Kurdish	25	1.3
Gypsy	2	0.1
Romany	10	0.5
Refused	17	0.9
Total	1987	100.0

Using the Census categorisation does, however, mask the wide range of ethnic groups who took part in the study, although for some of these groups the numbers involved were very small. In the case of the 'Any Other white background' this included individuals who described themselves as Polish (23 or 1.1%), Italian (6 or 0.3%), Dutch (3 or 0.1%), Greek (3 or 0.1%), European (3 or 0.1%), French (2 or 0.1%) and Anglo (2 or 0.1%). Those who have been included within the 'Any Other Asian background' were those who described themselves as Kashmiri (25 or 1.2%) and those who referred to themselves as either Islamic or Muslim (collectively accounting for 20 or 1.0%). Those who classified themselves as either Arabic (12 or 0.6%), Afghanistani (6 or 0.3%) or Brazilian (4 or 0.2%) represented the main groups identified within the 'Any Other Black background' while the Vietnamese (7 or 3.5%) accounted for the majority of those in the 'Any Other background.'

Although the study identified twenty households who described themselves as being gypsies or travelers, this relatively low number makes it impossible to consider this group separately. Rather, they have been grouped according to their ethnicity (either as Romany or Irish). However, it should be borne in mind that the needs of this community may be very different to that of the other ethnic groups in the sample given their more transient lifestyle.

Table 2 highlights the range of ethnic groups who participated in the study according to local authority area. The first point to note is that generally, Nottingham has a more diverse ethnic population compared with the remaining four local authorities. On the

basis of the study findings Gedling, on the other hand, appears to have fewer ethnic groups.

The largest group of interviewees from Nottingham were from the Pakistani community (21.9%), followed by 16.5% who were Caribbean and a slightly smaller group who were African (13.7%). Among those currently living in Rushcliffe, nearly four out of ten were from the Indian community (28.4%), with much smaller proportions being from the Pakistani, Caribbean or Iranian communities (15.1%, 10.5% and 10.5% respectively). With regard to Broxtowe, over half the sample of residents from this local authority area described themselves as being Indian (52.3%), while slightly more than one in ten (12.8%) were African. Three main ethnic groups dominated among the sample of Ashfield residents who were interviewed: Indian (32.8%), Any Other White Background (20.7%) and those from the African community (13.8%). Similarly, three ethnic groups collectively accounted for seven out of ten of the respondents from Gedling: Caribbeans (30.0%), Indians (23.8%) and those from 'Any Other Black background' (16.3%).

Table 2: Ethnicity by local authority area

Ethnic group	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Irish	59	3.6	3	3.5	3	3.5	1	1.7	1	1.3
Any other white background	41	2.5	3	3.5	-	-	12	20.7	1	1.3
White & Caribbean	77	4.6	3	3.5	1	1.2	3	5.2	-	-
White & African	11	0.7	-	-	-	-	1	1.7	-	-
White & Asian	59	3.6	3	3.5	5	5.8	5	8.6	2	2.5
Any other mixed background	53	3.2	-	-	-	-	1	1.7	1	1.3
Indian	188	11.3	33	38.4	45	52.3	19	32.8	19	23.8
Pakistani	363	21.9	13	15.1	5	5.8	1	1.7	5	6.3
Bangladeshi	32	1.9	-	-	-	-	1	1.7	-	-
Any other Asian background	45	2.7	1	1.2	1	1.2	1	1.7	-	-
Caribbean	274	16.5	9	10.5	5	5.8	5	8.6	24	30.0
African	227	13.7	7	8.1	11	12.8	8	13.8	5	6.3
Any other Black background	55	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	16.3
Chinese	7	0.4	1	1.2	5	5.8	-	-	-	-
Any other background	9	0.5	-	-	1	1.2	-	-	-	-
Iranian	118	7.1	9	10.5	3	3.5	-	-	8	10.0
Kurdish	25	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gypsy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romany	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Refused	14	0.8	1	1.2	1	1.2	-	-	1	1.3
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

For the purposes of analysis these ethnic groups have been classified into nine categories. The Black Other group includes those who described themselves as White and Caribbean, White and African and Black Other. The Asian Other category refers to those who were White and Asian, from any Other Asian background, Bangladeshi and Chinese. Finally, the Other group covers a diverse range of ethnic groups including Other white, Kurds and Gypsies. These latter groups were grouped under this general heading given their relatively small size.

Table 3 reveals the settlement patterns of these nine groups according to local authority area.

Table 3: Local authority area by ethnic group

LA	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Nottingham	1657	83.4	59	80.8	188	61.8	363	93.8	274	86.4	227	88.0	118	85.5	143	87.2	143	85.1	142	79.8
Rushcliffe	86	4.3	3	4.1	33	10.9	13	3.4	9	2.8	7	2.7	9	6.5	3	1.8	5	3.0	4	2.2
Broxtowe	86	4.3	3	4.1	45	14.8	5	1.3	5	1.6	11	4.3	3	2.2	1	0.6	11	6.5	2	1.1
Ashfield	58	2.9	1	1.4	19	6.3	1	0.3	5	1.6	8	3.1	-	-	4	2.4	7	4.2	13	7.3
Gedling	80	4.0	1	1.4	19	6.3	5	1.3	24	7.6	5	1.9	8	5.8	13	7.9	2	1.2	3	1.7
Travellers	20	1.0	6	8.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	7.9
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Section I: Respondent and Household Characteristics

Introduction

Respondents were asked to provide details of their age, the size and type of their household together with information about their households income. Information about the main languages used by the interviewees and their religious beliefs was also collected.

Gender and age of respondent

Slightly more than half the sample consisted of men (56.8%), although this proportion varied according to ethnic group, accounting for 40.4% of the Caribbean sample to 87.0% of the Iranian respondents – see table 4.

In terms of the age profile of the sample as a whole, the largest proportion were in the age range 25-39 (42.8%) and collectively six out of ten of the sample (60.5%) were under 40 years of age. In terms of those in the older age range, one in ten were aged 60-74 (10.1%) and a further small minority (2.9%) were aged 75 or over.

Table 5 does show that the age profile of the respondents from the nine ethnic groupings varied. The Indian respondents tended to be older than those in the remaining groups, for example, 26.6% were aged 60 or over and just 39.1% were under 40 years of age. A rather different picture emerges among the Caribbean and African samples where over one quarter of each of these groups were aged under 24 and collectively, 64.2% and 74.4% respectively were below 40 years of age. There was also a paucity of older people in the Iranian sample with just four respondents (2.9%) being aged 50 or over. With regards to the Irish respondents, with the exception of those in the age range 25-39, there was a relatively even distribution of interviewees across the remaining age bands.

Table 4: Gender of respondents

Gender	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	1128	56.8	36	49.3	201	66.1	214	55.3	128	40.4	136	52.7	120	87.0	71	43.3	115	68.5	107	60.1
Female	823	41.4	37	50.7	100	32.9	155	40.1	187	59.0	121	46.9	13	9.4	92	56.1	47	28.0	71	39.9
Not given	36	1.8	-	-	3	1.0	18	4.7	2	0.6	1	0.4	5	3.6	1	0.6	6	3.6	-	-
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 5: Age of respondent

Age group	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16-24	352	17.7	8	11.0	29	9.5	65	16.8	43	26.7	69	26.7	27	19.6	26	15.9	42	25.0	43	24.2
25-39	850	42.8	29	38.7	90	29.6	177	45.7	119	37.5	123	47.7	81	58.7	87	53.0	67	39.9	77	43.3
40-49	353	17.8	11	15.1	62	20.4	59	15.2	70	22.1	49	19.0	26	18.8	32	19.5	27	16.1	17	9.6
50-59	158	8.0	9	12.3	42	13.8	43	11.1	26	8.2	7	2.7	3	2.2	6	3.7	12	7.1	10	5.6
60-74	216	10.9	8	11.0	77	25.3	34	8.8	44	13.9	9	3.5	1	0.7	13	7.9	17	10.1	13	7.3
75+	58	2.9	8	11.0	4	1.3	9	2.3	15	4.7	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	3	1.8	18	10.1
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Size of household

The size of the household who took part in the study varied from those consisting of just one person and which represented the largest group (28.2%) to those with over ten members living at the same address. There were important differences in household size according to ethnic group as table 6 shows. Among the Caribbean, African, Iranian, Black Other and Asian Other samples the one-person household dominated, accounting for between 28.0% (Black Other) and 47.8% (Iranian) of these groups. These households were comprised predominantly of young people. In contrast, among the Irish and Indian respondents the largest group consisted of two person households (32.9% and 27.3% respectively). Two other salient points to note from the table are first, that among the Pakistani group the largest number of respondents from this community were from four person households (22.0%) and second, that there was wide variability in household size which was most marked in relation to the Iranian group in direct comparison to the Pakistani and Asian Other groups. In the case of the former community group, there were no households with six or more members and just one in ten consisted of either four or five members. In terms of the Pakistani community respondents, nearly one quarter (23.3%) were from households with six or more members – the comparable figure among the Asian Other group was 20.2%.

The household composition reflects the findings relating to the household size referred to above. Looking first at the sample as a whole, the three most prominent household types were: households consisting of one adult under the age of 60, accounting for 21.8%; those consisting of two adults and either one or two children (16.0%); another type of household (14.3%). Focusing on the pattern of household types across the nine ethnic groups, there is some noticeable variability. One in five of the Irish respondents (19.2%) were from two adult households where both were under 60 years of age and at the same time, a comparable group (20.5%) were households consisting of older people over the age of 60, the majority of whom were single person households.

Among the Indian sample similar proportions were either from households with two adults and one or two children (18.8%) or those consisting of older people (18.4%). At the same time, one quarter of this community group referred to themselves as being from 'another household type'. In contrast, 44.5% of the Pakistani sample were households with two adults and at least one child with roughly half this group being households with three or more children. In contrast, those households which included at least one older person over the age of 60 were in a distinct minority (3.9%). Among the Caribbean, African and Iranian groups the largest proportion of respondents came from single person household where the respondent was under 60 years of age. This was also the patterns evident among the Asian Other and Other community groups. In contrast, similar proportions of the Black Other households were single people under 60 and single parent families with one or two children (22.0% and 21.3% respectively).

Table 6: Size of household

Number	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	560	28.2	21	28.8	50	16.4	27	7.0	122	38.5	108	41.9	66	47.8	46	28.0	49	29.2	71	39.9
Two	359	18.1	24	32.9	83	27.3	41	10.6	71	22.4	33	12.8	27	19.6	40	24.4	10	6.0	30	16.9
Three	336	16.9	9	12.3	40	13.2	76	19.6	42	13.2	52	20.2	27	19.6	36	22.0	33	19.6	21	11.8
Four	327	16.5	10	13.7	62	20.4	85	22.0	43	13.6	36	14.0	12	8.7	23	14.0	24	14.3	32	18.0
Five	198	10.0	4	5.5	28	9.2	68	17.6	27	8.5	18	7.0	6	4.3	11	6.7	18	10.7	18	10.1
Six	123	6.2	5	5.5	32	10.5	48	12.4	8	2.5	5	1.9	-	-	7	4.3	15	8.9	4	2.2
Seven	50	2.5	-	-	8	2.6	20	5.2	3	0.9	5	1.9	-	-	-	-	12	7.1	2	1.1
Eight	17	0.9	1	1.4			12	3.1	1	0.3	1	0.4	-	-	1	0.6	1	0.6	-	-
Nine	7	0.4	-	-			5	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.2	-	-
Ten+	10	0.6	-	-	1	0.3	5	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2.4	-	-
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 7: Household composition

Type of household	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 adult 60+	126	6.3	10	13.7	24	7.9	8	2.1	40	12.6	7	2.7	-	-	10	6.1	8	4.8	19	10.7
2 adults 60+	56	2.8	-	-	32	10.5	7	1.8	7	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.2	8	4.5
1 adult >60 & 1 adult <60	62	3.1	5	6.8	21	6.9	14	3.6	9	2.8	2	0.8	-	-	4	2.4	3	1.8	4	2.2
1 adult <60	434	21.8	11	15.1	26	8.6	19	4.9	82	25.9	101	39.1	66	47.8	36	22.0	41	24.4	52	29.2
2 adults <60	166	8.4	14	19.2	30	9.9	13	3.4	27	8.5	24	9.3	24	17.4	15	9.1	3	1.8	16	9.0
3+ adults <60	151	7.6	5	6.8	18	5.9	26	6.7	17	5.4	21	8.1	22	15.9	8	4.9	19	11.3	15	8.4
1 adult & 1 or 2 children	146	7.3	7	9.6	5	1.6	23	5.9	39	12.3	22	8.5	3	2.2	35	21.3	6	3.6	6	3.4
1 adult & 3+ children	68	3.3	3	4.1	2	0.7	17	4.4	13	4.1	9	3.5	-	-	5	3.0	1	0.6	16	9.0
2 adults & 1 or 2 children	318	16.0	3	4.1	57	18.8	92	23.8	37	11.7	38	14.7	18	13.0	27	16.5	27	16.1	19	10.7
2 adults & 3+ children	177	8.9	4	5.5	12	3.9	80	20.7	19	6.0	13	5.0	2	1.4	11	6.7	27	16.1	9	5.1
Another type	285	14.3	11	15.1	77	25.3	88	22.7	27	8.5	21	8.1	3	2.2	13	7.9	31	18.5	14	7.9
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Further reinforcing the findings in the table above, slightly more than half the households in the sample (51.1%) did not contain any couples (either married or living as married), which compares with 45.4% that contained one such couple and smaller numbers who reported either two couples living at the same address (3.3%) or three or more (0.2%).

Economic and financial information

Respondents were asked to provide details of their own employment status together with details of the sources of income received by the households as a whole and their monthly income.

Just over one third of the respondents reported being in full-time employment (34.8%) and a further one in ten (9.8%) worked part-time. The proportion who were unemployed was relatively large at 17.4%. Students (aged over 16) accounted for 10.1%. The other noticeable feature from the table is that the proportion of the respondents who described themselves as suffering from a long-term illness or disability was relatively low (2.6%).

However, this general finding masks some important differences between the different ethnic groups. In relation to the proportion who were in full-time employment, this varied from 44.1% (Indians) to just 14.5% (Iranian). This latter community sample together with members of the African sample were also more likely to be working part-time than respondents from the remaining ethnic groups and especially in comparison with the Irish (11.6% and 14.0% respectively compared with 5.5%). However, a high proportion (around 6 out of 10) of these later two groups described themselves as asylum seekers.

The 1997 Labour Force Survey found that while 5.8% of the white working population was unemployed the figure among the BME community was 13%. However, this makes some important differences in unemployment rates among the different BME groups. Bangladeshis and Pakistanis experienced the highest unemployment rates of 23% and 20% respectively), compared with 9% among the Indian group. Although it is not possible to directly compare these unemployment rates with those found in this study due to different ethnic origin classifications being applied, there is some evidence there is some evidence that would suggest that unemployment rates among some groups in the study sample are lower than the national average. For example, the study found that just 4% of Indians were unemployed compared with a national average of 9% and for the Pakistanis the figure was 11% as compared with the national average of 20%. However, at the same time, Black Caribbeans living in South Nottinghamshire were more likely to be unemployed than the national picture (19% as compared with 13%) (reported in Harrison and Phillips, 2003)

The study also found that unemployment levels were particularly high among the Iranians. Another important feature in table 8 is the proportion of Pakistani respondents who reported being unable to work due to a long-standing illness or health problem (6.5%) compared with the mean for the sample as a whole (2.5%). There was also found to be a predominance of students in further education among the Iranian and Other sample groups (32.6% and 21.9% respectively).

Table 8: Economic status of respondent

Economic status	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Working full-time	691	34.8	29	39.7	134	44.1	133	34.4	110	34.7	102	39.5	20	14.5	71	43.3	59	35.1	33	18.5
Working part-time	194	9.8	4	5.5	27	8.9	36	9.3	32	10.1	36	14.0	16	11.6	15	9.1	17	10.1	11	6.2
Retired	270	13.6	15	20.5	78	25.7	36	9.3	65	20.5	9	3.5	2	1.4	14	89.5	21	12.5	30	16.9
Unemployed	345	17.4	16	21.9	12	3.9	44	11.4	61	19.2	45	17.4	51	37.0	27	16.5	37	22.0	52	29.2
Long-term sick/disabled	51	2.5	1	1.4	7	2.3	25	6.5	5	1.6	4	1.6	-	-	3	1.8	2	1.2	4	2.2
Student	200	10.1	5	6.8	18	5.9	18	4.7	26	8.2	20	7.8	45	32.6	14	8.5	15	8.9	39	21.9
Housewife/husband	136	6.8	2	2.7	13	4.3	67	17.3	8	2.5	12	4.7	1	0.7	12	7.3	14	8.3	7	3.9
Other not working	56	2.8	1	1.4	5	1.6	9	2.3	8	2.5	25	9.7	1	0.7	7	4.3	-	-	-	-
Not specified	44	2.2	-	-	10	3.3	19	4.9	2	0.6	5	1.9	2	1.4	1	0.6	3	1.8	2	1.1
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 9: Length of time unemployed

Length of time	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 6 months	44	2.2	2	2.7	-	-	5	1.3	14	4.4	6	2.3	4	2.9	4	2.4	5	3.0	4	2.2
6-12 months	99	5.0	1	1.4	4	1.3	14	3.6	15	4.7	14	5.4	17	12.3	5	3.0	13	7.7	16	9.0
12 months – 2 years	94	4.7	5	6.8	5	1.6	11	2.8	13	4.1	9	3.5	19	13.8	8	4.9	9	5.4	15	8.4
2-5 years	50	2.5	2	2.7	-	-	4	1.0	9	2.8	6	2.3	11	8.0	4	2.4	6	3.6	8	4.5
5+ years	23	1.2	4	5.5	1	0.3	1	0.3	7	2.2	-	-	-	-	2	1.2	4	2.4	4	2.2
Can't remember	38	1.9	2	2.7	2	0.7	9	2.3	3	0.9	10	3.9	-	-	4	2.4	3	1.8	5	2.8
Not unemployed	1639	82.5	57	78.1	292	96.1	343	88.6	256	80.8	213	82.6	87	63.0	137	83.5	128	76.2	126	70.8
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Those who reported being unemployed (17.4% or 345 respondents) were asked to indicate how long they had been out of work. The largest group referred to a period of less than two years although a significant group mentioned a period of more than two years including a small group who suggested that they had been unemployed for more than five years. The general pattern across all nine ethnic groupings was for respondents to report having been unemployed for a shorter rather than longer period (i.e. less than two years as opposed to more than two years.)

Slightly less than one in ten (8.2%) of the total sample reported that they did not have the right to work in this country. This was more likely to be the case for those from the Iranian, Other and African community groups (45.7%, 15.2% and 13.6% respectively) than those from the other six ethnic samples. The majority of the Iranians (52.6%), those in the Other Group (67.7%) and three out of ten of the Africans described themselves as being Asylum Seekers or Refugees. Of this group who did not have the right to work, the largest proportion who provided details of their economic status described themselves as being unemployed (42.3% or 69 out of 163) and a further 22.7% were in full-time education. However at the same time, 8.6% (14) were in some form of paid work and 12.9% (21) described themselves as 'other not working.'

Nearly four out of ten households in the sample did not receive any state welfare benefits (38.2%). The most common benefits received by the remainder of the group were Income Support (23.9%), Council Tax Benefit (23.5%) and Housing Benefit (20.0%). Smaller numbers also received Child Tax benefit (10.4%) and a state retirement pension (9.8%).

Three community groups in particular stand out in the table below. First, the Indian respondents had the largest number of households in this sample who were in receipt of a state retirement pension – reinforcing the earlier finding about the relative proportion of households in this sample group containing an older person over 60 years of age. Second, the African and Iranian groups – unlike the remaining five community groups where the greatest proportion were in receipt of either Income Support, Council Tax Benefit or Housing Benefit, 17.4% and 44.2% respectively of these former two groups received National Asylum Support Service (NASS) equating to 44.3% of the African sample and 52.6% of the Iranians who described themselves as Asylum Seekers or Refugees.

Looking specifically at the number of benefits received per household, three out of ten (29.8%) referred to receiving just one type of benefit and smaller but similar numbers mentioned two and three benefits (12.0% and 14.2% respectively). At the same time, 17 households (1.0%) cited five or more different benefits.

The extent to which households are dependent upon welfare provision can be gauged by considering the number of means-tested benefits received as opposed to universal benefit (available irrespective of financial position). In this case, 58.3% of the group as a whole do not receive any means-tested benefits compared with 17.5% who mentioned just one and half this figure (8.2%) who mentioned two. However, at the same time, 13.6% referred to three different benefits and 2.5% suggested that, as a household, they were in receipt of four or more different means-tested benefits.

Table 10: Have right to work in this country

Right to work	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	1754	88.3	70	95.9	289	95.1	371	95.9	281	88.6	219	84.9	71	51.4	151	92.1	160	95.2	142	79.8
No	163	8.2	1	1.4	8	2.6	7	1.8	14	4.4	35	13.6	63	45.7	4	2.4	4	2.4	27	15.2
Refused to answer	70	3.5	2	2.7	7	2.3	9	2.3	22	6.9	4	1.6	4	2.9	9	5.5	4	2.4	9	5.1
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 11: Welfare benefits received

Type of benefit	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Income support	474	23.9	24	32.9	49	16.1	158	40.8	77	24.3	29	11.2	26	18.8	39	23.8	34	20.2	38	21.3
Council Tax benefit	467	23.5	19	26.0	31	10.2	126	32.6	97	30.6	39	15.1	16	11.6	55	33.5	38	22.6	46	25.8
Housing benefit	398	20.0	16	21.9	28	9.2	94	24.3	77	24.3	38	14.7	32	23.2	44	26.8	30	17.9	39	21.9
Child Tax Credit	206	10.4	3	4.1	27	8.9	53	13.7	37	11.7	24	9.3	-	-	29	17.7	22	13.1	11	6.2
State retirement pension	194	9.8	7	9.6	56	18.4	35	9.0	42	13.2	6	2.3	-	-	9	5.5	18	10.7	21	11.8
National Asylum Support Service (NASS)	152	7.6	1	1.4	3	1.0	6	1.6	5	1.6	45	17.4	61	44.2	4	2.4	2	1.2	25	14.0
Incapacity benefit etc.	152	7.6	5	6.8	35	11.5	57	14.7	24	7.6	4	1.6	-	-	11	6.7	6	3.6	10	5.6
Working Tax Credit	114	5.7	2	2.7	12	3.9	37	9.6	16	5.0	15	5.8	1	0.7	16	9.8	10	6.0	5	2.8
Jobseekers Allowance	75	3.8	-	-	2	0.7	10	2.6	9	2.8	26	10.1	6	4.3	9	5.5	8	4.8	5	2.8
Occupational pension	54	2.7	-	-	8	2.6	4	1.0	13	4.1	3	1.2	-	-	8	4.9	4	2.4	14	7.9
Widows pension	51	2.6	2	2.7	23	7.6	13	3.4	5	1.6	1	0.4	-	-	2	1.2	3	1.8	2	1.1
Supporting People Grant	7	0.4	-	-	4	1.3	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	1	0.6	-	-
None of these	762	38.3	32	43.8	127	41.8	133	34.4	123	38.8	120	46.5	34	24.6	58	35.4	69	41.1	66	37.1

More than one answer was permitted

Those who were the least likely to be reliant upon state welfare provision included members of the African, Irish and Asian Other communities (around four out of ten in each case) and in direct comparison to just 24.6% of the Iranians and 34.4% of the Pakistani households.

Respondents were asked to provide details of their household's net monthly income including income from all sources (benefits, savings and overtime etc.). The first point to notice from the table is that four out of ten of the sample declined to provide information about their household's income (43.1%) and a further one in ten (10.5%) were unable to comment upon the total income received. Among those who did provide this information, the largest group (16.3% of the total sample) reported that they did not have any income and one in ten (11.1%) received an income of less than £650 per month. In contrast, 9.9% referred to a figure of more than £1,081 per month.

Table 12 suggests that the poorest respondents are those from the Iranian, Other and African communities with 67.4%, 21.3% and 18.6% respectively arguing that they have no income. Again, the fact that a high proportion of these groups are asylum seekers explains the findings. At the same time, those respondents who were from the Indian community were the least likely to argue that they had no income. Those respondents with higher incomes (above £1,300 per month) tended to be from the Indian, Caribbean and Asian Other groups. ODPM figures (Harrison and Philips, 2003) suggest that traditionally Indian households have had higher incomes compared to other BME groups, equating to £2,188 per month. The figure for the Black and Pakistani households has been found to be £1,538 and £1,282 respectively and this latter category was found to have the lowest incomes of any of the main BME groups. Excluding asylum seekers from the sample (predominantly with the African and Iranian samples, the findings from this study compare favourably with the national picture.

Language

Respondents were asked to indicate the language that they would normally read in. Nearly three-quarters of the sample (72.9%) referred to English, with the next most popular languages being Farsi (7.3%), Urdu (6.3%), Punjabi and French (3.1% and 2.1% respectively). A very wide range of other minority languages were also cited by the respondents including: Bangla (1.2%), Kurdy (1.2%), Somalian (1.1%), Polish (0.6%), Pashtu and Swalia (0.3% in each case) together with languages which were cited by just one or two individuals (such as Daru, Zulu and Spanish).

In terms of the language normally spoken by the respondents, slightly more than half referred to their first language as being English, with one in ten mentioning Punjabi (11.7%), 7.7% Urdu and 6.2% Farsi. Other minority languages cited included: Bangla (4.2%), Gujarati (2.0%), Kurdy and French (1.5% and 1.4% respectively).

The ability to read English was greatest (with the exception of the Irish community) among the Caribbean and Black Other respondents (98.1% and 95.1% respectively) and a similar finding was evident in relation to the ability to speak in English.

With the exception of those from the Iranian community, a greater proportion of respondents from the remaining eight ethnic groups reported that they could read in

English than could speak English and this difference was quite marked among some of the community groups, for example in the case of the Indian respondents: while 76.0% reported normally reading in English, just 30.3% would normally speak in English. In the case of the Iranian respondents very low numbers would normally either read or speak in English (4.3% and 12.3% respectively).

The focus group with Chinese older people (11 in total, with a mix of genders and ages ranging from 58-78), highlighted the problems of language for this section of the population. The vast majority of this group were unable to speak English or read English. Those who could speak some English were not confident in their use of the English language and felt that some service providers were intolerant of anyone who could not speak English. This had caused many of them to rely upon translators or avoid particular agencies. As one 68 year old woman commented:

‘we lack the confidence in speaking to them (service providers) and so you tend not to use them.’

Hence, language was seen as a major barrier to accessing appropriate services. It was suggested that providing information in Chinese was not necessarily the answer since:

‘not everyone I know can read – I think taped information in Chinese would help’
(68 year old woman)

The issue of language was also a major issue of concern among the Pakistani women who took part in a focus group discussion. This group consisted nine women ranging in age from 28-58. The major concern identified was that translation services were not always available and therefore, information about specific services were gleaned from discussions with other members of the community. This it was felt had lead to some confusion about the services provided by particular organisations and its relevance to this section of the community. The general consensus was that there needed to be wider availability of English language classes but that these needed to take place within community venues. Many of the women were reluctant to venture outside their community for fear of racism. As one woman in her late 40s commented:

‘I don’t like to go out too far. I had a bad experience some time ago with some white youths. Since then I’m scared to leave the area but I do want to learn. I only came here (International Community Centre) because the taxi was arranged for me and my friend came with me.’

Table 12: Monthly household net income

Monthly income	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No income	323	16.3	6	8.2	6	2.0	46	11.9	47	14.8	48	18.6	93	67.4	24	14.6	15	8.9	38	21.3
£217 or less	64	3.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	12	3.8	26	10.1	4	2.9	2	1.2	7	4.2	12	6.7
£218-£433	69	3.5	3	4.1	5	1.6	14	2.6	11	3.5	18	7.0	2	1.4	6	3.7	4	2.4	6	3.4
£434-£650	87	4.4	3	4.1	12	3.9	13	3.4	13	4.1	16	6.2	-	-	8	4.9	12	7.1	10	5.6
£651-£867	98	4.9	4	5.5	8	2.6	15	3.9	11	3.5	31	12.0	1	0.7	5	3.0	12	7.1	11	6.2
£868-£1,080	85	4.3	4	5.5	11	3.6	15	3.9	9	2.8	25	9.7	-	-	6	3.7	11	6.5	4	2.2
£1,081-£1,300	62	3.1	1	1.4	10	3.3	7	1.8	11	3.5	16	6.2	2	1.4	7	4.3	3	1.8	5	2.8
£1,301-£1,733	38	1.9	-	-	9	3.0	7	1.8	5	1.6	6	2.3	1	0.7	3	1.8	4	2.4	3	1.7
£1,734-£2,167	44	2.2	2	2.7	11	3.6	7	1.8	7	2.2	8	3.1	-	-	5	3.0	3	1.8	1	0.6
£2,168-£3,033	31	1.6	1	1.4	8	2.6	4	1.0	6	1.9	4	1.6	1	0.7	2	1.2	2	1.2	3	1.7
More than £3,033	21	1.1	1	1.4	3	1.0	2	0.5	4	1.3	2	0.8	1	0.7	2	1.2	5	3.0	1	0.6
Don't know	208	10.5	9	12.3	50	16.4	61	15.8	22	6.9	7	2.7	2	1.4	14	8.5	13	7.7	30	16.9
Refused	857	43.1	39	53.4	171	56.3	195	50.4	159	50.2	51	19.8	31	22.5	80	48.8	77	45.8	54	30.3
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 13: Proportion who read and speak in English

Language normally used	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Read in English	1448	72.9	72	98.6	231	76.0	250	64.6	311	98.1	187	72.5	6	4.3	156	95.1	111	66.1	124	69.7
Speak in English	1109	55.8	68	93.2	92	30.3	133	34.4	307	96.8	174	67.4	17	12.3	145	88.4	58	34.5	115	64.6

Religion

The main religion noted among the sample group was Christianity (27.2%), followed by a slightly smaller group who were Muslims and 16.8% who referred to Islam. Smaller numbers were Hindus (7.3%) and Sikhs (5.4%) and were members of a Pentecostal church (1.8%). Other respondents described themselves as being a Seventh Day Adventist (0.5%), a member of the New Life Assembly (0.1%) and a Pagan (0.1%). A sizable group either described themselves as not having a religion (14.5%) or refused to divulge details of their religious beliefs (2.6%).

The Chinese focus group participants commented how they had had to *'change their culture.'* They explained that in China their religious and cultural practice entailed the worship of their ancestors within a specific prayer room in the house. Since coming to the UK and given the size of their house, the continuation of this religious practice was not feasible. As one of the women (73 year old) noted:

'We have had to change not through choice but because we don't have an option. We have had to change our culture.'

Summary

- Slightly more men than women took part in the study, although this did vary according to ethnic origin.
- A wide range of age groups were represented in the sample, although there was a predominance of those under 40 years of age. While the Indian respondents tended to be in the older age ranges, those from the Caribbean and African communities tended to be younger.
- The size of the households who took part in the study was quite wide, ranging from single person households (the main household type among the Caribbean, African, Iranian, Black Other and Asian Other samples) to those with six or more members (especially noticeable in relation to the Pakistani sample).
- Only one third of respondents were in full-time employment and those registered unemployed accounted for slightly less than one in five. However, employment rates differed according to ethnic origin. The groups with the highest levels of unemployment were those in the Other group and Asian Others, together with those from the Iranian and African communities who were asylum seekers.
- Just four out of ten households were not reliant upon state welfare provision. Members of the African, Irish and Asian Other communities were the most reliant upon welfare benefits.

- Where details of household income was provided, it suggests that some community groups are much poorer than others. This was particularly noticeable in relation to Iranian, African and Other community groups and can partly be explained by the status of some of their number as asylum seekers.
- Although nearly three-quarters of the sample as a whole would normally read in English, this was much less likely to be the case among those from the Iranian group and to a lesser extent, among those who described themselves as being Pakistani or Asian Other. A wide range of other languages were noted. The general finding was that members of the sample were more likely to be able to read English than speak English and this difference was particularly noticeable among the Indian respondents.
- The main religion was that of Christianity, followed by those who described themselves as Muslims or who referred to Islam.

Section II: Current Property

Introduction

This section provides an overview of the current housing situation of those who took part in the study and provides details of the type of property they occupied, the tenure of the property and the facilities available within the home. Views from the individual householders were also recorded, in terms of their perception of the state of repair of their home, the level of overcrowding and their general level of satisfaction with their property.

Tenure and type of property

Four out of ten (43.6%) were owner-occupiers, the greater proportion of whom had a mortgage. A further one fifth of the sample rented their home from a council – predominantly the five local councils, although two respondents referred to their landlord as Birmingham City Council. A smaller proportion (14.4%) rented their home from a housing association including: Tun Tum Housing Association, the Guinness Trust and Nacro Housing Association. Those renting in the private sector accounted for slightly more than one in ten (12.6%), roughly evenly split between those tenancies which were furnished and those which were unfurnished.

Nationally, the tenure of the property occupied by different BME groups varies considerably. Eight out of ten (81%) of the Indian community are own-occupiers – a figure that is higher than that for the white population (71%), while the figure for the Pakistani/Bangladeshi community is 60% with just 39% of the Black community living in this tenure. (Harrison and Philips, 2003)

The likelihood of members of the study sample being a home owner was greatest among the Indian community (73.3%) and Pakistani community (61.0%) and this links with the previous finding that Indians in particular were the least likely to be dependent upon state welfare provision. Those from the Iranian and African community groups were the least likely to own their own home (10.1% and 19.0% respectively). Of these latter two groups who described themselves as Asylum Seekers or Refugees, just 4.3% of the Iranian's owned their own home as did 1.0% of the Africans. It should also be noted that four out of ten of the Iranian respondents live in this tenure and these were predominately Asylum Seekers and Refugees, accounting for 62.4% of the Iranian sample.

In terms of council rented accommodation, the Black community are more likely to be found in this tenure nationally (33%), followed by Bangladeshis/Pakistanis (17%) and latterly, the Indian community (5%). In comparison, among the study sample, the proportion in this tenure equated to 6.6% of the Indians, 16% of Pakistanis and 24.4% of the Black samples. Hence, the reliance on council rented housing by these former two ethnic groups is comparable with the national picture, members of the Black community in South Nottinghamshire are less likely to be in this tenure that is found nationally.

Focusing on the housing association sector, nationally it has been found that members of the Black community are more likely to be in this sector compared with either white

households, Pakistanis or Indians (16% as compared with 9%, 5% and 3% respectively) (Harrison and Philips, 2003). This pattern was also found among the study sample with those living in housing association properties were more likely to belong to the Black Other, African or Caribbean groups as opposed to the Asian communities.

Those renting from private sector landlords were especially likely to be African or Iranian (23.7% and 20.3% respectively) and this was the dominant tenure among the African community. It is also worth noting from the table that the proportion of the Irish respondents who were lodging with relatives or friends (6.8%) was around twice that for the sample as a whole.

Table 14: Current tenure

Tenure	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Owner-occupier (with mortgage)	682	34.3	17	23.3	184	60.5	175	45.2	107	33.8	45	17.4	12	8.7	46	28.0	57	33.9	39	21.9
Council tenant	405	20.3	18	24.6	20	6.6	62	16.0	81	25.5	51	19.7	58	42.0	49	29.8	29	17.2	37	20.7
HA tenant	272	13.7	9	12.3	16	5.3	44	11.4	51	16.1	49	19.0	20	14.5	29	17.7	22	13.1	32	18.0
Outright owner-occupier	184	9.3	12	16.4	39	12.8	61	15.8	24	7.6	4	1.6	2	1.4	8	4.9	11	6.5	23	12.9
Private tenant (furnished)	131	6.6	3	4.1	12	3.9	13	3.4	11	3.5	34	13.2	27	19.6	8	4.9	8	4.8	15	8.4
Private tenant (unfurnished)	120	6.0	3	4.1	8	2.6	15	3.9	21	6.6	27	10.5	1	0.7	10	6.1	21	12.5	14	7.9
Lodging with relatives/friends	78	3.9	5	6.8	17	5.6	10	2.6	12	3.8	4	1.6	7	5.1	5	3.0	10	6.0	8	4.5
Tied accommodation	8	0.4	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	3	1.2	-	-	1	0.6	1	0.6	-	-
Shared owner	4	0.2	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	2	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
Other/not specified	113		6	8.2	6	1.9	6	1.5	9	2.8	39	15.1	11	7.9	8	4.8	9	5.3	9	5.0
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Those living in a house as opposed to another type of property were in the vast majority within the sample (71.6%). Those living in flats accounted for just over one in ten (12.3%) and 5.8% and 4.9% lived in a semi-detached and terraced property respectively. A small group also referred to living in either a bedsit or a bungalow (1.1% and 1.3% in each case). Other, more unusual types of accommodation were also mentioned including a trailer (0.7%) and a boat (0.1%).

Those occupying a house varied from 48.5% of the Black Other respondents to 86.2% of the Indian group. Those who lived in flats were more likely to be Caribbean (24.0%), from the Other group (21.6%) compared with those from the Pakistani (2.4%), Indian (4.9%) or Irish (10.9%) samples.

Table 15: Type of property occupied

Type of property	No.	%
House (non specific)	1332	71.6
Flat – above ground floor	149	7.5
Other	131	6.5
Semi-detached house	115	5.8
Terraced house	97	4.9
Flat – ground floor	95	4.8
Bungalow	26	1.3
Bedsit	21	1.1
Maisonette	15	0.8
Sheltered housing	3	0.2
Not specified	3	0.2
Total	1987	100.0

Size of property occupied

An indication of the size of the properties occupied by the sample was gleaned by recording the number of rooms available within each property. The largest group (25.7%) referred to having four rooms (excluding the kitchen or bathroom) and a slightly smaller group had five rooms (24.6%). At the same time, one in ten had two rooms (10.3%) and a tiny minority had just one room. In terms of the larger properties, just under one fifth had five or more rooms for use by members of their household.

Generally, households from the Indian and Pakistani communities tended to live in the larger sized properties. For example, in relation to the Indians, 34.9% had five rooms at their disposal and a further one quarter (25.0%) had six rooms and one in ten had either seven or eight or more. In contrast, those from the Caribbean and African samples tended to live in the smaller homes: 34.4% of the Caribbean respondents had four rooms and one fifth of the group (20.5%) had three. Among the African and Black Other community groups the corresponding figures were 29.1% and 22.5% and 27.4% and 23.2% respectively.

In terms of the number of bedrooms, although 38.6% of the sample had three, 14.8% had just one bedroom. Those with four bedrooms equated to roughly one fifth of the

sample and those with five or more accounted for 7.1% and included four households with seven or more bedrooms.

With the exception of the Iranians (the majority of whom were either asylum seekers or refugees and predominantly consisted of smaller household sizes), the largest group of respondents from the remaining ethnic groups had three bedrooms. Those with more than four bedrooms at their disposal tended to be from the Indian, Pakistani and Other Asian communities, reflecting the larger property occupied by respondents from these samples as highlighted earlier as well as their household composition. The other interesting feature in the table is the relatively high proportion of respondents among the African, Caribbean and Black Other groups with just one or two bedrooms – again largely reflecting the smaller sized households among these communities.

Table 16: Size of property

Number of rooms	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	79	4.0	6	8.2	8	2.6	3	0.8	6	1.9	22	8.5	6	4.3	3	1.8	7	4.2	18	10.1
Two	205	10.3	8	11.0	9	3.0	14	3.6	36	11.4	34	13.2	22	15.9	28	17.1	32	19.0	22	12.4
Three	340	17.1	9	12.3	26	8.6	47	12.1	65	20.5	58	22.5	40	29.0	38	23.2	36	21.4	21	11.8
Four	511	25.7	21	28.8	42	13.8	99	25.6	109	34.4	75	29.1	43	31.2	45	27.4	26	15.5	51	28.7
Five	489	24.6	22	30.1	106	34.9	137	35.4	55	17.4	44	17.1	12	8.7	40	24.4	27	16.1	46	25.8
Six	256	12.9	4	5.5	76	25.0	72	18.6	37	11.7	15	5.8	4	2.9	8	4.9	23	13.7	17	9.6
Seven	76	3.8	3	4.1	25	8.2	10	2.6	5	1.6	2	0.8	9	6.5	2	1.2	17	10.1	3	1.7
Eight or more	31	1.6	-	-	12	3.9	5	1.3	4	1.3	8	3.1	2	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 17: Number of bedrooms

Number of bedrooms	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	294	14.8	17	23.3	22	7.2	14	3.6	46	14.5	57	22.1	29	21.0	30	18.3	40	23.8	39	21.9
Two	421	21.2	13	17.8	30	9.9	83	21.4	79	24.9	63	24.4	44	31.9	46	28.0	31	18.5	32	18.0
Three	767	38.6	25	34.2	114	37.5	180	46.5	131	41.3	99	38.4	42	30.4	66	40.2	47	28.0	63	35.4
Four	364	18.3	16	21.9	86	28.3	88	22.7	45	14.2	30	11.6	10	7.2	18	11.0	33	19.6	38	21.3
Five	109	5.5	1	1.4	45	14.8	20	5.2	13	4.1	5	1.9	3	2.2	3	1.8	13	7.7	6	3.4
Six	28	1.4	1	1.4	5	1.6	1	0.3	3	0.9	3	1.2	10	7.2	1	0.6	4	2.4	-	-
Seven or more	4	0.2	-	-	2	0.7	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Length of residency

Nearly four out of ten had been living at the same address for between one and five years and collectively 56.1% referred to a period of five years or less. At the other extreme, one in ten had been living at the same property for more than twenty years including a small group (3.8%) who had moved to their current home more than thirty years ago.

Length of residency varied according to ethnicity. Generally, those from the Indian, Pakistani and Asian Other groups reported having lived at the same address for longer periods of time than respondents from the remaining ethnic groups and in direct contrast to those from the African and Black Other groups. It is also interesting to note that half of the Iranians had moved to their current home within the last twelve months and a further 41.9% reported a period of between one and five years. Hence, it can be seen that the Asian communities were generally the more settled than those from the remaining ethnic groups. This patterns among the Iranian and African samples is largely explained by the fact that many of these two sample groups are asylum seekers and refugees and as such, have only recently entered the UK. In contrast, members of the Asian community have a much longer history within this country.

In terms of location, the findings suggests that among the Broxtowe residents there was greater likelihood of having lived at the same address for more than twenty years (26.7%) than was the case for residents from the remaining local authority areas. Furthermore, those currently living in Nottingham were particularly likely to have moved to their current home within the last five years (57.6%), followed by 55.2% of those from Ashfield and half (50.0%) of those from Rushcliffe. In contrast, the figure for Broxtowe was much lower at 37.2%.

Facilities available

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not their property had a number of predefined facilities including a kitchen or bath. The vast majority (99.1%) had a kitchen and 98.8% had an inside toilet. The likelihood of having a bath was greater than that of having a shower (96.4% as compared with 61.9%). A small group (6.2%) reported having an outside toilet and in all but 11 cases they also had an inside toilet.

One in ten respondents reported that they shared their kitchen with another household (11.9%) and a similar proportion shared an inside toilet (11.5%). Those who had to share a bath or shower were smaller in number (10.9% and 9.3% respectively).

Those who shared either one or more facilities with another household were more likely to be from the Iranian and African groups than the remaining sub-samples. In terms of this former group at least four out of ten households shared a kitchen, toilet and bathing facilities. The majority of these were Asylum Seekers and Refugees. For example, of the Iranian group who shared a kitchen, 54.3% were Asylum Seekers, while 52.6% shared an inside toilet and a bath. Among the African group the proportion was slightly smaller, around three out of ten. In comparison, less than 4% of the Indian community had to share their facilities while the proportion among the Pakistani respondents was even smaller.

Among those who took part in the Pakistani women focus group discussion were four who rented privately. Two of this group of four argued that their homes were unsuitable for their family as it lacked some important amenities or they had to share basic amenities with another family. One woman referred to having to share a bathroom with another family. She felt that there was a lack of privacy. She had approached the council but because she was not homeless, they stated that they were unable to assist her. She had no option of moving since she could not afford a higher rent.

The necessity to share accommodation was also highlighted by the community interviewers during a group discussion as a recurrent issue among some of those households interviewed. They felt that some of the private landlords were placing a number of families in the same property by renting out the accommodation on a 'per room basis' and this resulted in families having to share cooking and bathing facilities. An example was given of one young Iranian mother who had to bath her small child in the kitchen sink since the bathroom was always in use by other occupiers of the property.

Table 18: Length of time at current address

Length of time	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 1 year	349	17.6	7	9.6	21	6.9	35	9.0	29	9.1	101	39.1	69	50.0	19	11.6	23	13.7	45	25.3
1-5 years	766	38.6	21	28.8	72	23.7	146	37.7	135	42.6	108	41.9	63	45.7	74	45.1	82	48.8	65	36.5
6-10 years	260	13.1	9	12.3	41	13.5	74	19.1	58	18.3	20	7.8	3	2.2	25	15.2	17	10.1	13	7.3
11-15 years	211	10.6	12	16.4	55	18.1	50	12.9	32	10.1	12	4.7	1	0.7	21	12.8	12	7.1	16	9.0
16-20 years	172	8.7	6	8.2	52	17.1	43	11.1	23	7.3	7	2.7	2	1.4	10	6.1	13	7.7	16	9.0
21-30 years	154	7.8	7	9.6	48	15.8	34	8.8	27	8.5	8	3.1	-	-	8	4.9	15	8.9	7	3.9
Longer than 30 years	75	3.8	11	15.1	15	4.9	5	1.3	13	4.1	2	0.8	-	-	7	4.3	6	3.6	16	9.0
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 19: Facilities shared with another household

Facility shared	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Kitchen	236	11.9	4	5.5	11	3.6	7	1.8	16	5.0	71	27.5	66	47.8	11	6.7	16	9.5	34	19.1
Inside toilet	228	11.5	5	6.8	12	3.9	8	2.1	14	4.4	68	26.4	64	46.4	11	6.7	13	7.7	33	18.5
Bath	217	10.9	4	5.5	12	3.9	7	1.8	13	4.1	63	24.4	64	46.4	12	7.3	12	7.1	30	16.9
Shower	185	9.3	4	5.5	11	3.6	5	1.3	10	3.2	40	15.5	62	44.9	4	2.4	16	9.5	33	18.5
Outside toilet	65	3.3	1	1.4	2	0.7	2	0.5	1	0.3	10	3.9	27	19.6	1	0.6	8	4.8	13	7.3
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Views on the size of the home

In terms of respondents' views on the size of their home in relation to the needs of their household, the vast majority (75.0%) commented that their current home was about the right size. This compares with one fifth (20.1%) who argued that it was too small and a small group (3.1%) who felt that their home was too big.

The proportion among each of the nine ethnic groups who felt that their home was about the right size varied from 83.3% (Asian Other) to 60.1% (Iranians), while the proportion who felt that it was too small ranged from 12.5% (Asian Other) to over one quarter of those respondents from the Iranian and African groups (29.7% and 25.6% respectively). A clear distinction in views is evident between those among the Iranian samples who classified themselves as being an Asylum Seeker or Refugee compared with those who were not. While 9.5% of those from the Iranian community who were not Asylum Seekers or Refugees felt their home was too small, this figure rises to 33.6% among those who were Asylum Seekers or Refugees. There was not found to be a corresponding distinction in the views between Asylum Seekers and non Asylum Seekers among the African sample (24.7% and 25.8% respectively).

The reasons given in support of the view that their home was too small included comments about the general lack of space for members of their family (129 or 32.3%), the inadequate number of rooms (51 or 12.8%) and reference to their household getting bigger over time (37 or 9.3%). Smaller numbers also made reference to the need for additional facilities, such as more storage space, an additional bathroom, a guest room, an additional living room, a study room and a garden. Two households also reported that their children were forced to sleep in the front room due to the lack of bedrooms in their home and another two commented that they had to share their home with another household.

Some of the Pakistani women referred to their children having to sleep in one room. They also commented on the lack of bedrooms for visitors and especially other relatives who would visit them from abroad for quite long periods of time. When this occurred, the visitors were given priority for the bedrooms and the host family had to sleep on mattresses on the living room floor.

The lack of additional living room space was also seen as problematic by this group of women. The majority of them had access to only one living room. The tradition of separating the sexes became problematic. Invariably, the women had to stay in the kitchen while the men used the living room.

Concern was also expressed about the lack of washing facilities. Having only one bathroom caused problems for many of the larger households. One of the women explained that their religious beliefs required them to frequently wash themselves but that this put great pressure on the one bathroom and caused tension within the family.

Overcrowding is recognised as a particular problem among BME communities. According to a recent Shelter press release (29th October 2003) BME households are seven times more likely to than their white counterparts to be living in an overcrowded home and Bangladeshis and Pakistanis are ten times more likely to be overcrowded. A recent ODPM report (Harrison and Philips, 2003) confirmed that nationally, 7% of Indian households live in overcrowded conditions while the figure for the Pakistani and Bangladeshis was 23%. Slightly less than one in ten of the Black community (9%) were overcrowded.

The study found that collectively, one in ten householders felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions and a further 2.5% were unsure. The extent of overcrowding did vary quite noticeably across the nine sub-samples. Comparable numbers from the Irish, Indian and Caribbean communities reported that they were living in overcrowded conditions (equating to around 6%) while for the African and Iranian respondents, the figure was twice and three times greater respectively (12.8% and 18.8%). Over half of these latter two groups (six out of ten and 7 out of 10 respectively) were Asylum Seekers and Refugees.

Hence, the level of overcrowding among the Indian community was comparable with the national figure (6.6% as compared with 7%), while the study suggests that among the Pakistani group, the reported proportion was slightly less than the national picture (19% as opposed to 23%). However, with the exception of the Caribbeans, the Black community in the sample was more likely to be living in overcrowded housing than that found nationally (21.9% as compared with 9%), although a significant proportion of this group were asylum seekers and refugees.

Table 20: Views on size of home in comparison to needs of household

View	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
About the right size	1491	75.0	60	82.2	246	80.9	303	78.3	235	74.1	173	67.1	83	60.1	125	76.2	140	83.3	126	70.8
Too small	399	20.1	12	16.4	39	12.8	76	19.6	65	20.5	66	25.6	41	29.7	39	23.8	21	12.5	40	22.5
Too big	62	3.1	1	1.4	13	4.3	4	1.0	11	3.5	14	5.4	4	2.9	-	-	7	4.2	8	4.5
Don't know	35	1.8	-	-	6	2.0	4	1.0	6	1.9	5	1.9	10	7.2	-	-	-	-	4	2.2
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 21: Views on overcrowding

Overcrowded	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	196	9.9	5	6.8	20	6.6	43	11.1	19	6.0	33	12.8	26	18.8	15	9.1	13	7.7	2	12.4
No	1741	87.6	66	90.4	272	89.5	341	88.1	214	82.9	214	82.9	103	74.6	148	90.2	153	91.1	148	83.1
Don't know	50	2.5	2	2.7	12	3.9	3	0.8	2	0.6	11	4.3	9	6.5	1	0.6	2	1.2	8	4.5
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

State of repair of property

When asked to consider how satisfied they were with the state of repair of their home, the majority gave a positive response reporting that they were either satisfied (53.9%) or very satisfied (10.0%). In contrast, one in ten were dissatisfied (9.3%) and a small group (3.1%) was very dissatisfied.

The extent to which respondents were positive did vary according to ethnic grouping. Members of the Indian sample were more likely to be positive (79.3% were either very satisfied or satisfied) than those from the other ethnic groups and this group of residents were also the least negative. In contrast, just 57.3% of the Black Other group were positive and 18.3% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Slightly less than one in five of the respondents (18.0%) did feel that there were outstanding urgent repairs to their property. This was seen to be a particular issue among the council tenants (20.4% of this tenure group referred to outstanding repairs), owner-occupiers (18.4%), followed by those renting their home from a housing association (16.5%). In contrast, just 12.3% of those in the private rented sector suggested that there were urgent repairs required.

The ODPM uses substantial levels of disrepair as an indicator of poor housing conditions and Harrison and Philips (2003) found, in reviewing national statistics on this issue, that Pakistani and Bangladeshi households were more likely to be living in poor housing conditions than other BME groups. The figure for the Pakistanis/Bangladeshis was 34.8% with the figures for the Black community and Indians was 22.9% and 18.6% respectively). Looking at the study findings relating to outstanding urgent repairs, it can be seen that the Pakistani households were the most likely to be living in such conditions (26.6%), followed by the Black group (collectively accounting for 21.3%) and then the Indians (11.8%). The higher figure for the Black community within the sample compared with the national average could be related to the relatively large number of asylum seekers and refugees in this group.

The most common repairs cited included the replacement of doors and windows (22.7%), repairs to the roof of the property (7.8%), improvements to the kitchen (7.6%), attention to the heating system (6.7%), repairs to bathrooms fittings (6.3%) and problems due to dampness (5.9%). One or two individuals also mentioned: the need for their property to be decorated, the need for loft insulation, problems with the hot water, a 'bad smell under the floor', electrical problems, the replacement of the garden fence and re-plastering.

The majority of those with outstanding repairs reported that they were planning to get the repairs done (216 out of 357 or 60.5%), compared with 39.5% who expressed the opposing view. The principle reasons given by this latter group (141 in total) included the contention that this was the responsibility of their landlord (56 or 39.7%) and that they were unable to obtain a grant from the council (53 or 36.9%), followed by the comment that they were unable to afford the repairs (18 or 12.8%). Smaller numbers also referred to the fact that they were physically unable to manage to do the repairs (4 or 2.8%), a lack of time (2 or 1.4%), while one person was of the opinion that the repairs required to their property were too severe (0.7%). Seven respondents mentioned other

reasons: four suggested that work had already begun but that it had not yet been completed, one felt that they needed support to carry out the repairs and two suggested that they were planning to move.

Three of the Chinese focus group participants reported that their home was in a poor state of repair (for example, poorly fitting doors and windows which caused draughts and one case of severe dampness). None of the three could afford to have repair work done and none knew who to contact for assistance. As one of the women, who was an owner-occupier commented:

'I have a problem with the roof. I don't know where to start to get help. I'm scared to go to the Council – they might move me out. I've tried Age Concern, but they didn't help. I don't know where to go.'

One of the Pakistani women also reported major outstanding repairs to her home. As a private tenant she had approached her landlord but he was unwilling to undertake the repairs. She did not know who to contact for help or advice. She was concerned about the health of her children.

Among those with outstanding repairs to their home, slightly more than one third (127 out of 357 or 35.6%) felt that the repairs had either caused or made worse health problems among members of their household. In contrast, 64.4% contended that this was not the case.

The proportion who felt that the state of their home had impacted on their health of their family varied from 16.7% (Irish) to 75.0% (Iranian), although in this latter case, this related to only three respondents. The Asian Other group were also highly critical, with 66.7% arguing that their own health or that of their family had suffered as a consequence of the outstanding repairs.

A wide range of health problems were cited including: stress levels (26 respondents or 20.5% mentioned this problem); asthma (21 or 16.5%); colds and influenza (20 or 15.7%). Other problems which were noted, but by a smaller number of respondents were: arthritis (10 or 7.9%); injuries to children within the family (6 or 4.7%); rheumatism (4 or 3.1%); problems breathing (4 or 3.1%); back problems due to the damp environment (4 or 3.1%); and general comments about the property being unhygienic (8 or 6.3%). A further nine respondents felt that the outstanding repairs had had a detrimental impact on the health of their household but did not specify in what way (7.1%).

One in ten felt that they did need support to carry out the repairs (11.6%) compared with the vast majority who contended that such support was not necessary (83.4%) and a small group who reported that they already received support (3.8%). The desire for support was particularly noticeable among the Pakistani group with 23.3% contending that they needed assistance, followed by 14.3% of the African residents and 11.0% of the Caribbean community. In contrast, the figure among the Iranian and Irish groups was just 2.9% and 4.1% respectively.

Table 22: Level of satisfaction with state of repair of property

Level of satisfaction	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	198	10.0	9	12.3	37	12.2	28	7.2	32	10.1	35	13.6	6	4.3	15	9.1	16	9.5	20	11.2
Satisfied	1071	53.9	36	49.3	204	67.1	219	56.6	167	52.7	122	47.3	62	44.9	79	48.2	108	64.3	74	41.6
Neither/nor	445	22.4	23	31.5	47	15.5	76	19.6	69	21.8	49	19.0	58	42.0	37	22.6	28	16.7	58	32.6
Dissatisfied	185	9.3	3	4.1	9	3.0	46	11.9	36	11.4	29	11.2	7	5.1	24	14.6	13	7.7	18	10.1
Very dissatisfied	61	3.1	2	2.7	2	0.7	15	3.9	11	3.5	15	5.8	2	1.4	6	3.7	3	1.8	5	2.8
Don't know	27	1.4	-	-	5	1.6	3	0.8	2	0.6	8	29.6	3	2.2	3	1.8	-	-	3	1.7
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 23: Views on whether outstanding repairs have impacted on health of household

	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	127	35.6	2	16.7	15	41.7	47	45.6	13	22.0	14	21.5	3	75.0	11	32.4	14	66.7	8	34.8
No	230	64.4	10	83.3	21	58.3	56	54.4	46	78.0	51	78.5	1	25.0	23	67.6	7	33.3	15	65.2
Total	357	100.0	12	3.4	36	10.1	103	28.9	59	16.5	65	18.2	4	1.1	34	9.5	21	5.9	23	6.4

Excludes 1630 not applicable cases

Table 24: Views on whether support required to carry out minor repairs

View	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	1658	83.4	68	93.2	270	88.8	287	74.2	264	83.3	201	77.9	126	91.3	141	86.0	148	88.1	153	86.0
Yes – but don't receive	231	11.6	3	4.1	16	5.3	90	23.3	35	11.0	37	14.3	4	2.9	13	7.9	17	10.1	16	9.0
Yes – already receive	76	3.8	2	2.7	9	3.0	8	2.1	16	6.2	16	6.2	7	5.1	8	4.9	2	1.2	8	4.5
Not specified	2	1.1	-	-	9	3.0	2	0.5	2	0.6	4	1.6	1	0.7	2	1.2	1	0.6	1	0.6
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Energy saving initiatives

Respondents were asked to provide details about the extent to which their home was double-glazed, had central heating and had loft insulation.

Double-glazing

Six out of ten reported that they had double-glazing throughout their home compared with 12.4% who had partial double-glazing. However, one quarter of the sample properties were not double-glazed. Considering the response patterns in relation to tenure, it can be seen that while 71.4% of the owner-occupied properties had full double-glazing, the proportion among the other main tenures was lower: in relation to housing association properties it was 62.9%, those living in private sector rented properties 49.4% and finally, council rented homes 48.6%. In terms of those properties with no double-glazing at all, the largest proportion were either private rented or council rented (28.4% and 28.9% respectively);

Looking across the five local authority areas, those respondents whose home did not have any double-glazing were more likely to live in Nottingham (26.5% of residents from this local authority area reported that their home was not double-glazed), Gedling (12.5%), and Broxtowe (10.5%), followed by Rushcliffe (9.3%) and finally, Ashfield (6.9%).

Across the different ethnic groups the proportions of respondents lived in properties which were fully double-glazed varied from 48.1% (African) to 76.3% (Indian). At the same time, the Irish community were much more likely than any other of the ethnic groups not to have any double glazing (34.2%), contrasting with around one in ten of the Indian sample (12.2%).

Central heating

Nine out of ten households lived in properties with full central heating and a further 5.2% had partial central heating. This compares with a small minority (3.2%) who had no central heating. In addition, in contrast to the trend identified above in relation to double-glazing, council tenants were more likely to live in homes with full central heating (91.5%) than those from the remaining tenures: housing association properties (91.2%), owner-occupiers (89.0%) and private sector tenancies (88.0%). Also in contrast to the findings in relation to double-glazing, residents from the Ashfield area were the least likely to have full central heating (87.9%) compared with, for example, Broxtowe residents (96.5%).

Ethnicity was generally not found to be significant in terms of whether or not respondents lived in properties with central heating.

Loft insulation

Although just less than half the sample (49.2%) reported living in properties with loft insulation and one in ten commented that they did not have it, a sizeable group (33.4%) were unsure. Furthermore, it was found that the proportion who reported that they did

have loft insulation varied considerably across the main tenures, accounting for 69.0% of the owner-occupiers compared with just 29.3% of those in private rented accommodation. The figure for those in council housing was 34.5% and housing association properties 38.2%. However, it should be remembered that those who do not own their own home will not necessarily be fully aware of whether their home has loft insulation or not or the extent of the coverage.

Nottingham residents were the least likely to report that their home was fully insulated (56.9%), followed by 56.9% of those from Ashfield and compared with 65.0% of those from Gedling and more than seven out of ten of those from Rushcliffe and Broxtowe.

It is difficult to draw any conclusions about the availability of loft insulation in the properties occupied by the different ethnic groups given the large numbers who reported that they did not know whether their home was insulated or not.

Table 25: Availability of double-glazing

Availability	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All of home	1205	60.6	45	61.6	232	76.3	234	60.5	198	62.5	124	48.1	73	52.9	91	55.5	96	57.1	112	62.9
Part of home	247	12.4	3	4.1	27	8.9	47	12.1	36	11.4	54	20.9	22	15.9	22	13.4	24	14.3	12	6.7
None of home	484	24.4	25	34.2	37	12.2	103	26.6	75	23.7	60	23.3	41	29.7	48	29.3	46	27.4	49	27.5
Don't know	51	2.6	-	-	8	2.6	3	0.8	8	2.5	20	7.8	2	1.4	3	1.8	2	1.2	5	2.8
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 26: Availability of central heating

Availability	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All of home	1787	89.9	67	91.8	274	90.1	340	87.9	290	91.5	211	81.8	127	92.0	156	95.1	162	96.4	160	89.9
Part of home	103	5.2	1	1.4	19	6.3	30	7.8	12	3.8	25	9.7	5	3.6	4	2.4	5	3.0	2	1.1
None of home	63	3.2	5	6.8	4	1.3	13	3.4	8	2.5	14	5.4	5	3.6	2	1.2	-	-	12	6.7
Don't know	34	1.7	-	-	7	2.3	4	1.0	7	2.2	8	3.1	1	0.7	2	1.2	1	0.6	4	2.2
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 27: Availability of loft insulation

Availability	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
All of home	978	49.2	36	49.3	230	75.7	236	61.0	142	44.8	93	36.0	38	27.5	68	41.5	66	39.3	69	38.8
Part of home	138	6.9	8	11.0	9	3.0	11	2.8	50	15.8	29	11.2	1	0.7	21	12.8	4	2.4	5	2.8
None of home	208	10.5	10	13.7	21	6.9	39	10.1	36	11.4	35	13.6	3	2.2	23	14.0	24	14.3	17	9.6
Don't know	663	33.4	19	26.0	44	14.5	101	26.1	89	28.1	101	39.1	96	69.6	52	31.7	74	44.0	87	48.9
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

It is interesting to note that, when considering the proportion of properties who have not had either one, two or all three energy saving initiatives installed, that, 68.5% have at least partial central double-glazing, central heating or loft insulation. In contrast, one quarter of the properties in the sample do not possess one of the energy saving measures and smaller numbers do not possess two of the three (4.3%) or in the case of 1.2%, all three.

Table 28: Proportion of properties without energy saving initiatives

No. of initiatives not available	No.	%
None – have at least partial	1361	68.5
One	530	26.2
Two	83	4.2
Three	23	1.2
Total	1987	100.0

Previous housing circumstances

In terms of previous housing circumstances immediately prior to moving to their current home, the largest group among the sample as a whole had lived with their immediate family (18.8%), followed by smaller and similar proportions who had either lived as an owner-occupier (14.5%) or rented from a council (14.4%). A sizable group (12.4%) also referred to having always lived at their current address.

Table 29: Previous housing circumstance

Housing circumstance	No.	%
Lived with immediate family	374	18.8
Lived as owner-occupier	288	14.5
Rented from a council	287	14.4
Always lived here	247	12.4
Lived in hostel/refuge	123	6.2
Rented privately	220	11.1
Lived with other relatives/friends	115	5.8
Rented from a housing association	110	5.5
Lived abroad	108	5.4
Another housing circumstance	85	4.3
Homeless	30	1.5
Total	1987	100.0

Looking at this response profile according to ethnicity it can be seen that:

- One quarter of the Irish sample reported that they had always lived at the same address (24.7%) – a higher figure than that recorded among the remaining ethnic groups and especially those among the African and Caribbean groups;
- Those who had previously rented from the council were more likely to be from the Other ethnic group and African and Caribbeans.

- Members of the Asian sample were especially likely to have previously been owner-occupiers (21.8%) or had lived with their immediate family (28.0%). Those from the Mixed ethnic group were also likely to have lived with their immediate or extended family (collectively accounting for 34.1% of this group); and
- Among those who had previously lived in a hostel or a refuge, 46.3% were African and a further 32.5% were from the Other ethnic group. Among the African group, nearly half (48.5%) were Asylum Seekers or Refugees, while the proportion of those in the Other category who were Asylum Seekers or refugees and who had previously lived in a hostel or refuge was 22.6%. In contrast, none of the Irish referred to having lived in a hostel immediately prior to moving to their current home and the figure for Indian respondents was 8.9%.

Of those who had ever moved home, the largest group had moved to their present home from elsewhere within Nottinghamshire (44.2%) with a slightly smaller group referring to having moved within the same area (39.7%). Those who had migrated to Nottinghamshire from elsewhere in the UK accounted for 13.8% and a small minority (2.3%) had moved to South Nottinghamshire directly from abroad.

Table 30: Previous location

Lived previously	No.	%
Within the same area	648	39.7
Elsewhere in Nottinghamshire	721	44.2
Elsewhere in the UK	226	13.8
Outside UK	37	2.3
Total	1632	100.0

Excludes 355 not applicable cases

Important differences are discernable in terms of where respondents had moved from to their current home:

- Six out of ten of the Indians (60.0%) had moved house within the same area as had 41.8% of the Irish group. This was, however, less likely to be the case among those in the Other ethnic group (20.5%) or those from the African and Caribbean communities;
- Over half of these latter ethnic groups had moved to their current home from elsewhere in Nottinghamshire (54.0%) as had 43.6% of the Irish and 47.9% of the Other group;
- Three out of ten of those from the Other group referred to having previously lived elsewhere in Nottinghamshire, contrasting with just 7.7% of the Indian sample; and

- Members of the African and Iranian samples were more likely to have moved directly to their present home from outside the UK (4.6%) than those from the remaining ethnic groups. A sizeable number of these two groups were Asylum Seekers or Refugees.

Across the five local authority areas, slightly different settlement patterns can be distinguished. Residents of Broxtowe were more likely to have moved within the same area (63.1%) as were 47.4% of those from Rushcliffe. However, the figure for the other three areas was much lower at around three out of ten. Those currently living in Gedling and Nottingham were particularly likely to have moved from elsewhere in Nottinghamshire (54.0% and 45.5% respectively) and three out of ten of those now living in Ashfield had previously lived in other parts of the UK (30.6%). This latter figure compares with just 4.6% of those from Broxtowe and 7.9% of the Rushcliffe residents.

In relation to the locations across the UK where respondents had moved from, it was found that one third of those who had moved to Nottingham had previously lived in London

Level of satisfaction with current home

The majority of respondents were positive about their current home with 12.0% suggesting that they were very satisfied and 58.6% satisfied. In contrast, those who expressed a negative view accounted for 6.7% with a larger proportion of this group being dissatisfied as opposed to very dissatisfied.

The extent to which the respondents from the different ethnic groups were positive varied from 82.9% (Indians) to 42.1% (Iranians). There was equal variability in terms of those who were critical of their home, ranging from 2.3% who were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied (Indians) to one in ten of the Other group and 13.1% of the African respondents.

This finding contrasts directly with the trend identified nationally which suggests that at least 19% of BME communities are dissatisfied with their home. The national figures for levels of dissatisfaction for specific BME groups are: Black 19%; Indian 33%; and Pakistani/Bangladeshi 42% (Harrison and Phillips, 2003).

The main reasons put forward by those who were negative related to the inadequate size of the property (30 out of 122 or 24.6% mentioned this), the state of disrepair (25 or 20.5%) and a dislike for the area (13 or 10.7%). Other comments included neighbour problems (6 or 4.9%), a problem with managing with the stairs in their home (4 or 3.3%) and a general comment that their current home was not their ideal home (5 or 4.1%).

Views on potential improvements to their housing situation

A range of potential options that could improve their housing situation was presented and respondents asked to indicate which they would be interested in. The first point to note is that 26.5% reported that they would not be interested in any of the options listed and a further 23.8% answered 'don't know.' Among the remaining respondents, the most attractive options were financial assistance for improvements (28.3%), financial

assistance for repairs to their present home (21.2%) and moving to a larger rented home (10.3%). A slightly smaller group was also interested in moving to a larger home to buy (9.5%). Moving to a smaller home either to buy or rent was a less attractive option. Those who would be receptive to the idea of support to find a new home accounted for 8.2%. Around one in twenty would welcome the provision of support to remain in their own home (4.6%) and a slightly larger proportion were interested in the notion of support being provided to help them find more suitable furniture (5.9%).

In terms of the influence of ethnicity on views on these potential improvements, the first point to note from the table is the varying proportions of respondents from each group who contended that none of the identified potential improvements were attractive to them, ranging from 39.1% (Indians) to 18.9% (Black Other). At the same time, a relatively large proportion from each group answered 'don't know' to this question, with a minimum of one fifth of respondents from each ethnic grouping giving this response.

Considering those who did acknowledge a preference from the list of potential improvements to their housing situation, the largest group of respondents from six of the nine identified ethnic groupings advocated receiving financial assistance for improvements to their current property: Pakistanis, Caribbeans, Africans, Black Other, Asian Other and the Other ethnic group. In contrast, the largest proportion of the Irish respondents (27.4%) favoured receiving financial assistance for repairs to their current home. One quarter of the Iranian sample favoured the possibility of moving to a larger rented home, as opposed to any of the other options highlighted. This group consisted predominately of Asylum Seekers and Refugees.

Table 31: Level of satisfaction with current home

Level of satisfaction	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	239	12.0	9	12.3	31	10.2	45	11.6	49	15.5	37	14.3	3	2.2	28	17.1	17	10.1	20	11.2
Satisfied	1165	58.6	41	56.2	221	72.7	232	59.9	210	63.4	126	48.8	55	39.9	87	53.0	112	66.7	90	50.6
Neither/nor	427	21.5	19	26.0	43	14.1	82	21.2	44	13.9	53	20.5	74	53.6	35	21.3	31	18.5	46	25.8
Dissatisfied	94	4.7	3	4.1	6	2.0	14	3.6	16	5.0	23	8.9	4	2.9	9	5.5	3	1.8	16	9.0
Very dissatisfied	40	2.0	1	1.4	1	0.3	11	2.8	5	1.6	11	4.3	1	0.7	4	2.4	4	2.4	2	1.1
Don't know	2	1.1	-	-	2	0.7	3	0.8	2	0.6	8	3.1	1	0.7	1	0.6	1	0.6	4	2.2
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 32: Views on potential improvements to housing circumstance

Potential improvement	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Financial assistance for improvements	563	28.3	16	21.9	39	12.8	167	43.2	110	34.7	65	25.2	7	5.1	59	36.0	62	36.9	38	21.3
Financial assistance for repairs	422	21.2	20	27.4	25	8.2	149	38.5	69	21.8	40	15.5	4	2.9	45	27.4	39	23.2	31	17.4
Move to larger rented home	204	10.3	6	8.2	10	3.3	20	5.2	27	8.5	41	15.9	35	25.4	24	14.6	16	9.5	25	14.0
Move to larger home to buy	188	9.5	9	12.3	16	5.3	28	7.2	37	11.7	39	15.1	10	7.2	18	11.0	12	7.1	19	10.7
Support to find new home	162	8.2	5	6.8	12	3.9	23	5.9	33	10.4	48	18.6	9	6.5	10	6.1	9	5.4	13	7.3
Support for/more suitable furniture	118	5.9	1	1.4	7	2.3	19	4.9	15	4.7	39	15.1	9	6.5	7	4.3	10	6.0	11	6.2
Financial assistance for adaptations	105	5.3	1	1.4	10	3.3	35	9.0	26	8.2	9	3.5	1	0.7	9	5.5	6	3.6	8	4.5
Support to remain in home	92	4.6	3	4.1	8	2.6	14	3.6	16	5.0	21	8.1	1	0.7	6	3.7	12	7.1	11	6.2
Move to smaller home to buy	27	1.4	1	1.4	2	0.7	3	0.8	6	1.9	2	0.8	1	0.7	4	2.4	5	3.0	3	1.7
Move to smaller rented home	19	1.0	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	4	1.3	6	2.3	-	-	1	0.6	3	1.8	4	2.2
None of these	527	26.5	17	23.3	119	39.1	10	25.8	68	21.5	61	23.6	51	37.0	31	18.9	38	22.6	42	23.6
Don't know	473	23.8	23	31.5	106	34.9	69	17.8	67	21.1	37	14.3	34	24.6	33	20.1	40	23.8	64	36.0

Summary

- While four out of ten were owner-occupiers, one fifth were council renters and smaller numbers either rented their home from a housing association or were in another tenure. The likelihood of being a homeowner was greatest among the Indian and Pakistani communities while the African and Caribbean groups tended to rent from the council or a local housing association.
- Seven out of ten respondents lived in a house as opposed to another type of property. Those living in flats were more likely to be from the Caribbean and Other group than the remaining ethnic groups.
- Property sizes varied according to ethnicity. Indian and Pakistani households tended to live in the larger sized homes while the Caribbean and African respondents tended to occupy the smaller properties.
- One in ten shared at least some of their facilities (such as kitchen) with another household and there was a dominance of asylum seekers within this group.
- While for the majority of respondents felt that their home was the right size for the needs of their household, one fifth argued that it was too small. Those who were the most critical tended to be asylum seekers. An inadequate number of bedrooms or the overall size of the property were the main issues mentioned.
- One in ten households felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions: again asylum seekers among the Iranian and African samples were the most critical.
- Slightly more than one in ten were negative about the state of repair of their home. Outstanding repairs were seen as a particular concern among council and housing association tenants. Although the majority were expecting to get the repairs done, just over one third said that they were not, due to either it being the responsibility of their landlord or their financial inability to undertake the repairs.
- Around one third of respondents who felt that there were outstanding repairs to their property argued that there was a direct link between this and the health of their family. The most common health complaints were asthma and colds and influenza.
- One in ten felt that they needed external support to carry out repairs to their home.
- Overall, six out of ten properties were double-glazed, however, this varied by tenure with seven out of ten homeowners having double-glazing compared with slightly less than five out of ten of council renters.
- Nine out of ten homes were centrally heated with council tenants, more than those from any other tenure, living in centrally heating homes.

- In terms of previous housing circumstances, the largest group had lived with their immediate family. Previous housing circumstances did vary according to ethnic grouping. Those who had lived in a hostel of refuge tended to be from the African and Other ethnic groups - a large proportion of whom were asylum seekers.
- The largest proportion of respondents had moved to their current home from elsewhere in Nottinghamshire and a slightly smaller number had moved house within the same area. Indian households showed the greatest attachment to their current area (six out of ten of whom had moved house within the same area). In contrast, over half of those from the African and Caribbean communities had moved to their current area of residence from elsewhere in Nottinghamshire. Given the large proportion of asylum seekers among the Iranian and African samples, it is not surprising that a proportion of these had previously lived abroad. Slightly different patterns of movement can be distinguished across the five local authority areas.
- Only a minority of respondents (6.7%) were critical of their home - the most critical were those among the Other group and members of the African sample. The main reason for being critical was the inadequate size of their home.
- In terms of improving their housing situation, the preference was for financial assistance for improvements to their current home, followed by financial assistance for repairs. Smaller numbers wanted to move to a larger rented home.

Section III: Views on the Area

Introduction

This third section focuses predominantly upon the respondents' views on the area where they live, including their views on the facilities and amenities available within the locality, the extent of any problems in the area and their level of satisfaction with their area of residence. Particular emphasis is given to the views expressed about the facilities available at the local level for their own BME community.

Reasons for moving to the area

Among the sample as a whole, the main reasons cited for moving to where they currently lived included the desire to move to the particular area through choice (35.6%) while just over one fifth (22.7%) reported that they had had no choice in where they moved to. Smaller numbers mentioned the significance of being nearer to family and friends (13.6%) and that they had always lived in the area (11.5%). The necessity of moving to be nearer to their place of work was referred to by 6.1%.

The exercise of choice in where respondents located to was the dominant reason mentioned by over half the Indian respondents (53.0%) and four out of ten of the Irish, Caribbean, Iranian, Black Other, Asian Other and the Other group. Although this was also the main reason cited by the Pakistani respondents, the proportion equated to just less than three out of ten, followed by a slightly smaller group (24.5%) who reported that they had always lived in the area.

The largest group of respondents who were from the African community reported that they had not had any choice in deciding where they moved to (44.6%) and this was also the second most common response given by one quarter of those in the Other group. Eight out of ten of this group of African respondents were Asylum Seekers (79.4%), while among the Other group, the proportion who were Asylum Seekers accounted for 71.0%.

Moving to their current area of residence to be nearer to their place of work was mentioned by one in ten of the Indian sample and this reason was also given by slightly less than one in ten of the Irish respondents (8.2%). Moving to be nearer family and friends was a particular influential factor for over one fifth of the Pakistani community.

Table 33: Reason for moving to the area

Reason	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Liked the area	707	35.6	30	41.1	161	53.0	111	28.7	127	40.1	58	22.5	65	39.6	65	39.6	64	38.1	68	38.2
No choice	451	22.7	12	16.4	26	8.6	48	12.4	56	17.7	115	44.6	31	18.9	31	18.9	30	17.9	44	24.7
Nearer family/friends	270	13.6	9	12.3	27	8.9	87	22.5	49	15.5	14	5.4	21	12.8	21	12.8	25	14.9	23	12.9
Have always lived here	229	11.5	9	12.3	23	7.6	95	24.5	34	10.7	14	5.4	1	0.7	21	12.8	22	13.1	10	5.6
Other	134	6.7	5	6.8	23	7.5	11	2.8	27	8.5	25	9.6	3	2.1	18	10.9	8	4.7	13	7.3
To be nearer to work	121	6.1	6	8.2	33	10.9	22	5.7	12	3.8	16	6.2	4	2.4	4	2.4	12	7.1	13	7.3
With own community	35	1.8	1	1.4	3	1.0	8	2.1	4	1.3	8	3.1	1	0.6	1	0.6	6	3.6	4	2.2
Better quality of life	22	1.1	1	1.4	8	2.6	2	0.5	2	0.6	5	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.1
Bigger home	19	1.0	-	-	-	-	3	0.8	6	1.9	3	1.2	2	1.4	3	1.8	1	0.6	1	0.6
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Rating of aspects of the area of residence

Respondents were asked to consider a number of aspects and facilities in the area where they lived and rate each of them according to how good or poor they felt that they were.

The general trend was for respondents to rate each of the aspects/facilities as generally being good, ranging from 58.4% (access to healthcare) to 29.5% (childcare facilities). Those which were rated as being very good by the greatest proportion of residents included public transport (23.7%), followed by the shops in the area (20.2%) and access to healthcare facilities (16.0%). In contrast, those which were more likely to be rated negatively included the reputation of the area (collectively 19.0% were negative about this aspect of the area where they lived), and the availability of leisure facilities. In all, at least one in ten respondents rated seven of the aspects/facilities negatively. It should be borne in mind, however, when interpreting these findings that in some cases, a relatively large group of the sample answered 'don't know', ranging from 47.2% (in relation to the provision of childcare facilities) to 1.6% (shops).

Important differences of opinion were recorded according to where the respondent lived (local authority area). The response profile for the residents from each local authority are shown individually in tables 35 to 39.

Looking first at the views of those currently living in Nottingham (table 35), it can be seen that over half the residents rated three of the aspects where they lived as being good: healthcare (59.7%); public transport (57.0%); and the shops in the vicinity (56.9%). At the same time, four out of ten rated five of the aspects as being very good. The least positive views were expressed in relation to access to housing advice (25.6% rated this aspects as either very good or good) and childcare facilities (33.7%). However, it should be noted that a very high proportion of respondents answered 'don't know' in relation to these two aspects (38.1% and 48.2% respectively). The most negative views were elicited in relation to the reputation of the neighbourhood with 14.4% rating this as poor and a further 7.2% very poor, followed by the quietness of the neighbourhood and the availability of leisure facilities. Residents were the least critical of the health care services available in their area.

In terms of the views of those living in the Rushcliffe local authority area (table 36), a more positive picture emerges in comparison with the residents of Nottingham. At least one third of the respondents in Rushcliffe felt that three of the aspects were very good: the quietness of the neighbourhood (37.2%); the reputation of the neighbourhood (34.9%); and the public transport system (33.7%). In addition, at least one quarter of the group felt that a further three aspects were very good: access to health care, the schools in the area and leisure facilities. The table does highlight the fact that very few Rushcliffe residents were critical of any aspect of where they lived. The one issue that does stand out is the closeness of a place of worship – 11.6% were critical of this aspect. This group tended to consist predominately of members of the Asian community and especially members of the Pakistani community.

A similar picture to that of Rushcliffe can be seen in relation to Broxtowe (table 37). Residents from this area were particularly complimentary about the public transport

system – 33.7% rated this aspect as being very good, followed by the quietness of the neighbourhood (29.1%), the reputation of the neighbourhood and access to health care services (24.4% in both cases). As with Rushcliffe residents, those living in Broxtowe were generally not critical of the services and aspect available in their areas with the exception of the closeness to a place of worship – 24.4% rated this aspects as poor and a further 4.7% very poor.

A more mixed response is noticeable among the residents of Ashfield (table 38). While around four out of ten felt that the public transport system and the quietness of the neighbourhood was very good, respondents were less likely to be complimentary about the access to housing advice or housing related support services and public transport. Two issues in particular stand out in the table where respondents were especially critical: the availability of leisure facilities in the area (27.6% were critical of this aspect with similar proportions suggesting that this aspect was poor and very poor in their area) and the closeness to a place of worship (25.9%)

Among those living in Gedling (table 39), the general response was for respondents to suggest that the aspects were good as opposed to very good and negative views were limited to a small minority with the exception of being close to a place of worship – 23.8% were critical of this aspect.

Table 34: Rating of aspects and facilities in the area

Aspect/facility	Very good		Good		Neither nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Public transport	470	23.7	1112	56.0	181	9.1	92	4.6	35	1.8	97	4.9
Shops	402	20.2	1122	56.0	280	14.1	122	6.1	30	1.5	31	1.6
Healthcare	317	16.0	1160	58.4	254	12.8	95	4.8	21	1.1	140	7.0
Quietness of area	265	13.3	916	46.1	453	22.8	216	10.9	84	4.2	53	2.7
Schools	255	12.8	869	43.7	20	10.1	88	4.4	24	1.2	551	27.7
Place of worship	234	11.8	825	41.5	331	16.7	198	10.0	88	4.4	311	15.7
Reputation of area	228	11.5	856	43.1	425	21.4	261	12.6	128	6.4	99	5.0
Parks & open spaces	227	11.4	964	48.5	390	19.6	214	10.8	56	2.8	136	6.8
Leisure facilities	166	8.4	701	35.3	459	23.1	235	11.8	68	3.4	358	18.0
Childcare facilities	132	6.6	586	29.5	205	10.3	96	4.8	31	1.6	937	47.2
Access to housing service	67	3.4	662	33.3	449	22.6	193	9.7	78	3.9	538	27.1
Access to support service	49	2.5	475	23.9	407	20.5	189	9.5	86	4.3	781	39.3

Table 35: Rating of Aspects of the area of residence: Nottingham

Aspect	Very good		Good		Neither/nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Public transport	366	22.1	944	57.0	154	9.3	82	4.9	30	1.8	81	4.9
Shops	315	19.0	943	56.9	242	14.6	110	6.6	24	1.4	23	1.4
Healthcare	235	14.2	990	59.7	220	13.3	85	5.1	16	1.0	111	6.7
Closeness to place of worship	197	11.9	744	45.9	247	14.9	148	8.9	65	3.9	256	15.4
Schools	187	11.3	716	43.2	179	10.8	79	4.8	21	1.3	475	28.7
Quietness of neighbourhood	166	10.0	75	45.6	410	24.7	206	12.4	79	4.8	41	2.5
Parks/open spaces	164	9.9	791	47.7	340	20.5	198	11.9	49	3.0	115	6.9
Reputation of neighbourhood	139	8.4	690	41.6	387	23.4	239	14.4	120	7.2	82	4.9
Leisure facilities	110	6.6	570	34.4	399	24.1	215	13.0	52	3.1	311	18.8
Childcare facilities	88	5.3	471	28.4	188	11.3	85	5.1	26	1.6	799	48.2
Access to housing service	52	3.1	569	34.3	402	24.3	177	10.7	63	3.8	394	23.8
Access to housing-related support services	36	2.2	387	23.4	356	21.5	175	10.6	71	4.3	632	38.1

Table 36: Rating of Aspects of the area of residence: Rushcliffe

Aspect	Very good		Good		Neither/nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Quietness of neighbourhood	32	37.2	46	53.5	5	5.8	1	1.2	1	1.2	1	1.2
Reputation of neighbourhood	30	34.9	49	57.0	2	2.3	1	1.2	1	1.2	3	3.5
Public transport	29	33.7	53	61.6	2	2.3	-	-	-	-	2	2.3
Shops	27	31.4	54	62.8	3	3.5	2	2.3	-	-	-	-
Healthcare	25	29.1	56	65.1	2	2.3	-	-	-	-	3	3.5
Schools	24	27.9	45	52.3	2	2.3	-	-	-	-	15	17.4
Leisure facilities	22	25.6	39	45.3	11	12.8	5	5.8	-	-	9	10.5
Parks/open spaces	20	23.3	58	67.4	7	8.1	-	-	-	-	1	1.2
Childcare facilities	17	19.8	38	44.2	2	2.3	3	3.5	-	-	26	30.2
Closeness to place of worship	11	12.8	21	24.4	32	37.2	8	9.3	2	2.3	12	14.0
Access to housing service	5	5.8	32	37.2	8	9.3	1	1.2	1	1.2	39	45.3
Access to housing-related support services	2	2.3	34	39.5	5	5.8	1	1.2	1	1.2	43	50.0

Table 37: Rating of Aspects of the area of residence: Broxtowe

Aspect	Very good		Good		Neither/nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Public transport	29	33.7	44	51.2	7	8.1	2	2.3	-	-	4	4.7
Quietness of neighbourhood	25	29.1	40	46.5	14	16.3	-	-	-	-	7	8.1
Reputation of neighbourhood	21	24.4	37	43.0	21	24.4	-	-	-	-	7	8.1
Healthcare	21	24.4	47	54.7	7	8.1	2	2.3	1	1.2	8	9.3
Shops	19	22.1	48	55.8	11	12.8	4	4.7	1	1.2	3	3.5
Schools	16	18.6	45	52.3	4	4.7	1	1.2	1	1.2	19	22.1
Leisure facilities	13	15.1	43	50.0	16	18.6	3	3.5	1	1.2	10	11.6
Childcare facilities	10	11.6	35	40.7	2	2.3	1	1.2	-	-	38	44.2
Parks/open spaces	9	10.5	47	54.7	14	16.3	5	5.8	1	1.2	10	11.6
Closeness to place of worship	7	8.1	18	20.9	22	25.6	21	24.4	4	4.7	14	16.3
Access to housing-related support services	3	3.5	25	29.1	20	23.3	2	2.3	1	1.2	35	40.7
Access to housing service	2	2.3	24	27.9	19	22.1	3	3.5	1	1.2	37	43.0

Table 38: Rating of Aspects of the area of residence: Ashfield

Aspect	Very good		Good		Neither/nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Public transport	25	43.1	23	39.7	4	6.9	3	5.2	-	-	3	5.2
Quietness of neighbourhood	23	39.7	20	34.5	8	13.8	5	8.6	2	3.4	-	-
Shops	20	34.5	27	46.6	7	12.1	3	5.2	1	1.7	-	-
Healthcare	20	34.5	21	36.2	9	15.5	3	5.2	1	1.7	4	6.9
Reputation of neighbourhood	18	31.0	20	34.5	9	15.5	7	12.1	3	5.2	1	1.7
Schools	14	24.1	14	24.1	7	12.1	2	3.4	2	3.4	19	32.8
Parks/open spaces	13	22.4	23	39.7	8	13.8	9	15.5	2	3.4	3	5.2
Closeness to place of worship	13	22.4	4	6.9	14	24.1	7	12.1	8	13.8	12	20.7
Leisure facilities	11	19.0	11	19.0	10	17.2	8	13.8	8	13.8	10	17.2
Childcare facilities	10	17.2	10	17.2	4	6.9	4	6.9	1	1.7	29	50.0
Access to housing service	7	12.1	17	29.3	5	8.6	3	5.2	4	6.9	22	37.9
Access to housing-related support services	7	12.1	14	24.1	7	12.1	2	3.4	4	6.9	24	41.4

Table 39: Rating of Aspects of the area of residence: Gedling

Aspect	Very good		Good		Neither/nor		Poor		Very poor		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Shops	20	25.0	44	55.0	11	13.8	2	2.5	2	2.5	1	1.3
Public transport	19	23.8	44	55.0	11	13.8	4	5.0	2	2.5	-	-
Healthcare	16	20.0	44	55.0	12	15.0	2	2.5	-	-	6	7.5
Reputation of neighbourhood	16	20.0	56	70.0	4	5.0	2	2.5	2	2.5	-	-
Quietness of neighbourhood	16	20.0	49	61.3	13	16.3	2	2.5	-	-	-	-
Schools	14	17.5	46	57.5	4	5.0	2	2.5	-	-	14	17.5
Parks/open spaces	13	16.3	41	51.3	19	23.8	2	2.5	2	2.5	3	3.8
Leisure facilities	10	12.5	37	46.3	21	26.3	3	3.8	1	1.3	8	10.0
Childcare facilities	7	8.8	32	40.0	8	10.0	2	2.5	-	-	31	38.8
Closeness to place of worship	4	5.0	36	45.0	15	18.8	14	17.5	5	6.3	6	7.5
Access to housing service	1	1.3	19	23.8	14	17.5	7	8.8	1	1.3	38	47.5
Access to housing-related support services	1	1.3	15	18.8	19	23.8	7	8.8	1	1.3	37	46.3

Access to housing services

Table 40 highlights the views on access to housing services according to ethnic group. The first point to note is that in some cases the relatively large number of 'don't know' responses to this question means that some caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the data. Notwithstanding this, the largest proportion of respondents from each of the nine ethnic groupings were generally complimentary about the accessibility of housing services within their locality. This was particularly the case with those from the Asian Other and Iranian groups (48.8% and 42.7% rated this issue as being either very good or good). In contrast, however, the Black Other and Pakistani respondents were the most critical with one fifth of each group arguing that it was either poor or very poor.

In relation to access to housing support services respondents were on the whole, less complimentary about this aspect. Those who were more likely to be positive were from the Asian Other and Indian communities (42.3% and 33.6% respectively rated this aspects as being either very good or good). The Pakistanis and those in the Black Other group were the most critical.

Table 40: Views on access to housing services

Views	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	67	3.4	1	1.4	11	3.6	11	2.8	13	4.1	9	3.5	5	3.6	3	1.8	5	3.0	9	5.1
Good	62	33.3	26	35.6	95	31.3	135	34.9	107	33.8	65	25.2	54	39.1	48	29.3	77	45.8	55	30.9
Neither/nor	449	22.6	21	28.8	55	18.1	85	22.0	59	18.6	56	21.7	55	39.9	43	26.2	37	22.0	38	21.3
Poor	193	9.7	8	11.0	14	4.6	61	15.8	24	7.6	25	9.7	4	2.9	27	16.5	13	7.7	17	9.6
Very poor	78	3.9	4	5.5	4	1.3	19	4.9	16	5.0	14	5.4	2	1.4	7	4.3	-	-	12	6.7
Don't know	538	27.1	13	17.8	125	41.1	76	19.6	98	30.9	89	34.5	18	13.0	36	22.0	36	21.4	47	26.4
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 41: Views on access to housing-related support services

Views	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	49	2.5	-	-	9	3.0	6	1.6	13	4.1	6	2.3	2	1.4	2	1.2	4	2.4	7	3.9
Good	475	23.9	19	26.0	93	30.6	79	20.4	91	28.7	54	20.9	11	8.0	38	23.2	67	39.9	23	12.9
Neither/nor	407	20.5	28	38.4	5	18.1	88	22.7	54	17.0	42	16.3	32	23.2	42	25.6	33	19.6	33	18.5
Poor	189	9.5	6	8.2	18	5.9	56	14.5	27	8.5	22	8.5	3	2.2	28	17.1	13	7.7	16	9.0
Very poor	86	4.3	4	5.5	4	1.3	27	7.0	15	4.7	15	5.8	2	1.4	8	4.9	-	-	11	6.2
Don't know	781	39.3	16	21.9	125	41.1	131	33.9	117	36.9	119	46.1	88	63.8	46	28.0	51	30.4	8	49.2
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Views on potential problems in the area

A range of potential problems were presented to respondents who were asked to indicate whether they felt that each of them represented a major or minor problem or not a problem for them in the area where they lived.

As table 42 shows, across the sample as a whole, the general view expressed was that ten of the eleven potential problems highlighted were not deemed to be a problem by the greatest proportion of respondents, ranging from 70.4% (feeling like part of a community) to 43.4% (drug abuse and drug dealing). The level of crime was more likely to be seen as a minor problem by the greatest number of respondents than either a major problem or not a problem.

At the same time, over one in ten of the sample rated seven of the potential problems as constituting a major problem for them where they lived including 22.1% who felt that the level of crime was a major problem and 16.7% who rated drug abuse and dealing in this way.

Table 42: Views on potential problems in the area (All)

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	440	22.1	784	39.5	667	33.6	96	4.8
Drug dealing/abuse	332	16.7	466	23.5	862	43.4	327	16.5
Noise levels	262	13.2	788	39.7	917	46.1	20	1.0
Dumping rubbish	259	13.0	463	23.3	1128	56.8	137	6.9
Police support	240	12.1	379	19.1	1089	54.8	279	14.0
Anti-social behaviour	201	10.1	551	27.7	1147	57.7	88	4.4
Level of traffic	201	10.1	601	30.2	1140	57.4	45	2.3
Racial harassment	138	6.9	450	22.6	1303	65.6	96	4.8
Feeling like part of community	129	6.5	278	14.0	1398	70.4	182	9.2
Condition of empty homes	125	6.3	275	13.8	1162	58.5	425	21.4
Condition of occupied homes	88	4.4	314	15.8	1272	64.0	314	15.8

Desegregation of these findings according to local authority area (tables 43 to 49) reveals some interesting findings. Residents from Nottingham tended in the main to identify a greater number of issues as being either a major or minor problem where they lived. This was especially the case in relation to the level of crime (collectively 65.9% rated this as a major or minor problem with only 29.5% suggesting that it was not a problem), the level of noise (57.3%), the level of traffic (43.1%), dumping rubbish on common ground (40.5%), drug dealing or drug abuse (34.6%) and the level of police support (34.0%). Also, one fifth of the residents from this area did not feel like part of the community.

The majority of Rushcliffe residents felt that none of the issues represented a major or minor problem. For example, in relation to the level of crime and only 2.3% were critical of the level of police support. Furthermore, 80.2% suggested that the level of traffic was

not a problem – the greatest proportion recorded across the five local authority areas. Only a tiny minority (1.1%) felt that drug taking and drug pushing was a major problem. Nine out of ten (91.9%) suggested that they did feel part of the community.

Broxtowe residents tended, like those from Rushcliffe, to suggest that few problems existed in the area: just 2.3% felt that the level of crime was a major problem and 82.6% suggested that racial harassment was not a problem. Only 1.1% of the residents felt that the area had a major problem with drugs. Similarly, Gedling was generally perceived to have few problems. Just 2.3% argued that the area suffered from a major crime problem. However, it is interesting to note the fairly large proportion of residents who felt that the level of police support was either a major or minor problem (25.2% - a figure that was much higher than that recorded by residents from the remaining four areas).

A rather different picture emerges from the responses given by those living in Ashfield. This group of residents were especially concerned about the level of crime in the area (60.4% suggested that this was either a major or minor problem where they lived) and 43.7% were critical of the level of noise. Three out of ten also rated racial harassment, drug dealing and the level of traffic as being a major or minor problem and a slightly smaller group (27.6% - the highest proportion recorded across the five authority areas) indicated that they did not feel like part of the community.

Table 43: Rating of potential problems in the area: Nottingham

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	416	25.1	676	40.8	489	29.5	76	4.6
Noise levels	247	14.9	705	42.5	687	41.5	18	1.1
Level of racial harassment	120	7.2	392	23.7	1066	64.3	79	4.8
Level of drug dealing/abuse	317	19.1	422	25.5	663	40.0	25	15.4
Dumping rubbish on common ground	242	14.6	429	25.9	884	53.3	102	6.2
Level of unreasonable behaviour	187	11.3	484	29.2	912	55.0	74	4.5
Level of traffic	178	10.7	537	32.4	90	54.3	42	2.5
Level of police support	223	13.5	340	20.5	866	52.3	228	13.8
Condition of occupied homes	84	5.1	295	17.8	1036	62.5	242	14.6
Condition of empty homes	118	7.1	265	16.0	939	56.7	35	20.2
Feeling like part of the community	106	6.4	24	14.7	1153	69.6	154	9.3

Table 44: Rating of potential problems in the area: Rushcliffe

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	2	2.3	20	23.3	62	72.1	2	2.3
Noise levels	1	1.2	18	20.9	67	77.9	-	-
Level of racial harassment	2	2.3	10	11.6	71	82.6	3	3.5
Level of drug dealing/abuse	2	2.3	10	11.6	58	67.4	16	18.6
Dumping rubbish on common ground	2	2.3	6	7.0	66	76.7	12	14.0
Level of unreasonable behaviour	1	1.2	9	10.5	71	82.6	5	5.8
Level of traffic	1	1.2	15	17.4	69	80.2	1	1.2
Level of police support	-	-	8	9.3	67	77.9	11	12.8
Condition of occupied homes	-	-	1	1.2	70	81.4	15	17.4
Condition of empty homes	-	-	-	-	68	79.1	18	20.9
Feeling like part of the community	-	-	2	2.3	79	91.9	5	5.8

Table 45: Rating of potential problems in the area: Broxtowe

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	2	2.3	25	29.1	54	62.8	5	5.8
Noise levels	3	3.5	19	22.1	64	74.4	-	-
Level of racial harassment	-	-	9	10.5	71	82.6	6	7.0
Level of drug dealing/abuse	-	-	5	5.8	60	69.8	21	24.4
Dumping rubbish on common ground	-	-	10	11.6	67	77.9	9	10.5
Level of unreasonable behaviour	-	-	18	20.9	65	75.6	3	3.5
Level of traffic	3	3.5	20	23.3	62	72.1	1	1.2
Level of police support	1	1.2	4	4.7	68	79.1	13	15.1
Condition of occupied homes	1	1.2	4	4.7	65	75.6	16	18.6
Condition of empty homes	1	1.2	2	2.3	63	73.3	20	23.3
Feeling like part of the community	-	-	8	9.3	71	82.6	7	8.1

Table 46: Rating of potential problems in the area: Gedling

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	2	2.5	35	43.8	38	47.5	5	6.3
Noise levels	1	1.3	22	27.5	55	68.8	2	2.5
Level of racial harassment	2	2.5	23	28.8	53	66.3	2	2.5
Level of drug dealing/abuse	1	1.3	16	20.0	51	63.8	12	15.0
Dumping rubbish on common ground	2	2.5	7	8.8	66	82.5	5	6.3
Level of unreasonable behaviour	2	2.5	22	27.5	52	65.0	4	5.0
Level of traffic	4	5.0	14	17.5	61	76.3	1	1.3
Level of police support	1	1.3	19	23.8	50	62.5	10	12.5
Condition of occupied homes	2	2.5	8	10.0	62	77.5	8	10.0
Condition of empty homes	2	2.5	5	6.3	63	78.8	10	12.5
Feeling like part of the community	4	5.0	14	17.5	54	67.5	8	10.0

Table 47: Rating of potential problems in the area: Ashfield

Potential problem	Major problem		Minor problem		Not a problem		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Level of crime	12	20.7	23	39.7	18	31.0	5	8.6
Noise levels	7	12.1	19	32.8	32	55.2	-	-
Level of racial harassment	6	10.3	13	22.4	33	56.9	6	10.3
Level of drug dealing/abuse	10	17.2	8	13.8	21	36.2	19	32.8
Dumping rubbish on common ground	5	8.6	7	12.1	39	67.2	7	12.1
Level of unreasonable behaviour	5	8.6	13	22.4	38	65.5	2	3.4
Level of traffic	10	17.2	12	20.7	36	62.1	-	-
Level of police support	4	6.9	7	12.1	32	55.2	15	25.9
Condition of occupied homes	1	1.7	5	8.6	33	56.9	19	32.8
Condition of empty homes	4	6.9	3	5.2	24	41.4	27	46.6
Feeling like part of the community	7	12.1	9	15.5	35	60.3	7	12.1

Level of satisfaction with the area

Despite a number of problems being identified in the locality, when asked to rate the area where they lived in terms of how satisfied they were, the majority of the sample were positive with 8.5% reporting that they were very satisfied and a further 58.0% satisfied. Just 7.9% were negative, with the majority of this group being dissatisfied as opposed to very dissatisfied.

Table 48: Level of satisfaction with the area

Level of satisfaction	No.	%
Very satisfied	169	8.5
Satisfied	1152	58.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	495	24.9
Dissatisfied	113	5.7
Very dissatisfied	43	2.2
Don't know	15	0.6
Total	1987	100.0

Generally, those who were negative about the area where they lived, tended to refer to the level of crime (4.8%), the amount of drugs and alcohol in the area (4.7%), the fact that it was noisy (4.1%), the problems caused by 'kids hanging around' (3.2%) and the amount of rubbish being dumped on common ground in the neighbourhood (1.9%).

None of those from Rushcliffe or Broxtowe were negative compared with 10.4% of those from Ashfield, 8.7% of the Nottingham residents and 3.8% of those from Gedling.

Table 49: Level of satisfaction with the area by location

Level of satisfaction	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	122	7.4	11	12.8	7	8.1	14	24.1	13	16.3
Satisfied	923	55.7	68	79.1	71	82.6	27	46.6	56	70.0
Neither/nor	455	27.5	7	8.1	7	8.1	11	19.0	8	10.0
Dissatisfied	105	6.3	-	-	-	-	3	5.2	2	2.5
Very dissatisfied	39	2.4	-	-	-	-	3	5.2	1	1.3
Don't know	13	0.8	-	-	1	1.2	-	-	-	-
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

In terms of the level of satisfaction with the area of residence according to ethnic group, there was some variability in the extent to which respondents were positive ranging from 44.9% (Iranians) to over three-quarters of the Indian sample (85.2%). Although levels of dissatisfaction were relatively low across most of the community groups, there were two ethnic groups where a relatively large proportion were critical, being either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the area where they lived: Africans (17.5%) and the Black Other group (15.3%). Many of those in these two groups were asylum seekers and refugees. In direct contrast, just 2.0% of the Indian residents were negative.

Table 50: Level of satisfaction with the area by ethnic group

Level of satisfaction	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	169	8.5	7	9.6	28	9.2	38	9.8	29	9.1	27	10.5	2	1.4	14	8.5	9	5.4	15	8.4
Satisfied	1152	58.0	35	47.9	231	76.0	234	60.5	188	59.3	115	44.6	60	43.5	81	49.4	122	72.6	86	48.3
Neither/nor	495	24.9	26	35.6	36	11.8	98	25.3	66	20.8	69	26.7	69	50.0	43	26.2	27	16.1	61	34.3
Dissatisfied	113	5.7	5	6.8	4	1.3	8	2.1	23	7.3	34	13.2	6	4.3	19	11.6	5	3.0	9	5.1
Very dissatisfied	43	2.2	-	-	2	0.7	7	1.8	9	2.8	11	4.3	1	0.7	6	3.7	3	1.8	4	2.2
Don't know	15	0.8	-	-	3	1.0	2	0.5	2	0.6	2	0.8	-	-	1	0.6	2	1.2	3	1.7
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Changing nature of the area

Generally the South Nottinghamshire area as a whole was seen as having remained the same in the last three years as opposed to improving (21.6%) or deteriorating (13.7%), although one quarter of the sample were unsure how to answer this question.

Table 51: Changing nature of the area within the last three years

Changing	No.	%
Improved	429	21.6
Remained the same	795	40.0
Deteriorating	272	13.7
Don't know	491	24.7
Total	1987	100.0

The main issues cited by those who felt that the area had deteriorated included concerns about the increase in the level of crime, the availability of drugs and youths 'hanging around.'

Looking specifically at the views of the respondents from the five local authority areas:

- Excluding those from Broxtowe who answered 'don't know' to this question (37.2%), the largest proportion felt that the area had improved (32.6%) contrasting with 3.5% who argued that it had deteriorated;
- Nottingham residents were more likely to suggest that the area had remained the same in the last three years (40.4%), although the proportion who felt that it had improved was greater than the figure who suggested that it had got worse (20.5% compared with 14.8%);
- Those who came from Rushcliffe were generally evenly divided between suggesting that the area had remained the same and improved recently (34.9% and 32.6% respectively), with just 7.0% advocating that the area had deteriorated;
- Although four out of ten of the Ashfield residents felt that the area had remained the same the proportion who felt that it had either improved or deteriorated was the same (20.7% in each case); and
- As with Ashfield residents those from Gedling tended to suggest that the area had stayed the same (41.3%), although nearly three out of ten (27.2%) were of the opinion that the area had improved, contrasting with a minority (6.3%) who expressed the opposing view.

Table 52: Views on whether area is improving

Level of satisfaction	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Getting better	339	20.5	28	32.6	28	32.6	12	20.7	22	27.5
Staying the same	669	40.4	30	34.9	23	26.7	25	43.1	33	41.3
Getting worse	245	14.8	6	7.0	3	3.5	12	20.7	5	6.3
Don't know	404	24.4	22	25.6	32	37.2	9	15.5	20	25.0
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

Importance of locational factors

Respondents were asked to indicate from a list of factors, the degree of importance they would attach to each in any decision concerning where they would want to live.

Table 53: Relative importance of locational factors

Being close to...	Very important		Quite important		Not so important		Not at all important		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Being a safe area	1827	91.9	111	5.6	4	0.2	4	0.2	41	2.1
Being safe from racial harassment	1789	90.0	126	6.3	28	1.4	7	0.4	37	1.9
Healthcare	1474	74.2	370	18.6	90	4.5	18	0.9	35	1.8
Reputation of area	1449	72.9	356	17.9	120	6.0	17	0.9	45	2.3
Relevant shops	1443	72.6	402	20.2	88	4.4	15	0.8	39	2.0
Quietness of area	1443	72.6	390	19.6	90	4.5	17	0.9	47	2.4
Public transport	1430	72.0	358	18.0	110	5.5	47	2.4	42	2.1
Feeling like part of community	1426	71.8	298	15.0	174	8.8	40	2.0	49	2.5
Car parking	1246	62.7	362	18.2	234	11.8	84	4.2	61	3.1
Schools	1042	52.4	255	12.8	375	18.9	247	12.4	68	3.4
Parks & open spaces	978	49.2	545	27.4	354	17.8	61	3.1	49	2.5
Place of worship	953	48.0	423	21.3	370	18.6	173	8.7	68	3.4
Family & friends	846	42.6	674	33.9	342	17.2	56	2.8	69	3.5
Leisure facilities	788	39.7	569	28.6	490	24.7	88	4.4	52	2.6
Childcare facilities	744	37.4	266	13.4	517	26.0	353	17.8	107	5.4
Access to housing advice	697	35.1	529	26.6	499	25.1	146	7.3	116	5.8
Access to support services	623	31.4	470	23.7	565	28.4	187	9.4	142	7.1

The greatest proportion of residents rated all of the aspects as being very important in terms of influencing their decision of where to live, although the proportion did vary enormously between the different issues. Perhaps not surprisingly, nine out of ten rated issues of personal safety as being very important (91.9% rated being in a safe area as being very important and 90.0% rated being safe from racial harassment in the same way). In the case of six of the aspects listed, seven out of ten rated them as being very

important. Those aspects which were rated as very important by a smaller proportion of residents included access to housing advice (35.1%), access to support services (31.4%) and the availability of childcare and leisure facilities within the area (39.7% and 37.4% respectively). Those who tended to suggest that childcare facilities and access to schools (17.8% and 12.4% respectively) were not at all important were predominantly those without children, with young male asylum seekers figuring quite strongly among this group.

Table 54 highlights the views of the respondents from the nine ethnic groups regarding those aspects which were deemed as being very important in terms of deciding where to live.

For respondents from all nine ethnic groups the two most influential factors were deemed to be that the area was a safe place to live and that it was safe from racial harassment. Beyond this, however, some important differences are discernable:

- Among the Irish community the most important factors were identified as the quietness of the area (72.6%), the proximity of relevant shops (68.5%) and access to health care services (65.8%)
- Those from the Indian community suggested that the reputation of the area was the most important issue to take account of (83.9%), followed by the closeness to health care services (83.2%) and feeling part of the community (80.6%);
- The three most important issues for the Pakistani households were being close to relevant shops (50.6%), and the reputation and quietness of the neighbourhood (79.6% and 79.1% respectively);
- The Caribbean respondents highlighted the relative importance of being close to public transport (74.4%), health care (69.7%) and relevant shops;
- While the African group felt that although these issues were very important, the main issue would be car parking (76.8%);
- There was consensus among the Iranian sample that the two most important considerations in deciding where to live were the reputation of the neighbourhood and the quietness (92.0% and 94.9% respectively);
- Seven out of ten of the Black Other respondents rated being close to public transport, relevant shops and health care as being particularly important factors;
- The Asian Other group referred to the quietness of the area (79.8%), being close to health care services (78.0%) and the reputation of the neighbourhood (76.2%);
- Finally, the Other group cited relevant shops (78.1%), health care (74.7%) and the reputation of the neighbourhood (73.6%).

Table 54: Proportion of each ethnic group who rated each aspect as being very important

Aspect rated as very important	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Being a safe place	1827	91.9	64	87.7	283	93.1	365	94.3	285	89.9	230	89.1	136	98.6	144	87.8	157	93.5	163	91.6
Safe from racial harassment	1789	90.0	51	69.9	280	92.1	359	92.8	276	87.1	231	89.5	138	100.0	143	87.2	153	91.1	158	88.8
Close to healthcare	1474	74.2	48	65.8	253	83.2	303	78.3	221	69.7	172	66.7	97	70.3	116	70.7	131	78.0	133	74.7
Reputation of the neighbourhood	1449	72.9	46	63.0	25	83.9	308	79.6	191	60.3	155	60.1	127	92.0	108	65.9	128	76.2	131	73.6
Close to relevant shops	1443	72.6	50	68.5	230	75.7	312	80.6	215	67.8	164	63.6	93	67.4	115	70.1	125	74.4	139	78.1
Quietness of neighbourhood	1443	72.6	53	72.6	243	79.9	306	79.1	194	61.2	157	60.9	131	94.9	98	59.8	134	79.8	127	71.3
Close to public transport	1430	72.0	43	58.9	242	76.9	266	68.7	236	74.4	191	74.0	88	63.8	115	70.1	123	73.2	126	70.8
Feeling part of the community	1426	71.8	46	63.0	245	80.6	335	86.6	177	55.8	184	71.3	97	70.3	94	57.3	123	73.2	125	70.2
Car parking	1246	62.7	37	50.7	205	67.4	288	74.4	179	56.5	126	76.8	106	76.8	90	54.9	112	66.7	103	57.9
Being close to schools	1042	52.4	23	31.5	157	51.6	275	71.1	141	44.5	136	52.7	23	16.7	97	59.1	121	72.0	69	38.8
Close to parks/open spaces	978	49.2	37	50.7	148	48.7	208	53.7	145	45.7	84	32.6	94	68.1	80	48.8	94	56.0	88	49.4
Close to place of worship	953	48.0	27	37.0	131	43.1	307	79.3	153	48.3	119	46.1	6	4.3	62	37.8	98	58.3	50	28.1
Close to family/friends	846	42.6	35	47.9	121	39.8	266	68.7	133	42.0	68	26.4	2	1.4	70	42.7	79	47.0	72	40.4
Close to leisure facilities	788	39.7	32	43.8	151	49.7	153	39.5	107	33.8	74	28.7	52	37.7	68	41.5	80	47.6	71	39.9
Close to childcare facilities	744	37.4	15	20.5	129	42.4	179	46.3	108	34.1	106	41.1	7	5.1	75	45.7	80	47.6	45	25.3
Access to housing advice	697	35.1	26	35.6	84	27.6	204	52.7	96	30.3	68	26.4	28	20.3	51	31.1	72	42.9	68	38.2
Access to housing-related support services	623	31.4	23	31.5	83	27.3	170	43.9	100	31.5	64	24.8	10	7.2	48	29.3	71	42.3	54	30.3
Close to place of work	410	20.6	26	35.6	85	28.0	91	23.5	70	22.1	6	2.3	-	-	39	23.8	54	32.1	39	21.9

BME community facilities

Slightly more than four out of ten (44.1%) rated the facilities in their area for the BME community as being either very good or good. This contrasts with 13.9% who were critical, suggesting that these facilities were either poor or very poor. A group equating to one in ten of the sample reported that they did not know how to respond to this question.

The Iranians, those in the Asian Other group and the Indian respondents tended to be the most positive about the facilities available for the BME community. In contrast, those respondents who tended to be the most critical came from the Caribbean, African, and Black Other groups. One fifth of the Iranians were also negative.

Members of the Chinese older persons focus group felt that there were insufficient community facilities for older people from their community. Many of the group argued that they would be socially and culturally isolated if it was not for the service provided by the Chinese Welfare Association. However, apart from this facility, none of the group were aware of any other community resources in the area. In terms of the development of additional community facilities, it was felt that there was a need for:

'a retirement home just for Chinese people' (64 year old woman), and

'a centre just for the Chinese .. so that just older people can come' (58 year old woman).

Among the African and Caribbean focus group participants there was a call for the development of local churches and specialist food retailers. One woman commented that in order to find the food that her family like, she had to get two buses to the nearest Caribbean specialist shop.

In addition, it was suggested that there needed to be more community facilities which could be shared by local BME residents. Rather than facilities catering for specific ethnic groups, it was advocated that shared facilities would assist in integrating people from different communities. Reference was also made to the importance of providing facilities which could be used by asylum seekers and refugees and as such would help these groups integrate within the community rather than facing isolation and stigmatisation.

The consensus view among the Pakistani women was that, although specific services did exist, such as local college classes in English and re-training, there was no central point where this information could be accessed. It was suggested that there needed to be a 'one stop shop' for information services about what was available for specific client groups. This was seen as being particularly important for women who had just arrived in to this country and who had little knowledge of English or the locality.

One or two of the women would also favour the establishment of a confidential service for those experiencing problems within their home environment. Two examples were cited, that of depression and domestic violence.

Many of the women were concerned about having community facilities which were also open to men and it was suggested that some activities or venues should be restricted to Pakistani or Asian women only. One woman argued that this would help such women increase their sense of their own self-confidence. The presence of men often serves to reinforce the unequal relationship between the genders within their community.

Those living in Rushcliffe tended to be the most positive about the facilities for the BME communities in the area (collectively 54.6% suggested that they were either very good or good), although as table 36 highlighted, concern was expressed about the closeness of a place of worship. This is followed by 45.5% of those from Nottingham, 34.9% of those living in Broxtowe and 32.5% of the Gedling residents who were positive. In contrast, just 27.6% of those resident in Ashfield were positive and indeed, 41.4% of these residents were negative suggesting that what was available was either poor or very poor. In direct contrast, just 2.3% of those from Rushcliffe registered a negative viewpoint.

Respondents were given the opportunity to state what additional facilities for the BME community they would like to see developed within the locality:

Among the Nottingham and Ashfield residents the main facility mentioned was that of a community centre, continental food shops, a place of worship and play areas for the children. Among the Ashfield residents there was also a call for the availability of English language classes.

Table 55: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities

Rating of facilities	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	124	6.2	3	4.1	16	5.3	43	11.1	12	3.8	10	3.9	3	2.2	10	6.1	13	7.7	14	7.9
Good	752	37.8	32	43.8	138	45.4	167	43.2	99	31.2	70	27.1	71	51.4	42	25.6	76	45.2	57	32.0
Neither/nor	644	32.4	18	24.7	110	36.2	127	32.8	116	36.6	63	24.4	28	20.3	63	38.4	60	35.7	59	33.1
Poor	138	6.9	3	4.1	12	3.9	23	5.9	32	10.1	27	10.5	18	11.0	18	11.0	5	3.0	10	5.6
Very poor	139	7.0	8	11.0	9	3.0	13	3.4	36	11.4	25	9.7	15	9.1	15	9.1	5	3.0	22	12.4
Don't know	190	9.6	9	12.3	19	6.3	14	3.6	22	6.9	63	24.4	16	9.8	16	9.8	9	5.4	16	9.0
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 56: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities by location

Rating of facilities	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	113	6.8	5	5.8	2	2.3	1	1.7	2	2.5
Good	642	38.7	42	48.8	28	32.6	15	25.9	24	30.0
Neither good nor poor	524	31.6	30	34.9	39	45.3	12	20.7	36	45.0
Poor	121	7.3	-	-	2	2.3	9	15.5	5	6.3
Very poor	102	6.2	2	2.3	1	1.2	15	25.9	8	10.0
Don't know	155	9.4	7	8.1	14	16.3	6	10.3	5	6.3
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

Views on equality of access to housing

Respondents were asked to comment upon whether or not they felt that members of their own ethnic community had the same opportunity to access housing as members of other ethnic groups. The general view expressed by the sample as a whole was that the equality of access did exist (52.5%) with just 12.3% expressing the opposing view. Slightly more than one third (35.1%) were unsure how to answer this question.

Views on equality of opportunity varied according to where the respondents lived. Those from Ashfield were the most likely to suggest that the same opportunity for all did not exist (15.5%), followed by 12.4% of the Nottingham residents, and 11.3% of those from Gedling. In contrast, just 1.2% of those from Broxtowe held this view, as did 5.8% of those currently living in Rushcliffe.

Table 57: Views on equality of access to housing by location

View on equality	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes – equal treatment	859	51.8	56	65.1	49	57.0	28	48.2	50	62.5
No – unequal treatment	206	12.4	5	5.8	1	1.2	9	15.5	9	11.3
Don't know	592	35.7	25	29.1	36	41.9	21	36.2	21	26.3
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

In terms of views on this issue according to ethnicity, with the exception of those from the African and Iranian groups, at least half of those from the remaining ethnic groups reported that they felt that there was equality of opportunity to access housing in the area. Those who held the opposing view were more likely to be from the African and Caribbean community groups (22.1% and 20.5% respectively), although in this latter case it needs to be noted that half of the sample answered 'don't know' to this question.

The majority of the focus group participants, irrespective of their ethnic origin felt that in practice they felt that they were treated unfairly by some service providers. In part this was seen as a reflection of their own lack of knowledge of the appropriate procedures or language problems. Some of the women participants felt that their unequal treatment was due to their gender.

They did suggest that they were treated more equally when the person they spoke to was from a BME background and they felt more assured in such situations that their needs would be recognised and followed-up.

Table 58: Views on equality of opportunity

View on equality	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes – equal treatment	1044	52.5	41	56.2	169	55.6	252	65.1	165	52.1	67	26.0	51	37.0	90	54.9	104	61.9	105	59.0
No – unequal treatment	245	12.3	10	13.7	22	7.2	31	8.0	65	20.5	57	22.1	2	1.4	23	14.0	11	6.5	24	13.5
Don't know	698	35.1	22	30.1	113	37.2	104	26.9	87	27.4	134	51.9	85	61.6	51	31.1	53	31.5	49	27.5
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Access to financial advice

Two thirds of the sample felt that they had sufficient access to financial advice compared to 31.1% who suggested that this was not the case. This latter group was more likely to be made up of those from the African, Iranian and Caribbean communities in direct comparison to those from the Indian community. At least one third of these former two ethnic groups who felt that there was insufficient access were Asylum Seekers and Refugees.

Access to financial information and advice was more likely to be an issue for those living in Nottingham and less of an issue for those from Rushcliffe.

Table 59; Views on access to financial advice

View on equality	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes – enough access	1337	67.3	54	74.0	252	82.9	283	73.1	200	63.1	105	40.7	83	60.1	107	65.2	128	76.2	125	70.2
No not enough access	618	31.1	19	26.0	48	15.8	96	24.8	112	35.3	147	57.0	51	37.0	55	33.5	39	23.2	51	28.7
Don't know	32	1.6	-	-	4	1.3	8	2.1	5	1.6	6	2.3	4	2.9	2	1.2	1	0.6	2	1.1
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Summary

- Although the greatest proportion of respondents were living in their area of choice (35.6%), a significant proportion argued that they had been given no choice in where they lived. Other factors given for moving to the area included the proximity of family and friends and that they had always lived in the area. Those who reported that they had had no choice in where they lived tended to be asylum seekers.
- Differences in opinion were noted in terms of the facilities available or aspects within the five local authority areas. Nottingham residents were particularly complimentary about the health care services, public transport and the shops in the area. Rushcliffe and Broxtowe residents were positive about the quietness and reputation of the neighbourhood and the public transport system. A more critical appraisal was noted among the Ashfield respondents with smaller numbers being positive about the aspects or facilities in the area compared with those from the other areas. Gedling residents were generally the least negative.
- One fifth of the Black Other and Pakistani community were critical of access to housing services and respondents from all ethnic groups were more negative about access to housing support services.
- Nottingham residents were particularly concerned about the level of crime in the area, noise levels and the amount of traffic. Rushcliffe, Broxtowe and Gedling respondents did not generally highlight any issues which were perceived as being a major problem in their respective areas. In contrast, those from Ashfield identified a number of issues which were seen as representing a major problem including crime levels, the level of noise and racial harassment.
- Overall, slightly less than one in ten were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the area where they lived. Those who were critical tended to be from either Nottingham or Ashfield. Concern was expressed about the level of crime, the availability of drugs and alcohol and noise levels.
- Among the sample as a whole, 21.6% felt that the area had improved within the last two years: 13.7% felt it had deteriorated. Rushcliffe and Broxtowe residents were especially likely to suggest that the area had improved while those who felt that the area had deteriorated were more likely to live in Ashfield, followed by Nottingham.
- Personal safety and being safe from racial harassment were the two most influential factors that respondents considered when deciding where to live. Differences of opinion on other factors, such as being close to family and friends and in close proximity to a place of worship varied according to ethnicity.
- Where facilities for the BME community exist they were generally rated positively. However, there was also a call for more of such facilities and particularly community centres, specialist food shops and a place of worship near the community itself.

- Slightly more than one in ten felt that there was not equality of access to housing and this was more likely to be the case among those living in Ashfield, Nottingham and then Gedling. African and Caribbean households tended to be the most critical.
- Three out of ten respondents did not feel that they had sufficient access to financial advice - again views varied according to ethnicity and area of residence.

Section IV: Support, Health and Social Care

Introduction

As well as focusing on the current housing situation of the respondents, the interview also sought information about the health and social care needs of the households in the sample. Information was requested concerning the health problems and disabilities experienced by members of the household as well as the need for adaptations to their existing home and the perceived need for specialist accommodation.

Prevalence of health problems and disabilities

All respondents were asked to indicate if they or a member of their household suffered from a long-standing illness or disability

Slightly more than one in ten (11.9%) reported that at least one member of their household had a visual impairment and in a minority of cases (1.2%) this was either three or more people from the same household. A smaller number referred to a hearing impairment (5.6%) with 7.9% mentioning a mobility problem. Approximately one in twenty households contained someone who had a learning difficulty (4.2%) and a slightly larger group contained someone with a mental health problem (4.1%). Less than one in twenty suffered from frailty, confusion or senile dementia, diabetes or heart disease. There was a greater likelihood of respondents mentioning asthma (13.2%), arthritis (13.9%) and high blood pressure (12.7%). A small group also made reference to Sickle Cell anemia (2.3%).

Depression was seen as a major problem among Asian women, some of whom were confined to the home and had very little contact with other members of their community or were unable to venture out beyond their community. One of the Pakistani women discussants, who had lived in Nottingham for 6 years, reported that this was the first time she had been to Nottingham City Centre. She had been accompanied by a friend in the taxi. She felt that she, like other Pakistani women, was socially isolated and had little contact with people. This had an impact on her knowledge of what services might be available to her and other women in her position.

Anxiety and depression were also seen to be caused by living in inappropriate housing (either due to overcrowding or the condition of the property) and poverty. The relationship between such women and their partners was also seen as a major contributing factor.

All respondents were asked to state whether they felt that their property had been adapted in any way for someone with a health problem or disability or if such an adaptation would be beneficial. Although only 4.8% had a walk-in shower or disabled bath in their property, one in ten felt that they needed this type of adaptation (9.8%). Only a minority had either ramps outside or inside the home and 2.8% and 1.7% respectively felt that each of these was needed. The greatest level of demand was

noted in relation to a handrail on the stairs: while 19.3% had this feature in their home, a slightly larger group felt that this was needed (21.3%). As regards a stair lift, 1.5% of properties already had this installed and twice this figure felt that this type of adaptation was necessary (3.9%). A relatively large group would also want a bathroom grab rail (15.5%).

Other facilities were also mentioned by some of the respondents including a downstairs toilet (5 respondents cited this), a bathroom lift (3), additional heating (2), the installation of a shower (2) and a larger kitchen (2).

Members of the Indian community were more likely to have had their home adapted in some way in comparison to those from the remaining ethnic groups and particularly in comparison to those from the Irish community. The demand for adaptations was greatest among those from the Other Asian, Pakistani and Indian samples, while the Iranians were the least likely to identify the needs for their home to be adapted.

Three of the Pakistani women had children who were disabled. Only one of the women, who could speak very good English and was highly educated, was receiving assistance from social services. The remaining two women, one of who had two disabled children had to rely on informal care and help from family and friends. Neither of these two women could speak English and neither were aware that help could be provided by social services. One of them commented:

'I don't know who to ask for help. People tell me I can get help but who do I contact. My friend told me that I might have to pay for it but I can't afford it so I just manage. My neighbours are very good and help me from time to time. What else can I do?' (via translator)

The lack of awareness of the type of social care and support available to households with someone with a health problem was also highlighted by some of the African and Caribbean women. Some of this group who had only recently arrived in this country (as asylum seekers) reported that nobody had informed them about the range of services that were available. As one woman commented:

'When they know that you are a refugee they think that you just want free services and that's why you've come to this country. It's not true but they don't believe you. I'm embarrassed to tell them I've only just come here.'

Those who felt that adaptations to their home were required generally needed some form of support to identify or carry out the adaptations (45.5% or 80 out of 176) contrasting with 39.8% who felt that such support was not necessary.

There was a general lack of knowledge concerning whom to approach for advice regarding adaptations to their home. The largest group referred to the council (21.0%), followed by smaller numbers who reported that they would contact either their GP or social services (17.4% and 16.3% respectively) and smaller numbers who would seek

advice from the Citizens Advice Bureau (4.5%), the one stop shop (3.6%) and their 'landlord.'

Specialist accommodation requirements

The majority of respondents did not feel that their household required any form of specialist accommodation. Those who did, tended to favour accommodation without stairs (3.9%), accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system (2.6%), accommodation with a visiting warden (1.1%) and to a lesser extent, housing with day-time staff on site with emergency call out at night (0.9%), accommodation with a resident warden (0.9%), a residential care home setting (0.5%) and a live-in landlady or landlord. In a minority of cases (2.8%) it was felt by the respondent that the family should provide any care that was required.

Table 62 shows the type of specialist accommodation required according to ethnic origin.

Table 60: Adaptations already have in the home

Type of adaptation	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Handrail on stairs	384	19.3	10	13.7	87	28.6	55	14.2	73	23.0	59	22.9	7	5.1	40	24.4	31	18.5	22	12.4
Bathroom grab rail	233	11.7	9	12.3	103	33.9	17	4.4	37	11.7	15	5.8	6	4.3	21	12.8	13	7.7	12	6.7
Walk-in bath/disabled shower	95	4.8	1	1.4	31	10.2	15	3.9	21	6.6	6	2.3	6	4.3	3	1.8	4	2.4	8	4.5
Tap adaptations	93	4.7	-	-	47	15.5	9	2.3	9	2.8	9	3.5	6	4.3	6	3.7	4	2.4	3	1.7
External access ramps	55	2.8	-	-	16	5.3	4	1.0	9	2.8	11	4.3	6	4.3	4	2.4	4	2.4	1	0.6
Internal access ramps	34	1.7	-	-	19	6.3	1	0.3	2	0.6	4	1.6	6	4.3	1	0.6	1	0.6	-	-
Stair lift	30	1.5	-	-	6	2.0	1	0.3	5	1.6	4	1.6	6	4.3	5	3.0	1	0.6	2	1.1

Table 61: Adaptations required

Type of adaptation	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Walk-in bath/disabled shower	100	5.0	7	9.6	20	6.6	32	8.3	19	6.0	7	2.7	-	-	2	1.2	7	4.2	6	3.4
Bathroom grab rail	74	3.7	3	4.1	12	3.9	21	5.4	11	3.5	5	1.9	-	-	5	3.0	15	8.9	2	1.1
External access ramps	53	2.7	2	2.7	10	3.3	15	3.9	8	2.5	2	0.8	-	-	-	-	13	7.7	3	1.7
Tap adaptations	53	2.7	3	4.1	10	3.3	10	2.6	11	3.5	5	1.9	-	-	-	-	13	7.7	1	0.6
Stair lift	48	2.4	1	1.4	9	3.0	14	3.6	14	4.4	3	1.2	1	0.7	2	1.2	2	1.2	2	1.1
Handrail on stairs	40	2.0	3	4.1	8	2.6	10	2.6	8	2.5	3	1.2	-	-	1	0.6	5	3.0	2	1.1
Internal access ramps	36	1.8	1	1.4	4	1.3	8	2.1	7	2.2	3	1.2	-	-	-	-	13	7.7	-	-

Table 62: Specialist accommodation requirements

Type of accommodation	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Don't know	166	8.4	12	16.4	17	5.6	19	4.9	22	6.9	33	12.8	24	17.4	12	7.3	10	6.0	17	9.6
Accommodation without stairs	78	3.9	2	2.7	11	3.6	17	4.4	14	4.4	11	4.3	5	3.6	4	2.4	6	3.6	8	4.5
Family providing support	56	2.8	1	1.4	15	4.9	9	2.3	8	2.5	12	4.7	-	-	2	1.2	4	2.4	5	2.8
Emergency alarm system	52	2.6	-	-	7	2.3	6	1.6	10	3.2	9	3.5	3	2.2	1	0.6	12	7.1	4	2.2
Suitable for wheelchair	21	1.1	1	1.4	4	1.3	3	0.8	7	2.2	3	1.2	-	-	1	0.6	1	0.6	1	0.6
Resident warden	18	0.9	1	1.4	2	0.7	2	0.5	6	1.9	2	0.8	1	0.7	1	0.6	3	1.8	-	-
Daytime staff on site	17	0.9	1	1.4	3	1.0	4	1.0	3	0.9	3	1.2	-	-	1	0.6	1	0.6	1	0.6
Other special housing	17	0.9	-	-	5	1.6	2	0.5	2	0.6	3	1.2	2	1.4	-	-	-	-	3	1.7
Residential care home	9	0.5	-	-	3	1.0	3	0.8	1	0.3	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	1	0.6	-	-
Live-in landlady/lord	7	0.4	-	-	2	0.7	2	0.5	-	-	3	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Visiting warden	2	1.1	-	-	3	1.0	4	1.0	5	1.6	3	1.2	1	0.7	1	0.6	4	2.4	1	0.6
None of these	1671	84.1	58	79.5	262	86.2	341	88.1	270	85.2	199	77.1	105	76.1	144	87.8	143	85.1	149	83.7

Support received

At the time of the survey, a minority of the households (6.5%) were receiving some form of support from an outside agency. The largest group (27 or 1.9%) referred to floating support from CCA, followed by 5.4% who mentioned the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) and 3.8% who were receiving support from Social Services. Other agencies mentioned included a tenancy support worker, a clinical psychologist, assistance with childcare and interpretation facilities.

Just 3.2% of households (63 in total) were in receipt of housing related support services and this group were distributed across all the ethnic groups in the sample. This was more likely to be in the form of floating support (29 out of 63) than 24 hour with sleep in support or 24 hour with waking night staff. In most cases, this support was either provided by a housing association (21), a voluntary organisation (9) or one of the local authorities (8). Five respondents mentioned Co-operative Community Action and two a private company. The largest proportion (28 or 44.4%) had been receiving this support for a period of less than twelve months. This compares with 12.7% who cited a period of between one and two years and the same proportion who mentioned two to five years. One quarter of the group could not recall how long they had been in receipt of this external support.

The majority of the support received was related to specific health problems experienced by members of the household, although a sizable group also mentioned that it related to them being an Asylum seeker or refugee or that it was designed to assist them to integrate into the community.

Summary

- Evidence of health problems and disabilities were found among the sample of households with the main health problems being asthma, arthritis and high blood pressure.
- Only a minority of properties had been adapted for someone with a health problem or disability. There was a particular demand for the installation of handrails on the stairs. The need for adaptations was greatest among members of the Other Asian, Pakistani and Indian samples.
- Where adaptations were felt to be necessary, there was an associated need by the majority of this group for support to either identify or carry out appropriate adaptations to their home. There was a general lack of knowledge about which agency to approach for help with adaptations.
- The majority of respondents did not feel that they needed specialist housing. The small number who did tended to favour accommodation without stairs or accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system.
- Only a minority of households (6.5%) were, at the time of the study, receiving some form of external support and just 3.2% were in receipt of housing related support services, predominantly floating support.

Section V: Future Intentions

Introduction

Respondents were asked to indicate their plans for moving house within the foreseeable future. This potential mover group were subsequently asked a range of questions concerning their housing aspirations, such as their preferred type and tenure of property, the range of facilities they would need and preferred location.

Likelihood of moving

Three-quarters of the households were not planning on moving home in the near future compared with 17.7% who stated that they were and a small group who were undecided (8.1%).

Around one quarter of those from the Black Other, Caribbean and African communities indicated that they would expect to move house (25.6%, 24.0% and 23.3% respectively), while in contrast, the figure among the Indian and Pakistani samples were just 11.8% and 11.6% respectively. This presents a very different picture to that found nationally, with 45% of Indians reporting that they wanted to move home compared with 52% each of the Bangladeshi/Pakistani and Black households (Harrison and Phillips, 2003). Hence, it can be seen that among the main BME communities in South Nottinghamshire, there is less desire to move house than the national picture would suggest.

Table 63: Planning to move by ethnicity

Planning to move	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	1471	74.0	59	80.8	259	85.2	329	85.0	218	68.8	174	67.4	73	52.9	107	65.2	136	81.0	116	65.2
Yes	351	17.7	9	12.3	36	11.8	45	11.6	76	24.0	60	23.3	21	15.2	42	25.6	24	14.3	38	21.3
Maybe	161	8.1	5	6.8	9	3.0	12	3.1	23	7.3	24	9.3	44	31.9	15	9.1	6	3.6	23	12.9
Don't know	4	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.2	1	0.6
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

The likelihood of moving was also related to location. While only a tiny minority of residents from Broxtowe would expect to move house, and less than one fifth of those from Nottingham, Gedling and Rushcliffe, the figure among the Ashfield residents was 34.5%.

Table 64: Planning to move by location

Planning to move	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	1220	73.6	69	80.2	76	88.4	35	60.3	64	80.0
Yes	291	17.6	12	14.0	4	4.7	20	34.5	13	16.3
Maybe	143	8.6	4	4.7	6	7.0	3	5.2	3	3.8
Don't know	3	0.2	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

The group that stated that they would move or might move (accounting collectively for 512 households) generally suggested that they would move within the next twelve months (41.2%) or within the next two years (14.8%). Those who suggested a time frame of more than three years accounted for 9.1%. However, at the same time, slightly more than one quarter of this potential mover group could not stipulate a time frame for moving.

Over half of those who lived in Rushcliffe and Ashfield (56.3% and 52.2% respectively) anticipated moving within the next twelve months. The comparable figures for Nottingham, Broxtowe and Gedling residents were 39.4%, 40.0% and 31.3% respectively.

The main reasons for wanting to move varied quite considerably, although some common themes were evident, namely, the need for a larger property (37.3% mentioned this), the desire to live in a better area (15.0%) and the aspiration to buy their own home (9.6%). Other reasons cited by much smaller numbers of respondents included: the fact that they were facing eviction; the desire to move to a property with a garden; to be nearer their place of work; and to move to an area where there was less racial harassment.

In terms of the locations that respondents would want to move to, again a range of responses were elicited. While the majority would want to remain within South Nottinghamshire, others would want to move away altogether. The most popular locations within Nottingham were the City Centre (24 or 4.7%) followed by Sherwood (3.7%), Hyson Green (17 or 3.3%) and Wollaton (2.0%). West Bridgford was also found to be a popular location (23 or 4.5%).

Table 65: Time frame for moving

Time frame for moving	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Within next year	171	39.4	9	56.3	4	40.0	12	52.2	5	31.3
Within next 2 years	62	14.3	4	25.0	1	10.0	6	26.1	2	12.5
Within next 3 years	32	7.4	-	-	1	10.0	1	4.3	2	12.5
Within next 4 years	11	2.5	1	6.3	-	-	1	4.3	-	-
Within next 5 years	17	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	12.5
Longer than 5 years	12	2.8	1	6.3	-	-	1	4.3	1	6.3
Don't know	129	29.7	1	6.3	4	40.0	2	8.7	4	25.0
Total	434	84.8	16	3.1	10	2.0	23	4.5	16	3.1

Excludes 1488 not applicable cases

Despite an apparent intention to move, only 22.5% of the potential mover group had actually done anything about moving. The action taken primarily revolved around contacting a local estate agent (53 out of 115 or 10.4%), applying to a local housing association (10.2%), with smaller numbers either talking to their support worker (3.5%) or contacting private landlords (2.3%). A further group (21 in total or 4.1%) had approached the LETS scheme and six had been looking in other areas.

Members of the different ethnic groups had taken slightly different action. For example, those from the Indian and Pakistani communities had tended to either contact local estate agents or had applied to a council, while those from the Caribbean and African groups had tended to apply for social housing either with a council or a local housing association.

Table 66: Action taken in preparation for moving

Action taken	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Applied to a council	115	2.5	3	21.4	6	13.3	13	22.8	23	23.2	22	26.2	14	21.5	10	17.5	11	36.7	13	21.3
Contacted estate agents	53	10.4	3	21.4	17	37.8	13	22.8	7	7.1	8	9.5	2	3.1	1	1.8	-	-	2	3.3
Applied to a local HA	52	10.2	1	7.1	1	2.2	5	8.8	7	7.1	15	17.9	6	9.2	4	7.0	3	10.0	10	16.4
Talked to support worker	18	3.5	1	7.1	1	2.2	1	1.8	1	1.0	6	7.1	2	3.1	-	-	3	10.0	3	4.9
Contacted private landlords	12	2.3	-	-	2	4.4	1	1.8	-	-	6	7.1	2	3.1	1	1.8	-	-	-	-
None taken	273	53.3	5	35.7	18	40.0	25	43.9	56	56.6	41	48.8	41	63.1	35	61.4	17	56.7	35	57.4

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Important factors when choosing a new home

Those in the potential mover group were asked to consider which was the most important aspect when choosing a new home. The three most common aspects mentioned were: the area (38.3%), the size of the home (26.0%) and the type of property (10.4%). A sizable group (9.0%) also felt that the proximity of family and friends was also an important consideration. Other issues which were mentioned included comments about being with their own community (3.9%), general security (3.3%) and the potential to receive support (1.0%). A further 5.5% stated that they could not decide which were the most influential factors.

Preferred property type and tenure

Respondents were asked to indicate which type of property they would consider and then which would be their first choice. There was generally a greater receptiveness to a detached or semi-detached property (65.6% and 51.6%) than the remaining property types and especially in relation to a bedsit.

With the exception of those from the Iranian group, the two most favoured property types among the respondents from all the ethnic groups were a detached or a semi-detached house. However, beyond this, there was some variability between the different groups in terms of the other types of property that they would consider. For example, 34.5% of the African community would consider moving to a flat while in contrast, only 5.3% of the Indians would consider this option.

In terms of the type of property that respondents would prefer, again, the general preference was for a detached property. However there was some variability in relation to their second choice. Around three out of ten of the Iranian and Irish groups referred to a bungalow (28.6% and 30.8% respectively) while the Asian Other group would want a terraced house. There was a greater range of preferences among some of the ethnic groups compared with others, for example the African respondents would prefer a greater range of property types compared with the Irish or Indian respondents.

Table 67: Most important aspect when choosing a new home

Aspect	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Area	196	38.3	5	35.7	11	24.4	14	24.6	33	33.3	28	33.3	44	67.7	27	47.4	13	43.3	21	34.4
Size of home	133	26.0	3	21.4	22	48.9	2	38.6	22	22.2	16	19.0	17	26.2	10	17.5	5	16.7	16	26.2
Type of home	53	10.4	-	-	2	4.4	7	12.3	23	23.2	7	8.3	1	1.5	7	12.3	3	10.0	3	4.9
Near family/friends	46	9.0	2	14.3	4	8.9	4	7.0	8	8.1	10	11.9	1	1.5	4	7.0	4	13.3	9	14.8
Near own community	20	3.9	-	-	-	-	5	8.8	2	2.0	7	8.3	-	-	-	-	1	3.3	5	8.2
Other	31	6.0	3	21.4	2	4.4	2	3.5	8	8.0	5	5.9	2	3.0	3	4.0	3	10.0	3	4.9
Receiving support	5	1.0	-	-	1	2.2	1	1.8	1	1.0	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	1	3.3	-	-
Can't decide	28	5.5	1	7.1	3	6.7	2	3.5	2	2.0	10	11.9	-	-	6	10.5	-	-	4	6.6
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 68: Type of property would consider

Property type	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Semi-detached house	264	51.6	6	42.9	18	40.0	39	68.4	54	54.5	45	53.6	22	33.8	41	71.9	15	50.0	24	39.3
Detached house	336	65.6	7	50.0	33	73.3	47	82.5	67	67.7	46	54.8	42	64.6	40	70.2	17	56.7	37	60.7
Bungalow	164	32.0	5	35.7	10	22.2	10	17.5	29	29.3	16	19.0	49	75.4	16	28.1	6	20.0	23	37.7
Flat	120	23.4	2	14.3	10	22.2	3	5.3	19	19.2	29	34.5	21	32.3	8	14.0	10	33.3	18	23.4
Terraced house	116	22.7	4	28.6	10	22.2	20	35.1	15	15.2	21	25.0	5	7.7	18	31.6	13	43.3	10	16.4
Sheltered housing	7	1.4	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	2	2.0	1	1.2	1	1.5	-	-	2	6.7	-	-
Bedsit	5	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.4	-	-	-	-	1	3.3	2	3.3
Don't know	13	2.5	-	-	2	4.4	-	-	-	-	6	7.1	1	1.5	-	-	-	-	4	6.6

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 69: Type of property preferred

Property type	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Detached house	224	43.8	5	35.7	27	60.0	33	57.9	43	43.4	26	31.0	31	47.7	26	45.6	6	20.0	27	44.3
Semi-detached house	99	19.3	1	7.1	7	15.6	12	21.1	27	27.3	19	22.6	4	6.2	15	26.3	8	26.7	6	9.8
Bungalow	72	14.1	4	28.6	4	8.9	3	5.3	16	16.2	5	6.0	20	30.8	8	14.0	3	10.0	9	14.8
Flat	42	8.2	-	-	3	6.7	1	1.8	7	7.1	14	16.7	6	9.2	3	5.3	4	13.3	4	6.6
Other	29	5.6	3	21.4	1	2.2	2	3.6	3	3.0	5	6.0	3	4.6	-	-	-	-	11	18.0
Terraced house	24	4.7	-	-	-	-	6	10.5	2	2.0	6	7.1	-	-	3	5.3	7	23.3	-	-
Sheltered housing	5	1.0	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	2	6.7	-	-
Don't know	17	3.3	-	-	3	6.7	-	-	-	-	8	9.5	1	1.5	2	3.5	-	-	4	6.6
Total	512	1000.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 70: Type of property would consider and prefer

Property type	Would consider		First choice	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sheltered housing	7	1.4	5	1.0
Terraced house	116	22.7	24	4.7
Semi-detached house	264	51.6	99	19.3
Detached house	336	65.6	224	43.8
Flat	120	23.4	42	8.2
Bungalow	164	32.0	72	14.1
Bedsit	5	1.0	-	-
Other	36	7.1	27	5.7
Don't know	13	2.5	17	3.3

More than one answer was permitted

In summary then, table 70 shows that, although respondents would consider a range of property types, they would prefer to move to a detached house (43.8%), a semi-detached property (19.3%) or a bungalow (14.1%).

Over one third of the group (36.7%) would prefer to move to a newly built home, followed by a larger improved home (32.4%). A further 17.2% reported that they did not have a preference. Those who would prefer to move to either a smaller newly built home or a smaller improved home were in a minority (4.3% and 3.5% respectively).

Members of the Caribbean, Iranian and Other community groups indicated a preference for moving to a larger newly built property while the largest proportion of respondents from the remaining ethnic groups would prefer a larger improved property. The other notable feature from the table is that nearly three out of ten of the Indian respondents (28.9%) and 26.7% of the Asian Other group did not have a particular preference.

It should be remembered that the tenures that respondents will either consider or prefer will be greatly influenced by their knowledge and experience of the different tenures and their perception of accessibility. Over three-quarters of the sample as a whole would consider home ownership, followed by four out of ten who referred to council rented accommodation and one third who mentioned housing association properties. Smaller numbers would consider other tenures.

This general pattern can be seen in terms of the responses to this question by the different ethnic groups. Although greater consideration would be given to owner-occupation than other forms of tenure, this was not the case among the Asian Other group, where 66.7% indicated that they would consider council rented accommodation and 56.7% mentioned home ownership.

In terms of the tenures that respondents would actually prefer, the main preference was for owner-occupation, although the proportion from each ethnic group did vary from 92.9% (Irish) to 46.7% of the Asian Others. Among all the ethnic groups the second most preferred tenure was that of renting from a council, although again, the proportion varied from 40.0% (Asian Other) and 33.3% (Africans) to just 1.6% of the Iranians. Housing Association rented housing was more likely to be the preferred choice of tenure among members of the Other and African groups (12.1% and 10.7% respectively). In comparison, none of the Irish would prefer to live in this tenure.

Table 71: Preference for new build or improved property

Property type	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Larger newly built home	188	36.7	4	28.6	7	15.6	22	38.6	35	35.4	22	26.2	46	70.8	18	31.6	8	26.7	26	42.6
Smaller newly built home	22	4.3	-	-	2	4.4	-	-	10	10.1	1	1.2	3	4.6	2	3.5	1	3.3	3	4.9
Larger improved home	166	32.4	8	57.1	18	40.0	27	47.4	23	23.2	27	32.1	12	18.5	25	43.9	11	36.7	15	24.6
Smaller improved home	18	3.5	-	-	2	4.4	-	-	4	4.0	6	7.1	-	-	2	3.5	1	3.3	3	4.9
No particular preference	88	17.2	2	14.3	13	28.9	8	14.0	21	21.2	17	20.2	2	3.1	6	10.5	8	26.7	11	18.0
Don't know	30	5.9	-	-	3	6.7	-	-	6	6.1	11	13.1	2	3.1	4	7.0	1	3.3	3	4.9
Total	512	1000.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 72: Tenure of property would consider

Property type	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Home ownership	400	78.1	13	92.9	39	86.7	46	80.7	86	86.9	51	60.7	56	86.2	50	87.7	17	56.7	42	68.9
Council rented	221	43.2	3	21.4	10	22.2	22	38.6	39	39.4	45	53.6	27	41.5	27	47.4	20	66.7	28	45.9
HA rented	171	33.4	2	14.3	9	20.0	13	22.8	24	24.2	26	31.0	42	64.6	10	17.5	12	40.0	33	54.1
Private rented	104	20.3	1	7.1	2	4.4	7	12.3	12	12.1	10	11.9	45	69.2	5	8.8	4	13.3	18	29.5
Group/shared home	11	2.1	2	14.3	-	-	1	1.8	2	2.0	3	3.6	-	-	1	1.8	1	3.3	1	1.6
Grant assisted home ownership	44	8.6	1	7.1	2	4.4	7	12.3	10	10.1	11	13.1	-	-	6	10.5	1	3.3	6	9.8
Moving in with family	19	3.7	1	7.1	3	6.7	2	3.5	5	5.1	3	3.6	-	-	-	-	3	10.0	2	3.3
None of these	15	2.9	-	-	2	4.4	-	-	2	2.0	6	7.1	1	1.5	1	1.8	-	-	3	4.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 73: Preferred tenure of property

Property type	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Home ownership	365	73.4	13	92.9	37	86.0	40	70.2	79	81.4	42	53.8	56	87.5	47	83.9	14	46.7	37	63.8
Council rented	81	16.3	1	7.1	2	4.7	13	22.8	12	12.4	26	33.3	1	1.6	6	10.7	12	40.0	8	13.8
HA rented	27	5.4	-	-	2	4.7	2	3.5	1	1.0	8	10.3	4	6.3	2	3.6	1	3.3	7	12.1
Private rented	11	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.1	-	-	3	4.7	-	-	1	3.3	5	8.6
Group/shared home	3	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	-	-	1	1.8	-	-	1	1.7
Grant assisted home ownership	7	1.4	-	-	1	2.3	2	3.5	2	2.1	2	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moving in with family	3	0.6	-	-	1	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6.7	-	-
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Owner-occupation was also more likely to be the preferred choice of respondents from particular areas, most notably those from Gedling (93.3%) and Broxtowe (90.0%). Council rented accommodation was more likely to be the preference of those living in Nottingham (17.8%), Ashfield (21.7%) and Gedling (6.7%). None of those currently living in Rushcliffe or Broxtowe would prefer this tenure.

Table 74 Preferred tenure of property by location

Tenure	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Home ownership	302	71.6	14	87.5	9	90.0	15	65.2	14	93.3
Council rented	75	17.8	-	-	-	-	5	21.7	1	6.7
HA rented	24	5.7	1	6.3	1	10.0	1	4.3	-	-
Private rented	10	2.4	1	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Group/shared home	2	0.5	-	-	-	-	1	4.3	-	-
Grant assisted home ownership	7	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moving in with family	2	0.5	-	-	-	-	1	4.3	-	-
Total	434	84.8	16	3.1	10	2.0	23	4.5	15	3.1

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Half of those who stated a preference for a specific tenure felt that they would achieve their first choice. This compares with 12.3% who argued that they would not get their preference and over one third (37.7%) who were unsure.

While six out of ten of those from the Pakistani, Black Other, Irish, Asian Other Caribbean and Indian samples felt that they would achieve their first choice, the figure among the Other group was 41.0% and for the Africans, 40.5%. At the same time, just 7.7% of the Iranians expressed this view, although this equated to only five individuals.

Those living in Nottingham and Broxtowe were the least likely to suggest that they would obtain their first choice of tenure. This contrasts with 73.9% of those living in Ashfield and over eight out of ten of the Gedling residents (81.3%).

The main reasons given as to why they felt that they would not achieve their first choice related primarily to their lack of finances (in relation to buying their own home) and the lack of housing available within their preferred area. Three respondents also felt that achieving their preferred tenure would be some way off in the future and two commented that they might experience discrimination due to being members of the BME community. One respondent argued that their age would act as a barrier to entering owner-occupation and another simply commented that 'my situation does not permit it.'

Table 75: Views on likelihood of getting preferred tenure choice

Get first choice	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	256	50.0	9	64.3	27	60.0	39	68.4	60	60.6	34	40.5	5	7.7	38	66.7	19	63.3	25	41.0
No	63	12.3	1	7.1	6	13.3	4	7.0	26	26.3	9	10.7	1	1.5	5	8.8	3	10.0	8	13.1
Don't know	193	37.7	4	28.6	12	26.7	14	24.6	13	13.1	41	48.8	59	90.8	14	24.6	8	26.7	28	45.9
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Size of property and facilities required

In terms of the size of the property required and the amenities available, the following was noted.

Nearly four out of ten would need a property with three bedrooms and 26.2% referred to needing two. Those who felt that they would need four or more bedrooms accounted for one quarter (25.2%) and included a small group who stated a requirement for either seven or eight bedrooms. Those who required more than four bedrooms were generally from the Pakistani and Caribbean communities. In contrast, the largest proportion of Iranian potential movers would just need two bedrooms and only 21.5% would require three or more. Over half the potential movers would just want one living room (55.3%), although four out of ten (41.4%) referred to needing two. The demand for two or more living rooms was greatest among the Pakistani respondents.

The vast majority (97.9%) reported needing just one kitchen.

In relation to the number of bathrooms, two-thirds identified a need for one and 29.5% mentioned needing two. In addition, thirteen respondents stated that they would need three. Members of the Pakistani and Asian Other groups were at least twice as likely as those from the remaining ethnic groups to need two bathrooms.

Purchase of next property

Members of the potential mover group were asked to indicate how they would purchase their next home. Just 13.5% indicated that they did not intend to buy a property. The majority of the remainder stated that they would raise the necessary money through a mortgage (75.8%) while 7.2% suggested that they would use their own money or borrow the money in some other way (2.3%).

It is interesting that although the majority of all the ethnic groups would look to arrange a conventional mortgage to purchase their next home, the proportion varied. The Irish were much more likely to suggest that they would use their own money (21.4%) than those from the other ethnic groups where around one in ten or less would pursue this option. The proportion who reported that they did not intend to buy was much greater among the African and Asian Other samples (25.0% and 20.0% respectively) than for the remaining groups.

Table 76: Size of property required

Number of bedrooms	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	43	8.4	3	21.4	-	-	-	-	3	3.0	7	8.3	9	13.8	1	1.8	3	10.0	17	27.9
Two	134	26.2	1	7.1	8	17.8	2	3.5	25	25.3	20	23.8	42	64.6	11	19.3	9	30.0	16	26.2
Three	198	38.7	5	35.7	15	33.3	23	40.4	43	43.4	41	48.8	13	20.0	25	43.9	12	40.0	21	34.4
Four	102	19.1	4	28.6	14	31.1	22	38.6	19	19.2	13	15.5	1	1.5	18	31.6	4	13.3	7	11.5
Five	25	4.9	1	7.1	5	11.1	7	12.3	6	6.1	2	2.4	-	-	2	3.5	2	6.7	-	-
Six	5	1.0	-	-	1	2.2	2	3.5	1	1.0	1	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seven	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eight or more	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	3	0.6	-	-	2	4.4	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Table 77: Views on how a property would be purchased

How purchase property	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Get a mortgage	388	75.8	8	57.1	36	80.0	42	73.7	74	74.7	58	69.0	64	98.5	44	77.2	21	70.0	41	67.2
Borrow money	12	2.3	1	7.1	2	4.4	-	-	4	4.0	1	1.2	-	-	3	5.3	1	3.3	-	-
Use own money	37	7.2	3	21.4	1	2.2	6	10.5	9	9.1	4	4.8	-	-	1	1.8	2	6.7	11	18.0
Another way	6	1.2	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	4	4.0	-	-	-	-	1	1.8	-	-	-	-
Don't intend to buy	69	13.5	1	7.1	6	13.3	9	15.8	8	8.1	21	25.0	1	1.5	8	14.0	6	20.0	9	14.8
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Excludes 1475 not applicable cases

Inter-generational housing

It is important to appreciate the extent to which traditional forms of family living are changing among the BME communities in order to build such considerations in to the strategic framework for responding to the housing needs of these communities. The question was posed ‘When your children get married, where will they live?’

For one third of the sample (33.6%), this question was not relevant either because they did not have any children or because their children were already married. A similar proportion reported that they would expect their children, upon marriage, to move to their own accommodation. The remaining respondents indicated that they would expect their married children to live with them (2.9%), or that the eldest married son would remain with his parents in their home and the other children would move to alternative accommodation (2.3%). The possibility of all members of the household moving together was referred to by 2.7%.

Views on this issue did vary according to ethnic origin, reflecting their cultural traditions. Members of the Pakistani community were more likely than those from the remaining ethnic groups to suggest that their children would either live with them, the family would all move together or that the eldest son would remain in the parental home and the other children would move out.

Table 78: Views on where children will live upon marriage

Views	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No children/already married	667	33.6	32	43.8	130	42.8	45	11.6	111	35.0	77	29.8	97	70.3	38	23.2	50	29.8	87	48.9
They will live here	57	2.9	1	1.4	8	2.6	30	7.8	5	1.6	4	1.6	1	0.7	1	0.6	4	2.4	3	1.7
Move to own home	665	33.5	26	35.6	73	24.0	129	33.3	161	50.8	96	37.2	6	4.3	80	48.8	46	27.4	48	27.0
Eldest son will stay, others will move	45	2.3	-	-	4	1.3	30	7.8	4	1.3	2	0.8	-	-	1	0.6	4	2.4	-	-
All move together	53	2.7	1	1.4	3	1.0	23	5.9	2	0.6	11	4.3	-	-	-	-	11	6.5	2	1.1
Something else	58	2.9	2	2.7	13	4.3	19	4.9	2	0.6	6	2.3	-	-	3	1.8	7	4.2	6	3.4
Don't know	442	22.2	11	15.1	73	24.0	111	28.7	32	10.1	62	24.0	34	34.6	41	25.0	46	27.4	32	18.0
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Summary

- The vast majority of households were not planning on moving from their current home: 17.7% stated that they were wanting to move and this was more likely to be the case among the Black Other, Caribbean and African groups.
- The likelihood of moving was also related to location: one third of those from Ashfield indicated a preference for moving.
- The main reasons put forward for wanting to move included the need for a larger property and the desire to live in a better area. A sizeable group also wanted to move to buy their own home.
- The majority of the potential mover group would want to continue to live within South Nottinghamshire.
- Only around one fifth of the potential movers had actively done anything about moving, such as contacting local estate agents or applying to a local housing association.
- The three most important factors when choosing a new home were deemed to be: the area; the size of the new home and the type of property.
- The majority of the potential movers wanted to move to either a detached or semi-detached property. Some of the ethnic groups (e.g. Africans) would consider a greater range of property types than other groups.
- There was also found to be a preference for a newly built home, followed by a larger improved home.
- Over three-quarters of the sample would consider home ownership with smaller numbers preferring housing association tenancies and then council rented accommodation. However, the general preference was for home ownership, although the proportion varied across the nine ethnic groups.
- Slightly more than one out of ten felt that they would not achieve their first choice of tenure, primarily due to the cost involved (for those preferring home ownership) and the lack of available properties in their area of choice.
- There was an identified need for properties ranging in size from two to those with seven or eight bedrooms, although the largest group indicated a need for three bedrooms. Property sizes varied according to ethnicity.
- Although half of the potential movers would want just one living room, four out of ten referred to needing two. The demand for two or more living rooms was greatest among the Pakistani respondents. A similar finding was evident in relation to the number of bathrooms required.

- The vast majority of the potential mover group intended to buy their next property and most of these would look to buy through a conventional mortgage.
- The largest proportion of respondents would expect their children to move to their own accommodation when they got married. Alternative scenarios (e.g. all the family would move together) were more likely to be preferred by the Pakistani respondents.

Section VI: Views on Consultation

Introduction

This final section reviews the respondents' views on the amount of consultation with their community and their preferred methods of being consulted.

Views on amount of consultation

Although half the sample as a whole felt that they were consulted enough about issues which affected their community (50.3%), one third of the sample, expressed the opposing view (34.3%) and the remainder (15.5%) were unsure.

While over half of those from the Indian, Pakistani, Iranian and Asian Other groups felt that there was sufficient consultation, the figure for the remaining groups ranged from 36.6% (Black Other) to 49.3% (Irish). The Caribbeans and Black Other respondents were the most likely to suggest that there was not enough consultation.

The issue of consultation was discussed with all the focus group participants. Very few of them had experience of being consulted but would generally welcome the opportunity to voice their concerns and views. Those who had some experience of being consulted were generally critical either of the way the consultation process had taken place (i.e. asked to attend an open meeting) or that very little had resulted from their involvement. One of the Caribbean men in the groups suggested that consultation was just a buzzword and didn't really mean very much in practice. He further commented:

'It's okay asking us what we think and what we want but then you have to act on it. Nothing ever changes but people still want to know what we think. Why should we bother, they don't listen. My time is precious just like theirs.'

It was suggested that generally, consultation would be more successful if:

- It took place within community venues
- It sought views on issues which were relevant to local people and the local environment
- People were aware of what would happen next (i.e. the process); and
- Those who had been consulted were given feedback on the views elicited and how these would be put into practice.

To sum up, in the words of one of the African participants:

'Ask me once and I'll tell you. Ask me twice and I'll consider it, but don't ask me a third time.'

While three-quarters of those living in Rushcliffe and seven out of ten of those from Broxtowe argued that there was enough consultation with BME groups, the figure for Gedling and Nottingham residents was 51.3% and 49.1% respectively. In direct contrast, just three out of ten of those living in Ashfield expressed this view and indeed, 44.8% argued that there was not enough consultation.

Table 79: Views on amount of consultation with BME community

Amount of consultation	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes – enough	999	50.3	36	49.3	206	67.8	249	64.3	106	33.4	87	33.7	72	52.2	60	36.6	99	58.9	84	47.2
No – not enough	681	34.3	28	38.4	62	20.4	86	22.2	181	57.1	114	44.2	19	13.8	89	54.3	43	25.6	59	33.1
Don't know	307	15.5	9	12.3	36	11.8	52	13.4	30	9.5	57	22.1	47	34.1	15	9.1	26	15.5	35	19.7
Total	1987	100.0	73	3.7	304	15.3	387	19.5	317	16.0	258	13.0	138	6.9	164	8.3	168	8.5	178	9.0

Table 80: Views on amount of consultation according to location

Tenure	Nottingham		Rushcliffe		Broxtowe		Ashfield		Gedling	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes – enough	813	49.1	66	76.7	61	70.9	18	31.0	41	51.3
No – not enough	586	35.4	13	15.1	14	16.3	26	44.8	32	40.0
Don't know	258	15.6	7	8.1	11	12.8	14	24.1	7	8.8
Total	1657	83.4	86	4.3	86	4.3	58	2.9	80	4.0

Preferred method of consultation

Respondents were asked to indicate their preferred method of consultation from a pre-defined list. As the table below reveals, one of the most noticeable findings is that three out of ten of the sample indicated that they were not interested in being consulted. For the remainder, the three most favoured methods of consultation were: via letter to the individual householder (48.0%), by telephone (22.3%) and by one-to-one meetings (21.0%). A similar proportion would also welcome being consulted through open meetings. There was also interest from a sizeable group in the use of surveys. The proportion who would like to be consulted by email or the Internet accounted for just less than one in ten. This proportion is much higher than is generally found in similar BME surveys in other parts of the country where the proportion is less than one in twenty.

The first point to note when considering the views of the respondents from the nine ethnic groups concerning their preferred methods for being consulted is that the proportion of each group who reported that they were not interested in consultation varied enormously from 53.4% of the Irish respondents to just 1.4% of the Iranians.

With the exception of the Pakistani respondents the most favoured method was that of the personal letter, ranging from 65.4% of the Africans who advocated this method, to 32.9% of the Irish. A combination of personal letters and telephone contact was the preferred approach for the Iranian and Other groups. The Caribbean, African, Black Other and Asian Other respondents referred to personal letters followed by the use of open meetings. The Irish and the Indians would want to be consulted, as a second preference, through surveys, while the Pakistanis favoured one-to-one meetings followed closely by telephone contact

Table 81: Preferred method of consultation

Method	Total		Irish		Indian		Pakistani		Caribbean		African		Iranian		Black Other		Asian Other		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Letter	953	48.0	24	32.9	111	36.5	118	30.5	162	51.1	168	65.1	119	86.2	93	56.7	64	38.1	94	52.8
Telephone	443	22.3	4	5.5	30	9.9	152	39.3	41	12.9	57	22.1	73	52.9	24	14.6	23	13.7	39	21.9
One-to-one meetings	435	21.9	5	6.8	27	8.9	155	40.1	51	16.1	46	17.8	65	47.1	27	16.5	31	18.5	28	15.7
Email/Internet	190	9.6	4	5.5	13	4.3	21	5.4	36	11.4	38	14.7	35	25.4	17	10.4	9	5.4	17	9.6
Newsletter	35	1.8	-	-	5	1.6	8	2.1	5	1.6	4	1.6	-	-	4	2.4	2	1.2	7	3.9
Through open meetings	421	21.2	10	13.7	41	13.5	137	35.4	54	17.0	84	32.6	10	7.2	31	18.9	32	19.0	22	12.4
Through surveys	339	17.1	11	15.1	107	35.2	35	9.0	36	11.4	75	29.1	9	6.5	22	13.4	26	15.5	18	10.1
Via tenants associations	131	6.6	4	5.5	15	4.9	13	3.4	20	6.3	35	13.6	2	1.4	17	10.4	17	10.1	8	4.5
Not interested	604	30.4	39	53.4	120	39.5	109	28.2	113	35.6	36	14.0	2	1.4	52	31.7	72	42.9	61	34.3
Total	512	100.0	14	2.7	45	8.8	57	11.1	99	19.3	84	16.4	65	12.7	57	11.1	30	5.9	61	11.9

Summary

- Although the majority felt that there was sufficient consultation with the BME community, one third felt that this was not the case. Ashfield residents were the least satisfied with their experience of consultation.
- There was generally a preference for consultation by letter, followed by the telephone, one-to-one meeting and open meetings. However, views on this issue did vary according to ethnic grouping.

Chapter IV: Findings from the other household member interviews

Introduction

In addition to the main household interview with the head of household, short supplementary interviews were conducted with other household members available at the time. These were randomly selected. In total 375 such interviews were undertaken across the 1987 households who participated in the main survey. More than half of these group included women aged 25-55 who were not the head of household and a further 38.9% were young people aged 16-24. The remainder (7.8%) were older household members aged 55 and over.

For the purposes of analysis given the relatively small numbers involved the individual ethnic groups have been combined into five broad groups: Irish; those of Mixed ethnic background, African and Caribbean; Asian; and Other.

The findings for each of these three interviewee groups will be discussed in turn.

Young people

Introduction

Over half of those who agreed to be interviewed (54.8%) were from the Asian community with slightly less than three out of ten describing themselves as being either African or Caribbean (27.4%). Much smaller numbers were of Mixed ethnic origin (8.2%), members of an Other ethnic group (6.8%) or Irish (2.7%).

In terms of location, the vast majority (84.9%) lived in the area covered by Nottingham City Council, with 15.4% from Ashfield and one in ten (10.7%) from Broxtowe. Those from Gedling and Rushcliffe accounted for 7.8% and 6.5% respectively.

This group of respondents were asked to comment upon whether or not they were planning on moving into their own accommodation in the near future and their property type and tenure aspirations (see attached questionnaire- Appendix 1).

Planning on moving to own accommodation

Slightly less than half (48.6%) reported that they were not planning to look for independent accommodation within the next year, contrasting with four out of ten (39.0%) who expressed the opposite view. However, at the same time, 12.3% were undecided. Those who were looking to move were more likely to be from the Mixed and Irish groups (58.3% and 50.0% respectively) compared with those young people from the African and Caribbean communities (45.0%), the Asian sample (35.0%) and especially in contrast to those from the Other ethnic group (20.0%).

Those who were not planning on moving within the next twelve months generally argued that they would expect to move out of the parental home within the next two years (50.0%) or the next

three years (13.3%). A small group felt that this was not likely to happen for at least another five years. At the same time, however, one fifth of this group commented that they did not know when they were likely to move.

The majority of the potential mover group anticipated either moving within the same area or to other locations within South Nottinghamshire. Those who would look to relocate to other areas of the country (such as London and Liverpool) accounted for less than one in twenty (4.0%). Again, however, a sizeable group were unsure, at this point, about where they would look to move to.

In terms of the action taken in anticipation of finding their own accommodation, the vast majority (70.7%) had not taken any action. In contrast, one fifth (20.0%) had applied to a council. While this group of potential council housing renters accounted for around three out of ten of those from the Irish, Mixed, African and Caribbean and the Other groups, the proportion among the Asian young people was much smaller at 5.7%. Just less than one in ten had applied to a local housing association (9.3%). Around 4.0% had approached a private landlord – all of whom were either from the Asian community or the African and Caribbean group. A slightly larger number (5.3%) had contacted local estate agents and one person had spoken to their support worker.

Issues influencing choice of new home

Respondents were asked to consider what factors or aspects they regarded as the most important when choosing a new home. The largest group (37.0%) cited the area of residence, followed by 13.0% who suggested that being near family and friends was the most influential factor. Slightly more than one in ten (11.0%) referred to health issues. The type and the size of the property were seen as being less important (8.2% and 9.6% respectively). The importance of moving to a property where appropriate support could be received was acknowledged by a small minority (3.4%). There was little variability in views according to ethnicity, with the largest proportion of all five ethnic groups referring to the area as being the most important factor, although this did vary from 75.0% of the Irish young people to 32.5% of those from the African and Caribbean group.

Preferred property type and tenure

Table 1: Property type would consider and first choice

Property type	Would consider		First choice	
	No.	%	No.	%
Terraced	31	21.2	8	6.8
Semi-detached	72	49.3	26	22.0
Detached	81	55.5	52	44.1
Flat	41	28.1	19	16.1
Bungalow	21	14.4	6	5.1
Bedsit	6	4.1	6	5.1
Another type	8	5.5	1	0.8
Don't know	28	19.2	-	-
Total			118	100.0

More than one answer was permitted

The table above shows the range of property types that the group of potential movers would consider. They were least likely to favour a bedsit or bungalow (4.1% and 14.4%) respectively) in contrast to either a detached or semi-detached property (55.5% and 49.3% respectively). However, more definite views were expressed in terms of their preferred type of property with 44.1% referring to a detached home, 22.0% a semi-detached and 16.1% mentioned a flat as being their first choice. There was little interest in the remaining types of property.

Although half the Irish young people and those from the Mixed and Asian groups identified a detached house as being their first choice, the comparable figures among the African and Caribbean and Other samples was lower at 33.3% and 22.2% respectively. Indeed, a relatively large proportion of those from the African and Caribbean group would prefer to move to a flat (36.7%), directly contrasting with just 8.1% of the Asian young people. The other interesting finding is that the Asians were more likely to stipulate a terraced house as their first choice than those in the remaining ethnic groups.

Similar numbers would prefer either a larger improved home (21.9%) or had no particular preference (20.5%), while a slightly smaller group made reference to wanting a smaller newly built home (19.9%). The least popular option was moving to a smaller improved home (see table 2).

Table 2: Preferred type of home

Type	No.	%
Larger newly built home	26	17.8
Smaller newly built home	29	19.9
Larger improved home	32	21.9
Smaller improved home	6	4.1
No particular preference	30	20.5
Don't know	23	15.8
Total	146	100.0

Table 3: Tenure would consider and first choice

Tenure	Would consider		First choice	
	No.	%	No.	%
Own own home	108	74.0	93	73.2
Council rented	67	45.9	23	18.1
HA rented	37	25.3	1	0.8
Private rented	17	11.6	1	0.8
Group/shared home	8	5.5	2	1.6
Grant-assisted home ownership	21	14.4	4	3.1
Move in with other family members	5	3.4	1	0.8
None of these	16	11.0	-	-
Don't know	3	2.1	2	1.6
Total			127	100.0

More than one answer was permitted

Table 3 shows the different tenures that young people would consider and their first choice. Three-quarters of the group would consider moving to their own home and a further 45.9% would

consider council rented accommodation with one quarter suggesting that they would consider a housing association property (25.3%).

However, a rather different picture emerges when respondents were asked to indicate their preferred choice: the overwhelming preference (73.2%) was for home ownership and slightly less than one fifth would prefer council housing. Only a tiny minority would actually prefer any of the remaining tenures listed.

Although the vast majority of each ethnic group would prefer to own their own home, the proportions varied from 54.6% of the African and Caribbeans to 100.0% of the Irish. The former group were much more likely than young people from the other ethnic groups to indicate a preference for council housing and particularly in contrast to the Asian group (8.3%).

Six out of ten felt that it was likely that they would get their first choice of tenure. This was found to be particularly the case among the Asian and African and Caribbeans (64.3% and 58.1% respectively). Just over one quarter felt that they were not sure whether or not they would secure their preferred tenure.

Size of property required and facilities

Generally, this group of young people would need either just a one-bedroom property (36.3%) or two bedrooms (23.3%). In contrast, one in ten commented that they would need four bedrooms and a tiny minority cited five (1.4%).

Two-thirds (67.1%) would need just one living room with the remainder needing two. A large proportion of this latter group were Asian. While only one kitchen would be required and three-quarters referred to just one bathroom, 24.7% felt that they would need to have two bathrooms.

Purchasing a property

The general consensus was that they would purchase their home via a conventional mortgage (67.1%) with just one in twenty suggesting that they would use their own money. One fifth argued that they did not intend to buy and this group were predominantly from the African and Caribbean sample.

Summary

- Over half of the young people aged 16-24 were from the Asian community and three out of ten were either African or Caribbean.
- Eight out of ten came from the Nottingham area.
- Slightly less than half were not intending to look for their own accommodation within the next twelve months, while four out of ten would wish to do so.
- The majority of the potential mover group would want to live within the same area as their parents and only a minority would look to locate away from South Nottinghamshire.

- The area of residence was the principle factor which would influence their choice of where to move to: smaller numbers cited the proximity of family and friends.
- Although they would consider a range of property types, there was a preference for detached or semi-detached properties.
- Similarly, while they would consider a number of tenures, seven out of ten would want home ownership as their first choice while nearly one in five would prefer council housing. Preference was found to be related to ethnicity. Only six out of ten felt that they were likely to get their first choice.
- Generally, there was an identified need for smaller properties with one or two bedrooms, one rather than two living rooms and just one bathroom.
- Most of those who would want to be owner-occupiers would look to purchase their first home via a conventional mortgage.

Women

Introduction

The group of 192 women who were interviewed, where they were not the head of household, were generally from the Nottingham area (77.1%), with 6.3% from Rushcliffe and Broxtowe and smaller numbers from Gedling (5.2%) and Ashfield (3.1%).

In terms of ethnicity, nearly two-thirds of those interviewed were from the Asian community (64.1%) with 16.1% describing themselves as being either African or Caribbean. Smaller numbers were from the Other ethnic group (13.5%), of Mixed ethnic background (5.2%) or Irish (1.0%).

The women were primarily asked to comment on the services available in their area for children and BME women (see attached questionnaire – Appendix 1).

Level of satisfaction with the home

Six out of ten women reported being satisfied with their home and a further 16.7% were very satisfied. In contrast, 7.8% were negative, a greater proportion of whom were dissatisfied as opposed to being very dissatisfied. Those who were critical of their home were more likely to be from the African and Caribbean community (46.2% of this ethnic group were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), than those women from the remaining groups. Among those who were negative (43 in total), the main issues highlighted related to the inadequate size of their home and concerns about the level of overcrowding (18 or 42.0% mentioned this issue), followed by criticism about the state of repair and general condition of their home (6 or 14.0%), with smaller numbers referring to not feeling safe in their own home (2 or 4.7%), the reputation of the area (1 or 2.3%) and the lack of parking facilities. Eight out of the nine African and Caribbean women who were negative about their home cited the issue of overcrowding as the main reason, as did twelve out of the twenty-two Asian women.

Table 4: Level of satisfaction with home

Level of satisfaction	No.	%
Very satisfied	32	16.7
Satisfied	115	59.9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28	14.6
Dissatisfied	13	6.8
Very dissatisfied	2	1.0
Don't know	2	1.0
Total	192	100.0

Views on facilities for children

Among the group of women as a whole, slightly less than half (48.9%) were positive about the services and facilities available in their area for children. In contrast, 14.6% were negative. A greater proportion of the African and Caribbean women were critical (38.8%) compared with those from the Asian community (10.6%), the Other and Irish groups (14.4% and 7.7%

respectively). None of those from the Mixed ethnic group were negative about the services and facilities available.

Table 4: Level of satisfaction with facilities and services for children

Level of satisfaction	No.	%
Very satisfied	21	10.9
Satisfied	73	38.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	50	26.0
Dissatisfied	15	7.8
Very dissatisfied	13	6.8
Don't know	20	10.4
Total	192	100.0

Additional services

Slightly more than one third of the women suggested that there were services which were not currently available where they lived but which they would like to see developed and a further 28.6% were unsure. Those from the African and Caribbean and Asian groups (51.6% and 39.0% respectively) were especially likely to suggest that additional services were required.

Among the women as a whole, there was a call for more leisure facilities (17 out of 70 or 24.3%), followed by children facilities such as play groups and specially designated children's play area (14 or 20.0%), community centres (9 or 12.9%) and learning facilities (9 or 12.9%). Other facilities and services mentioned included additional childcare provision (5 or 7.1%), a centre for disabled Asian women (2 or 2.9%), Black food shops (2 or 2.9%) and a day care centre (1 or 1.4%). Differences in opinion can be seen across the ethnic groups in terms of the additional facilities required. The main services required by the Asian women were leisure facilities (13 or 27.1% of this group mentioned this) and learning facilities (9 or 18.8%), while among the African and Caribbean women the major gaps in provision were felt to be children's facilities (7 or 43.8%) and child care places (3 or 18.8%).

Support needs

The women were asked if they had any support needs and if so, the type of support that they felt they required. Only a small group, equating to one in twenty of this group, did feel that they needed support (11 women in total), with three suggesting that they had mobility problems and three more highlighting the need for home help. In addition, two of the women needed some form of financial support and one each referred to English language classes, interpretation services and support to help them integrate into the community.

Facilities for BME women

Slightly more than four out of ten (43.8%) reported that they would like to see services developed in their locality which catered specifically for the needs of BME women and a further 31.8% were unsure. In direct contrast, just 24.5% felt that such additional facilities and services were not required. Asian women were much more likely to suggest that additional services were necessary (59.3%) than compared with those from the Mixed (30.0%), African and Caribbean (19.4%) and Other ethnic groups (7.7%). None of the Irish women felt that additional services were required. A wide range of services were advocated with the main one being: the provision of a community centre which was available to women (41 out of 84 or 48.8% mentioned this and was the main service identified by the Asian women); day centres (20 or 23.8% - again the majority of these were from the Asian community), more leisure facilities (6 or 7.1%), a luncheon club (4 or 4.8%), care groups (3 or 3.6%) and organised social activities (2 or 2.4%).

Summary

- Two-thirds of those women who were interviewed were from the Asian community and smaller numbers were either African or Caribbean.
- The vast majority of women were satisfied with their home - just 7.8% were negative. Those who were critical were most likely to be African or Caribbean. The main problems with their current home were its inadequate size and concerns over the state of repair.
- A group of 14.6% were critical of the facilities in the area for children: African and Caribbean women were the most critical.
- Slightly more than one third felt that additional services were required. The most commonly mentioned were additional leisure facilities, community centres and learning facilities.
- Only a minority of women had support needs and these mentioned either mobility problems or the need for home help.
- Four out of ten would like to see facilities developed for their own community. Asian women were more likely to suggest that additional facilities were required. The most commonly mentioned were community centres, day centres and more leisure facilities.

Older people

Introduction

In terms of those older people aged 55 and over who were interviewed (37 in total), the vast majority (78.4%) were Asian and the sample also included four African Caribbeans (10.8%), three of Mixed background (8.1%) and one respondent who was from the Other ethnic group (2.7%).

Six out of ten of this group (62.2%) were from Nottingham while those from Broxtowe accounted for 13.5%. Smaller numbers were from Rushcliffe (8.1%), Gedling (8.1%) and Ashfield (5.4%).

This group were asked about their need for independent accommodation and support requirements (see attached questionnaire – Appendix 1).

Views on need for own accommodation

Nine out of ten of this group of older respondents felt that they would need their own independent accommodation in the near future. Indeed, only two respondents (5.4%) felt that this would not be the case.

In terms of the type of accommodation they would consider moving to, only a minority indicated a specific preference: three referred to accommodation without stairs.

Support needs

Seven respondents (18.9%) and all of whom were from the Asian community felt that they had support needs which were not currently being met. Three of this group made reference to a separate toilet and two felt that they would benefit from the services of a home help. One each mentioned 'daily help' and assistance with mobility.

Facilities for older people

Nearly three-quarters of the sample felt that there was a need for additional services for older members of the community where they lived. There was an over-riding preference for a day centre (14 or 51.9% referred to this), followed by 'more clubs' (6 or 22.2%), general help (3 or 11.1%) and more information (1 or 3.7%).

Summary

- The majority of the older people who took part were from the Asian community (nearly eight out of ten).
- Nine out of ten felt that they would need their own accommodation within the near future, although few had a specific preference.
- Just less than one fifth felt that they had support needs, either in terms of adaptations to their existing home or the provision of home help.

- There was a general need identified for more facilities for older people within the community setting. A day centre was seen as the most important facility that was required.

Chapter V: Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Introduction

The UK is a signatory to the 1951 UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol. All applications for asylum made at UK ports of entry or within the country are considered in accordance with the obligations under the Convention. The Convention states that a refugee is a person who 'owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country'.

Support is provided to asylum seekers who are destitute whilst their claims for asylum are being considered. Accommodation is provided on a "no choice" basis in parts of the UK where there is less pressure on accommodation than in London and other parts of the South East. Asylum seekers are given subsistence payments in order that they may purchase food and other goods. This 'dispersal' of asylum seekers and their support is provided by the National Asylum Support Service (NASS)

In 2002, 51,695 asylum appeals were received by the Home Office, a 30% fall compared with 201. The main nationalities of applicants in 2002 were Iraqi (17%), Zimbabwean (9%), Afghan (9%), Somali (8%) and Chinese (4%). Over one third of all applications in 202 were from African nationals, 25% were from Asian nationals, 22% were from nationals of the Middle East and 16% were from European nationals.

Within the City of Nottingham, there are approximately 1,600 bed-spaces managed by 3 main providers for the National Asylum Support Service (NASS). In May 2003, within this accommodation, there were 904 people in 240 family units. The main nationalities are Iraqi (mainly Kurdish), Iranian, Somali and Zimbabwean. There are, however, over 70 different nationalities speaking approximately 40 different languages

The study findings

Respondents to the household survey were asked to indicate if they were an Asylum Seeker or Refugee and 295 or 14.8% stated that they were. Just less than half this group (47.5%) reported being in receipt of the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) benefit. Where relevant, the findings distinguish between those who are acknowledge to be Asylum Seekers (on the basis of receiving NASS) and refugees.

The table below highlights the ethnic origin of this group according to the 2001 census of Population categorisation. The largest group were from Iran (39.3%), with a slightly smaller group (32.9%), classifying themselves as being African (with a large proportion of this group being from Somalia). Much smaller numbers were Kurdish (8.1%), from an Other Asian background (3.7%) or Pakistani (3.4%). The full range of ethnic groups represented among the Asylum Seeker and Refugee group is shown in table 1.

Table 1: Background of Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Ethnicity	No. %		Asylum Seekers		Refugees	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White & Caribbean	8	2.7	2	25.0	6	75.0
White & African	2	0.7	1	50.0	1	50.0
White and Asian	8	2.7	-	-	8	100.0
Any other mixed background	3	1.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
Indian	2	0.7	2	100.0	-	-
Pakistani	10	3.4	5	50.0	5	50.0
Bangladeshi	1	3.4	-	-	1	100.0
Any other Asian background	11	3.7	2	18.2	9	81.8
Caribbean	8	2.7	4	50.0	4	50.0
African	97	32.9	43	44.3	54	55.7
Any other Black background	1	0.3	1	100.0	-	-
Any other background	2	0.7	1	50.0	1	50.0
Iranian	116	39.3	67	52.6	55	47.4
Kurdish	24	8.1	16	66.7	8	33.3
Romany	1	0.3	-	-	1	100.0
Refused	1	0.3	-	-	1	100.0
Total	295	100.0				

Although among some of the ethnic groups the numbers are very small, a greater proportion of those who described their ethnicity as being White and Caribbean, Any Other Asian background and African were more likely to be refugees than asylum seekers, while the opposite is the case among those from the Any Other mixed background, Indian, Iranian and Kurdish samples.

The vast majority of the Asylum Seekers and Refugees (96.6%) were, at the time of the study living within Nottingham, with just five respondents (1.7%) staying in the Gedling area and two each being from the Boroughs of Rushcliffe and Broxtowe. None of the group lived in the Borough of Ashfield.

Summary

- Just less than 300 of the interviewees (14.8%) described themselves as being asylum seekers or refugees. Just less than half this group were in receipt of NASS. The largest group within the sample were from Iran with a slightly smaller group being African (including those from Somalia), as well as those from Kurdistan.
- The vast majority were living within Nottingham City.

Section I: Personal and Household Characteristics

Introduction

Respondents were asked to provide details of their age and household type and size as well as information about their own economic activity and household finances.

Gender and age

The majority of the Asylum Seekers and Refugees in the study were men (78.3%) and in terms of the age profile of this sub-sample, the largest group (61.4%) were aged 25-39 with just over one quarter being in the age range 16-24 (26.8%). In contrast, only one in ten (9.2%) were in the age group 40-49 and those aged over 50 were in a minority (2.7%). None of the group were aged 60 or above. It should be noted then, that throughout this chapter, the findings will relate primarily to male asylum seekers and refugees.

Household size and composition

Over half the respondents were from single person households (55.3%) and smaller but similar proportions came from households with either two or three members (14.2% and 16.3% respectively). Those with four or more members collectively accounted for 14.2%. While single person households dominated, those households without children represented over three-quarters of the group (78.0%) compared with 11.9% which were comprised of two adults and at least one child. Half this figure were single parent households.

Economic status

Just over half the group reported that they did have the right to work in this country (54.6%) and eight respondents (2.7%) refused to provide this information. The vast majority of asylum seekers (i.e. those who reported receiving NASS benefit) reported that they did not have the right to work while 15.7% stated that they did have a right. In contrast, nearly 9 out of 10 of the refugees reported having the right to work.

Table 2: Have right to work in this country

Right to work	No.	%	Asylum Seekers	Refugees
Yes	161	54.6	22 15.7	139 89.7
No	126	42.7	114 81.4	12 7.7
Refused	8	2.7	4 2.9	4 2.6
Total	295	100.0	140 47.5	155 52.5

Respondents were asked to indicate their economic status. As table 2 reveals, just 8.5% were in full-time employment and a slightly higher figure were working on a part-time basis (8.8%). However, the largest group (39.3%) reported being unemployed. This was considerably greater than for the BME sample as a whole (13.5%). A relatively large proportion of the Asylum Seeker/Refugee group were in full or part-time education (22.7%) and this figure again was much

larger than for the total BME sample (7.9%). Slightly more than one in ten of the Asylum Seeker/Refugee group were 'other not working' - see table 3.

Table 3: Employment status of respondent

Employment status	No.	%
Working full-time	25	8.5
Working part-time	26	8.8
Retired	1	0.3
Unemployed	116	39.3
Long-term sick disabled	2	0.7
Student (over 16)	67	22.7
Housewife/househusband	10	3.4
Other not working	37	12.5
Not specified	11	3.7
Total	295	100.0

Among those who were unemployed, the largest group (32.7%) had not worked for between one and two years and a slightly smaller group (29.3%) mentioned a period of between six months and one year. Those who had been unemployed for more than two years accounted for one fifth of this group (19.8%).

Just 14.2% were not in receipt of any welfare benefits. As table 4 shows, and as highlighted earlier, just under half the group were in receipt of the National Asylum Support Service (NASS) (47.5%) and one quarter received Housing Benefit (26.1%) and similar proportions referred to receiving Income Support and Council Tax Benefit (20.3% and 20.0% respectively). Looking at the range of benefits received by asylum seekers in comparison to refugees, the table shows that the latter group received a much wider range of benefits and in greater numbers. Only a minority of asylum seekers received benefits other than NASS: 3 mentioned housing benefit and 2 referred to Income Support.

Table 4: Welfare Benefits Received

Type of benefit	No.	%	Asylum Seekers		Refugees	
Income Support	60	20.3	2	1.4	58	37.4
Council Tax Benefit	59	20.0	1	0.7	58	37.4
Housing Benefit	77	26.1	3	2.1	74	47.7
Child Tax Credit	4	1.4	-	-	4	2.6
Working Tax Credit	3	1.0	-	-	3	1.9
Jobseekers Allowance	37	12.5	-	-	37	23.9
National Asylum Support Services	140	47.5	140	100.0	-	-
Supporting people grant/subsidy	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.6
Incapacity benefit etc.	3	1.0	-	-	3	1.9
Other benefits	5	1.6	1	0.7	4	2.6

More than one answer was permitted

In terms of net household monthly income, nearly six out of ten (57.6%) reported that they had no income and a further 12.5% reported a figure of £217 or less. In contrast, 4.3% had an income of more than £868 per month. It should be noted that one in ten respondents refused to provide this financial information and a further 3.1% stated that they did not know what their households monthly income was.

Language

Just one fifth of the group (19.3%) acknowledged that they would normally read in English and the same proportion (19.0%) reported that they would normally speak in English. Among the first languages noted by those who could not speak English were Farsi (36.9%), Kurdish (9.5%), Lingala (6.1%), Somalian (5.4% and Swahili (5.1%), together with over twenty additional languages which were spoken by either one or two of the respondents, such as Dari (2). A similar finding was evident in relation to those first languages for reading: 42.7% mentioned Farsi, 11.5% French, 7.5% Kurdish, Pashto (1.7%) and Swahili (1.4%) together with a further eleven languages which were mentioned by just one or two.

Religion

Muslims accounted for 63.1% of the sample with the second most common religion being Christianity (26.8%). Those who reported that they did not have a religion equated to 5.1% and two respondents refused to divulge details of their religious beliefs.

Summary

- Nearly eight out of ten were men and the largest group were aged 25-39.
- Over half the respondents came from single person households and larger households (four or more members) accounted for 14.2%.
- Half the group did not have the right to work in this country: eight out of ten of the asylum seekers did not have the right to work compared with just 7.7% of refugees. Hence, employment levels were low. Nearly one quarter of the group were in full or part-time education.
- In addition to NASS, a small group among the asylum seekers received other benefits. Nearly half the group of refugees received Housing benefit and smaller numbers referred to either Income Support or Council Tax benefit. Nearly one quarter also received Jobseekers Allowance.
- Just one fifth of the group would normally read in English and a comparable proportion would normally speak English. A wide range of other languages were mentioned.
- Muslims accounted for six out of ten of this group with the second most common religion being that of Christianity.

Section II: Housing circumstances

Introduction

Details of the current housing circumstances, such as tenure and property type are noted in this section together with the respondents views on their housing.

Current tenure and property type

The group were living in a very wide range of tenures. The largest proportion (41.7%) were renting from the Council with a much smaller group (25.4%) referring to being a housing association tenant. Those renting in the private sector equated to 14.9% and there was a minority who were living as owner-occupiers. In addition, 3.7% were living in supported accommodation, 2.7% were lodging with friends and relatives and smaller numbers were staying at a hostel and National Asylum Support Service (NASS) accommodation. Slightly more than one in twenty declined to provide this information. Refugees were more likely to be Council tenants than asylum seekers (61.3% as compared with 45.9%). However the opposite was found to be the case in relation to housing association properties with six out of ten of asylum seekers (60.6%) living in this tenure compared with 39.4% of refugees. The proportion from both groups renting in the private sector was broadly comparable.

In terms of the type of property occupied, over half were living in a house (55.6%) while those occupying a flat accounted for 34.5%. Smaller numbers referred to a bedsit (3.1%), a hostel, (1.0%), a trailer (0.3%) and a semi-detached property (0.3%).

Three-quarters of the respondents mentioned that they did not have a choice in where they lived (74.9%), compared with nearly one in ten (9.5%) who commented that they moved to a particular location because they liked the area and 8.1% mentioned wanting to be near family and friends. A small group also suggested that they had moved to their current address due to work reasons. Those who reported that they did not have a choice were more likely to be asylum seekers than refugees (54.8% as compared with 45.2%).

Size of property and amenities

Similar proportions lived in properties with three or four rooms (25.8% and 26.1% respectively) and one in five (20.7%) had two rooms. Those with six or more rooms accounted collectively for 8.2%, a slightly greater proportion than had just one room at their disposal (6.4%).

In terms of the number of bedrooms available, 28.1% had just one and a similar proportion had either two or three (27.5% and 28.5% respectively). Those with four or more bedrooms were in the minority.

A small group (2.4%) reported that their home did not contain a kitchen and 1.4% suggested that there was no inside toilet. A larger group (4.4%) did not have a bath and four out of ten (39.7%) did not have a shower. In addition, nearly half the group (45.8%) had to share their kitchen with another household and a slightly smaller group had to share an inside toilet and bath. Fewer had to share a shower (33.6%). The likelihood of sharing these facilities was considerably greater among asylum seekers than refugees. For example, 73.3% of this former group shared a kitchen

compared with 26.7% of refugees. The comparable figures relating to sharing an inside toilet were 73.8% and 26.2% respectively.

Six out of ten felt that their home was about the right size for the needs of their household, although 28.8% argued that their home was too small. This compares with just 5.1% who felt that the property was too big. Asylum seekers were more likely to argue that their home was too small (57.6%) compared with refugees (42.4%).

Table 5: Views on size of property

View	No.	%
Too big	15	5.1
Too small	85	28.8
About the right size	179	60.7
Don't know	16	5.4
Total	295	100.0

Although the majority of respondents (73.2%) did not consider themselves to be living in overcrowded conditions, one in five felt that this was the case and a small group were undecided (6.4%). Asylum seekers were twice as likely to suggest that they were living in overcrowded conditions than those in the refugee group (27.9% compared with 13.5%)

Table 6: Living in overcrowded conditions

View	No.	%	Asylum Seekers	Refugees
Yes	60	20.3	39 27.9	21 13.5
No	216	73.2	89 63.6	127 81.9
Don't know	19	6.4	12 8.6	7 4.5
Total	295	100.0	140 47.5	155 52.5

Nearly nine out of ten (87.5%) lived in properties with full central heating and 47.5% referred to their home having full double-glazing

The majority of the properties occupied were generally deemed to be in an acceptable state of repair, although in the case of 15.6% of homes, urgent repairs were felt to be needed and there was a general view expressed that the state of their home had had a detrimental impact on the health of either themselves or other members of their family. Those with outstanding repairs were generally not planning on getting them done, the main reason being that this was the responsibility of the landlord. One in ten felt that they needed support to carry out minor repairs to their home.

Satisfaction with current property

Slightly more than one in ten (11.2%) reported being either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their home. This compares with 46.1% who were positive, suggesting that they were either very satisfied or satisfied. However, a relatively large group (39.3%) commented that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 7: Level of satisfaction with home

Level of satisfaction	No.	%
Very satisfied	13	4.4
Satisfied	123	41.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	116	39.3
Dissatisfied	22	7.5
Very dissatisfied	11	3.7
Don't know	10	3.4
Total	295	100.0

There were no real discernable differences of opinion in terms of satisfaction levels with their home between asylum seekers and refugees.

It should be borne in mind that the views of the asylum seekers in particular, will be based on living in temporary accommodation while they await a decision regarding their status.

Summary

- The largest proportion of asylum seekers and refugees were living in council accommodation and nearly one quarter were housing association tenants. Tenure differences were observed between the asylum seeker and refugee groups.
- Three-quarters of the group did not have a choice in where they lived - this was more likely to be the case among asylum seekers than refugees.
- A minority of the group either had to share basic amenities with another households or lived in properties without such facilities. Asylum seekers, as opposed to refugees were more likely to have to share.
- Nearly three out of ten felt that their home was too small: six out of ten asylum seekers held this view compared with four out of ten of refugees.
- One in five felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions and asylum seekers were twice as likely to express this view than refugees.
- Evidence of properties requiring urgent repairs was found and which were deemed to be the responsibility of the landlord.

- Only a minority were negative about their current home (11.2%) compared with 46.1% who were either satisfied or very satisfied.

Section III: Views on the Area of Residence

Introduction

Respondents were asked to comment upon the area where they lived in terms of the facilities and services available and potential problems in the locality.

Reasons for moving to the area

The vast majority of the group reported that they did not have a choice in where they lived while one in ten (10.8%) had moved to the area because they felt that it was a nice area. Smaller numbers also moved to the locality because they already had friends and family in the area. The lack of choice was the dominant reason given by 86.4% of the asylum seekers group and compares with 64.5% of refugees. This first statistics reflects the fact that asylum seekers do not have any choice in where they live.

Satisfaction with the area

Respondents were asked to rate a number of potential problems in the area. Those issues which were more likely to be seen as representing a major problem for them included: the level of crime (21.7%), drug dealing and drug abuse (21.0), noise levels (19.7%) and not feeling like part of the community (14.9%). However, despite some concerns about the area, only 13.6% were negative about the area where they lived compared with 41.3% who were either very satisfied or satisfied. As noted earlier in terms of the level of satisfaction with the home, 43.1% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their neighbourhood.

Table 8: Level of satisfaction with area of residence

Level of satisfaction	No.	%
Very satisfied	11	3.7
Satisfied	111	37.6
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	127	43.1
Dissatisfied	31	10.5
Very dissatisfied	9	3.1
Don't know	6	2.0
Total	295	100.0

Respondents were presented with a range of facilities and amenities and asked to consider the relative important of each in choosing where to live. The most important facilities and aspects included: being safe from racial harassment (94.9%) and it being a safe area (93.2%). Other secondary concerns included the quietness and reputation of the area (82.0% and 79.3% respectively), feeling like part of a community (75.6%). Those aspects and facilities which were regarded as being less important were access to housing advice (just 34.6% suggested that this was very important) and access to housing related support services (23.7%).

Four out of ten (40.7%) felt that the facilities in the area where they lived were either very good or good. Three out of ten, however, suggested that they were neither good nor poor and one in ten (11.8%) rated them as either being poor or very poor.

Table 9: Rating of facilities in the area for ethnic minorities

Rating	No.	%
Very good	9	3.1
Good	111	37.6
Neither good nor poor	86	29.2
Poor	21	7.1
Very poor	14	4.7
Don't know	54	18.3
Total	295	100.0

Just less than half the sample felt that additional community facilities for the BME communities were not required in the area where they lived. For those who voiced the need for extra facilities, a wide range was mentioned. The need for a community centre was particularly noted (4.1%), followed by a place of worship (1.7%), a cultural group (1.7%), a legal advice office (0.7%), more Indian shops (0.7%), an Asian women's club (0.7%), immigration advice (0.7%), a continental food shop (0.7%) and social clubs (0.3%). Although suggesting that more facilities were required, 36.6% answered 'don't know' when they were asked to indicate the type of facilities they would like to see developed.

Access to housing

When asked the question 'Do you feel that people from your community group have the same opportunity in terms of access to housing as those from other communities?' the majority (58.0%) suggested that they were not sure and just one third of the group (33.6%) felt that there was equality of opportunity. In contrast, 8.5% felt that access to housing was not equal. While nearly 6 out of 10 of the refugees in the sample felt that there was equality of access, the figure among asylum seekers was smaller at 41.4%.

Table 10: Views on equal access to housing

View	No.	%
Yes	99	33.6
No	25	8.5
Don't know	171	58.0
Total	295	100.0

Access to financial advice

Half the sample group felt that they did not have sufficient access to financial advice (50.2%) compared with 47.1% who expressed the opposing view. While just over half of the refugees felt that they had had enough access to financial advice (51.0%), the figure for asylum seekers was smaller at 42.9% and indeed 54.3% of this latter group expressed the opposing view. The comparable figure for the refugee sample was 46.5%

Summary

- The vast majority reported not having a choice in where they lived and this was especially the case among the asylum seekers compared to the refugee group.
- A minority were negative about the area where they lived.
- Being safe from racial harassment, followed by general safety in an area were seen as the dominant factors in deciding where to live.
- Just less than half felt that additional BME community facilities in the area were not required. Those who expressed the opposite view tended to cite the need for a community centre and a place of worship.
- Although one third of the group felt that there was equality of access to housing, a much larger proportion (58.0%) were not sure. Concern about equality of access was more likely to be mentioned by asylum seekers than refugees.
- Access to financial advice was seen as problematic by over half the group and especially for the asylum seekers.

Section IV: Support, Health and Social Care

Introduction

Information was recorded about the incidence of health problems among the sample group and the type of support currently received.

Incidence of health problems

A small group of the respondents referred to either themselves or another member of their household who suffered from a health problem or disability including: a visual impairment (2.4%), a hearing impairment (2.0%), mobility problems (3.0%), learning disabilities (3.0%) and mental health problems (4.1%). However, the incidence of these problems were generally lower than was the case for the BME sample as a whole.

Support services

The majority of Asylum Seekers and Refugees reported that they did not receive support from an outside agency (62.4%) and a further 8.8% were unsure. The remainder received support from a wide range of agencies including floating support (5.4%), National Asylum Support Service (NASS) (4.4%), social services (1.4%), help to integrate into the community (1.0%). At the same time, 3.1% did not specify the type of support received.

One in ten (11.2%) also referred to receiving housing-related support services. This was slightly more likely to be the case among refugees than asylum seekers (11.6% and 10.7% respectively). Of this group (33 in total), slightly more than half (17 or 51.5%) were in receipt of visiting or floating support and one person mentioned 24-hour cover with sleep in staff. The support tended to be provided by a housing association (12 or 36.4%), a voluntary organisation (8 or 24.2%), co-operative community action (12.5%) and a council (9.1%).

In the majority of cases, the support had been received by the household for less than twelve months (69.7%), although 21.2% argued that they could not recall how long that had been in receipt of support.

Summary

- There was some evidence of ill health or disability among this group, although it only affected a minority of households.
- The majority of the group did not receive any support from an outside agency (62.4%) and just one in ten received housing related support.

Section V: Moving Intentions

Introduction

Respondents were asked to comment upon how likely it was that they were to move house and their preferred type, tenure and size of property.

Likelihood of moving

One fifth of the group indicated that they were planning on moving home and 23.1% commented that they might move. In contrast, 55.9% stated that they had no intentions to move. This is largely explained by the fact that they will have no choice about where they live.

Table 11: Moving intentions

Intend to move	No.	%
No	165	55.9
Yes	62	21.0
Maybe	68	23.1
Don't know	-	-
Total	295	100.0

Six out of ten (60.8%) were unsure about their timescale for moving compared with 33.8% who suggested that they were likely to move within the next twelve months and 3.8% who referred to a period of around two years. The main reasons given for wanting to move included the need for a larger property (35.4%), the desire to move to a better area (21.5%), for financial reasons (5.4%), a desire to buy their own home (3.8%) and the acknowledgement that they would be moving out of their temporary housing into more permanent accommodation. In terms of their preferred area of residence, the vast majority were undecided (63.1%) and a further 7.7% referred to moving to an area outside Nottingham. However, at the same time, a significant group (around one third) would want to move to areas within South Nottinghamshire and particularly within Nottingham City.

The most important factor in deciding where to move to was felt to be the area (49.2%), followed by the size of the property (23.8%). Much smaller numbers suggested that other issues were as important, such as being near family or friends (6.9%) and security (3.8%).

Preferred property type and tenure

There was a general preference among the group for detached property (32.3%), although significant numbers would prefer a bungalow (20.8%), a semi-detached (14.6%) or a flat (11.5%). Only one person would want to move to sheltered housing.

In terms of preferred tenure, the dominant view was for home ownership (61.8%), followed by renting from the council (24.4%) or from a housing association (9.8%). Just five respondents (4.1%) would want to rent from a private landlord. The vast majority reported that they did not know whether or not they would achieve their preferred tenure (83.1%) compared with 15.4% who felt that they would get their first choice and just 1.5% who were not optimistic. Asylum seekers,

more than refugees, would prefer to own their own home (59.2% compared with 40.8%), or rent from a housing association (58.3% compared with 41.7%). However, refugees were more likely to prefer to rent from a council (60.0% compared with 40.0%).

Size of property and amenities required

Half the sample (53.8%) would need just two bedrooms and a further 28.5% cited three. At the same time, 13.1% would want a one-bedroom property and one in twenty mentioned four bedrooms (4.6%). Eight out of ten would need just one living room and all but one respondent would need just one kitchen. In terms of bathrooms, one in ten felt that they would need two (10.8%) as opposed to just one.

Consultation

Four out of ten (42.0%) felt that they had been consulted enough about community issues while 26.4% felt that this was not the case and a further 31.5% were unsure.

In terms of their preferred method of consultation, eight out of ten mentioned consultation via a personal letter and 44.7% referred to the telephone. Smaller numbers cited a preference for the remaining methods of consultation as shown in the table below.

Table 12: Preferred methods of consultation

Method	No.	%
Via letter	237	80.3
Via the telephone	132	44.7
One-to-one meetings	103	34.9
Email/Internet	55	18.6
Newsletter	1	0.3
Through open meetings	55	18.6
Through surveys	33	11.2
Through tenants associations	24	8.1
No interest in being consulted	22	7.5

More than one answer was permitted

Summary

- One fifth of the group indicated a preference for moving.
- The most important factor in deciding where to move to was the area followed by the size of property.
- There was a general preference for a detached property, although one fifth would want a bungalow.
- The dominant preference was for home ownership, followed by renting from the council. The majority were unsure about whether or not they would realise their tenure aspiration.

- There was a need for relatively small properties - two bedrooms, one living room, bathroom and kitchen.
- One quarter felt that there was insufficient consultation and a slightly larger group (31.5%) were unsure. There was a preference for consultation by letter, followed by the use of the telephone and one-to-one meetings.

Chapter VI: Findings from the Homelessness Survey

Introduction

Black and Minority Ethnic communities are over-represented among those accepted as homeless. Of the 36,260 households accepted as homeless nationally, in the third quarter of 2003, 23% were from a BME background.

Whereas nationally around 8% of the population are from a BME community, they accounted for 22% of those who were accepted as homeless in the last quarter of 2002. Although it is difficult to be precise about the true extent of BME homelessness, concern has been expressed by Crisis that homelessness among the African and Caribbean and Asian communities is more likely to increase substantially over the next few years. Homelessness disproportionately affects certain BME communities (especially those from the African and Caribbean communities) (ODPM, 2002)

Young people

It is recognised that young people from ethnic minority backgrounds are more likely to be living in deprived neighbourhoods and overcrowded conditions than young people from white households. This can affect educational achievement, because there is nowhere for young people to study at home, and has an adverse effect on health.

Overcrowding, racism and discrimination are some of the pressures which can lead to homelessness. Young people from BME backgrounds can also become homeless because of a rejection of cultural and family traditions, which causes extreme isolation and can require considerable support. This is particularly an issue for those of Asian background.

There are considerable differences in the experiences of young homeless people from different ethnic backgrounds. Young white people are more likely to sleep rough than those with ethnic minority backgrounds, who tend to stay with friends or relatives. Homelessness is more likely to be hidden, especially amongst Asian people, who are less likely to apply to agencies for help. Where they do turn to agencies and hostels, they prefer to deal with staff from their own communities. There are however few BME-led organisations offering support and accommodation to young homeless people.

It is difficult to assess numbers; but monitoring in Nottingham, and by Centrepoint in London, shows that homelessness among young people from BME backgrounds is increasing.

Older people

Many elderly members of BME communities do not access the available support services. There are a range of reasons for this. Often they are unaware that help is available. There may be religious or cultural barriers to seeking help outside the family.

Study findings

A total of 55 completed questionnaires were received. Three quarters of the sample (76.4%) were living in a hostel at the time of the survey, while around one in ten were either renting in the private sector or living in supported accommodation. A small number were also renting in the social housing sector with their landlord being either a housing association (3.6%) or a local authority (1.8%).

Personal Characteristics

Respondents were asked to indicate their ethnic origin. The largest group, equating to four out of ten, described themselves as Caribbean (38.2%), with the next largest group (18.2%) being of mixed Caribbean and White. Those from the Asian community collectively accounted for 7.2% and the white minority group, which included 3 individuals from Eastern Europe, represented one in ten. Table 1 shows the full range of ethnic groups represented on this sample, based on the 2001 census classification system.

Table 1: Ethnic Group

Ethnic group	No.	%
White other	5	9.1
White & Caribbean	10	18.2
White & Asian	2	3.6
Indian	4	7.3
Pakistani	2	3.6
Bangladeshi	2	3.6
Caribbean	21	38.2
African	2	3.6
Any other Black background	2	3.6
Other	5	9.1
Total	55	100.0

Six out of ten (60.4%) were women. In terms of the age profile of the sample, 45.7% were aged under 21, including four respondents aged 16 and six respondents aged 17. Those aged 21 – 25 accounted for 17.3% while the 26-35 year olds represented 22.6%. Those over the age of 35 also equated to 22.6% were aged 26 – 35 (17.5%).

Slightly more than four out of ten reported that they had children and in the majority of cases their children were living with them at the time of the study.

None of the group were working full-time but a minority were in part time employment (8.3%) and slightly smaller group (6.3%) were registered on training scheme. The largest group, however (35.4%) were studying at college.

Half the group were in receipt of Income Support (50.0%) and 16.7% reported receiving unemployment benefits. Three respondents were in receipt of welfare benefit relating to a disability or health problem, such as Incapacity Benefit. One in five were also in receipt of other

types of benefits. Just 3 respondents stated that they did not receive any form of state benefit provision.

Around half (51.1%) considered themselves to come from somewhere other than Nottingham originally. The most reported place outside Nottingham was London. Other respondents stated places such as Pakistan, Iran, Afghanistan and India. 42.2% did not consider themselves to be from anywhere originally and 3 respondents (6.7%) did not know.

Previous Housing Circumstances

As shown in table 2, four out of ten of the group (43.8%) had only been living in the South Nottinghamshire area for less than 3 months and collectively 81.3% referred to a period of less than 1 year. In contrast, slightly less than one in five stated a period of in excess of 1 year, including one in ten who had been resident in the area for 3 or more years.

Table 2: How long have you lived in your current area

Length of time	No.	%
Less than 7 days	1	2.1
1 – 4 weeks	8	16.7
1 – 3 months	12	25.0
4 – 5 months	8	16.7
6 – 9 months	3	6.3
10 – 12 months	7	14.6
1 – 2 years	4	8.3
3 – 4 years	1	2.1
Over 5 years	4	8.3
Total	48	100.0

Excludes 7 missing cases

The vast majority (73.6%) had spent the previous night in a hostel in the area. To a larger extent this reflects the approach adopted by the study, i.e. contacting temporary accommodation, to identify potential applicants. Those who had stayed with either friends or relatives accounted for 18.9% and a small group reported having stayed in their own home (see table 3)

Although the majority of all four age groups had spent the previous night in a hostel, this was more likely to be the case for those over 35 (91.7%) as compared with those aged 16-21 (61.9%). Those who referred to living with relatives were all aged 16-21. this group was also more likely to have stayed with friends.

Table 3: Where did you spend last night

Where	No.	%
Hostel	39	73.6
Own home	4	7.5
Living with relatives	3	5.7
Staying with friends	7	13.2
Total	53	100.0

Excludes 2 missing cases

In terms of their most recent home, the largest group, three out of ten, had lived with their parents and a further 5.5% referred to living with their relatives. One fifth had rented a home from the council and the equivalent of half this number had lived in a housing association property. A sizeable group also referred to their most recent home as a hostel (12.7%).

Over half of those aged 21-25 (75.0%) and under 21 (57.1%) had previously lived with their parents. The comparable figure among the older age groups was around one third or less. Those in the 26-35 age group were the most likely to have owned their own home while the largest group among the over 35 year olds referred to their most recent home as being a hostel.

Table 4: What was your most recent home

Recent home	No.	%
Own home	6	11.8
Lived with parents	24	47.1
Lived with other relatives	4	7.8
Lived with friends	5	9.8
No fixed address	1	2.0
A hostel	6	11.8
Other	5	9.8
Total	51	100.0

Excludes 4 missing cases

Table 5: Tenure of your recent home

Tenure	No.	%
Owned with a mortgage	3	5.5
Rented from the council	11	20.0
Rented from a housing association	6	10.9
Rented privately	1	1.8
Lived with parents	16	29.1
Lived with other relatives	3	5.5
Lived with friends	3	5.5
No fixed address	2	3.6
A hostel	7	12.7
Other	3	5.5
Total	55	100.0

Although 16.3% had lived at their previous home for less than 6 months, one fifth had been at their home for between 1 and 2 years. Similarly one third (32.7%) mentioned a period in excess of 5 years.

Table 6: How long did you live at your most recent home

Length of time	No.	%
1 – 3 months	8	14.5
4 – 5 months	1	1.8
6 – 9 months	7	12.7
10 – 12 months	4	7.3
1 – 2 years	11	20.0
3 – 4 years	6	10.9
5 – 10 years	7	12.7
Over 10 years	11	20.0
Total	55	100.0

Reason For Homelessness

Although a diverse range of reasons were cited for leaving their last accommodation, the largest group (36.0%) referred to a dispute with their parents, while smaller numbers had experienced or were in fear of domestic violence (14.0%). These also had to leave their last settled place due to pregnancy and having a child, accounted for one in ten. Another sizeable group reported having had a dispute with relatives (8.0%), faced eviction. Another group also mentioned other types of harassment (12.0%) and a large group (36.0%) cited other reasons but they were not explicit about what these were.

The vast majority of the young people aged 21-25 (75.0%) cited a dispute with parents as the main reason for being homeless and this explanation was also given by 42.9% of the 16-21 year olds. Those who mentioned domestic violence were all women and either aged under 21 (4 respondents) or in the age range 26-35 (3). Having a child was a particular concern for the younger women while being subjected to other forms of harassment was an issue for both the younger age group (14.3% of the 16-21 year olds mentioned this) and those aged 26-35 (23.1%).

Table 7: Reasons for leaving this accommodation

Reasons	No.	%
Dispute with partner	1	2.0
Dispute with parents	18	36.0
Domestic violence	7	14.0
Dispute with relatives	4	8.0
Dispute with friends	2	4.0
Had a child	5	10.0
Other harassment	6	12.0
Rent/mortgage arrears	1	2.0
Eviction	2	4.0
Other	18	36.0

More than one answer was permitted

Informal Support

Only a minority of the group (12.2%) had received support or help from their parents when they first became homeless. This is perhaps not surprising given that one of the main reasons for being homeless was following a dispute with their parents. Smaller numbers had received help from other family members such as sisters/brothers (4.9%), grand parents (4.9%) or other relatives (12.2%). There was a greater likelihood of support being offered/received by friends (12.2%), to a lesser extent by other members of their community.

The type of support given varied from general advice (50.0% who had received assistance mentioned this), the provision of food (42.9%), financial help (33.3%) and 1 in 10 had been given furniture (9.5%). One fifth also mentioned receiving other types of support/assistance.

Table 8: What type of support did you receive

Support received	No.	%
Financial	14	33.3
Advice	21	50.0
Food	18	42.9
Furniture	4	9.5
Other	9	21.4

More than one answer was permitted

Access to and Knowledge of Housing Options

In terms of finding housing in the area, the general consensus was that it had been either quite difficult or very difficult (collectively accounting for 63.8% of the sample). In contrast, just one respondent (2.1%) had found it easy and one fifth felt that it was neither easy nor difficult.

Accessing housing was a particular problem for the younger members of the sample: 76.2% of those in the 16-21 year olds felt that it had been quite or very difficult. This compares with 53.9% of the 26-35 year olds and none of those aged over 35.

Table 9: Rate of difficulty in finding housing

Rating	No.	%
Very easy	-	-
Quite easy	1	2.1
Neither easy nor difficult	9	19.1
Quite difficult	16	34.0
Very difficult	14	25.5
Don't know	7	12.7
Total	47	100.0

Excludes 8 missing cases

Respondents stated that they had contacted a range of organisations for help and advice in trying to find accommodation. The most frequently mentioned was the local authority, housing department (64.6%), followed by a local housing association (37.5%) and a housing advice centre

(27.1%). Smaller numbers also contacted private landlords in the area (12.5%), local estate agents (8.3%), the youth service (8.3%) and social services (6.3%). Respondents were generally least likely to have contacted the probation service or the Citizens Advice Bureau for advice/help.

The younger respondents were more likely to have contacted the housing department than those in the older age ranges. For example, 86.7% of the 16-21 year olds had made contact compared with 41.7% of the over 35s. Those who had contacted social services were exclusively under 25 years of age.

However, the under 21s were less likely to have contacted a housing advice provider for assistance than the 21-25 and 26-35 year olds (13.3% as compared with 50.0% and 46.2%). Less than one in ten of the over 35 year olds had sought housing advice. However, the older age groups, as compared with those under 25 were more likely to have spoken to staff from a local housing association. The four respondents who had contacted an estate agent for assistance were all under 25 and five of the six who had contacted a private landlord were also in this age range.

The general picture presented then, is that the younger respondents were more likely to have made contact with agencies and a wider range of agencies than the older respondents.

Table 10: Did you contact anyone for help finding present accommodation

Contact	No.	%
Housing department	31	64.6
Housing association	18	37.5
Housing advice	13	27.1
Other	9	18.8
Private landlord	6	12.5
Youth service	4	8.3
Estate agents	4	8.3
Voluntary groups	4	8.3
Social services	3	6.3
Probation services	2	4.2
Citizens advice bureau	2	4.2

More than one answer was permitted

Slightly less than a quarter of this group of homeless people (23.6%) had endeavoured to find accommodation in the private rented sector and the majority of these (10 out of 13) reported experiencing problems in doing so. This accounted for 28.6% of the under 21 year olds, half of the 21-25 age group (50.0%), just 7.7% of the 26-35 year olds and 15.4% of those aged over 35.

All of the group referred to the high rents charged in the sector and nine or 16.4% found that an important barrier was the unwillingness of some landlords to accept people on State Benefits and around half this number (5 or 9.1%) were critical of the poor condition of some of the housing available. Other problems encountered, although by fewer respondents, included the requirement by some landlords for a deposit (16.4% or 3 respondents referred to this), the payment of rent in advance (16.4%) and that landlords were unwilling to accept pets (16.4%).

Three respondents also felt that there was generally a lack of accommodation available in the area and the same proportion were unhappy about the prospect of having to share accommodation. However, none of the respondents felt that either their age or ethnicity acted as a barrier to finding accommodation in the private rented sector.

Table 11: What problems did you experience in finding accommodation in the private sector

Problems	No.	%
Rents too expensive	10	18.2
Landlord not accepting people on benefits	9	16.4
Poor condition of housing	5	9.1
Landlords requiring deposit	3	5.5
Landlords requiring rent in advance	3	5.5
Sharing with others	3	5.5
No accommodation	3	5.5
Landlord not accepting children	3	5.5
Age acting as barrier	-	-
Ethnicity acting as barrier	-	-
Landlord not accepting pets	-	-
Language acting as a barrier	-	-
Other reasons	-	-

More than one answer was permitted

A much greater proportion (84.8%) had endeavoured to find either council or housing association housing to rent.

Table 12: Have you tried to find council or housing association housing

Tried to find social housing	No.	%
Yes	39	84.8
No	7	15.2
Total	46	100.0

Again, however, the majority (26 out of 39) reported experiencing problems in accessing this sector. The main problem was seen as the general lack of accommodation available (37.8%) followed by criticism of the poor condition of some of the properties that were available (17.8%). Smaller numbers also reported that their age acted as a barrier (11.1%), while one person (2.2%) reported that being from a BME background had acted as a barrier and that he had experienced discrimination in trying to find housing in this sector. Two (4.4%) respondents were concerned that their language skills had resulted in problems in accessing housing. A relatively large group also mentioned other reasons but no additional information was forthcoming.

At the time of the study two thirds of the group were registered on a housing waiting list for rehousing. This included seven out of ten of the 16-21 year olds and a slightly higher proportion of those aged 21-25 (87.5%). In contrast, just 41.7% of the 26-35 age group were registered and a minority of those older than 35.

Of those who were not registered (17 in total or 32.1%), two did not realise that such lists existed (3.8%) and two more commented that the lists were too long. Another three respondents simply commented that they had not 'got round to it' and one believed that he would not qualify for rehousing. Seven respondents (17.2%) gave other reasons.

One quarter of the sample had experience of sleeping rough. This was more likely to be experienced by men than women and by those aged 21-25 (60.0%) than either the younger age group (10.0%) or the older respondents (23.1% of the 26-35 year olds had slept rough as had 40.0% of the over 35s).

In terms of their status as an existing tenant, although two thirds of this group did not have a tenancy, 28.5% had a sole tenancy and the remainder (9.1%) had a joint tenancy (see table 14). Those with a tenancy (either sole or joint) tended to be in the older age range (35 and over) and accounted for 38.5% of this age group. In comparison, just 14.3% of the 16-21 year olds had a tenancy.

Table 13: Do you have a tenancy

Have tenancy	No.	%
Yes – sole tenancy	14	25.5
Yes – joint tenancy	5	9.1
No	36	65.5
Total	55	100.0

Six out of ten had been living at their current address for less than 3 months and collectively 66.1% mentioned a period of less than 6 months. In contrast one in ten had been at the same address for between 1 and 4 years.

Two thirds of the people surveyed contended that they were not living in their preferred area, reflecting the lack of choice available to homeless people.

Future Preferences

In terms of their housing preferences in the future, three quarters of the group indicated that they would prefer to have somewhere to live permanently now, while with the exception of 1 person who did not want a permanent home, the remainder would be looking for somewhere permanent in the future.

Across the four age ranges, the proportion who would be looking for a permanent home now as opposed to in the future varied. While 87.5% of the 22-25 year olds would want to find accommodation now, as would 76.9% and 100.0% of the 26-35 and over 35 year old, the figure among the 16-21 years olds was 63.2%. Three-quarters of this latter group would be looking to find a permanent home sometime in the future.

Table 14: Do you want somewhere to live permanently now or in the future

Want permanent home	No.	%
Yes now	35	76.1
Yes in the future	10	21.7
No	1	1.8
Total	46	100.0

Excludes 9 missing cases

As regards to their preferred choice of accommodation, the largest group (65.2%) would want a house as opposed to a flat (28.3%). Two respondents (4.3%) stipulated a maisonette and one a bedsit. The younger respondents tended to cite a flat as opposed to another type of property.

Table 15: First choice of type of accommodation

Type	No.	%
House	30	65.2
Flat	13	28.3
Maisonette	2	4.3
Bedsit	1	2.2
Total	46	100.0

Excludes 9 missing cases

When asked whether or not they would achieve their preferred type of accommodation, four out of ten answered negatively and while a relatively large group (34.5%) felt that they would achieve it, 25.5% were not sure. The main reasons offered as to why they were negative about the prospect of getting their first choice of accommodation included the criticism that either the waiting lists were too long and they did not believe that they would be regarded as a priority (40.0%) or that there was not enough suitable housing available (30.9%). Other issues which they felt that they would negate against them securing their preferred choice included a previous negative experience of trying to find suitable housing (14.5%), the high rents charged (12.7%), their ineligibility (9.1%) and their experience of racism by some of the housing providers (9.1%).

On-going support provision

Finally, respondents were asked to consider what type of support they felt they would need in order to settle into their own home or to help them sustain their tenancy. Two thirds of the group (64.2%) referred to assistance to identify or buy furniture for their home and half (50.9%) would want to be allocated a support worker. A slightly smaller group also felt that they would benefit from advice concerning household budgeting (47.2%). Two other types of support were also mentioned by a relatively large group of respondents; being provided with advice on the type of benefits they were entitled to and careers advice concerning opportunities for work or studying (37.7% and 35.8% respectively). The need for cultural support was seen as necessary by 17.0% and half this number would welcome the opportunity to participate in organised social activities.

The possibility of a caretaker was seen as particularly attractive among the 22-25 year olds (50.0%) and especially in comparison to the under 21 year olds (9.5%) and those over 35 (8.3%).

Over half the young people aged 16-21 would welcome being allocated a support worker (52.4%) as would half of those aged 26-35 (50.0%) and a slightly larger group among the over 35 age group (58.3%). The impact of age was particularly noticeable in relation to the services of a health worker. While just 12.5% of the 22-25 year olds and 19.0% of the younger age group would favour this option, the figures for the 26-35 and over 35 age groups were 58.3% and 25.0% respectively.

Budgeting advice was seen as being relevant to all age groups and slightly more so to those aged 22-25 (87.5%), while over four out of ten of the 16-21 year olds and the 26-35 year olds would want advice on welfare benefits. Those who felt that they could benefit from support from social services tended to be in the younger age groups under 26.

Those who would want race or cultural support or assistance with buying furniture were not from any single age group.

Careers advice was seen as being particularly relevant to the younger members of the sample: 33.3% of the 16-21 year olds and 75.0% of the 22-25 age group felt that this type of support was necessary.

A focus group discussion was convened with eight young homeless people at one of the hostels within the City. The respondents, all women and aged between 17 and 26, were asked for their views on the type of preventative measures that were required to curtail the incidence of repeat homelessness.

Six out of the eight who took part had become homeless due to a dispute with their parents or another family member or were concerned about their own welfare. Five of the eight were originally from the Nottingham area.

One of the main causes of repeat homelessness was felt to be the difficulty of maintaining their own independence and feelings of isolation. Concern was also expressed about the 'lure' of the homelessness lifestyle for some young people, especially the notion of transience and the lack of responsibility. Others felt that the availability of drugs on the homelessness scene was an issue.

In terms of curtailing repeat homelessness, the general view expressed was encapsulated by the comment of one young woman:

'Nobody really wants to be homeless but sometimes you don't have a choice. It's difficult to know what to do. I want my one place nice things like everybody else and a good job but that seems a long way off. At the moment, I'm just living day to day. I need help to get on - support to know what I can really get for myself and to keep it. Being young it's difficult to get on in life without someone around you helping you get to the next base. If I don't have the help then it is so easy for me not to do anything - I can see myself here in the future. I don't want that.'

The provision of help and support to access services was seen as being particularly important and more so initially than finding accommodation. Help was felt to be particularly needed in terms of access to benefits, training, education and employment. As another participant commented:

'I want a job first. I don't want a place where all I do all day is sit around looking at the walls. If I have a job I can afford to do things, see my friends and have a life. Then a home is important to me.'

Table 19: Usefulness of following services if had own home

Service	No.	%
Warden	5	9.4
Caretaker	10	18.9
24 Hour support	4	7.5
Support worker	27	50.9
Health worker	15	28.3
Budgeting advice	25	47.2
Welfare rights advice	20	37.7
Race/cultural support	9	17.0
Social services help	12	22.6
Help buying furniture	34	64.2
Careers advice	19	35.8
Organised social activities	5	9.4
Other	4	7.5

More than one answer permitted

Comments

It is widely acknowledged that the main reasons for remaining homeless revolve around relationship breakdowns with parents, other family members or friends. This was the main message of the findings of a BME youth homelessness study in 1998 in Nottingham (Steele, 1998) and according to this study, some five years on, this situation still appears to be the case.

Informal support from family and friends when people have become homeless was found to be variable and although many people do attempt to access accommodation in either the private or social rented sectors, they experience a range of barriers which results in them being excluded from finding suitable housing. While some of these barriers are structural, reflecting local housing market dynamics (such as supply and demand of the provision of some types of properties), others are based on discriminatory practices of individual landlords, such as not accepting people with pets or refusal to accept people on benefits. The findings from this study would suggest that these barriers are slightly different across the two housing sectors: while age and ethnicity were not believed to act against an individual trying to find accommodation in the private rented sector, these barriers were felt to be more evident in the social housing sector.

The vulnerability, social isolation and a general lack of life experiences is evident among many in this sample of BME people and reflected in the need for a wide range of support services to help them move into and sustain a tenancy. Rather than the emphasis being upon particular individual types of support being provided, the study suggests the need for comprehensive care packages, which focuses on their financial, health and social and cultural needs.

Summary

- Of the 55 completed returns received, three-quarters were living in a hostel and one in ten were either living in supported accommodation or renting in the private sector.
- The largest group were Caribbean, with the next largest group being mixed Caribbean and white. Those from the Asian community equated to 7.2%. Six out of ten were women and nearly half were aged 21 or younger.
- None of the group were working full-time but a minority were in part-time employment. The largest group were in education.
- In terms of welfare benefits received, half received Income Support and 16.7% received unemployment benefit.
- Slightly more than four out of ten had been living within the South Nottinghamshire area for less than three months and collectively eight out of ten referred to a period of less than one year.
- The vast majority had spent the previous night in a hostel.
- Most had, prior to moving to where they were currently staying, lived with either their parents or other relatives. Slightly more than one in ten described their recent home as being a hostel.
- The main reasons for being homeless related to a dispute with a family member, or fear of violence towards themselves.
- Only a minority had received informal support or help from their parents, other family members or friends.
- Most had experienced some degree of difficulty in finding alternative accommodation and this was a particular problem for the younger age group.
- Those who had sought assistance from agencies generally referred to the local authority, housing associations or a housing advice centre.
- Just one quarter of the group had tried to find accommodation within the private rented sector. Typical barriers were the unwillingness of some landlords to accept people on state benefits and concerns about the poor condition of some of the properties.
- Although a much greater proportion (84.8%) had tried to secure social housing, the majority of this group reported having experienced problems including the general lack of accommodation and the condition of some of them
- At the time of the study two-third were registered for social housing. Those who were not registered were unaware that such lists existed or felt that the lists were too long.
- One quarter of the sample had experience of sleeping rough.

- Three-quarters expressed the desire to have somewhere to live permanently now as opposed to sometime in the future and the general preference was for a house rather than a flat. However, four out of ten recognised that this would not necessarily happen.
- A wide range of support needs were identified to either settle into their own home or sustain their tenancy. The most commonly referred to support was that to identify or buy furniture or the need to be allocated a support worker. Packages of support were more likely to be required than one single type of support.

Chapter VII: Emerging Themes and Action Plan

Introduction

The study suggests that, using a range of key indicators, the BME community in South Nottinghamshire generally appears to experience a range of disadvantages compared with the white majority population including: living in overcrowded or poor housing conditions, relatively high levels of unemployment; lack of an informed understanding of their housing choices and a perceived inequality in access to housing; and a lack of community facilities. However, at the same time, the study does reveal important differences between ethnic groups in the area and according to area of residence (local authority area). Furthermore, differences are also discernable between the more established BME communities and the 'new' BME communities, comprised primarily of asylum seekers and refugees.

This chapter then, provides an overview of the main messages arising from the research study and provides an outline action plan for service providers within South Nottinghamshire to respond to the needs of the BME community. The emerging issues are considered under the following heading: diversity of the BME community; poverty and welfare dependency; housing needs; access to services; cohesive and stable communities; BME facilities; support services; consultation; and future needs. In relation to homeless BME people, the main issues for discussion relate to: reasons for becoming homeless, barriers to accessing housing; and support needs.

Diversity of the BME community

A wide range of BME community groups participated in the study reflecting the heterogeneity of the BME population within the South Nottinghamshire area. However, some of these groups are relatively small in size in both the population and the study sample. It is important that the needs of such groups are not overlooked and additional research will be required at the local community level to further investigate the needs of these communities. That having been said and despite the grouping of respondents into nine ethnic categories, the findings of the study do suggest that there are important differences between individual communities. For instance, in relation to settlement patterns and comparing the more established Asian communities with the newer communities, such as Iranians. Differences are also evident in relation to the economic position of some communities, with the Indian community being more affluent than for instance, those from the Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities, which are nationally acknowledged to be the poorest communities of the main BME groups. The extent of housing need also varied, reflected in self-reported levels of overcrowding. This was found to be more acute among the Iranian, African and Pakistani samples compared with those from the Caribbean, Indian or Irish

Poverty and welfare dependency

The study does reveal a wide variation in the economic position of some of the BME communities within the study area. While some groups and households are quite affluent (e.g. members of the Indian community) some of these groups experience relatively high degrees of poverty, emphasized by their lack of economic activity and associated high levels of unemployment which is sustained over a long period of time. This is particularly noticeable in relation to the Pakistanis and concurs with the national picture. This results in relatively low household income levels and a dependency on state welfare provision. Such impoverishment has important implications for the ability of such households and communities to have any self-determination over improvements to their housing situation. It severely limits their housing choice. The inability to repair their own home directly impacts in the health and well being of family members. Lack of finances also restricts their ability to actively engage with their own community and reinforces any sense of social and economic isolation

Housing Needs

A significant group among the BME community are currently living in unsuitable housing either due to the poor condition of their homes or the inadequate size. This is particularly the case among the Pakistani community in relation to living in properties with urgent outstanding repairs and is similar to the national picture.

Over-crowding is a particular problem for some community groups (notably the Black community), although it is not restricted to a specific community or simply those with larger than average households. Another secondary important factor is that, for some households, the lack of space within the home has implications for their cultural needs. The finding that some households have to share basic amenities with another household is of concern and re-enforces the inability of such households to improve their housing situation. The preference for financial assistance for either improvements or repairs to their property and the general levels of satisfaction with their current housing highlights the general preference among many in housing need to remain within their current home and among their own community.

Access to services

A number of important barriers to accessing services within the area were identified. First, language was highlighted as a particular issue. Among some BME groups the proportion that can read or speak English is quite low. Some instances were noted where individuals were reluctant to approach service providers because they felt that the agency would not be able to understand their needs. The desire for English language classes among some of the Pakistani women is indicative of the extent to which some sections of the community may feel isolated from mainstream services due to their inability to speak English.

Second, a significant finding from the study was that there was a sense in which there was inequality of opportunity in accessing housing. This suggests that certain BME groups and individuals believe that preferential treatment is given to some sections of the population over others. Fears of discrimination and a sense that the needs of other client groups may be more 'worthy' may impact on their willingness to access particular services.

Third, some communities are not aware of how to access information about specific services. This was highlighted in the case of adaptations where there was little real understanding among those whose homes needed adapting for a family member with a health problem or disability, about which agency to contact. However, given the relatively large proportion of asylum seekers and refugees in the sample who would not necessarily be expected to have experience of accessing particular services, this may distort the overall picture.

Finally, in some cases, there was deemed to be only a limited availability of some services. Views of respondents on the provision of financial advice to the BME community illustrates this point.

Cohesive and stable communities

One of the important findings from the study concerns the relative stability of some of the communities represented within the sample. An attachment to a particular area (indicated by length of residency) and, where a house move is anticipated, to move within the same area, together with a general level of satisfaction with their neighbourhood suggests a strong association with a particular locality and community. This is important in that it suggests some communities are more cohesive and individual households are able to benefit from the close proximity of family and friends and community facilities to counter any economic or social isolation. This issue is also particularly relevant in that the choice of area is the most important factor when choosing where to live, combined with the need to live in an environment which is safe and free from racial and other harassment. Stable communities tend to be more dynamic and instil a greater a sense of belonging and mutual self-help among its members, which can counterbalance individual's households' own, impoverished circumstances. Those communities that are much less stable tend to be more transient, less involved in community activities and more reliant on outside agencies.

BME facilities

Related to the point above is the lack of BME facilities in some areas to support local communities. The study reveals that the community services that do exist are generally rated positively but that there is a need for additional ones. The nature of these additional community facilities varies according to ethnic groups and the different sections of the community. BME specific community centres are universally noted. The importance of such a community resource should not be under-estimated. For some of the BME women, such a centre provides the opportunity to meet other people and especially women from their own community, providing the opportunity to share information and provide a social outlet.

Support services

Three areas were identified within the main household survey where support was required from outside agencies. First, in relation to improving the condition of those properties where there were major outstanding repairs. Support to identify and undertake repairs was seen as an important issue, especially among those living in the owner-occupied sector who could not afford to have the repairs completed. Second, related to this, there was a call for financial support to improve their existing property and to remain within their own home. Third, the study has highlighted an element of demand for support to assist with reviewing the needs of the household in terms of adaptations to their property and arranging for these to be carried out.

Consultation

Consultation with the BME communities by service providers needs to be improved. BME communities are receptive to being consulted about issues, which directly affect them: just 30% of the sample were not interested in being involved in consultation exercises. However, what the study explicitly highlights is the need for a range of consultation methods to be employed, reflecting the preferences of individual communities. The wide range of BME communities represented within the sample, accessed by the community interviewers, is a further testament to the desire for communities to be actively engaged in expressing their views.

Future needs

The inclusion within the study of the views of other household members, apart from the head of household, highlights the range of future needs within the BME community. In some respects, the future aspirations of young people are quite clear: a preference for owner-occupation and for remaining within the same area of residence as their parents and other family networks. However, in other respects, they are less well developed, for example in relation to the timescale for looking for their own accommodation. As the potential heads of household of the future, the views of this section of the community will be influential.

The study also highlights the need for separate housing for older people in the future. This suggests that a changing shift in family living patterns away from the more traditional practice of older people remaining within the family home and being cared for by other family members. It is unlikely that such older people are fully aware of the range of specialist housing available to them. However, given the acknowledged growing proportion of the BME community in the older age ranges, the housing needs of this section of the community will become more pressing. Increasing age and associated frailty will also have important implications for social care providers and the nature of the support required by this group.

Homeless

Homeless BME people have specific needs, which have been highlighted in this study. However, these needs should be seen as part of the housing and related needs of the BME community generally rather than being specific to one section. In relation to the causes of BME homeless, the main factor has been found to be disputes with parents. Overcrowding, the poor condition of some properties and the inability to improve their situation will inevitably put a strain on relationships within the household. This can be further aggravated by differing views across the different generations about a wide range of issues, such as personal autonomy and relationships. Many people subsequently find themselves homeless. Hence, to consider the causes of homelessness simply as a breakdown in relationships between household members is to ignore the underlying economic and social pressures.

Individuals who find themselves homeless, experience a range of barriers in accessing services and housing. Some of these barriers relates to the dynamics of the private and social housing markets (i.e. the availability and condition of accommodation), while others relate to the attitude and practices of individuals landlords (such as discriminating against those in receipt of state benefits by some private sector landlords) and the general lack of information about the housing choices open to this client group or assumptions on the part of homeless people about their likelihood of securing particular housing.

For homeless people, a wide range of support services are required to provide them with the necessary skills and advice to move to their own accommodation (such as budgeting advice) or support to sustain them in their own home.

Action Plan

Based on the findings of the study, the following outline Action Plan is advocated for the South Nottinghamshire area. It should be borne in mind that, given the diversity of BME communities resident in the study area and the differences between these groups, any action proposed should reflect this acknowledged diversity. Secondly, the Action Plan is intended as a comprehensive overview and individual agencies will be expected to identify those issues, which directly impact on their provision of services and client groups. However, where the study has highlighted an action which is particularly pertinent to one of the five local authorities, the individual local authority has been included adjacent to the particular action point.

Any Action Plan adopted should have, at its core, the requirement for all service providers to audit themselves to ensure that they are providing equality of access to the BME communities and that these communities are receiving equal standards of service. Particular emphasis should be given to identifying and removing any barriers which unfairly restrict access and use of services by any community group.

The Action plan is grouped around 6 core themes: tackling housing needs; increasing the economic and financial circumstances of households and communities; encouraging community cohesion; social and housing related support; future consultation with BME communities; and information needs.

Each of these will now be considered in detail:

Tackling housing needs

- Ensure BME communities are aware of the range of housing options available to them;
- Social housing providers should disseminate information about their services more widely;
- Audit services to see if discrimination in access to such services is based on perceptions rather than a reality. Engage with community groups to ensure that they are fully aware of the procedures for accessing services and equality of opportunity (*Ashfield, Nottingham and Gedling*);
- Ensure that all staff are aware of equality and diversity issues via training;
- Local authorities and housing associations should review their repairs and maintenance service to ensure that those from the BME community living in social housing are not discriminated against in relation to this service;
- Local authorities should consider an anti-fuel poverty strategy which includes a requirement to ensure that properties are energy-efficient and includes a refurbishment plan to ensure that properties are double glazed;
- Opportunities for alleviating overcrowding among BME households should be addressed by:

- Providing financial assistance (e.g. shared ownership opportunities) for home owners to purchase more suitable properties;
 - Ensuring that households are fully aware of the range of alternative housing available in the private rented sector;
 - Within the social housing sector, 'ring-fence' larger properties within BME community areas as they become vacant for households living in overcrowded conditions; and
 - Local authorities and housing associations should review their housing application procedure to ensure that adequate recognition is given to the degree of overcrowding experienced by some BME households;
 - Considering the feasibility of undertaking '2-into-1' property conversions.
- Ensure that the development of new housing (social and private) reflects the needs of a diverse community;
 - Publicise the availability of grant aid to enable home owners to repair their property and consider targeting awareness of such aid to specific communities, most notably the Pakistani community. Ensure that this is identified within the local authority private sector strategy;
 - Social housing providers should ensure that a range of property types and sizes are available to members of the BME community and seek to ensure that such properties meet any required cultural needs (such as the need for two living rooms or more than one bathroom); and
 - Ensure that the future needs of BME older people are taken in to account in development plans (social and private);
 - Undertake further investigation/research around particular communities or sections of communities where their needs have not been or have only partially been explored in this study, such as
 - older BME members in relation of independent accommodation and specifically looking at the views of this client group towards supported housing (such as sheltered accommodation) in terms of the facilities required, potential tenant profile and location of any such facility. The study suggests further work is needed around older Asian people, while the lack of representation of older Irish in the study also points to the need for additional work with this group.
 - some of the more 'hard to reach groups' where there is a currently a paucity of information available, such as travelers and gypsies and some of the white minority groups, e.g. the Polish.

Increasing the economic and financial circumstances of households and communities

- Support and advice should be directly available to those members of the community who experience periods of unemployment as well as those community members who have traditionally had little experience of paid employment (especially Pakistani women);
- English language classes should be provided at venues within specific communities and focus on the provision of such classes to enhance employment opportunities, particularly in relation to Asian women (*Nottingham*);
- Information should be provided at the community level about practical training and employment opportunities for the Asian community within the local area (*Nottingham*);
- Access to welfare rights services should be improved;
- Greater access should be given to financial advice services and the service promoted among the BME communities (*Nottingham*).

Encouraging community cohesion

- Agencies should work with existing community groups to support community stability as well as responding to emerging needs of 'new' communities as they settle into new areas, such as asylum seekers
- Agencies should recognize the importance of freedom from racial harassment and personal safety generally, as the most important factors impacting on choice of location. Allocations policies need to be sensitive to these issues (*Nottingham, Ashfield*).
- Audit existing community facilities to ensure people from BME communities are included;
- Additional community facilities (including places of worship, leisure facilities and community centers) which enable regular contact between community members, should be developed within the BME community areas to promote social cohesion and reduce social isolation. Facilities specifically designated for BME women should be developed or at least the provision of women-only events. Similarly, facilities catering for older members of the community should be made available. Alternatively, consider the re-dedication of all or part of existing community facilities, in consultation with the wider community (*Ashfield, Nottingham*); and
- Service providers, including social housing providers, should consider ways of supporting the development of multi-cultural communities;

Social and housing related support

- Greater publicity should be made available to the BME communities about the range of support available to individual households in terms of: social care provision, property adaptations and support to remain within their own home. Information should also be made available concerning which agencies to contact for assistance;
- Information concerning the availability of aids and adaptations needs to be disseminated widely through existing community groups to reach older and vulnerable households;
- A multi-agency approach should be developed to respond to the need from the BME community for support in identifying and carrying out adaptations; and
- Ensure that the Supporting People Strategy takes account of the changing profile and needs of older members of the BME community

Future consultation with BME communities

- Build on the good will, expertise and enhanced skills base of the community interviewers for future consultation exercises. They should be considered a resource for consultation which is not BME specific
- Review existing BME consultation mechanisms (*Ashfield, Gedling and Nottingham*) to ensure that current practices are:
 - Responsive to the consultation preferences of individual communities;
 - Recognise the 'issues of interest' among the different communities;
 - Provide a supportive and informed environment to encourage communities to participate in consultation exercises (such as the provision of child care facilities, locally organised venues and training);
 - Encourage multi-ethnic consultation forums where appropriate to reinforce community diversity and cohesion; and
 - Encourage and support the development of 'consultation champions' among the more 'hard to reach' communities who traditionally have had only minimal experience of consultation.

Homelessness

- Work with young people before they consider leaving home to educate them about their housing options;
- Provide a mediation service to prevent homelessness occurring;
- Ensure homelessness prevention services meet the needs of the BME community;
- Audit homelessness services to ensure there is no discrimination against BME communities. Engage with community groups to ensure that they are fully aware of the procedures for accessing services; and
- Ensure that all homelessness service staff are sensitive to inter-generational cultural conflicts.

Information needs

- All agencies should provide information about their services, which is located within BME community venues;
- Information should be available upon request in a wide range of languages or via translators. Language requirements will need to be periodically reviewed in recognition of the range of 'new' communities being established, especially in relation to asylum seekers and refugees; and
- Information should be specifically targeted at older members of the BME community about their housing options.

References

Harrison, M. and Phillip, D. (2003) **Housing and black and minority ethnic communities: Review of evidence base**, ODPM.



My name is I am undertaking interviews with people from ethnic minorities about their housing circumstances for the University of Salford (**SHOW IDENTIFICATION BADGE**). The people we interview have been selected at random. I would like to ask you a few questions. Your answers and those of other households will enable service providers to have a better understanding of the needs of your community. The interview will take no more than 20 minutes and all the answers you give will be treated as confidential.

Is it okay to start the interview ...

Refusal – reason

Full Address

.....

Postcode

Date:

Time started interview

Time finished interview

Interviewer name:

Number of visits to property (**circle**) 1 2 3

SECTION I: ABOUT YOUR HOME

Q1 Can I begin by asking you about your home? What type of property do you live in? **(circle)**

House		1
Multiple houses (joined)	2	
Ground floor flat	3	
Flat above ground floor	4	
Bedsit		5
Bungalow		6
Another type of property	7	

Q2 And which of these best describes your present housing situation? **(Read out) (circle)**

Owner-occupier with mortgage		1
Outright owner-occupier		2
Council tenant (<i>which</i>)		3
Housing Association tenant		4
Tenant of private landlord (furnished accommodation)		5
Tenant of private landlord (unfurnished accommodation)	6	
Living in accommodation provided with job	7	
Shared owner (part own/part rent)	8	
Lodging with friends/relatives		9
Sheltered housing for older people	10	
Supported housing		11
Another housing situation	12	

Q3 How many rooms does your home have, *not counting bathrooms, toilets and kitchens?* **(circle)**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8+

Q4 Of these, how many are used only as a bedroom? **(circle)**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

Q5 Does your home have any of the following facilities **(Read out) (circle)**

Kitchen	Yes	No
Inside toilet	Yes	No
Outside toilet	Yes	No
Bath	Yes	No
Shower	Yes	No

Q6 And do you share any of the facilities with another household? **(Read Out) (Circle)**

Kitchen	Yes	No
Inside toilet	Yes	No
Outside toilet	Yes	No
Bath	Yes	No
Shower	Yes	No

Q7 How would you describe the size of your home in terms of your family's needs? Would you say your home is: **(Circle)**

- Too big 1
- Too small 2
- Or about the right size 3
- Don't know 4

Why do you say that?

Q8 Would you say that your household is living in overcrowded conditions?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- Don't know 3

Q9 **SHOW CARD 1** Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the state of repair of your home?

- Very satisfied 1
- Satisfied 2
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3
- Dissatisfied 4
- Very dissatisfied 5
- Don't know 6

Q10 Are there any repairs required to your home which you feel are urgent?

- Yes 1 **(Go to Q11)**
- No 2 **(Go to Q16)**

Q11 Could you describe these repairs?

.....
.....
.....

Q12 Are you planning to get these repairs done?

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| Yes | 1 | (Go to Q14) |
| No | 2 | (Go to Q13) |

Q13 Is this because **(Code ONE only)**

- | | |
|--|---|
| You cannot afford to? | 1 |
| The repair problems are too severe? | 2 |
| You cannot physically manage? | 3 |
| You are unable to get a grant from the Council | 4 |
| The repairs are the responsibility of your landlord? | 5 |
| You don't have the time? | 6 |
| Or is there another reason – explain | 7 |

Q14 Have these repair problems caused or made worse any health difficulties?

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| Yes | 1 | (Go to Q15) |
| No | 2 | (Go to Q16) |

Q15 What health difficulties have they caused or made worse?

.....
.....

Q16 Do you need support to identify and/or carry out minor repairs in your home?

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| No | 1 |
| Yes – but don't receive | 2 |
| Yes – and already receive | 3 |
| Other | 4 |

Q17 Does your home benefit from the following?

	All of home	Part of home	None of home	Don't know
Double glazing	1	2	3	4
Central heating	1	2	3	4
Loft insulation	1	2	3	4

Q18 How long have you lived at this address?

Less than 1 year	1
Between 1-5 years	2
Between 6-10 years	3
Between 11-15 years	4
Between 16-20 years	5
Between 21-30 years	6
Longer than 30 years	7

Q19 What were your housing circumstances before you moved to this address?

Always lived here	1
Lived abroad	2
Rented from the Council	3
Rented from a Housing Association	4
Rented privately	5
Lived as owner-occupier	6
Lived with immediate family	7
Lived with other relatives/friends	8
Homeless	9
Lived in a hostel/refuge	10
Another housing circumstance	11

Q20 Where did you live prior to moving to your current address?

- Still in this area (*insert area*) 1
- Elsewhere in Nottinghamshire 2
- Elsewhere in UK 3
- Outside UK 4

Q21 Why did you move to your current address?

- To be nearer family/friends 1
- For work reasons 2
- Didn't have a choice 3
- Liked the area 4
- Other 5

Q22 **SHOW CARD 1** Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your home?

- Very satisfied 1 **(Go to G24)**
- Satisfied 2 **(Go to Q24)**
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3 **(Go to Q24)**
- Dissatisfied 4 **(Go to Q23)**
- Very dissatisfied 5 **(Go to Q23)**
- Don't know 6 **(Go to Q24)**

Q23 Why do you say that?

.....
.....

Q24 **SHOW CARD 2** Could any of these measures be taken to improve your housing situation?
(Multi-code)

Financial assistance for improvements	1	
Financial assistance for repairs	1	
Financial assistance for adaptations	1	
A move to a larger rented property	1	
A move to a smaller rented property	1	
A move to a larger house to buy	1	
A move to a smaller house to buy	1	
Support to remain in your home	1	
Support for more or more suitable furniture	1	
Support to find a new home	1	
None of these	1	
Don't know		1

SECTION II: VIEWS ON THE AREA

Q25 Why did you move to this area?

Have always lived in this area	1	
Like the area		2
Did not have a choice	3	
To be nearer family/friends		4
To be nearer to work	5	
To be with my own community	6	
Other reasons	7	

Q26 **SHOW CARD 3** Now can I ask you how good or poor you would rate the following aspects of your neighbourhood?

	Very good	Good	Neither good nor poor	Poor	Very poor	Don't know
Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
Childcare facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public transport	1	2	3	4	5	6
Shops	1	2	3	4	5	6
Health care	1	2	3	4	5	6
Leisure facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Parks and open spaces	1	2	3	4	5	6
Closeness to place of worship	1	2	3	4	5	6
Reputation of neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quietness of neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
Access to housing advice	1	2	3	4	5	6
Access to housing-related support services	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q27 **SHOW CARD 4** And how would you rate the following in terms of being a major or minor problem or not being a problem in your neighbourhood?

	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
The level of crime	1	2	3	4
Noise levels (<i>i.e. from traffic, outside noise, neighbours, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4
The level of racial harassment	1	2	3	4
The levels of drug dealing and drug abuse	1	2	3	4
The incidence of dumping rubbish on common ground	1	2	3	4
The level of unreasonable behaviour from people in the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4
The level of traffic	1	2	3	4
The level of police support	1	2	3	4
The condition of occupied homes in general	1	2	3	4
The condition of empty homes	1	2	3	4
Feeling like part of a community	1	2	3	4

Q28 What do you particularly *like* about this neighbourhood?

.....

Q29 What do you particularly *dislike* about this neighbourhood?

.....

Q30 **SHOW CARD 1** Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the area in which you live?

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Very satisfied | 1 | (Go to Q32) |
| Satisfied | 2 | (Go to Q32) |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 3 | (Go to Q32) |
| Dissatisfied | 4 | (Go to Q31) |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 | (Go to Q31) |
| Don't know | 6 | (Go to Q32) |

Q31 Why do you say that?

.....
.....

Q32 Would you say your area is:

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| Getting better | 1 | |
| Staying the same | 2 | |
| Or getting worse | 3 | |
| Don't know | | 4 |

Q33 Why do you say that?

.....
.....

Q34 **SHOW CARD 5**

How important are the following to you when choosing an area in which you want to live?

	Very important	Quite important	Not so important	Not important at all	Don't know
Being close to Schools	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to Childcare facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to Public transport	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to relevant Shops	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to Health care	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to Leisure facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to Parks & open spaces	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to a place of worship	1	2	3	4	5
Being close to family/friends		2	3	4	5
Reputation of neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5
Quietness of neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5
Access to housing advice	1	2	3	4	5
Access to housing-related support services	1	2	3	4	5
Car parking	1	2	3	4	5
Being a safe place (e.g. safe from burglaries)	1	2	3	4	5
Safe from racial harassment	1	2	3	4	5
Feeling like part of the community	1	2	3	4	5

Q35 How would you rate the facilities in the neighbourhood for your ethnic community?

- Very good 1
- Good 2
- Neither good nor poor 3
- Poor 4
- Very poor 5
- Don't know 6

Q36 Are there any specific facilities for your community that you want which are not currently provided?

- Yes **(which)** 1
- No 2
- Don't know 3

Q37 Do you feel that people from your community group have the same opportunities in terms of access to housing as those from other communities?

- Yes 1 **(Go to Q39)**
- No 2 **(Go to Q38)**
- Don't know 3 **(Go to Q39)**

Q38 Why do you say that?

.....
.....

Q39 Do you feel that you have enough access to financial advice?

- Yes 1
- No 2

SECTION III: HEALTH AND SUPPORT NEEDS

Q40 Now could you tell me how many people in your household have any of these illnesses or disabilities

		None	1 person	2 people	3 or more people
A	Visual impairment	1	2	3	4
B	Hearing impairment	1	2	3	4
C	Mobility problems	1	2	3	4
D	Learning disability	1	2	3	4
E	Mental health problem (<i>e.g. depression</i>)	1	2	3	4
F	Frailty (<i>elderly</i>)	1	2	3	4
G	Confusion/senile dementia (<i>elderly</i>)	1	2	3	4
H	Asthma	1	2	3	4
I	Arthritis	1	2	3	4
J	Diabetes	1	2	3	4
K	Heart disease	1	2	3	4
L	High blood pressure	1	2	3	4
M	Sickle cell	1	2	3	4
N	Other illnesses or disabilities	1	2	3	4

Q41 Which of these alterations to your home do you already have? And which of them do you need?

	Already have	Don't have but do need	Don't have and Don't need
A walk-in shower or disabled bath	1	2	3
Access ramps outside your home	1	2	3
Access ramps inside your home	1	2	3
Tap adaptations	1	2	3
A handrail on the stairs	1	2	3
A stair lift	1	2	3
A bathroom grab rail	1	2	3
Other facilities you <i>already have</i> (Please describe these)			
Other facilities you <i>don't have, but do need</i> (Please describe these)			

IF ANSWER 2 TO ANY OF ABOVE GO TO Q42

Q42 Do you need support to identify or carry out adaptations or aids to your home which you need?

- No 1
- Yes – but don't receive 2
- Yes – and already receive 3
- Other 4

Q43 Where would you go to seek advice on aids and adaptations to your home? (**Code ONE only**)

Council	1	
Housing Association	2	
Social Services	3	
GP/Health Centre	4	
Citizens Advice Bureau	5	
Other	6	
Don't know		7

Q44 Would you say that you or any members of your household need any of these special forms of housing?

	Need	
	Yes	No
Accommodation without stairs	1	2
Accommodation suitable for a wheelchair	1	2
Accommodation with a resident warden	1	2
Accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system	1	2
Residential care home (<i>e.g. nursing home</i>)	1	2
Accommodation with a visiting warden	1	2
Day time staff on site with Emergency call Out	1	2
Live in landlady/landlord	1	2
Family providing support	1	2
Other special accommodation	1	2
None of these	1	2
Don't know	1	2

Q45 Apart from financial assistance (e.g. welfare benefits), do you or other members of your family receive any help or support from outside agencies or do you feel that some support is needed?

Yes – currently receive support or help (Record type) 1
.....
.....

No – don't receive support but need support (Record type) 2
.....
.....

No – don't receive support and don't need support 3
Don't know 4

Q46 Does anyone in your household receive any housing-related support services?

Yes 1 (Go to Q47)
No 2 (Go to Q51)

Q47 Do you receive any of the following:

Floating or visiting support 1
24 hour with sleep in staff 1
24 hour with waking night staff 1
None of these 1

Q48 Who provides this service?

A charity		1
A Housing Association	2	
A private landlord		3
Age Concern /Care & Repair	4	
Council	5	
NHS Trust		6
Voluntary organization	7	
Private company	8	
Family or friends	9	
Other	10	
Don't know		11

Q49 How long have you been receiving this support for?

Less than 6 months		1
6 months or more but less than 12 months	2	
12 months or more but less than 2 years		3
2 years or more but less than 5 years		4
5 years of more		5
Can't remember		6

Q50 Why do you receive this support?

.....
.....

SECTION IV: YOUR FUTURE HOUSING INTENTIONS

Q51 Are you planning to move from your present home?

- | | | |
|-------|---|--------------------|
| No | 1 | (Go to Q67) |
| Yes | 2 | (Go to Q52) |
| Maybe | 3 | (Go to Q52) |

Q52 Within how many years do you think you will move?

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Within the next year | 1 |
| Within the next 2 years | 2 |
| Within the next 3 years | 3 |
| Within the next 4 years | 4 |
| Within the next 5 years | 5 |
| Longer than 5 years from now | 6 |
| Don't know | 7 |

Q53 Why are you considering moving? What is the main reason? (**Code ONE only**)

I need a larger house	1	
I need a smaller house	2	
I need to be nearer work	3	
My home is in a poor state of repair	4	
I want to live in a better area	5	
I need sheltered accommodation	6	
I would like a garden	7	
I want to be nearer relatives/friends	8	
I want to buy my own home	9	
I want to get away from racial harassment	10	
I want to get away from anti-social behaviour	11	
To receive greater care	12	
To receive more support	13	
For financial reasons	14	
I am dissatisfied with my home	15	
I am dissatisfied with the services provided	16	
I am facing eviction		17
I have problems with my neighbours	18	
The rent is too high		19
Other reasons	20	

Q54 Where do you intend to move to?

Within the same area	(<i>record area</i>)	1
Elsewhere		2
Don't know		3

Q55 Have you done anything about moving? **(Multi-code)**

Applied to a Council		1
Applied to a local Housing Association	1	
Contacted private landlords	1	
Contacted an estate agent	1	
Talked to your support worker	1	
Taken other action	1	
None of these	1	

Q56 What has happened?

.....
.....

Q57 Which of the following is the most important when choosing a new home? **(Read Out) (Code ONE only)**

The type of home	1	
The size of home	2	
The area	3	
Being near family/friends	4	
Being within your own community	5	
Receiving support		6
Something else	7	
Can't decide		8

Q58 Which of these types of home would you consider moving to? (**Multi-code**)

Sheltered housing (with warden support)	1
Terraced house	1
Semi-detached house	1
Detached house	1
Flat	1
Bungalow	1
Bedsit	1
Another type of home	1
Don't know	1

Q59 And which would be your first choice (**Code ONE only**)

Sheltered housing (with warden support)	1
Terraced house	2
Semi-detached house	3
Detached house	4
Flat	5
Bungalow	6
Bedsit	7
Another type of home	8
Don't know	9

Q60	Would you most prefer (Read out) Code ONE only)	
	A larger newly built home?	1
	A smaller newly built home?	2
	A larger improved home?	3
	Or a smaller improved home?	4
	No particular preference	5
	Don't know	6

Q61	Which of these forms of tenure would you consider? (Multi-code)	
	Owning your home	1
	Renting from the Council	1
	Renting from a Housing Association	1
	Renting from a private landlord	1
	Group home or shared home	1
	Grant-assisted homeownership	1
	Moving in with other family members	1
	None of these	1

Q62	Which would be your first choice? (Code ONE only)	
	Owning your home	1
	Renting from the Council	2
	Renting from a Housing Association	3
	Renting from a private landlord	4
	Group home or shared home	5
	Grant-assisted homeownership	6
	Moving in with other family members	7
	None of these	8

Q63	Do you think you will get your first choice?	
	Yes	1 (Go to Q65)
	No	2 (Go to Q64)
	Don't know	3 (Go to Q65)

Q64 Why do you think that?

.....
.....

Q65 How many of the following rooms would you need for your household? (**Read Out**)

Bedrooms	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8+
Living Rooms	1	2	3					
Kitchens	1	2	3					
Bathrooms	1	2	3					

Q66 If you buy a home, how will you purchase the property? Will you: (**Code ONE only**)

Get a mortgage							1	
Borrow money – where from						2		
Use your own money							3	
Or purchase the property in another way?						4		
Don't intend to buy								5

Q67	When your children get married, where will they live? (Code ONE only)		
	No children/children already married	1	
	They will live here		2
	They will move into their own home	3	
	The eldest son will stay, but others will move to their own home	4	
	We will move to a larger home and live all together	5	
	Something else	6	
	Don't know		7

Q68	Do you feel that you are consulted enough about issues affecting you and your community?		
	Yes		1
	No		2
	Don't know		3

Q69	How would you prefer to be consulted? (Multi-code)		
	By letter	1	
	By telephone		1
	By one-to-one meetings	1	
	By email/Internet	1	
	Through open-meetings	1	
	Through surveys	1	
	Through tenants' associations	1	
	Other (specify))	1	
	No interest in being consulted		1

SECTION V: ABOUT YOU AND YOUR HOUSEHOLD

Q70	Including yourself, how many people are in your household (Circle)										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	12	13	14	15+							

Q71 **SHOW CARD 6** Which of these best describes your type of household?

One adult over 60 years of age	1
Two adults over 60 years of age	2
One adult over 60 years of age and one adult under 60 years of age	3
One adult under 60 years of age	4
Two adults under 60 years of age	5
Three or more adults under 60 years of age	6
One adult with one or two children	7
One adult with three or more children	8
Two adults with one or two children	9
Two adults with three or more children	10
Another type of household	11

Q72 And how many of these does your household contain? **(Circle)**

Couples – married or living as married	0	1	2	3+
Single people aged over 20 with no children	0	1	2	3+
Single males aged 16-20 with no children	0	1	2	3+
Single females aged 16-20 with no children	0	1	2	3+
Lone male parents aged 16-20	0	1	2	3+
Lone female parents aged 16-20	0	1	2	3+
Lone male parents aged over 20	0	1	2	3+
Lone female parents aged over 20	0	1	2	3+

Q73 Now, would you mind providing me with some information about each of the adults living in the household? Please begin with yourself.

	ADULT 1	ADULT 2	ADULT 3	ADULT 4	ADULT 5	ADULT 6	ADULT 7	ADULT 8	ADULT 9
AGE									
16 – 24 years	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25 – 39 years	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
40 – 49 years	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
50 – 59 years	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
60 – 74 years	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
75 years or over	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GENDER									
Male	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
WORKING STATUS									
Full-time employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Part-time employment	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Retired	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Unemployed	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Long-term sick/disabled	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Student 16 or over/Trainee	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Housewife/ Househusband	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Other not working	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

Q74 **(IF RESPONDENT UNEMPLOYED)** How long have you been unemployed?

Less than 6 months		1
6 months or more but less than 12 months	2	
12 months or more but less than 2 years		3
2 years or more but less than 5 years		4
5 years or more		5
Can't remember		6
Respondent not unemployed		7

Q75 Do you have the right to work in this country?

Yes	1
No	2

Q76 How many children in the household are in the following age groups?

Under 2 years old	0	1	2	3	4	5+	
2-4 years		0	1	2	3	4	5+
5-7 years		0	1	2	3	4	5+
8-10 years		0	1	2	3	4	5+
11-12 years		0	1	2	3	4	5+
13-15 years		0	1	2	3	4	5+

Q77 And how many are boys and how many are girls? **(Circle)**

Boys	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Girls	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Q78 How would you describe your ethnic origin?

.....

Q79 Are any members of your household from a different ethnic origin?

Yes	1	(Go to Q80)
No	2	(Go to Q81)

Q80 What is their ethnic origin?

.....

Q81 Are you a Refugee or Asylum Seeker

Yes

1

No

2

Q82 Does anyone in your household receive any of the following welfare benefits? **(Multi-code)**

Income support	1	
Council Tax Benefit		1
Housing Benefit	1	
Child Tax Credit	1	
Working Tax Credit		1
Jobseekers Allowance	1	
National Asylum Support Service/Home Office	1	
Supporting People Grant/Subsidy	1	
State retirement pension	1	
Widows pension	1	
Incapacity Benefit or Disability Living Allowance or Attendance Allowance	1	
Other benefits or pension from the Government	1	
.....		
Occupational pension	1	
None of these	1	

Q83 SHOW CARD 7 Bearing mind that your answer is confidential, would you mind telling me the amount of your household's **total** income. Please use **net** income from all sources (i.e. after deductions for income tax and national insurance) but **exclude** any housing benefit you receive.

	MONTHLY INCOME	ANNUAL INCOME
1	No income	No income
2	£217 or less per month	£2,600 or less per year
3	£218 - £433 per month	£2,601 - £5,200 per year
4	£434 - £650 per month	£5,201 - £7,800 per year
5	£651 - £867 per month	£7,801 - £10,400 per year
6	£868 - £1,080 per month	£10,401 - £13,000 per year
7	£1,081 - £1,300 per month	£13,001 - £15,600 per year
8	£1,301 - £1,733 per month	£15,601 - £20,800 per year
9	£1,734 - £2,167 per month	£20,801 - £26,000 per year
10	£2,168 - £3,033 per month	£26,001 - £36,400 per year
11	More than £3,033 per month	More than £36,400 per year
12	Don't know	
13	Refused to say	

Q84 What language do you normally read or write in? **(Record ONE only)**

Q85 And what language do you normally speak? **(Record ONE only)**

Q86 What other languages can you speak?

Q87 What is your religion?

.....

No religion 1

Thank you for taking part in the survey. Staff from Salford University may wish contact you to ask you to take part further in this study. Would you be happy for someone from the University to contact you?

Yes 1

No 2

If yes, Record Name

Contact Telephone No.

Would you like to receive feedback on the survey results?

Yes 1 No 2

Name:

Address:.....

Do you know of any other households living in this area who are from the same ethnic background as yourself.

Address:

.....

AGREE & SIGN CHECK LIST & LEAVE COPY OF THE THANKYOU LETTER WITH THE RESPONDENT (overleaf)

This form is to be signed by the respondent to state that they saw your identification badge and were left with a letter explaining the survey.

I confirm that:

I saw the Identification Badge of the person who interviewed me and

I was given a copy of the letter from the university of Salford explaining the survey.

Signed

Date:

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRES

Number of older people (aged 55 and over) in the household

.....

Number of young people (aged 16-24) in the household

.....

Number of women (aged 25-55) in the household

.....

Questions for young person

Q1 Are you planning to look for your own accommodation in the near future

No 1 (Go to Q5)

Yes 2 (Go to Q2)

Maybe 3 (Go to Q2)

Q2 Within how many years do you think you will move?

Within the next year 1

Within the next 2 years 2

Within the next 3 years 3

Within the next 4 years 4

Within the next 5 years 5

Longer than 5 years from now 6

Don't know 7

Q3 Where do you intend to move to?

Within the same area (*record area*) 1

Elsewhere 2

Don't know 3

Q4 Have you done anything about moving? (**Multi-code**)

Applied to a Council 1

Applied to a local Housing Association 1

Contacted private landlords 1

Contacted an estate agent 1

Talked to your support worker 1

Taken other action 1

None of these 1

Q5 Which of the following is the most important when choosing a new home? (**Read Out**) (**Code ONE only**)

The type of home	1	
The size of home	2	
The area	3	
Being near family/friends	4	
Being within your own community	5	
Receiving support		6
Something else	7	
Can't decide		8

Q6 Which of these types of home would you consider moving to? (**Multi-code**)

Terraced house	1	
Semi-detached house	1	
Detached house	1	
Flat		1
Bungalow		1
Bedsit		1
Another type of home	1	
Don't know		1

Q7 And which would be your first choice (**Code ONE only**)

Terraced house	1	
Semi-detached house	2	
Detached house	3	
Flat		4
Bungalow		5
Bedsit		6
Another type of home	7	
Don't know		8

Q8	Would you most prefer (Read out) Code ONE only)		
	A larger newly built home?		1
	A smaller newly built home?	2	
	A larger improved home?	3	
	Or a smaller improved home?	4	
	No particular preference	5	
	Don't know		6
Q9	Which of these forms of tenure would you consider? (Multi-code)		
	Owning your home		1
	Renting from the Council	1	
	Renting from a Housing Association	1	
	Renting from a private landlord	1	
	Group home or shared home	1	
	Grant-assisted homeownership	1	
	Moving in with other family members	1	
	None of these	1	
Q10	Which would be your first choice? (Code ONE only)		
	Owning your home		1
	Renting from the Council	2	
	Renting from a Housing Association	3	
	Renting from a private landlord	4	
	Group home or shared home	5	
	Grant-assisted homeownership	6	
	Moving in with other family members	7	
	None of these	8	
Q11	Do you think you will get your first choice?		
	Yes	1	(Go to Q65)
	No	2	(Go to Q64)
	Don't know	3	(Go to Q65)

Q12 How many of the following rooms would you need for your household? (**Read Out**)

Bedrooms		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8+
Living Rooms	1	2	3						
Kitchens	1	2	3						
Bathrooms		1	2	3					

Q13 If you buy a home, how will you purchase the property? Will you: (**Code ONE only**)

Get a mortgage								1	
Borrow money – where from							2		
Use your own money								3	
Or purchase the property in another way?							4		
Don't intend to buy									5

Questions for Older people

Q1 Do you think that you will need your own accommodation in the near future?

No 1 **(Go to Q4)**

Yes 2 **(Go to Q2)**

Maybe 3 **(Go to Q2)**

Q2 When do you think you will need your own accommodation?

Within the next year 1

Within the next 2 years 2

Within the next 3 years 3

Within the next 4 years 4

Within the next 5 years 5

Longer than 5 years from now 6

Don't know 7

Q3 Would you consider moving to any of the following special forms of housing?

	Need	
	Yes	No
Accommodation without stairs	1	2
Accommodation suitable for a wheelchair	1	2
Accommodation with a resident warden	1	2
Accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system	1	2
Residential care home (<i>e.g. nursing home</i>)	1	2
Accommodation with a visiting warden	1	2
Day time staff on site with Emergency call Out	1	2
Live in landlady/landlord	1	2
Family providing support	1	2
Other special accommodation	1	2
None of these	1	2
Don't know	1	2

Q4 Do you have any support needs which are not currently provided for?

Yes	1 (Go to Q5)
No	2 (Go to Q6)
Don't know	3 (Go to Q6)

Q5 What are these support needs

.....

Q6 Are there any facilities that you would like to see developed in the area for older people from your community?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3

Q7 What type of facilities?

.....

Questions for Women

Q1 **SHOW CARD 1** Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your home?

Very satisfied	1	(Go to Q3)
Satisfied	2	(Go to Q3)
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	(Go to Q2)
Dissatisfied	4	(Go to Q2)
Very dissatisfied	5	(Go to Q2)
Don't know	6	(Go to Q3)

Q2 Why do you say that?

.....
.....

Q3 How would you rate the services/facilities for children in the area?

Very good	1
Good	2
Neither good nor poor	3
Poor	4
Very poor	5
Don't know	6

Q4 Are there any services which are not available in the area that you would want to use?

Yes	1 (Go to Q5)
No	2 (Go to Q6)
Don't know	3 (Go to Q6)

Q5 Which services would you want to use?
.....

Q6 Do you have any support needs?

Yes	1 (Go to Q7)
No	2 (Go to Q8)
Don't know	3 (Go to Q8)

Q7 What are these support needs
.....

Q8 Are there any facilities that you would like to see developed in the area for older people from your community?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3

Q9 What type of facilities?
.....