

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO AUDIT CONSULTATION AND KEY ISSUES FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN 4 (2008-2011)

1. Members will recall that we set ourselves a number of targets around responses to the Tackling Crime and Disorder Audit 2007. This paper looks at the analysis of responses received and where applicable identifies how we have performed against targets that we set in the Consultation Strategy paper that was brought to the meeting on 24th October 2006.

2. Target C was to increase the overall response rate by 10% to at least 4,000

The closing date for responses was 5 October. By this date a total of 4,021 responses were received, achieving the target, however, 39 surveys could not be analysed due to errors on the forms. Some respondents had not understood the need to prioritise. There were 3,982 valid responses received, which is an 8.1% increase on the 3,685 valid responses received in 2004. In addition, there were a further 21 forms received a week late which could not be included in the analysis.

The responses have been analysed as follows:-

2.1 **Format**

Schools	1,192 (30%)
Postal returns	631 (16%)
Website completion	124 (3%)
Face to face interview	1,903 (47%)
Meetings	<u>171 (4%)</u>
	4,021 (100%)

2.2 **Gender**

Male	1,806 (45%)
Female	2,042 (51%)
Not stated	<u>134 (3%)</u>
	3,982

2.3 Target b was to maintain the BME response rate to at least representative level of the Borough, which is 2.8%. Whilst our response from this group is lower than in 2004 where we achieved 5% we have maintained the level to above the Borough average.

Ethnicity

White	3,663 (92%)
Non-White	133 (3%)
Not stated	<u>186 (5%)</u>
	3,982

- 2.4 Target d was to increase responses from 16 – 34 age range. (11% in 2004) We have exceeded this target and achieved an 18.7% response from this age grouping.

<u>Age Range</u>			<u>Borough Population</u>
Under 16	1220	(30.6%)	19%
16 to 24	284	(7.1%)	12%
25 to 29	235	(5.9%)	} 27%
30 to 34	225	(5.7%)	
35 to 44	454	(11.4%)	
45 to 54	380	(9.5%)	} 24%
55 to 59	196	(4.9%)	
60 to 64	287	(7.2%)	
65 to 75	444	(11.2%)	11%
Over 75	196	(4.9%)	7%
Not stated	<u>61</u>	(1.5%)	n/a
	<u>3,982</u>		

It is apparent that the views of teenagers, who are often described as a ‘hard to reach’ group, but are represented in disproportionately high numbers among both offenders and victims of crime, were very well represented.

3. Analysis of the results is given in the Appendices, as detailed below. In each case, priorities are also identified on a ‘net score’ basis, i.e. the number of respondents identifying an issue as a priority minus the number of respondents identifying that issue as a non-priority.

- Appendix A – Overall position by Gender, Ethnicity and Disability
- Appendix B – Overall position by Age range
- Appendix C – Overall position by Ward
- Appendix D – ASB priorities by Gender, Ethnicity and Disability
- Appendix E – ASB priorities by Age range
- Appendix F – ASB priorities by Ward

- 3.1 Appendix A shows that there are 10 issues with a positive net score, which is an increase from 2004 when there were only seven. Below at Table 1 is a summary of the priorities by all respondents.

The top five priorities are clear but there is some ambiguity about number six that we will need to give some thought to.

- Robbery and Mugging is an element of Violent Crime and incidents are very low in our Borough with only 131 offences of Robbery being recorded in 2006/07. Therefore it may be appropriate to include this within the Violent Crime category. Later in the paper we can see that non-white respondents identified Domestic Violence as their third key priority even though overall it is ranked at 11. We know that this is an offence that is hidden and under reported so consideration needs to be given on whether this should also be included as a category within Violent Crime.

We may then need to determine what should be priority six or if indeed we should have a sixth priority.

- Alcohol Misuse is ranked at seven however we need to consider whether as a Crime Reduction Partnership our focus should be Alcohol Misuse in general or whether we should add this to the ASB priority and monitor it within that. Within the ASB priorities that are discussed later in the paper ASB involving substance misuse, which includes alcohol, is a key concern for respondents appearing three times in the top six priorities. Members will be aware that we currently tackle alcohol related violent crime through our Violence Reduction Group using the successful ThinkB4UDrink campaign.
- Domestic violence again does not make it into the top six on 'popular vote' alone. In previous cycles of consultation and planning the Partnership has taken the view that domestic violence should be included as a priority within violent crime because although it affects only a minority of residents, its impact on those it does affect is often very significant.
- We may want to consider having a more generic priority looking at reducing fear of crime and increasing feelings of safety. Some members may recall that we did have a Providing Reassurance target in the first Community Safety Plan and that it was difficult to set intelligence led on 'SMART' targets for this.
- We will be monitoring Dwelling Burglary through Priority Action 2 within PSA Delivery Agreement 23 and as members are aware Dwelling Burglary was reported as an all time low for 2006/07.

	Priority	Should be	Should not be	Net rating
1	<i>Anti-social behaviour</i>	62.1	6.1	56
2	<i>Drugs</i>	47.7	6.9	40.8
3	<i>Violent crime</i>	24.6	4.8	19.8
4	<i>Criminal damage</i>	21.3	7.7	13.6
5	<i>Diverting young people from offending</i>	27.6	14.3	13.3
6	<i>Robbery/mugging</i>	18.1	4.8	13.3
7	Alcohol misuse	24.6	20.5	4.1
8	Dwelling burglary	10.1	6.3	3.8
9	Arson/deliberate fires	13.6	11.8	1.8
10	Hate crime	0.1	0	0.1
11	Domestic violence	10.8	10.8	0
12	Vehicle crime	5.1	13.6	-8.5
13	Environmental crime	4.2	29.6	-25.4
14	Road safety	9.3	36.6	-27.3
15	Counter-terrorism	9.1	37.4	-28.3
16	Prostitution	4.7	33.5	-28.8
17	Business/retail crime	2.6	46.6	-44

- 3.2 A simplified version of Appendix B is set out in Table 2 below and it demonstrates how prioritising varied across age groups. It is interesting that only those under 16 gave a different top priority and that they did not prioritise Diverting Young People from Offending in the top three. Whilst Violent Crime was the most common third priority it is worth noting that the over 75's identified Robbery and Mugging as their third priority (an element of violent crime that often receives media coverage in this area).

Table 2				
	No of Responses	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Under 16's	1,220	Drugs	Anti Social Behaviour	Violent crime
16 – 24	284	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Violent crime
25 – 29	235	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Violent crime
30 – 34	225	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending
35 - 44	454	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending
45 – 54	380	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Violent crime
55 – 59	196	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Violent crime
60 – 64	287	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending
65 – 75	444	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending
Over 75	196	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Robbery / Mugging
Not stated	61	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Robbery / Mugging

- 3.3 Table 3 below shows how priorities varied by ethnicity. Of note is the non-white prioritisation of Domestic Violence.

Table 3			
	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
White	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Violent crime
Non - White	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending & Domestic violence
Not stated	Anti Social Behaviour	Drugs	Diverting YP from offending

3.4 Target a) was to obtain a response rate of at least 10 per thousand per ward. Due to time restraints a simplified table looking at priorities by ward could not be included with the papers but it will be available at the meeting and will also be brought to the December meeting for further discussion. Ward analysis will also need to be considered alongside Neighbourhood Policing priorities identified through resident consultation.

4 Table 4 below summarises ASB priorities. On this occasion there are nine categories that have shown a positive net score. ASB involving substance misuse, which includes alcohol is a key concern for respondents appearing three times in the top six priorities. The ASB Strategy that will be produced in April 2008 will provide detail of how we will tackle each of these issues.

	Anti-social behaviour		Should be	Should not be	Net rating
1	<i>People using/dealing drugs</i>	A	44.9	2.5	42.4
2	<i>Alcohol misuse/street drinking</i>	B	44.3	5.9	38.4
3	<i>Diverting young people from offending</i>	C	29.3	6.5	22.8
4	<i>Vandalism</i>	D	19.6	4.2	15.4
5	<i>Poor parental responsibility</i>	E	20.9	7.2	13.7
6	<i>People being drunk or rowdy</i>	F	17.4	4.5	12.9
7	Lack of respect for others	G	20.5	8.5	12
8	Threats/verbal abuse	I	13.8	4.1	9.7
9	Racial harassment	J	12.8	7.4	5.4
10	Litter and rubbish	K	11.9	14	-2.1
11	Noise nuisance	L	8.3	12.8	-4.5
12	Graffiti	M	8.4	19.8	-11.4
13	Kerb crawling	N	6.6	18.7	-12.1
14	Homophobic/hate crime	O	3.7	17.7	-14
15	Prostitution	P	5.8	20	-14.2
16	Dog fouling	Q	13.8	35.2	-21.4
17	Trespassing	R	1.9	26.9	-25
18	Abandoned cars	S	4.8	29.9	-25.1
19	Begging	T	7.1	45.9	-38.8

5. When deciding priorities for the Community Safety Plan that will be produced in April 2008 we will need to consider other elements:

- a) The Police Strategic Intelligence Assessment that will be produced imminently will identify emerging issues for us to consider.
- b) The Partnership Strategic Intelligence Assessment will be produced in January 2008 and that will analyse data for the period July to December 2007, which may in turn also identify some emerging issues.
- c) The 198 Indicators discussed in Agenda item 13 will also need to be taken into consideration.

6. It is proposed that a further paper providing additional detailed analysis will be brought to the December meeting and that will include a draft of the Partnership Strategic Intelligence Assessment.

Members are asked to:

- a) Endorse the five clear key priorities identified by respondents to Audit 2007 (ASB, Drugs, Violent Crime including Robbery / Mugging, Criminal Damage and Diverting young people from offending.
- b) Consider whether domestic violence should again be incorporated as a priority.
- c) Determine whether we should have a sixth priority and what it should be based on the responses received.

Community Safety Manager
22nd October 2007