

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

1. This is the second report on responses to the Tackling Crime and Disorder Audit consultation that was carried out during the summer of 2007. This report provides additional analysis by ward, Fear of Crime and how informed residents feel broken down by Age; Gender; Ethnicity and Disability.
2. 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 the performance against targets that we set in the Consultation Strategy paper that was agreed at the meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2004.
3. 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 valid 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. (sometimes defined as ‘hard to reach’.)

<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	61	(1.5%)	n/a
	<u>3,982</u>		

It is apparent that the view 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 – Gender, Ethnicity and Disability

Appendix B – Age range

Appendix C – Ward

Appendix D – ASB priorities by Gender, Ethnicity and Disability

Appendix E – Age range

Appendix F – 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 is a summary of the priorities by all respondents.

The top five priorities were clear but there was some ambiguity about the sixth.

- a. 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. It was agreed that this would be considered within the Violent Crime category.
- b. Alcohol Misuse was ranked at seven and we considered 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. It was agreed that this would be incorporated into both Anti Social Behaviour and Violent Crime priorities.

- c. 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. It was agreed that Domestic Violence will be tackled within the Violent Crime category as it has been in the last two Community Safety Plans.
- d. 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.
- e. We considered 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 targets for this. There was discussion about Other Theft and the impact that this has on our communities. Other theft has been identified as a key concern in the Police Strategic Assessment however it was felt that it would be prudent to allow an option for other issues to emerge at a later stage in the life of the Community Safety Plan. It was agreed that our sixth priority will be Emerging Issues and that for 2008/09 we will focus on Other Theft.

**Table 1**

	Priority	Should be	Should not be	Net rating
<b>1</b>	<b><i>Anti-social behaviour</i></b>	<b>62.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Drugs</i></b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>40.8</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Violent crime</i></b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>19.8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b><i>Criminal damage</i></b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>13.6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b><i>Diverting young people from offending</i></b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Robbery/mugging</i></b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>
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 also that they did not prioritise Diverting Young People from Offending in the top three. Whilst Violent Crime was the highest 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), although very few older people are victims of robbery or mugging. This indicates a need to publicise this fact more widely.

3.3

**Table 2**

	<b>No of Responses</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>	<b>Priority 3</b>
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

3.4 Table 3 below shows how priorities varied by ethnicity. Of note is the non-white prioritisation of Domestic Violence referred to earlier in the paper. Of the 19 respondents, seven were female, 10 male and two left this field blank.

**Table 3**

	<b>Priority 1</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>	<b>Priority 3</b>
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

3.5 Target a was to obtain a response rate of at least 10 per thousand per ward. (i.e.1% of population).

Table 4 below provides a summary of the rate of responses by ward and it shows that we achieved this target in respect of 22 of the 26 wards. In four

wards, (Billingham North, Billingham South, Billingham West & Northern Parishes) responses were below the target set. In the cases of Billingham South and Billingham West, an additional three or four responses would have reached the target. In 2004 we had low responses from Thornaby wards, which have relatively high levels of crime and anti social behaviour, whereas the lower responses in 2007 are from wards with lower levels of crime and anti social behaviour.

**Table 4**

<u>Ward</u>	<u>Number of responses</u>	<u>% of overall responses</u>	<u>Rate per 1000 population</u>	<u>Crime rank from Audit</u>
Billingham Central	76	1.9	11.2	12
<b>*Billingham East</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>7</b>
Billingham North	78	1.9	8.2	20
Billingham South	64	1.6	9.6	11
Billingham West	55	1.4	9.3	23
Bishopsgarth and Elm Tree	107	2.7	16.4	15
*Eaglescliffe	442	11.0	41.9	21
Fairfield	138	3.4	22.4	22
Grangefield	99	2.5	15.0	16
<b>Hardwick</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>3</b>
Hartburn	164	4.1	24.2	24
Ingleby Barwick East	117	2.9	12.4	25
Ingleby Barwick West	453	11.3	42.7	26
<b>*Mandale and Victoria</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Newtown</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>4</b>
Northern Parishes	14	0.3	4.3	17
<b>Norton North</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Norton South</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>8</b>
Norton West	118	2.9	18.6	18
<b>Parkfield and Oxbridge</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>6</b>
Roseworth	73	1.8	10.1	10
<b>*Stainsby Hill</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Stockton Town Centre</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>1</b>
Village	107	2.7	16.9	13
Western Parishes	37	0.9	11.5	19
Yarm	133	3.3	14.0	14
Other wards	87	2.2	n/a	
Not stated	186	4.6	n/a	
TOTAL	4021	100.0	21.5	

\* = Wards including school responses

**Wards that are above the Borough average crime rate**

4 Table 5 below summarises analysis by ward.

**Table 5**

	<b>Priority 1</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>	<b>Priority 3</b>
Billingham Central	ASB	Drugs	Robbery & Mugging
Billingham East	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Billingham North	ASB	Drugs	Criminal Damage
Billingham South	ASB	Drugs	Robbery & Mugging
Billingham West	ASB	Drugs	Criminal Damage
Bishopsgarth and Elm Tree	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Eaglescliffe	ASB	Drugs	Diverting YP offending
Fairfield	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Grangefield	ASB	Drugs	Violence / Robbery & Mugging
Hardwick	ASB	Drugs	Alcohol Misuse
Hartburn	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Ingleby Barwick East	ASB	Drugs	Violence / Diverting YP offending
Ingleby Barwick West	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Mandale and Victoria	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Newtown	ASB	Drugs	Diverting YP offending
Northern Parishes	ASB	Drugs	Criminal Damage / Robbery & Mugging
Norton North	ASB	Drugs	Criminal Damage
Norton South	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Norton West	ASB	Violence	Drugs
Parkfield and Oxbridge	ASB	Drugs	Robbery & Mugging
Roseworth	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Stainsby Hill	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Stockton Town Centre	ASB	Drugs	Diverting YP offending
Village	Drugs	ASB	Criminal Damage
Western Parishes	ASB	Drugs	Violence
Yarm	ASB	Drugs	Violence

- a) All wards identified Anti Social Behaviour as the top priority, except Village ward, which chose Drug Related Offending first with ASB a close second. All but two wards chose Drug Related Offending as their second priority, the exceptions being Village as previously mentioned and Norton West, having Violence as the second choice.
- b) Only three wards identified Dwelling Burglary in the top six priorities, Billingham West, Parkfield & Oxbridge and Western Parishes.
- c) Thirteen wards considered that Violent Crime should be priority three, with four wards choosing Diverting Young People, five choosing Robbery/mugging, five choosing Criminal Damage, one choosing Drugs and one choosing Alcohol (three wards gave a multiple third choice). All of these issues will be addressed in the new Community Safety Plan (alcohol as an aspect of the ASB priority).
- d) All 26 wards felt that Business Crime should not be a priority. 17 wards felt that Prostitution should not be a priority and also, 14 Counter

Terrorism, 13 Road Safety and nine Environmental Crime as issues that we should not prioritise.

- 5 Table 6 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.

**Table 6**

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

5. The chart below shows the total responses in relation to the question; after reading the magazine do you feel less safe, more safe, or no different? A number of respondents failed to answer this question and their response is shown as blank. This was particularly an issue when conducting face-to-face interviews and the school surveys as not all respondents had read the magazine prior to completing the survey. The overall effect of the consultation programme has been a net increase in feelings of safety. Appendix E provides a full breakdown of feelings of safety based on age, gender, ethnicity, disability and ward.

Less Safe	116	2.9%
More Safe	499	12.4%
No Different	2,276	56.6%
Blank	1,130	28.1%

The only significant variations are that 6% of respondents over 75 felt less safe (although 19% felt more safe), 8.2% of respondents in Norton South felt less safe, and more disabled respondents (nearly 19%) recorded feeling more safe.

6. The chart below shows the total responses in relation to the question; do you feel well informed on what the council is doing to tackle crime and ASB? A number of respondents failed to answer this question and their response is shown as blank. This was particularly as issue when conducting face-to-face interviews and the school surveys as not all respondents had read the magazine fully prior to completing the survey. Appendix F provides a full breakdown of how well informed based on age, gender, ethnicity, disability and ward.

Well informed	1,794	44.6%
Not well informed	1,175	29.2%
Blank	1,052	26.2%

Fewer respondents aged under 16 felt well informed than was the case for other age groups, but there was little variation by ethnicity or disability.

7. When deciding priorities for the Community Safety Plan that will be produced in April 2008 we will consider other elements:
- a) The Partnership Strategic Intelligence Assessment will be produced in January 2008 and that will analyse data for the period April to September 2007, which may in turn also identify some emerging issues.
  - b) The proposed National Performance Indicators will also need to be considered.
  - c) It is **RECOMMENDED** that Priorities by Ward will be fed back to Neighbourhood Policing Teams and Ward Councillors.

Community Safety Manager  
19 November 2007