

### **In depth discussion – Evaluation of Safe at Home**

1. Members will recall that in March 2005 we agreed a number of principles that we will use to trigger our in depth discussions:
  - a) What do we know about the issue?
  - b) How reliable/complete is our information base?
  - c) What are we doing about the gaps?
  - d) What more could we do about the gaps?
  - e) Who bears the economic costs and the savings?
  - f) What have we tried so far?
  - g) How much has the intervention cost?
  - h) Do we think that we have been successful?
  - i) Have we been able to evaluate impact?
  - j) What else may be worth trying?
  - k) Can we afford these other possible interventions?

This report addresses the principles above and should be used to form the basis of our discussion.

2. This project originated from the Repeat Victims of Dwelling Burglary Project that commenced in 2001 using funding from the Partnership Development Fund Burglary Reduction Initiative Funding. A full evaluation was carried out in November 2002 by Safe in Tees Valley. A further evaluation report was brought to the partnership in January 2005.
3. Since the project commenced we have assisted 661 people who were either a repeat victim of dwelling burglary and/or a victim of domestic violence and/or considered to be vulnerable following a visit by the Police Crime Prevention Officer. Of those 205 were victims of domestic violence and 219 were over the age of 65. The remainder were vulnerable for a range of other reasons such as being a single parent, mental health issues, other health issues etc.
4. The University of Durham researched the project again in 2005 and their report was brought to our September meeting. In this research a sample of recipients (109 issued with 87 responses) were contacted to identify whether they had been burgled again after their homes had received enhanced security measures but also to identify whether feelings of safety had increased.
  - 59% of the respondents had been a victim of a dwelling burglary in the previous two years
  - 48% knew that their neighbour had also been a victim of this crime.

- Before the target hardening 66% were worried about being burgled, but almost 80% of respondents reported feeling safer and more secure after they had received the security measures.
- 90% had not been burgled again, of the six who had in three cases nothing was stolen. Of the other three, one was forced entry, one was a bogus caller and the remaining one was through an open door (she had been a victim of burglary on four previous occasions).

The conclusion was that this project had contributed to a reduction in dwelling burglary by reducing repeat incidents and also in increased feelings of safety and security.

5. During the last three years dwelling burglary incidents have reduced and the scheme has evolved to be more preventative to include those seen as vulnerable. We have also assisted victims of domestic violence incidents however we did not badge the project as a Sanctuary Scheme due to the transient nature of the funding that is available.
6. The Council's Community Safety Team continues to run the project with referrals coming to them from Police Crime Prevention Officers and DV Officers. Every referral has received a visit from a Police Crime Prevention Officer who recommends the level of intervention for each case.
7. Following the evaluation from the University of Teesside we have made a number of alterations to how the project is run. All traders who work for the project are checked through the Criminal Records Bureau and all attend a training session run by Harbour (formerly North Tees Women's Aid) to help them to work with people who are vulnerable.
8. In 2007 Tristar Homes Ltd agreed to contribute a yearly amount of £5,000 for domestic violence victims. Other funding has come from the Home Office and from Domestic Violence headroom money from the Council. The total budget for this year is £25,000.
9. From April to September this year we have achieved the following:
  - a) Target hardened 148 properties, 70 for vulnerable people and 78 for victims of domestic violence. Referrals have come from:

<b>Referral source</b>	<b>Vulnerable</b>	<b>DV</b>
Police	27	38
Victim Support	20	3
Social Services	1	
Tristar Homes Ltd	22	23
Harbour		14

- b) Average spend on each property is £141 the highest spend was £2,270
- c) We have created two safe rooms for victims of domestic violence allowing them to remain in their home.
- d) Newtown ward has the highest number of recipients 24, followed by Mandale and Victoria with 20.
- e) A breakdown of tenure is shown below.

<b>Tenure</b>	<b>Vulnerable</b>	<b>DV</b>
Housing Association	5	5
Owner Occupier	33	21
Private rented	6	18
Tristar Homes Ltd	26	34

- f) Total actual spend for this year is £21,000 however some of this is on equipment supplied by Police Crime Prevention who have a separate equipment budget of £6,000 so this figure can be recovered and taken from the total spend. This means that for the rest of the year we have £10,000 remaining in the budget.
- g) Spend on THL properties is £10,701.
- h) Spend on RSL properties is £396. Generally housing associations carry out the work themselves after we have advised them of what needs to be done, in this instance urgent work was needed so the project stepped in to make this victim safe.
- i) Private rented property accounts for £1,448 and Owner Occupied for £8,374

10. During the coming winter months we will also offer a warm pack to recipients. These packs are being developed by the Fire Service and will contain items such as; a blanket, a flask, a wind up torch, electric blankets, hat/scarf/gloves. We will also use the data from the project to identify other vulnerable people who would benefit from receiving a pack.

11. Clearly the scheme continues to be well used, but funding continues to be an issue. For the remainder of this financial year we will need to prioritise cases as they come in and we will focus on those who have already been a victim of crime.

12. Next year we will have money for victims of domestic violence but we may not be able to offer the full service to vulnerable people as we have in the past unless additional funding can be found.

13. An in depth discussion will follow based on this report.

Community Safety Manager  
6<sup>th</sup> October 2008