

Report of the Chief Executive to the Chair and Members of the Operational Policing Panel 14 July 2009.

Author: Mrs Sarah Wilson, Consultation & Performance Officer

Status: For Information

Place Survey Results

1 Purpose

- 1.1 This report is to inform Members of the results of the Place Surveys undertaken by each Local Authority.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members note this report.

3 Reasons

- 3.1 From April 2008 a new performance framework was introduced based around a comprehensive National Indicator Set of 198 performance measures. This replaced Best Value Performance Indicators. 18 of the 198 indicators are collected through the newly introduced Place Survey which is administered by Local Authorities. This includes 5 community safety indicators.
- 3.2 At police force level the community safety indicators are measured through British Crime Survey (BCS) data, which is collected on a rolling basis through face to face interviews. At Local Authority level the community safety indicators are measured through the Place Survey, which is a bi-annual postal survey.
- 3.3 In addition to the data for the 18 national indicators, the Place Survey also asks questions related to quality of life, perceptions of the local council and other local services and the local area in general.

- 3.4 Each of Cleveland's 4 Local Authorities undertook the Place Survey for the first time in late 2008. Initial baseline results for all questions were received locally. An independent statistician then reviewed all results nationally, which has led to the figures being re-weighted, partly due to low return rates in some Local Authorities. On 23rd June the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) released the re-weighted data for the national indicators. There are considerable discrepancies between the initial local data received and the re-weighted data for the national indicators – typically the discrepancies are between 3% and 4% but in one case there is a 26% difference. DCLG are to release national guidance on the weighting of the data to Local Authorities but until this is received only data for the national indicators is to be released.
- 3.5 The 5 community safety indicators measured by the Place Survey are:
- NI 17 - Perceptions of anti-social behaviour – this is calculated by adding up all those who stated that any of the 7 anti-social behaviour types¹ listed was a 'very big' or 'fairly big' problem in their area.
 - NI41 – Perceptions of drunk and rowdy behaviour – all those who stated that this was a 'very big' or 'fairly big' problem in their area.
 - NI42 – People using or dealing drugs – all those who stated that this was a 'very big' or 'fairly big' problem in their area.
 - NI 27 – Understanding local concerns – all those who agreed that the police and local public services seek people's views about the anti-social behaviour types listed above.
 - NI21 – Dealing with local concerns – all those who agreed that the police and local public services are successfully dealing with the anti-social behaviour types listed above.
- 3.6 The results of the community safety indicators are outlined in full at Appendix A.
- 3.7 Perceptions of anti-social behaviour were consistently the lowest in Hartlepool, for overall anti-social behaviour, drugs and drunk and rowdy behaviour. Middlesbrough residents had the highest perceptions of overall anti-social behaviour, whilst Redcar and Cleveland had the highest perceptions of drug use/dealing and drunk and rowdy behaviour. Perceptions of anti-social behaviour in Hartlepool were below the North East average, whilst all other BCUs were above the North East average, apart from drunk and rowdy behaviour in Stockton which was marginally below. Results across these three indicators were roughly comparable with BCS results.

¹ Noisy neighbours or loud parties, Teenagers hanging around the streets, Rubbish or litter lying around, Vandalism, graffiti and damage to property or vehicles, People using or selling drugs, People being drunk or rowdy in public places, Abandoned or burnt out cars

- 3.8 Middlesbrough residents were the most likely to feel that the police and other public services sought their views regarding the anti-social behaviour types listed at 3.5, and also that these issues were successfully dealt with. Redcar and Cleveland results were the worst for these two indicators. Results were below the North East average, apart from understanding local concerns in Middlesbrough, but above the average across England, apart from Redcar and Cleveland which scored considerably less than the other BCUs for these questions.
- 3.9 It is noticeable that the Place Survey results for NI 27 and NI 21, which is the overarching performance indicator, are considerably lower than the BCS results. The questions asked in the Place Survey for these two indicators are slightly different to those asked in BCS. BCS refers to crime and anti-social behaviour issues, whereas the Place Survey focuses on the 7 types of anti-social behaviour listed at 3.5. For NI 21 the Place Survey asks whether these issues are being 'successfully dealt with', as opposed to 'dealt with' in the BCS. The difference in methodology between the two surveys could also be responsible for disparities in data. However, given that BCS results placed Cleveland top of the country for NI21, whereas Place Survey results place all 4 BCUs below the North East average there is still some cause for concern.

4 Implications

4.1 Finance

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

4.2 Diversity & Equal Opportunities

There are no direct diversity implications arising from this report.

4.3 Sustainability

The police force and authority must take account of this in their future service planning and delivery.

4.4 Risk

There are no direct business risks to be considered as part of this report.

4.5 Human Rights

There are no human rights implications to this report.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 This report has apprised Members of the results of the Place Surveys carried out in each of Cleveland's 4 Local Authority areas. These performance results will form part of the evidence base for the Audit

Commission when carrying out the new Comprehensive Area Assessments from April 2009.

Joe McCarthy
Chief Executive

Appendix A

	Hartlepool	Middlesbrough	Redcar and Cleveland	Stockton	North East	England	British Crime Survey 2008
	%						
Perception of anti-social behaviour (NI 17)*	20.5	26.9	24.4	22.5	21	20	22.6
Perception of drunk/rowdy behaviour (NI 41)*	27.9	33.9	36.1	31.9	32	29	30.1
Perception of drug use/drug dealing (NI 42)*	30.4	38.8	39.8	37.4	32	31	36.3
Understanding local concerns (agencies) (NI 27)**	26.5	29.4	21.5	27.1	28	25	46.4
Dealing with local concerns (agencies) (NI 21)**	28.3	28.7	22.8	26.7	29	26	53.8

*Percentage of respondents who feel that these issues are a very big or a fairly big problem

** Percentage of respondents who agree that agencies do understand and deal with local concerns

	Best performer
↓	
	Worst performer