

**Report of the Chief Executive to the Chair and Members of the  
Community Protection Panel**

**Date: 15th October 2008**

**Executive Officer: Mr Joe McCarthy**

**Author: Mrs Sarah Wilson**

**Status: For Information**

**End of Year Police Authority Consultation Report**

**1. Purpose of the Report**

2. Engaging with the public and seeking the views of our communities remains a key activity for Cleveland Police Authority<sup>1</sup>. This report presents the findings of consultation activities undertaken by Cleveland Police Authority during 2008.

**3. Recommendations**

4. It is recommended that members:
5. Take cognisance of the Police Authority's consultation findings (see Appendix 1) with a view to using the results, along with the Force strategic assessments and the Home Secretary's national policing priorities, to assist in setting the local policing priorities for 2009 - 2010.

**6. Reasons**

7. The Police Act 1996 clearly sets out the statutory duty placed upon police authorities to 'consult with those in that policing area, about the policing of that area.' This is one of the authority's core activities. Throughout 2008 Cleveland Police Authority have consulted with a

---

<sup>1</sup> Police Act 1996, Local Government Act 1999.

wide range of groups and individuals from communities across the Cleveland Police area.

8. The consultation data collated in Appendix 1 consists of various forms of consultation, both qualitative (for example focus groups) and quantitative (for example surveys). That data which is not statistically valid on a stand alone basis is rendered valid by means of "triangulation", whereby the weakness of one consultation method is countered by the strengths of another. It is often the case that the same results are reported from different sources. For example, if the responses to postal surveys and focus groups all point to ASB as being the most significant concern of citizens, we can reasonably accept that this is representative of public opinion.
9. The Police Act 1996, as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006, stipulates that the Force and Authority will produce an annual, rolling three year Policing Plan and an annual Policing Plan Summary, both of which will be informed by consultation activities.

## **10. Key Findings of Consultation**

11. Anti social behaviour remains the number one priority for residents in Cleveland. The predominant anti-social behaviour concerns are vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage, people using or dealing drugs, rowdy/nuisance behaviour and problems with vehicles.
12. Other high priorities areas are crimes associated with drugs and violence.
13. Results from postal surveys indicate that the public perceive a reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour in their local area over the last 12 months and a consequent improvement in their feelings of safety.
14. The main reasons for believing that crime and anti-social behaviour are a problem are personal experience, either through being a victim, knowing someone who has been a victim, or witnessing incidents. However, the older population are far more likely to be influenced by media portrayal of crime and anti-social behaviour. For the older population anti-social behaviour was a far bigger factor than crime in determining feelings of personal safety.
15. Postal survey results indicate that the top 3 public priorities for policing resources are emergency response (999) followed by street

patrols to reassure the public (neighbourhood policing) followed by investigating serious/organised crime (CID).

16. Results from consultations on neighbourhood policing have varied considerably. Respondents from open meetings, focus groups and face to face surveys express higher confidence levels than respondents from postal surveys. Those who attend police and community meetings are also significantly more likely to feel that neighbourhood policing has improved local policing, and that crime and anti-social behaviour levels are decreasing.
17. Results of all consultations showed significant improvements in satisfaction with and perceptions of neighbourhood policing when compared to last year's results.
18. Redcar and Cleveland showed the most significant improvements over last year's consultation results.
19. Over all four Districts, public knowledge of local police officers was considerably higher than knowledge of PCSOs, but the gap had decreased significantly since 2007, which may be the result of the PCSO recruitment drive.
20. Overall, residents felt that the police had a very good understanding of local issues, and that these were dealt with relatively well.
21. Extensive consultation with young people highlighted similar results to adults but with some important variations. Young people tended to favoured CCTV and more activities for young people as methods of improving community safety.
- 22. Finance**
23. A budget of £30,000 was allocated to undertake consultation work.
- 24. Diversity**
25. Cleveland Police Authority has built targeting of hard to engage groups into its consultation strategy and plans.
- 26. Sustainability**
27. There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

**28. Conclusion**

29. It is recommended that members take into account key consultation findings detailed in Appendix 1 when setting and approving the local policing priorities for 2009-2010.
30. Consider this report along with:
- Cleveland Police Strategic Assessment and Control Strategy
  - The National Crime Strategy (Cutting Crime – A New Partnership 2008-11)
  - National Community Safety Plan (last update 2006-2009)
  - Local CDRP Community Safety Plans
  - Public Service Agreement goals for crime and disorder 2008-11
  - Delivering Safer Communities: A Guide to Effective Partnership Working (Home Office September 2007)
  - Strong and Prosperous Communities – Local Government White Paper
  - From the Neighbourhoods to the National: Policing our Communities Together – Green Paper 2008

**Joe McCarthy**

**Chief Executive**

01642 301291

[joe.mccarthy@cleveland.pnn.police.uk](mailto:joe.mccarthy@cleveland.pnn.police.uk)

## End of Year Consultation Report

## Appendix 1

The key objectives for Cleveland Police Authority consultation activities are to inform the new annual, rolling three year Policing Plan and assist in identifying policing priorities for the residents of Cleveland.

Cleveland Police Authority adopted a number of different methods to undertake consultation during 2008. The table below details the various qualitative and quantitative methods used.

<b>Who we have consulted with</b>	<b>Numbers/Groups Involved</b>	<b>How we consulted</b>	<b>When we consulted</b>
Council tax payers in the Cleveland Area	Distributed 236,200 Respondents 427	Freepost survey distributed with the Precept Leaflet	February 2008
Policing Plan Summary Survey to Residents in the Cleveland Area	Distributed 241,000 Respondents 4198	Freepost survey distributed with the Policing Plan Summary <sup>2</sup>	July 2008
Contact list of residents in the Cleveland Area	Distributed 972 Response 530	Postal survey on neighbourhood policing and anti-social behaviour	February 2008
<b>Stockton District</b>			
Tier 3 Public Consultation Meeting, Stockton Library	34 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2008
Crucial Crew Yr 5/6 Primary School	2000 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2008
Children's Trust Board – Secondary school consultation	90 participants	IML Software Survey	January 2008
Children's Trust Board – primary school	131 participants	IML Software Survey	February/April 2008

<sup>2</sup> When considering the relative importance of the various consultation activities, it should be noted that the most statistically significant results were gained from the Policing Plan Summary survey.

consultations			
Middlesbrough District			
Neighbourhood Policing Focus Group	14 participants	Focus Group	June 2008
Face the People – BME	26 participants	IML Software Survey	February 2008
Face the People - Disability	19 participants	IML Software Survey	February 2008
Face the Young People Sessions	130 participants	IML Software Survey	October 2007
Tier 3, Middlesbrough Teaching and Learning Centre	18 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2008
Redcar and Cleveland District			
Crucial Crew Yr 5/6 Primary School	1700 participants	IML Software Survey	June/July 2008
Tier 3, Redcar and Cleveland College	30 participants	IML Software Survey	October 2008
Neighbourhood Policing Focus Groups	56 participants	Focus Group	February/March 2008
Older Persons Partnership Board	35 participants	IML Software Survey	March 2008
Hartlepool District			
Tier 3, Historic Quay	47 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2008
LGBT Focus Group	7 participants	Focus Group	January 2008
Anti-Social Behaviour Awareness Days	1000 participants	IML Software Survey	January 2008

Issues covered by the consultation include:

- Policing Priorities
- Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour
- Neighbourhood Policing
- Fear of crime
- Community safety
- LGBT community views

## **Key Consultation Findings**

### **Policing Priorities**

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked what they would like Cleveland police to concentrate on during 2009-2010. Reducing anti-social behaviour was the top priority in Middlesbrough (35%), Stockton (32%) and Redcar and Cleveland (28%), and the second priority for Hartlepool (25%). Drugs was the top concern in Hartlepool (29%) and joint top in Middlesbrough (35%). Stockton and Redcar & Cleveland attendees chose drugs as their second priority. Vandalism and criminal damage was the third priority in Hartlepool, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton, with attendees in Middlesbrough being more concerned by burglary.

Respondents who completed the precept leaflet survey were asked what they thought policing priorities should be. Anti-social behaviour was the top priority for all four BCUs, and vandalism and criminal damage was the second priority. Third priority was drugs for Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland, and violent crime for Middlesbrough and Stockton.

Respondents from the Cleveland contacts list of residents indicated that the top policing priorities for resource allocation should be emergency response (999) followed by street patrols to reassure the public (neighbourhood policing) followed by investigating serious/organised crime (CID).

Middlesbrough's disabled community who took part in the Disability Face the People session rated criminal damage, drugs and then jointly violent crime and car crime as their main crime concerns.

Middlesbrough's BME community who took part in the BME Face the People session rated car crime as their top concern followed jointly by house burglary, hate crime and criminal damage.

### **Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour**

Respondents who completed the precept leaflet survey were asked to identify their three most important anti-social behaviour concerns. Across the whole Cleveland area the top three concerns were vandalism and criminal damage, drugs and nuisance behaviour. These concerns remained roughly the same across all four BCUs, although drugs was joint top concern in Hartlepool, and

Middlesbrough respondents regarded nuisance behaviour as a greater concern than drugs.

Respondents from the Cleveland contacts list of residents indicated that the main anti-social behaviour issues are firstly, criminal damage, secondly, vehicles being driven or parked illegally/dangerously and, thirdly (jointly) rowdy behaviour and rubbish/litter. They indicated that the police and partners could best deal with anti-social behaviour by putting more police on the streets and by using enforcement regimes such as ASBOs, warnings and fines.

Middlesbrough's disabled community who took part in the Disability Face the People session rated teenagers hanging around the streets and people being drunk and rowdy as joint top concerns, followed by noisy neighbours and loud parties.

Middlesbrough's BME community who took part in the BME Face the People session rated teenagers hanging around the streets as their top concern followed by rubbish and drugs.

The responses vary according to the questions, the options given and the survey group. However, criminal damage and drugs misuse are commonly top priorities.

## **Fear of Crime**

At the Middlesbrough BME and Disability Face the People session attendees were asked what their main reasons were for believing that crime and anti-social behaviour was a problem in their area. Personal experience proved to be a far greater factor than the media, with respondents either having been a victim themselves, known someone who was a victim, or in the case of anti-social behaviour, seen it taking place.

Attendees at the Redcar Older Person's Partnership consultation had fairly low feelings of personal safety, with 48% stating that they felt unsafe or very unsafe walking alone in their local area after dark. Anti-social behaviour levels were a far bigger factor in determining feelings of personal safety than crime levels. For this sector of the community the media was the main factor in determining views of crime and anti-social behaviour levels.

Respondents who completed the Policing Plan Summary survey were asked whether they felt that crime and anti-social behaviour levels had increased, stayed the same, or decreased in the last year. Across the whole Cleveland area 22.7% of respondents felt that crime levels had increased. Middlesbrough respondents were the most positive about crime levels and Redcar and Cleveland the least positive. Respondents were more likely to feel that anti-social behaviour

had increased, with 36.9% across Cleveland noting an increase. Again Middlesbrough respondents were the most positive and Redcar and Cleveland respondents the most negative.

Respondents from the Cleveland contacts list of residents indicated that crime and anti-social behaviour problems in their area had decreased (positive differential of 21.4%) and that the area had become safer over the last year (positive differential of 19.8%).

## Neighbourhood Policing

Numerous consultation exercises have been undertaken in 2008 to measure the success of neighbourhood policing in delivering against the four key areas:

- **Access** – to policing services through a named point of contact
- **Influence** – over community safety priorities in the neighbourhood
- **Interventions** – joint actions with communities and partners to solve problems
- **Answers** – sustainable solutions to problems and feedback on results

Neighbourhood policing was the focus of the following consultation activities:

- Policing Plan Summary questionnaire
- Tier 3 meeting IML survey
- Focus groups in Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland

### Access

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked how satisfied they were with the levels of visible police patrol in their area. Across the whole Cleveland area 50% of attendees were satisfied or very satisfied compared to only 34% in 2007. Middlesbrough attendees were the most satisfied and all four BCUs saw an increase in satisfaction levels from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland showing the greatest improvement - 39% more attendees feeling satisfied with visible patrol levels.

Respondents who completed the Policing Plan Summary survey were asked whether they knew who their ward police officer and PCSO were. Across the whole Cleveland area 16.3% of respondents knew their local police officer with this figure ranging from 21.3% in Middlesbrough to 12.7% in Stockton. With the exception of Stockton, all areas had seen an increase in knowledge of police officers.

Respondents were less likely to know their local PCSO, but the gap in knowledge was far smaller than in 2007. Across the whole Cleveland area 14.6% of

respondents knew their local PCSO with this figure ranging from 20.4% in Hartlepool to 10.2% in Stockton.

Respondents who completed the Policing Plan Summary survey were also asked when they had last seen a police officer or PCSO in their local area. Across the whole Cleveland area 38.4% of respondents stated that they had seen a police officer or PCSO within the last month, 20.3% of these being within the last week. Figures ranged considerably across the four policing districts, with 53.5% of Hartlepool respondents stating that they had seen a police officer or PCSO within the last month compared to only 35% in Stockton. With the exception of Stockton, all Districts had seen a rise in visibility of policing teams, with Redcar and Cleveland showing the greatest improvement.

Policing Plan Summary survey respondents were also asked when they had last spoken to a police officer or PCSO in their local area. Across the whole Cleveland area only 11.9% of respondents had spoken to their local policing team within the last month, this figure ranging from 15.9% in Middlesbrough to 8.8% in Stockton.

When asked how satisfied they were with contact with their local policing teams, across the whole area 24.6% of Policing Plan Summary respondents were satisfied. Those in Hartlepool and Middlesbrough were the most likely to have had contact with their local teams, and also the most satisfied with the level of contact which they received, therefore pointing to the fact that contact levels are a major factor in determining satisfaction with the service.

Policing Plan Summary respondents were asked whether they knew how to contact their local police team for a non emergency. Relatively few knew the contact number, ranging from 35.7% in Middlesbrough to 24.6% in Stockton. Knowledge of local police and community meetings varied greatly, ranging from 48.5% in Middlesbrough to only 18.8% in Stockton. Middlesbrough respondents were the most likely to attend neighbourhood policing meetings. Given that Middlesbrough respondents were also the most likely to be aware of the meetings and to know the non emergency contact number, it would appear that Middlesbrough has the most effective promotion mechanisms.

## **Influence**

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked how much influence they felt they had on policing in their local area. Across the whole Cleveland area 61% of attendees felt that they had some or a lot of influence. This ranged from 80% in Middlesbrough to 52% in Stockton. With the exception of Hartlepool, all areas saw increases in feelings of influence from 2007. Redcar and Cleveland showed

the greatest increase with 37% more attendees feeling that they had some or a lot of influence than in 2007.

Respondents from the Cleveland contacts list of residents indicated that community involvement in the process of identifying policing priorities has increased considerably over the last year, with a positive differential of 30.7%.

## **Interventions**

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked how well they felt the police dealt with problems in their local area. Across the whole Cleveland area 78% of attendees felt that the police dealt very well or fairly well with local problems. This figure ranged from 89% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Hartlepool. All areas saw an increase in confidence in how issues were dealt with compared with 2007.

Respondents to the Policing Plan Summary survey were asked the same question and showed lower feelings of confidence, with 49.5% overall stating that they felt the police dealt very well or fairly well with local problems. This ranged from 57.4% in Hartlepool to 43.1% in Redcar and Cleveland.

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with local policing. Across the whole Cleveland area 76% of attendees were very satisfied or fairly satisfied. This figure ranged from 90% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Stockton. All areas saw an increase in satisfaction with Redcar and Cleveland again showing the biggest increase with a massive 55% more attendees feeling satisfied with their local policing than in 2007.

## **Answers**

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked how well they felt the police understood the issues in their local area. Confidence levels were high. Across the whole Cleveland area 84% of attendees felt that the police had some or a lot of understanding of local issues. This figure ranged from 95% in Middlesbrough to 78% in Hartlepool. With the exception of Hartlepool, all areas saw an increase in confidence from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland again showing the greatest improvement.

Respondents to the Policing Plan Summary survey were asked the same question and showed lower feelings of confidence, with 58.7% overall stating that they felt the police had some or a lot of understanding of local issues. This ranged from 63.8% in Hartlepool to 55.6% in Redcar and Cleveland.

Participants at the tier 3 public meetings were asked how satisfied they were with the levels of information which they received from their local police. Across the whole Cleveland area 51% of attendees felt very satisfied or satisfied. Satisfaction levels ranged from 66% in Middlesbrough to 46% in Stockton. All areas saw an increase in satisfaction from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland again showing the greatest increase.

Respondents to the Policing Plan Summary survey were asked whether they felt that the introduction of neighbourhood policing had improved their local policing. Overall, nearly a third (32.9%) felt that policing had improved. This figure ranged from 43% in Hartlepool to 27.9% in Redcar and Cleveland. Those respondents who attended police and community meetings were far more likely to feel that neighbourhood policing had improved their local policing (63.7% compared with 32.9%).

## **LGBT Community Views**

In January 2008 a focus group was held with members of the Hart Gables LGBT group in Hartlepool. Topics covered including reporting homophobic incidents, neighbourhood policing and attitudes towards the police.

Although the group had an extremely good relationship with their dedicated minorities liaison officer, most had a very negative image of the police. It was felt that training on LGBT issues was inadequate and should be revisited more often. As a direct response to this consultation Hartlepool's District Commander ensured that all officers received a diversity session as part of Hartlepool's Professional Development Days. It is also hoped that all Hartlepool probationers will undertake an attachment with the Hart Gables group.

## **What the young people of the Cleveland Police area said**

Young people are an important group in our local community. Cleveland Police Authority has undertaken a considerable amount of consultation activities with primary and secondary school pupils and teenagers in 2008, utilising interactive voting equipment.

### **Crucial Crew**

In 2008 Cleveland Police Authority took part in Crucial Crew events in both Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland, during which roughly 3700 ten and eleven year old pupils were surveyed using the IML equipment.

Issues covered by the consultation included:

- Types of crime which most affect you
- Types of anti-social behaviour causing the most concern
- Police contact numbers
- Neighbourhood policing

Participants were asked to identify what three types of crime most affected them. The three most frequently mentioned crime types in both Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland were drugs, house burglary and robbery/mugging.

When asked what aspects of anti social behaviour most affected them participants in Redcar and Cleveland stated that teenagers hanging around was the top priority, followed by vandalism and criminal damage. Those at the Stockton event were not given the teenagers option, and chose vandalism and criminal damage and drugs as their top two choices.

Participants were asked whether they knew their local police officer and PCSO. In Stockton 60% knew their local police officer and 50% knew their local PCSO. Knowledge of local policing teams was slightly higher in Redcar and Cleveland, with 69% stating that they knew their local police officer and 62% that they knew their local PCSO. When compared with similar questions posed to adults, it is apparent that young people are far more likely to know their local policing teams, which demonstrates the good work that neighbourhood teams are doing by getting into local schools.

### **Face the Young People**

During 2008 Cleveland Police Authority was involved in four 'Face the Young people' session across the more deprived areas of Middlesbrough.

Issues covered by the consultations included:

- Crime and anti-social behaviour priorities
- Reasons for feeling that crime and anti-social behaviour are a problem
- Reporting crime and anti-social behaviour

The top three anti-social behaviour priorities were teenagers hanging around on the streets, drug use and vandalism. The top three crime priorities were drug dealing, car crime and criminal damage. The main reasons for feeling that crime and anti-social behaviour were problems was being a victim themselves or having witnessed it taking place. Encouragingly, most who had been victims of crime or anti-social behaviour had reported it to somebody.

## **Children's Trust Events**

Cleveland Police Authority has developed a close relationship with Stockton Children's Trust which has led to involvement in four consultation events in Stockton, aimed at both primary and secondary age children.

Results of the secondary age consultation indicated that the young people were most likely to have been a victim of crime outside of school and home, and most likely to have been a victim of violence at school. The main reason for not reporting incidents to the police was feeling that it wasn't important enough. The main reasons for feeling unsafe were drugs, drunken behaviour and gangs. CCTV and more leisure activities for young people were seen as the most effective ways to make areas safer.

Results of the primary age consultations indicated that drugs, house burglary and robbery/mugging were the top three crime concerns. People being drunk or rowdy was the top anti-social behaviour concern.

## **Anti-Social Behaviour Awareness Days (ASBAD)**

For the first time Cleveland Police Authority took part in the week long ASBAD event in Hartlepool, consulting with all Year 8 pupils across the Borough, including physiological and behavioural special needs pupils. The young people's top four anti-social behaviour concerns were vandalism /graffiti/criminal damage, people being drunk or rowdy and jointly litter or dog fouling and people using or dealing drugs. The most popular methods for reducing anti-social behaviour were CCTV, more police officer and PCSO patrols and more leisure activities for young people. The top three policing priorities were emergency response, anti-social behaviour and investigating serious and organised crime.