

To: Chair and Members of the Operational Policing Panel
Date: 13th November 2009

Executive & Presenting Officer: Mrs Sarah Wilson, Consultation & Performance Officer

Status : For information

End of Year Police Authority Consultation Report

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 Engaging with the public and seeking the views of our communities remains a key activity for Cleveland Police Authority¹. This report presents the findings of consultation activities undertaken by Cleveland Police Authority from October 2008 to September 2009.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that members 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 2010 - 2011.

3. Reasons

- 3.1 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.'
- 3.2 The newly created joint Force and Authority Neighbourhood Survey was implemented in 2009, replacing the Force Quality of Life Survey and the Police Authority's precept leaflet and policing plan summary surveys. An initial postal

¹ Police Act 1996

survey was conducted in April 2009, but following new national guidance the Force and Authority are now in the process of moving to a telephone methodology. Once the telephone survey is embedded the Authority will be conducting additional qualitative consultation focusing on groups who are under-represented in the Neighbourhood Survey and specific issues raised through the survey. Therefore the focus of consultation undertaken by the Authority during the past year has been primarily on young people and minority groups.

- 3.3 The consultation data collated in Appendix 1 consists of various forms of consultation, both qualitative (for example focus groups) and quantitative (for example IML surveys at Crucial Crew). 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 and becomes relevant when the same results are being reported. For example, if the responses to postal surveys and focus groups all point to anti-social behaviour as being the most significant concern of citizens, we can reasonably accept that this is representative of public opinion.
- 3.4 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 Summary, both of which will be informed by the consultation activities.

4 Key Findings

- 3.5 Consultation results for the overarching performance measure, how well the police and council are dealing with local concerns, varied considerably. British Crime Survey results consistently place Cleveland in first or second place in the country, with the latest release giving a rating of 56.5%. Neighbourhood Survey results were considerably lower, at 44.2%. Attendees at the Tier 3 open meetings had much higher levels of confidence, at 64%. Tier 3 attendees generally have higher confidence levels as they are mostly 'engaged' with the police through open meetings, Neighbourhood Watch etc. Children questioned at Crucial Crew had quite low feelings of confidence (37% in Middlesbrough and 43% in Redcar and Cleveland), however, there was a high percentage of 'don't know' responses at Crucial Crew.
- 3.6 Anti social behaviour remains a top priority for residents in Cleveland. Teenagers hanging around the streets, rubbish, drugs, motoring offences and vandalism/criminal damage are all key concerns for adults.
- 3.7 The top policing priorities for young people aged eleven to nineteen are criminal damage, house burglary and robbery/mugging, whilst for younger children violence

is the top priority. Teenagers hanging around the streets and vandalism/graffiti/criminal damage are the top anti-social behaviour concerns for both children and young people.

- 3.8 Knowledge of Neighbourhood Policing is high - nearly two thirds of those questioned in the Neighbourhood Survey are aware of their local policing team, and 63.8% know how to contact them. Attendees at Tier 3 had higher levels of knowledge regarding their local teams, which is unsurprising given that they are mostly 'engaged' citizens. 57% of attendees at Tier 3 were satisfied with the levels of visible police patrol in their area, with all four BCUs showing improvements on last year's satisfaction levels.
- 3.9 Whilst the 'engaged' people who attended Tier 3 feel well informed by the police (60%), the general public questioned through the Neighbourhood Survey do not feel well informed (23%), showing that work is still needed to reach those members of the community who do not participate directly in community activities.
- 3.10 Feelings of safety when walking alone during the day, and when alone in the home at night are high, but residents feel much less safe when walking alone after dark. Residents are most worried about criminal damage, car crime and burglary.
- 3.11 25.6% of respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey feel that crime has increased in the last two years, and 32.7% feel that anti-social behaviour has increased.
- 3.12 For children television is the primary influence on their perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour, especially physical special needs children. For the LGBT community personal experience is a far greater factor than the media.
- 3.13 The most effective methods of improving community safety are seen as increased work between the police and young people, more activities for young people to do outside school and work with offenders to help prevent re-offending.
- 3.14 Consultation with young offenders indicates that the main factors behind offenders committing their first offence are money and alcohol. Getting a job is seen as by far the most effective method to prevent re-offending.
- 3.15 Members of the LGBT community who were consulted have high levels of personal victimisation, with nearly all having been a victim of hate crime within the last twelve months. Many didn't report the incidents due to feeling that there was no point as nothing would get done, worry that they wouldn't be taken seriously and not wanting the stress of the investigation process. Teenagers are seen as the main perpetrators of homophobic hate crime.

5 Implications

5.1 Finance

A budget of £35,000 was allocated to undertake consultation work. This is divided as follows:

- £28,000 – Neighbourhood Survey
- £4000 – IML system
- £3000 – other consultation

5.2 Diversity/Equal Opportunities

Cleveland Police Authority has built targeting of hard to engage groups into its consultation strategy and plans.

5.3 Human Rights Act Implications

There are no human rights act implications arising from this report.

5.4 Sustainability

There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

5.5 Risk

Failure to take account of consultation findings could result in reduced public confidence in the Force and the Authority and therefore lead to a reduction in engagement with communities.

6 Conclusion

6.1 It is recommended that members take into account key consultation findings detailed in Appendix 1 when setting and approving the local policing priorities for 2010-2011.

6.2 Consider this report along with:

- Cleveland Police Strategic Assessment and Control Strategy
- Home Secretary's national policing priorities
- Local CDRP Community Safety Plans
- Public Service Agreement goals for crime and disorder 2008-11

Joe McCarthy
Chief Executive

01642 301291

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 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 from October 2008 to September 2009. The table below details the various qualitative and quantitative methods used.

Who we have consulted with	Numbers/Groups Involved	How we consulted	When we consulted
Adults in the Cleveland area	Distributed 25,000 Respondents 4163	Joint postal Neighbourhood Survey	April 2009
11 to 19 year olds in the Cleveland area	Distributed 38,000 Respondents 2590	Freepost survey distributed with the Youth Policing Plan Summary	Autumn 2008
15 to 21 year old male young offenders	18 participants	IML Software Survey	December 2008 and March 2009
Stockton District			
Tier 3 Public Consultation Meeting	41 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2009
Middlesbrough District			
Crucial Crew Yr 6 Primary School	1740 participants	IML Software Survey	July 2009
Face the People – LGBT	31 participants	IML Software Survey	October 2008
Tier 3 Public Consultation Meeting	25 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2009
Breckon Hill school session, parents and primary children	58 participants	IML Software Survey	November 2008
Redcar and Cleveland District			
Crucial Crew Yr 6 Primary School	950 participants	IML Software Survey	June/July 2009

Tier 3 Public Consultation Meeting	47 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2009
Farmwatch meeting, Guisborough	47 participants	IML Software Survey	January 2009
Youth Voice event, 13 to 19 year olds	49 participants	IML Software Survey	October 2008
Hartlepool District			
Tier 3 Public Consultation Meeting	49 participants	IML Software Survey	September 2009

Issues covered by the consultation include:

- Confidence measure
- Policing Priorities
- Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour
- Neighbourhood Policing
- Fear of crime
- Community safety
- LGBT community views
- Farming/rural community views
- Reasons behind offending
- Weapons and gun crime

Key Consultation Findings

National Confidence Measure

The Home Office overarching performance indicator for policing (APACS 2.2 / PSA23) focuses on the percentage of people who agree that the Police and Local Authority are dealing with local concerns. This is derived from the British Crime Survey (BCS) question below:

It is the responsibility of the police and local council working together in partnership to deal with anti-social behaviour and crime in your area. Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statement:

The police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in this area:

- *Strongly agree*
- *Tend to agree*
- *Neither agree nor disagree*
- *Tend to disagree*

- *Strongly disagree*
- *Don't know*

Cleveland have consistently been graded as number one or two in the country for this question in the BCS, with the release for the year ending 31st March 2009 giving a rating of 56.5%.

Due to the length of the wording it is not always appropriate to ask this question in its exact BCS format. Methodologies of consultation also differ, which can make comparison of results problematic.

In the Neighbourhood Survey carried out in April 2009, the question was asked in its BCS format but without the introductory paragraph. Overall across the whole of Cleveland 44.2% agreed that the police and council were dealing with the issues that matter. This ranged from 49.1% in Hartlepool to 38.9% in Redcar and Cleveland, with Stockton and Middlesbrough rating 45.3% and 44.9% respectively.

Participants at the Tier 3 public meetings were asked how much they agreed or disagreed that the police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in this area. Overall across the whole of Cleveland 64% agreed. This ranged from 81% in Middlesbrough to just 44% in Stockton, with Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland rating 73% and 61% respectively.

Children at Crucial Crew (Year 6 pupils, aged 10 and 11) were asked a simplified version of the question - 'Do you think the police and council do a good job in dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour' with options of 'yes', 'no' and 'don't know'. In Middlesbrough, 37% felt that the police and council did a good job, with this rising to 43% for Redcar and Cleveland. There was a high percentage of 'don't know' answers at both events (21% don't know for Middlesbrough and 22% for Redcar and Cleveland).

Policing Priorities

Respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey identified the top three policing priorities across Cleveland to be teenagers hanging around on the street, rubbish or litter lying around and motoring offences. These priorities remained roughly the same across all four BCUs, although drugs was more of a priority than motoring offences in Middlesbrough.

Participants at the Tier 3 public meetings were asked what they would like Cleveland police to concentrate on during 2010-2011. Across the whole of Cleveland the top three priorities were drugs, anti-social behaviour and vandalism/criminal damage. These priorities remained roughly the same across all four BCUs apart from Middlesbrough where violent crime was more of a priority than vandalism/criminal damage.

Middlesbrough's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community who took part in the LGBT Face the People session rated hate crime, criminal damage and drug dealing as their main crime concerns.

Young people aged between eleven and nineteen who completed the youth policing plan summary survey were asked what their main crime concerns were. The top three crime concerns across Cleveland, and in each BCU², were criminal damage, house burglary and robbery and mugging.

For children at Crucial Crew the top crime concern in both Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland was violence. House burglary and robbery were the second and third concerns for Middlesbrough, and drug dealing and house burglary were the second and third concerns for Redcar and Cleveland. For the behavioural special needs children at Middlesbrough the top concern was drug dealing, whilst the physical special needs children at Middlesbrough were more concerned by criminal damage and car crime. The physical special needs children at Redcar and Cleveland were primarily concerned by house burglary, bullying and drugs.

For children and parents who took part in the consultation event at Breckon Hill School in Middlesbrough, anti-social behaviour and drugs were the top concerns.

Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour

Respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey were asked how much of a problem they perceived anti-social behaviour to be in their local area. Across the whole of Cleveland 14.4% thought that anti-social behaviour was a 'very big' or 'fairly big' problem. This ranged from 19.8% in Middlesbrough to 9.3% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 17.2% and 12.1% respectively. Across the whole of Cleveland 32.7% felt that anti-social behaviour had increased in the last two years, with Redcar and Cleveland respondents perceiving the largest increase and Hartlepool respondents the smallest.

Young people who completed the youth policing plan summary survey were asked to identify their three most important anti-social behaviour concerns. Across the whole Cleveland area the top three concerns were teenagers hanging around the streets, vandalism, graffiti and criminal damage and rubbish/litter. These top three concerns remained the same across Stockton and Hartlepool, but in Redcar and Cleveland racism replaced rubbish/litter as the third biggest concern.

For children at Crucial Crew the top two anti-social behaviour concerns in both Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland were teenagers hanging around the streets and vandalism/graffiti/criminal damage. Noisy neighbours was the third concern in Middlesbrough and drunk and rowdy people was the third concern in Redcar and Cleveland. For the behavioural special needs children at Middlesbrough the top concerns were teenagers and

² Middlesbrough BCU was not represented in this survey

drug using, whilst the physical special needs children at Middlesbrough were most concerned by rubbish and teenagers. The physical special needs children at Redcar and Cleveland were primarily concerned by drugs, noisy neighbours and teenagers.

Middlesbrough's LGBT community who took part in the LGBT Face the People session rated teenagers hanging around the streets and rubbish or litter lying around as joint top concerns, followed by vandalism, graffiti, deliberate damage and deliberate fires.

Fear of Crime

Respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey were asked how safe they felt in their local area. Feelings of safety were reasonably high when walking alone during the day (91%), and when alone in the home at night (84.1%), but residents felt much less safe walking alone after dark (53.9%). Feelings of safety were consistently lower in Middlesbrough. Residents were most worried about criminal damage, car crime and burglary. Overall 25.6% felt that crime had increased in the last two years. As for the same question regarding anti-social behaviour, Redcar and Cleveland respondents perceived the largest increase and Hartlepool respondents the smallest.

Farmers and other members of the rural community who attended the Redcar and Cleveland Farmwatch event were asked whether they felt that crime levels had increased, stayed the same or decreased within the last year. 39% felt that levels were lower compared to only 6% who felt that they were higher.

Children at Crucial Crew were asked what their main reasons were for believing that crime and anti-social behaviour was a problem in their area. Television was the primary influence, with 24% of the votes registered at both events, however over half the children did have personal experience of crime and anti-social behaviour either through being a victim themselves, knowing someone who had been a victim, or having seen crime or anti-social behaviour taking place. The physical special needs children were particularly likely to be influenced by what they saw on TV, whilst the behavioural special needs group were most likely to have had personal experience of crime or anti-social behaviour.

For children and parents who took part in the consultation event at Breckon Hill School the principal cause of fear of crime came from drug users and strangers on the street. 74% of those questioned at this event felt that the Police did a good job in keeping them safe, compared to 86% for the Fire Brigade and only 33% for the Council.

Thirteen to nineteen year olds questioned at the Redcar and Cleveland Youth Voice event had particularly low feelings of personal safety, with 38% feeling that Redcar and Cleveland was becoming a less safe place to live and 9% feeling that it is an unsafe place.

At the Middlesbrough LGBT 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.

For this community personal experience proved to be a far greater factor than the media, with high levels of respondents having either been a victim themselves (40% for anti-social behaviour and 47% for crime), or seen it taking place (41% for anti-social behaviour and 23% for crime).

Children at Crucial Crew were asked what they thought the police and partners should do to stop crime and anti-social behaviour and make people feel safer. The most popular choices were police officers working with young people, more activities for young people to do outside school and working with offenders to help prevent them re-offending.

For the children and parents who took part in the Breckon Hill School consultation, more police on the streets, more activities for young people and more education in schools about the dangers of crime and anti-social behaviour were seen as the best ways to improve feelings of safety.

The LGBT community at the Middlesbrough Face the People session felt that there should be more police officers who were specifically trained to deal with LGBT issues and that more effective street wardens could improve feelings of safety.

Neighbourhood Policing

Both the Tier 3 meetings and the Neighbourhood Survey had a strong focus on Neighbourhood Policing. Nearly two thirds (65.8%) of respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey were aware of their local policing teams. 63.8% knew how to contact their local policing team, and 22.2% knew a member of their team, either by name or sight. Knowledge of local teams was consistently highest in Redcar and Cleveland, which could be as a result of Operation Contact. Attendees at the Tier 3 meetings had a higher level of knowledge regarding their local teams – 83% knew how to contact their local policing team, ranging from 93% in Stockton to 71% in Hartlepool.

Tier 3 attendees were also asked how satisfied they were with the levels of visible police patrol in their area. Across the whole Cleveland area 57% of attendees were 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied' compared to 50% in 2008, showing a continued increase in satisfaction levels since the introduction of neighbourhood policing. Middlesbrough attendees were the most satisfied and all four BCUs had seen an increase in satisfaction levels from 2008, with Middlesbrough showing the greatest improvement from 54% to 76%.

23% of respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey felt that they were 'very well' or 'fairly well' informed about the way their local area is policed. This ranged from 24.2% in Hartlepool to 21.2% in Stockton. Attendees at the Tier 3 meetings had a higher level of satisfaction, with 60% feeling 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with the level of information which they received from their local police. This rose to 76% for Middlesbrough attendees.

Of those respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey who had had contact with the police, 67% felt 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with this contact, with Hartlepool respondents showing the highest levels of satisfaction (68.7%).

Of those attendees at the Redcar and Cleveland Farmwatch event who had had contact with Cleveland Police in the last year 71% felt that they had received a 'very good' or 'good' service.

52.9% of respondents to the Neighbourhood Survey felt that the police in their local area were doing a 'good' or 'excellent' job. This ranged from 56.4% in Hartlepool to 49.8% in Redcar and Cleveland, with Stockton and Middlesbrough rating 53.5% and 53.2% respectively. Attendees at the Tier 3 meetings had higher levels of satisfaction – 68% overall felt that the police were doing a 'good' or 'excellent' job, ranging from 88% in Middlesbrough to 56% in Stockton.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Community Views

In October 2008 Cleveland Police Authority ran an interactive IML session with members of the LGBT community at a Face the People session in Middlesbrough. Nearly all of the attendees had been a victim of hate crime within the last twelve months, with some reporting suffering daily abuse. The most common forms of victimisation were verbal abuse or mickey taking.

80% of attendees had been a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour within the last year, and 70% hadn't reported it. The most common reasons for not reporting incidents were feeling that there was no point as nothing would get done, being worried that you wouldn't be taken seriously and not wanting the stress of the investigation process.

Teenagers were seen as the main perpetrators of homophobic hate crime.

Rural Community Views

In January 2009 Cleveland Police Authority ran an interactive IML session with members of the Redcar and Cleveland farming and rural community at a Farmwatch event. Nearly two thirds (64%) of attendees felt that Cleveland Police understood concerns regarding farm/rural areas. 57% felt that wildlife crime affected them a 'great deal' or 'quite a lot' and 90% placed 'very high' or 'high' importance on conservation issues. The top rural policing priorities were theft and poaching.

Young Offender Views

In December 2008 and March 2009 Cleveland Police Authority undertook two consultation sessions at HMP and YOI Castington in Morpeth. Castington is a juvenile and young offender

institute accommodating 15 to 21 year old males. The young offenders who took part in the consultation sessions were from Middlesbrough and Redcar and Cleveland.

Of the eighteen young offenders who were consulted only two had been victims of crime themselves, but for those offenders being a victim had influenced their own decision to commit crime. Nearly two thirds of the offenders drank regularly when not in prison and all the underage offenders stated that they drank.

The major factors behind offenders committing their first offence were money and alcohol. When asked to list all the reasons behind committing offences other key factors were boredom/something to do and for the thrill/buzz.

Getting a job was seen as by far the most effective method to prevent re-offending, and the key action needed from YOS and Probation upon release from prison was support in finding a job or getting back into training.

Weapon and Knife Crime

In October 2008 Cleveland Police Authority ran an interactive IML session at the Redcar and Cleveland Youth Voice event which was aimed at thirteen to nineteen year olds from 'hard to reach' groups and deprived areas, including BME and special needs groups. The session focused on weapons and knife crime.

A quarter of the young people questioned stated that they had carried or considered carrying a weapon, and nearly three quarters (74%) knew someone who had carried a weapon. 63% of those questioned knew someone who had been injured or attacked with a weapon, and weapons being brought into school was not considered uncommon.

Most of the young people (88%) disagreed with carrying weapons, and most would report an incident to the police or a parent, even if someone they knew was involved. Knives were seen as the most common form of weapon to be carried due to the fact that they are easy to obtain and easily concealable.