



Police Headquarters  
Ladgate Lane  
Middlesbrough  
TS8 9EH

Chair: Cllr Dave McLuckie Tel: 01642 301467  
Chief Executive: Mr J McCarthy BA(Hons), IPFA Tel: 01642 301623  
Chief Constable: Mr S Price QPM BSc(Hons) MSt(Cantab) Fax: 01642 301495  
Tel: 01642 301215

**TITLE: TIER 3 OPEN MEETING CONSULTATION RESULTS 2008**

**AUTHOR: SARAH WILSON, CONSULTATION OFFICER, CPA**

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 During September and October 2008 the annual Tier 3 public meetings took place across the four BCUs. The meetings are a chance for the public to put their questions and concerns to the Chief Constable, Police Authority Chair and District Commander.
- 1.2 An interactive consultation session using the IML equipment was incorporated into each meeting as part of the District Commander's presentation. The questions covered policing priorities together with the four strands which form the basis of neighbourhood policing - Access, Influence, Intervention and Answers.
- 1.3 Across the four BCUs 134 people took part in the consultation session. This is a slightly lower attendance than in 2007 when 183 people voted.
- 1.4 Due to technical problems at the Middlesbrough meeting results recorded were through manual means.

## **2 RESULTS**

### **Publicity**

- 2.1 The initial question asked attendees how they had found out about the meeting, with the following options:
  - Poster
  - Newspaper advert
  - Personal invitation
  - Through my ward councillor
  - Through my ward police officer/PCSO
  - Leaflet
  - Force website
  - Other

- 2.2 The most popular response by far was personal invitation (70%). Due to a misunderstanding with the start time of the Stockton meeting it was noticeable that the majority of attendees were from the District invitations rather than those which came centrally.
- 2.3 Suggestions were received at the Stockton meeting that future events could be better publicised through residents and community associations.

### **Influence**

- 2.4 Attendees were next asked how much influence they felt that they had on policing in their local area, with the following options:
- I feel that I have a lot of influence
  - I feel that I have some influence
  - I feel that I don't have much influence
  - I feel that I have no influence
- 2.5 Across the whole Cleveland area 21% of attendees felt that they had a lot of influence, 40% that they had some influence, 30% that they didn't have much influence and only 9% that they had no influence. This equates to 61% of attendees feeling that they had some or a lot of influence on policing in their local area, which is a 10% rise from 2007 results.
- 2.6 The percentage of attendees who felt that they had some or a lot of influence ranged from 80% in Middlesbrough to 52% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 71% and 54% respectively. Together with scoring the top influence ratings, Middlesbrough was also the only BCU where none of the attendees felt that they had no influence.
- 2.7 With the exception of Hartlepool all areas had seen an increase in feelings of influence from 2007. Redcar and Cleveland showed the biggest increase with 37% more attendees feeling that they had some or a lot of influence. Redcar and Cleveland also scored the highest in the 'lot of influence' category. Table 2.1 below shows the full results of this question.

**Table 2.1 How much influence do you feel you have on policing?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>A lot of influence</b>	21	15	20	29	23
<b>Some influence</b>	40	39	60	42	29
<b>Not much influence</b>	30	31	20	19	42
<b>No influence</b>	9	15	0	10	6

## Access

- 2.8 Attendees were next asked how satisfied they were with the levels of visible police patrol in their local area with five options ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.
- 2.9 Across the whole Cleveland area 18% of attendees were very satisfied, 32% were satisfied, 22% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 18% were dissatisfied and 10% were very dissatisfied. This equates to 50% of attendees expressing satisfaction compared to only 34% in 2007.
- 2.10 The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied ranged from 54% in Middlesbrough to 47% in Stockton, with Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland rating 52% and 48% respectively.
- 2.11 All areas saw an increase in satisfaction from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland again achieving by far the greatest increase with 39% more attendees feeling satisfied or very satisfied with visible patrol levels.
- 2.12 Although Stockton scored the lowest in overall satisfaction it did have the highest score in the 'very satisfied' category. Table 2.2 below shows the full results of this question.

**Table 2.2 How satisfied are you with levels of visible patrols?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Very satisfied</b>	18	15	14	19	22
<b>Satisfied</b>	32	37	40	29	25
<b>Neither</b>	22	13	14	29	33
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	18	25	14	13	14
<b>Very dissatisfied</b>	10	10	18	10	6

## Answers

- 2.13 Attendees were asked how satisfied they were with the levels of information which they received from their local police, with five options ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.
- 2.14 Across the whole Cleveland area 19% of attendees were very satisfied, 32% were satisfied, 26% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 15% were dissatisfied and 8% were very dissatisfied. This equates to 51% of attendees expressing satisfaction compared to only 34% in 2007.
- 2.15 The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied ranged from 66% in Middlesbrough to 46% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 55% and 47% respectively.

2.16 All areas saw an increase in satisfaction from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland again achieving by far the greatest increase with 33% more attendees feeling satisfied or very satisfied with information received. Redcar and Cleveland also scored the highest in the 'very satisfied' category. Table 2.3 below shows the full results of this question:

**Table 2.3 How satisfied are you with levels of information?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Very satisfied</b>	19	11	22	28	19
<b>Satisfied</b>	32	36	44	27	27
<b>Neither</b>	26	24	11	18	40
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	15	16	17	18	11
<b>Very dissatisfied</b>	8	13	6	9	3

2.17 Attendees were next asked how well they felt that the police understood the problems in their local area with the following options:

- I feel the police understand most issues
- I feel the police have some understanding of issues
- I feel the police have little understanding of issues
- I feel the police have no understanding of issues

2.18 Across the whole Cleveland area 56% of attendees felt that the police understood most issues, 28% felt that the police had some understanding, 10% that the police had little understanding and 6% that the police had no understanding.

2.19 Confidence levels were high with 84% of attendees feeling that the police had some or a lot of understanding of local issues, a 13% rise from 2007. This figure ranged from 95% in Middlesbrough to 78% in Hartlepool, with Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton scoring 91% and 82%% respectively. Together with scoring the top confidence ratings, Middlesbrough was also the only BCU where none of the attendees felt that the police had no understanding of local problems.

2.20 With the exception of Hartlepool, all areas saw an increase in confidence from 2007, with Redcar and Cleveland again showing the greatest improvement with 31% more attendees feeling that the police understood some or most of the area's problems.

2.21 Although Hartlepool's results equalled those achieved in 2007, with the increase seen in other areas this meant that Hartlepool dropped to last place in this question compared with second in 2007. Table 2.4 below shows the full results of this question:

**Table 2.4 How well do the police understand local problems?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Understand most issues</b>	56	51	53	59	62
<b>Some understanding of issues</b>	28	27	42	32	20
<b>Little understanding of issues</b>	10	16	5	3	9
<b>No understanding of issues</b>	6	6	0	6	9

### Interventions

- 2.22 Attendees were next asked how well they felt that the police dealt with the problems in their local area with five options ranging from very well to very poorly.
- 2.23 Across the whole Cleveland area 30% of attendees felt that the police dealt very well with local problems, 48% that they dealt fairly well, 10% that they dealt poorly and 7% very poorly. The remaining 5% had no opinion either way. This equates to 78% of attendees feeling that the police deal well with problems compared to 55% in 2007.
- 2.24 The percentage of attendees who felt that the police dealt very well or fairly well with local problems ranged from 89% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Hartlepool, with Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland scoring 82% and 79% respectively. Together with scoring the top confidence ratings, Middlesbrough was also the only BCU where none of the attendees felt that the police dealt very poorly with local problems.
- 2.25 All areas saw an increase in confidence in how issues were dealt with. Stockton showed the biggest increase with 38% more attendees feeling that the police dealt well with local problems than in 2007. Again, although Hartlepool's results were better than those achieved in 2007, with the greater increase seen in other areas this meant that Hartlepool dropped to last place in this question compared with second in 2007. Table 2.5 below shows the full results of this question:

**Table 2.5 How well do the police deal with local problems?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Very well</b>	30	23	47	25	35
<b>Fairly well</b>	48	48	42	54	47
<b>Neither</b>	5	8	0	9	0
<b>Poorly</b>	10	8	11	9	12
<b>Very poorly</b>	7	13	0	3	6

## Policing Priorities

- 2.26 Attendees were asked to choose the three main areas which they felt that the police should concentrate on during 2009/2010, with the following options:
- Drugs
  - Burglary
  - Car crime
  - Anti-social behaviour
  - Vandalism and criminal damage
  - Violent crime
  - Hate crime
  - Counter terrorism
  - Traffic legislation/road safety
- 2.27 The options were slightly changed from 2007. Hate crime and counter terrorism were added as priorities and responding to emergency incidents and providing high visibility patrols were removed. This was to better align the question with that asked in the precept leaflet survey to allow for comparison.
- 2.28 Across the whole Cleveland area the top three priorities were anti-social behaviour (29%), drugs (27%) and vandalism and criminal damage (14%). This remains consistent with 2007 results bearing in mind the options that were removed in 2008.
- 2.29 The priorities remained roughly the same across all four BCUs, although drugs was the top priority in Hartlepool, and burglary replaced criminal damage as the third priority in Middlesbrough.
- 2.30 The priorities from the Tier 3 consultation were roughly the same as those obtained through the precept leaflet survey, although in the precept leaflet consultation violent crime was more of a concern for Middlesbrough and Stockton. Table 2.6 below shows the full results of this question:

**Table 2.6 Policing priorities for 2009/2010**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Anti-social behaviour</b>	29	25	35	28	32
<b>Drugs</b>	27	29	35	25	29
<b>Vandalism &amp; criminal damage</b>	14	15	6	17	14
<b>Burglary</b>	8	12	10	8	2
<b>Violent crime</b>	7	9	2	8	5
<b>Traffic legislation</b>	6	3	4	8	8
<b>Car crime</b>	4	4	4	4	2
<b>Counter terrorism</b>	3	3	2	1	4
<b>Hate crime</b>	2	0	2	1	4

1<sup>st</sup> priority (red) 2<sup>nd</sup> priority (amber) 3<sup>rd</sup> priority (green)

## Overall Satisfaction

- 2.31 The final question asked attendees to rate their overall satisfaction with local policing, with five options ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.
- 2.32 Across the whole Cleveland area 35% of attendees were very satisfied, 41% were satisfied, 13% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5% were dissatisfied and 5% were very dissatisfied. This equates to 76% of attendees expressing satisfaction compared with only 49% in 2007.
- 2.33 The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied ranged from 90% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 75% and 74% respectively.
- 2.34 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 compared with 2007. Table 2.7 below shows the full results of this question.

**Table 2.7 How satisfied are you overall with your local policing?**

	Percentage (%)				
	All	H	M	R&C	S
<b>Very satisfied</b>	35	34	48	37	26
<b>Satisfied</b>	41	40	42	38	45
<b>Neither</b>	13	6	5	16	23
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	5	9	0	6	3
<b>Very dissatisfied</b>	6	11	5	3	3

## 3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 Personal invitations from District Commanders are the key means of getting people to attend the meetings.
- 3.2 As in 2007, Middlesbrough consistently achieved the best results across all questions. Middlesbrough was also the only BCU where none of the attendees felt that they had no influence on policing, none felt that the police had no understanding of local problems and none felt that the police dealt very poorly with local problems.
- 3.3 Middlesbrough, Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland showed significant improvements across all of the questions asked. Hartlepool showed improvements in most areas, apart from perceptions of police understanding of local problems, which remained stable, and feelings of influence which decreased slightly. However, due to achieving smaller improvements than the other three BCUS, in 2008 Hartlepool fell to third or fourth in all categories, as opposed to 2007 when it consistently achieved second place.

- 3.4 Redcar and Cleveland showed by far the greatest improvement on 2007 when it had consistently achieved significantly worse results than the other BCUs. In 2008 Redcar and Cleveland achieved the biggest improvement in all of the questions, taking it to second or third place in all questions. Redcar and Cleveland attendees were also the most likely to feel that they had a lot of influence on local policing and the most likely to feel very satisfied with the information which they received from the police.
- 3.5 The percentage of attendees who felt that they had some or a lot of influence on their local policing ranged from 80% in Middlesbrough to 52% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 71% and 54% respectively.
- 3.6 The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied with levels of visible patrol ranged from 54% in Middlesbrough to 47% in Stockton, with Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland rating 52% and 48% respectively.
- 3.7 The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied with the amount of information received from the police ranged from 66% in Middlesbrough to 46% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 55% and 47% respectively.
- 3.8 There was very high confidence in the police understanding of local issues. The percentage of attendees who felt that the police understood most or some of the issues in their local area ranged from 95% in Middlesbrough to 78% in Hartlepool, with Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton scoring 91% and 82% respectively.
- 3.9 There was also relatively high confidence in the police handling of local issues. The percentage of attendees who felt that the police dealt very well or fairly well with local problems ranged from 89% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Hartlepool, with Stockton and Redcar and Cleveland scoring 82% and 79% respectively.
- 3.10 Overall satisfaction in local policing was high. The percentage of attendees who were satisfied or very satisfied with their local policing ranged from 90% in Middlesbrough to 71% in Stockton, with Redcar and Cleveland and Hartlepool rating 75% and 74% respectively. Redcar and Cleveland saw a massive improvement on last year's results with 55% more attendees feeling satisfied with their local policing in 2008 than in 2007.
- 3.11 Policing priorities for 2009/2010 were:
- Middlesbrough – ASB & drugs, burglary
  - Hartlepool – Drugs, ASB, vandalism and criminal damage
  - Stockton – ASB, drugs, vandalism and criminal damage
  - Redcar & Cleveland – ASB, drugs, vandalism and criminal damage

- 3.12 The results of the priorities question confirm consultation done through the precept leaflet survey, although precept respondents in Middlesbrough and Stockton rated violent crime as more of priority than the Tier 3 attendees.