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Summary

1 How safe or unsafe people feel in their neighbourhoods is not always related to the actual incidence of crime. People's concerns are often about very local anti-social behaviour issues. The achievement of national targets to reduce crime and to reassure the public by reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour depends upon the police, councils and other local services working effectively together at the neighbourhood level. Consequently a sound understanding is needed of what makes people feel safe in a particular area.

2 National targets for reducing crime and anti-social behaviour need to be underpinned by neighbourhood approaches by all local services delivering community safety:
   • local authority-wide targets can mask under-performance at a neighbourhood level and present the risk that resources are wasted;
   • making communities safer requires agencies to combine the knowledge and information of frontline workers at neighbourhood level; and
   • local partners need to be able to distinguish between the concerns of different types of neighbourhoods and deploy appropriate resources, evaluating the cost and impact of their actions.

3 To do this well, good multi-agency reporting systems and up-to-date information about problem areas are needed. In some areas, local partners have many of these elements in place. But further action is needed for local services to have a full picture of neighbourhood problems and prioritise their activities well to ensure effective use of their combined resources.

4 By most measures, the general trend of crime has been falling nationally since 1995. But the public, whose lives are affected by crime and anti-social behaviour on their local streets, often do not recognise this. In fact, nearly two-thirds of people believe that crime is rising and one in three people living in more deprived areas thinks that anti-social behaviour is damaging their quality of life.

5 Our findings show that the actual incidence of crime, including serious crime, is not the principal factor determining how safe people feel. For a majority of people, it is their daily experience of anti-social behaviour in their immediate neighbourhood, on their street or estate, or their perception of what is happening locally, that shapes their view. Fear of
crime is fuelled by dirty streets cluttered by abandoned cars and anti-social behaviour such as noisy neighbours.

6 Despite recent advances by the police and councils, most data on low-level crime and anti-social behaviour still take too broad-brush an approach. Government targets and national performance results are measured using the local authority area, which can have up to a quarter of a million residents, as the smallest measurement unit. In other words, information is aggregated at far too high a level to paint a faithful picture of life in individual neighbourhoods which may have populations counted in a few thousands. This makes it hard to target the pattern of crime in different neighbourhoods effectively.

7 Precise and detailed data are particularly important in relation to anti-social behaviour where real-time intelligence can best single out what response is needed. Councils and the police do understand people’s concerns but are not fully exploiting their combined intelligence and the knowledge and skills of frontline workers to analyse and respond to local issues. High-quality information is needed for areas smaller than a ward.

8 This has important implications for the 373 crime and disorder reduction partnerships (CDRPs) in England and community safety partnerships (CSPs) in Wales. These are the key partnerships for addressing local crime and anti-social behaviour problems. The government is keen to ensure that their ways of doing business are brought up to date. The recent review of the Crime and Disorder Act proposes new national standards for CDRPs to improve their consistency.

9 The government has selected the 40 CDRPs with the highest levels of crime (a crime rate almost twice the national average) for particular attention. Yet measuring crime outcomes at CDRP level can conceal huge differences in local neighbourhoods. A typical CDRP covers a population of over 100,000 people. So even if government targets on crime reduction are achieved, many people living in pockets of crime or in areas where anti-social behaviour is rife may not feel any better off.

10 Solutions may be at hand since local agencies collectively hold a great deal of information, about crimes, incidents, victims, offenders and problem locations. But this information is collected in different ways. CDRPs could pool this information and adopt the principles of the police national intelligence model (NIM) to respond to local problems. Then they could create a detailed profile of crime and anti-social behaviour in their local neighbourhood and devise long-term solutions.
Frontline workers such as neighbourhood wardens, police community support officers (PCSOs) and housing officers are in daily contact with local people. They are well placed to identify the issues that concern people and tell them what actions have been taken. But frontline workers need the authority to take quick and effective action. Failure to act in a timely way dents the confidence of residents.

CDRP partners should tackle crime and anti-social behaviour at the neighbourhood level. To do this, partners should:

a) analyse and understand specific crime and anti-social behaviour problems in their neighbourhoods using the principles of the police national intelligence model (NIM) to collect community intelligence, including local information provided by frontline workers;

b) deploy resources cost-effectively, respond quickly to local concerns and inform people when action has been taken; and

c) evaluate neighbourhood interventions regularly, assessing cost-effectiveness and value for money through a rigorous performance management framework which focuses on neighbourhood improvement.

Addressing crime and anti-social behaviour must be linked to other improvements in the environment to enhance the quality of life for people. To be successful, CDRPs need to work with other partners to develop short- and long-term solutions based on local knowledge of what people really want.
15 Local government

Local government has an important local leadership role to play as well as specific responsibilities to address anti-social behaviour and environmental nuisance. To contribute to better neighbourhood outcomes councils should in addition:

a) ensure that the data they hold on anti-social behaviour is reliable, up to date, easily accessible to other partners and conforms to the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR);

b) make better use of their frontline workers in gathering information and community intelligence, empowering them to take swift action;

c) enable frontline workers to perform an effective two-way communication role between the council and local people with an emphasis on keeping residents well informed of action taken; and

d) use their enhanced scrutiny powers to support improved performance in CDRPs.

16 Central government

Central government should support, encourage and enable local partners to tackle neighbourhood crime and anti-social behaviour. To do this government should:

a) ensure that the new strategic police authorities and forces maintain a focus on providing neighbourhood solutions; and

b) review the performance framework for policing and community safety, shifting the focus to improving services at the neighbourhood level and providing assurance to people that CDRP partners are working together effectively to deliver shared outcomes.

17 Regulators

Regulators need to support a neighbourhood-focused and joined-up approach to service delivery. The new Justice, Community Safety and Custody Inspectorate and the Audit Commission should assess how well public bodies are collectively delivering safer and stronger communities to a local area, examining local community safety outcomes, disseminating good practice and providing clear and accessible information to local people.
Introduction

This report considers how local agencies responsible for community safety can work better together and with local people to make neighbourhoods safer and improve the perception of public safety. These local agencies include the police, local government, the fire authorities and, in England, primary care trusts, or, in Wales, local health boards. The Commission previously reported, in Safety in Numbers (Ref. 1), on community safety, while the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was being developed. Three years ago, we specifically assessed the progress made by the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) created by the Act (Ref. 2). Since then, the framework within which CDRPs are expected to operate has changed considerably.

Our work addresses the extent to which these changes are impacting on delivery on the ground. We have looked at how well local agencies have developed their approach to making places safer, how they involve their frontline workers and how well they use information to solve local problems in ways which deliver value for money for local people. Delivering community safety is a high priority for most councils and their partners. This report identifies some good achievements and also some ways in which agencies can improve further.

The government has recently concluded its own review of the Crime and Disorder Act (Ref. 3) which will bring about further changes to how CDRPs operate and are accountable to local people. It is also intending to extend the scope of Partnerships to include anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment through provisions in the Police and Justice Bill (Ref. 4).

The emphasis on building a more responsive police service through neighbourhood policing and restructuring authorities and forces to deal with serious crime into larger bodies, will also have major implications. It will be important that a focus is maintained on police and CDRP performance during the implementation of strategic forces and authorities. Through the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) framework for councils, the Commission assesses how well councils, with their partners, are delivering safer and stronger communities within their areas. This report offers ways, many of them based on existing notable practice, of dealing with some of the problems that CDRPs face at both strategic and operational levels to make neighbourhoods safer.
22 Since we first reported on community safety, crime has been falling nationally, as measured both by police statistics and findings from the British Crime Survey. While these measures include criminal damage, they do not include anti-social behaviour such as noisy neighbours. Surveys show the public often regard the two as part of the same problem (Ref. 5). So police and crime statistics are only part of the story. The response of local government in tackling anti-social behaviour and environmental concerns is vital in making people and places safer.

23 Every local area has its own mix of people, buildings, transport links, amenities and leisure facilities. Each has varying levels of engagement from frontline workers in the police, local authorities, schools, social services and the health service. Neighbourhoods require solutions to different problems of crime and anti-social behaviour tailored to particular circumstances.

24 We gathered from our fieldwork that neighbourhoods mean different things to different people. A neighbourhood may be defined by the people who live in it as a street, an estate, part of an estate, or a local government ward. We have taken as our starting point what local people consider as their area. We did not seek to define neighbourhoods.

25 This report draws on evidence from the following sources:

- A web-based information-gathering exercise from about one in five of the 351 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in England, the 22 Community Safety Partnerships in Wales and the 246 basic command units (BCUs) within police forces in both England and Wales. The purpose of this was to ascertain how ready they are to respond to problems at a local level.
- Fieldwork in ten wards in five council districts, each with a quite different demographic composition, to inform how a street-level approach can assist in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour.
- A MORI in-home survey of 1,068 people aged 15 and over within ten wards in England and Wales, and 107 separate in-home interviews with children between the

---

1 At the time this research was conducted, the Audit Commission’s remit covered Wales. Since 1 April 2005, responsibility for regulating local public bodies in Wales has rested with the Wales Audit Office. In this report, the term CDRP means both Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships and Community Safety Partnerships.
ages of 10 and 17. For comparative reasons, an additional 208 people were interviewed in two wards in the London Borough of Bexley, a police reassurance pilot borough. The survey was designed to measure localised perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour.

- In-depth interviews in an additional four council areas with local authority, police and other CDRP partner agencies. The purpose of these interviews was to capture local initiatives and inform notable practice case studies.

26 The report is primarily designed to help those responsible for making places safer for people: police; councils; primary care trusts or local health boards; and other service providers, such as health and fire authorities, who are all partners within CDRPs.

27 The report focuses on the issues for councils and community safety partners which relate to safer, stronger, sustainable communities and which are key aspects of the Commission’s work on area profiles. Area profiles provide a wide-ranging picture of the quality of life and public services in a local area, bringing together data, information and assessments for every local authority area in England. These can be found on our website at www.audit-commission.gov.uk.

28 This report also forms part of a suite of information aimed at helping agencies to understand and improve their responsiveness to neighbourhood problems. This includes:

- a framework for neighbourhood working developed by combining elements of good practice from the examples of partnership activities which are working well in local areas;
- a companion web tool which is available on the Audit Commission website entitled Compiling neighbourhood profiles – a guide for local agencies; this includes advice on drawing up a neighbourhood profile and developing a costing framework to assess value for money;
- Comprehensive Performance Assessment inspections that assess the achievements of councils, with their partners, including safer and stronger communities; and
- detailed case studies providing practical advice on how agencies are successfully dealing with neighbourhood problems.

29 We set out the national crime and disorder picture in chapter one. In chapter two we describe the extent to which information is being used effectively to support neighbourhood approaches. Chapter three explains how agencies can deliver better
value for money from local interventions. Chapter four looks at how better neighbourhood outcomes can be delivered and chapter five considers the way ahead, including recommendations for partner agencies, central government and regulators.

Background and policy context

30 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002) requires public services to work with other local organisations through statutory CDRPs. The government’s aim was to address problems that affected people’s quality of life, but which had not previously been recognised as crime. There are 351 CDRPs in England and 22 CSPs in Wales and public services are required under the Act either to take a leading role (responsible authorities) or to provide support (cooperating bodies) (Figure 1, overleaf).

31 The responsible authorities are required by the Act to work together to identify how crime, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and fear of crime affect the local district and to use this information to develop a community safety strategy. In forming a strategy, the responsible authorities are required to take account of the views of the cooperating bodies and to encourage participation from the public and other local, private, voluntary and community organisations.

32 Most community strategies place crime and anti-social behaviour as a high priority and over 70 per cent of CDRPs are chaired by local authority representatives. In many areas, council and police BCU boundaries are coterminous. In areas where this is not the case, government is seeking a reorganisation of boundaries to achieve coterminosity through provisions in the Police and Justice Bill (Ref. 4).

33 Since the establishment of CDRPs, the government has introduced a number of initiatives designed to facilitate a neighbourhood approach to addressing crime and anti-social behaviour. The Safer and Stronger Communities Fund (SSCF) and local area agreements (LAAs) are designed to increase local influence and decision making in crime reduction interventions. The role of local government, in particular, in responding to anti-social behaviour and wider environmental concerns is addressed in the LAA framework and the CPA corporate assessment framework for safer and stronger communities. Local authorities have specific powers to address environmental concerns which have recently come into force under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 (Ref. 6).
Figure 1
Roles within crime and disorder reduction partnerships
Most local public services either play a lead or supporting role in CDRPs.

Source: Audit Commission
The need to adopt local approaches to reduce crime and disorder is highlighted in the move towards problem-oriented (Ref. 7) and intelligence-led policing and the introduction of the National Intelligence Model (NIM) (Ref. 8). The intention to have neighbourhood policing teams in every area in England and Wales by 2008 is part of the government’s objective to build a more responsive police service. At the same time there will be a restructure of the existing 43 police forces to introduce larger force areas to deal with serious crime. For the first time, a National Community Safety Plan sets out policing and community safety priorities for 2006-09 (Ref. 9).

In view of the considerable changes in the ways in which CDRPs are now expected to operate, the government has conducted a review of the Crime and Disorder Act (Ref. 3), which has addressed the structures, delivery, governance and accountability and standards of CDRPs. The government is intending to introduce secondary legislation to extend the list of responsible authorities, repeal the requirement for three-year strategies, strengthen information sharing and produce national standards for all CDRPs to comply with.
Crime and anti-social behaviour in England and Wales today

Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour is crucial to making neighbourhoods better places to live. When asked about experience and fear of crime, people often include anti-social behaviour in their assessment. Surveys in 2001 and 2005 that measure liveability or the local quality of life show that a low crime rate is the most important single factor determining where people want to live (Figure 2).

**Figure 2**
**Liveability surveys – 2001 and 2005**
A low crime rate is the largest single factor that determines where people want to live.

**Source:** MORI liveability survey; GB adults, 15+; 2001 n = 2,031; 2005 n = 2,017; weighted for national representation
When people are asked about crime, they often describe incidents of anti-social behaviour (see Figure 6, page 21). Similarly, people’s understanding of what constitutes anti-social behaviour is determined by a series of factors including context, location, community tolerance and quality of life expectations (Ref. 10). However, an understanding of the nature of anti-social behaviour and an ability to distinguish between crime and anti-social behaviour is vital when identifying local concerns and developing appropriate responses.

A widely used definition of anti-social behaviour is that contained in the Crime and Disorder Act (1998): ‘Acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as (the defendant).’ The Home Office has identified four broad types of anti-social behaviour: misuse of public space, disregard for community/personal well-being, acts directed at people and environmental damage (Ref. 10). The Respect Action Plan describes anti-social behaviour as ‘behaviours which can make life a misery for others, particularly in most disadvantaged communities’ (Ref. 11). Some low-level crimes may be classed as anti-social behaviour depending on the seriousness of the act.

Since reaching a peak in 1995, levels of crime recorded by the British Crime Survey (BCS) have fallen by nearly one half (44 per cent) (Figure 3, overleaf). This fall represents 8.5 million fewer crimes nationally. Reductions have occurred in all major categories, with vehicle crime and burglary falling by 57 per cent and violent crime by 43 per cent (Ref. 12).

Despite the trend for the data indicating that districts are becoming safer, there remains a disparity between public perception of crime in their neighbourhoods and the actual level of crime recorded by the BCS. Over 60 per cent of BCS respondents in 2004/05 felt that crime had increased nationally in the previous 12 months; and over 40 per cent felt that crime had increased in their local area during the same period. It is clear that crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime have a profound effect on people’s quality of life and their view about their neighbourhood as a pleasant place to live.

The cost of crime is high. The government estimates that the total cost of crime against individuals and households in 2003/04 was over £36 billion (Ref. 13). The physical and emotional distress to victims accounts for half of this total. In addition, research has estimated that dealing with anti-social behaviour costs nearly £3.5 billion a year (Ref. 14).
Figure 3
British Crime Survey (BCS) trends 1995 to 2004/05
Since 1995, crime as recorded by the British Crime Survey has fallen by nearly one half.

Source: Home Office

Variation in crime and anti-social behaviour between CDRPs

Rates of crime and anti-social behaviour are not spread evenly across England and Wales. For example, the 40 CDRPs with the highest overall crime rate in 2004/05 had an average crime rate that was nearly double that of the remaining 331 CDRPs (Figure 4). The 40 high crime CDRPs cover mainly urban areas with high multiple deprivation, for example, Nottingham, Manchester, Bristol and Camden; these CDRPs are found in 18 of the 20 most deprived councils in England. (Ref. 15).
Figure 4
The 40 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships with the highest overall crime rate

In 2004/05, the 40 high-crime CDRPs had an average crime rate that was nearly double that of the remainder.

Source: Home Office (note: based on the number of CDRPs at 2004/05. This has since changed to 373 due to mergers of partnerships)

43 The government aims to reduce the geographical variation in crime rates. The Home Office’s previous public service agreement (PSA) target of 1999 had two objectives: to reduce overall rates of key crimes and to reduce the variation in crime rates between CDRPs. Comparing 2002/03 and 2003/04, crime rates fell more quickly in high crime CDRPs; falling from 27 offences per 1,000 people in 2002/03 to 23 offences per 1,000 people in 2003/04. The latest data suggest that recorded crime continues to fall, and is still falling faster in the high-crime CDRPs with an 11 per cent reduction between 2003/04 and 2004/05 compared to five per cent in the remaining CDRPs.

I Defined as robbery, burglary and car crime.
Revised PSAs between HM Treasury and the Home Office cover the period between 2004 and 2007. These targets are:

- PSA target 1 – to reduce (all) crime by 15 per cent and further in high-crime areas, by 2007/08; and
- PSA target 2 – to reassure the public (by) reducing the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and (by) building confidence in the criminal justice system (but) without compromising fairness (Ref. 15).

Within PSA 1, high-crime areas are again defined as being the 40 CDRP areas that have the highest rates of recorded crime per head of population, plus the highest crime rates measured by the BCS in 2003/04. Achievement of PSA1 depends on the performance of CDRPs in reducing local rates of crime and anti-social behaviour and is measured by the collective local performance of all CDRPs. Despite some increased flexibility, the current Home Office PSA target prescribes a reduction in only some recorded crimes and a reduction in the variability of crime rates between CDRPs based on setting more challenging targets in high-crime areas. There is no specific incentive for a CDRP to reduce variation in crime and disorder within the CDRP area, for example between different neighbourhoods.

PSA 2 seeks an improvement in public confidence about crime, anti-social behaviour and the criminal justice system generally. While CDRPs will have developed their own local targets, at a national level, the target is only measurable nationally through the BCS as the sustainable impact accrues to society generally. This PSA target does not create an incentive to narrow the performance gap between CDRPs by reducing any variation in the extent of the fear of crime between CDRPs, still less within a CDRP area.

Despite the revised targets, there is a continued mismatch between government aspirations for a neighbourhood approach to crime and disorder, the measures in place to achieve this and the management and measurement of CDRP performance. The disparity between aspirations and targets is driven, in part, by a lack of appropriate data. The BCS is generally agreed to be the best indicator of trends in crime over time. It measures the amount of crime in England and Wales by asking people about crimes they have experienced in the previous year. The BCS includes crimes that are not reported to the police, so it is an important alternative to police records. The BCS is unaffected by changes in crime reporting patterns and police practice in recording reported crime. Its sample size of nearly 50,000 is robust for assessing national trends and findings, but not
large enough for small area analysis at a level lower than police force area. The historic nature of the data also means that it is not able to pick up current or emerging trends.

For more current crime data, CDRPs use the Home Office iQuanta system to manage performance. iQuanta is a database of all police recorded crime. Individual CDRPs use this data to compare real-time performance with other CDRPs, but the data cannot be analysed below CDRP level. Nor does iQuanta enable CDRPs to record incidents of anti-social behaviour on a consistent and comparable basis.

**Variation in crime and anti-social behaviour within CDRPs**

Measuring crime at a CDRP level masks wide variations within CDRPs, including very high concentrations of crime in specific streets or estates. Research has shown (Ref. 16) that, within neighbourhoods, households are becoming more homogenous in terms of socio-economic and demographic characteristics. At the same time, however, neighbourhoods are becoming increasingly distinct from one another. As a result, those living in households with the greatest risk of being a victim of crime and anti-social behaviour are becoming ever more concentrated in a relatively small number of neighbourhoods.

We asked five CDRPs with varying demographic profiles to identify two wards each in their area that displayed local problems with crime and anti-social behaviour. Two of the CDRPs, Liverpool and Bradford, are ranked at eight and 17 within the government’s 40 high-crime areas. Rhondda Cynon Taff (at 126), Thanet (at 128) and Kerrier (at 256) are not, but still have pockets of problem areas. We carried out an in-depth analysis of crime and anti-social behaviour in those wards, which revealed much variation at a neighbourhood level. **Box A, overleaf**, provides a brief overview of these five CDRPs. More detailed profiles of the ten neighbourhoods (wards) are provided in the web tool, *Compiling Neighbourhood Profiles – a guide for local agencies*. 
Box A
Overview of the five CDRPs in our study

Bradford is a metropolitan borough council. A high proportion of the area is rural, but most of the population lives in urban districts. It has a diverse and multi-cultural population, which is expected to increase. Unemployment rates are relatively high and educational attainment levels well below the national norm. Bradford has an above average crime rate, particularly for violent offences against the person. The wards selected were Eccleshill and Tong.

Kerrier is a district council in Cornwall, which includes urban and rural areas and attracts holidaymakers to its beaches. The proportion of economically inactive people is twice the national average. Average wages are nearly a quarter below the national average, yet house prices are around the national average and rising rapidly. Crime rates are below the national average, but crime is concentrated in a few areas. The wards selected were Redruth North and Illogan South.

Liverpool is a metropolitan borough council. Deprivation in the city is high – unemployment is more than twice the national average, over a third of the population live in poverty, twice the national norm live in unfit homes. Liverpool has an above-average crime rate, particularly for violent crime. The wards selected were Anfield and Warbreck.

Rhondda Cynon Taff is a county borough council near Cardiff in South Wales. The area has many communities with close kinship ties. It has below average crime rates, but problems with unreported crime and a high concentration of incidents in a few areas. The wards selected were Pen y waun and Talbot Green.

Thanet is a coastal district council in Kent. It has relatively high levels of deprivation, with comparatively high rates of unemployment, child poverty and poor health and a low skills base. The proportion of retired older people in the population is relatively high and the area has suffered economically and socially from tourism decline. Immigration rates are high, including homeless people and people from Central and Eastern Europe. Crime rates are about the national average, but there are distinct problems in some neighbourhoods. The wards selected were Cliftonville West and Newington.

Source: Audit Commission
Recorded crime below the level of the CDRP

The Neighbourhood Statistics (NeSS) project by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) provides information on the distribution of crime within the area covered by CDRPs in England by using the Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD 2004). At present, the IMD 2004 is the only published small area crime data for the whole country. The crime component of the IMD 2004 estimates local rates of four categories of recorded crimes: burglary, theft, criminal damage and violence. The data covers the period 2001/02 and an update is due in 2006 (Ref. 17).

The NeSS website provides the facility to map the variation in IMD 2004 crime by Lower Layer Super Output Area (LSOA) (Ref. 18). LSOAs cover smaller areas than electoral wards. Typically, a LSOA comprises around 1,500 people. An electoral ward will comprise between five and ten LSOAs. Such analysis is a useful starting point in understanding how crime rates vary across a CDRP's area. Care is required in interpreting such maps because the crime data is now five years old.

Using this facility, we have mapped two of our districts, Kerrier and Liverpool (Figure 5, overleaf) to illustrate the importance of understanding the variation in crime levels within a CDRP area. The darker shadings show where there are higher crime rates but the figures are relative to the level of crime overall in the area. Thus Kerrier CDRP has a low overall crime rate, but one LSOA in each of the Redruth North and Illogan South wards has a higher crime rate compared to the rest of the CDRP. However, the highest crime rate is broadly equivalent to the lowest crime rate in Liverpool. Liverpool CDRP has a very high overall crime rate, but four LSOAs in the Anfield and Warbreck electoral wards have relatively less crime.
Figure 5
Crime rates in Liverpool and Kerrier Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships

Distribution of crime rates for two different settings highlights the importance of understanding local variation.

Source: ONS
While variation in rates of crime differs, there is a strong similarity in the type of problems that affect high-crime neighbourhoods (Figure 6). We surveyed 1,068 residents living in ten wards. We asked people to indicate which crime and anti-social behaviour problems they were most affected by in their neighbourhood. Their unprompted replies showed that things that most concern them are related to anti-social behaviour problems.

**Figure 6**

Residents’ key concerns about problems affecting their neighbourhoods

Our survey showed that things that concern residents most relate to anti-social behaviour.

![Bar Chart]

Source: MORI. 1,068 adults surveyed between 23 May-20 July 2005

Further analysis of other issues of concern showed that problems related to well-being and quality of life, such as unemployment, often have more significance than crime. These are recurrent themes and are highlighted by people who live in all neighbourhoods, even those in areas where there are serious problems such as gun crime and drug misuse.
Quality of life issues are important to everybody. People are aware of serious crime locally but are affected daily by anti-social behaviour. They assess the likelihood of serious crime directly affecting them and their feedback indicates that they are affected more by quality of life and anti-social behaviour issues in their daily lives.

Our survey of over 100 young people in the same wards also found differences in concerns: young people are much more worried about bullying by other young people. Surveys of adults may not highlight these concerns. CDRPs need to consider the concerns of different groups in local areas.

Analysis of crime and anti-social behaviour at national, regional and CDRP levels does not adequately address people’s perceptions about crime and safety, which are driven by local considerations. Successful CDRPs find ways of getting better local information and understand that people need solutions to both crime and anti-social behaviour in order to feel safe.
Towards better local information

59 The first chapter identified the need for local level data and for data to measure anti-social behaviour. This chapter looks at how these can be delivered.

60 To assess the extent to which agencies were able to work below the CDRP district level, we collected information from 21 per cent of police BCU commanders and 21 per cent of the 373 CDRPs in England and Wales. Because of the small sample size, the results are indicative but still useful. We also collected data for each of the ten wards to review the way public services made use of available information. The data included:

• police incidents;
• police-recorded crime;
• councils’ and housing associations’ records of anti-social behaviour;
• fire services’ records of emergency calls, including malicious and hoax calls;
• councils’ records of Council Tax and Housing Benefit fraud investigations;
• councils’ records of criminal damage to public buildings and open space facilities, including schools;
• local education authorities’ records of short-term and permanent exclusions from mainstream schools;
• councils’ records of environmental enforcement action – for example, abandoned vehicle removal, noise abatement;
• NHS ambulance trusts’ records of emergency calls; and
• NHS acute trust records of presentations at accident and emergency departments.

Source: Audit Commission – data collected between April-September 2004

CDRPs’ current use of information

61 The NIM is the framework used by the police to research and analyse information. Most police forces now manage operational business using NIM reviews, which involve regular tasking and coordination meetings. NIM provides strategic direction, supports tactical resourcing decisions about operational policing and supports risk management. The model works at three levels:
• Level 1 BCU – local issues;
• Level 2 Force and/or regional – cross-border issues; and
• Level 3 Serious and organised crime that is usually national or international.

62 Tasking and coordinating takes place at each level both strategically through twice yearly Strategic Tasking and Coordinating Groups and tactically through Tactical Tasking and Coordinating Groups. Information and intelligence flow between levels and between neighbouring police forces and other law enforcement agencies. There are four main intelligence products:

• the Strategic Assessment which provides the big picture of current developments and future trends;
• the Tactical Assessment which provides an overview every two weeks;
• the Problem Profile which arises from the Tactical Assessment and identifies the scale of a problem in a BCU and identifies potential suspects; and
• the Target Profile which profiles suspects and offenders and recommends tactical options.

63 At these daily or weekly meetings, action to address priorities is allotted to individual police officers. The police performance assessment framework (PPAF) places an expectation on this approach. The Crime and Disorder Act review (Ref. 3) also now places an emphasis on all partners using the principles of NIM as part of its good practice framework. In particular, it proposes that the six monthly strategic intelligence assessments should be used by ‘all those discharging strategic and operational community safety functions’ (Ref. 3) and replace the three-yearly CDRP audits. This will help local CDRP partners to focus on improving how they share community safety intelligence.

64 However, our survey of CDRPs found that only one in ten CDRPs had adopted the principles of NIM, or routinely used a similar process to manage their work. Our fieldwork found that most tasking and coordination analysis was police-led, but analysts were using only data held within police computer databases on incidents and recorded crimes that are NIM-led.
Where the police have worked with other agencies using the principles of NIM, they can provide enhanced intelligence assessments to reflect local circumstances and conditions. For example, West Yorkshire Police have adopted a local approach in Bradford North BCU.

**Case study 1**

**West Yorkshire Police**

West Yorkshire Police are using enhanced intelligence assessments in the Bradford North BCU as a response to the impact of crime and the civil disturbance of 2001 upon the communities living in the area. The Community Reassurance Information System (CRIC) is used, drawing information from a range of sources, to identify four broad factors: criminal or racist; political; social; and community, which are likely to lead to community tension, and would not be included under the NIM. They have built these into the assessment to support community cohesion and take pre-emptive and appropriate action through a range of agencies.

**Source:** West Yorkshire Police

Measuring and recording anti-social behaviour

Police forces’ own management information systems remain the most useful source of data for operational purposes. But prior to the introduction of the Home Office National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR) in 2005, these systems did not consistently record some types of public order offence. They did not record anti-social behaviour at all, because incidents were not defined for recording purposes. In addition, response to and responsibility for dealing with many types of anti-social behaviour falls to local government.

To compile a picture of the extent and prevalence of types of anti-social behaviour, the Home Office Anti-Social Behaviour Unit conducted a ‘one-day count’ in September 2003, where a number of agencies collaborated to record over 66,000 calls, grouped into 13 categories. (Ref. 10). Litter/rubbish, criminal damage/vandalism, vehicle-related nuisance and inappropriate vehicle use were the most frequently recorded categories of anti-social behaviour. While cost has made this exercise unrepeatable, the Respect Action Plan (Ref. 11), launched in January 2006, aims to tackle the underlying causes of anti-social behaviour and to undertake earlier interventions. This is dependent on a multi-agency response.
68 The BCS asks questions about the extent of anti-social behaviour, but data cannot be analysed reliably for areas below national level. A few local authorities opted to include these BCS questions in the ODPM triennial best value satisfaction surveys of 2004 (Ref. 19). But as most local authorities did not participate, insufficient data exist for a national analysis. The ability to measure the extent and prevalence of anti-social behaviour will be a key factor in determining outcomes for success of the Respect Action Plan.

69 There is a wealth of national and BCU level crime data and a variety of data from disparate systems across local agencies that aim to capture information on anti-social behaviour. But to use these at local level they must be accurate, fit for purpose and used effectively to identify neighbourhood problems.

70 In our survey of CDRPs and BCUs, we asked whether they were recording anti-social behaviour and were receiving information on incidents other than recordable crime. While over two-thirds of CDRPs and BCUs are recording anti-social behaviour within their own agencies, coverage was patchy from other sources. For example, while over half (60%) were using information from neighbourhood wardens, less than half (46%) had information from housing officers. Furthermore, methods of recording anti-social behaviour have been developed locally and only 30 per cent of CDRPs are using the categories in the Home Office one-day count (Ref. 10), so there are little comparable data across districts.

71 Analysis of anti-social behaviour is limited. We found instances where data from neighbourhood watch, housing officers and youth offending teams (YOTs) were exchanged within CDRPs, but in summary form, making risk analysis impossible. In some CDRPs, fire services are taking a proactive role in risk and other analysis, but often separately to other analyses of crime hot spots.

72 Social housing landlords are under a duty to publish an anti-social behaviour policy under Section 12 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003. They frequently hold useful information about anti-social behaviour, crime hotspots, victims and offenders for the tenancies they manage. But inconsistent information recording and exchange between housing associations in particular, who are independent bodies, and among CDRP partners

---

1 All landlords that are local housing authorities, Housing Action Trusts and registered social landlords are required to prepare and publish policies and procedures in relation to anti-social behaviour.
constrains risk assessment of neighbourhood problems. One council had recreated an anti-social behaviour team after the transfer of its housing stock to a housing association that had a similar team. Duplication was increased by the police having its own anti-social behaviour team. The CDRP is now establishing a single co-located, multi-agency team. Another local authority complained of the difficulty in working with 43 different housing associations, each with its own distinct anti-social behaviour policy.

73 In individual police forces, councils, housing associations and youth offending teams, we found good examples of people working at very local levels, below the CDRP structure, to improve safety in neighbourhoods.

Case study 2
Coventry
In the Willenhall area in Coventry, neighbourhood wardens are acting on information from the public and feeding this into daily local police-led tasking meetings. The neighbourhood warden can collect and provide information in a format that can be used by the police and the other services responsible for tackling crime and anti-social behaviour at street level.

Source: Coventry City Council and West Midlands Police

74 To respond effectively to local concerns, public services need a framework to help them pool information about neighbourhood concerns and ensure that recording anti-social behaviour is integrated into existing data systems. The Home Office National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR), being used by police forces, works to an agreed standard containing principles of recording and definitions of anti-social behaviour incidents. This is an approach that is improving information recording within forces and could be used for other public services to ensure that local concerns that are wider than crime are being recorded and responded to. Other agencies, such as council environmental health departments and housing bodies, who have distinct powers to tackle nuisance behaviour, could provide additional information to present a more rounded picture of incident and response.
Connecting incidents to individuals

Within neighbourhoods, peoples’ concerns are often about individuals who create problems, but knowledge of this depends on effective sharing of both personal and de-personalised data. As well as the police, many local public services have regular contact with communities and households. They possess useful information about crime and disorder. But this information cannot be used for crime reduction if it is not shared because of worries about the use of personal data.

Reluctance by public services to share personal data to reduce crime is not a new issue. The government review of the Crime and Disorder Act refers to the Audit Commission’s report on community safety partnerships (Ref. 2) and in relation to information sharing it states the intention to strengthen Section 115 to give relevant agencies the power to share de-personalised data (Ref. 3). More recently, the government’s Prolific and Other Priority Offender programme (PPO) provides a framework for CDRPs to identify high-risk offenders and to mitigate the risk to the community by action targeted at each offender. To facilitate this programme, the Home Office provided a model information sharing protocol for use by CDRPs. We saw some instances of notable practice, where CDRPs identified PPOs at high risk of re-offending and then took appropriate preventive action. But education, health and social care providers remain reluctant to release personal client data because of client confidentiality issues.

Making the link between people and places

In their daily work, local agencies will have access to incident data on crime and anti-social behaviour, which could also be shared within CDRPs. Where data exist some CDRPs also have information about public concern. The key is for agencies to find workable solutions that combine information about people and places, which connects concerns with incidents.
Analysis using geo-demographic information (GDI) provides a useful method for gaining information about public concern at a neighbourhood level. ACORN (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods) and MOSAIC™ are two examples of the range of widely used classification systems that cover the UK. Using GDI, local agencies can compile neighbourhood profiles to model the risk of residents in different neighbourhoods being the victim of, or witnessing, crime and anti-social behaviour. This can be compared with average risks by using information from the British Crime Survey. It is possible to make a prediction of risk for every neighbourhood in the UK. Further information about these methods is contained in the web tool Compiling Neighbourhood Profiles – a guide for local agencies.

Geographical information systems (GIS) enable local agencies to compare GDI-based predicted risk with actual incidence. But regular use of GIS to organise and present data was patchy in the areas we visited. The use of contextual data from other sources to build up a picture of risk was also rarely used. In our fieldwork visits, the capacity of CDRPs to handle large amounts of complex data was also of concern. One CDRP we visited had only one GIS analyst. Yet the extent to which predicted risk equals observed incidence is the key to identifying an unknown relationship, or confirming an uncertain one. For example, in Bradford’s Eccleshill ward, (Figure 7, overleaf), a strong relationship shows between predicted concerns about ‘teenagers hanging around being a big problem’ (red circles) and observed pupil exclusions (small black boxes).
Figure 7
Pupil exclusions in Bradford, Eccleshill ward
There is a relationship between pupil exclusions and BCS respondents perceiving groups of young people as a very big problem in the neighbourhood.

Note: Perception that groups of young people in the street are a very big problem:
- below national average (black and grey circles); or
- national average (white circles); or
- above national average (red circles).

Source: Audit Commission/UCL

Good analysis requires care in attributing risks derived from national surveys to small neighbourhoods. GDI and GIS are useful analytical tools, but are not ends in themselves. They need to be used in conjunction with in-depth and detailed knowledge of each neighbourhood. A thorough neighbourhood profile would include a comparison of predicted risk with incident data as part of a broader analysis of quantitative and qualitative information. The ability to predict patterns and incidence of crime and anti-social behaviour is a key aid to planning and commissioning community safety activity. The London Borough of Bexley used postcode analysis to identify a problem area that was not picked up in their borough-wide crime audit (Case study 3).
Case study 3

Bexley

In 2002, residents’ feedback to ward councillors indicated that crime and disorder audits did not accurately capture neighbourhood concerns about feeling ignored and ill-served by police and local authority services. The anecdotal evidence challenged findings from Bexley Council’s 2001 crime and disorder audit which suggested that more than 80 per cent of Bexley residents felt ‘fairly’ or ‘very’ safe outside their homes during the day.

In response, Bexley’s Community Safety Partnership analysed the distribution of crime by offender and victim postcodes. Certain postcodes had both the highest incidence rate (28 per cent) and the strongest clustering of victims and offenders. The area was designated a Community Safety Action Zone (CSAZ) and a multi-agency team was created in 2002. Further neighbourhood consultation obtained a more accurate assessment of residents’ concerns, identifying anti-social behaviour by a large group of young people as a key issue.

The multi-agency community safety partnership team, co-located in Belvedere Police Station, responded to the problem with a range of interventions, including:

- policing targeted at key offenders;
- warning letters and visits to, plus support for, parents of offenders;
- school-based education programmes;
- environmental works to reduce crime and improve quality of life;
- promotional work with the local news media; and
- regular feedback to residents.

Between 2001/02 and 2003/04, overall crime rates in Bexley reduced by 4 per cent. Between 2003/04 and 2004/05 a further fall of 6.4 per cent was recorded, bringing Bexley’s safety rating up from eighth- to fourth-safest London Borough.

Source: London Borough of Bexley and Metropolitan Police
Making the links between places and people most at risk from crime and anti-social behaviour enables CDRPs to be more discerning about what action to take and where. The challenge for CDRPs is to use this local knowledge to inform resource allocation decisions and to communicate this to people to inform them of what has been done and why. It is essential for all agencies involved in preventing and reducing crime and disorder to use information to improve their understanding of public concern about neighbourhood issues.

The importance of responding to anti-social behaviour and having a clean environment for local people highlights the key role that local authorities have to play in using their powers to shape and lead the partnership response in these areas. Local authorities will do this well if they evaluate, articulate and deliver their role effectively at the strategic partnership level and make good use of their scrutiny powers, which are planned to be extended to CDRPs under the Police and Justice Bill.
Better value for money from local interventions

83 Councils and the police have obtained considerable crime-fighting resources through CDRPs. The Home Office has provided grants of nearly £1 billion since 1999 to fund crime reduction initiatives (Ref. 20), with £70 million per annum going directly to CDRPs (Ref. 21). Ensuring that resources are being deployed cost-effectively is a major challenge for CDRPs.

84 In recent years, police funding has also increased substantially and the number of police officers is at an all-time high. Police funding has grown from £7 billion in 1997 to £12 billion in 2005, representing an increase of 58 per cent in cash terms and 27 per cent in real terms (Ref. 22). In March 2005, there were 141,000 police officers in England and Wales, a substantial increase from 127,200 in March 1997 (Ref. 23). In its 2004 White Paper, Building Communities, Beating Crime (Ref. 24), the government made a commitment to provide neighbourhood policing teams across the country by 2008. The intention is that every community will have dedicated, accessible and visible teams, led by police officers and involving special constables, PCSOs, volunteers, neighbourhood wardens and other local agencies. To support the teams, by 2008, the government aims to have a further 25,000 PCSOs, making £465 million available through the Neighbourhood Policing Fund for this purpose.

85 In some council areas, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) has supported the provision of neighbourhood wardens to provide a uniformed presence in social housing areas and town centres. Neighbourhood wardens may be the first point of contact for local people in reporting local concerns, such as litter, graffiti and criminal damage. An independent evaluation of neighbourhood wardens found that the presence of wardens can reassure the public and reduce crime, the fear of crime and improve people’s overall quality of life (Ref. 25). ODPM’s £90.5 million fund has, so far, supported 245 warden schemes across the country. Funding for the third round of local street warden schemes ended in March 2006, and is now incorporated into the Safer and Stronger Communities Fund. Local strategic partnerships (LSPs) are able to use these funds according to local priorities and targets, including funding new and existing warden schemes.

This is a neighbourhood renewal programme for Neighbourhood Wardens’ presence in high-crime areas.
While there has been a substantial increase in resources, the nature of the funding framework has meant that CDRPs have had to bid for and administer many streams of funding and there is no systematic evaluation either at national level through the Home Office or at local level to determine whether these schemes make a difference. This was highlighted by the Public Accounts Committee’s comments on a National Audit Office report (Ref. 26). National performance management frameworks such as the police performance assessment framework (PPAF) and the CDRP self-assessment framework do not yet place a strong emphasis on cost-effectiveness.

There is a growing body of academic research about the cost-effectiveness of specific interventions, including arson prevention (Ref. 27), installation of alley gates behind houses (Ref. 28) and CCTV (Ref. 29). But we have found little evidence in our field studies or other research sources about cost-effectiveness of activity on an area basis (Ref. 30). This is a gap, particularly given the emerging trends towards tackling neighbourhood problems through neighbourhood policing and housing neighbourhood management. Area-based assessment of value for money would be consistent with the government’s approach to achieving the maximum impact from area-based funding through the SSCF.

The adoption of shared priorities by central and local government has been welcome in moving thinking away from service silos. Through CPAs, the Commission assesses councils’ achievements against the themes of safer, stronger and sustainable communities. The Crime and Disorder Act review (Ref. 3) signals a clear separation to be made between the strategic and operational functions of CDRPs to deal with committing resources and overseeing performance, as part of the strategic role, resting at local strategic partnership level and operational functions, including commissioning services and deploying resources on either a locality or thematic basis.

Findings for the cost-effectiveness of CCTV were equivocal.
89 LAAs are being implemented as a contract between local and central government to deliver local priorities. One aim is to provide freedoms and flexibilities to councils and their partners in using resources and to reduce unnecessary monitoring. A review of the first tranche of LAAs reveals obstacles associated with funding which can be removed if:

- funding priorities are led by local priorities, not central initiative;
- processes for seeking match funding are made easier and simpler;
- tensions between mainstream funding and initiatives are well managed;
- councils focus on long-term planning when deciding about short-term funding; and
- national initiatives support and do not inhibit local innovation.

90 Where councils and CDRPs can maximise the freedoms and flexibilities introduced by LAAs, they can provide opportunities to review performance measures on crime, drugs and anti-social behaviour. These flexibilities could help to ensure a more targeted approach to delivering on locally determined priorities. As a starting point, agencies were asked whether they could provide details of community safety activity and costs in the ten field study wards between April and September 2004. We also asked agencies whether funding came from mainstream service budgets or special initiatives.

91 Many local service providers fund community safety activity. But they often have difficulty, or find it impossible, to supply detail about activities and costs at or below CDRP or BCU level (Figure 8, overleaf).

92 In these ten wards, agencies identified community safety activity costs of over £12 million for one six-month, spring and summer, period. The police incurred nearly half this cost, with other agencies meeting the balance. The agencies’ high contribution reinforces the need for them to understand how effectively their resources are used in delivering community safety outcomes. Nearly 70 per cent of the cost was exclusively funded from public service base budgets. A quarter was funded from additional UK or EU government grants. The remaining six per cent was funded by a mix of base budgets and additional grants. All wards and CDRPs use a mix of mainstream and special funds. But drawing distinctions between these is difficult for some agencies such as probation boards and primary care trusts that do not systematically match funds with areas. Other agencies can make clear distinctions and some can report where their figures contain a combination of mainstream and special initiative funding.
Figure 8
Community safety activity costs
Community safety activity costs for ten wards were difficult to identify and some agencies could not provide costings at all.

Source: Audit Commission

We found that financial information provided by the police was the most complete and easiest to obtain. Police forces use Activity-Based Costing (ABC) and while it is not fully embedded and mature in all forces, accounting systems tend to support analysis on a geographic basis. The shift towards neighbourhood policing, adopted through the wide ranging police reform and modernisation agenda has focused attention on understanding costs and the link between resources, activities and performance outcomes that are measured in the PPAF.
Fire services were also able to identify costs to ward level. They use routinely available activity information to produce ward-level estimates for emergency response calls. It was more difficult to identify the cost of local preventive fire safety work.

Agencies which provide services on a locality basis in a distinct geographical area, such as police, fire and district councils, were better able to provide ward-level information. Agencies which provide personal services to individuals such as primary care trusts, local education authorities, housing associations and social care providers had difficulty in identifying geographical boundaries to analyse their case-based information. There was even more difficulty where organisational boundaries were not coterminous, for example, where housing associations cover a wider area than the local authority. This difference in perspective and approach sits at the heart of many of the problems we have identified.

Many agencies were unable to demonstrate that value for money is considered when either reviewing past performance, or planning future activity. Success is often measured locally by the meeting of government targets. It is therefore unclear how community safety-related expenditure is managed by the CDRP to achieve the best possible overall outcome. If agencies had more information about costs they would be able to understand how effective preventive measures are and work out the benefits over time of investments made to improve safety. It would assist in making decisions about stopping certain initiatives and expanding others. More cost-effective procurement decisions would be possible and comparisons could be made between interventions and approaches to problems in different neighbourhoods.

Making the link between resource demand and resource allocation decisions

Local working at neighbourhood level and encouraging better community engagement may have financial implications for agencies, particularly in dealing with increased reporting of anti-social behaviour cases. Yet recent research found that only in a quarter of police forces is anti-social behaviour evident as a factor in decision making about local use of resources (Ref. 31). Emphasis on national performance measures for crime and detection rates has caused police resources to be diverted from tackling anti-social behaviour (Ref. 31). Anti-social behaviour is difficult to measure and improvement targets

---

1 The costs shown in this report are each organisation’s estimate of the direct cost of activity, plus the cost of direct supervision. All other on-costs or overheads are excluded.
have not been specified. The police now have to report publicly not just on reducing crime but also responsiveness to the community and user satisfaction and compare their performance to other similar forces elsewhere. This is likely to shift the focus towards responsiveness to community concerns, such as anti-social behaviour.

98 While considerable effort is being made to improve public consultation by agencies in some areas, duplication in effort, time and resources happens frequently with police and councils. Such duplication is often further compounded by the individual obligations upon councils, police authorities and forces to consult with local communities (Ref. 24). The Crime and Disorder Act review will require CDRPs to produce regular reports for their communities and police authorities also have a statutory requirement to produce annual reports at least at authority or force level from April 2006, although guidance recommends BCU or CDRP level. Rationalisation of these obligations or nomination of a lead agency for each area is needed to reduce waste and improve value for money.

99 Greater standardisation by the police in the use of the NIM and the NSIR is likely to lead to an increase in the volume of recognised incidents as more incidents are categorised and recorded. Effective call handling and incident management are needed which allows for problems and incidents to be reported and then directed to the right local agency for resolution. Multi-agency tasking which uses the principles of the NIM would ensure that agency responses are prioritised according to needs across neighbourhoods. Closer links should be made between resource demands identified through these systems and resource deployment decisions. The Single Non Emergency Number (SNEN) is being piloted in five police forces in England and Wales during 2006 and is aimed at improving call handling and responsiveness by the police.

100 Merseyside Police was one of the sites trialling neighbourhood policing in St Helens under the government’s national reassurance policing pilot (NRRP), which ran between 2003 and April 2005. All 16 sites have been evaluated by the Home Office (Ref. 32). The St Helens trial identified a need for the police to integrate community intelligence and incident reporting with the NIM. By mapping local processes, Merseyside Police identified links between each planning and delivery framework (Figure 9). This approach is a useful starting point for improving the connection between the demand for services and the available resources to respond. The Crime and Disorder Act review (Ref. 3) also identifies the value of using the NIM framework to provide ‘regular opportunities for local people to raise their concerns and provide valuable community intelligence’.
Linking neighbourhood policing with the national intelligence model can improve the connection between local intelligence and resource allocation.

Source: Merseyside Police

101 Using community intelligence can help local agencies to view community safety issues more broadly than police-led crime reduction activity, with some council and housing association support. This can help to free up the use of the significant assets of all the agencies to improve capacity, value for money and outcomes together and be effective in achieving sustainable community safety.

102 Although the national CDRP performance system does not measure neighbourhood activity, some CDRPs are making good progress in improving their performance management information systems to understand more about local neighbourhoods and capture local data more effectively. Liverpool City Council is beginning to present...
information for each of its seven Neighbourhood Management Areas, broken down by ethnicity, age, gender and by priority crime type, for victims and offenders. But the financial systems in place are inappropriate for reporting costs according to geographical areas. It is therefore hard for CDRPs to measure relative performance and share learning and good practice about cost-effective interventions across areas either at CDRP or neighbourhood level.

103 The Crime and Disorder Act review of partnership arrangements places an emphasis on separating the strategic and operational functions of the CDRP. The LSP is well placed to undertake a strategic role in ensuring that CDRPs maximise the use of their resources and evaluate the success of their interventions in a way that demonstrates value for money. CDRPs need to have clear information about the total resources available to local neighbourhoods, have better planning processes, and place less emphasis and reliance upon special initiatives. When agencies have better local intelligence and can use financial information more effectively, it will enable CDRPs to have a greater understanding of the cost effectiveness of local interventions.
Better neighbourhood outcomes

104 Value for money is not just about financial systems and frameworks. People are fundamentally important in creating value. Where CDRPs are using the expertise of those working at the frontline and of local people, it is helping them to fully understand and deal with problems at a local level. Service delivery planning involving frontline workers and importantly local people makes for better impact and better use of information and resources.

105 Frontline workers based in neighbourhoods have a wealth of local knowledge and information. PCSOs and neighbourhood wardens provide a community safety patrolling role, but refuse collectors, traffic wardens, shopkeepers, housing officers, utility workers, postal workers, social workers and teachers all have a strong local presence.

106 People working for local agencies in frontline roles are often closest to the problems and can work jointly in a very pragmatic and effective way at local level. These agencies can also play a key part in meeting the public’s local concerns about safety, which are often far broader than just policing. Their knowledge can contribute to preventing crime and anti-social behaviour, reassuring residents who are fearful. Frontline workers who meet local people on a regular basis, listen to their concerns and take effective local action reassure local people and have a direct impact on the delivery of the PSA targets.

107 While a one-size approach will not fit all, an understanding of the factors that drive people to feel less or more secure in their neighbourhoods will start to identify the types of action that may be appropriate. Our survey of public opinion in ten wards identified four outcomes that people thought made the difference when describing safe, strong neighbourhoods (Figure 10, overleaf) which are:

- **quality of life**: those things which make somewhere a good place to live;
- **support for the neighbourhood**: being involved and proud to live in a neighbourhood;
- **confidence in how incidents are dealt with**: knowing problems will be addressed; and
- **feelings of safety outside the home at night**: having the confidence to be outside the home day or night.
Each of the four community safety outcomes identified by this research is affected dynamically by a series of underlying factors, which exert a positive or negative effect upon the outcome. These are:

- high socio-economic demographics which exert a **positive** influence;
- ambivalent residents’ satisfaction which exerts a neutral influence;
- strong social cohesion which exerts a **positive** influence;
- good communication between residents and public services which exerts a **positive** influence; and
- Ambivalent responses to residents’ concerns which exert a **negative** influence.
Understanding the characteristics of households within neighbourhoods will help to identify the types of interventions which are more likely to lead to positive outcomes. This is crucial to ensuring that local targets are appropriate and that resources are prioritised effectively. Further research on each of the four community safety outcomes also identified a range of issues that residents felt impacted positively or negatively on their outlook. We have taken as our starting point residents’ own descriptions.

In this chapter we explain what we found when we asked people in our ten study areas about the community safety outcomes. We report some of their comments and summarise the findings of our survey into four exhibits which show the factors that people said made the most difference to how safe they are and how safe they feel in the local areas.

Quality of life

‘Loud music from neighbours, verbal abuse, vandalism, damage to property. [This] has made me feel angry/annoyed, and [I] am in constant contact with the council about the problem,[and it] spoils the quality of my life.’
Female respondent, age 65+

‘Teenagers with plastic drain pipe-type tubes filled with mud, thrown at people’s houses – took police two days to come. My neighbour was crying…’
Male respondent, age 55-59

‘Ten or 11 year olds smashing bottles at the house next door, not nice. I have asked for an exchange, I have a bad heart [and I am] on anti-depression tablets. Can’t let my son play out.’
Female respondent, age 25-34

‘The garden gate was vandalised. Didn’t report it to police, there’s a few people here had things vandalised, like cars scratched. It happens all the time round here, nothing seems to be done about it…’
Female respondent, age 65+

‘Witnessed drug-taking in my street. Women and men together in the street taking drugs. [I] felt sick at the sight of it. I felt that I wanted to go and sort them out myself.’
Male respondent, age 45-54
Our survey of local people identified the factors which have a positive or negative bearing on how people perceive quality of life in their neighbourhood (Figure 11).

**Figure 11**

Quality of life
Factors which have a positive or negative influence.

**Source:** Audit Commission

A better quality of life was evident where residents felt part of the community and there was a pleasant and well-designed environment with well-managed social housing. Most residents’ concerns related to issues such as noisy neighbours and insecurity from poor environmental design. For example, car crime and assault and robbery in unsafe or poorly lit alleyways. Residents who had poor health or were lone parents were more likely to stay within the environs of the neighbourhood during the day. Poor or remote healthcare services and a poor environment have a disproportionate impact upon their sense of well-being.
Frontline services can work together to identify the local problems that are causing concern and promote better quality of life. In Coventry, housing associations are working together to tackle nuisance neighbours and in the Hillfields area, the design problems caused by alleys. By closing off unauthorised access this has reduced prostitution and associated drug dealing.

**Case study 4**

**Coventry**

Coventry City Council has transferred its housing stock to a housing association and the 13 housing associations working in Coventry have formed a consortium, using a consistent framework for information-sharing to tackle anti-social behaviour and noisy neighbours (linked to the CDRP). They provide skills training and support, improving consistency in the way action is taken to improve the service response from housing officers, including legal action where necessary.

West Midlands Police and Coventry City Council are taking action to deal with street prostitution and associated drug dealing in Hillfields, a densely populated area adjacent to the city centre. A local umbrella organisation representing the community formed a partnership with the City Council to produce a neighbourhood plan with key community safety targets. The outcome has used the SWISH (sex workers into sexual health) arrest referral and advice scheme and widespread installation of gates by the local authority to stop unauthorised access to alleys.

**Source:** Coventry City Council/West Midlands Police
Support for the neighbourhood

‘The council [is] working with the police and it’s improved lots of things…’
Male respondent, age 65+

‘Neighbourhood Watch was useful in dealing with this incident by bringing it to police’s attention.’
Female respondent, age 60-64

‘The alley gates [have] helped [to] stop gangs running down the back streets.’
Female respondent, age 16-24

‘Not at all [effective] – [the new ‘teen shelter’ is] too open to rain and wind [and provides] only a place to congregate [and] not any activities for [young people].’
Male respondent, age 65+

‘More street lighting. More police around this area, patrolling at all times.’
Male respondent, age 15

‘Community police, uniform police on patrol, more enforcement from teaching staff.’
Male respondent, age 15

Residents identified factors which impacted positively and negatively on whether they felt supportive of the neighbourhood and the extent to which agencies cared about the area (Figure 12). People’s confidence about the neighbourhood was directly affected by whether they had been a victim or a witness to anti-social behaviour or crime. Others who were less confident tended to rely on people in the neighbourhood for information about anti-social behaviour and crime rather than local agencies. Poor environment, street lighting, vehicle crime and noisy neighbours all contribute to a view that the neighbourhood is not supported. Whereas residents who feel part of a neighbourhood where people from different backgrounds get on well together and feel able to influence decisions have a more positive outlook. The design and cleanliness of the environment is a big factor in whether people want to stay in the area.
Where local people feel that they are able to influence decisions about the area and this has been backed up with tailored action, residents are becoming more supportive of the area. In Wyrley Birch, a new community centre and improvements to the environment has improved community engagement and support for the neighbourhood.

**Case study 5**

**Birmingham**

Birmingham’s pilot Safer Neighbourhood Programme operated in five high-crime areas (2001-04). Due to the success of the programme, further projects have been developed in various parts of the city using the same model. Safer neighbourhood
projects use a problem-solving audit to action approach developed by Crime Concern. A comprehensive audit of crime, safety and environmental problems is undertaken, using neighbourhood-based statistics, a survey of residents and consultation with local organisations and community groups. Key themes emerge. Action groups are formed, which draw up detailed action plans that are locally appropriate according to defined needs and, critically, are ‘owned’ by both the public services and local community.

In Wyrley Birch, a 1960s run-down estate with social, economic and environmental problems, physical regeneration, including a new community centre, needed to be backed by other improvements. Residents carried out their own environmental audit and identified severe problems, including young people starting fires, abandoned cars, litter and drug activity. Feedback from the residents suggests the area has now improved through regeneration, backed by the police and council tackling crime and anti-social behaviour. Community engagement which was previously seen as a major barrier due to a lack of trust in public agencies is improving due to the community centre, which is well used.

Source: Crime Concern/Birmingham City Council

Confidence in incident handling

I can’t [be confident] because I haven’t been able to get hold of them. I have only seen them supporting children which is good, but they are just not available from a resident point of view. If we could get hold of them they would be more use.
Female respondent, age 35-44.

It’s useful because I’m now seeing more community wardens on the streets at the times I would like to see them.
Female respondent, age 25-34

Time [the police] arrive [it is] all over and done with.
Male respondent, age 25-34

They have been a small influence but they are needed more at night time in the area.
Male respondent, age 45-54.
A bit more police, at about 5.00 pm-ish in the winter.
**Male respondent, age 14**

Security guards on street – at night it’s worse.
**Female respondent, age 11**

Increasing people’s confidence in how incidents are dealt with and how problems are addressed helps to reduce crime and enhance perceptions of the local area (**Figure 13**). Residents are more negative about a neighbourhood when they believe that they do not receive adequate information about crime and anti-social behaviour from the police. The same is true if they have been a victim or a witness to anti-social behaviour or crime in the past year and feel that local policing is inadequate in dealing with nuisance behaviour.

**Figure 13**

**Confidence in incident handling**
Factors which have a positive and negative influence.

### Factors with a **positive** influence

- **Confidence:** Residents are confident about how crime is dealt with
- **Communication:** Residents know about local action to address anti-social behaviour
- **Satisfaction:** Community safety patrols meet the neighbourhood’s needs
  - Local uniformed policing meet the neighbourhood’s needs
- **Social cohesion:** Residents feel part of the community
  - Neighbours look out for each other
  - Residents are members of a faith group

### Factors with a **negative** influence

- **Concerns:**
  - Theft of cars or dangerous driving
  - Local uniformed policing is unsatisfactory
  - Drunken behaviour in the street
  - Substance misuse
  - Crime rates are high
  - Disturbance by young people

- **Confidence:**
  - Have been a victim of anti-social behaviour or crime in the last year
  - Have been a witness to anti-social behaviour or crime in the last year

- **Communication:**
  - Do not receive information about crime and anti-social behaviour from the local police, and would prefer to do so

**Source:** Audit Commission
In contrast, if residents feel more confident about the way crime is dealt with, know about what local action has been taken to address crime and anti-social behaviour and have visible community safety or policing in the neighbourhood, they are likely to be more positive about the neighbourhood. This requires local agencies and frontline workers to actively involve local residents when identifying solutions to local problems. Local people have in-depth knowledge about recurring problems and their views are essential if the underlying causes to problems are to be addressed.

South Cumbria BCU’s work is an example of where agencies have worked together to provide a visible presence where residents can voice their concerns to the appropriate agency. Frontline workers can take immediate action, without the need to refer back. Frontline workers such as wardens, street cleaners, PCSOs and police officers are often well known to local people. They can build confidence in local communities when people see that they have the remit to make decisions, prioritise activities and can report back on the results of their actions.

Case study 6
South Cumbria BCU
Streetsafe is a multi-agency operation that uses a variety of problem-solving techniques to promote effective partnership working, build community confidence, reduce crime and enhance perceptions of the local area. It uses teams to visit residents to find out their concerns and act on them. In September 2005, over 120 people in 56 multi-agency teams visited 520 homes in a day. Of the 520 respondents, 21 per cent had no concerns about crime and liveability issues. Priority concerns for the other residents were fly tipping, dog fouling, road safety, speeding vehicles, youth disorder and drugs.

The survey was supported by direct action, as appropriate:
- rubbish and fly tipping was collected from 30 areas;
- 30 square metres of graffiti were removed;
- 12 hours of environmental enforcement work were carried out between the police and the council;
- the Fire and Rescue service installed six smoke alarms;
- 35 personal safety alarms were issued; and
- 320 electrical items were property marked using ultra violet marking pens.

As a result of the survey, six community safety groups (neighbourhood watch) have been formed so far. Key messages have been communicated to residents through associated media work.

Source: Cumbria Police Force
Feeling safe outside home

‘It has helped [the dispersal order], last year things were a lot noisier late at night down at the Square, it’s been much quieter of late.’
Female respondent, age 55-59

‘Very useful [the PCSOs], the number of crime incidents has gone down, they are interactive and responsive and have established good relationships with leaders in the community, like vicars, teachers and youth club leaders.’
Female respondent, age 45-54

‘Very good, fewer dumped cars, more close contact with police appreciated.’
Female respondent, age 25-34

‘I think it worked brilliantly on the buses, because there’s a marked difference in the amount of graffiti and etching on the windows of the buses. They caught them, their pictures were in [the] paper, people shopped them and they were prosecuted.’
Male respondent, age 60-64

‘Greater visible police presence during the day and night would make me feel safer. Would like to see more for youngsters to do in area to keep them off the streets, such as youth clubs, track and field [facilities].’
Female respondent, age 14

Older residents and people who are less able to work and travel outside the neighbourhood are more likely to be fearful of being outside the home at night (Figure 14, overleaf). They have a higher fear of crime. They are likely to be more dependent on local shopping facilities and public transport, so safety is a bigger issue. Where local uniformed policing is perceived to be unsatisfactory, disturbances by young people and concerns about assault and robbery have greater prominence. Housing also plays a part in determining whether people feel safe. Where people (particularly men) are mobile, in employment, know people in the neighbourhood and less dependent on staying within the environs of the neighbourhood, they are less concerned.
Neighbourhood crime and anti-social behaviour

Demographics play a major part in identifying the households where people are more fearful outside the home. Devon and Cornwall police force is making use of geo-demographic data to identify risk and to develop targeted policing plans. In Exeter, they have started a force-wide approach to identify people and places at risk in order to inform their action planning.

**Figure 14**
Feeling safe outside the home at night
Factors which have a positive or negative influence.

**Source:** Audit Commission

120 Demographics play a major part in identifying the households where people are more fearful outside the home. Devon and Cornwall police force is making use of geo-demographic data to identify risk and to develop targeted policing plans. In Exeter, they have started a force-wide approach to identify people and places at risk in order to inform their action planning.
Case study 7
Devon and Cornwall Police

In December 2004, officers from the North and East Devon Basic Command Unit (BCU), identified a specific subgroup of people in Exeter at the greatest risk of being victims of crime immediately outside their homes, or, for some, within 15 minutes walk from home. The subgroup was identified as most likely to obtain information from television, direct mail and posters.

A residents’ survey showed the issues of greatest concern:

- Anti-social behaviour by people leaving pubs and nightclubs, rubbish, substance misuse, the sale of illegal drugs and criminal damage.
- Local dissatisfaction with the police. Only one in eight residents knew their beat officer and less than one in ten frequently saw a neighbourhood foot patrol.
- Local fear of domestic burglary was contrary to BCS indications. In the relevant Exeter areas between December 2002 and November 2004, the domestic burglary rate rose to 24.5 per 1,000 households, compared to the national average of 20.

Through high-visibility policing, a targeted policing plan for the relevant neighbourhoods was developed, including:

- police officers to use public transport in the relevant areas to increase direct public contact and police visibility; and
- a poster campaign advertising the plan, located in local bus shelters.

A joint environmental audit of the relevant Exeter areas is to be conducted with local CDRP partner agencies.

Source: Devon & Cornwall Police

The importance of good communication

One of the common influences affecting safety in the neighbourhood is how well informed people feel. Residents in our survey were likely to feel less safe when they get information from other local people. They would like to receive information from the police in particular about crime and anti-social behaviour in their area. Having a visible police or community support officer or neighbourhood warden was also valued.
The Safer Neighbourhood Team Police Reassurance project in London was committed to having neighbourhood policing teams and improving consultation and community engagement in each ward in London. This approach is already being piloted in several London boroughs and the police are adopting new community policing styles based on a model adopted in Chicago, which makes use of street briefings or roll calls to pick up and act on community concerns. We visited the London Borough of Bexley, where they had police reassurance areas in East Wickham and Welling and Falconwood (Ref. 32). A positive outcome has been that young people have found the roll calls an approachable form of consultation and have been willing to give their views.

Case study 8
Bexley

Since April 2004, reassurance policing teams based in East Wickham and Falconwood and Welling have undertaken ‘street briefings’ or ‘roll calls’ based on an approach copied from Chicago. Briefings are arranged when issues of significant local concern in a small area are identified. A week before a briefing, all affected properties received a publicity leaflet.

Briefings usually occur at 7 pm on a specified street corner and last for 45 minutes. Timing and location are chosen to meet local residents’ needs. Locations have included railway stations to include commuting residents.

A police sergeant opens each briefing and explains its purpose:
- to gather information by listening to residents;
- to clarify and assess the extent of the issue; and
- to provide feedback about any preventive action taken or that is underway.

With particularly serious problems, a series of weekly briefings may occur until the matter is under control or resolved. The approach has improved reporting and increased community confidence. Children interviewed for our MORI survey were positive about the stronger police presence, particularly regarding PCSOs.

Source: London Borough of Bexley/Metropolitan Police
The residents’ survey shows that each of the four outcomes identified for safer and stronger communities is affected by a series of factors reflecting local circumstances. As well as communication, the factors that are common to all four outcomes are:

- **Demography** – residents’ age, gender, socio-economic category, employment status and income, state of health.

- **Social cohesion** – how much residents feel part of the community, how well residents from different backgrounds get on, how much residents feel able to influence decisions affecting the neighbourhood.

- **Concerns** – inadequate local housing and healthcare provision, high-crime rates, anti-social behaviour and high levels of fear of crime.

- **Confidence** – having been a witness to or a victim of anti-social behaviour or crime in the last year, confidence about how well crime and anti-social behaviour are dealt with.

- **Communication** – how well informed residents are about action on crime and anti-social behaviour.

- **Satisfaction** – services such as policing, street lighting and street cleaning that meet the needs of the neighbourhood, or are being improved.

The factors affecting each outcome are dynamic. Whether a factor has a positive or negative effect on the outcome reflects, for example, changes in residents’ concerns, public service quality or demographics. A solution for one problem may not work in a similar situation elsewhere or at another time if the underlying factors are different or have changed. Neighbourhoods change over time and so it is important that local agencies are alive to the ways in which they are changing. Places can change quite swiftly when businesses relocate, new people from outside the established neighbourhood arrive, people leave due to regeneration activity elsewhere or if local facilities such as schools or transport no longer meet the expectations of local people. Local agencies which plan well for the long term while keeping up to date with current activity in their neighbourhoods through good communication with local people are well placed to deliver the long term outcomes of safer and stronger communities. A forthcoming Commission study looking at migrant workers explores this issue in more detail (Ref. 33).
Better neighbourhood outcomes need to address not just the immediate concerns of the
neighbourhood, but also the longer-term service planning of all agencies responsible for
reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Our survey shows that what drives people to
have positive or negative feelings about their neighbourhood is much wider than short
term initiatives can offer. Having real-time information about the changing face of
neighbourhoods and what threatens people’s safety and security is vital to their
well-being. Where councils are able to encourage residents’ associations and ward
councillors to act as local advocates for their neighbourhoods, they are better placed to
pick up community concerns.

A multi-agency approach is needed to improve the quality of life in neighbourhoods,
which recognises that while crime and safety is part of the problem, wider community
issues such as activities for children and young people play a big part. Councils that are
strong performers in the CPA corporate assessment are those that work well with their
local partners to deliver safer, stronger, sustainable communities. This requires councils to
have a more integrated approach within their organisations and good coordination with
partners to address neighbourhood problems.
The way ahead

Progress has been made within the CDRPs we visited to identify the differing characteristics of their neighbourhoods and to take tailored action. Many of the issues for improvement we have identified in the report are not new and are being addressed individually by some agencies. Figure 15, overleaf, shows how a whole improvement programme for neighbourhood action based on a clear framework can help to bring a more effective impact that all local agencies can contribute to.

Stage 1 – Know and understand your wards and neighbourhoods

This first stage is about gathering the local intelligence to identify and predict problem areas. Good local intelligence is critical in the move from crime reduction to crime prevention. Collecting information only at CDRP area level fails to capture the differences between wards and neighbourhoods.

Selected techniques may help CDRPs to undertake an analysis of place, household, victim and offenders. These are:

- Neighbourhood Statistics (NeSS), an online service from the Office of National Statistics that uses geographical units broken down below ward level into much smaller areas.
- The NIM can be used as a framework for hotspot analysis, most of which is done in conjunction with geographical information systems, to track and record information.
- Geo-demographic data can be used to link places with people. This enables CDRPs to classify individual neighbourhoods using statistically reliable information, and compare the risk in different neighbourhoods of people becoming a victim of, or witness to, different types of crime or anti-social behaviour.

CDRP agencies can benefit from assessing and using these techniques for local purposes in the most resource effective way. They can also make clear links between analysis and future action. The key to achieving this is the use of up-to-date information and direct links with local people to discover their concerns.

There is great value to be gained by using a range of statistical analysis methods and tools coupled with accurate, relevant and up-to-date intelligence from frontline workers and neighbourhood police officers who speak regularly with local people.
Figure 15
Effective neighbourhood action
A framework for CDRPs to follow.

1. Know and understand your wards and neighbourhoods
   - Compile a profile of each neighbourhood
   - Assess the likelihood of crime risk and concern
   - Identify potential hotspots
   - Use information from frontline workers to test analysis

2. Find out what concerns local people
   - Find ways for them to tell you
   - Listen to them
   - Find out what your frontline workers say

3. Analyse the particular local problem
   - Understand hotspots
   - Understand offenders
   - Understand victims
   - Draw on knowledge of your frontline workers
   - Agree analysis

4. Take action
   - Agree who is going to lead on what
   - Identify short- and long-term action
   - Align capacity and resources accordingly
   - Co-locate teams
   - Use frontline workers effectively

5. Reassure local people
   - Tell them what action has been taken
   - Evaluate action
   - Learn lessons
   - Involve your frontline workers

Source: Audit Commission
Stage 2 – Find out what concerns local people

Underpinning the National Community Safety Plan (Ref. 9) is the government’s expectation that partnerships will get local people involved in identifying community safety priorities for their neighbourhoods. The process of sharing concerns, collectively dealing with problems and making local police and community safety partners accountable for results will, it is hoped, increase community involvement and pride in local neighbourhoods.

Where CDRPs are developing effective ways for local people to tell them what they think about crime and anti-social behaviour, people believe that their views are listened to. Our household survey found that people feel most confident when they are well informed about what is being done to tackle anti-social behaviour in their local area. Occurrences such as nuisance parking and poor quality of environment have an impact on people’s quality of life. It is in these cases that the knowledge and intelligence of frontline workers, who have a presence in the neighbourhood, can be invaluable to provide information about problems at an early stage.

Stage 3 – Analyse the local problem

The key to addressing local problems is to analyse data from a variety of sources and systems to understand neighbourhoods, and to identify priorities. Further analysis is needed to profile hotspots, the factors driving problems and to find solutions. Consideration also needs to be given to the built environment and the impact of alleyways, communal green areas, tower blocks and isolated housing estates.

This is not new advice and agencies are already spending a great deal of time and effort in analysing data. But there is scope to use the broad range of data from across all services, retailers, other businesses and local people.

Individual CDRP agencies hold a wide range of very useful data, though some are uncertain how to use this effectively. Sharing information within the CDRP structure can generate a more precise picture of local neighbourhoods. Interventions may then be closely targeted at the specific cause of a problem. When information is routinely pooled by CDRPs, problems are more often subject to more effective joint agency action, rather than what individual agencies are able to deliver.
Use of neighbourhood profiling is becoming more common, especially by the police. The scope of profiles varies according to the range of agencies involved and their aims. Most profiles aim and succeed in providing a better description of neighbourhood problems and the opportunities for overcoming them. No profiles seen in this study, however, described the agency resources currently providing neighbourhood services. Consequently, solutions to neighbourhood problems failed to consider existing service provision. This caused further resources to be committed, which overlay existing provision. Agencies and CDRPs need to be more cost-effective in their approach to solving neighbourhood problems to reduce the risks associated with duplicated provision.

This report is accompanied on our website by a set of ten example neighbourhood profiles that incorporate a review of existing service provision. These examples use GDI and resource mapping assessments to draw up a picture of the ten electoral wards covered by this study. While not exhaustive or definitive, these examples show how desk-based work can provide useful contextual information for frontline workers to supplement with their local knowledge. Agencies and CDRPs need to agree an aim for all analysis before it is undertaken and so make sure that they are gaining the added value of all their individual and collective knowledge. A set of key questions are set out below to assist CDRPs in using neighbourhood profiles to address crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour (Box B). These should be used in conjunction with our web tool Compiling Neighbourhood Profiles – a guide for local agencies.

**Box B: Analysis tool**

**Questions for CDRP agencies to help analyse problems in priority neighbourhoods**

**Neighbourhood level communication and analysis**

- How well do these ward profiles compare with others locally?
- What is the full scale of local service activity that affects community safety?
- How well does current and planned action reflect ward profile priorities?
- Are priority activities communicated to the public in ways that reassure people?
- How well are the public’s views and concerns captured?
- How well analysed are relationships between places, victims and offenders?
Neighbourhood level action planning

Q How well is work allocated to address neighbourhood priorities?
Q How integrated is activity by all agencies to provide a fully coordinated response to neighbourhood priorities?
Q How precisely are success criteria specified at the start and progress monitored when work is underway?
Q How good are arrangements for ending work that is no longer a priority, but where the impact to reassure people needs to be sustained?

Neighbourhood use of resources and value for money

Q Who provides each service and what is the funding method?
Q Who decides how each service is allocated to neighbourhoods?
Q How rigorously is action subject to financial appraisal before proceeding?
Q How well do accounting methods report agency activity geographically and thematically?
Q How well do resource allocation decisions support coordinated responses to neighbourhood priorities?
Q How could resources be re-allocated or work organised differently to achieve a more efficient and effective outcome?

Neighbourhood governance

Q How much authority do frontline workers have to take action in order to address neighbourhood priorities efficiently and effectively?
Q How much authority do frontline workers have to spend money similarly?
Q Who manages and reports progress?

Source: Audit Commission
Stage 4 – Take action

139 Action is most effective where all CDRP agencies share an analysis of the problem and agree which agency should lead actions, being clear about roles and responsibilities. Complex local issues require short- and long-term action. This may be a mix of crime-based interventions in the short term and non-crime based solutions over the longer term.

140 Where the commissioning and operational role of CDRPs is clearly defined and reports to the strategic role of LSPs, a realistic appraisal can be made of what is deliverable and what outcomes are sought. This relies on LAAs identifying targets which are informed by local concerns and are aware of capacity and resources to deliver.

141 Sharing the praise for successful results across all partners and frontline workers by using the media is an effective way to spread enthusiasm for tackling even the most deep-seated problems. Liverpool CDRP has successfully tackled neighbourhood problems in this way.

Case study 9
Liverpool

Anti-social behaviour by groups of young people was identified as a problem by local people and considered by both the police and the CDRP.

Police:
- Profiling of all young people seen in Orrell Park, to compile a comprehensive index.
- Letters sent to parents asking their help for their children not to congregate in Orrell Park.
- Video recording of anti-social behaviour presented at school parents evenings.
- Intensive, high-visibility patrol during hotspot periods.
- Leaflet delivery to 1,200 local homes by the Orrell Park Regeneration Group.
- Publicity by Teletext®/Ceefax® and local news media announcements.

Youth inclusion:
- Neighbourhood Renewal Fund grant funded additional youth work, a youth needs survey and a youth engagement event.
- Sessions held to identify young people’s needs and encourage social responsibility.
- Intensive detached youth work targeting young people on the streets.
• Trip to Snowdonia organised and attended by Merseyside Police where they explained the police and community’s concerns to young people.

Liverpool City Council, quality of life:

• Leaflets sent to residents regarding environmental issues.
• Regular patrols to identify and contact residents who caused waste disposal problems.
• Installation of gates to control access to rear alleys.
• Youth diversion programmes to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.
• A dedicated neighbourhood officer for Orrell Park.

Incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour reduced by 27 per cent within six months.

Source: Liverpool City Council/Merseyside Police

142 Better value for money can be achieved by adopting a business-like approach to intervention, based on clear objectives, tasks and funding sources. This approach takes account of the capacity and skills needed for different situations, depending on the level of risk. A business case should specify the outcomes the intervention aims to achieve, the resources and activities to be employed and how success will be measured afterwards. For example, where agencies have given frontline workers the freedom and funding to deal with local issues at an early stage, it can save money and address people’s concerns quickly. Value for money can also be better achieved by CDRP agencies having a framework in place that can map funding from all relevant sources. The Commission has included value for money considerations into its companion web tool Compiling Neighbourhood Profiles – a guide for local agencies. Agencies can then start to formulate a process for decision making based on very local knowledge. It then becomes easier for evaluation to be carried out at neighbourhood level and reported back to the CDRP and local councils using their scrutiny role.

143 Where agencies have been able to engage communities, identify clear priorities and pool resources, neighbourhood action is starting to be developed. Residents associations and ward councillors using their advocacy role are the key to successfully engaging with public service providers.
Stage 5 – Reassure local people

Telling local people what has happened once they have been involved in devising solutions is an important indicator of measuring the success of local solutions over the long term. Asking the community for its views, recording the feedback and ensuring this is robust enough to inform the evaluation of local action plans will help to achieve these objectives.

A one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate. Reporting back to local people requires the same rigour as the data analysis. Having achieved a good understanding of the various people making up the communities in local neighbourhoods, making use of the analysis to design communications methods for all local people is vital.

Frontline workers are well placed to provide advice on how best to do this and are well placed to talk to the local people and share feedback in an informal way. If CDRPs ensure that frontline workers are well briefed and ready to report back to people as they go about their daily jobs, they will open up new communication channels with local people in a way that formal meetings and consultation exercises cannot. In Kerrier, strong lobbying from the residents’ association ensured that resources were spent on what was most needed to reassure local people.

Case study 10
Kerrier

Public facilities in the North Close estate were, until 2000, limited to a run-down play area. This became a focus for anti-social behaviour and crime, especially car crime. Cornwall County Council secured £460,000 in Home Zone Challenge Funding for the estate in 2002, following strong residents’ association lobbying.

Objectives of the home zone were to:

- reduce road speed;
- increase careful driving;
- balance parking and environmental improvements;
- reduce crime and anti-social behaviour; and
- improve the overall environment.

Further lobbying by the residents’ association led to:

- over £130,000 of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding to landscape the estate’s play area and create a site for a residents’ association office;
• the association acquiring a portable building and leasing land from the council; and
• Kerrier District Council securing Neighbourhood Renewal Funding of £25,000 to re-equip the play area.

Source: Kerrier District Council/Cornwall County Council/Devon and Cornwall Police

Conclusion

147 Understanding what makes people safe or unsafe in their neighbourhoods and identifying appropriate interventions is vital for CDRPs if they are to improve quality of life in their districts. National crime reductions do not dispel the local concerns of people, who are often more concerned about quality of life issues and anti-social behaviour. These issues are important to everybody, including those who live in high-crime areas.

148 Better intelligence, recording and targets to capture the problems that can make life a misery in some neighbourhoods are needed. Getting this right through the involvement of frontline workers is critical to solving problems. This will mean that resources can be targeted and used more effectively. Improved systems of financial management which can record the costs of all agencies can then be used to evaluate value for money. These principles governing better neighbourhood working could form part of the standards being developed for CDRPs as part of the government's review. Councils that are judged as performing strongly in the CPA corporate assessment are those who can work effectively with their local partners to deliver safer, stronger, sustainable communities and are using their powers to tackle anti-social behaviour and environmental concerns.

149 Police services in particular are undergoing both structural and cultural reforms to make them more responsive and accountable to local people. The government’s plans to reshape police forces by merging and realigning boundaries need to ensure that local neighbourhood concerns are fully addressed.

150 For local people, making places safer is dependent on how confident they feel in the ability of agencies to understand their concerns. Where agencies are accessible and have clearly identified frontline workers to report and deal with problems, involve local people in the solutions, and provide feedback, improvements in tackling neighbourhood crime and anti-social behaviour are tangible.
Recommendations in full

151 The Crime and Disorder Act review sets out a number of recommendations for more effective partnership working and proposes the development of national standards for CDRPs. The Police and Justice Bill also proposes amendments to the Crime and Disorder Act to extend the scope of strategies from the reduction of crime and disorder and the combating of the misuse of drugs to include anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment. Our recommendations build on these proposals to identify the standards which could be used for more effective working at the neighbourhood level across partnerships, government and regulators.

152 Partnerships need to develop an improvement framework for neighbourhood action. Our proposed framework in Chapter 5 provides a focus for determining how local agencies collectively and individually can deliver improvements at the neighbourhood level. For CDRPs to deliver improvements at the neighbourhood level they need to:

- analyse and understand specific crime and anti-social behaviour problems in their neighbourhoods using the principles of the police NIM to collect community intelligence and the views of frontline workers to provide better local information;
- deploy resources cost effectively and respond rapidly to local concerns;
- develop a standard form of recording all forms of anti-social behaviour building on the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR);
- draw up detailed neighbourhood profiles that include information about victims, offenders and crime hotspots and workable solutions to connect concerns with incidents;
- share personal data more effectively by extending the use of the prolific and other priority offenders framework to identify all potential risks in a neighbourhood;
- use better local knowledge to inform resource allocation decisions;
- communicate with people regularly and in a way that best suits them, placing greater emphasis on letting people know when action has been taken and why;
- evaluate neighbourhood interventions regularly, assessing cost-effectiveness and value for money through a rigorous performance management framework which focuses on neighbourhood improvement;
- develop targets which address people’s wider community safety concerns; and
- involve frontline workers and local people in service delivery planning.
Individual partners in the CDRP need to shape their respective roles and responsibilities to support neighbourhood working. Local government has an important local leadership role as well as specific responsibilities to address anti-social behaviour and environmental nuisance. In addition, therefore, councils need to:

- make better use of their frontline staff in gathering information, data and community intelligence at the neighbourhood level;
- ensure that the data they hold, especially that relating to anti-social behaviour, is reliable, up to date, easily accessible to other partners and conforms to the NSIR;
- involve frontline workers in service planning and empower them to take rapid and effective action to deal with local issues;
- enable frontline workers to perform an effective two-way communication role between the council and local people, with an emphasis on keeping residents well informed of action taken;
- use the freedoms and flexibilities introduced by LAAs in England to ensure a more targeted approach to delivering local priorities on crime and anti-social behaviour;
- work with housing providers to review their anti-social behaviour policies and procedures so that they are fit for purpose for a neighbourhood approach;
- encourage residents’ associations and ward councillors to use their advocacy role to engage with neighbourhood community safety providers;
- make better use of the local strategic partnership to promote community safety outcomes across all services; and
- identify how they will exercise their enhanced scrutiny powers proposed in the Justice and Police Bill to support improved performance in CDRPs.

The police, in addition, need to:

- support neighbourhood working through the deployment of frontline resources in targeted areas;
- use their intelligence frameworks to collect a broader range of data relating to anti-social behaviour from other partners; and
- continue to work with other local agencies at the neighbourhood level to provide better intelligence and rapid responses to address anti-social behaviour.
For central government to support and facilitate a neighbourhood approach, it should:

- ensure that in the move to new strategic police authorities and forces the emphasis on providing neighbourhood solutions, with a focus on performance improvement at the neighbourhood level, is maintained;
- acknowledge the specific role local government has in tackling anti-social behaviour and ensure that the performance framework incentivises all local partners, including the police, to tackle problems at neighbourhood level, addressing pockets of high crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour at below CDRP and ward level;
- develop a national framework for recording incidents of anti-social behaviour, which encompasses the extended definition (including behaviour adversely affecting the environment and substance misuse), based on the police NSIR for all agencies;
- build on the recommendations of the CDA Review in the sharing of de-personalised data, to offer further guidance on the sharing of personal data, using the prolific and other priority offenders information-sharing protocol as a framework, so that local partners share information more effectively;
- further rationalise funding streams to local community safety partners and enable area-based assessments of value for money to be developed using the principles of LAAs; and
- review the performance framework for policing and community safety shifting the focus to improving services at the neighbourhood level, getting the balance right between national and local priorities and providing assurance to people that CDRP partners are working together effectively to deliver shared outcomes.

Regulators need to support a neighbourhood-focused and joined-up approach to service delivery. The Justice, Community Safety and Custody Inspectorate and the Audit Commission should assess how well public bodies are collectively delivering safer and stronger communities to a local area, examining local community safety outcomes, disseminating good practice and providing clear and accessible information to local people. The inspection framework for housing services should assess how social housing landlords are contributing to safer neighbourhood outcomes.
Glossary of terms

ABC
Activity-Based Costing is a widely used costing system that seeks to place an accurate cost on what an organisation produces. As a key component of the Policing Performance Assessment Framework, ABC enables accurate comparison between police forces, is key to identifying good practice and providing assistance to forces with poor performance. As of 2003/04, ABC is a mandatory requirement of the National Policing Plan.


BCS
The British Crime Survey measures the amount of crime in England and Wales. The survey includes crimes which may not have been reported to the police, or recorded by them. The survey provides an important alternative to police-recorded crime statistics. Without the BCS, the government would have no information on these unreported crimes. The BCS also helps to identify those most at risk of different types of crime, which is used to design and inform crime prevention programmes. The BCS is also used to assess the public’s attitude to crime and towards the criminal justice system. The BCS is a major source of information about levels of crime, public attitudes to crime and other Home Office issues.


BCU
Basic command units cover over 300 geographically-defined areas in England and Wales, variously named as districts, areas, operational command units and divisions. Varying in size between 100-1,000 officers and covering densely-populated, ethnically-diverse inner cities or vast tracts of sparsely-populated countryside.

(HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, Going local: the BCU Inspection Handbook, Home Office, 2001.)

CDA
The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 established crime and disorder reduction partnerships, anti-social behaviour orders, sex offender orders, drug treatment and testing orders, racially aggravated offences, a youth justice system, including the Youth Justice Board for
England and Wales, youth offending teams and various new court orders for young people and the Sentencing Advisory Panel.

CDRP/Community Safety Partnership
The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 created 376 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in every council area. The Act requires local agencies to work together, and states that councils and the police have the prime responsibility to reduce and prevent crime. The CDRPs in Wales are named community safety partnerships.

(Audit Commission, Community Safety Partnerships: learning from audit, inspection and research, Audit Commission, 2002.)

CPA
The Audit Commission introduced comprehensive performance assessment in 2002. CPA measures how well councils are delivering services to the public and reduces the overall regulatory burden. CPA distils a complex set of judgements on councils and the services that they provide into one simply understood rating.

(Audit Commission, CPA – The Harder Test, Audit Commission, 2005.)

Crime hotspot
Analysis of crime patterns aims to detect high-density areas known as crime hotspots. Analysing hotspots helps the police and other crime reduction agencies to identify high-crime areas, the types of crime being committed, and the best way to respond.

Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science website, http://www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk/crime_mapping, University College London, 2006.)

CSO/PCSO
Community support officers, (sometimes called police community support officers), support police officers by providing a visible and reassuring presence on the street. CSOs/PCSOs work under the direction of police commanders to reduce crime and disorder, but do not have the same powers as a regular police officer.

Home Zone Challenge Funding
Home zones are residential streets designed as places for people and not just vehicles. Restoring a balance between traffic and communities can help to make streets safer and more sociable places to be. To support the creation of home zones by councils in England, a £30 million home zone challenge fund was announced by the government in April 2001.

(Department for Transport website, http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_susttravel/documents/divisionhomepage/610453.hcsp, Department for Transport, 2006.)

iQuanta
iQuanta is an internet-based analysis tool developed by the Police Standards Unit to turn statistical data routinely collected by the Home Office into useful outputs for understanding and improving policing performance.


LSP
A local strategic partnership is a single non-statutory, multi-agency body that matches a council’s boundary. LSPs aim to bring together locally, representatives of public, private, community and voluntary sectors.


Neighbourhood warden
Neighbourhood wardens provide a visible, uniformed, semi-official presence in residential and public areas that aims to reduce crime and the fear of crime, deter anti-social behaviour, foster social inclusion and care for the environment. The overall purpose of neighbourhood wardens is to improve the quality of life and to contribute to the regeneration of areas.


NIM
The national intelligence model is a policing framework that ensures that information is fully researched, developed and analysed to inform senior police managers by:

- providing strategic direction;
• informing tactical resourcing decisions for operational policing; and
• assisting in the management of risk.

The framework applies to most policing activities. The government’s national policing plan 2006/07 stipulates that ‘NIM should be adopted by all forces to commonly accepted standards by April 2004 at the latest’ and that ‘arrangements for implementation should be set out in local policing plans’.


NRF
The Neighbourhood Renewal Fund supports England’s most deprived councils and their LSPs to improve services and to narrow the gap between deprived areas and the rest of the country. Following the 2000 spending review, the government set targets for public services to achieve improved outcomes in deprived neighbourhoods.


NSIR
The principal aim of the National Standard for Incident Recording is to ensure that all appropriate incidents, be they crime or non-crime, are recorded by police in a consistent and accurate manner, so as to allow resulting data to be used at a local and national level to meet the management and performance information needs of all stakeholders.


PCT/LHB
Primary care trusts manage local health services in England such as doctors, dentists, opticians and pharmacists. PCTs work with councils and other agencies that provide health and social care to meet the community’s needs. PCTs receive 75 per cent of the NHS budget. In April 2003, local health boards replaced health authorities in Wales. LHBs manage similar services as PCTs on behalf of local communities.


PPAF
The policing performance assessment framework is the government’s process for measuring, comparing and assessing strategic performance in policing across the full range of policing responsibilities for all forces in England and Wales. PPAF focuses on force and BCU performance and may, in time, include CDRP performance.

PPO
The Prolific and Other Priority Offenders programme was implemented nationally by the government in September 2004. The PPO programme requires CDRPs to identify offenders who are considered to be the most prolific, the most persistently anti-social and those who pose the greatest threat to their community. Within the programme, CDRPs coordinate a set of local programmes, procedures and protocols to monitor PPO behaviour under one or more of the following three strands:
• Prevent and deter, which aims to stop young people from engaging in offending behaviours and graduating to become the prolific offenders of the future.
• Catch and convict, which aims to prevent PPOs from offending through apprehension and conviction, and through licence enforcement, by ensuring a swift return to the courts for those PPOs continuing to offend.
• Rehabilitate and resettle, which aims to rehabilitate PPOs who are in custody or serving sentences in the community, by close work between local agencies and by post-sentence support.

PSA
Public service agreements were introduced by the government in 1998, and since then, have remained an integral part of the government’s public expenditure framework. PSAs set out the government’s key priorities for each national department of state. PSAs aim to ensure value for money from public services and that outcomes are delivered in return for resources. Each department of state publicly reports performance against its PSA targets twice annually.
SSCF
The Safer and Stronger Communities Fund was introduced by the government for all councils in England in April 2005. The fund brings together funding provided by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Home Office that aims to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour, substance misuse, and to improve the condition of streets and public spaces. The government has targeted the fund in particular at disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

(VFM
Value for money is the relationship between economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

- Economy is the price paid for what goes into providing a service – for example, the cost per hour of care workers; the rent per square metre of accommodation.
- Efficiency is a measure of productivity – how much you get out in relation to what is put in. For example, the number of people visited per home care worker per week; kilometres of road maintained per £1,000 spent.
- Effectiveness is a measure of the impact achieved and can be quantitative or qualitative. For example, how many people were prevented by home care services from needing residential care (quantitative); satisfaction levels among different sections of the community with tenant participation arrangements (qualitative).

Value for money is high when there is an optimum balance between all three – relatively low costs, high productivity and successful outcomes.

(Audit Commission, Use of Resources: Guidance to Councils, Audit Commission, 2005.)

YOT
A youth offending team covers every council area in England and Wales. YOTs comprise representatives from police, probation, social services, health, education, substance misuse and housing services. Each YOT is managed by a YOT manager who is responsible for coordinating local youth justice service work.
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