



OFFICER REPORT TO RUNNYMEDE LOCAL COMMITTEE

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP 2012-13
30 September 2013

KEY ISSUE

Section 17 of The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a requirement on Surrey County Council to consider crime and disorder in all the services it provides.

This report updates the Local Committee on the joint work through the Runnymede Community Safety Partnership, which receives a contribution from Surrey County Council.

SUMMARY

This report is for information only.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:

- i) Note the expenditure from funding awarded to the Partnership by Surrey County Council (Annex 1)
- ii) Note the emerging priorities of the Partnership 2013-14 (see 3.4);
- iii) Note the community safety survey summary (Annex 2).

www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and subsequent legislation place a requirement on Surrey County Council to consider crime and disorder in all the services it provides.
- 1.2 Surrey County Council is one of the statutory 'responsible authorities' of the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and is required to work with partners to improve community safety and reduce crime and disorder.
- 1.3 The Partnership uses a wide range of methods to engage with the local community. These include meetings such as forums and panels and written forms of engagement such as surveys, leaflets and websites.

2. REVIEW OF LAST YEAR

- 2.1 As previously, the monthly multi-agency partnership meetings to review local hotspots and individuals (the Joint Action Group and Community Incidents Action Group) were the key forums for agreeing actions to address community concerns. Some of the issues which were tackled successfully included:
 - The anti-social use of quad bikes on land near Thorpe Green;
 - Thefts of pedal cycles and tools from sheds and allotments at various locations around the borough;
 - Rowdy and drunken behaviour around Addlestone town centre;
 - "crack house closures" to address illegal drug use in Egham Hythe and Addlestone;
 - Criminal damage around New Haw and Heathervale.
- 2.2 As well as monitoring crime and anti-social behaviour, the Partnership worked together to ensure that the 2012 Olympic Torch Relay event in Egham, attended by 15,000 people, passed off safely and successfully. Close co-operation between partners also ensured minimal crime and successful operation of the Olympic Village at Royal Holloway in summer 2012.
- 2.3 At the end of March 2013, customer satisfaction with Surrey Police locally stood at 90%, with a 30% reduction in reported offences in Runnymede, which was the highest percentage reduction in the county. Surrey had the fourth lowest rate of reported crimes per 1000 population in England and Wales, after Powys, North Yorkshire and Norfolk. Latest data by area can be found at www.police.uk/crime

3. SURVEY OF RESIDENTS 2013

- 3.1 The borough has commissioned a survey of residents' perceptions of safety every three years since 1998. Previous surveys have been sent

by post to a 5% sample of the borough's residents, whereas reduced funding in 2012-13 meant that residents were encouraged to participate in a web-based survey, leading to a reduced sample of respondents. The response rate from people under 25 was low.

- 3.2 The survey findings show that more residents feared crime in 2013 compared to 2010, with one in three respondents indicating that fear of becoming a victim of crime affected their lifestyle. Fear of being burgled was more prominent than previous years. The top five concerns in the respondents' neighbourhoods (in order of mention) were:
- Speeding vehicles (31%)
 - Parking on pavements/verges (26%)
 - Litter (25%)
 - Dog fouling (24%)
 - Burglary (18%)
- 3.3 The survey also found a higher proportion of residents who had experienced anti-social behaviour within the last three years – 23% compared to 12% in 2010, and in about half of cases the incidents had occurred very close to their home. Where this was not the case, Egham and Addlestone town centres were named as hotspots.
- 3.4 Based on strategic assessment data and resident feedback, the emerging priorities for the Partnership are:
- * vehicle nuisance and inappropriate use of vehicles
 - * drugs and alcohol
 - * burglary
 - * dog fouling

4. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Surrey County Council contributed £3,160 towards the work of the Community Safety Partnership in 2012/13. The SCC contribution to the CSP was added to a pooled income pot along with contributions from other organisations.
- 4.2 In 2012/13, the funding was used mainly for communicating with the public, to advise them of restrictions on alcohol consumption in public places and to highlight how to report and comment on anti-social behaviour (for full details see **Annex 1**).
- 4.3 As set out in the Scheme of Delegation for Local Committees, the Local Committee has a devolved responsibility for £3,226 of funding toward community safety for 2013/14. The Committee agreed at its June meeting to delegate this funding to the Community Partnerships Team manager to be spent in accordance with the local community safety strategy, and in agreement with other partners.

5 RESPONDING TO CHANGE

- 5.1 The Partnership seeks to be alert and respond to emerging concerns and patterns of crime and disorder in Runnymede and also to the changes arising from local governance. Already the transfer of public health specialists to the County Council is increasing joint working in a number of areas, including community safety, e.g. in relation to drug and alcohol misuse, mental health and road safety.
- 5.2 Most significantly, the election of Kevin Hurley, the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Surrey in November 2012, and the associated changes to funding and governance arrangements, has had implications for the operation of the Partnership.
- 5.3 Non-ring-fenced Government grants which included community safety no longer go to Surrey County Council, but to the Police & Crime Commissioner. He awarded £90,000 of this funding to a county-wide domestic abuse outreach service and a further £60,000 for drug testing and treatment, soon after his appointment. The remaining £0.5 million is available for partnerships to bid for particular schemes, to address local priorities in 2013-14.
- 5.4 The PCC and Surrey Police have published a Policing Pledge, and set up local policing boards to listen to residents' concerns – the first Runnymede meeting was held at Addlestone Community Centre on 25 June 2013. The annual Crime Summit is planned for February 2014.

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

The partnership will continue to consider further ways to engage with hard to reach and minority groups within the community.

6. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

The Runnymede Community Safety Partnership has been established to improve community safety in Runnymede by prioritising the key issues within the Borough.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Surrey County Council is required by legislation to consider crime and disorder in all the services it provides. In Runnymede the County Council is a 'responsible authority' of the Community Safety Partnership.
- 7.2 Together with key local partners, the CSP has been working to tackle crime and disorder in the Borough, focusing on key priorities within the Partnership Plan.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Under Part 3, Section 1 of the County Council's constitution, the Local Committee is responsible for monitoring services provided locally and contributing to the borough- based community safety strategy.
- 8.2 The Local Committee's service monitoring role and devolved budgets provide an excellent opportunity for supporting the work of the CSP.

LEAD OFFICER: Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer

TELEPHONE: 01932 794081

E-MAIL: Sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Wendy Roberts, Community Safety Manager, Runnymede Borough Council

TELEPHONE: 01932 838383

E-MAIL: Wendy.roberts@runnymede.gov.uk

ANNEXES: Annexe 1: Partnership expenditure 2012-13
Annexe 2: Community Safety Survey 2013: summary

ITEM 12

ANNEX 1

COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP EXPENDITURE 2012-13

Surrey County Council contribution: £3 160

Expenditure:

Details	Amount
Advert/posters on noticeboards around St Peter's Hospital	300
Contribution to the costs of advertising a Designated Public Place Order (DPPO) around Addlestone in 2012 (total cost £2800)	886
Video about alcohol-related anti-social behaviour, shown on waiting room screens at St Peter's Hospital casualty department (costs shared with Spelthorne and Elmbridge)	1000
Street signs advising of the DPPO in Chertsey and Addlestone	369
9 x tri-signs around Runnymede to encourage resident participation in the Community Safety Survey 2013	405
Court costs, to obtain a Crack House closure order at private residence	200

NB: the partnership also has webpages hosted by Runnymede Borough Council which will be re-designed in autumn 2013 as part of a refresh of the RBC site.

APPENDIX 2

COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY 2013 (by Geoff Berry Associates)

Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of the perceptions of those living and working in the Runnymede Borough area, with regard to community safety issues, compared to such views three years ago.

All previous surveys have utilised a postal questionnaire to a 5% sample of residents in the Borough area, drawn from the electoral roll and stratified in relation to ward of residence, enabling ward by ward analyses to take place. However, it was recognised that this is a relatively costly and staff intensive process and that developments in software technology have made other mechanisms for the collection of data available at lower cost. As a result, for the first time, the survey data was gathered by means of an online survey utilising Survey Monkey software. While this has probably contributed to poorer response rates than in previous survey exercises, the sample size continues to be statistically significant and representative of the broader population.

The residents' survey reveals that concerns continue to focus upon quality of life issues such as speeding vehicles, parking on pavements, litter and dog fouling. Indeed, the first "crime", burglary, is fifth on the ranking list, concern for this crime having increased significantly since 2010. Overall, while quality of life concerns still dominate, the level of concern has risen in 15 of the 21 categories considered, compared to the 2010 survey.

A slightly larger proportion of respondents have been victims of crime compared to 2010 and many of these were in relation to vandalism. Perceptions specifically with regard to crime problems continue to be higher than actual victimisation rates, though the gap between reality and perception has closed since 2010, with the exception of burglary, where perception of the problem is much greater than the chance of becoming a victim and the gap has widened significantly.

One third of respondents feel that fear of crime affects their lifestyle, compared to one fifth in 2010, fuelled primarily by the perceived level of crime in their area. Despite relatively low victimisation rates in relation to both crime and anti-social behaviour, one in three of all respondents are still fearful of becoming a crime victim. The message needs to be reinforced that the Runnymede Borough area continues to be a very safe part of the country in which to live and work.

As in 2010, just over a quarter of those surveyed identified areas where they feel particularly unsafe. These relate mainly to the three main town centre areas, but particularly Addlestone. In addition, 23% stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour, compared to 12% in 2010. Almost half of these had taken place outside the individuals' home with many of the remainder taking place in town centre areas. Satisfaction with the area remains high, at levels almost identical to those expressed in 2010, though there are local differences across the wards. In general, perceptions regarding changes in the crime and disorder situation are similar to those in 2010.

Awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme has bucked the trend of surveys since 2001 and risen as have positive perceptions regarding the impact of the

ITEM 12

scheme. There has been a significant increase in awareness across a range of crime prevention measures, though work still needs to be done to promote schemes.

There was no young people's survey this year but the online survey was actively promoted through schools and on school transport. Focus groups with elderly people, which had not been held since 2007, did take place. Concerns expressed by the elderly groups are broadly similar to those of the residents though the elderly group appear to be less concerned about crime issues rather than traffic and quality of life problems. Victimisation of the elderly group is lower than for the residents survey sample and fear of crime has also fallen since 2007.

The business survey delivered a very poor response, and the results therefore need to be considered with some caution. Once again, concerns focus on traffic and quality of life issues with lower levels of concern than in 2010, across thirteen of the 21 categories. The level of provision for crime prevention has fallen again, continuing a trend that stretches back to 1998 and this is a source of some concern.

In summary, the findings from the surveys suggest that the following areas should be the focus for attention in the future:

- Continued focus on traffic related and road safety issues (speeding, dangerous parking) and neighbourhood environmental issues (litter, dog fouling).
- A focus on addressing concerns about burglary, notably the fear of victimisation, which is significantly higher than the likelihood of becoming a victim. This should be part of continuing efforts to re-assure the community in order to further reduce the fear of crime.
- Continued attention to the problem of anti-social behaviour (noise, drunken/threatening behaviour and verbal abuse) across the Borough area, particularly in town centre areas especially Addlestone, and residential areas.
- Though good progress has been made the marketing and publicity of crime reduction opportunities and initiatives across the Borough area must be maintained.
- Increased efforts to encourage businesses to seriously consider crime and the potential effects of becoming a victim. This should be linked with projects encouraging them to be more proactive in adopting crime reduction measures.

In summary, levels of concern, fear of crime and victimisation are slightly higher than they were three years ago. The survey suggests that the work of the Community Safety Partnership is having an impact on the views and perceptions of residents and businesses in the area but there is still work to be done. The emergence of burglary as a concern is particularly pertinent. All of those responsible for community safety in the Runnymede Borough area should again be much encouraged by the findings of the surveys and should ensure that efforts should now seek to build further upon the progress made in the last three years.