

gEOFF bERRY aSSOCIATES

# **RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT**

**2010**

**Geoff Berry Associates**  
82 Barnfield Way, Stafford. ST17 4NB  
Tel: 01785 665998

*E-mail: [geoffrey.berry@btconnect.com](mailto:geoffrey.berry@btconnect.com)*

**RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2010 COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT**

**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Management summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Background</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Residents survey findings</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Young People's survey</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>5. Survey of the business community</b>	<b>34</b>

## **MANAGEMENT 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.

The residents' survey, which exhibits a statistically significant overall response rate of 31%, reveals that most resident concerns continue to focus upon quality of life issues such as speeding vehicles, parking on pavements, litter and dog fouling. Indeed, the seven highest priorities fall into this category, with the first "crime" on the list being vandalism and damage, at number eight (in the 2007 survey, the first crime was seventh on the list).

Overall, while quality of life concerns still dominate, the level of concern has fallen in 16 of the 21 categories considered, compared to the 2007 survey. Even in the remaining 5 categories the increases in concern are small and not significant.

A slightly smaller proportion of respondents have been victims of crime compared to 2007 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 2007, with the exception of burglary, where perception of the problem is much greater than the chance of becoming a victim.

One fifth of respondents feel that fear of crime affects their lifestyle, compared to one quarter in 2007, 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 five 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 2007, 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, 12% stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour, compared to 17% in 2007. 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 2007.

Awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme has continued to fall, maintaining a trend since 2001. There has been a significant increase in awareness of PCSOs and neighbourhood officers reflecting the impact of neighbourhood policing. While awareness of generic crime prevention initiatives such as neighbourhood watch and property marking continues to be relatively high, it has also fallen consistently since 2001, while awareness of local schemes remains generally low.

Young people took part in a postal survey through a number of local schools, though the response was very disappointing. Those young people who did respond are generally slightly more concerned about problems overall than respondents to the resident's survey. Victimisation of young people responding remains at 2007 levels, while fear of crime has fallen in the young people's group since 2004.

The business survey reveals generally lower levels of concern than in 2007, across all except three of the 21 categories. The primary concerns of businesses remain traffic related problems, young people hanging around and litter. 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 such as speeding, abandoned vehicles and dangerous parking.
- Maintaining efforts to re-assure the community in the area regarding their safety, in order to further reduce the fear of crime. In particular, this should address the gap between perceived risk of becoming a victim and actual victimisation especially in relation to burglary. In addition, efforts should focus on re-assuring younger females.
- Continued attention to the problem of anti-social behaviour across the Borough area, particularly in residential areas.
- Marketing and publicity of crime reduction opportunities and initiatives across the Borough area, particularly generic initiatives such as crimestoppers and property marking.
- 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 significantly lower than they were three years ago. The survey suggests that the work of the Community Safety Partnership is now having a major impact on the views and perceptions of residents and businesses in the area. 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.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of perceptions of those living and working in the Runnymede Borough area, with regard to community safety issues. Perceptions were gathered through a variety of survey methods and the results will inform both the community safety strategic assessment process and the continual review and development of the community safety strategy for the Borough area.

Where appropriate, survey data has been compared to baseline data and previous surveys. Such comparisons will enable conclusions to be drawn regarding the possible impact of the strategy and its' component parts. It will also highlight areas of concern, which may require future attention.

As far as practicable, the methodology used in this survey exercise mirrors that of previous exercises. This will support the validity of comparisons between the various sets of data.

The data from the 2010 exercise (outlined in this report) is compared with data from the audit surveys of 2007, which will allow strict comparison over the 3-year period of the strategy.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Residents survey**

The residents' survey was carried out by means of a postal questionnaire to a 5% sample of residents in the Borough area. The sample was drawn from the electoral roll and stratified in relation to ward of residence, enabling ward by ward analyses to take place.

All questionnaires were returned directly to Geoff Berry Associates by means of a postage paid envelope. It was felt that this would enhance the response rate and reinforce the fact that the survey was being carried out by an independent organisation.

A total of 3002 questionnaires were issued in March 2010.

### **2.2 Survey of young people**

Up until 2007 the views of young people had been gathered through the use of focus groups. While this was a valid method, it was felt that the numbers of responses were relatively small.

It was therefore decided to change the approach adopted and for the 2007 survey, postal questionnaires were issued to schools together with a stock of postage paid reply envelopes. The schools were requested to issue these to students as they saw fit in order that the young people might complete and return them directly to the researchers. This approach has also been adopted in the 2010 survey.

A total of 500 questionnaires were issued to schools in the Borough area.

### **2.3 Business survey**

The business survey was carried out by use of a postal questionnaire to a sample of businesses in the Borough, drawn from a list compiled by Runnymede Borough Council and a total of 465 questionnaires were issued. Replies were again sent directly to us using postage paid envelopes.

### 3 RESIDENTS SURVEY FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 928 postal surveys were returned which represents an overall response rate of 30.9%. This is an acceptable and statistically significant response rate and compares well with the 30% achieved in the previous Borough wide survey in 2007. An accepted benchmark for response rates is 25% and this survey clearly exceeds that by some distance.

A total of 34 respondents (3.7%) did not provide information regarding their gender. Of those that did, 36.9% of respondents were Male and 63.1% were Female compared to 42.2% and 57.3% respectively in the 2007 survey. The gender is, therefore, more skewed towards female respondents, and is very similar to the profile of the 2004 survey.

Table 3.1 below shows the age profile of respondents compared to the 2004 and 2007 surveys.

	<b>Under 24</b>	<b>24-44</b>	<b>45-64</b>	<b>65+</b>
<b>2010 survey</b>	5.0%	25.0%	37.3%	32.5%
<b>2007 survey</b>	6.9%	26.8%	36.7%	29.6%
<b>2004 survey</b>	4.5%	30.3%	37.9%	27.3%

**Table 3.1: Age profile of survey respondents**

The latest survey shows that almost 70% of respondents were over 45, compared with 66% in 2007. There is a higher proportion of respondents aged under 24 but a lower proportion of those aged 24 to 44, compared to the previous survey exercise.

Some 66% of respondents have lived in the area for over ten years, which is higher than the figures in 2007 and 2004 survey (59% and 60% respectively). This survey, therefore, still primarily represents the views of people well established in the community. It increasingly however reflects the views of older members of the community and the inclusion of a separate young person's survey will go some way to providing a greater balance across the findings.

With regard to response rates by ward, Table 3.2 shows the rates for the latest survey compared to the previous Borough wide survey exercise in 2007.

<b>WARD</b>	<b>2010 Survey</b>	<b>2007 Survey</b>
<b>Addlestone Bourneside</b>	34%	28%
<b>Addlestone North</b>	30%	25%
<b>Chertsey Meads</b>	35%	30%
<b>Chertsey St. Ann's</b>	23%	28%
<b>Chertsey South &amp; Rowtown</b>	36%	34%
<b>Egham Hythe</b>	33%	30%
<b>Egham Town</b>	26%	29%
<b>Englefield Green East</b>	24%	27%
<b>Englefield Green West</b>	35%	27%
<b>Foxhills</b>	28%	32%
<b>New Haw</b>	34%	29%
<b>Thorpe</b>	32%	31%
<b>Virginia Water</b>	29%	34%
<b>Woodham</b>	37%	38%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>30%</b>

**Table 3.2: Survey response rates by ward**

Generally response rates are slightly higher in most wards compared to the 2007 survey, response rates for Woodham, Chertsey South & Rowtown and Chertsey Meads were particularly impressive. The lowest response rates were from Chertsey St. Ann's and Englefield Green East with 23% and 24% respectively of those surveyed responding, though these still provide an acceptable and statistically significant sample. Other than these, the rate did not dip below 26% for any ward and as a result, the sample is felt to be representative both as a whole and across each ward.

### **3.2 Perceived crime, neighbourhood and traffic problems**

Respondents were asked if they felt whether or not their area suffered particular crime, neighbourhood or traffic problems and if so, whether they were major or small problems. The proportion of respondents citing major problems in the latest survey is shown in Table 3.3 in rank order. Comparisons are also shown with the findings from the 2007 survey.

	<b>2010</b>	<b>2007</b>
Speeding vehicles	28.7	34.2
Parking on pavements/verges	25.6	23.6
Litter	22.6	23.5
Dog fouling	20.6	20.3
Young people hanging around	16.2	20.2
Cycling on pavements	14.0	18.3
Other vehicle nuisance	12.6	14.7
Damage and vandalism	11.9	16.9
Burglary	11.1	10.8
Under age drinking	8.3	12.8
Alcohol abuse	7.9	8.3
Disorder in public places	7.5	9.9
Vehicles broken into	7.4	13.4
Drug misuse (dealers and users)	7.1	6.0
Loud music/parties	4.1	5.3
Empty, derelict buildings	3.9	2.9
Vehicles being stolen	3.6	5.9
Neighbours	3.3	4.0
Abandoned vehicles	2.9	4.1
Minor assault	2.7	3.5
Street robbery	1.6	3.2

**Table 3.3: Percentage of respondents who perceive major crime, neighbourhood and traffic problems.**

There has been a slight increase in the level of concern in just five of the 21 categories, namely:

- Parking on pavements/verges
- Dog fouling
- Burglary
- Drug misuse (dealers and users)
- Empty, derelict buildings

Even in relation to these categories however, the increases are small and not significant.

Conversely, there has been a reduction in 16 categories, several of these being significant, notably:

- Speeding vehicles
- Young people hanging around
- Cycling on pavements
- Under age drinking
- Vehicles broken into

Overall concerns continue to focus on quality of life type problems, though less than one in three of respondents feel that this is a major problem. The first “crime” on the list is damage and vandalism, at number eight though even for this, less than one in eight of those responding feel that this is a problem.

The highest levels of concern continue to be in relation to traffic-related issues and road safety. The level of concern regarding young people hanging has fallen significantly and while there has been an increase in concern regarding drug misuse though this only relates to small numbers of responses.

When the proportion of respondents who felt that an issue was a small problem is added, the ranking list changes slightly with greater concern in relation to burglary, vandalism and litter.

There are “hotspots” where perceived major problems are greater than the Borough average. Listed below are the crime and crime related problems, again ranked, highlighting those wards whose responses are significantly higher than the Borough average.

Where known, the figures of the 2007 survey are included in brackets.

### **3.2.1 Speeding vehicles – Borough average 28.7% (34.2%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 39% (24%)
- Virginia Water – 36%
- Englefield Green West – 32% (46%)
- Woodham – 32%
- Chertsey St Ann’s – 32%
- Foxhills – 31% (38%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Thorpe – now 29% compared to 44% in 2007
- Addlestone North – now 24% compared to 38% in 2007
- Chertsey South & Rowtown – now 19% compared to 38% in 2007
- New Haw – now 30% compared to 38% in 2007

### **3.2.2 Parking on pavements and verges – Borough average 25.6% (23.6%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green West – 36% (46%)
- Egham Hythe – 33.3%

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Chertsey South & Rowtown – now 28% compared to 32% in 2007
- Egham Town – now 20% compared to 31% in 2007

### **3.2.3 Litter – Borough average 22.6% (23.5%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chertsey St. Anne's – 32% (32%)
- Egham Town – 29% (24%)
- Englefield Green West – 28%
- New Haw – 26% (32%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Addlestone Bourneside – now 22% compared to 31% in 2007.

#### **3.2.4 Dog Fouling – Borough average 20.6% (20.3%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 33%
- Thorpe – 31%
- Englefield Green West – 28%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 27% (23%)
- Addlestone North – 27% (29%)
- Addlestone Bourneside – 25% (29%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Chertsey Meads – now 18% compared to 27% in 2007

#### **3.2.5 Young people hanging around – Borough average 16.2% (20.2%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 37% (28%)
- Addlestone North – 21% (29%)
- Englefield Green West – 20%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 19% (37%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 17% compared to 37% in 2007
- New Haw – now 11% compared to 28% in 2007

#### **3.2.6 Cycling on pavements – Borough average 14.0% (18.3%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 26%
- Addlestone North – 24% (29%)
- Addlestone Bourneside – 21% (26%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 15% compared to 27% in 2007

### **3.2.7 Other vehicle nuisance – Borough average 12.6% (14.7%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Englefield Green East – 19%
- Englefield Green West – 18% (20%)
- Thorpe – 18% (22%)
- Egham Hythe – 15%

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Egham Town – now 11% compared to 19% in 2007
- Chertsey South & Rowtown – now 11% compared to 19% in 2007

### **3.2.8 Damage and vandalism – Borough average 11.9% (16.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 23% (24%)
- Addlestone Bourneside – 18% (31%)
- Englefield Green West – 16%
- New Haw – 16%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 16%
- Addlestone North – 16% (21%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 8% compared to 23% in 2007

### **3.2.9 Burglary – Borough average 11.1% (10.8%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chertsey St. Ann's – 20% (16%)
- Virginia Water – 20% (17%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Englefield Green East – now 8% compared to 19% in 2007
- Chertsey Meads – now 11% compared to 19% in 2007

### **3.2.10 Under age drinking – Borough average 8.3% (12.8%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 17%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 15% (23%)
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 13%

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 6% compared to 33% in 2007
- Addlestone North – now 8% compared to 25% in 2007

### **3.2.11 Alcohol abuse – Borough average 7.9% (8.3%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone Bourneside – 15% (15%)
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 14%
- Englefield Green East – 14% (3%)
- Egham Hythe – 10% (14%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 6% compared to 19% in 2007
- Englefield Green West – now 8% compared to 14% in 2007

### **3.2.12 Disorder in public places – Borough average 7.5% (9.9%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Egham Hythe – 18% (16%)
- New Haw 11%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 11%

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Woodham – now 9% compared to 22% in 2007
- Englefield Green West – now 3% compared to 20% in 2007
- Addlestone Bourneside – now 9% compared to 16% in 2007

### **3.2.13 Vehicles broken into – Borough average 7.4% (13.4%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chertsey St. Ann's – 18% (21%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Englefield Green West – now 10% compared to 28% in 2007

### **3.2.14 Drug misuse – Borough average 7.1% (6.0%)**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Addlestone North – 14%
- Addlestone Bourneside – 13%
- Chertsey St. Ann's – 13% (12%)

Problem areas identified in the 2007 survey and now seen as less of a problem are:

- Chertsey South & Rowtown – now 4% compared to 12% in 2007
- Egham Hythe – now 6% compared to 12% in 2007

The remaining seven problems on the list are not shown as they only represent very small numbers, which are not statistically significant. Overall, less than one in twenty surveyed felt that these were significant problems across the Borough. The only significant variations from the Borough average in relation to these categories are listed below. The data needs to be treated with some caution, however, as these relate to small numbers.

- Loud music/parties – Englefield Green West 8% (14% in 2007)
- Empty, derelict buildings – Chertsey St. Ann's 13%, Egham Hythe 10% (10% in 2007).
- Vehicles being stolen – Chertsey St. Ann's 13% (10% in 2007).
- Neighbour disputes – Englefield Green West 8% (10% in 2007), Chertsey St. Ann's 8% (10% in 2007)
- Abandoned vehicles – Chertsey St. Ann's 11%
- Minor assault – Chertsey St. Ann's 9%
- Street robbery – Addlestone North 8%

It is worth noting that in the majority of cases listed in all of the above hotspot lists, the level of concern expressed is lower than in 2007 where a comparison is made, and in some cases significantly so.

The wards of Chertsey St. Ann's, Egham Hythe and Englefield Green West appear most often in the above lists, indicating that the level of concern is greatest in those areas. (In 2007 greatest concern was expressed in Englefield Green West and Addlestone Bournside).

It is also noted that from August 2009 to February 2010 a Section 30 dispersal order was in place in the Egham Hythe area. In addition to a range of activities in the area during that time those living and working in the area were encouraged to report incidents or suspicious activity. It is highly likely that this has influenced these findings.

Two wards do not feature at all in the lists, namely Chertsey South & Rowtown and Chertsey Meads and three wards appear only once, namely Foxhills, Virginia Water and Egham Town. This is an indication of the lower levels of concern in these wards.

Respondents were asked if there were any other crime or crime related problems, which they perceived in their areas. Many problems mentioned restate some of the issues listed above, notably loud music and parking and traffic offences. Of the other problems, many offences were only highlighted by one or two respondents and just one slight issue did emerge namely:

- Fly tipping – 0.7% (1.3% in 2007)

It should not be forgotten that strength of feeling about these issues was such that individuals felt compelled to comment specifically on them.

### 3.3 Victims of crime

Some 12.9% of respondents had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months compared to 14.7% in 2007. Of these, 30% had been victims of vandalism compared to 39% in 2007. Some 14% had been victims of theft from vehicle (19% in 2007), 14% had been victim of a burglary (16% in 2007) and 13% victims of thefts from gardens or sheds. When victimisation is compared to ward areas, no single area emerges as particularly prevalent.

Table 3.4 compares the perception of problems with the victimisation in the last twelve months.

	<b>% who perceive a problem</b>	<b>% who have been a victim</b>	<b>Gap perception to reality 2010</b>	<b>Gap perception to reality 2007</b>
Damage and vandalism	11.9	3.9	8.0	11.2
Vehicles broken into	7.4	1.8	5.6	10.7
Burglary	11.1	1.8	9.3	8.5
Vehicles being stolen	3.6	0.4	3.2	3.2
Minor assault	2.7	0.3	2.4	2.9

**Table 3.4: Percentage of respondents who perceive major crime problems compared to percentage who have been a victim in the last twelve months.**

This clearly shows that the perception of crime problems is greater than the likelihood that any one individual will become a victim of crime for selected crime categories. The difference between perception and reality for damage, theft from vehicle and burglary is particularly striking.

When comparing the results to 2007, it is interesting to note that for every category except burglary and vehicle theft, the gap between perceived victimisation and actual victimisation is smaller in 2010. This narrowing of the perception gap is further evidence of the success of the partnership in addressing community concerns regarding crime and community safety. Equally, this analysis suggests that there is still some work to do in addressing fear of victimisation in relation to burglary.

Some 75% of victims had suffered a crime only once during the year (66% in 2007), but 14% had been a victim twice (22% in 2007). One-third of these had suffered vandalism with the remainder spread over a number of offence types. No particular ward was more prevalent than others in relation to repeat victimisation. This clearly shows that, not only is victimisation falling, but so also is repeat victimisation.

Of those who had been victims, some 78% reported the crime to police compared to 68% in 2007. The improvement in the reporting rate may reflect increased confidence that the police and partners will deal effectively with the problem. The reporting rate for vandalism is recognised as traditionally low and 66% of victims of this type of crime reported the offence; significantly lower than the overall average.

When those not reporting were asked why they did not do so, report just over almost 40% stated that it was waste of time as the police were unlikely to pursue it so there was no point (almost exactly the same as in 2007). A small number of others stated that they did not report the crime as it was a very minor occurrence and not worth reporting.

Just 9% of those who did report the crime, knew the offender (8% in 2007) and all except two of these told the police. This reinforces the findings above and suggests that individuals are more inclined to report if they believe that there is a reasonable chance that the offender will be apprehended.

Of those who did report the crime, some 54% were satisfied with the service that they received from Surrey Police, which is almost the same as in 2007 (55%). For those who were not satisfied, the main criticism was that the police “did not seem to be bothered” and seemed uninterested as “there was little that they could do”. Others stated that there was no visit and no feedback.

Finally, respondents were asked if they knew anyone who had been a victim of crime in the previous twelve months. Some 23% replied that they did so (25% in 2007) and of these, 42% said they knew someone who had been a victim of burglary (33% in 2007) and 18% knew someone who had been a victim of damage. The remainder said they knew people who had been victims of, primarily, theft from vehicles and general theft.

### 3.4 Fear of crime

Some 20% of respondents stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle in some way, compared to 25% in the 2007 survey. This comprises, 18% of male respondents (22% in 2007) and 22% of female respondents (28% in 2007).

Age and gender analysis of respondents fearful becoming a victim of crime is of some interest. It is immediately noted however that not all respondents provided age and gender information. The data in Table 3.5 therefore only reflects the views of those who provided such information.

	Under 24		24-44		45-64		65+	
	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010
<b>Male</b>	19.0%	0.0%	21.4%	19.7%	24.8%	22.0%	18.5%	14.5%
<b>Female</b>	27.2%	32.3%	32.9%	20.3%	31.1%	26.3%	17.9%	15.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	24.6%	24.4%	29.1%	20.0%	28.4%	24.8%	18.2%	15.0%

**Table 3.5: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, by age grouping.**

Table 3.5 clearly shows that fear of crime is focused in the middle age groups in males. It is interesting to note that none of those male respondents aged under 24 suggested that fear of crime affected their lifestyle. This is in contrast to female respondents in the same age group, one third of whom said that fear of crime affected their lifestyle.

With the exception of females aged under 24, there has been a reduction in expressed fear of crime across all categories, compared to the 2007 survey results.

With regard to the type of crime of which respondents were most fearful, four main responses were given, namely:

- Burglary – 35% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (34% in 2007)
- Assault – 15% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (18% in 2007)
- Robbery/Mugging – 7% of those expressing concern about fear of crime (6% in 2007).

In 2007, gangs of young people was cited by 10% of those expressing concern about fear of crime. In 2010, this did not appear at all, though 5% did say that they were fearful about drunken and aggressive behaviour

In addition, 20% did not state any specific crime that they were fearful of (10% in 2007).

From a gender perspective, a higher proportion of females than males state that fear of becoming a victim of assault affects their lifestyle.

Before too much is made of these figures, they are of interest when set against the context of the overall survey as Table 3.6 below illustrates.

	<b>% who feel it is a major problem</b>	<b>% who state fear affects their life</b>
Burglary dwelling	11.1	6.4
Assault	2.7	2.7
Robbery/Mugging	1.6	1.3
Disorder	7.5	0.9

**Table 3.6: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, compared to overall concern about crime.**

For assault and robbery the proportions who feel they are a major problem (from Table 3.3 above) is broadly similar to the proportions who say that their lifestyle is affected by them. With regard to burglary and disorder the proportion of respondents who feel that they are major problems in their area is significantly higher than the proportion of those who state that it affects their lifestyle.

Three main responses emerged when asked about how it affected their lifestyle:

- 19% said that fear of crime prevented them going out after dark, compared to 16% in 2007.
- 15% said that it made them very careful about locking and securing their home both when in their home and if they left it at any time, compared to 20% in 2007.

- 19% stated that it made them very wary generally, when out and about compared to 10% in 2007.

From a geographical perspective, fear of crime seems to be most prevalent in Chertsey St. Ann's (30% of respondents from that ward), Egham Hythe (27%) and Addlestone North (25%). In 2007 those wards where fear of crime was most prevalent were Englefield Green West, Woodham and Chertsey South & Rowtown.

Respondents were then asked what the major contributory factors were to their fear of crime. For the first time in any of the surveys that have been carried out in Runnymede over the last 13 years, crime and incidents reported in the media was **not** the major contributory factor. This is still an issue, with 48% of those who said they were fearful, citing this as the main reason (53% in 2007).

However, some 54% stated that their fear was fuelled by the apparent level of crime in their area, compared to 50% in 2007. This factor has therefore increased slightly in the last three years. While small numbers are involved, (and hence the results should be treated with caution), the fear of crime through the perceived level of crime in the area was most prevalent in Egham Hythe. As noted above, the presence of a Section 30 dispersal order and associated activity is highly likely to have influenced these findings.

Some 44% of those who were fearful of crime suggested that the primary cause was their being a past victim, which is somewhat higher than in 2007. As only 13% of all respondents had been victims in the last twelve months, this again suggests that being a victim of crime has a long lasting impact.

Police drama on TV and lack of victim support were not seen as significant contributory factors to the fear of crime, though some 7% said that lack of a visible police presence was (9% in 2007).

### **3.5 Perceived safety by Area**

Respondents were asked if they felt either particularly safe or unsafe in any area of the Borough and if so, why. Some 27% of respondents answered this question, compared to 28% in 2007 and 27% in 2004. Within the Runnymede area three locations were identified by a number of respondents, namely:

- Addlestone town centre (15% of those responding to this question).
- Chertsey town centre (10% of those responding to this question, compared to 6% in 2007).
- Pooley Green area (7% of those responding to this question).

The main reason put forward to explain why people felt unsafe for each of the above areas was the number of young people hanging around.

Interestingly, 6% of those responding to this question felt that Staines was an unsafe area, but this lies outside the Runnymede Borough area.

The following areas were also suggested as unsafe by more than 5 respondents to this question:

- Hare Hill open space (9)
- Ottershaw (9)
- Larkesfield Estate (7)
- At or near their home (6)
- Wendover Road (8)
- Surrey Towers (6)

In all of these cases, the presence of groups of young people was put forward as the primary reason for feeling unsafe.

### **3.6 Anti-social behaviour**

Respondents were then asked if they had been a victim of anti-social behaviour (ASB) in the last three years and if so, the nature, time and location of the incident. Some 12% of all respondents stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour in the last three years compared to 17% in 2007.

Of these incidents:

- 17% had taken place during the last year (23% in 2007)
- 9% had taken place between 1 and 2 years ago (12% in 2007)
- 16% had taken place during the last three months (8% in 2007)
- In addition, 38% said that these incidents happened all of the time and were ongoing compared to 31% in 2007.

In terms of location, 45% of the incidents (24% in 2007) took place outside the home of the respondents and the majority of these fell into three categories of verbal abuse, loud music and minor vandalism. Of the remainder, the following areas were identified by five or more respondents:

- Egham High Street (verbal abuse)
- Addlestone town centre (verbal abuse, threatening behaviour)

These were the same as identified in the 2007 survey.

In terms of type of behaviour, two broad categories dominated, namely:

- Aggressive/threatening behaviour – 18% of ASB victims (27% in 2007)
- Verbal abuse – 14% of ASB victims (22% in 2007)
- Objects being thrown at people's houses – 14% (this was not identified as problem in 2007 and it is felt that it relates to snowball throwing during the winter months in 2009/10).

The other categories identified by fewer respondents include:

- Minor vandalism and damage
- Loud music from neighbours
- Noise nuisance generally including loud/unruly behaviour
- Under age drinking

### **3.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood**

Respondents were then asked how satisfied they were with the neighbourhood in which they live. The responses are summarised, by ward, in table 3.7 below.

WARD	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied	
	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010
<b>Addlestone North</b>	14%	27%	79%	59%	4%	14%	-	-
<b>Addlestone Bourneside</b>	32%	32%	56%	55%	10%	12%	2%	1%
<b>Chertsey South &amp; Rowtown</b>	32%	44%	59%	52%	5%	4%	1%	-
<b>New Haw</b>	34%	33%	57%	63%	6%	3%	-	1%
<b>Woodham</b>	37%	44%	53%	57%	7%	-	1%	-
<b>Chertsey St. Ann's</b>	32%	36%	59%	59%	7%	3%	1%	2%
<b>Chertsey Meads</b>	36%	36%	57%	60%	4%	4%	-	-
<b>Foxhills</b>	53%	43%	47%	55%	-	2%	-	-
<b>Egham Town</b>	37%	35%	55%	59%	1%	6%	6%	-
<b>Egham Hythe</b>	24%	26%	68%	64%	3%	7%	4%	3%
<b>Virginia Water</b>	57%	59%	38%	39%	4%	2%	-	-
<b>Thorpe</b>	34%	46%	59%	49%	4%	4%	-	-
<b>Englefield Green West</b>	22%	33%	56%	66%	18%	3%	-	-
<b>Englefield Green East</b>	50%	44%	45%	50%	3%	6%	2%	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Table 3.7: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, by ward.

Some 3.2% of respondents declined to answer this question but for those who did, the overall levels of satisfaction are very similar to those in 2007 showing that over nine out of ten respondents are still either satisfied or very satisfied with the neighbourhood in which they live (94% compared as in 2007).

Levels of dissatisfaction are highest in Addlestone North, Addlestone Bourneside, and Egham Hythe. It is stressed however that these relate to small numbers only.

Respondents were then asked whether they felt that the crime and disorder situation had changed in the last twelve months and if so, how and why.

WARD	Improved	No change	Worse	Don't know
Addlestone North	4%	56%	19%	21%
Addlestone Bourneside	17%	60%	7%	16%
Chertsey South & Rowtown	12%	74%	10%	4%
New Haw	12%	54%	10%	24%
Woodham	17%	60%	7%	16%
Chertsey St. Ann's	6%	68%	9%	17%
Chertsey Meads	4%	73%	6%	17%
Foxhills	9%	72%	3%	16%
Egham Town	9%	51%	17%	23%
Egham Hythe	5%	56%	23%	15%
Virginia Water	14%	62%	16%	8%
Thorpe	8%	68%	12%	12%
Englefield Green West	24%	44%	16%	16%
Englefield Green East	4%	64%	4%	28%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>

**Table 3.8: Perceptions of respondents regarding the change in the crime and disorder situation in the last twelve months.**

Again, some 4% of respondents declined to answer this question but for those who did, Table 3.8 shows that, as in 2007 almost two-thirds of all respondents feel that the crime and disorder situation has not changed in the last twelve months (63% in 2007), while 11% feel that it has worsened (12% in 2007) and 11% feel that it has improved (8% in 2007).

There are significant variations across the wards. Those wards where there is felt to be most improvement are Englefield Green West, Woodham and Addlestone Bourneside, while those felt to have worsened most are Egham Hythe, Addlestone North, Egham Town, Virginia Water and Englefield Green West. The case of Englefield Green West is of interest in that it shows a relatively high proportion of respondents who feel that the situation has improved and a relatively high proportion who feel that it has deteriorated. This suggests that there is a polarisation of views in the respondents from this ward.

It is also perhaps not surprising that respondents from two of the three wards showing highest levels of dissatisfaction (Table 3.7) have suggested that the crime and disorder situation has worsened in the last 12 months (Egham Hythe, Addlestone North).

When looking at why respondents felt that there had been an improvement the major reason put forward is the view that neighbourhood police officers and PCSOs are now more visible and have started to address several of the problems. Others have suggested that there now appear to be fewer groups hanging around.

In relation to those who felt that the situation had worsened, the major reason suggested was the continued problem of gangs hanging around. It is noticeable however, that far fewer have suggested that the lack of a police presence is a factor, compared to previous surveys.

### 3.8 Crime prevention measures

Respondents were offered a list of measures which might help to reduce opportunities to commit crime and asked to state whether they felt they were adequate or needed improving. Table 3.9 below highlights the percentage that felt that facilities needed improving.

Measure	2004	2007	2010
Closing passageways	11.5%	13.6%	11.6%
Better Lighting	27.0%	32.9%	33.7%
More Police patrol	72.8%	69.2%	61.0%
Design of buildings	12.8%	13.5%	12.7%

**Table 3.9: Percentage of respondents who believe measures need improving.**

The level of satisfaction with the provision of crime prevention measures seems to be at broadly the same level as in the previous two audit surveys, with the exception of more police patrol where satisfaction has increased significantly. This resonates with other findings from the survey regarding greater visibility of police officers and the associated reduction in levels of concern expressed by respondents. Despite this, a greater proportion of respondents in Addlestone North, Woodham and Egham Hythe would still like to see more police on patrol.

Concern with regard to closure of passageways was greatest in Egham Hythe

Concern with regard to better lighting was greatest in Egham Hythe, Virginia Water and Englefield Green East wards.

Concern with regard to new building design was greatest in Addlestone Bourneside.

Respondents were asked to suggest other crime prevention measures that might prove effective and three responses dominated, namely:

- The need for visible and accessible police patrol - 6% of all respondents (7% in 2007)
- More activities for young people to reduce the opportunities for them to be drawn into crime and nuisance – 3% of respondents (as in 2007)
- Extension of the CCTV scheme – 2% of all respondents (3% in 2007)

Other suggestions put forward by at least 5 respondents were:

- Speed control and traffic calming measures
- Dispersal of groups of people hanging around

### 3.9 The CCTV scheme

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of the CCTV scheme in the Borough and if so, whether they thought it was having an effect. The results of both surveys are summarised in Table 3.10 below.

	<b>2004</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	70%	62%	59%
<b>% who think it will reduce crime</b>	62%	55%	46%
<b>% who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	45%	43%	36%
<b>% who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	65%	59%	58%

**Table 3.10: Perceptions with regard to the CCTV scheme**

The awareness of the scheme across the Borough has continued to fall and the proportion of respondents who perceive that the system has a positive impact has fallen to its lowest level since it was introduced.

In common with previous surveys and those in other parts of the country, there is less perceived impact on the fear of crime.

As in 2007, there is slightly greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by male respondents than female. In addition, there is greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by older respondents.

Awareness of CCTV is greater in those areas where the scheme has been in place for longest, especially Addlestone and Chertsey while the lowest level of awareness is 43% in Egham Hythe and Virginia Water 44%.

### 3.10 Other crime prevention measures

Respondents were offered a list of crime prevention schemes currently running in the area and asked to state whether or not they were aware of them. Their responses are outlined below.

INITIATIVE	2004	2007	2010
<b>Community safety strategy</b>	9%	6%	10%
<b>PCSO/Community Constables</b>	36%	56%	66%
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	28%	25%	24%
<b>Neighbourhood Specialist Officers</b>	11%	19%	26%
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	56%	52%	55%
<b>Property marking</b>	25%	21%	18%
<b>Pub Watch</b>	19%	18%	19%
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	13%	11%	11%
<b>Vehicle crime awareness</b>	10%	10%	8%
<b>Victim support</b>	28%	19%	22%
<b>ASB reporting form</b>	N/a	5%	8%

**Table 3.11: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

Table 3.11 clearly shows how the awareness of PCSO and neighbourhood officers has increased significantly since 2007 and even more so since 2004. This reflects the considerable efforts put into the launch and operation of neighbourhood policing.

Awareness of some of the other initiatives has risen slightly since 2007, notably neighbourhood watch and victim support. In relation to neighbourhood watch there are pockets where awareness remains much lower, notably New Haw 38% and Egham Hythe 36% (35% in 2007).

Only 8% of respondents are aware of the community safety strategy, despite the fact that it has now been in place for many years (6% in 2007). It might be that important and valuable advice is available to residents of the area, which may reduce their fear of crime or likelihood that they might become victims of crime. They need to be told, however, that such initiatives are available, how they can help and where they can be accessed.

### 3.11 Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim

Respondents were asked what measures they took, and how often they took them, to reduce the likelihood that they would become a crime victim.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	10	07	10	07	10	07	10	07	10
Lock up when leaving home	1	0	0	0	2	1	95	96	2	3
Set burglar alarm when leaving home	14	11	2	2	3	3	18	18	63	66
Check identity of any caller	4	3	14	12	24	26	52	52	6	7
Lock car when leaving it	0	1	1	0	3	2	85	83	11	14
Keep all valuables in car, out of sight	1	2	1	0	7	8	79	73	12	17
Set car alarm when leaving it	2	2	1	1	2	2	56	51	39	44
Active member of Neighbourhood watch	21	23	3	4	4	5	9	9	63	59
Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.	8	9	10	8	15	17	56	53	11	13

Table 3.12: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim.

There is little variation between the results in 2007 and the latest survey.

#### 3.11.1 Locking home

As in 2007, the very high proportion of respondents who always lock their home is encouraging and there is little variation in terms of area, age or gender.

### **3.11.2 Setting burglar alarms**

The results of the survey in 2010 are almost identical to those in 2007, perhaps suggesting that the level of burglar alarm ownership has stabilised.

### **3.11.3 Checking caller's identity**

Once again the results from the 2010 survey are very similar to those in 2007. Half of respondents always check the identity of callers to their home and (49% of male and 54% of female respondents). As in 2004 and 2007, for both male and female respondents, the older that they are, the more likely they are to check caller identity which is encouraging.

There is little variation across the wards with the possible exception of New Haw where only 43% of respondents stated that they always checked the identity of callers to their home.

### **3.11.4 Locking cars**

Again the majority of respondents always lock their cars when leaving them. The 14% suggesting that this measure is not applicable indicates the level of non-car ownership. Again, there is little variation in terms of area, age or gender.

### **3.11.5 Keeping valuables out of sight**

A slightly smaller proportion of those owning cars, always keep valuables out of sight when leaving their cars. The gender split is broadly equal to the overall average. In terms of age, however, those in the middle age groups are more likely to keep valuables hidden, as in 2007. This may be a function of the possible higher levels of car ownership for these age groups. There is little variation across the wards.

### **3.11.6 Setting car alarms**

Once again, the results are very similar to those in 2007. The high proportion of respondents who state that this is not applicable suggests that many do not have car alarms. It is also worth remembering however that many new cars now come with automatic alarm systems that do not have to be "set" as such. This might therefore also explain the high proportion of not applicable responses to this question.

There is significant gender variation, with 65% of male respondents stating that they always set car alarms, compared to just 45% of female respondents (61% and 52% respectively in 2007). This again may be partly a function on non-car ownership. As in 2007, middle aged male respondents in the age categories 35 to 64 are most likely to always set their car alarms. This might indicate both car ownership and the fact that the value and type of vehicles owned at those ages are worth protecting.

### **3.11.7 Active member of Neighbourhood Watch**

The fact that 59% (63% in 2007) of respondents suggest that this measure is not applicable and that a further 23% (21% in 2007) never become actively involved, suggests a lack of neighbourhood watch schemes across the Borough. Several respondents requested more information about joining or setting up schemes.

Areas with highest levels of “not applicable” and/or non-participation are New Haw and Egham Hythe. Conversely, the highest levels of active participation in neighbourhood watch are in Egham Town, Foxhills, Englefield Green East and Thorpe.

While there is little variation between male and female respondents with regard to active involvement in such schemes, those in the older age categories appear more likely to become more actively involved.

### **3.11.8 Keeping an eye on property**

Some 53% (56% in 2007) always ask their neighbour to keep an eye on their property when leaving home for any length of time.

There is a slight gender variation, with 52% of male respondents stating that they always ask their neighbours to keep an eye on their property, compared to 56% of female respondents (54% and 58% respectively in 2007). Once again, those in the older age categories appear more likely to ask their neighbours to do so.

With regard to the wards, a higher proportion of respondents stated that they always asked their neighbours to keep an eye on their property in Woodham (71%) and Thorpe (66%). Conversely the lowest proportions were in Englefield Green East (40%), Egham Hythe (41%) and Addlestone Bourneside (43%).

## **3.12 Other measures**

Finally, respondents were asked if any other specific actions should be taken to help reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim. Many of the responses restate those outlined in section 3.8, particularly in relation to police patrol, improved street lighting and the extension of CCTV. Others include:

- Harsher sentencing
- More neighbourhood watch schemes
- More efforts to bring the community together

## 4 YOUNG PEOPLE'S SURVEY

### 4.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 500 surveys were issued to schools in the area and just 20 surveys were returned giving a response rate of just 4% compared to 25% in the 2007. This is a very disappointing response and it is not known whether this is due to schools not issuing the surveys or students failing to return them.

It should not be forgotten however, that though the sample for the 2010 survey is small compared to the 2007 survey, it is broadly comparable with surveys from years prior to 2007. It is also interesting to note that the findings are broadly in line with those from 2007 and previous years, which indicate that they may well be representative.

Just 17 of the 20 respondents provided age and gender data and of these, two-thirds were female and half of all respondents were aged 13 or 14.

### 4.2 Perceived crime problems

A summary of the proportion of the young people who responded, who perceived that there were major problems in the area, is shown below in Table 4.1.

PROBLEM		
	2010	2007
Abandoned vehicles	20%	14%
Alcohol abuse	10%	21%
Burglary	20%	17%
Cycling on pavements	15%	33%
Disorder in public places	-	14%
Dog fouling	25%	37%
Drugs misuse	25%	24%
Empty/derelict housing	20%	8%
Litter	25%	46%
Speeding	40%	40%
Loud music/party	10%	10%
Minor assault	25%	17%
Neighbours	5%	13%
Parking on pavements	25%	38%
Street robbery	10%	14%
Under age drinking	15%	25%
Vandalism	25%	41%
Vehicle nuisance	20%	13%
Vehicles broken into	25%	21%
Vehicles stolen	25%	16%
Young people hanging around	25%	37%

Table 4.1: Perceived major problems by young people survey group

The small sample means that it is difficult to draw conclusions from the comparative analysis. However, what is of interest is that the level of concern across both survey groups is high in relation to speeding. This is echoed by the resident's survey.

#### **4.3 Victims of crime**

Some 4 (20%) of the young people had been victims of crime in the last twelve months compared to 19% in 2007. Of these, one had been victim of damage, one of burglary, one of theft and one of robbery. Two of the victims were male and two were female.

Three of the victims reported the crime to the police and in none of the cases the victim knew the offender. Of those who reported the crime, two were satisfied with the service that they received from the police (felt that they were given appropriate interest and feedback). The dissatisfied victim felt that the police took a long time to come back to them.

Some 30% of the young people respondents said that they knew someone who had been a victim of a crime (32% in 2007).

#### **4.4 Fear of crime**

Just 2 respondents (10%) stated that they felt fearful of crime compared to 16% in 2007, in relation to general intimidation. This fear of crime is primarily fuelled by the level of crime in their area.

#### **4.5 Perceived safety by Area**

Some 55% stated that there were locations in the Borough where they felt unsafe compared to 40% in 2007. The primary areas identified in the Borough were:

- At school
- The alleyway by Fullbrook school
- Parks
- Addlestone town centre
- Aviator skate park

Again however, it should be noted that these areas were only highlighted by a small number of respondents. The primary reason for fear of becoming a victim is the presence of gangs of young people and a fear of bullying.

#### **4.6 Anti-social behaviour**

Only 4 of the young respondents or 20% stated that they had been victims of ASB compared to 3% in 2007. The very small numbers, however, means that little significance should again be attached to this finding.

#### 4.7 Satisfaction with the neighbourhood

In relation to satisfaction with the neighbourhood in which they are living the responses for young people are summarised, in table 4.2 below and compared to the residents' survey. Table 4.3 compares the results of the young people's survey in 2007 with those from the 2004 survey.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>Young people's group</b>	15%	70%	10%	-	5%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	38%	56%	5%	1%	-

**Table 4.2: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, young people compared to resident's survey, 2010.**

Table 4.2 shows that the young people who responded are generally less satisfied than the respondents to the resident's survey with the neighbourhood in which they live. Table 4.3 shows the comparison with the 2007 situation and shows that the level of satisfaction has also fallen slightly in the last three years.

	<b>Very Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Dis-satisfied</b>	<b>Very Dis satisfied</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>2007</b>	20%	71%	8%	-	1%
<b>2010</b>	15%	70%	10%	-	5%

**Table 4.3: Young people's satisfaction with neighbourhood, 2010 compared to 2007.**

The small sample size for 2010 is again noted however.

Table 4.4 shows that young people also have a more positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents.

	<b>Improved</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Young people's group</b>	20%	50%	10%	20%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	11%	62%	11%	16%

**Table 4.4: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, young people compared to resident's survey, 2010.**

The results from the young people's survey are broadly similar to the results in 2007.

#### 4.8 Crime prevention measures

When asked about a range of crime prevention measures and which needed improving, the following responses emerged.

MEASURE		
	2010	2007
Close passageways	30%	33%
Better Lighting	50%	48%
More Police patrol	45%	52%
New building design	30%	48%

**Table 4.5: Crime prevention measures that need to be improved, young people's survey.**

The level of satisfaction with crime prevention measures is broadly similar to that expressed in 2007. It is interesting to note that, as in the residents survey, the level of satisfaction with policing appears to have increased.

#### 4.9 The CCTV scheme

Some 60% of the young people were aware of the scheme, compared to 57% in 2007. Once again, the predominant view was that the CCTV scheme has had an impact on the prevention and detection of crime but less of an impact on the fear of crime.

#### 4.10 Other crime prevention initiatives

Asked about other schemes in the area, young people revealed the following level of awareness.

INITIATIVE		
	2010	2007
Community Safety Strategy	20%	5%
PCSO	50%	60%
Crimestoppers	30%	27%
Neighbourhood officers	15%	17%
Neighbourhood Watch	45%	57%
Property marking	10%	17%
Pub Watch	25%	21%
Bogus Caller Initiative	10%	6%
Vehicle Crime Awareness	15%	29%
Victim support	20%	43%
Anti-social behaviour reporting process	15%	44%

**Table 4.6: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

The relatively high level in awareness of PCSO and neighbourhood officers continues to be encouraging. The low level of awareness of property marking schemes is perhaps disappointing.

#### 4.11: Positive action to reduce the likelihood of becoming a crime victim

Table 4.7 below shows the propensity to take active crime prevention measures.

	Never (%)		Some times (%)		Usually (%)		Always (%)		N/A (%)	
	07	10	07	10	07	10	07	10	07	10
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	3	-	2	-	10	10	83	70	2	20
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	21	-	24	35	19	25	25	20	11	20
<b>Keep all valuables in car, out of sight</b>	5	-	2	-	13	15	65	45	15	40
<b>Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.</b>	22	10	16	5	16	10	27	50	19	25

**Table 4.7: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim – young people’s group**

There has been a fall in the proportion of the young people respondents who always adopt the suggested measures (except keeping an eye on neighbours property), since 2007. This may suggest that further promotion of the need for young people to take steps to reduce their risk of becoming a victim of crime, may be required. The small sample size however should be taken into account.

## 5. SURVEY OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

### 5.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 121 questionnaire responses were received or 26% of those issued, compared to the 24% in 2007. Table 5.1 below shows the composition of each survey sample by sector.

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Retail</b>	21.0%	33.1%
<b>Industrial</b>	11.8%	9.1%
<b>Service</b>	58.8%	50.4%
<b>Other</b>	8.4%	7.4%

**Table 5.1: Survey sample by sector**

This shows that the retail sector is more heavily represented than in the 2007 survey and this may reflect a change in the economic structure within the Borough, particularly the reduction in representatives of the industrial sector.

Some 65% of those business survey respondents have been in the area for more than ten years compared to 83% in 2007 and 68% of the businesses surveyed employ 10 people or less, which is the same as in the 2007 survey.

In terms of location, as those owning businesses might not be aware of the ward in which they were located, they were asked to provide the postcode area. While this is useful, it must be remembered that postcode boundaries do not align exactly with the Borough boundaries. They do however give an indication of the broad areas in which the business sample is located, as shown in Table 5.2 below.

	<b>% of sample 2010</b>	<b>% of sample 2007</b>
KT16 – Chertsey, Ottershaw	26.4	36.3
TW20 – Egham, Englefield Green	37.2	28.3
KT15 – Addlestone area	22.3	31.0
GU25 – Virginia Water	5.8	4.4

**Table 5.2: Location of business respondents**

This shows that a slightly greater proportion of respondents are located in the Egham/Englefield Green area than in 2007 with a smaller proportion drawn from the Chertsey and Addlestone areas.

It is re-stated however that the sample is drawn on a purely random basis and the data in Table 5.2 only reflects the areas in which those businesses which responded, are sited.

## 5.2 Perceived crime problems

Businesses were asked whether they felt that the area in which they were sited suffered particular crime problems and if so whether they were major problems or small ones. The major problems are listed below in rank order, according to the proportion of respondents who felt them to be so.

	2010	2007
Speeding vehicles	21.5	26.1
Litter	20.7	24.4
Young people hanging around	18.2	21.8
Damage and vandalism	17.3	18.5
Parking on pavements/verges	14.0	20.2
Cycling on pavements	12.4	15.1
Vehicles broken into	12.4	18.5
Burglary	11.6	17.6
Other vehicle nuisance	10.7	11.8
Under age drinking	9.1	11.8
Alcohol abuse/drunken behaviour	9.1	7.6
Dog fouling	8.3	10.9
Disorder in public places	5.8	5.9
Empty, derelict buildings	4.1	1.7
Minor assault	3.3	5.9
Drug misuse (dealers and users)	3.3	6.7
Neighbours	3.3	1.7
Vehicles being stolen	2.5	8.4
Street robbery	2.5	4.2
Abandoned vehicles	2.5	2.5
Loud music/parties	0.8	1.7

**Table 5.3: Percentage of business respondents who perceive major crime and anti-social behaviour problems.**

As in 2007 and 2004, the main problems identified are those, which most affect businesses, (particularly in town centre areas), such as litter, young people hanging around and traffic i.e. speeding and parking problems.

As with the resident's survey, there has been a significant reduction in concern in relation to most of the categories, the only exceptions being alcohol abuse/drunken behaviour, empty/derelict buildings and neighbour nuisance.

The following areas have been identified by respondents as more problematic with regard to specific problems.

- Addlestone area
  - Litter
  - Under age drinking (as in 2007)
  - Young people hanging around (as in 2007)

- Chertsey area
  - Vehicle nuisance
  
- Egham area
  - Damage
  - Vehicles broken into
  - Alcohol abuse/drunken behaviour
  - Cycling on pavements
  - Speeding vehicles

The proportion of respondents who perceive small problems is also lower than in 2007 and broadly in line with the ranking of major problems.

### **5.3 Business specific problems**

Businesses were then asked if they perceived any problems in the area, in which they were sited, specific to business. Only two issues were raised as significant concerns, namely vandalism (8% of those responding, as in 2007) and industrial theft (7%, primarily from the Egham area), which was not an issue in 2007.

A number of small problems have remained since the last survey however, though the level of concern is generally lower than in 2007, the only exception being damage.

- Damage - 31% (35% in 2007)
- Fraud – 22% (as in 2007)
- Industrial theft – 20% (15% in 2007)
- Shoplifting – 21% (as in 2007)
- Internal theft – 12% (as in 2007)

There is no clear pattern with regard to the greater concern in some areas.

### **5.4 Victims of crime**

Some 36% of businesses responding had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months, which is lower than the 39% in 2007 and the 43% identified in the 2004 survey.

In addition, as in 2007, just over a quarter of these had been a victim of crime on more than one occasion.

Almost 20% of victims did not state the crime of which they had been a victim. Of those businesses who did, 16% had been a victim of general theft (32% in 2007), 18% had been victims of vandalism (28% in 2007) and 11% had been victim of burglary (compared to none in 2007). The rest of the victims had suffered from such offences as shoplifting, theft of and from vehicles, and violence to staff though not in significant numbers.

A significantly higher number of victims were from the Chertsey area overall.

Some 84% of victims had reported the crimes compared to 89% in 2007. Of the small number who did not report, those who explained why they did not report stated that it was because the crime was minor and not worth reporting.

## 5.5 Fear of crime

Some 17 or 14% of businesses responding, felt that fear of crime was having an impact on trade, compared to 12% in 2007. A small number stated that fear of crime prevented customers from coming into an area, particularly after dark. Others felt that increased security costs affected their business.

Table 5.4 shows that, as in 2007, business survey respondents have a less positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents. Over half who responded, however, answered "Don't know" again, as in 2007 (51%).

	Improved	No change	Worse	Don't know
<b>Business survey</b>	5%	31%	9%	55%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	11%	62%	11%	16%

**Table 5.4: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, business survey respondents compared to resident's survey, 2010.**

## 5.6 Crime prevention measures

Table 5.5 shows the views of businesses in 2010 with regard to the need to improve existing crime prevention measures compared to 2007.

MEASURE	2007	2010
<b>Close passageways</b>	19.3%	9.1%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	33.6%	30.6%
<b>More police</b>	72.2%	59.5%
<b>Building design</b>	16.8%	11.6%

**Table 5.5: The need for improvements to crime prevention measures**

As with the residents survey, these results clearly show an increase in satisfaction in relation to all of the measures stated since the 2007 survey. The significant increase in satisfaction with the level of policing, noted in the residents and young people's survey, is also noted here.

## 5.7 The CCTV scheme

Respondents were asked whether they were aware of the CCTV scheme in the Borough and if so, whether they thought it was having an effect. The results of both the 2010 and 2007 surveys are summarised in Table 5.6 below.

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	64%	61%
<b>% who think it will reduce crime</b>	51%	43%
<b>% who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	43%	32%
<b>% who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	54%	45%

**Table 5.6: Perceptions with regard to the CCTV scheme**

These findings are consistent with those from the resident's survey and show that the proportion of respondents who are aware of the system and who perceive that the system has a positive impact has continued to fall. Levels of awareness are greater for businesses in Addlestone.

### **5.8 Business specific crime prevention issues**

Respondents were asked approximately how much funding, if any, they provided for crime prevention in their business. Just 71% of those surveyed answered this question, which is significantly lower than the 82% in 2007. Of these, 91% stated that they provided nothing, which is much higher than the 81% recorded in 2007. There appears to be no significant variation in relation to the size or location of business.

Only 6 of those surveyed were therefore prepared to state how much they set aside and half of these said that they allowed 2% of turnover.

Businesses were then asked if they expected to provide for the costs of crime in the future and if so, how much? Some 86% stated that they did not expect to make provision in the future compared to 84% in 2007. Once again, this is a disappointing result and it can be seen the continuation of a trend that runs back to 1998.

Of the 14% who did intend to provide in the future, only a small number were able or prepared to put a value on the provision. Most saw their annual alarm rental, insurance premiums and in-house CCTV schemes as sufficient crime prevention funding. A number also stated however that they would set aside between 1% and 2% of turnover for such purposes.

## **5.9 Impact of crime on staff**

Some 69% of those interviewed stated that they did take steps to encourage staff to reduce opportunities for crime in the workplace. This compares with 65% in 2007. Of these 69%, it appears that many (18%) do little more than encourage staff to be watchful and vigilant (17% in 2007). Others (36%) encourage staff to secure the premises at night and lock all valuables away (39% in 2007).

Some 26 business respondents suggested that crime in the workplace had an impact on staff, the same as in 2007. Of these, a large number did not state how they felt staff were impacted, though one third felt that staff morale had been affected.

## **5.10 Self monitoring**

Some 27% of business respondents indicated that they had some form of internal CCTV system to prevent crime (32% in 2007). Of these, 73% were monitored in-house (84% in 2007). Just 1 or 3% stated that the system was not monitored **at all**, as in 2007.

A total of 17% said that they were aware of the services offered by the Safer Runnymede Centre as in 2007.