

gEOFF bERRY aSSOCIATES

# **SURREY HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT (V2.0)**

**2007**

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

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

**SURREY HEATH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**2007 COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY REPORT (V1.0)**

**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Management summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Background</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Residents survey findings</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Focus Group Responses</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>5. Survey of the business community</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix A – Resident’s survey questionnaire</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix B – Young people’s survey questionnaire</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Appendix C – Business survey questionnaire</b>	<b>61</b>

## **MANAGEMENT SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of the perceptions of those living and working in the Surrey Heath Borough Council area, with regard to crime, community safety and neighbourhood issues. It is intended that this will inform the strategic assessment process.

The residents' survey, which is based on a statistically significant sample, reveals that over half of all respondents feel that there is a sense of community spirit in their local neighbourhoods, though this varies by ward. Some 92% of respondents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the area in which they live, compared to 83% in 2004.

Almost 60% of all respondents feel that the crime and disorder situation has not changed in the last twelve months, while 17% feel that it has worsened and just 7.9% feel that it has improved.

Most resident concerns focus upon quality of life issues such as speeding vehicles, parking on pavements, young people hanging around, litter and dog fouling. Indeed, the five highest priorities fall into this category, with the first "crime" on the list being vandalism and damage, at number six. Priorities for future action identified by the residents reflect this focus on quality of life issues.

Some 12.8% of respondents had been victims of crime in the last twelve months primarily in relation to vandalism, vehicle crime and burglary. Over half of the victims who reported the crimes to the police, were satisfied with the service that they received.

Just less than one-fifth of respondents feel that fear of crime affects their lifestyle, primarily in the middle age groups (45 to 64). 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. In addition, while concern may be high for a number of offence types, the proportion of respondents whose life is affected by fear of such crimes is relatively low. The message still needs to be reinforced that the Surrey Heath Borough area continues to be a very safe part of the country in which to live and work.

Just over a third of those surveyed identified areas where they feel particularly unsafe (46% in 2004). Camberley town centre area was cited by over half of those who answered this question (also identified in 2004), primarily due to drunken behaviour and groups of young people. Other main areas cited were Old Dean, Heatherside shops (again also highlighted in 2004) and Frimley Green recreation ground.

In addition, 16% stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour, and 40% of these incidents had taken place outside the individuals' home with many of the remainder taking place in town centre areas.

Awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme is relatively low, but this reflects national trends following the introduction of CCTV into any area. With regard to other community safety schemes, awareness of generic initiatives such as neighbourhood watch and crimestoppers is higher than for more local schemes. Of all of the listed initiatives, Pub watch was felt to be of least value.

Some 62% of respondents were satisfied with the local policing that they received, though this varied across the wards with a range of 44% to 80%.

With regard to the young people surveyed, they have a less positive view regarding community spirit in their areas and are slightly less satisfied than the residents group with the area in which they live. While they do have a more positive view regarding how the crime and disorder situation has changed than residents, there are a large number of "Don't knows".

Young people are generally more concerned about problems overall than respondents to the resident's survey, but significantly so in relation to litter, under age drinking, alcohol abuse, drug misuse, loud music and neighbour disputes. Concern for more "traditional" crimes such as burglary and vehicle crime is however lower for young people than the residents group

While victimisation of the young people's group is slightly higher than for the residents group, fear of crime is significantly lower. In addition to Old Dean and Camberley, the young people's group also identified parks and alleyways as areas which were perceived to be unsafe. It is not surprising therefore that there was a wish for better passage control and lighting.

The data suggests that young people (particularly boys) are not as active as they might perhaps be in taking positive action to prevent them becoming a victim of a crime. This is particularly the case in relation to protecting personal (high value) property such as mobile phones and MP3 players, checking caller identity and avoiding poorly lit areas.

The primary concerns of businesses are also traffic related problems but include burglary, damage and young people hanging around. While a quarter of business respondents had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months, only 4 (10%) said that they made any budgetary provision for the impact of crime.

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

- Strong focus on traffic related and road safety issues such as speeding and dangerous parking.
- The further reduction of crimes in the area, particularly vandalism, burglary and under age drinking.
- Environmental issues such as dog fouling litter and fly tipping.
- Re-doubling 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.
- Continued attention to the problem of anti-social behaviour across the Borough area, particularly in Camberley town centre.
- Addressing perceived safety concerns in park areas and alleyways.
- A focus on addressing the needs of young people as victims of crime, both actual and potential. This should include encouraging young people (particularly boys) to be more proactive in preventing themselves from becoming victims of crime.
- Targeted marketing and publicity of crime reduction opportunities and initiatives across the Borough area, particularly generic initiatives such as crimestoppers and property marking.
- Better marketing of and support for existing and new neighbourhood watch schemes.
- 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.

## **1. BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of perceptions of those living and working in the Surrey Heath 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. It is recognised however that many of the questions posed, the temporal bases and the analytical techniques used in previous surveys are different to those used in this survey. It is therefore not possible to carry out comparisons for these areas and this has limited the ability to carry out meaningful comparisons.

This report summarises the findings from the surveys based on a detailed analysis of the responses.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

Data for this survey has been drawn from three sources, namely surveys of a sample of residents, young people and businesses in the Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC) area.

### **2.1 Residents survey**

The residents' survey was carried out primarily 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 us by means of a freepost return. 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 3040 questionnaires were issued in June 2007.

The resident's survey was augmented by a one day street survey that took place in Camberley on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> July 2007. An additional 47 responses were gathered in this way.

In addition, the questionnaire was also available on the Surrey Heath Borough Council website for completion on line.

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

Views of young people were gathered using a variety of methods. Some 550 questionnaires each were issued to two schools in the area for them to distribute to pupils across the various year groups. These included filter questions which ensured that we only gathered the views of those young people who live in the Surrey Heath area. The remainder of the responses have not been ignored however and a separate short report will be produced which highlights key findings in relation to questions which are not geography specific, across the whole of the survey group.

In addition to the school survey, surveys have been issued to youth groups in the area and young people were particularly targeted through the street survey exercise outlined above.

### **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 Surrey Heath Borough Council and a total of 250 questionnaires were issued. Replies were again sent directly to us using freepost envelopes.

Copies of the questionnaires used in each of the surveys are found in the Appendices to this report.

### 3. RESIDENTS SURVEY FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Profile of respondents

The resident's survey is based on a sample of 782 residents comprising 722 from the postal survey, 13 from the website and 47 from the street survey. This gives a statistically significant sample to 95% (the industry standard) based on a population of 81,000, and clearly provides a representative sample

As noted above, a total of 722 postal surveys were returned which represents an overall response rate of 23.8% and this is an acceptable and statistically significant response rate.

Across the whole of the sample, some 42.1% of respondents were Male and 57.9% were Female so the gender split is, therefore, slightly more skewed towards female respondents.

Table 3.1 below shows the age and gender profile of respondents.

	<b>Under 24</b>	<b>24-44</b>	<b>45-64</b>	<b>65+</b>
<b>Male</b>	7.6%	23.1%	32.8%	36.5%
<b>Female</b>	8.8%	26.5%	35.3%	29.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	8.3%	25.1%	34.3%	32.3%

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

The latest survey shows that two-thirds of respondents were aged 45 and over and of these, a higher proportion were male respondents.

Just over 66% of respondents have lived in the area for over ten years, so this survey primarily represents the views of people well established in the community.

Some 10% of respondents have children aged up to 4 years, 11.5% have children aged 5 to 10 years and 12% have children aged 11 to 16.

Of the respondent group, the average number of adults per household is 2.2, with 58.6% of the respondent group living in houses where there are two adults.

Table 3.2 shows the response rates for each ward from the postal component of the survey.

WARD	2007 Survey
Bagshot	21.3%
Bisley	26.5%
Chobham	18.5%
Frimley	29.3%
Frimley Green	22.7%
Heatherside	23.7%
Lightwater	23.6%
Mytchett & Deepcut	20.9%
Old Dean	25.5%
Parkside	26.8%
St. Michael's	19.3%
St. Paul's	19.9%
Town	22.6%
Watchetts	29.1%
West End	24.3%
Windlesham	24.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23.8%</b>

**Table 3.2: Survey response rates by ward from the postal survey**

Response rates for Frimley and Watchetts were particularly impressive. The lowest response rate was from Chobham, with 18.5% of those surveyed responding, though this still provides an acceptable and statistically significant sample. Other than this, the 19.3% for St. Michael's and the 19.9% for St. Paul's, the rate did not dip below 20% for any ward and as a result, the sample is felt to be representative both as a whole and across each ward.

It was felt that those completing surveys online and those taking part in the street survey might not be aware of the ward in which they lived and they were therefore 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 these survey respondents live as shown in Table 3.3 below.

Postcode area	Number responding
GU15 – St. Michaels, Old Dean, St. Pauls, Camberley town, Watchetts, Parkside, Heatherside.	45
GU16 – Frimley, Frimley Green, Mytchett & Deepcut, Heatherside, Parkside	9
GU18 – Lightwater	4
GU19 – Bagshot	3
GU20 – Windlesham	1
GU24 – Bisley, Chobham, West End.	1

**Table 3.3: Residence of online and street survey respondents by postcode area.**

The small sample sizes for postcode areas GU18 through to GU24 should be borne in mind when considering the findings.

### 3.2 Views regarding local neighbourhoods

Respondents were asked how whether they felt there was a sense of community spirit in their neighbourhood.

WARD	Yes	No	Don't Know
Bagshot	47.7%	36.3%	16.0%
Bisley	77.1%	20.0%	2.9%
Chobham	62.1%	24.1%	13.8%
Frimley	36.1%	44.2%	19.7%
Frimley Green	55.1%	38.8%	6.1%
Heatherside	48.0%	36.0%	6.0%
Lightwater	67.2%	22.4%	10.4%
Mytchett & Deepcut	58.8%	29.4%	11.8%
Old Dean	25.6%	51.2%	23.2%
Parkside	39.3%	54.1%	6.6%
St. Michael's	48.6%	28.6%	22.8%
St. Paul's	53.7%	34.1%	12.2%
Town	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%
Watchetts	29.8%	52.6%	17.6%
West End	81.1%	10.8%	8.1%
Windlesham	76.9%	17.9%	5.2%
GU15	48.9%	42.2%	8.9%
GU16	66.7%	33.3%	-
GU18	75.0%	25.0%	-
GU19	33.3%	66.7%	-
GU20	100.0%	-	-
GU24	100.0%	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52.4%</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>

**Table 3.4: Respondent's views regarding community spirit**

Table 3.4 shows that just over half of all respondents feel that there is a sense of community spirit in their local neighbourhood, while just over one-third feel that there is not. There are significant variations across the wards. Those wards where there is felt to be most community spirit are:

- West End – 81.1% yes
- Bisley – 77.1% yes
- Windlesham – 76.9% yes
- Lightwater – 67.2% yes
- Chobham – 62.1% yes

In 2004 the greatest perceived community spirit was found in Windlesham, West End, Chobham, Bagshot and Town.

Those wards where community spirit is felt least are:

- Parkside – 54.1% no
- Watchetts – 52.6% no
- Old Dean – 51.2% no
- Frimley – 44.2% no

In 2004, the least perceived community spirit was in St. Michael's, Watchetts, Parkside and Old Dean.

Respondents were then asked how satisfied they were with the neighbourhood in which they live. The responses are summarised, by ward, in table 3.5 below.

WARD	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Very Dis-satisfied
Bagshot	22.7%	68.1%	6.8%	2.2%
Bisley	51.4%	45.7%	2.9%	-
Chobham	27.6%	69.0%	3.4%	-
Frimley	27.9%	68.9%	3.3%	-
Frimley Green	38.8%	55.1%	4.1%	2.0%
Heatherside	46.0%	50.0%	4.0%	-
Lightwater	32.8%	65.5%	1.7%	-
Mytchett & Deepcut	47.1%	41.1%	9.8%	-
Old Dean	25.6%	51.3%	20.5%	-
Parkside	29.5%	67.2%	3.3%	-
St. Michael's	17.1%	71.4%	8.6%	2.9%
St. Paul's	56.1%	41.5%	2.4%	-
Town	33.3%	60.6%	6.1%	-
Watchetts	19.3%	70.1%	10.5%	-
West End	29.7%	64.9%	5.4%	-
Windlesham	66.7%	28.2%	2.6%	2.6%
GU15	20.0%	66.7%	8.9%	4.4%
GU16	22.2%	66.7%	11.1%	-
GU18	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	-
GU19	33.3%	-	66.7%	-
GU20	100.0%	-	-	-
GU24	-	100.0%	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>

**Table 3.5: Satisfaction with neighbourhood, by ward**

This data is encouraging and shows that over one-third (34.3%) of respondents are very satisfied with the neighbourhood in which they live (24% in 2004) and more than nine out of ten respondents (92.6%) are either satisfied or very satisfied with the neighbourhood in which they live (83% in 2004).

Levels of satisfaction are highest in Windlesham, St. Paul's and Bisley wards.

Levels of dissatisfaction are highest in Old Dean, Watchetts and to a lesser extent Mytchetts and Deepcut though it is stressed that in the latter case, this relates to relatively small numbers only. Respondents from Old Dean and Watchetts also feel that there is little community spirit in their areas, relative to the rest of the Borough area.

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
Bagshot	4.5%	59.1%	11.4%	25.0%
Bisley	-	54.3%	28.6%	17.1%
Chobham	13.8%	62.1%	13.8%	10.3%
Frimley	13.1%	68.9%	4.9%	13.1%
Frimley Green	8.2%	55.1%	18.3%	18.4%
Heatherside	12.0%	56.0%	16.0%	16.0%
Lightwater	3.4%	63.8%	17.3%	15.5%
Mytchett & Deepcut	13.7%	52.9%	19.6%	13.8%
Old Dean	17.9%	46.2%	23.1%	12.8%
Parkside	4.9%	63.9%	14.8%	16.4%
St. Michael's	8.6%	60.0%	17.1%	14.3%
St. Paul's	14.6%	61.0%	9.8%	14.6%
Town	3.0%	66.7%	18.2%	12.1%
Watchetts	10.6%	47.4%	17.5%	24.5%
West End	-	51.4%	35.1%	13.5%
Windlesham	-	79.5%	12.8%	7.7%
GU15	2.2%	66.7%	20.0%	11.1%
GU16	22.2%	66.7%	-	11.1%
GU18	-	25.0%	75.0%	25.0%
GU19	-	66.7%	33.3%	-
GU20	-	100.0%	-	-
GU24	-	100.0%	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>

**Table 3.6: Perceptions of respondents regarding the change in the crime and disorder situation in the last twelve months.**

Table 3.6 shows that almost 60% of all respondents feel that the crime and disorder situation has not changed in the last twelve months, while 17% feel that it has worsened and just 7.9% feel that it has improved.

There are significant variations across the wards. Those wards where there is felt to be most improvement are Old Dean, St. Paul's, Chobham, Mytchett & Deepcut and Frimley while those felt to have worsened most are West End, Bisley and Old Dean.

The case of Old Dean is of interest in that it shows both a relatively high proportion of respondents who feel the crime and disorder situation has improved and a high proportion who feel that it has worsened. This suggests that there is a polarisation of views in the respondents from Old Dean and this is reinforced by the fact that the ward also has one of the lowest percentages of "don't knows".

When looking at why respondents felt that there had been an improvement the major reasons put forward is that there are fewer “youngsters hanging around” (26% of those answering this question) and PCSOs having a positive impact (also 26% of those answering question). Other reasons put forward are:

- It is quieter in the area now (10%)
- A greater police presence (10%)
- No burglaries in the area (6%)
- Less vandalism (6%)
- Less crime in the area (6%)

In relation to those who felt that the situation had worsened, the major reasons suggested were increased anti-social behaviour in the area (20% of those who answered this question) and more youngsters hanging around (18%). Other reasons put forward are:

- More burglaries in the area (15%)
- More crime generally in the area (10%)
- Increased vandalism (10%)
- An increase in speeding traffic (4%)

It is interesting to note that only a very small number of those who thought that the crime and disorder situation had worsened, blamed a lack of police presence.

### **3.3 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 is shown in Table 3.7 in rank order. Where it is possible to carry out a fair comparison, the result for 2004 is included.

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2004</b>
Speeding vehicles	42.2%	26.0%
Parking on pavements/verges	25.3%	29.0%
Young people hanging around	25.2%	31.0%
Dog fouling	20.1%	17.0%
Litter	18.5%	n/a
Vandalism and damage	18.2%	n/a
Under age drinking	16.8%	n/a
Other vehicle nuisance	15.7%	n/a
Burglary	15.5%	34.0%
Cycling on pavements	14.7%	n/a
Disorder in public places	13.4%	n/a
Alcohol abuse	13.4%	n/a
Vehicles broken into	13.2%	23.0%
Drug misuse (dealers and users)	10.0%	15.0%
Fly tipping	10.0%	n/a
Vehicles being stolen	7.5%	24.0%
Loud music/parties	6.3%	11.0%
Neighbours	5.4%	11.0%
Minor assault	4.6%	n/a
Empty, derelict buildings	4.2%	n/a
Abandoned vehicles	4.1%	12.0%
Street robbery	3.5%	n/a

**Table 3.7: Percentage of respondents who perceive major crime, neighbourhood and traffic problems.**

The five highest priorities are what might be seen as “quality of life” issues, with the first “crime” on the list being damage and vandalism, at number six. Even for this, however, only one in six of those surveyed feel that this is a major problem.

There is a high level of concern in relation to traffic-related issues with the top two concerns being speeding vehicles and parking on pavements. In addition, one in four respondents feel that there is a major problem with young people hanging around.

When the proportion of respondents who feel that an issue is a small problem is added the ranking list changes slightly, with greater concern in relation to litter, burglary, theft from vehicles, dog fouling and litter.

Where comparable data is available, this clearly shows that levels of major concern are lower in 2007 than in 2004 with the exception of speeding vehicles and dog fouling.

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

### **3.3.1 Speeding vehicles – Borough average 42.2 %**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Windlesham – 69.2%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 56.9%
- Chobham – 55.1%
- Watchetts – 50.9%

### **3.3.2 Parking on pavements and verges – Borough average 25.3%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 46.2%
- Windlesham – 41.0%
- St. Michaels – 34.3%
- Bagshot – 34.1%
- Frimley – 31.1%
- Parkside 31.1%

### **3.3.3 Young people hanging around – Borough average 25.2%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 51.3%
- Heatherside – 38.0%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 35.3%
- GU15 postcode area – 31.7%
- Frimley Green – 30.6%
- Town – 30.3%

### **3.3.4 Dog Fouling – Borough average 20.1%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 41.0%
- Frimley Green – 36.7%
- Bagshot – 29.5%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 27.5%
- St. Michael's – 25.7%

### **3.3.5 Litter – Borough average 18.5 %**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 38.5%
- St. Michael's – 25.7%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 25.5%
- Bagshot – 25.0%
- Town – 24.2%
- Windlesham – 23.1%
- Watchetts – 22.8%

### **3.3.6 Vandalism and damage – Borough average 18.2%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 41.0%
- GU15 postcode area – 29.3%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 27.4%
- West End – 24.3%
- St. Michael's – 22.9%

### **3.3.7 Under age drinking – Borough average 16.8%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- GU15 postcode area – 31.7%
- Old Dean – 25.6%
- Heatherside – 24.0%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 23.5%
- Frimley – 22.9%

### **3.3.8 Other vehicle nuisance – Borough average 15.7%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Bisley – 28.6%
- Town – 27.3%
- Chobham – 24.1%
- Windlesham – 23.0%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 19.6%

### **3.3.9 Burglary – Borough average 15.5%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Lightwater – 27.6%
- Windlesham – 25.6%
- Chobham – 24.1%

### **3.3.10 Cycling on pavements – Borough average 14.7%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Old Dean – 35.9%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 21.6%

### **3.3.11 Disorder in public places – Borough average 13.4%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- GU15 postcode area – 22.0%
- Old Dean – 20.5%
- Frimley Green – 18.4%
- Town – 18.2%

- Heatherside – 18.0%

### **3.3.12 Alcohol abuse – Borough average 13.4%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- GU15 postcode area – 26.8%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 21.5%
- Heatherside – 20.0%
- St. Michael's – 20.0%

### **3.3.13 Vehicles broken into – Borough average 13.2%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chobham – 20.7%
- GU15 postcode area – 19.5%
- Windlesham – 17.9%
- Mytchett & Deepcut – 17.6%

### **3.3.14 Drug misuse – Borough average 10.0%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- West End – 24.3%
- St. Michael's – 20.0%
- Old Dean – 17.9%
- Chobham – 17.2%

### **3.3.15 Fly tipping – Borough average 10.0%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chobham – 41.3%
- Bagshot – 25.0%
- St. Michael's – 17.1%
- Windlesham – 15.4%
- Old Dean – 15.4%
- Lightwater – 13.8%

### **3.3.16 Vehicles being stolen – Borough average 7.5%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Chobham – 17.2%
- Lightwater – 17.2%

### **3.3.17 Loud music/parties – Borough average 6.3%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- Mytchett & Deepcut – 17.6%
- GU15 postcode area – 17.0%

- St. Michael's – 11.4%

### **3.3.18 Neighbour nuisance – Borough average 5.4%**

The wards with the greatest level of expressed concern are:

- GU15 postcode area – 12.2%

The remaining 4 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 four categories are listed below. The data needs to be treated with some caution, however, as these relate to small numbers.

- Minor assault (4.6%)
  - West End 13.5%
- Empty/derelict buildings (4.2%)
  - St. Michael's 14.3%
  - Old Dean 12.8%
  - Town – 12.1%
- Abandoned vehicles (4.1%)
  - Old Dean 10.3%
- Street robbery (3.5%)
  - West End 10.8%
  - Frimley 8.2%

The wards of Old Dean and Mytchett & Deepcut appear most often in the above lists, indicating that the level of concern is greatest in those areas.

Just one ward, St. Paul's does not feature in the above lists and two wards feature once, namely Parkside and Bisley.

Respondents were asked if there were any other crime, neighbourhood or traffic problems, which they perceived in their areas. Many problems mentioned restate some of the issues listed above, notably obstructive parking and noise nuisance. Of the other problems, many offences were only highlighted by two or three respondents namely:

- Children playing football on streets (Old Dean)
- Mini motos and quad bikes racing on open ground (Bagshot & Frimley Green)
- Bogus callers
- Bonfires

While these relate to very small numbers of respondents, it should not be forgotten that strength of feeling about these issues was such that individuals felt compelled to comment specifically on them.

Finally, when asked to state their top three priorities for action, respondents across the whole of the survey suggested the following:

- First – Speeding vehicles
- Second – Parking
- Third - Young people hanging around

It is perhaps not a surprise that these reflect the top three concerns as described above. On a ward by ward basis, the top three priorities are as laid out in Table 3.8.

<b>WARD</b>	<b>Priority 1</b>	<b>Priority 2</b>	<b>Priority 3</b>
<b>Bagshot</b>	Speeding vehicles	Parking	Litter
<b>Bisley</b>	Speeding vehicles	Other vehicle nuisance	Parking
<b>Chobham</b>	Speeding vehicles	Parking	Fly tipping
<b>Frimley</b>	Speeding vehicles	Parking	Young people hanging around
<b>Frimley Green</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Parking
<b>Heatherside</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Litter
<b>Lightwater</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Parking
<b>Mytchett &amp; Deepcut</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Parking
<b>Old Dean</b>	Speeding vehicles	Vandalism & graffiti	Young people hanging around
<b>Parkside</b>	Speeding vehicles	Parking	Young people hanging around
<b>St. Michael's</b>	Young people hanging around	Parking	Speeding vehicles
<b>St. Paul's</b>	Speeding vehicles	Burglary	Vandalism & graffiti
<b>Town</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Burglary
<b>Watchetts</b>	Speeding vehicles	Parking	Abandoned vehicles
<b>West End</b>	Speeding vehicles	Theft from vehicles	Young people hanging around
<b>Windlesham</b>	Speeding vehicles	Young people hanging around	Parking

**Table 3.8: The top three suggested priority areas for action by ward.**

This clearly shows that for every ward except St. Michael's, speeding vehicles was the top priority. In the main, the priorities for most wards reflect the Borough wide priorities, though the ordering is sometimes different.

### **3.4 Victims of crime**

Some 12.8% of respondents had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months. Of these, 35% had been victims of vandalism, some 17% had been victims of theft from vehicle and 14% had been victim of a burglary.

Some 76% of victims had suffered a crime only once during the year, but 17% had been a victim twice and 6% had been a victim on 3 or more occasions. Of those who had been a victim more than once half 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.

Of those who had been victims, 81% reported the crime to police and 6% reported the crime to Surrey Heath Borough Council (primarily damage).

Just 11% did not report the crime and these related primarily to minor assaults and damage. Respondents were asked why they did not report but just 2 victims provided an answer. Both stated that they did not report for fear of retribution; both were victims of damage and both lived in Frimley ward.

In addition, 15 % of those who did report the crime, knew the offender and all except two of these told the police. The crimes were primarily damage, minor assault and intimidation.

Of those who did report the crime, 56% were satisfied with the service that they received from Surrey Police but 33% were not. The main criticism was that the police "did nothing" and in some cases did not attend. The remaining victims did not answer this question.

Finally, respondents were asked if they knew anyone who had been a victim of crime in the previous twelve months. Some 21% replied that they did so and of these, one-third said that they knew someone who had been a victim of burglary. The remainder said they knew people who had been victims of, primarily, damage, theft from vehicles and assault.

### **3.5 Fear of crime**

Just less than one-fifth (19.2%) of respondents stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle in some way and this comprises, 19.1% of male respondents and 19.2% of female respondents.

Age and gender analysis of respondents fearful becoming a victim of crime is of some interest.

	<b>Under 24</b>	<b>24-44</b>	<b>45-64</b>	<b>65+</b>
<b>Male</b>	4.0%	21.1%	25.9%	15.0%
<b>Female</b>	17.5%	15.8%	26.3%	14.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>26.1%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>

**Table 3.9: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, by age grouping.**

Table 3.9 clearly shows that fear of crime is focused in the middle age groups notably those aged 45 to 64. The differences in fear of crime between males and females in the under 24 and 24 to 44 age groups is of interest. In addition, the fear of crime in those aged 65 and over is relatively low compared to other age groups.

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

- Burglary – 41 % of those expressing concern about fear of crime
- Gangs of young people – 18% of those expressing concern about fear of crime
- Assault – 10% of those expressing concern about fear of crime
- Drunken behaviour – 6% of those expressing concern about fear of crime
- Robbery/Mugging – 5% of those expressing concern about fear of crime

In addition, 7% stated that they were not fearful of any specific crime, but just fearful of becoming a victim of crime generally.

From a gender perspective, a higher proportion of males (particularly older males) than females state that fear of becoming a victim of burglary affects their lifestyle. The reverse is true for all of the other categories.

Before too much is made of these figures, they are of interest when set against the context of the overall survey as Table 3.10 below illustrates.

	<b>% who feel it is a major problem</b>	<b>% who state fear affects their life</b>
Burglary dwelling	15.5	7.8
Assault	4.6	1.9
Robbery/Mugging	3.5	0.9
Gangs of young people	25.2	3.5

**Table 3.10: Proportion of total respondents who stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyle, compared to overall concern about crime.**

This clearly shows that while concern may be high for a number of offence types, the proportion of respondents whose life is affected by fear of such crimes is relatively low.

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

- 23% 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
- 19% said that fear of crime made them fearful or wary when out and about after dark, particularly in relation to young people hanging around.
- 18% stated that it made them very wary generally, when out and about.

From a geographical perspective, fear of crime seems to be most prevalent in:

- Town – 30.3% of respondents
- Frimley Green – 24.5%
- Lightwater – 24.1%
- Watchetts – 22.8%
- Heatherside – 22.0%

Respondents were then asked what the major contributory factors were to their fear of crime. Some 47% of those who said they were fearful cited the reporting of crime in the media as the main reason.

Some 9% stated that their fear was fuelled by the apparent level of crime in their area. 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 Old Dean, Town, Frimley Green and Heatherside.

Over a third (38%) of those who were fearful of crime suggested that the primary cause was their being a past victim. 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.

### **3.6 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 273 or just over one-third (34.9%) of all respondents answered this question compared to 46% in 2004 (some 658 respondents).

Half of those who answered this question (139 respondents) cited Camberley town centre as an area perceived to be unsafe primarily due to drunken behaviour and gangs of young people in the area. This was also mainly in the evening or at night. In 2004 some 175 respondents or 27% cited Camberley town centre, which indicates that many residents perceive that the area has become less safe in the last three years.

The other main problem areas identified are:

- Old Dean Estate (9.5% of those answering this question) – 6% in 2004
- Heatherside shops (5.1%) – 7% in 2004
- Frimley Green recreation ground (4.0%)

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

- Local shops
- Lightwater centre
- Park areas

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

Interestingly, Woking was perceived to be unsafe by some who answered this question, yet this lies outside the Surrey Heath Borough Council boundary.

### **3.7 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 16% of all respondents stated that they had been victims of anti-social behaviour in the last three years. Of these incidents:

- 34% had taken place during the last year
- 10% had taken place between 1 and 2 years ago
- 17% had taken place during the last three months

In addition, 19% said that these incidents happened all of the time and were ongoing.

In terms of location, 40% of the incidents took place outside the home of the respondents and the majority of these fell into three categories of verbal abuse, loud music/noise nuisance and minor vandalism. Of the remainder, the following areas were identified by five or more respondents:

- Camberley town centre (verbal abuse and threatening behaviour)
- Heatherside (verbal abuse)

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

- Verbal abuse – 21% of ASB victims
- Aggressive/threatening behaviour – 22% of ASB victims

The other categories identified by fewer respondents include:

- Drunken behaviour

- Noise nuisance
- Vandalism

In just over half of the cases (51%), the problem was not reported and the majority of the remainder were reported to the police only.

### 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 3.11 below highlights the percentage that felt that facilities needed improving.

Measure	
Closing passageways	10.6%
Better Lighting	26.7%
More Police patrol	63.7%
Design of buildings	10.4%

**Table 3.11: Percentage of respondents who believe measures need improving.**

Concern with regard to closure of passageways was greatest in Heatherside, Old Dean, Frimley Green and Frimley.

Concern with regard to better lighting was greatest in West End, Old Dean, Frimley Green, St. Michael's, Windlesham and Chobham.

Just less than two-thirds of all respondents would still like to see more police patrolling. This is particularly the case for West End, Old Dean and St. Michael's.

Concern with regard to new building design was greatest in Frimley Green.

Respondents were asked to suggest other crime prevention measures that might prove effective. Again, many of these reinforced those already considered and focused on more visible police patrol (i.e. walking around the area rather than patrolling in cars), more facilities for young people (particularly Mytchett & Deepcut) and the development of CCTV across the Borough.

Other suggestions put forward by at least 4 respondents were:

- Improved measures to reduce speeding
- Harsher sentencing
- Extension of neighbourhood watch

- Zero tolerance policing

### 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 3.12 below.

<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	39%
<b>% of those aware of CCTV scheme who think it will reduce crime</b>	56%
<b>% of those aware of CCTV scheme who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	36%
<b>% of those aware of CCTV scheme who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	61%

**Table 3.12: Perceptions with regard to the CCTV scheme**

The awareness of the scheme across the Borough is relatively low but particularly so in Bisley, Windlesham, Chobham, West End and Lightwater. In common with surveys in other parts of the country, there is less perceived impact on the fear of crime but greater perceived impact on the levels of and detection of crime.

There is slightly greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by male respondents than female (43% compared to 36%). In addition, there is greater awareness of and support for the CCTV scheme expressed by older male respondents, while awareness of the scheme by female respondents is similar across all age categories.

### 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	
<b>Community safety strategy</b>	5%
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	31%
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	69%
<b>Property marking</b>	19%
<b>Pub Watch</b>	20%
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	14%
<b>Vehicle crime awareness</b>	12%
<b>Victim support</b>	23%

**Table 3.13: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives**

Table 3.13 clearly shows that awareness of generic initiatives such as neighbourhood watch and crimestoppers is higher than for more local schemes.

In relation to awareness of Neighbourhood Watch, there are pockets where awareness remains much lower than the Borough average, notably Old Dean (39%), Mytchett & Deepcut (55%), Chobham (55%) and West End (59%). This might indicate those areas where efforts to develop Neighbourhood Watch could be targeted.

Only 5% of respondents are aware of the community safety strategy, despite the fact that it has now been in place for almost nine years. 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.

Of the above, 15% of those who were aware of Pub watch felt that it was of little value, while 2% of all respondents felt that none of the initiatives were of any use. In all other cases, the overwhelming view expressed was that the initiatives were of value.

### **3.11 Local Policing**

Respondents were then asked if they were satisfied with the local policing that they receive from their neighbourhood officers and PCSOs. A total of 62% stated that they were satisfied. Table 3.14 below summarises the results by ward area.

WARD	Satisfied
Bagshot	63.6%
Bisley	65.7%
Chobham	62.1%
Frimley	67.2%
Frimley Green	79.6%
Heatherside	72.0%
Lightwater	67.2%
Mytchett & Deepcut	49.0%
Old Dean	58.9%
Parkside	44.3%
St. Michael's	48.6%
St. Paul's	68.3%
Town	63.6%
Watchetts	61.4%
West End	62.2%
Windlesham	56.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61.9%</b>

**Table 3.14: Respondent's satisfaction with local policing.**

This shows that levels of satisfaction are greatest in Frimley Green, Heatherside and St. Paul's and lowest at Parkside, St. Michael's and Mytchett & Deepcut

The main reasons given for dissatisfaction were:

- Never see an officer or PCSO in the vicinity – 41% of those who expressed dissatisfaction
- Lack of visible presence on foot or bike – 36%
- Take too long to attend or do not attend at all – 5%

Of those who had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months (see section 3.4 above), just 52% were satisfied with local policing, compared to 63% of non-victims.

### **3.12 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 (%)
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	0.4	0.3	2.0	95.2	2.0
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	11.9	2.7	3.7	23.1	58.6
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	4.6	13.6	25.6	52.7	3.5
<b>Lock car when leaving it</b>	0.4	0.6	4.2	82.2	12.5
<b>Keep car keys safe at night</b>	1.9	2.8	5.8	76.5	13.0
<b>Active member of Neighbourhood watch</b>	19.9	3.7	6.3	13.3	56.8
<b>Ask neighbours to “keep an eye” on property.</b>	8.6	8.3	14.3	59.8	9.0

**Table 3.15: Action taken to reduce risk of becoming a crime victim.**

### **3.12.1 Locking home**

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. The 95% is comparable with the 97% from the 2004 survey.

### **3.12.2 Setting burglar alarms**

Some 59% of respondents noted that this measure was “not applicable” indicating that a high proportion do not have burglar alarms. Again there is little variation with regard to age or gender. A total of 23% always set their alarms when going out compared to 21% in 2004.

### **3.12.3 Checking caller’s identity**

Some 53% of respondents (36% in 2004) always check the identity of callers to their home (51% of male and 54% of female respondents). 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 exception of Bisley (34% always check caller identity), Frimley Green (47%), St. Michael’s (80%) and Mytchett & Deepcut (73%).

It is interesting to note that for those area expressing greatest concern regarding burglary in section 3.3.9 above (Lightwater, Windlesham and Chobham), there does not appear to be a disproportionate number of respondents who always check caller identity. At 48.3%, 53.8% and 51.% respectively, these are all close to the overall Borough average of 52.7%.

#### **3.12.4 Locking cars**

Again the majority of respondents always lock their cars when leaving them (82% compared to 86% in 2004). The 12.5% suggesting that this measure is not applicable indicates the level of non-car ownership. but there is little variation in terms of area and age.

#### **3.12.5 Keeping car keys safe**

Just over three-quarters of respondents always keep their car keys safe at night and again a much higher proportion of male respondents always keep the keys safe compared to female respondents.

#### **3.12.6 Active member of Neighbourhood Watch**

The fact that 57% of respondents suggest that this measure is not applicable and that a further 20% 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 Old Dean (85%), Bisley (71%), Chobham (69%) and St. Michael’s (69%). Conversely, the highest levels of active participation in neighbourhood watch are in St. Paul’s, Lightwater and Frimley Green.

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.

#### **3.12.7 Keeping an eye on property**

Some 60% always ask their neighbour to keep an eye on their property when leaving home for any length of time.

There is some gender variation, with 57% of male respondents stating that they always ask their neighbours to keep an eye on their property, compared to 62% of female respondents. 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 Bagshot (70%) and Mytchett & Deepcut (69%). Conversely the lowest proportions were in Town (45%), St. Michael’s (51%) and Chobham (52%).

### **3.13 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 and harsher sentencing. Others suggested by a minimum of 4 respondents were:

- Development of neighbourhood watch
- Make cold-calling an offence
- More community meetings with local police officers
- Extension of dispersal orders to more areas.

## 4 YOUNG PEOPLE'S SURVEY FINDINGS

### 4.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 1100 surveys were issued to schools in the area and 541 were returned giving a response rate of almost 50%. Respondents were asked to include their postcode on the questionnaire in order that we could ensure that we were taking into account the views of those who live in the Surrey Heath area.

Almost one-quarter of the questionnaires received did not include a postcode and therefore have to be discounted from this analysis. In addition, some 46 of the responses were from young people who live outside the Surrey Heath area and these have also been discounted. These responses have not been ignored however and a separate short report will be produced which highlights non geography specific key findings across the whole of the young people's survey group.

In addition a small number of surveys were received from youth groups in the area.

Overall, there is a total sample group of 368 of which 48% are male and 62% of all respondents were aged 13 or 14. The majority of respondents live in either the GU15 or GU16 postcode areas.

### 4.2 Views regarding local neighbourhoods

Table 4.1 shows whether or not the young people surveyed feel that there is a sense of community spirit in the area in which they live.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
<b>Young people's group</b>	37.8%	31.3%	30.9%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	52.4%	35.4%	12.2%

**Table 4.1: Young people's views regarding a sense of community spirit in their local neighbourhoods compared to resident's survey results.**

This suggests that young people have a less positive view regarding the community spirit in their areas than respondents in the resident's survey. There is a significantly higher proportion of "don't knows" in the young people's group however. There is no significant variation between the views of boys and girls with regard to community spirit.

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.

	<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>	27.1%	63.9%	7.1%	1.4%	0.5%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	34.3%	58.3%	6.4%	0.9%	-

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

Table 4.2 shows that the young people who responded are generally slightly less satisfied than the respondents to the resident's survey with the neighbourhood in which they live, though the difference is not significant. Again, there is no significant variation between the views of boys and girls with regard to satisfaction with the neighbourhood.

Table 4.3 shows that young people also have a more positive view regarding the crime and disorder situation than the general resident's survey respondents. Once again, there is no significant variation between the views of boys and girls.

	<b>Better</b>	<b>No change</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>Young people's group</b>	13.9%	47.8%	8.7%	29.6%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	7.9%	59.7%	17.0%	15.4%

**Table 4.3: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, young people compared to resident's survey.**

The main reasons put forward for improvement in the situation are less perceived crime and a greater police presence in the area. For those who felt that the situation had worsened, the main reason was felt to be more perceived incidents and crimes in the area.

### **4.3 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 4.4 in rank order.

	Young %	Residents %	Rank in residents survey
1. Speeding vehicles	31.8	42.2	1
2. Parking on pavements/verges	29.1	25.3	2
3. Litter	28.3	18.5	5
3. Young people hanging around	28.3	25.2	3
5. Dog fouling	24.5	20.1	4
6. Under age drinking	21.2	16.8	7
7. Vandalism and damage	18.5	18.2	6
8. Cycling on pavements	17.4	14.7	10
8. Alcohol abuse	17.4	13.4	12
10. Drug misuse (dealers and users)	14.9	10.0	14
11. Other vehicle nuisance	14.7	15.7	8
12. Loud music/parties	12.8	6.3	17
13. Burglary	11.7	15.5	9
14. Disorder in public places	11.1	13.4	11
15. Fly tipping	10.3	10.0	15
15. Neighbours	10.3	5.4	18
17. Vehicles broken into	9.5	13.2	13
18. Empty, derelict buildings	8.7	4.2	20
19. Minor assault	8.4	4.6	19
20. Abandoned vehicles	7.8	4.1	21
21. Street robbery	7.6	3.5	22
22. Vehicles being stolen	7.3	7.5	16

**Table 4.4: Perceived major problems by young people survey group compared to resident's group.**

When compared to the resident's survey it is clear that young people are generally more concerned about problems overall but significantly so in relation to litter, under age drinking, alcohol abuse, drug misuse, loud music and parties and neighbour disputes.

Concern is greater than the resident's survey in 17 of the 22 categories but it is interesting to note that concern regarding traditionally recognised crime categories such as burglary and vehicle crime is much lower in young people.

When rankings are considered, the top seven areas identified are the same for both the young people's and resident's surveys, though the ordering is slightly different.

There is slightly more concern expressed by boys than girls in relation to most categories (but not significantly so), but there is significantly greater concern expressed by boys regarding drug misuse, alcohol abuse, neighbour disputes and cycling on pavements.

When more minor problems are identified, there is more concern with vandalism and cycling on pavements and less in relation to traffic offences. Other than these, the ranking are broadly similar.

The top three priorities identified by the young people's group were:

- Speeding vehicles
- Dog fouling
- Litter

The top priority is the same as that in the resident's survey.

A small number of other problems were identified by the young people's survey and those identified by at least two respondents are:

- Sexual assault
- Under age smoking
- Arson
- Mini motos/quad bikes on open ground
- Bonfires

#### **4.4 Victims of crime**

Some 53 (14.4%) of the young people had been victims of crime in the last twelve months (11.4% male and 17.1% female) compared to 12.8% of the residents survey group. This is a slightly higher proportion but not significantly so.

Victims had primarily suffered the following crimes:

- Burglary – 23% of victims
- Damage/vandalism – 15%
- Assault – 11%
- Theft of bike – 11%
- Other theft – 10%
- Threatening behaviour/intimidation – 8%

Three quarters of victims had only suffered one crime in the last twelve months. For those who had been a victim on more than one occasion, the most prevalent crime category was burglary.

Just over two-thirds (68%) of the victims reported the crime to the police (60% male and 73% female). Of those who did not, the majority were for damage, threatening behaviour and bike theft. In one-third of cases the victim knew the offender, primarily in relation to assault and damage in three-quarters of these cases they told the police.

Of those who reported the crime, 44% were satisfied with the service that they received from the police compared to 56% of the resident's survey. Of those who were dissatisfied, most felt that the police were not interested and did nothing.

Some 22% of the young people respondents said that they knew someone who had been a victim of a crime, primarily burglary, assault and damage.

#### **4.5 Fear of crime**

Some 14.9% of young respondents stated that fear of crime affected their lifestyles in some way compared to 19.2% of the residents survey group. This was primarily in relation to gangs of young people, burglary and rape/sexual assault.

This resulted in those being fearful being generally wary and one-third stated that it made them fearful when going out, particularly after dark.

This fear of crime is primarily fuelled by the reporting of crime in the media (55%), being a past victim (27%) and the level of crime in their area (24%) but the small numbers means that this finding should be viewed with some caution.

#### **4.6 Perceived safety by Area**

Over one-third (37%) stated that there were locations in the Borough where they felt unsafe, compared to 34.9% of respondents to the resident's survey. The primary areas identified in the Borough were:

- Park areas – 24% of those identifying problem areas (8% in 2004)
- Old Dean – 20% (25% in 2004)
- Camberley town centre – 15% (15% in 2004)
- Alleyways – 13% (1% in 2004)
- Outside/near home – 7%

In 85% of the cases these relate to concerns during the evenings and hours of darkness. Clearly, young people are concerned about being out and about in open public spaces during evenings and at night. Two of the areas also feature in the resident's survey

Other areas identified by at least two respondents were:

- Woods
- Paddock Hill, Frimley
- Windmill Field

- School

The primary reason for fear of becoming a victim is the presence of gangs of young people particularly in park areas, rowdiness and a fear of being assaulted. In relation to alleyways a key concern was the lack of lighting and in relation to Old Dean many expressing concern said that it had a “bad reputation”. Concern in relation to park areas is fuelled the fact that they are isolated, and the presence of groups of young people is seen as a major factor behind concerns around individual’s homes.

#### 4.7 Anti-social behaviour

Only 26 of the young respondents or 7.1% stated that they had been victims of ASB compared to 16% of the resident’s survey group. In over half of these cases, the incidents took place outside or near the victims’ home and a quarter took place in Camberley town centre. This may reflect a view that young people perhaps have a higher tolerance of anti-social behaviour and a different perception of what it entails than the general resident population.

Incidents were primarily threatening behaviour, drunkenness, verbal abuse and vandalism. The very small numbers, however, means that the findings should be treated with some caution.

In 38% of the cases, the incident was not reported and the majority of these were threatening behaviour and verbal abuse.

#### 4.8 Crime prevention measures

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

	Young %	Residents %
<b>Close passageways</b>	29%	11%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	40%	27%
<b>More Police patrol</b>	46%	64%
<b>New building design</b>	34%	10%

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

Consistent with concerns expressed regarding alleyways and dark open spaces, significantly more young people than residents would like to see more alleyway control and better lighting (and a slightly higher proportion of girls than boys). It is interesting to note that the proportion of young people who would like to see more police patrol is much lower than the residents group.

When asked what other measures could be provided, over half of those who answered this question wanted to see more CCTV in the area. A small number also suggested tighter control of the sale of alcohol to young people and more measures to deal with speeding traffic. It is interesting that only 5 respondents suggested that there should be more facilities for young people.

#### 4.9 The CCTV scheme

Some 53.5% of the young people were aware of the scheme, compared to 39% of the resident's survey respondents. 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. This is consistent with the resident's survey.

#### 4.10 Other crime prevention initiatives

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

	Young %	Residents %
<b>Community Safety Strategy</b>	9	5
<b>Crimestoppers</b>	55	31
<b>Neighbourhood Watch</b>	65	69
<b>Property marking</b>	17	19
<b>Pub Watch</b>	20	20
<b>Bogus Caller Initiative</b>	8	14
<b>Vehicle Crime Awareness</b>	25	12
<b>Victim support</b>	31	23

**Table 4.6: Awareness of crime prevention initiatives compared to residents survey**

The awareness of most of the initiatives is greater for the young people's group than for the resident's survey group. Lower awareness of the bogus caller initiative is perhaps to be expected given the target group for this activity.

The initiative which was felt to be of least value was Pub Watch (21% of those who were aware of the initiative), the same as for the residents survey and to a lesser extent the bogus caller initiative.

With regard to the local policing of their area and satisfaction with the local policing that they receive from their neighbourhood officers and PCSOs, a total of 73% stated that they were satisfied, compared to 62% of the resident's survey group. The major reasons for dissatisfaction were:

- Never see a police officer or PCSO – 39% of those dissatisfied
- Lack of "accessible" police presence on foot/on bike – 19%

- Slow/non response – 10%

#### 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 (%)
<b>Protect personal property when out</b>	10.6	17.4	23.9	41.3	6.8
<b>Only go out in groups</b>	9.5	34.8	32.9	16.0	6.8
<b>Make sure someone knows where you are</b>	4.1	9.2	18.2	63.0	5.4
<b>Lock up when leaving home</b>	4.3	7.6	11.4	66.3	10.3
<b>Set burglar alarm when leaving home</b>	42.4	10.1	8.4	12.0	27.1
<b>Check identity of any caller</b>	25.8	20.9	15.5	25.0	12.8
<b>If over 17 and a car owner, lock car when leaving it</b>	2.2	0.3	0.5	4.9	92.1
<b>Avoid poorly lit areas</b>	13.3	20.7	24.2	29.6	12.2

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

##### **4.11.1 Protecting personal property**

Less than half of the young people responding always protect their personal property (i.e. mobile phones, MP3 players etc) though girls are more likely to do so than boys. This might suggest that there is a need to reinforce messages around the need to protect personal property to young people and particularly boys.

##### **4.11.2 Going out in groups**

Almost half of respondents only go out in groups (for feelings of security). Of these 22% of girls always go out in groups compared to just 9% of boys. This reinforces earlier views expressed about vulnerability and safety in certain areas. There is no significant variation across the postcode areas.

#### **4.11.3 Letting people know where you are**

Almost two-thirds of respondents always make sure someone knows where they are when they are out and again this is true for a greater proportion of girls (69%) than boys (56%). A higher proportion of young people in the GU18 (Lightwater) and GU20 (Windlesham) postcode areas let people know where they are, than other areas.

#### **4.11.4 Locking home**

Some 66% of the young people's group always lock their home if they go out when no-one else is home. This compares to 95% of the residents group and suggests that this might be an area for attention. Again, girls are more likely to lock their home (74%) compared to boys (58%).

#### **4.11.5 Setting burglar alarms**

This data would suggest that young people are not often asked to set burglar alarms in the home, where they exist. The 27% of respondents who said that this measure was "not applicable" and 42% who said that they never set the alarm might indicate that a high proportion do not have burglar alarms.

#### **4.11.6 Checking caller's identity**

Just 25% of respondents always check the identity of callers to their home compared to 53% of the resident's survey group. This comprises 26% of male and 24% of female respondents indicating that this is an issue for young people as a whole.

To reinforce this point 26% of the young peoples group never check the identity of any caller (23% of boys and 28% of girls) compared to just 5% of the residents survey group.

It is interesting that 32% of young people who have been victims of crime always check caller identity compared to 23% of non-victims.

#### **4.11.7 Locking cars**

The age profile of the survey group meant that very few answered this question but for those who were aged 17 or over and who were car owners, 62% always lock their car when leaving it. The very small numbers however mean that this should be treated with some caution.

#### **4.11.8 Avoiding poorly lit areas**

Reflecting concerns expressed by some about poorly lit areas and fear of crime/intimidation after hours of darkness over half of the young people's group often avoid poorly lit areas, while only 13% never do so. While 36% of female respondents always avoid poorly lit areas, just 23% of male respondents do. Again this reflects earlier findings regarding perceived vulnerability and areas felt to be unsafe.

Finally, respondents were asked to suggest other measures to improve safety and reduce victimisation. Most of the responses reflected those areas already identified, particularly in relation to more police, greater police visibility, better lighting and CCTV development. Other measures suggested by a small number related to improved home security such as chains on doors, better alarm systems and even buying guard dogs.

## 5. SURVEY OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

### 5.1 Profile of respondents

A total of 41 questionnaire responses were received or 16.4% of those issued. While this may be somewhat disappointing, it is recognised that the response of the business sector generally to such surveys is often limited. On a more optimistic note, this may reflect the relative lack of concern that the business community has regarding crime and associated problems in the area. It may, however, also reflect the relatively low priority that businesses have traditionally given to crime and community safety in the past.

Table 5.1 below shows the composition of the sample group by sector.

<b>SECTOR</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Retail</b>	14.6%
<b>Industrial</b>	14.6%
<b>Service</b>	65.9%
<b>Other</b>	4.9%

**Table 5.1: Survey sample by sector**

This shows that the service sector is more heavily represented than any other in the sample group, comprising two-thirds of the group.

Some 59% of business survey respondents have been in the area for more than ten years, 44% of the business survey respondents employ 10 people or less and a further 44% employ 11 to 25 people. The survey is dominated therefore by relatively small service sector businesses who have been in the area for a considerable time.

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.

Postcode area	Number responding
<b>GU15 – St. Michael’s, Old Dean, St. Pauls, Camberley town, Watchetts, Parkside, Heatherside</b>	16
<b>GU16 – Frimley, Frimley Green, Mytchett &amp; Deepcut, Heatherside, Parkside</b>	8
<b>GU18 – Lightwater</b>	2
<b>GU19 – Bagshot</b>	5
<b>GU20 – Windlesham</b>	1
<b>GU24 – Bisley, Chobham, West End.</b>	9

**Table 5.2: Location of business respondents**

This shows that three areas dominate (GU15, 16 and 24) with almost 40% of respondents being located in the GU15 area.

## 5.2 The business and the neighbourhood

Just 7 (17%) of business respondents said that they were involved in some way with the community in the neighbourhood in which they operated. When asked how, one did not respond and the 6 remaining businesses provided 6 different responses, namely:

- Charity shop
- Business club
- Donation of a police car
- Support for charity events
- Public house
- Nursery school

In addition, 88% of all respondents said that the neighbourhood in which their business was sited was a pleasant place in which to operate a business.

Table 5.3 shows business respondents views regarding the crime and disorder situation compared to the resident’s survey respondents. Some 78% answered “Don’t know” and hence there is little that can be drawn from this question. It may however indicate a sense of distance/dislocation between business owners and the areas in which the businesses operate.

	Better	No change	Worse	Don't know
<b>Business group</b>	-	19.5%	2.4%	78.0%
<b>Resident's survey</b>	7.9%	59.7%	17.0%	15.4%

**Table 5.3: Views regarding the crime and disorder situation, businesses compared to resident's survey.**

### 5.3 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.

	Business %	Residents %	Rank in residents survey
1. Speeding vehicles	31.7	42.2	1
2. Parking on pavements/verges	19.5	25.3	2
3. Burglary	17.1	15.5	9
3. Other vehicle nuisance	17.1	15.7	8
5. Vandalism and damage	14.6	18.2	6
5. Litter	14.6	18.5	5
7. Young people hanging around	12.2	25.2	3
7. Drug misuse (dealers and users)	12.2	10.0	14
7. Fly tipping	12.2	10.0	15
10. Cycling on pavements	9.8	14.7	10
11. Vehicles broken into	7.3	13.2	13
11. Empty, derelict buildings	7.3	4.2	20
13. Abandoned vehicles	4.9	4.1	21
13. Dog fouling	4.9	20.1	4
15. Alcohol abuse	2.4	13.4	12
15. Disorder in public places	2.4	13.4	11
15. Neighbours	2.4	5.4	18
18. Loud music/parties	-	6.3	17
18. Minor assault	-	4.6	19
18. Under age drinking	-	16.8	7
18. Street robbery	-	3.5	22
18. Vehicles being stolen	-	7.5	16

**Table 5.4: Perceived major problems by business survey group compared to resident's group.**

Consistent with each of the other surveys, the key concerns are speeding vehicles and illegal or obstructive parking. All of the top 7 (with the possible exception of burglary) could be viewed as problems which might affect trade, such as litter, young people hanging around and traffic i.e. speeding and parking problems.

Comparison with the ranking of the resident's survey is interesting and shows significantly less concern for businesses in relation to such issues as dog fouling and under age drinking.

The proportion of respondents who perceive small problems is broadly in line with the ranking of major problems though fly tipping and dog fouling are identified as areas of some concern.

The top three priorities for attention identified by the business group were:

- Speeding vehicles
- Burglary
- Damage

The top priority is the same as that in the residents and young people's surveys and the priorities clearly reflect the major concerns expressed by the business group.

#### **5.4 Business specific problems**

Businesses were then asked if they perceived any problems in the area, in which they were sited, specific to business. Only three issues were raised as significant concerns, namely damage, industrial theft and shop theft and this is likely to reflect the nature of the sample group. A number of small problems have emerged however:

- Damage - 22%
- Fraud – 15%
- Industrial theft – 12%
- Threat of violence – 7%

#### **5.5 Victims of crime**

Some 27% of businesses interviewed had been a victim of crime in the last twelve months. Of those businesses who had been a victim of crime, one-third had been victim of burglary. The rest of the victims had suffered from such offences as damage, theft from vehicles and shop theft. Only one victim did not report the crime.

#### **5.6 Fear of crime**

Just 1 of the businesses responding felt that fear of crime was having an impact on trade though again this may be a reflection of the nature of the sample group.

## 5.7 Crime prevention measures

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

	<b>Business %</b>	<b>Residents %</b>
<b>Close passageways</b>	5%	11%
<b>Better Lighting</b>	37%	27%
<b>More Police patrol</b>	71%	64%
<b>New building design</b>	22%	10%

**Table 5.5: Crime prevention measures that need to be improved, business survey compared to residents survey.**

These results clearly show a greater wish for better lighting and more police than the residents group. In terms of other measures, some 5% of those surveyed requested more visible police patrol and 7% also suggested that there should be an extension of the CCTV scheme.

## 5.8 The CCTV scheme

Business 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.

	<b>2007</b>
<b>Those aware of CCTV</b>	39%
<b>% who think it will reduce crime</b>	56%
<b>% who think it will reduce fear of crime</b>	38%
<b>% who think it will increase detection of crime</b>	81%

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

Table 5.6 shows that significantly fewer business respondents are aware of the CCTV scheme than the residents group. Views of those who are aware of the scheme in relation to the impact on crime, fear of crime and detection are consistent with the other two survey groups, though significantly more business respondents feel that CCTV is having an impact on the detection of crime.

### 5.9 Business specific crime prevention issues

Respondents were asked approximately how much funding, if any, they provided for crime prevention in their business. Some 76% of those surveyed answered this question and of these, 87% stated that they provided nothing. Of the rest, responses were 5% of turnover, 1% of turnover, 1% of profit and the cost of the security system.

Businesses were then asked if they expected to provide for the costs of crime in the future and if so, how much? Only 6 businesses (14%) stated that they expected to make provision in the future

Of those who did intend to provide in the future, only a small number were able or prepared to put a value on the provision. The most common value stated was 2% of profit but again this relates to very small numbers of businesses.

### 5.10 Impact of crime on staff

Some 63% of those interviewed stated that they did take steps to encourage staff to reduce opportunities for crime in the workplace.

Of these, it appears that many do little more than encourage staff to be watchful and vigilant. Others (60%) encourage staff to secure the premises at night and lock all valuables away. None of the respondents state that they train staff in security and crime prevention issues.

Just 8 business respondents suggested that crime in the workplace had an impact on staff. Of these, many did not state how they felt staff were impacted, though one quarter felt that staff morale had been affected.

### 5.11 Self monitoring

Some 34% of business respondents indicated that they had some form of internal CCTV system to prevent crime. Of these, 86% were monitored in-house and just 1 stated that the system was not monitored **at all**.

# **APPENDIX A**

Please tick boxes as appropriate.

**SECTION 1 – YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**Q1.1** Do you think that there is a sense of “community spirit” in your neighbourhood?

Yes	
No	
Don't know	

**Q1.2** Overall, how satisfied are you with living in your neighbourhood?

Very satisfied	
Satisfied	
Dissatisfied	
Very dissatisfied	

**Q1.3** Overall, how do you feel that the crime and disorder situation has changed in your neighbourhood in the last 12 months?

Improved	
No change	
Worse	
Don't know	

Please state why you feel this. \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.4** Below is a list of crime related and neighbourhood problems. Do you feel that any of these are a problem to you personally *in your neighbourhood?*

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Major Problem</b>	<b>Small Problem</b>	<b>Not a Problem</b>
<b><u>CRIME</u></b>			
Assault			
Burglary			
Drug misuse (dealers and users)			
Street Robbery			
Vandalism & graffiti			
Vehicles being broken into			
Vehicles being stolen			
<b><u>NEIGHBOURHOOD PROBLEMS</u></b>			
Alcohol abuse			
Cycling on pavements			
Disorder in public places			
Dog fouling			
Empty, derelict or boarded up buildings			
Fly tipping			
Litter			
Loud music/parties			
Neighbours			
Under age drinking			
Young people hanging around			
<b><u>TRAFFIC PROBLEMS</u></b>			
Speeding vehicles			

Other vehicle nuisance			
Abandoned vehicles			
Parking on pavements/verges			

Are there any other crime related or neighbourhood problems *in your neighbourhood*, which are not listed? If so, please state.

---



---



---

Which of the above problems, do you think are the top 3 priorities, if any?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.5** Have you been a victim of **crime in your neighbourhood in the last twelve months?**

Yes  No

**Q1.6** If you answered "No" to Q1.5, please go to Q1.12. If you answered "Yes" to Q1.5, please state (a) the type(s) of crime and (b) number of times you have been a victim in the last twelve months.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.7** Did you report the crime?

Yes to Police  Yes to Surrey Heath Borough Council  No

Yes to another organisation (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.8** Did you know who committed the crime?

Yes  No

**Q1.9** If you answered yes to Q1.8, did you tell those who you reported it to, who you thought it was?

Yes  No

**Q1.10** If you answered "No" to Q1.9, please state why.

---



---

**Q1.11** Were you satisfied by the service provided by those who you reported the problem to, in dealing with this and if not, please state why?

---

---

**Q1.12** Has anyone you know been a victim of **crime in your neighbourhood in the last twelve months** and if so, of what?

Yes

No

---

---

**Q1.13** Does fear of **crime in your neighbourhood** affect your lifestyle in any way?

Yes

No

**Q1.14** If your answer to Q1.13 was “No”, please go to Q1.16. If your answer to Q1.13 was “Yes”, please state (a) what type of crime you are fearful of and (b) how this fear affects your lifestyle.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.15** Is your fear of becoming a victim of crime influenced by: (you may tick more than one box).

The apparent level of crime in your area	
Crime and incidents reported on the TV/Radio or in Newspapers	
Police drama on the TV	
Being a victim of crime in the past	
The lack of victim support available	

Is there any other influencing factor? (Please state).

---

**Q1.16** Are there any places in this Borough where you feel either particularly unsafe? If so, please state (a) where, (b) why and (c) whether there is a specific day or time that you feel unsafe.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.17** If you or anyone in your household has suffered from **anti-social behaviour** in the Borough in the last three years, please state where and when and describe the type of behaviour involved.

Where \_\_\_\_\_ When \_\_\_\_\_

Behaviour \_\_\_\_\_

---

Was it reported and if so, who to? \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2 – PREVENTION OF CRIME & ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

**Q2.1** Below is a list of measures, which may help to reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour to be committed. Please tick one box per line depending upon whether you think that the particular measure is adequate *in your neighbourhood*, whether it could be improved or is not applicable.

	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Needs Improving</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Closing passage ways			
Lighting in streets and public places			
Local police patrols			
Security and design of new buildings in residential areas.			

**Q2.2** Are there any measures not listed, which you feel would help to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour to be committed, *in your area*?

---



---

**Q2.3** Are you aware of the CCTV scheme in the Surrey Heath Borough area?

Yes  No

**Q2.4** If you are aware of the CCTV scheme, do you think that it has had an impact on: (you may tick more than one box)

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The levels of crime		
Fear of becoming a victim of crime		
The detection of crime		

**Q2.5** Which of the following crime prevention schemes, which have recently been running or are still running in the Surrey Heath Borough area, are you aware of?

Surrey Heath Borough community safety strategy	
Crimestoppers	
Neighbourhood Watch	
Property security marking	
Pub Watch	
Bogus Caller Initiative	
Vehicle Crime Awareness	
Victim support	

**Q2.6** Do you think that any of the above schemes are of little value, and if so, which ones?

---



---

**Q2.7** Are you pleased with the local policing that you receive from you neighbourhood officers/police community support officers?

Yes

No

If you answered “No” please state why.

---

**Q2.8** How often do you take the following measures to avoid becoming a victim of a crime?

	Never	Some-times	Usually	Always	Not Applic.
Lock up your home when you go out					
Set a burglar alarm when you go out					
Check the identity of any caller to your home					
Lock your car when leaving it					
Keep your car keys safe at night					
Active member of neighbourhood watch					
Ask your neighbours to “keep an eye” on your property when you are away					

**Q2.9** Are there any specific actions you can suggest which would reduce any fear you may have of you or a member of your household becoming a victim of crime?

---



---



---

### **SECTION 3 – BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Q3.1** Are you?

Male

Female

**Q3.2** Into which age category do you fit?

16 or under	
17-18	
19-23	
24-34	
35-44	
45-54	
55-64	
65 or over	

**Q3.3** How long have you lived in your area?

Less than 1 year	
1-5 years	
6-10 years	
Over 10 years	

**Q3.4** Do you have any children of the following age groups living with you?

0-4	
5-10	
11-16	

**Q3.5** How many adults live in the household in total? \_\_\_\_\_

If you feel that you would like to make further comments on any of the issues covered by the questionnaire, or feel that the questionnaire has not covered any issue about which you are concerned, please use the space provided below and over the page.

---

---

---

If you would like us to respond to any concern, which you have raised, please write your name and address below:

---

---

---

**THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ASSIST IN THIS SURVEY**

If you have any queries regarding this survey, please contact Jacqui Newson, Policy Officer at Surrey Heath Borough Council on 01276 707154 or [jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk](mailto:jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk)

**Please return the survey in the enclosed FREEPOST envelope by Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2007**

**NO STAMP IS REQUIRED.**

# **APPENDIX B**

**YOUNG PEOPLE'S SURVEY**

Please tick boxes as appropriate.

**SECTION 1 – YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**Q1.1** Do you think that there is a sense of “community spirit” in your neighbourhood?

Yes	
No	
Don't know	

**Q1.2** Overall, how satisfied are you with living in your neighbourhood?

Very satisfied	
Satisfied	
Dissatisfied	
Very dissatisfied	

**Q1.3** Overall, how do you feel that the crime and disorder situation has changed in your neighbourhood in the last 12 months?

Improved	
No change	
Worse	
Don't know	

Please state why you feel this.

---



---

**Q1.4** Below is a list of crime related and neighbourhood problems. Do you feel that any of these are a problem to you personally *in your neighbourhood?*

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Major Problem</b>	<b>Small Problem</b>	<b>Not a Problem</b>
<b><u>CRIME</u></b>			
Assault			
Burglary			
Drug misuse (dealers and users)			
Street Robbery			
Vandalism & graffiti			
Vehicles being broken into			
Vehicles being stolen			
<b><u>NEIGHBOURHOOD PROBLEMS</u></b>			
Alcohol abuse			
Cycling on pavements			
Disorder in public places			
Dog fouling			
Empty, derelict or boarded up buildings			
Fly tipping			
Litter			
Loud music/parties			
Neighbours			
Under age drinking			
Young people hanging around			
<b><u>TRAFFIC PROBLEMS</u></b>			

Speeding vehicles			
Other vehicle nuisance			
Abandoned vehicles			
Parking on pavements/verges			

Are there any other crime related or neighbourhood problems *in your neighbourhood*, which are not listed? If so, please state.

---



---



---

Which of the above problems, do you think are the top 3 priorities, if any?

4. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5. \_\_\_\_\_  
 6. \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.5** Have you been a victim of **crime in your neighbourhood in the last twelve months?**

Yes  No

**Q1.6** If you answered “No” to Q1.5, please go to Q1.12. If you answered “Yes” to Q1.5, please state (a) the type(s) of crime and (b) number of times you have been a victim in the last twelve months.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.7** Did you report the crime?

Yes to Police  Yes to Surrey Heath Borough Council  No

Yes to another organisation (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.8** Did you know who committed the crime?

Yes  No

**Q1.9** If you answered yes to Q1.8, did you tell those who you reported it to, who you thought it was?

Yes  No

**Q1.10** If you answered “No” to Q1.9, please state why.

---



---

**Q1.11** Were you satisfied by the service provided by those who you reported the problem to, in dealing with this and if not, please state why?

---



---

**Q1.12** Has anyone you know been a victim of **crime in your neighbourhood in the last twelve months** and if so, of what?

Yes  No

---



---

**Q1.13** Does fear of **crime in your neighbourhood** affect your lifestyle in any way?

Yes  No

**Q1.14** If your answer to Q1.13 was “No”, please go to Q1.16. If your answer to Q1.13 was “Yes”, please state (a) what type of crime you are fearful of and (b) how this fear affects your lifestyle.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.15** Is your fear of becoming a victim of crime influenced by: (you may tick more than one box).

The apparent level of crime in your area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Crime and incidents reported on the TV/Radio or in Newspapers	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police drama on the TV	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being a victim of crime in the past	<input type="checkbox"/>
The lack of victim support available	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is there any other influencing factor? (Please state).

---

**Q1.16** Are there any places in this Borough where you feel either particularly unsafe? If so, please state (a) where, (b) why and (c) whether there is a specific day or time that you feel unsafe.

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.17** If you or anyone in your household has suffered from **anti-social behaviour** in the Borough in the last three years, please state where and when and describe the type of behaviour involved.

Where \_\_\_\_\_ When \_\_\_\_\_

Behaviour \_\_\_\_\_

---

Was it reported and if so, to who? \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2 – PREVENTION OF CRIME & ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

**Q2.1** Below is a list of measures, which may help to reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour to be committed. Please tick one box per line depending upon whether you think that the particular measure is adequate *in your neighbourhood*, whether it could be improved or is not applicable.

	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Needs Improving</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Closing passage ways			
Lighting in streets and public places			
Local police patrols			
Security and design of new buildings in residential areas.			

**Q2.2** Are there any measures not listed, which you feel would help to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour to be committed, *in your area*?

---



---

**Q2.3** Are you aware of the CCTV scheme in the Surrey Heath Borough area?

Yes  No

**Q2.4** If you are aware of the CCTV scheme, do you think that it has had an impact on: (you may tick more than one box)

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The levels of crime		
Fear of becoming a victim of crime		
The detection of crime		

**Q2.5** Which of the following crime prevention schemes, which have recently been running or are still running in the Surrey Heath Borough area, are you aware of?

Surrey Heath Borough community safety strategy	
Crimestoppers	
Neighbourhood Watch	
Property security marking	
Pub Watch	
Bogus Caller Initiative	
Vehicle Crime Awareness	
Victim support	

**Q2.6** Do you think that any of the above schemes are of little value, and if so, which ones?

---



---

**Q2.7** Are you pleased with the local policing that you receive from you neighbourhood officers/police community support officers?

Yes

No

If you answered “No” please state why.

**Q2.8** How often do you take the following measures to avoid becoming a victim of a crime?

	Never	Some-times	Usually	Always	Not Applic.
Protect your mobile phone, MP3 player when out and about.					
Only go out in groups					
Make sure that someone knows where you are.					
If you are the only one in, lock up your home when you go out					
If you are the only one in, set a burglar alarm when you go out					
Check the identity of any caller to your home					
If you are over 17 and drive, lock the car when leaving it					
Avoid poorly lit areas when alone					

**Q2.9** Are there any specific actions you can suggest which would reduce any fear you may have of you or a member of your household becoming a victim of crime?

---



---



---

**SECTION 3 – BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Q3.1** Are you?

Male

Female

**Q3.2** Into which age category do you fit?

11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

**Q3.3** How long have you lived in your area?

Less than 1 year	
1-5 years	
6-10 years	
Over 10 years	

**Q3.4** Please state your postcode \_\_\_\_\_

If you feel that you would like to make further comments on any of the issues covered by the questionnaire, or feel that the questionnaire has not covered any issue about which you are concerned, please use the space provided below and over the page.

---

---

---

If you would like us to respond to any concern, which you have raised, please write your name and address below:

---

---

---

**THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ASSIST IN THIS SURVEY**

If you have any queries regarding this survey, please contact Jacqui Newson, Policy Officer at Surrey Heath Borough Council on 01276 707154 or [jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk](mailto:jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk)

**Please return the survey in the enclosed FREEPOST envelope by Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2007**

**NO STAMP IS REQUIRED.**

# **APPENDIX C**

**BUSINESS SURVEY**

This questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes of your time to complete.

**SECTION 1 – YOUR BUSINESS AND YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**Q1.1** Is your business involved with the community in your neighbourhood?

Yes  No

If yes, please state how \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.2** Is your neighbourhood a pleasant place to run your business?

Yes  No

**Q1.3** Below is a list of crime related and neighbourhood problems. Do you feel that any of these are a problem *where your business is located*?

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Major Problem</b>	<b>Small Problem</b>	<b>Not a Problem</b>
<b><u>CRIME</u></b>			
Assault			
Burglary			
Drug misuse (dealers and users)			
Street Robbery			
Vandalism & graffiti			
Vehicles being broken into			
Vehicles being stolen			
<b><u>NEIGHBOURHOOD PROBLEMS</u></b>			
Alcohol abuse			
Cycling on pavements			
Disorder in public places			
Dog fouling			
Empty, derelict or boarded up buildings			
Fly tipping			
Litter			
Loud music/parties			
Neighbours			
Under age drinking			
Young people hanging around			
<b><u>TRAFFIC PROBLEMS</u></b>			
Speeding vehicles			
Other vehicle nuisance			
Abandoned vehicles			
Parking on pavements/verges			

Do you think that there are any other crime or neighbourhood related problems *where your business is located*, which are not listed? If so, please state.

---



---

**Q1.4** Which, if any, of these crimes do you perceive to be a problem to businesses in the area in which your business is located?

	<b>Major problem</b>	<b>Small problem</b>	<b>Not a problem</b>
Actual violence to staff			
Threat of violence to staff			
Criminal damage			
Fraud			
Industrial theft			
Internal theft			
Shop theft (shoplifting)			
Other (Please specify)			

Which of the above problems listed in Q1.3 and Q1.4 do you think are the top 3 priorities, if any?

7. \_\_\_\_\_  
 8. \_\_\_\_\_  
 9. \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.5** Has your business been a victim of crime in the last twelve months?

Yes  No

**Q1.6** If you answered “No” to Q1.5, please go to Q1.9. If you answered “Yes” to Q1.5, please state the type(s) of crime of which you were a victim.

---



---

**Q1.7** Did you report the crime?

Yes to Police  Yes to Surrey Heath Borough Council  No

Yes to another organisation (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Q1.8** If you did not report the crime, please state why.

---



---

**Q1.9** Do you feel that the fear of crime has had an adverse effect on business in your area?

Yes  No

**Q1.10** If your answer to Q1.9 was “No”, please go to Section 2. If your answer to Q1.9 was “Yes”, please state how you feel the fear of crime affects business in your area.

---



---



---

**Q1.11** Overall, how do you feel that the crime and disorder situation has changed in the *neighbourhood in which your business is located*, the last 12 months?

Improved	
No change	
Worse	
Don't know	

Please state why you feel this.

---



---

**SECTION 2 – PREVENTION OF CRIME**

**Q2.1** Below is a list of measures which may help to reduce opportunities for crimes to be committed. Please tick one box per line depending upon whether you think that the particular measure is adequate *in the area in which your business is located*, whether it could be improved or is not applicable.

	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Needs Improving</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Closing passage ways			
Lighting in streets and public places			
Local police patrols			
Security and design of new buildings in residential areas.			

**Q2.2** Are there any measures not listed which you feel would help to reduce the opportunities for crime to be committed, *in the area in which your business is located*?

---



---

**Q2.3** Are you aware of the CCTV scheme in the Surrey Heath Borough area?

Yes

No

**Q2.4** If you are aware of the CCTV scheme, do you think that it has an impact on: (you may tick more than one box)

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
The levels of crime		
Fear of becoming a victim of crime		
The detection of crime		

**SECTION 3 – BUSINESS SPECIFIC ISSUES**

**Q3.1** At what level do you make provisions for the cost of crime within your budget (for example, stock losses), e.g., 2% of profit, 2% of turnover, no provision.

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q3.2** Do you expect to provide for the cost of crime within the budget in the future?

Yes  No

**Q3.3** At what level do you make provision for the cost of crime prevention measures in your business (for example, alarm systems), e.g., 2% of profit, 2% of turnover, no provision?

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q3.4** Do you actively encourage staff to ensure that they take all possible steps to reduce opportunities for crime in the workplace?

Yes  No

**Q3.5** If you answered “Yes”, please state how.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Q3.6** Has crime had any effect on your staff?

No noticeable effect	
Staff have resigned due to the fear of crime	
Staff morale has reduced	
Staff sickness has increased	
Other (Please specify)	

**SECTION 4 – BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Q4.1** How many people do you employ?

1-10 employees	
11-25 employees	
26-50 employees	
51-100 employees	
Over 100 employees	

**Q4.2** What is the nature of your business?

Retail	
Industrial	
Service	
Other (Please specify)	

**Q4.2** How long has your business been established in the area?

Under 3 years	
3-10 years	
Over 10 years	

**Q4.4** Do you currently use your own in-house CCTV as part of your security measures?

Yes

No

**Q4.5** If yes, how is your system monitored?

Central monitoring station	
Monitored "in-house"	
Not monitored	
Other (Please specify)	

**Q4.6** Please state the postcode for your business \_\_\_\_\_

Have you any further comments on any of the issues covered, or feel that certain issues have not been covered, about which you are concerned?

---

---

---

**THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ASSIST IN THIS SURVEY**

If you have any queries regarding this survey, please contact Jacqui Newson, Policy Officer at Surrey Heath Borough Council on 01276 707154 or [jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk](mailto:jacqui.newson@surreyheath.gov.uk)

**Please return the survey in the enclosed FREEPOST envelope by Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2007**

**NO STAMP IS REQUIRED.**