Consultation on draft Community Safety & Crime Reduction Strategy 2017-20

Summary findings from the consultation

Methodology

- The consultation exercise took the form of an online survey on B&H Consultation Portal; it was open between 10th Feb and 12th Mar 2017.
- We provided summary aims and plans, and a link to whole draft strategy document and the strategic assessment if people wanted to see more information.
- For each proposed priority area we asked:
  - Do you support our aims and plans
  - Is there anything we haven't considered, or do you have any further comments
- We also invited any general comments

Respondents

- There were 76 respondents via Consultation Portal + 1 via email = 77
  - 49 residents
  - 16 community & voluntary sector orgs
  - 9 statutory organisations
  - 2 businesses
  - 1 ward councillor
- Demographic data (not always complete) was provided by 39/48 residents:
  - age range 22-84; mean age 53.7 years (n=22)
  - gender: 23 female; 11 male; 1 non-binary; 4 prefer not to say
  - gender identity: 27 identified with the sex they were assigned at birth; 12 prefer not to say or missing
  - sexual orientation: 24 heterosexual; 3 lesbian/gay women; 1 queer; 1 bisexual; 10 prefer not to say or missing
  - ethnic origin: 25 White British; 4 White other; 2 Irish; 8 prefer not to say or missing
  - religion: 14 no particular religion; 10 Christian; 2 atheist; 2 agnostic; 1 Buddhist; 2 prefer not to say or missing
  - LLTI: 24 had no long term limiting illness; 6 activities limited a little; 3 activities limited a lot; 6 prefer not to say or missing
  - 1 respondent was a carer

Levels of support for our proposals

Table 1

Do you support our aims and plans?						
	ASB and Hate incidents	Night time economy	Violence against Women & Girls	Reducing offending	Community Collaboration	Prevent and Challenging Extremism
yes	41	22	39	19	25	18
no	2	0	0	1	5	3
don't know/unsure	8	5	4	0	10	2
total respondents	***51***	***27***	***42***	***20***	***40***	***23***
% who support aims and plans	80%	81%	93%	95%	63%	78%
% who do not support aims and plans	4%	0%	0%	5%	13%	13%
% who did not know or were unsure	16%	19%	10%	0%	25%	9%

- Respondents could choose which topics they wanted to look at. Table 1 presents the number of people commenting on the six draft priority areas, and shows the extent to which they report supporting the draft aims and plans.
- ASB & hate incidents received the most interest with 51 out of the 77 people responding on this topic. Reducing offending received the lowest response (20 people responding).
- In general, survey respondents supported the aims and plans in the draft strategy. Over three quarters of respondents supported the aims and plans across five of the six topics. Nearly two thirds of respondents expressed their support in the area of community collaboration and resilience.
- Between 0% and 13% of respondents did not support the aims and plans, with a maximum of 5 (13%) respondents saying that they did not support the aims and plans in the community collaboration and resilience area and 3 respondents not supporting the aims and plans in the Prevent and challenging extremism area.

Number of respondents providing comments

Table 2

Number of respondents providing comments on each priority area						
	ASB and Hate incidents	Night time economy	Violence against Women & Girls	Reducing offending	Community Collaboration	Prevent and Challenging Extremism
residents	25	12	13	5	17	8
other respondents	3	2	10	3	5	1
total respondents	***28***	***14***	***23***	***8***	***22***	***9***

- ASB and hate incidents was the area which the highest number of residents responded to (25), with community collaboration and resilience receiving the next highest number (17).
- Ten respondents who were not residents commented on VAWG. The other areas received comments from fewer people who were not responding as residents.

Summary of comments provided by priority area

(roughly in order of frequency of mention)

ASB and hate incidents	• Police accessibility to/engagement with local residents was important • Alcohol & licensed premises in public places impacted on residents - noise & ASB, especially city centre. • Enforcement and appropriate regulations required. • Concern about viability of plans/impact of financial cuts, incl. to youth services • Wider implementation of PSPOs, but also a. lack of support for PSPO. Split opinion. • Support needed for vulnerable communities, • Graffiti (don't encourage) • Widened support across more agencies for addressing hate crime • Risk of escalation if low level incidents are not addressed • Drug dealing/drug use problems need more focus • Need more emphasis on hate crime
Safety in the night time economy	• Too many licensed premises, incl. the status of café-bars in the CIZ/SSA. Impact of changes in city centre economy on local resident demography. • Negative impact (feeling unsafe, stress, quality of life) on city centre residents. Enable residents to have a voice. • Retain funding for NTE support services • Issues with sexual assault. Safety of sex workers should be considered. • More police presence or that of other security staff needed • Drugs– accessible by young people (whereas alcohol is controlled). • The effect of some drugs (incl. alcohol) is negative on violence – other drugs don't have this effect. • Any way to address 'macho violence' between males – encourage camaraderie?
Domestic violence and abuse, sexual violence and other forms of violence against women and girls	• Funding needed: for core services; to support victims at all levels of risk; proportionate to demand. Provide for all genders. Refuge spaces to be funded • Provide consistent responses and raise awareness, building prevention across wide range of partners (including council services/policies, universities, health and criminal justice partners). Build into contracts for tendered work. • Prevention work for children and young people – train providers. • Support to families where ISVA/IDVA where child sexual abuse is noted. • Increase awareness in communities • Support for victims after they have left a relationship • Use social media to raise awareness of sexual assaults in city localities • Targeted prevention work to particular communities who may be at higher risk of domestic/sexual violence/abuse. Incl. society's vulnerable members who may have mental health problems, housing problems, etc. • Introduce network of safer spaces/places of refuge for those fearing assault/abuse/stalking when on the street. • Be specific about how serious domestic violence can be/become • Ensure advocacy support in family courts to maximise the chances of conviction • Consider support around financial coercion in relationships

	• Use of Mindfulness Cognitive Based Therapy
Reducing offending	• Work need sufficient resources – inadequate resources will be detrimental • Make more use of 3rd sector agencies in a 'holistic' approach • Reoffending by perpetrators of serious crimes is of concern • Youth/early help support important to achieving stated objectives – issue with funding cuts • Rehabilitation of drug users, their integration into society and emotional support needed • Ensure support on release from prison • Use of Mindfulness Cognitive Based Therapy
Community collaboration and resilience	• Some support for supporting migrants, but often concern expressed about lacking the infrastructure (especially housing) to cope, even with existing residents. Risk of a source of tension against migrants. Comment that 'City of Sanctuary' considered as political spin. • Lack of police accessibility is an issue, including at LATs. Communities need confidence that the issues they raise will be responded to by the authorities. • LATs and residents groups are at risk in city centre due to demographic shift • LATs need to be representative of their communities • LATs are good, but full coverage and publicity to draw attention to their existence is needed. • More events in local communities • Need a city-wide arena where dialogue can be had between residents/communities and authorities. • Communities at risk of breakdown without funding for 3rd sector. • Included community mediation
Prevent and building partnerships to challenge extremism	• Comments that Prevent was regarded as racist/stereotyping; concern about the impact of Prevent on Muslim community. Threat from right-wing more significant. • Being too politically correct can result in messages not being clear. • People should feel able to speak out about all forms of extremism • People in neighbourhoods need uniting; engagement between different religious groups important • Don't prioritise one community over another – can be divisive • Alternative to Prevent would be to increase education and promote ways in which people can help. Take a more positive approach. • Is there a case for censoring all people speaking with extremist views? • Risk of less communication between public and authorities with cuts. • Physical protection around potential targets of terrorists, eg. seafront crowds.
General comments (omitting issues covered under separate topics)	• On the whole, support for the strategy, but some concern that it is not realistic in its aims. • Don't spread resources too thinly. • Less strategy writing and more action. • Communities need confidence that problems will be addressed. • It needs to be more far-reaching and radical • A more robust approach to enforcement needed • More CCTV to help people feel safe • The council should be more strategic around ownership of its assets