Community Foundation
Tyne & Wear and Northumberland

Tees Valley's
Vital Issues 2017

Safety

Safety

1.1 Overview
The theme of safety covers crime and anti-social behaviour, and includes both the actual levels of these, and how they are perceived by local communities. In many cases the actual levels of crime can be higher than the official statistics suggest, simply because much of it is not reported. Similarly, the perception of crime levels can be higher or lower than the recorded level depending on the experiences of individuals and communities, and the extent to which they are influenced by newspapers and other media.

1.2 Recorded crime
More crimes were recorded in the Tees Valley than the NE average during 2015-16. The overall rate was particularly high in Middlesbrough, with 113 crimes per 1,000 population, which is 66% higher than the regional mean (68 crimes per 1,000 population). In fact, Middlesbrough recorded the highest levels of almost every category of crime in the Tees Valley, the only exceptions being homicide, burglary and vehicle offences.

Table 20 - Recorded crime rate per 1,000 population, headline offences, year to March 2016[i]

	D'ton	H'pool	M'bro	R&C	St-on-Tees	North East
Total recorded crime	74.74	87.83	113.29	79.34	69.77	68.16
Victim-based crime						
Violence against the person	18.35	19.68	28.46	15.62	15.81	16.08
Homicide	-	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.01
Violence with injury	8.25	9.31	12.64	7.35	7.41	7.64
Violence without injury	10.10	10.37	15.81	8.24	8.38	8.43
Sexual offences	2.16	2.20	3.23	2.01	2.07	2.00
Robbery	0.35	0.49	0.82	0.49	0.58	0.39
Theft offences	35.81	40.24	49.41	39.52	33.67	29.48
Burglary	8.63	8.23	11.00	12.61	7.69	6.92
Domestic burglary	3.09	3.59	6.38	3.86	3.27	2.72
Non-domestic burglary	6.98	4.64	4.62	8.75	4.43	4.51
Vehicle offences	6.35	6.12	6.48	6.94	4.74	0.58
Theft from the person	0.79	0.42	1.14	0.44	0.58	1.22
Bicycle theft	2.03	1.76	2.11	1.15	1.56	7.94
Shoplifting	9.50	13.46	16.15	8.93	9.80	8.30
All other theft offences	8.51	10.25	12.53	9.46	9.30	13.01
Criminal damage and arson	11.36	17.57	19.61	17.24	11.35	-
Other crimes against society						
Drug offences	2.23	2.86	4.13	1.50	2.15	0.52
Possession of weapons offences	0.47	0.66	0.55	0.33	0.46	3.26
Public order offences	2.79	2.89	5.63	1.78	2.63	1.17
Miscellaneous crimes against society	1.21	1.23	1.45	0.85	1.05	-

Hartlepool had the next highest incidences of almost every category. Redcar & Cleveland appears to have more of an issue around theft, with high rates of non-domestic burglary and vehicle offences, as well as criminal damage and arson.

Darlington has higher than the regional average rates of violence against the person, sexual offences, drug offences and public order offences, all of which could be related to its status as a nightlife destination, attracting a lot of younger people from County Durham.

Stockton on Tees appears to be higher than the regional average in several areas including burglary and vehicle offences, but is not the above the Tees Valley average for any specific crime, making it the safest area of the Tees Valley.

In rural areas, there is very little crime, although there have been spates of criminal damage including harm to livestock and fences etc, and theft of quad bikes. Local rural community voluntary networks have been set up to gather and share community intelligence where this happens.

One area in which recorded offences are very low in the Tees Valley is possession of weapons, where the average rate is around 0.5 per 1,000 population, less than a sixth of the regional average.

The rates of different common crimes can be combined to create a crime score for a particular area, and these are given in Table 21 below.

Table 21 - Combined crime score by area, 2016[ii]

Area Name	Crime: score (2016)	Offences: Burglary (per 1,000 pop) (2016)	Offences: total (per 1,000 pop) (2016)	Offences: total change (LT) (2003 - 2016)	Offences: total change (ST) (2015-2016)	Offences: violent crimes (per 1,000 pop) (2016)
Darlington	120.34	3.09	74.72	-33.86	-42.65	18.34
Hartlepool	141.6	3.59	87.92	-36.77	-45.23	19.7
Middlesbrough	181.95	6.36	112.97	-43.88	-43.74	28.38
Redcar and Cleveland	127.56	3.85	79.2	-21.41	-42.27	15.59
Stockton on Tees	111.97	3.25	69.52	-33.18	-39.74	15.75
North East	109.9	2.72	68.01	-35.45	-39.08	16.05
England & Wales	100	3.22	62.89	-43.57	-39.27	16.08

The crime scores confirm that crime in the Tees Valley is worse than in the NE generally, and the UK average. As expected, Middlesbrough scores the highest.

Table 20 also includes a measure of the changes in offence rates both in the short term (2015-16) and in the longer term (2003-16). The long-term data indicates that recorded crime is diminishing in the Tees Valley, but this is generally at a slower rate than the UK average, apart from in Middlesbrough where the rate of change matches the UK figure.

In terms of short-term change, the news is better, with all areas of the Tees Valley reducing recorded crime more quickly than the UK average, suggesting that the rates will move towards the UK average levels over time.

1.3 Anti-social behaviour

Anti-social behaviour is defined in The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 as acting in a manner that has "caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as the perpetrator".

Anti-social behaviour is very worrying for local people, and can often lead to the perceived level of crime being higher than the actual level of crime recorded, because people are aware of troubling activities in their neighbourhood.

It is not recorded as a crime but is recorded and reported by each police force at a neighbourhood level. The levels for each neighbourhood in the Cleveland and Darlington areas are given in Table 22 below.

Table 22 - Anti-social behaviour incidents by neighbourhood, 2016-17[iii]

	No of incidents	% in area
Berwick Hills	4,282	10%
Billingham	3,412	8%
Central	6,125	14%
Coulby Newham	2,610	6%
Guisboro'	2,645	6%
Hartlepool	7,239	17%
Redcar Town	3,929	9%
Southbank	3,085	7%
Stockton Town Centre	6,122	14%
Thornaby	3,401	8%
Darlington Central	817	2%
Cleveland and Darlington	**43,667**	**100%**

This shows that most anti-social behaviour incidents occur in Middlesbrough Central area, Hartlepool and Stockton Town Centre. It is not surprising that these three areas come highest as they are the most built up areas in the sub-region.

Levels are far lower in the more residential areas of Billingham, South Bank and Guisborough.

1.4 Reoffending rates

The likelihood of an offender reoffending is influenced by a wide variety of factors including the availability and quality of employment, housing, healthcare, drugs alcohol and addiction, as well as support from friends and family.

Providing support for offenders, both before they are released from prison and once they are back in the community, can be beneficial in helping them to stay clear of crime.

This is an area where the third sector has a long history of effective working, and increased support could be made available in those areas where reoffending is highest.

Table 23 - Reoffending rates, 2006-15[iv]

Area	Period	% of offenders who reoffend (%)	Average number of reoffences per reoffender	Number of reoffences	Number of reoffenders	Average no of previous offences per offender
Darlington	2006	33.75	3.3	6079	1860	11.1
	2015	31.30	3.9	4536	1162	19.9
	diff	*-2.46*	*0.6*	*-1543*	*-698*	*8.8*
Hartlepool	2006	34.74	3.6	6902	1938	14.8
	2015	33.15	4.4	5259	1202	24.3
	diff	*-1.59*	*0.8*	*-1643*	*-736*	*9.5*
Middlesbro'	2006	32.78	3.5	10470	2997	14.2
	2015	32.96	4.3	11028	2562	23.3
	diff	*0.18*	*0.8*	*558*	*-435*	*9.1*
Redcar & Cleveland	2006	29.93	3.0	6459	2136	9.8
	2015	28.06	3.3	3549	1065	16.5
	diff	-1.87	0.3	-2910	-1071	6.7
Stockton-on-Tees	2006	28.14	3.1	7201	2323	9.6
	2015	31.07	3.9	6825	1749	17.6
	diff	*2.93*	*0.8*	*-376*	*-574*	*7.9*
North East	2006	30.88	3.1	46391	15089	10.6
	2015	29.74	3.6	30547	8461	18.3
	diff	*-1.13*	*0.5*	*-15844*	*-6628*	*7.8*

Table 23, above, summarises how the reoffending rates for those convicted of a crime in the Tees Valley have changed in the period 2006-15. In most areas, the proportion of those offenders who go on to reoffend has fallen, though in Middlesbrough and Stockton-on-Tees there has been a slight increase.

Only Redcar & Cleveland has a better rate than the NE average, and the rate is highest in Hartlepool at 33.15% (albeit a drop from 34.74%). In all areas, the average number of reoffences committed has risen since 2006.

1.5 Perceptions of crime
The Crime Survey 2015[v] asked people about whether they thought crime in their own area was higher than the national average, about the same, or lower.

The results showed that people living in the most deprived communities are more likely to think that crime levels in their community are higher (21%) or above average (53%), compared to 8% and 41% for those in the midrange for deprivation. This suggests that, since the Tees Valley is among the most deprived areas in the country, people living here are more likely to over-estimate the level of crime in their neighbourhoods.

The same survey found that people who had been victims of crime in their local area were twice as likely (19%) to perceive crime as being higher than average than those who had not been a victim of crime (8%).

Given that the Tees Valley crime rates are higher than average, this suggests people in the Tees Valley are likely to perceive local crime as being very high, which will create fear and worry, particularly among those who have been the victim of crime.

The survey also found that those who have been a victim of crime are likely to score less well on the personal well-being ratings of happiness, satisfaction, and worthwhileness and to record higher levels of anxiety, particularly younger people aged 16-24 (see section 5- health). This is particularly true of those who are victims of violent offences, and especially domestic violence.

It is therefore essential that the police can increase public confidence, particularly in areas of high deprivation and high crime such as the Tees Valley.

The annual police efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy (PEEL) assessment for Cleveland Police found:

- The extent to which the force is effective at keeping people safe and reducing crime is **good**.
- The extent to which the force is efficient at keeping people safe and reducing crime is **good**.
- The extent to which the force is legitimate at keeping people safe and reducing crime **requires improvement**. [vi]

This is a big improvement on the previous report which rated the force as 'requires improvement' for all three measures. The inspector noted that *'The force uses several different sources to obtain the views of the public about how they are treated. However, it does not regularly seek feedback from those with less trust and confidence in the police.'* This implies there may be some way to go in terms of addressing public confidence around perceptions of crime.

By contrast, Durham Constabulary (which covers Darlington) was rated outstanding for efficiency and effectiveness and good for legitimacy for the past two years, and the inspector noted that "*It recognises the importance of enhancing public confidence and has established ways of engaging with those with less trust and confidence in the police to understand their perception of fair and respectful treatment.*"

The difference in the two ratings might suggest that there is scope for improving public trust in the police and justice systems in the Cleveland force area.

Potential roles for philanthropy

This work could usefully be focused on Middlesbrough as the area with the highest crime rates, but is also relevant to all areas of the Tees Valley given the above-average rates experienced:

- Supporting work with people of all ages, and particularly young people to discourage them from moving into crime by offering viable alternatives (e.g. securing education, training, employment opportunities, raising their aspirations).

- Working with offenders before and after release into the community to support them not to return to crime.

- Supporting victims of crime to help them overcome anxiety about becoming the victim of crime again and restore their trust and confidence in the community.

- Working in town centre areas with the highest rates of anti-social behaviour, meeting with perpetrators, creating diversionary activities.

[i] **Office of National Statistics (2017)** *Crime in England & Wales, year ending March 2016* - CSP tables, downloaded from: www.ons.org.uk 21/6/17 10:03

[ii] **Grant Thornton Analytics (2017)** *Crime*, created and downloaded at: http://gt-placeanalytics.org/placeanalytics/(S(evylqt4540vmzrfqueuupwqh))/paweb/ShowAllIndicators.aspx?spatialLevel=18&indicators=904,145,463,1430,927,7885, 27/6/17 17:59

[iii] **Police.UK (2017)** *Crime and policing in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*, downloaded and collated from: https://www.police.uk/cleveland/ 13/06/2017 10:33:00,

[iv] **Ministry of Justice (2016)** *Proven Re-offending Statistics, 2006-15*, Office of National Statistics, downloaded from: www.ons.gov.uk 19/5/17. 14:04

[v] **Office of National Statistics (2014)** *Crime Statistics, Focus on Public Perceptions of Crime and the Police, and the Personal Well-being of Victims',* downloaded from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/compendium/crimestatisticsfocusonpublicperceptionsofcrimeandthepoliceandthepersonalwellbeingofvictims/2015-03-26/crimestatisticsfocusonpublicperceptionsofcrimeandthepoliceandthepersonalwellbeingofvictims2013to2014referencetables 20/6/17 13:22

[vi] **HMIC (2017)** *PEEL assessments*, accessed at: https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/peel-assessments/peel-2016/cleveland/? 4/6/17 12:30