APPENDIX 'A'

POLICE AND CRIME PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION
Final Report

Overview
Public consultation in regards to what should be included in the PCC's Police and Crime Plan for his full period in office was carried out during the month of September.

This was done using 2 methodologies; firstly, a web-based survey that was promoted throughout the Force area and secondly, some telephone based surveying based on a stratified sample aimed to be representative of the population.

Response
The telephone survey was out-sourced to a Market Research Agency, they were commissioned to do 1,100 surveys and 1,105 were actually completed.

The web-based survey was circulated in 3 ways:

- To internal personnel (Police Officers and Police Staff)
- To members of the public directly
- To stakeholders (Councillors, MPs etc.)

In total over 6,000 "direct invites" were sent out, these included to most City / County / Borough & District Councillors (excluding those where the Councils themselves have indicated that they do not want Councillors contacted directly). As well as other local politicians and key stakeholders.

All internal personnel (over 3,000) were invited to contribute via the posting of "news items" on the Police intranet.

Many of these "direct invitees" have then circulated the request further, for example the Vice Chancellor of one of the universities forwarded onwards to all the students at that university, at least one Councillor forwarded it onwards to all their ward contacts, and many of the Parish Councils circulated to residents as well as their Parish Councillors. In addition the PCC, Chief Constable and others utilised social media to invite responses.

The web-based survey generated a total of 1,769 external responses and another 152 were received from Police Officers and Staff.

Therefore a total of 3,026 responses have been received.

Demographics

Whilst representative (in respect of the percentage of respondents when compared with the population as a whole) in terms of Gender, the data receivedcontains the following disproportionalities :

Age

Under representative of persons aged between 25 & 34 and 65 & over.
Over representative of persons aged between 45 & 64.

Ethnicity

Under-representative of persons of Asian ethnicity.
Under-representative of persons of Black ethnicity.
Over-representative of persons of White ethnicity.

Locational

Whilst the total sample size is sufficient to represent the whole Force area, the samples are not proportionate across all local authority boundaries, City residents are particularly over represented whereas those from some other areas are under-represented, the table below:

	Number of Resp.	Pop'n.%	Resp.%	C.I.%	Assessment
Blaby	161	9.2%	8.8%	+/- 1.3%	
Charnwood	211	16.3%	11.5%	+/- 1.5%	Under
Harborough	137	8.4%	7.5%	+/- 1.2%	
Hinckley & Bosworth	128	10.3%	7.0%	+/- 1.2%	Under
Leicester City	842	32.4%	46.1%	+/- 2.3%	Over
Melton	76	4.9%	4.2%	+/- 0.9%	
NW Leicestershire	92	9.2%	5.0%	+/- 1.0%	Under
Oadby & Wigston	97	5.5%	5.3%	+/- 1.0%	
Rutland	84	3.7%	4.6%	+/- 1.0%	Under
Not stated	1,198				
Leicestershire County Council area	902	63.9%	49.3%	+/- 2.3%	Under

Notwithstanding this, there are no differences in opinions between Local Authorities, merely that in some areas opinion is stronger or weaker than elsewhere.

Findings

The samples achieved in relation to all the surveys give responses that one can have 99% confidence are with +/- 2.5% of wh

at would have been achieved had every resident of the Force area (aged over 15) responded.

It should be noted that in many of the areas covered, respondents were asked to indicate their top preference from the options provided and some respondents indicated that more than one of the options was their "top" preference. Hence in some cases the totals shown in the tables add to greater than 100%.

In the tables showing the findings, the options are shown in the order that they were presented to persons participating in the consultation.

The survey includes questions on the following:

What Policing Priorities should be included in the Plan?

The table below shows the proportions of respondents (who expressed an opinion) who felt that the specified matters were either “Very” or “Fairly” Important for policing in the Leicestershire Force area.

Priorities	Very Important	Very or Fairly Important
Reducing and Preventing Crime	94.2%	99.7%
Ensuring that crimes such as Hate Crime, Domestic Violence, Sexual offences and Cyber Crime are reported to the Police	85.7%	97.7%
Ensure that neighbourhood policing teams continue to be supported	68.1%	97.2%
Making it easy for the public to report crime and ASB and to contact the Police and other agencies	71.1%	96.5%
Making sure the Police are visible to the public	65.4%	96.4%
Protecting the vulnerable from harm	72.1%	87.9%
Reducing offending and re-offending	67.9%	87.0%
Supporting victims of crime	58.9%	80.7%
Encouraging people to volunteer to assist in policing	32.7%	82.8%
Improving the public’s understanding of the role and work of the PCC	35.7%	78.1%

The two top priorities are identified by respondents as being the most important elements to include in the plan (with nine out of every ten respondents believing them to be important, similar to the levels of support in the web surveys) are:

- Reducing and preventing Crime
- Ensuring that crimes such as Hate Crime, Domestic Violence, Sexual offences and Cyber Crime are reported to the Police

It might be interesting to note that improving the reporting of “hidden” crimes is rated as more important by the public than Police visibility.

The following aspects were rated as statistically less important but nevertheless over 90% of respondents believed that they were of importance

- Making sure that the Police are visible to the public
- Ensuring that neighbourhood policing teams continue to be supported
- Making it easy for the public to report crime and ASB and to contact the police or other agencies

Over 80% of respondents felt that the following were of importance

- Protecting the vulnerable from harm
- Reducing offending and re-offending

Although it can be assumed that the latter refers primarily to re-offending since reducing “Offending” (Reducing and Preventing Crime) has already been identified as one of the aspects that is of most importance to the public.

Over 75% of respondents felt that Supporting Victims of Crime was of importance to the Police.

Whilst of some importance the remaining two aspects were only considered to be very important to around one in three people.

- Encourage people to volunteer to assist in policing (e.g. Special Constables, advisory or support enhancing roles
- Improving the public's understanding of the role and work of the PCC

Reporting non emergency matters

The survey asked respondents how they believed matters not requiring phoning 999 should be reported. The table below shows those persons who considered the option to be the preferred or second preference, together with the average "score" of preference (respondents were asked to rank them from 1 (top preference) to 5 (least preferred).

Preferences	1st Preference	1st or 2nd Preference	Average "Score"
Report at a Police Station	19.4%	46.4%	2.9
To a Police non-emergency phone line	61.2%	86.7%	1.6
To another agency (eg a Council)	1.6%	7.7%	4.0
To a multi-agency phone line	7.1%	27.5%	3.2
On-line or via an App	13.5%	35.0%	3.2

The public expressed a clear preference that a Police non-emergency number should be the means by which non-emergency matters were reported. There was also some support for reporting to a Police Station and to some extent, primarily amongst those responding to the web-survey, for reporting on-line or via an App.

There was less evidence of any support for either to reporting to another agency such as a Council or to a multi-agency phone line.

Receiving information from the Police

Respondents were asked how they would like to receive general information about the Police (i.e. not information to victims about specific crimes).

The vast majority of respondents (around 90%) state that they do not feel that there is any requirement for the Police to provide any type of general information about policing.

Notwithstanding that, if information were to be provided, this was an area where there was a significant variance in opinion between those who responded to the web-survey and those from the telephone survey.

The preference amongst telephone respondents would be by leaflet followed by email. It is perhaps unsurprising that this differs from the web-survey in which there was a clear preference for provision of information through a website.

The preferences indicated by all respondents are shown in the table below.

Preferences	1st Preference	1st or 2nd Preference
On a website	29.9%	49.8%
On a web chat	1.1%	3.5%
By SMS	8.8%	19.3%
By email	23.3%	43.4%
By leaflet	19.9%	36.6%
By social media	14.9%	28.8%
At a public meeting	7.4%	19.9%

Whilst there was at least some support for all of the options offered to respondents, it can be seen that there was virtually no support for the use of web chats.

Police visibility

Within the web survey there was a clear indication that the public's top preference to improve visibility was by seeing uniformed Police personnel on foot, however, telephone respondents were merely asked to indicate 3 options from 6 rather than ranking all their preferences.

Many respondents placed a number of options as being their "Top preference", hence the table below does not add up to 100%.

Preference	1st Preference	1st or 2nd Preference
Uniformed personnel on foot	70.0%	80.1%
Uniformed personnel on bicycles	28.1%	43.0%
Uniformed personnel in vehicles	48.1%	67.3%
Available in Police Stations	20.1%	30.9%
Available at other local community locations	14.2%	22.5%
On-line	7.3%	11.0%

Nevertheless, the clear top 2 options were to see uniformed Police personnel either or foot or in vehicles. The other 2 options, though selected by fewer respondents, were uniformed personnel on bicycles or available in Police Stations.

A minimal number of people suggested that seeing personnel in locations other than Police Stations and through an on-line Police presence are important forms of Police visibility.

Support to victims

Nearly two thirds of respondents (80% for web surveys) preferred that all victims support, from the provision of information about the case to any additional support needed to be provided in a "one stop shop" rather than the current arrangements (although the respondents were not specifically told that the alternative methodology presented in the survey was what the current arrangements were).

Furthermore, whilst 90% felt that the overall control and contact should fall to the Police and Police personnel, around two thirds felt that there could be collaborative delivery within this. This is virtually the same proportions as were seen within the web survey.

There is little evidence of any support for provision not involving police personnel, nor for victims to access updates for themselves on-line.

Respondents were asked who should provide on-going victim services. The table below shows the preferences:

Preference	%
By the (existing) Victim First service	13.8%
By Police personnel	19.0%
By Victim First working alongside Police personnel	38.9%
By another agency or organisation	2.7%
Collaboratively with other agencies	25.6%

It should be noted that whilst Victim First was specifically referred to within the consultation, no indication was given to respondents that this was the existing service, some may have been aware but there is a possibility that many were not.

Additional Funding through an increased Policing Precept

The level of support for the proposed increase in policing precept amongst telephone respondents is higher even than it was within the web survey (where around three quarters were supportive) with approximately nine out of every ten supporting the proposal.

The table below shows the responses by demographics to this question, the sampling confidence intervals (CI%) are shown to indicate whether or not there is any statistical evidence of the opinion of a demographic varying from the opinion of the population as a whole (**Red** indicates that there is statistical evidence that the support for an increase is weaker than total support, **Green** that support is stronger and **Amber** that support is in line with the overall average).

	% Support	CI %	Variance
Total Respondents	**83.3%**	**+/- 1.8%**	
- Telephone	89.0%	+/- 3.0%	**More**
- Web Survey (Public / Stakeholders)	80.0%	+/- 2.3%	
- Web Survey (Police Officers / Police Staff)	78.2%	+/- 8.0%	
Local Authority			
- Blaby	86.3%	+/- 5.3%	
- Charnwood	88.2%	+/- 4.4%	
- Harborough	84.7%	+/- 6.1%	
- Hinckley and Bosworth	85.9%	+/- 6.0%	
- Leicester	85.6%	+/- 2.4%	
- Melton	82.9%	+/- 8.5%	
- NW Leicestershire	91.2%	+/- 5.9%	**More**
- Oadby & Wigston	92.8%	+/- 5.2%	**More**
- Rutland	86.7%	+/- 7.3%	
- Leicestershire County Council	87.3%	+/- 2.2%	
Location			
- Rural	86.7%	+/- 1.8%	
- Urban	86.0%	+/- 3.3%	
Gender			
- Female	83.9%	+/- 1.9%	
- Male	83.7%	+/- 2.0%	
Age			
- 16 – 24	82.6%	+/- 3.7%	
- 25 – 34	84.1%	+/- 3.8%	
- 35 – 44	82.8%	+/- 3.4%	
- 45 – 54	82.4%	+/- 3.1%	
- 54 – 65	83.8%	+/- 3.1%	
- Over 65	85.8%	+/- 3.1%	

Ethnicity			
- Asian	75.7%	+/- 5.4%	**Less**
- Black	62.5%	+/- 19.8%	
- Other	75.0%	+/- 12.9%	
- White	85.6%	+/- 1.4%	
Ethnicity sub categorires			
- BME	74.6%	+/- 4.8%	**Less**
- BME + White – Non British	75.6%	+/- 4.1%	**Less**
- White – British	86.0%	+/- 1.4%	
Disability			
- Disabled	79.1%	+/- 5.7%	
- Not Disabled	80.1%	+/- 1.9%	
Sexuality			
- Bi-Sexual	78.0%	+/- 12.8%	
- Gay or Lesbian	83.3%	+/- 9.5%	
- Heterosexual	82.0%	+/- 2.0%	

It should be noted that, whilst in many cases the numbers of responses in the categories are very small, in no separate demographic or location other than for Black – African ethnicity is there a possibility that a majority of respondents are opposed to an increase in the precept.

Additional questions

In addition to the specific questions about policing, respondents were asked whether they would be prepared to volunteer to assist in policing in Leicestershire in various ways. Also whether they would be prepared to participate in further consultation in relation to local policing matters.

All those persons indicating that they are prepared to volunteer have had their details passed to the Volunteers' Coordinator who will make contact with them.

All those persons who said that they would be prepared to take part in further consultation have been acknowledged, thanked and placed on a consultation database.

This page is intentionally left blank