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Re-evaluating the Secured by Design (SBD) scheme 10 years on

Leanne Monchuk
Researcher
Applied Criminology Centre - University of Huddersfield
This presentation...

- Presents the findings of a re-evaluation of SBD housing in West Yorkshire
- Funded by University of Huddersfield, ACPO CPI Ltd and West Yorkshire Police – entirely independent
- Based upon evaluation of SBD conducted in 1999 (Armitage, 2000)
- Research conducted by the Applied Criminology Centre: Residential Design and Crime
Why re-evaluate?

• 3 reasons……

1) June 2008, Quaver Lane in Bradford become 10,000th SBD property to be built in West Yorkshire

2) 2009 marked 10 year anniversary of original evaluation

3) Need to update sample utilised in 1999 evaluation
• Original evaluation looked at 25 SBD and 25 non-SBD estates spread throughout West Yorkshire and began in 1999

Developments used for analysis

1994-1998

SBD evaluation began

1999

Major changes BS7950/PAS 24

1999

The 1999 sample of SBD properties used did not include these changes
Therefore....

the original sample **did not** represent an accurate reflection of SBD in 2009
Aims of the evaluation

• Whether SBD properties experience less crime than non-SBD properties

• Whether residents living in SBD properties have lower levels of fear of crime than non-SBD counterparts

• Whether SBD developments show less visual signs of disorder than non-SBD developments

• Whether SBD has maintained its effectiveness as a crime reduction measure
What we did...

• Police recorded crime data
• **FOUR** levels of analysis:
  1) SBD v the whole of West Yorkshire
  2) Same street analysis
  3) Matched pair analysis
  4) Re-evaluating original sample

• Questionnaires sent to residents (self-recorded crime data)
• Visual audit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBD</th>
<th>Non-SBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) WHOLE OF WEST YORKSHIRE</strong></td>
<td>Built April 2006-March 2007</td>
<td>West Yorkshire 867,885 properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 16 developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 342 properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) SAME STREET</strong></td>
<td>Built April 2006-March 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 11 developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 101 properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) MATCHED PAIRS</strong></td>
<td>Built April 2006-March 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 16 developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 342 properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) RE-EVALUATING ORIGINAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>Two developments</td>
<td>Two developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 developments</td>
<td>• 36 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-reported crime data

3) MATCHED PAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBD</th>
<th>Built April 2006-March 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 16 developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 342 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-SBD</th>
<th>• 16 developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 253 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11% response rate
Visual Audits

3) MATCHED PAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBD</th>
<th>Built April 2006-March 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 16 developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 342 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-SBD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 16 developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 253 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
Visual Audit Schedule
Findings...
1) SBD v whole of West Yorkshire

1) WHOLE OF WEST YORKSHIRE

**SBD**
- Built April 2006-March 2007
  - 16 developments
  - 342 properties

**Non-SBD**
- West Yorkshire
  - 867,885 properties

- August 2007-July 2008
  - 2 burglaries
  - 5.8 per 1,000 properties*

- August 2007-July 2008
  - 19,701 burglaries
  - 22.7 per 1,000 properties*
2) SBD against Same Street

2) SAME STREET

- **SBD**
  - Built April 2006-March 2007
  - 11 developments
  - 101 properties
  - August 2007-July 2008
    - 12 offences
    - 118.8 per 1000 households*
    - 0 burglary dwelling offences
    - 0 per 1000 households*

- **Non-SBD**
  - 11 developments
  - 354 properties
  - August 2007-July 2008
    - 93 offences
    - 262.7 per 1000 households*
    - 5 burglary dwelling offences
    - 14.1 per 1000 households*
Crime Categories recorded within the ‘Same Street’ sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Non SBD</th>
<th>SBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Dwelling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from vehicle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of vehicle + twoc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>262.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) SBD and non-SBD Matched Pairs

**SBD**
- Built April 2006-March 2007
- 16 developments
- 342 properties
- August 2007 – July 2008
  - 44 crimes
  - 128.7 per 1000 households
  - 2 burglary dwellings
  - 5.9 per 1000 households

**Non-SBD**
- 16 developments
- 253 properties
- August 2007 – July 2008
  - 42 crimes
  - 166 per 1000 households
  - 2 burglary dwellings
  - 7.9 per 1000 households
### Crime Categories recorded within the ‘Matched Pairs’ sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Non SBD</th>
<th></th>
<th>SBD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of vehicle + twoc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>166.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>128.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Reported Crime Data

- Questionnaire responses low: 11%
- SBD respondents experienced less crime than non-SBD
Re-evaluating Original 1999 Sample

4) RE-EVALUATING ORIGINAL SAMPLE

- SBD
  - 2 developments
  - 36 properties

- Non-SBD
  - 2 developments
  - 42 properties
1999 – 2009: Matched Pair One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBD Street</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-SBD Street</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>571.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SBD performs better than (or same as) non-SBD for both time periods

---

*Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals*
### 1999 – 2009: Matched Pair Two

**SBD performs better than non-SBD for both time periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBD Street</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SBD Street</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>178.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>214.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SBD versus ‘West Yorkshire’**
   - Burglary rates are lower within the SBD sample (5.8 per 1000 households compared to 22.7)
   - All crime categories lower in SBD sample

2. **SBD versus non-SBD ‘Same Street’**
   - Burglary rates are lower within the SBD sample (0 burglaries per 1000 households compared to 14.1)
   - All crime categories (with exception of criminal damage) lower in SBD sample

3. **SBD versus non-SBD ‘Matched Pairs’**
   - Burglary rates are lower within the SBD sample (5.9 burglaries per 1000 households compared to 7.9)
   - Assault, vehicle crime and burglary other higher in SBD sample
Conclusions

4. 1999 versus 2009
   - For both matched pairs SBD was performing either the same or better than non-SBD in both time periods of 1999/2000 and 2007/08
   - Pair one sustained crime reduction, non-SBD saw crime increase; pair two – SBD saw crime increase at a greater rate than non-SBD

• Self-Reported Crime
  - For all crime categories, the proportion of SBD respondents experiencing the crime was lower in the SBD sample

• Visual Audits
  - SBD sample scored lower than non-SBD sample
Conclusions

• SBD has continued to reduce crime and the fear of crime and SBD estates show less signs of visual disorder

• The effectiveness of SBD developments built more recently has exceeded that shown in the original evaluation
Residential Design and Crime
Residential Design and Crime
Residential Design and Crime
Thank-you for listening

Leanne Monchuk
l.y.monchuk@hud.ac.uk
01484 472670