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Leanne Monchuk and Dr. Rachel Armitage
This presentation...

- Presents the findings of a re-evaluation of SBD housing in West Yorkshire
- Conducted early 2009
- Funded by University of Huddersfield, ACPO CPI Ltd and West Yorkshire Police – entirely independent
- Based upon evaluation of SBD conducted in 1999 (Armitage, 2000)
- Other research conducted by the Applied Criminology Centre
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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
Updating the Sample


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
2009 Re-evaluation
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
Police Recorded Crime Data

1) WHOLE OF WEST YORKSHIRE
- SBD
  - Built April 2006-March 2007
    - 16 developments
    - 342 properties

- Non-SBD
  - West Yorkshire 867,885 properties

2) SAME STREET
- SBD
  - Built April 2006-March 2007
    - 11 developments
    - 101 properties

- Non-SBD
  - West Yorkshire 354 properties

3) MATCHED PAIRS
- SBD
  - Built April 2006-March 2007
    - 16 developments
    - 342 properties

- Non-SBD
  - West Yorkshire 253 properties

4) RE-EVALUATING ORIGINAL SAMPLE
- SBD
  - 2 developments
  - 36 properties

- Non-SBD
  - 2 developments
  - 42 properties
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>16 developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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
- August 2007-July 2008
  - 2 burglaries
  - 5.8 per 1,000 properties*

**Non-SBD**
- West Yorkshire
  - 867,885 properties
- August 2007-July 2008
  - 19,701 burglaries
  - 22.7 per 1,000 properties*
2) SBD against Same Street

2) SAME STREET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBD</th>
<th>Non-SBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built April 2006-March 2007</td>
<td>• 11 developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 101 properties</td>
<td>• 11 developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 354 properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 2007-July 2008
12 offences
118.8 per 1000 households*
0 burglary dwelling offences
0 per 1000 households*

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>Crime Type</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

3) 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>42</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>128.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Reported Crime Data

• Questionnaire responses low: 11%

• SBD respondents experienced less crime than non-SBD
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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBD Street</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</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>1</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**
### 1999 – 2009: Matched Pair Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBD Street</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>45.45</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>136.36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>

SBD performs better than non-SBD for both time periods
Visual Audits
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Conclusions

- Variety of methods and datasets to establish:
  - 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
Conclusions

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
Other research...

Sustainability via Security: Aligning the Agendas

- Funded by ACPO SBD
- Aimed to identify existing or potential tensions between the aims of sustainable and secure housing design
Sustainability via Security

Rear Access

Garden

Dwelling

FRONT DOOR

BACK DOOR
Residential Design and Crime

• Funded by the Home Office and managed by CABE

• Aimed to clarify some of the confusion regarding particular design features and their impact upon crime.

• The extent to which developments considered to be good practice examples of design quality offer crime reduction benefits.
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