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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
Content of the presentation

• Why re-evaluate?
• What we did
• What we found
• Conclusions
• Recommendations
Why re-evaluate?

• 3 reasons......

1) June 2008, Quaver Lane in Bradford become 10,000\textsuperscript{th} 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

- Original evaluation looked at 25 SBD and 25 non-SBD estates spread throughout West Yorkshire and began in **1999**

  - 1994-1998: Developments used for analysis
  - 1999: SBD evaluation began
  - 1999: Major changes BS7950/PAS 24

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
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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: 11 developments
     • 354 properties

3) MATCHED PAIRS
   - SBD: Built April 2006-March 2007
     • 16 developments
     • 342 properties
   - Non-SBD: 16 developments
     • 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>

| Non-SBD  | • 16 developments           |
|          | • 253 properties            |

11% response rate
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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>
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

**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></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>24</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Dwelling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from vehicle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of vehicle + twoc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>262.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>118.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) SBD and non-SBD Matched Pairs

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

**Non-SBD**
- 16 developments
- 253 properties

**Matched Pairs**
- August 2007 – July 2008
  - 44 crimes
  - 128.7 per 1000 households
  - 2 burglary dwellings
  - 5.9 per 1000 households

- 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></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
4) RE-EVALUATING ORIGINAL SAMPLE

SBD

- 2 developments
  - 36 properties

Non-SBD

- 2 developments
  - 42 properties
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### 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>SBD Street</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SBD Street</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></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>

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
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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
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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