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Introduction

There has been an increasing focus on the role of alcohol in crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour over recent years, partly due to the Licensing Act 2003; the publication of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy for England and a growing emphasis on the problems related to antisocial behaviour.

Alongside policy and legislative developments, many towns and cities are witnessing an expansion of their night-time entertainment districts. Although often a very positive development for the local economy, such expansion is sometimes accompanied by an increase in crime and disorder often attributed to high concentrations of pubs and clubs (Tierney and Hobbs, 2003).

The offences associated with alcohol tend to be violent. The 2001/2002 British Crime Survey (BCS) reported that in 47 per cent of violent incidents the victim believed the perpetrator to be under the influence of alcohol. In addition, the BCS found that 38 per cent of stranger violence and 23 per cent of acquaintance violence occurred in or around a pub or club (Allen et al., 2003).

Aims

This report explores how local concern about alcohol-related crime and disorder is implemented in practice by examining how it is identified, prioritised and tackled at a local level. The report also presents information on how some local areas are tackling some of the more negative aspects of a thriving night-time economy.

The report aims to present:
- a national picture of the concern about alcohol-related crime presented by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) throughout England and Wales;
- the extent to which partnerships acknowledged alcohol as a strategic priority; and
- examples of approaches to tackling local alcohol-related problems.

This was achieved these aims by systematically searching CDRP audit and strategy documents and by undertaking case studies of local initiatives set up to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder.

The report will be of use to practitioners in the alcohol field by providing an overview of how partnerships are dealing with alcohol-related crime and disorder in their audit and strategy documents and by sharing learning points from existing initiatives.

Structure of the report

The report is divided into two main sections. The first presents the results of the searches of the CDRP audit and strategy documents. It provides information on the importance CDRPs give to alcohol by identifying how many CDRPs mention alcohol, identify it as a priority and, importantly, how many then go on to devise a strategy to tackle the issue.

The second section describes a series of case studies of local initiatives set up to address alcohol-related crime and disorder, identifying the challenges faced by the initiatives and their responses to them. The case studies were largely identified from the audit and strategy documents, and illustrate the final step in the process of collecting the evidence, identifying the problem, developing a strategy and then implementing the strategy to address the problem.
Section I: Audit and strategy documents

- Background
- Method
- Audit findings
- Strategy findings
- Audits through to strategies
- Implications

Background

There are 376 Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) in England and Wales. Under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, every three years all CDRPs are required to conduct and publish an audit of crime and disorder in their area. The audit document helps partnerships identify their most pressing problems by collecting and analysing a range of crime and disorder data.

Once an audit has been developed, CDRPs are also required to develop and publish a strategy document which presents the strategic priorities for that area and outlines the CDRP’s three-year strategy to tackle these priorities, including targets to be reached. This research examined the second round of documents: audits of problems in 2001/02 and strategies for 2002–2005.

This research updates and extends previous research undertaken into the first round of audits and strategies (Deehan and Saville, 2000). However, it was not possible to exactly replicate the research methodology used in the first study, and so in most cases it is not possible to directly compare the findings of the two reports.

Before presenting the data, the limitations of data from such a source should be noted. The documents were not specifically designed for research purposes and there was great variation in content and thoroughness, making direct comparisons between documents difficult. Furthermore, identifying and adequately quantifying alcohol-related crime and disorder is a difficult process. Whilst there is a wealth of information indicating a strong link between alcohol use and criminal and disorderly behaviour, there are a wide range of social, environmental, individual and cultural factors which exert an influence on the relationship, making it very difficult to precisely establish the role of alcohol in offending. In addition, variations in police recording practices mean that official figures are also open to interpretation. Thus, it is often very challenging for CDRPs to gather accurate alcohol data on which to base their strategies.

The data collected by the partnerships for the audit documents came from a myriad of sources including police-recorded crime, probation services, surveys of the local population, focus groups and information from local treatment agencies. Whilst this can provide a rich and varied pool of information, CDRPs will not necessarily refer to the same data sources so the documents do not provide a standardised view of crime across the country.

In sum, the results of the searches do not necessarily present the full picture of alcohol-related crime and disorder in CDRP areas. However, notwithstanding these issues, the documents do provide a key indicator of the extent of awareness and interest CDRPs have in tackling the issues associated with alcohol-related crime and disorder.

Method

Three hundred and eight audit documents and 365 strategy documents were available for review. All subsequent figures are based on CDRPs for which there was available both an audit and strategy document, 304. Searches of both types of documents were undertaken for references to crime, disorder/antisocial behaviour and fear of crime, which were attributed to some degree to alcohol consumption. Searches took place between September and November 2002; it is possible that some CDRPs may have revised their documents since this date.

Audit findings

Almost all (97%) of audit documents mentioned alcohol as an issue in some form. Alcohol was most commonly related to disorder/antisocial behaviour (ASB) (including drunkenness and public drinking), the night-time economy and violence. Figure 1 presents the main crime and disorder types mentioned in relation to alcohol.

---

1. Recent guidance published by the Home Office assists CDRPs in collecting alcohol data (Finney and Simmonds, 2003).
2. When an alcohol-related concern was related to two areas, such as ‘fighting in licensed premises’, it was coded as both ‘violence’ and ‘night-time economy’.
Strategy findings

The strategy documents set out the CDRP’s key priorities and targets; the sections below will discuss each in turn.

Alcohol as a key priority

The intention of the audit and strategy process is for CDRPs to use information gained from the audit to better understand their local problems and as a result formulate key priorities for the local area. These priorities essentially form the basis of the area’s crime reduction strategy.

Although 94 per cent of CDRPs had a priority which included alcohol to some degree, there were relatively few that included alcohol under a crime or disorder priority.

Five per cent of CDRPs had a key priority dedicated to alcohol-related problems alone, compared with no CDRPs in the first round of audits and strategies in 1998 (Deehan and Saville, 2000). Four per cent of CDRPs designated alcohol as a cross-cutting priority, i.e. a factor which is of importance in several priority areas. Alcohol was also mentioned in other key priorities, either in combination with another factor e.g. alcohol and drugs, or under another priority heading. There were few priorities specifically addressing concerns about the night-time economy but it is possible that these concerns may have been addressed under a violence or disorder key priority.

The main findings in relation to key priorities are:

- in five per cent of strategies alcohol was a stand-alone priority;
- in four per cent of strategies alcohol was a cross-cutting priority;
- in 38 per cent of strategies alcohol was a priority in combination with another factor, nearly always drugs;
- in 18 per cent of strategies there was a ‘substance misuse’ priority which included alcohol to some extent (this does not include substance misuse priorities that did not specifically mention alcohol);
- in one per cent of strategies there was a priority specifically targeting the night-time economy;
- thirty per cent of strategies mentioned alcohol under a violence key priority; and
- twenty five per cent of strategies mentioned alcohol under a disorder or antisocial behaviour key priority.

Alcohol-related targets

Once key priorities are identified, CDRPs are encouraged to set targets to measure the impact of the proposed strategies. Overall, 45 per cent of strategies had a target relating to some form of alcohol-related crime and disorder. Targets were most common for disorder, violence and the night-time economy.

Specifically:

- twenty one per cent of strategy documents had a target around alcohol-related disorder or antisocial behaviour;
- sixteen per cent set a target to tackle alcohol-related violence; and
- thirteen per cent had a target centred on the night-time economy.
It is interesting to note that only 15 per cent of the alcohol-related targets were considered to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-related). This may result in problems for the CDRPs when they come to measure success against the targets.

**Audits through to strategies**

To understand the continuity from audit process to strategy it is possible to track the likelihood of an alcohol-related reference in the audit leading to either a key priority or target.

**Audit to key priority**

Focusing on the three main alcohol-related crime and disorder types highlighted in the audits, Figure 2 presents an overall picture of how each problem was dealt with by partnerships in terms of their key priorities.

Around a fifth of partnerships that identified an alcohol-related violence or an alcohol-related disorder/antisocial behaviour problem in the audit, then went on to include it as a priority. Although in most cases where alcohol-related crime or disorder was mentioned in the audit, it was not then included as a key priority. It is worth noting the relatively high proportions of strategic priorities that were developed for these two issues despite it not being highlighted as a problem in the audit documents.

In the case of the night-time economy, despite frequent mentions in the audit, few strategies prioritised the issue. Only around one per cent of CDRPs prioritised it in the strategy.

**Figure 2  Audit through to priority, three main alcohol-related crime and disorder types**
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*Note: Overall, 25 per cent of strategies mentioned alcohol under a disorder/ASB priority, observed differences are due to rounding.*

**Audit to strategic target**

In a similar way, the continuity from audit mention to strategic target can be tracked. Figure 3 shows that in each case the issue was more likely to be a target if it had been identified in the audit, however, again, most CDRPs that mentioned it as a problem in their audit did not go on to make it a strategic target. As with the key priorities there were a number of CDRPs who set alcohol-related targets in their strategy despite not discussing the issue in their audit.
Implications

Analysis of the second round of audit documents indicates a widespread awareness of the role of alcohol in many crime and disorder issues, particularly violence, disorder and the night-time economy. However, the extent to which the recognition of the role of alcohol in crime and disorder is then transferred into priorities and discrete, measurable targets in the strategy is fairly low. Furthermore, a closer look at the strategic priorities reveals that alcohol was often grouped together under a drug and alcohol or substance misuse priority with illegal drugs often the prime focus of the priority. However, unlike the first round of audit and strategy documents in 1998, this time some CDRPs did have a priority dedicated to alcohol issues alone.

The relative lack of alcohol-related strategic priorities and targets suggests that while many areas acknowledge the link between alcohol, crime and disorder, there may be difficulties in collecting reliable data with which to monitor alcohol-related strategies and targets. This has implications for how the evidence on which CDRP strategies are based is interpreted. Of course, even when comprehensive, high-quality alcohol data are collected by the CDRP, these may indicate that alcohol-related crime and disorder is not a priority in the area and hence will not be included in strategic priorities and targets.

Following on from these observations, the box below provides points for CDRPs to consider when thinking of ways to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder.

Learning points

- Collect as much robust alcohol-related data as possible in order to be able to adequately measure the extent and nature of local alcohol-related crime and disorder.
- Use the data to establish baselines against which change can be measured.
- Only include alcohol in a drug or substance misuse priority if there is a good reason to. Drug and alcohol crimes can differ substantially. If alcohol is a crime and disorder problem in the area, think about setting a dedicated priority or including alcohol under a violence, night-time economy or disorder key priority.
- Set SMART targets that can be robustly measured.
- Look at how to tackle alcohol problems innovatively using good practice from schemes already in existence in relation to specific problems experienced.
The audit and strategy documents also provided some information about schemes and initiatives being used to tackle alcohol-related problems. Encouragingly, there were many examples of projects and initiatives set up to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder. Many of these had very well thought out, multi-tiered, holistic approaches. This suggests that while at present it may be difficult for CDRPs to set measurable targets to monitor alcohol-related crime, many are looking at practical ways of addressing the problem although without baselines and targets it is virtually impossible to accurately measure the success of an initiative.

Section II presents a series of case studies of areas which have tried to identify and address their local alcohol-related crime problems.
Section II: Case studies

- Background
- Recommendations
- Burnley - ‘BAND scheme’
- Camden - ‘Glitterball scheme’
- High Peak - ‘Safer By… scheme’
- Leicester - ‘NiteRIDER scheme’
- Liverpool - ‘Crystal Clear scheme’
- Manchester - ‘City Centre Safe’
- North Northumberland - ‘Alcohol Awareness plus’

Background
A list of schemes and initiatives aimed at tackling alcohol-related crime and disorder in England and Wales was compiled from the CDRP audit and strategy documents and augmented with information from Home Office surveys of government office regions and police force areas. The list was then narrowed down to reflect a number of key Home Office concerns.

- Problem premises.
- Glass-related violence.
- Alcohol and the night-time economy.
- Under-age drinking.

Schemes were selected that aimed to address these issues, and that were well established, interesting and innovative. The case studies are not exhaustive or exclusive: there may be other similar schemes around the country that are not included in this report.

The case studies describe seven different initiatives. The studies do not attempt to evaluate the schemes but simply provide a description of various projects, ideas and experiences that may be useful to other local partnerships. As the case studies present very different schemes and initiatives the messages may vary between studies and are thus not intended to be prescriptive but rather provide examples of how a selection of areas have successfully established schemes to suit their own local needs.

In some cases the initiatives described adopted a holistic approach to a problem but we have chosen to concentrate on a particular aspect of the project although generally, a multi-tiered, comprehensive approach is likely to be more successful than a ‘stand-alone’ initiative. It should also be noted that some of the schemes might be more suitable for some types of area rather than others because of factors such as size of the area, location and number of licensed premises. For further information about preventing alcohol problems at a local level see for example; Heather et al., 2001, Holder, 1997 and Plant et al., 1997.

The recommendations below bring together the learning points from all of the case studies and are followed by a description of each of the initiatives studied.

Recommendations
Unsurprisingly, most of the initiatives had initial problems or areas that could be developed or improved over time. However, despite differences between schemes and some initial teething problems, most areas had some key issues in common, which form the basis of the recommendations below. There are, of course, other approaches and ideas not discussed as part of the case studies such as feeding into and influencing local planning and licensing decisions, approaches that will undoubtedly form part of holistic strategies.

Identifying the problem
The schemes examined found that, in order to create a successful initiative it was vital to ensure that the nature of the problem was fully understood in order to appropriately address it. Often anecdotal evidence began the process but, by identifying as many data sources as possible, areas were able to examine the precise nature and extent of the issue.
Where such information was not available locally, areas often benefited from conducting a data-gathering exercise. Funding this process may be problematic but the cases examined found it worthwhile: it ensured the schemes were properly targeted and viable, and also helped some schemes gain funding.

Advice on sources, collection and analysis of alcohol-related data can be found in Finney and Simmonds (2003).

Monitoring and evaluation

The schemes studied, on the whole, found that they were better able to monitor and evaluate their initiative if they had aims and objectives stated from the outset alongside mechanisms to monitor whether they were being achieved.

Monitoring and evaluation naturally leads on from the process of identifying the problem, as it is essential to have robust and reliable baseline (pre-initiative) figures against which progress can be measured. Without before and after figures, it is not possible to evaluate the success of the scheme, potentially jeopardising future funding.

As with identifying the problem, data may be already available locally to establish baselines and monitor progress. Many of the case studies found it beneficial to access the police, health services and other agencies’ data sources to gain as comprehensive a picture as possible.

Schemes which were able to commission an independent evaluation felt this provided them with a more objective and useful measure of the impact of their initiative.

Partnership

As suggested above, gaining the co-operation of other agencies can be crucial. This is not only in terms of the data they possess, but also in terms of setting up and running a viable initiative. All the case studies took a partnership approach to solving their problems. In addition to ensuring the partnership was comprised of the most relevant parties, the case studies suggested that engaging support and commitment as early as possible was conducive to the smooth running of the scheme.

In some cases this proved difficult, and a period of negotiation and protocol development was needed. Data sharing was often one of the largest stumbling blocks and establishing close working relationships with all stakeholders from the inception of the project was found to aid the process considerably.

It is not only statutory partners that were seen to be important. Licensees formed a part of many of the schemes studied, and were seen to be crucial in ensuring that the schemes actually worked in practice.

Funding

Funding was a difficulty that needed addressing by many of the areas studied. This was overcome in a number of different ways, sometimes by obtaining full or partial funding from the private sector. This was ‘sold’ to the investors in more than one case because the scheme was likely to have a positive impact on the investor’s business. Public funding was also available, but usually only if robust evidence about the nature of the problem could be produced.

Other ways to overcome funding problems was through joining together with other agencies or organisations with similar concerns to allow for small amounts of money to be pooled.

There are also many local and central funding avenues available, but the administration time to fully explore these avenues can often be prohibitive without dedicated staff in post.

Sustainability

For most of the case studies it was unlikely that the alcohol-related problem would ever be fully solved and it was therefore important for the schemes to think about the long-term prospects of the initiative.

Key to this was to secure long-term funding or develop self-financing schemes, but in addition it was necessary to think about the ownership of the project. Often projects appeared to be rooted in the ideas and enthusiasm of individuals and when they were no longer able to continue with the project the momentum disappeared and the project was put at risk.

Schemes which had successfully managed to achieve sustainability tended to ensure the project was the responsibility of a group with a shared goal and, if feasible, the aims and objectives of the project were linked in with other local policy or strategies. The issue of giving dedicated staff time for the running and developing of the scheme was highlighted in many of the examples as crucial to the long-term sustainability of a number of projects.
Burnley - Burnley Against Night-time Disorder (BAND)

Overview
Burnley is a large town in East Lancashire. It has a busy town centre, which is home to 28 licensed premises. In response to reported violent and disorderly behaviour, BAND, a partnership enterprise, was established to tackle the problem by banning perpetrators from all licensed premises for a period of twelve months.

Identifying the problem
Violence and disorder in Burnley town centre was initially identified by an independent town centre management team set up to develop and regenerate the economy of Burnley. The team was concerned that people were not using the town centre at night in part because of the problems associated with crime and disorder.

Gathering data
The management team undertook a local data collection exercise to gain an understanding of the extent and nature of the problem. The research included:
- a survey of users of the town centre on a Saturday night. This indicated that numbers of people coming into the centre was low relative to the size of the town's potential catchment area;
- a survey of the local community. This highlighted the perception of Burnley as a violent and disorderly place at night. Fear of alcohol-related violence was the main reason people were reluctant to come into the centre at night;
- a police review of crime in Burnley at weekends. This indicated that Burnley town centre had high levels of violent and disorderly behaviour compared to other local divisions. There was also evidence that under-age drinking and availability of drugs were a problem, particularly at weekends;
- further analysis of the police data above suggested that the majority of violent crime (92%) was committed in and around licensed premises; and
- a search of crime reports in order to gain an understanding of the socio-demographic details of victims and offenders.

Establishing the group
The town centre management team decided that a separate, dedicated group was needed to tackle the problems identified by the research, resulting in the development of BAND, a multi-agency partnership group.

BAND included representatives from police, the town centre management team, licensees, the Royal British Legion Association (who staff the CCTV), a licensing officer from the local council and the local drugs outreach worker.

Each licensee paid £100 as a joining fee and £50 for annual membership. All licensed premises in Burnley town centre are members of the scheme and are considered central to the group.

Taxi firms are also part of the scheme, mainly in an effort to reduce the racial abuse against the largely Asian taxi drivers. Doorstaff have not been invited to join, mainly due to confidentiality issues, but they are kept informed and are able to raise issues through separate, monthly meetings that feed into BAND.

Aims and objectives
The aims of BAND are:
- to reduce the prevalence of alcohol related crime including violence and disorder;
- to eliminate the supply and use of drugs in licensed premises;
- to reduce the prevalence of under-age drinking; and
- to promote the notion that antisocial behaviour is not acceptable.

Implementing the scheme
Those arrested in Burnley for crimes with an element of violence, criminal damage or drugs supply are photographed by the police and given an interim ban. This prevents them from entering licensed premises in the town centre until the next BAND meeting when a decision whether to uphold the ban is made.
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BAND meets monthly. At the meeting, all incidents reported to the police that month are discussed, then a vote is taken by the licensees on whether to ban the person responsible for the incident. Only the licensees are allowed to vote as only they have the power to ban individuals.

Once the ban is agreed, the individual’s details are recorded (name, date of birth and photograph) and sent to all BAND members. The banned person is then visited by the police, served with the banning documentation and informed of his/her right to appeal. The ban prohibits individuals from visiting any licensed premises in the town centre for twelve months.

The banned person’s details are circulated to town centre licensed premises and enforced by doorstaff, barstaff and the police, aided by information from CCTV. Each month new lists are circulated as people start and finish their ban.

BAND is also used to tackle racial discrimination against taxi drivers, non-payment of taxi fares and football hooliganism. This is achieved in a similar manner by banning perpetrators from licensed premises and/or local taxis.

The scheme is publicised through posters and adverts in the local press. Each year the scheme is relaunched and given local media coverage. Whilst BAND does not publicly name those banned, it does advertise the numbers being banned.

Protocols
The police have permission from licensees to ban individuals from premises using legislation under the Licensing Act 1964 which gives licensees the power to ban anyone from their premises without being obliged to give a reason. BAND also has a legally-agreed photograph protocol agreement which states that photographs will only be used for BAND purposes and will be kept out of public view. The names of the individuals and the licensee who reported the incident are not disclosed at BAND meetings to ensure objectivity and anonymity.

Funding
The scheme is totally self-funding. Costs are covered from the membership fees.

Monitoring
Burnley has reported a two-fold increase in night-time visitors to the town centre since the introduction of BAND. It has also seen the filling of previously empty premises and the arrival of nationwide chains. Whilst violence and disorder has continued, anecdotal evidence from police officers suggests that incidents since BAND started are less severe. These changes may not be attributed directly to BAND, but they are encouraging. Analysis of police data could be compared with the initial data gathered to inform the development of BAND which would be very useful but this has not happened as yet.

Another reported success of this scheme is the increase in communication between partners, especially between the police, local authority and licensees and doorstaff.

The BAND scheme has been recognised nationally and has won a certificate of merit from Crime Concern and the 2002 Tilley Award.

Learning points
- **Evidence**: This scheme found that collecting sufficient data helped them to correctly identify the problem. Collecting information from different sources allowed a fuller understanding of the problem and therefore a more targeted strategy could be developed.
- **Partnership**: Identifying key partners and defining their roles helped buy-in, membership and commitment to the group. BAND, although very much a multi-agency scheme, recognised that the licensees were the core of the group and that they should make decisions about whether to ban offenders; the police and council deliberately do not sit in positions of authority within the group.
- **Sustainability**: By charging licensees a nominal fee to be part of the scheme BAND has ensured that the scheme can continue without relying on outside funding. Financial stability was seen to be crucial to ensure sustainability.
- **Using legislation**: BAND was able to function by using a power under the Licensing Act 1964 by which licensees can ban individuals from their licensed premises. In addition, the establishment of legal protocols around the sharing of information, in this case photographs, ensured that the scheme worked.
- **Publicity**: BAND found that regular publication of the numbers being banned had a deterrent effect on potential offenders. They felt strongly that advertising the nature of the scheme and its successes were important to spread awareness.

- **Flexibility**: BAND was prepared to adapt initiatives in response to new issues and challenges. For example, it responded to problems with late night taxis by including taxi drivers and by extending the ban to violent behaviour and racist incidents.

- **Anonymity**: As the scheme does not link a ban to a particular licensee it avoids the issue of labelling particular premises and also lessens the likelihood of repercussions by banned individuals.

Thanks go to Inspector Andy Moore and Sergeant Caroline Edwards of the Lancashire Constabulary, Mick Armfield, Licensing Enforcement Officer at Burnley Borough Council and Jimmy Nelson, Chair of BAND, for providing information on which the above summary is based.
Camden - Glitterball Project

Overview
Camden is a busy, metropolitan borough in central London. It is home to many leisure and entertainment venues and has almost 2,000 pubs and around 130 licensed entertainment venues. The Glitterball project, a partnership approach between the London Borough of Camden, the Metropolitan police and local licensees, was established to reduce violent crime in and around licensed premises. It uses covert police visits with local authority follow-up to encourage more responsible management of licensed venues.

Identifying the problem
High levels of street crime and antisocial behaviour were identified in specific ‘hotspot’ areas. The local authority recognised that, within these areas, there was a link between the entertainment provision and crime.

Gathering data
No specific data collection was undertaken prior to the scheme.

Establishing the group
To engage the support of licensees, a seminar was arranged by the industry representatives and the local authority to raise awareness of crime linked to the night-time economy and discuss what could be done to address it. The seminar also informed the licensees that the Licensing and Safety Team within the local authority intended to conduct formal assessments of licensed venues. This seminar also let the local authority present the problem to the local police and led to partnership working between the two agencies to jointly tackle the problem.

Aims and objectives
The project aimed to encourage better management of licensed premises thereby increasing the safety of the borough at night for both customers and local residents.

Implementing the scheme
Selecting and arranging the visits
Twenty-four nightclubs and pubs with a capacity of over 200 were selected for covert police visits. These premises were selected because they fell within hotspot areas and not because of high records of crime and disorder on their premises (this ensured that premises that simply did not report their incidents were also included). The project was not publicised widely to ensure the reputations of individual premises were not inadvertently damaged. Once selected the licensees at each venue, in line with Camden’s policy, were notified in writing and informed that police officers would shortly make covert visits to assess how safely they were being run.

Covert visits
For each covert visit officers completed an inspection checklist which covered three main issues: doorstaff practices and queue management; evidence of drug dealing and how this was managed; and the atmosphere and environment of the venue including how customer welfare was ensured. The police addressed any immediate crime issues resulting from the visit then passed the completed checklists to the local authority Licensing and Safety Team.

Feedback
Once all visits were complete, the Licensing and Safety Team collated the findings and officers visited each venue to conduct a crime risk assessment in the presence of the licensee. The visit included identifying areas for improvement in the running and management of the premises. These were agreed and confirmed in writing.

At the request of the licensees a seminar has been arranged for them on designing out crime and crime prevention. Camden and the local police will fund the course. Both are also producing a designing out crime tool-kit that will be available for all licensees.
Support and enforcement

The Licensing and Safety Team and the police then jointly made recommendations for improvement, some of which were in the form of licensing conditions. Information was offered to support the implementation of any recommended changes and advice was given. If the licensee flouted the recommendations or the team or the police had serious concerns about how a venue was being managed they worked together to revoke the licence.

Funding

There was early difficulty in securing funding for the covert police visits, partly because this was not considered a police priority. The local authority, therefore, had to raise the funds to pay for the police visits, substantially delaying the project.

The local authority bid for funds from the Camden Community Safety Partnership based on a proposal to target specific premises that also had drug-related crime problems; £10,000 was allocated to fund covert police visits for the project.

Monitoring

Police crime and disorder data will indicate whether there have been any changes in the hotspot areas targeted by the project, although this analysis had not been conducted at the time of writing. However, it will not be possible to conclude from these data whether any monitored changes can be directly attributed to the project.

However, stronger working relationships between the local authority, the police and licensees have reported to have been forged as a result of this project, and anecdotal evidence suggests licensees appear to be taking a more responsible approach in their serving and supervision practices. Funding has been secured for the foreseeable future.

Learning points

- **Commitment:** By holding a seminar for licensees in the early stages of the project, Camden secured the engagement and commitment of its key partner agencies. It also facilitated good working relationships with them.

- **Planning:** The local authority licensing team found that having a clear project plan helped enable all partners involved in the project to understand their roles and ensured all parties were properly informed and involved at the start. It was also central to securing funding for the project.

- **Policy:** Camden’s licensing policy, published in ‘Night In, Night Out’, clearly set out the local authority’s commitment to ensuring safe and well-run entertainment venues. Glitterball was then developed to help meet the aims of this policy. This link between the overriding strategy and an individual project gave weight to the project, and helped ensure both co-operation and funding.

- **Sanctions:** The power to recommend license conditions and to apply for licence revocation where necessary meant that licensees had a vested interest in acting upon the recommendations they received. Camden had simply to ensure that they had the resources to adequately enforce these threatened sanctions.

Thanks go to Stephen Leonard, Senior Project Manager for Glitterball at the Licensing and Safety Team, for providing the information on which the above summary is based.
High Peak - Safer Pubs and Clubs

Overview

Buxton is a market town in the Peak district with numerous pubs and late opening venues. The ‘Peaks and Dales Safer Pubs and Clubs’ scheme adopted a multi-tiered approach to increase the safety of licensed premises. Ten ‘Safer By...’ action points were developed, which relate to a raft of schemes to tackle and improve many aspects of the night-time economy.

Identifying the problem

Police records were examined to identify the number and nature of glass-related incidents as there was anecdotal evidence that this was a problem in the area. Once known, the police were keen to address the causes of this problem.

Gathering data

Prior to the scheme

Local crime statistics identified the extent of violence around licensed premises. In addition, observations and consultation with those involved with licensing in the area were undertaken.

The police looked at police-led alcohol-related violence projects across the country and abroad and decided that they required a variety of schemes to tackle their local alcohol-related problems.

During the scheme

A later development was the introduction of an alcohol-related violence questionnaire, completed by officers in the custody suite. The questionnaire collected information about the offender, the offence and the place of the offender’s last drink and was used in every incident thought to involve alcohol.

In addition, local crime statistics showing the place of incidents were given to the Licensing Sergeant each morning to enable him to visit licensees very soon after any incident, thereby keeping a tight control of licensed premises in the area.

Establishing a group

A proposal was developed jointly by the police and local authorities which outlined a ‘Safer By...’ strategy to reduce the violence in or around pubs and clubs. Initially, it was difficult to find the necessary backing to properly implement the ideas due to time, resource constraints and the relatively low strategic priority given to licensing by the police. The scheme was only able to reach its full potential when a dedicated Licensing Sergeant was appointed by the police to co-ordinate the operation.

The police acknowledged that a partnership approach was necessary for the scheme to be successful. The partnership included the police, the two relevant borough councils, environmental health officers, local authority licensing solicitors, licensees, and independent evaluators.

Implementing the scheme

The scheme consisted of ten separate ‘Safer By...’ initiatives to be implemented by licensed premises in order to gain ‘safer by...’ accreditation.

- ‘Safer by Proof of Age’: All persons entering licensed premises were required to produce a valid Portman group card, ten-year British passport, or photo-id drivers license on entry if requested to do so.
- ‘Safer by Doorwatch’: All licensees were required to employ only those doorstaff who had undertaken doorstaff training and were fully accredited.
- ‘Safer by Drugs Protocol’: All staff had to be made aware of and comply to the divisional drugs protocol. Random searching was a condition of entry, and suitable posters and signs relating to drug use were displayed.
- ‘Safer by Design’: An initiative to actively ‘design out crime’ by structural alterations where possible. Premises were also required to create and implement a ‘Safer by Design’ survey and timetable for which changes were to be made on the recommendation of the police architectural liaison officer.
- ‘Safer by Exclusion’: Licensees had to fully assist police with any criminal investigation in and around the premises, support any application for exclusion orders and report all breaches.
‘Safer by Training/Education’: All licensed premises staff were required to complete in-house, or a distance learning package and licensees obligated to complete a National Licensees course, approved by the British Institute of Innkeepers (BII).

‘Safer by CCTV’: Premises were to run an effective and fully functional CCTV system, with tape recording and storage facilities.

‘Safer by Glass Management’: Premises were to use only plastic or toughened glass vessels.

‘Safer by Pubwatch’: Licensees were to support the local Pubwatch scheme by attending meetings.

‘Safer by Dispersal’: Licensees were made responsible for promoting the effective dispersal of customers at closing times from in and around the premises.

The ‘Safer By…’ scheme was piloted in four premises which had previously been identified as problematic. A small-scale evaluation of the pilot, carried out by a university student, showed an encouraging reduction in violent incidents in and around the premises. This provided the evidence necessary to support the roll-out of the scheme to the entire divisional area.

Problem premises were identified through police statistics and the custody-suite questionnaire. Police then worked with the premises to bring them up to standard within a three-month time frame, using the ‘Safer By…’ model. If the standard was achieved the premises received a ‘Safer By…’ brass plaque to display at the premises.

To ensure standards were maintained all premises involved received visits, support and advice from the police throughout the twelve-month period for which they were accredited. If local violent crime and disorder was continually reduced throughout the year and the licensee was willing to work alongside the partnership, they continued to be re-accredited.

**Funding**

The scheme was largely self-funded: ‘Safer By…’ premises funded any necessary changes themselves (achievable because, at the time of writing, most of the ‘Safer By…’ premises were national chains with adequate resources for refurbishment). However some smaller premises have adopted elements of the scheme. This does not result in full accreditation, but does mean that they are incorporating measures to increase safety for both staff and patrons.

Enforcing the ‘Safer By…’ scheme is seen as part of the core job of the police, but funding for a dedicated Licensing Sergeant is not secured and depends on local priorities. At present there is funding for three years.

**Monitoring**

Police statistics suggest that the number of violent incidents in and around the pilot premises reduced by half (from 24 to 12) within the first 12 months following accreditation.

The scheme has been widely publicised and information has been supplied to other areas considering adopting a similar approach. The ‘Peaks and Dales Safer Pubs and Clubs’ scheme has also won a Crime Concern national award.

**Learning points**

- **Evidence**: The custody-suite questionnaire and daily crime statistics enabled the police to immediately identify and target problem premises. These data also provided reliable evidence that can stand up in court, ensuring that the police are able to impose sanctions on premises when necessary.

- **Ongoing monitoring**: The ‘Safer By…’ accreditation lasts for 12 months and throughout this period the police continue to monitor premises and provide ongoing support and advice. Re-accreditation is only given if premises continue to work with the police to overcome any identified problems.

- **Dedicated staff**: Despite the enthusiasm of the police initially involved in ‘Safer By…’ the initiative was only able to fully function and develop when a dedicated Licensing Sergeant was appointed. In addition, once this post was established, having a key contact for the licensees to contact made it easier to build relationships between the police and licensees.

- **Incentives**: Promoting the success of a scheme encouraged participation. When licensed premises became accredited they were awarded with a ‘Safer By…’ brass plaque and featured in the local newspaper.

Thanks go to Sergeant Andy Torkington, Sergeant Tim Barlow and Architectural Liaison Officer P.C. Mark Freel of the Derbyshire Constabulary for providing information on which the above summary is based.
Leicester - NiteRIDER

Overview

Leicester is a large city in the East Midlands with a lively evening economy, with about 350 pubs and 80 nightclubs located within one square mile. The NiteRIDER scheme is a weekend late-night bus service initiated by the police to help address violence and disorder problems in the centre of Leicester.

Identifying the problem

Leicestershire Constabulary has a violence and disorder team within which there are three to four officers dedicated to problems in the night-time economy. When first established, the team undertook research to identify violence and disorder problems in the city centre. This led to an Alcohol Action Plan, which covered licensing enforcement, doorman, licensee accountability, situational crime prevention, dispersal, and identifying key offenders.

This summary focuses on the issue of dispersal. Initial research indicated that violence and disorder could be explained in part by the slow rate of dispersal of the crowds of people leaving clubs and late-night bars.

Gathering data

The police were keen to establish a late-night bus service to tackle the problem of dispersal. However, local bus companies were doubtful of the viability of such a scheme. To overcome this, the police undertook a survey of customers leaving Leicester’s two largest clubs. They collected information on customers’ home postcodes, whether or not they would welcome a night bus service, and if they would pay £2 to use the service. The results of the survey indicated overwhelming support.

Gaining support

Despite a positive response from potential customers, the police were not able to convince the local authority of the viability of the scheme. However, an independent transport organisation (First) became involved and worked in partnership with the police and three nightclubs to plan the service.

Implementing the scheme

The bus routes were prepared by the bus company with guidance from the police to ensure no route served neighbourhoods with known rivalries. The buses were smart and clean and fitted with digital CCTV and a protected driver area. One trained nightclub door supervisor provided by the affiliated nightclubs rode on each bus to supervise the passengers, thereby providing support to the driver.

All buses shared a single departure point, the bus station, and three departure times: 12.30am, 1.30am and 2.30am. Such consistencies ensured that the service was easy for customers to use and for the police, doorman supervisors and bus operator to manage.

During the trial period, police officers were assigned to the bus station at departure times to ensure orderly queuing and loading on to the buses. They now only attend on an informal basis as passengers appear to police themselves.

The launch was advertised in the local papers on three separate occasions and the affiliated nightclubs distributed fliers. Credit card sized leaflets available in the nightclubs detailed the service routes, departure point, times and price and the buses all carried the NiteRIDER logo.

Funding

The police secured funding from the local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (£1,500) and the three affiliated nightclubs (£1,500 each) to support the launch of the three-month trial of the service. This was largely used to cover the advertising costs.

The service is now an entirely commercial exercise run by the bus company and no longer needs any additional funds. The numbers using the service are such that expanding the service to include more buses or other routes is being considered.
Monitoring

The police regard the project as a success. Although disorder remains a problem, the number of assaults occurring during the trial period was half those occurring in the same period the previous year, although it is impossible to conclude whether this is as a direct result of NiteRIDER. Serious assaults (grievous bodily harm in particular) on weekend nights have substantially reduced. In the first six months of operation the buses had two incidents, one of which involved a passenger kicking out a window, but since then there have not been any incidents requiring police attendance.

NiteRIDER now regularly transports 500-600 people home at weekends.

Recommendations

- **Funding**: One-off funding contributions from the CDRP and the affiliated nightclubs was crucial to launch and establish this service. However, since then, the commercial viability of the project has secured its continuation beyond the trial period.

- **Ensuring support**: Leicestershire police were able to present a strong case for a night bus service through surveying local nightclub customers. In this way, they were able to show that there was enough interest in such a service for it to be commercially viable.

- **Timing**: The pilot for this service was launched during the run-up to Christmas, traditionally a busy time for the evening economy, to ensure a good passenger take-up and to provided an immediate base audience. In this way, the timing of the launch for this scheme was critical to its success.

- **Publicity**: Strong publicity for the project in local press, distribution of flyers to the target client group, and identifiable NiteRIDER buses contributed to good take-up of the project. Such a scheme could only be successful if potential customers were aware of it.

- **Safety**: A focus on passenger and driver safety has contributed to the popularity of the NiteRIDER service and to the good incident record on the buses. Ensuring on-board CCTV, a protected driver area, trained door supervisors and police presence at the departure point were key elements to ensure people were confident that this was a safe service: the project needed to be safe to maintain its credibility.

- **Maintaining standards**: The standards on the buses have remained high, with ‘zero tolerance’ of any sort of disorder. The door supervisors treat the bus like a licensed premises and will not let drunk or abusive people on. All incidents are recorded and monitored by the bus company and the police help sort out any problems.

Thanks go to PC Dave Piguillem, Inspector Daimon Tilley and Sergeant Luke Russell of Leicestershire Constabulary for providing the information on which the above summary is based.
Liverpool - Crystal Clear

Overview

Liverpool is a large city in Merseyside with a compact and busy city centre, which includes a large concentration of licensed premises. The Liverpool 'Crystal Clear' scheme aimed to remove glass from outdoor public places in Liverpool city centre with the purpose of reducing glass-related injuries.

Identifying the problem

Police officers from Liverpool city centre were aware of a number of violent incidents where glass was used as a weapon. Resources were made available to investigate the issue and an analysis of police records revealed that the majority of glass-related incidents occurred outside licensed premises. High concentrations of late-night premises in relatively close proximity to each other were thought to exacerbate the problem of patrons travelling between bars with glasses or bottles.

Initial response

As a first step the police allocated additional resources to hotspot areas and confiscated bottles and glasses from people in the streets. To assist with this, a police officer was stationed in the CCTV controller centre to direct police on the ground. This initial phase, named Operation Crystal, was deemed a success as police identified a 50 per cent reduction in the number of glass-related injuries over the two weekends it ran. However, it was expensive to run as the extra police resource was made possible by overtime and there were issues about the safe disposal of the confiscated glass.

Establishing a group

It was felt that while it was an encouraging start, the police needed additional support to run it properly. A multi-agency partnership was set up comprising police, local authority, representatives from the health authority, and the local clerk of the Northern Brewers and Licence Retailers Association.

Implementing the scheme

The multi-agency partnership launched a new version of the scheme, Crystal Clear, which had two main strands: enforcement and social marketing.

Enforcement

Local breweries were approached and agreed to fund new specially designed bottle bins, which were placed around the city. The police continued to confiscate glass bottles and containers from people drinking in outside public spaces in the city centre. This was aided by a condition to all Public Entertainment Licenses, which made licensees responsible for stopping glass leaving their premises, a condition granted after representation to the local licensing committee by Crystal Clear.

Social marketing campaign

An independent company, HIT, was contracted to undertake a social marketing campaign. This used strong messages and graphic images over a variety of media to convey the message that glass is dangerous and can lead to devastating consequences. It also aimed to inform and reinforce the legal message that drinking in the streets was not permitted. The campaign targeted specific age groups, who were then presented with messages throughout their evening out, for example during specific television and local radio programmes in the early evening; on trains and buses on the way to the city centre; then on billboards in the city centre and on beer mats, posters and T-shirts once inside venues.

The scheme has been repeatedly run at Christmas and over the summer since 1999. Each new round has used different images and messages depending on current problems. The ‘Crystal Clear’ message is also part of the Merseyside police campaigns ‘Citybeat’ and ‘Street Safe’.

Funding

The main cost to the partnership was the funding for the social marketing campaign, with funds obtained from the health authority and breweries. Additional funds were also obtained from a locally-held budget on the condition that funding was matched and included an independent evaluation by a local university.
Monitoring

The independent evaluation collected Accident and Emergency (A+E) data on assaults. This was broken down to measure glass-related assaults within the city centre. The evaluation found that Crystal Clear achieved a reduction in the number of glass-related assaults. It pointed to a number of factors which in combination might have resulted in the decrease. These included the media campaign, high visibility policing at hotspot times/places, city centre alcohol-free zones, and increased public awareness of the byelaw and the dangers of glass.

The scheme gained outside recognition in winning the Home Office 'Tilley Award' for Problem Solving Policing in 2001. In addition, schemes based on the principles of Crystal Clear have been successfully implemented in other parts of the country.

Recently Crystal Clear has suffered from the problem that due to reorganisation there is no one to champion the project or able to give dedicated time to it, so that despite the work of the partnership it has been difficult to develop the scheme. It is hoped that this situation will be rectified and that there will be a new steering group to take forward Crystal Clear and expand the profile of alcohol-related crime in Liverpool. Despite these problems the byelaw is still being regularly enforced in the city centre and it is hoped that further marketing campaigns will take place.

Learning points

- Collecting evidence: Data collection mechanisms based on A+E data resulted in a reliable method of recording and measuring alcohol-related assaults, overcoming the under-reporting inherent in police data. This has been used to evaluate the original campaign and has been such a success it is now being used for intelligence gathering more generally.

- Perseverance: The lessons learnt from Crystal Clear were instrumental in helping to secure the legal power to confiscate bottles and glasses in public spaces. This power was included under the Criminal Justice and Police Act, 2001.

- Ensuring support: By making it a condition of the PEL that licensees had to ensure glass did not leave their premises resulted in immediate support and buy-in to the scheme from managers and staff of city-centre pubs and clubs.

- Sustainability: Crystal Clear has recently suffered from the lack of a dedicated staff member to work on the project. This is vital for the sustainability and development of the project. At present negotiations are ongoing to rectify this problem.

- Timing: Crystal Clear is run over both the Christmas/New Year period and over the summer months, both of which are traditionally peak times for disorder. This allowed efficient targeting of resources.

- Publicity: A widespread, hard-hitting publicity campaign in media such as posters, television and radio have been instrumental in raising awareness of the scheme’s messages.

- Independent evaluation: The independent evaluation of Crystal Clear objectively indicated that the scheme was successful in achieving its aim of reducing glass and bottle-related injuries in Liverpool city centre. This in turn helped gain the funding for subsequent years.

Thanks go to Constable Keith Rice of Merseyside Police, and Kirsteen Shepherd of HIT advertising for providing the information on which the above summary is based.
Manchester - City Centre Safe

Overview

Manchester is a metropolitan city with a large entertainment district in north west England. The ‘City Centre Safe’ scheme was introduced to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder in the city centre area. It took a partnership approach to crime reduction and used a range of initiatives to combat the problem in a holistic manner.

Identifying the problem

In the years after the IRA bomb Manchester city centre underwent a great deal of redevelopment and during this time a large amount of planning permission was approved, a substantial proportion of which was for licensed premises. Over the same time period Manchester was attracting negative press coverage for being an unsafe place to go out at night, with a lot of violence and disorder associated with the now substantial night-time economy.

Against this backdrop, ‘City Centre Safe’ was developed to take a new approach to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder.

Gathering data

The police examined reported crime data and found that between 1996 and 1999 there had been a 225 per cent increase in assaults. Over the same period it was calculated that licensed premises' capacity had increased by 240 per cent. There was also police evidence that the concentration of intoxicated people in the city centre on weekend nights was fuelling other crimes such as theft, street robbery and sexual assault.

In setting up the project the police ensured they were adequately prepared to tackle the problem: they sought good practice from other areas of the country and took advice from academics in the field.

Establishing the group

Because of the extent of the local problems, police time was diverted to look at what was happening, why it was happening and what they could do about it. A fresh look at how the night-time economy was managed was taken and the police took steps to increase their knowledge about the licensing system.

It was soon realised that the police could not tackle this problem in isolation and that they needed to work in partnership with other agencies. By working with other agencies such as the CDRP, probation, health and local transport companies, they aimed to construct a range of initiatives that would work in a holistic way to tackle the identified problems.

Aims of the scheme

The scheme had four main goals.

- To reduce the number of serious assaults and glass-related injuries
- To work in partnership with the licensed trade to improve the management of licensed premises
- To promote the provision of safe drinking
- To reduce the perceptions of drunkenness, rowdiness and disorder in Manchester city centre.

Implementing the scheme

The scheme developed rapidly and at the time of writing consisted of over 20 separate initiatives, including:

- Top ten premises enforcement scheme: Monitoring of the worst ten premises in Manchester in terms of crime and disorder and providing subsequent support and advice to help them improve their performance.
- Best Bar None award: A high-profile annual event that acknowledges the best managed pubs in the city centre.
- Last drink initiative: City centre custody suites and A&E departments systematically record where attendees had their last drink with the aim of identifying problem premises.
- Nite net radio system: Enables pubs, clubs, CCTV, police and others working in the city centre at night to be in constant contact.
- Safe havens: Safety points linked to CCTV in the city centre so anyone in trouble or distress can access help and advice quickly.
- Think safe, drink safe campaign: All marketing and publicity contains this copyrighted message and is designed to publicise the ‘City Centre Safe’ scheme and promote sensible drinking.
Partnership working was crucial in enabling Manchester to effectively deliver ‘City Centre Safe’ aims and objectives. By working together with the voluntary, statutory and commercial sectors in the city and basing all their initiatives on the basis of partners supporting each other led to a strong and efficient scheme where all sectors, not only the police, helped to control the night-time economy.

‘City Centre Safe’ has also been very proactive in increasing collaboration with the Licensing Industry, which has helped to form good working relationships. This has led to successful joint initiatives such as the Best Bar None award which was sponsored by a major beer manufacturer.

A key issue to the continued success of the ‘City Centre Safe’ scheme has been keeping the momentum of the initiative going. Due to securing backing from the Greater Manchester Police ‘City Centre Safe’ has expanded from two part-time police staff to six full-time police staff. As a result, they have been able to greatly expand the amount and intensity of work they do.

**Funding**

In order for this project to have continued, it needed ongoing funding. Funding was secured from several sources, but it has taken a great deal of time to administrate and often has to be renegotiated each year. ‘City Centre Safe’ has also found that there can be difficulty with the flexibility of funding as some funding is ring-fenced and so cannot be used as creatively as the team would like.

**Monitoring**

Police statistics have indicated a 17 per cent reduction in serious assaults in Manchester since the launch of the scheme, although it is not possible to link this reduction directly to ‘City Centre Safe’. The scheme has attracted widespread publicity and has been identified as an area of good practice in the field. The ‘City Centre Safe’ team spend a large proportion of their work time advising other parts of the country on ways to tackle crime; they see this as a measure of the success of the scheme.

**Learning points**

- **Holistic**: Manchester found it useful to first identify the problem and then tackle it in a holistic manner so all aspects of the crime and disorder problem were addressed. That way, all aspects of the problem are tackled and there is no displacement from one type of disorder to another that is not the focus of police attention.

- **Organisational support**: By identifying the extent of the problem faced, Manchester police were able to secure backing and support from their management letting them commit undivided time and resources to the development and running of the scheme.

- **Sustainability**: The police in Manchester see their attention to the long-term future of the project as part of the success of the scheme. Linked to this is sustainable funding. Manchester received funding from a range of sources and spent a lot of time sourcing and administrating the processes.

- **Sharing good practice**: Manchester identified many examples of good practice from other areas of the country by visiting and talking to people already involved in tackling alcohol-related crime and disorder. They are now proactive in circulating good practice messages that have come out of their scheme to other interested parties.

- **Publicity**: ‘City Centre Safe’ have widely publicised their scheme and safe drinking messages using a range of material which is copyrighted and distinctively branded with the ‘Think Safe, Drink Safe’ logo. GMP deliberately do not put their own logo on the advertising. All material was designed so that it can be adapted for use in other parts of the country.

Thanks to Sergeant Jan Brown from ‘City Centre Safe’, Greater Manchester Police for giving up her time to take part in the interviews this case study is based on.
North Northumberland - Alcohol Awareness plus

Overview
North Northumberland is a rural area of northern England typified by small villages and a small resident population that increases by 100,000 during the tourist season. A joint approach by two neighbouring Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in North Northumberland targeted under-age drinking and, as a result, the fear of crime associated with youths drinking and hanging around public places. Alongside this runs a targeted policing approach to under-age drinking in Berwick, but this case study will focus on the CDRP initiative.

Identifying the problem and gathering data
A survey in Berwick for the 2001 CDRP audit process identified that alcohol misuse, especially under-age drinking, was a relatively big problem in the area. A CDRP forum consisting of various agencies within the area also identified under-age drinking as an issue for the region.

In addition, admission data from local hospitals and crime figures from the police indicated that alcohol misuse was a larger concern for the area than drug use. There was also much anecdotal evidence that youths drinking in highly visible public places was having a negative impact on residents' perception of the area and increasing fear of crime.

Establishing the group
Two local CDRPs were keen to jointly implement a project to address alcohol-related crime problems to ensure cost-effectiveness and a coherent approach throughout the area. Discussions were held with the local NHS Care Trust and Drug Action Team to discuss the way forward and as a result a seminar to spread awareness and attract support of the issues was arranged. A multi-agency group was formed to co-ordinate the seminar and steer the project.

The seminar was attended by key players from the region, including representatives from health, local authorities, education and youth groups. The aim of the day was to identify problems, suggest solutions and distribute financial assistance of up to £1,000 per bid to set up alcohol-related initiatives. In addition it provided the opportunity to discuss a range of alcohol-related problems.

The funding aspect was considered crucial to the success of the seminar as it encouraged new alcohol-related initiatives and ensured progress after the seminar. At the end of the seminar attendees were encouraged to submit a bid. Nine applications for funding were received and were all given £1,000.

Implementing the scheme
Reflecting the nature of the local problems uncovered by the CDRP survey, eight of the nine projects were targeted at young people. The young people's projects were mainly school-based, both middle and high schools, although some were in youth clubs and family centres. The schemes concentrated on providing diversionary activities for young people and equipping them with greater knowledge about alcohol to enable them to make more informed choices.

Funding
The two CDRPs involved had small safer community budgets due to the low crime rate of the region. For this reason, it made sense to pool their resources to fund this initiative. Initially each CDRP committed £3,000, but were able to redistribute money to fund all submitted bids.

Monitoring
As part of the bid, applicants were required to outline their plans to monitor and evaluate the scheme. A variety of ideas were submitted, including feedback from the young people who had taken part in the schemes at the beginning and at the end of the course, an alcohol knowledge quiz at the end of the course to assess knowledge and follow up of progress when the children moved onto high school. Process evaluation of the schemes by the staff was another popular method.

In addition, the Community Safety Officers were able to collect numbers of young people attending the centres where the alcohol projects take place. They also attempted to link in other available data, for example at the same time as these initiatives there has been a decline in local teenage pregnancy rates. A larger scale study of the impact of these projects may pick up changes against the audit baseline for the next round of audits and strategies.
At the end of the first year’s funding, the steering group intended to hold further seminars to discuss progress of the funded projects and give feedback and initiate a further round of funding.

Learning points

- **Flexibility of approach:** The difficulties of a rural location made it more beneficial to fund more small-scale projects over a wider geographical area. This may not suit all areas, but this fitted with the local area and the local problems.

- **Engaging partners:** North Northumberland is a very remote part of the country and coupled with the initial disinterest in alcohol issues meant that engaging the community and partner agencies was of prime importance.

- **Flexibility of funding:** The lower crime rates experienced by rural areas means that agencies had less money to resource projects. This was overcome by deciding to concentrate on alcohol as a priority and by pooling resources.

- **Addressing the right problem:** For North Northumberland the wide-scale perception that alcohol was a bigger concern than drug use gave them the impetus to dedicate a large proportion of the safer community budget to the projects. Finding out what the local issues were and who they affected was crucial for accurately targeting the initiatives.

- **Sustainability:** In this case, although the projects were initially funded for one year it was acknowledged that sustaining and developing the work through seminars and consistent funding in forthcoming years was vital in ensuring under-age drinking continued to be addressed.

Thanks to Gerald Connor, Community Safety Officer, Berwick CDRP, Brian Routledge, Community Safety Officer, Alnwick, CDRP and Paul Bolton, Drug Development Worker, North Northumberland for giving up their time to take part in the interview this summary is based on.
Conclusions

This report has shown that the majority of CDRP audit and strategy documents mentioned alcohol as a factor in crime and disorder in their area, particularly in relation to violent crime, disorder/antisocial behaviour and the night-time economy, although far fewer then proceeded to prioritise or target alcohol-related issues in their strategy. The case studies add to this picture by providing interesting and encouraging examples of what is being done throughout the country to improve local concern about alcohol-related crime and disorder. As all case studies took different approaches to tackle what they identified as the key local problems, they do not necessarily advocate the same processes, methods and solution. However, they do highlight the benefit of finding out what is happening locally and developing a strategy which best suits the needs of the community.
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