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1. Introduction

Waltham Forest Council commissioned CELLO mruk research to take over the management of their Residents’ Panel. A total of 752 existing panellists were re-contacted to advise of the change in managing agency and to check that they wished to continue of which 433 re-signed to the Panel. In addition, CELLO mruk recruited new members:

- A total of 297 new members have been recruited via a postal methodology to date;
- An additional 301 new members were recruited via a face-to-face method.

As part of the recruitment process, panel members completed a short questionnaire that focused on environmental crime and anti-social behaviour.

This document reports on the findings from the survey based on those who completed it with no missing values for gender, age and ethnicity: 939. Detailed computer tabulations are available under separate cover.

Fieldwork was carried out from 15th July to 1st September 2009.

The data have been weighted on gender, age and ethnicity to ensure it reflects the demographic make-up of the borough. The graph below shows the sample profile.
All figures denote the percentage based on number of respondents answering each question, excluding ‘don’t knows’ and non-responses. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest integer. Where two categories have been combined (e.g. very satisfied plus fairly satisfied) percentages might vary due to the rounding process (e.g. very satisfied 24.5% + fairly satisfied 24.5% = 49% but very satisfied 25% + fairly satisfied 25% = 50%).

Comparisons of these finding with previous surveys e.g. Place Survey, Borough-wide survey etc. should be done with caution as the different use of methodology can affect results. Some factors that vary between these projects are:

- Sample: Place survey – random self-selection; Borough-wide - random probability; Panel – pre-selected panel members.
- Methodology: Borough-wide – face to face; Panel and Place – Postal
- Order of the questions within the questionnaire
- Questions or possible answers worded slightly differently.

Comparisons with previous Panel surveys have also been made throughout the report. The findings from the Autumn 2009 survey have been obtained by using a freshly recruited Panel and comparisons between the Autumn 2009 survey and previous panel surveys should be made with caution.
2. Executive Summary

Tackling Environmental Crime

Overall perceptions of environmental crime as a problem in the area were very high with three-quarters of all respondents (77%) saying this is a problem. Furthermore, three in ten said this had got worse (31%) in the last year, with only (16%) saying it had got better and (53%) that it had stayed the same. Not surprisingly, perceptions of environmental crime being a problem in the area was at its lowest in North Chingford (51%), followed by South Chingford and Highams Park (71%). Walthamstow West had the highest perceptions of environmental crime being problematic in the area (84%).

Feeling informed about what the Council is doing to tackle environmental crime in Waltham Forest is split equally between those who feel informed (52%) and those who do not feel informed (48%).

Those that feel well informed are more likely to think that the Council is doing a good job - 61% of those who felt well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime thought that the Council is doing a good job, compared to only 27% of those who did not feel well informed (27%).

Although three in ten think that environmental crime in the area has worsened over the last year, it is encouraging to note that just under half of all respondents said that the Council is doing a good job in tackling environmental crime (45%), although just over a quarter (28%) of respondents disagreed with this.

There was strong support for the notion that residents have a role to play in fighting environmental crime with the majority of respondents (88%) agreeing with this, 43% of whom strongly agreed.

The two major environmental problems in the area, according to respondents were:

- Rubbish and litter lying around (82% a problem) with 36% saying this is a very big problem;
- Fly-tipping (71%) with a quarter saying this is a very big problem (26%)

Overall, half of all respondents (48%) were satisfied with the way Waltham Forest keeps the land clear of litter and refuse, while a third were dissatisfied with this (32%).

Relatively few respondents report environmental crime: 15% always with 30% saying they sometimes report it. A third (35%) rarely or never reports an enviro-crime.

In terms of awareness and knowledge of the Council’s ‘Wiping Out’ enviro-crime campaign, nearly a quarter claimed to have seen or heard it and know enough about it. A further third claimed to have seen or heard about it but knew little or nothing about it. Just over two-fifths (44%) had not seen or heard of Waltham Forest’s ‘Wiping out’ enviro-crime campaign.
The ‘wiping out’ campaign had the highest level of recall (61%) in terms of the campaign imagery. Nearly four in ten recalled the ‘Love your borough’ campaign (37%) and a similar proportion recall the ‘Shame on you’ campaign (36%).

The majority of those who are aware of the campaign support it (93%), with two-thirds (64%) supporting this strongly.

- The majority of respondents aware of the campaign (71%) said it made them aware of what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime;
- Over half of those aware of the campaign (58%) said that the enviro-campaign made them more aware of the issues around environmental crime.

Community Safety

Respondents were asked to indicate what influence fear of crime has on their quality of life, where 1 = no influence at all and 5 = a big influence. The mean or average score was 3.3, with a quarter (26%) of panellists saying it has no or little influence (scoring 1 or 2 on the 5 point scale. Three in ten (29%) scored the middle of the scale, while just under half of all respondents (44%) said it has some (22%) or a big influence (22%).

Respondents were asked how safe they feel in a series of situations. When comparing all situations - other than being at home where the majority feel safe whether during the day or after dark – feelings of safety drop significantly after dark:

- 47% feel unsafe in their neighbourhood (88% during the day);
- 47% feel unsafe in their local town centre (84% during the day);
- 46% feel unsafe waiting for public transport (86% safe during the day);
- 39% feel unsafe travelling on public transport (86% safe during the day).

Respondents were also asked if, in general, they avoid a series of situations after dark. Over two-fifths generally avoid:

- Groups of local young people (54%)
- Going out alone after dark (47%)
- Using public transport alone after dark (44%)
- Answering the door after dark (43%)
Finally residents were asked to indicate how concerned they are regarding a list of crimes.

Over two thirds were concerned about:

- Street robbery (mugging) (76%; 34% very concerned)
- Home burglary (73%; 32% very concerned)
- Car broken into or vandalised (63%; 29% very concerned)
- Drug-related crime (66%; 29% very concerned)

Anti-Social Behaviour

The majority of respondents thought that the following are a problem (very big + fairly big problem) in their local area:

- Parents not taking responsibility for their children (68%; 32% very big problem);
- Not treating people with respect and consideration (67%; 29% very concerned);
- Teenagers hanging around on the streets (60%);
- People using or dealing drugs (58%);
- People being drunk or rowdy in public places (53%);
- Vandalism (51%).

Six in ten (58%) thought anti-social behaviour generally is a very big (16%) or a fairly big problem (42%). A third of respondents thought that this is not a very big problem / not a problem at all (33%).

Finally, all respondents were asked how well informed they feel about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in their area. More respondents felt uninformed (44%), than informed (32%).
3. Detailed Findings

3.1 Tackling Environmental Crime

Feeling informed about what the Council is doing to tackle Environmental Crime

Respondents were asked to indicate how well informed they feel about what the Council is doing to tackle environmental crime in Waltham Forest. Half of all respondents said they were well informed about this, with one in ten residents being very well informed (9%) and 42% being fairly well informed.

The remaining half of residents (48%) said they were not well informed about this, with a third saying they are not very well informed (32%) and 16% saying they are not well informed at all.

Graph 1a. How well informed residents feel about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime (% - All respondents)

This is a notable increase in the percentage of residents who feel informed, from 45% in Winter 2008 to 51% in Autumn 2009.

This question has been used to create two groups of respondents, i.e. those who feel well informed and those who feel not well informed. This has been used to analyse all subsequent questions and identify whether people who feel well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime have different opinions from those who are not aware.
More women said they were well informed (57%) compared with men (46%), and so were white respondents (58%) compared with Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic respondents (BAME) (43%).

Fewer younger respondents aged 18-34 years (43%) felt well informed.

More home owners (56%) and those renting from a Housing Association (51%) felt well informed compared with those ‘renting privately/other’ (33%).

Graph 1b. How well informed residents feel about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime

By Demographics
(% - All respondents)

Over half of respondents from each of the Community Councils felt well informed, with the exception of Leyton and Whipps Cross, where only a third felt well informed (35%), and two-thirds said they were not well informed (65%).
**Extent to which environmental crime is a problem**

Three-quarters (77%) said that environmental crime in their local area is a problem, with a quarter saying this is a big problem (23%) and half saying this is a fairly big problem (54%). Only a fifth (20%) said this is not a big problem (19%) or not a problem at all (1%) (3% had no opinion).

The percentage of people who do not consider environmental crime to be a problem has risen slightly from 16% in 2008 to 20% in 2009.

**Graph 2a. Overall, environmental crime in your local area is...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>very big problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>fairly big problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>not a very big problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>not a problem at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, there were no substantial differences in the percentage of respondents who considered environmental crime to be a problem between those who felt well informed (76%) about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime and those who did not feel well informed (80%).
Panellists from North Chingford were less likely to think environmental crime is a problem in their local area (51% compared with 77% across Waltham Forest) while 44% said this was not a problem. Enviro-crime was also considered to be less of a problem in South Chingford and Highams Park.

Men (73%) were less likely to think enviro-crime was a big problem, compared with women (81%), as were those aged over 65 years (69%).

Change in environmental crime over the last year

Half of all respondents (53%) said that environmental crime in their area has stayed the same in the past year, while a third said this has got worse (31%). Only one in six respondents said this has got better (16%) (although this is an improvement from 2008, in which only 9% said it had got better).

CELO mruk  London Borough of Waltham Forest, Residents' Panel Survey: Autumn Survey, 2009
Those who said they were well informed about what the Council was doing (Q1) were more likely to say enviro-crime has got better (21%) compared with those who did not feel well informed (11%).

Black and Minority Ethnic respondents were more likely to say this has got better in their local area (21%), while those renting from a Housing Association were more likely to say this has got worse (38%).

In Leyton and Whips Cross Community Council area where awareness of what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime is at its lowest (35%), and eight in ten claims it is a problem in the area (82%), a high proportion also consider it to have worsened in the last year (38%).

In Walthamstow West, where a higher proportion of people claim to be aware of what the Council is doing to tackle environmental crime (57%), and 84% overall think there is a problem with environmental crime in the area, a third (35%) reported that the problems had become worse in the last year.

Fewer panellists in Walthamstow and Lea Bridge thought environment crime had worsened in the last 12 months (24%), with six in ten (58%) saying it had stayed the same. Nonetheless, it must be remembered that eight in ten (80%) of those in this area consider environmental crime to be a problem.

Graph 3b. In the last year, environmental crime in your local area has got...? By Com. Council (% - All respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Got Worse</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Got Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leyton &amp; Whips Cross</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leytonstone</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Chingford</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Chingford &amp; Highams Park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow &amp; Lea Bridge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of respondents that indicated that environmental crime is a problem has decreased by 20% for the Walthamstow and Lea Bridge area (44% in 2008; 24% in 2009).

While results are not statistically significant, there also seem to be a similar trend across other areas, with fewer respondents indicating that environmental crime is a problem in their area; North Chingford from 40% in 2008 to 28% in 2009; Leytonstone from 38% to 30%.
Residents’ role in fighting environmental crime and Council performance

Just under half of all respondents said that the Council is doing a good job in tackling environmental crime (45%), while just over a quarter disagreed with this (28%) and a quarter neither agreed nor disagreed (27%). Agreement that the Council is doing a good job has significantly risen since 2008, from just 30% to 45%.

On the other hand, the majority (88%) agreed that residents have a role to play in fighting environmental crime, with 43% strongly agreeing with this and 45% saying they tend to agree. Only 5% disagreed with this statement (7% neither agreed nor disagreed). Agreement with this is similar to the 2008 findings.

Graph 4a. Tackling environmental crime
(% - All respondents)

Black and Minority Ethnic respondents (50%) were more likely to say the Council is doing a good job in tackling environmental crime and so were those living in the Walthamstow and Lea Bridge (51%) Community Council area.

Interestingly, 61% of those who felt well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime thought that the Council is doing a good job, compared to only 27% of those who did not feel well informed (27%).

Similarly, those who had seen at least one of the campaign images (68%) were more likely to say the Council is doing a good job in this, compared with those who had not seen the campaign (38%).
Extent to which types of environmental crime are a problem

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they considered specific environmental crimes to be a problem in their local area.

- The majority (82%) said rubbish and litter lying around is a very big (36%) or fairly big (46%) problem. 16% considered this not to be a big problem.

- Just under three-quarters (71%) said fly-tipping is a very big (26%) or fairly big problem (45%). A quarter of respondents said this was not a big problem (25%).

- Half of all respondents considered fly-posting not to be a big problem (38% not very big; 11% not at all), while two-fifths (40%) said this is a fairly big (29%) or very big (11%) problem.

- Finally only 12% of respondents said abandoned or burnt out cars was a problem, while the majority said this was not a very big problem (48%) or not a problem at all (29%).

These findings are similar to the 2008 results.

No major differences in the degree to which these issues are a problem were identified between those who are well informed or not, or those who have seen one of the campaigns or not. An exception to this is fly-posting where those who feel well informed (36%) were slightly less likely to consider this a big problem, compared with those who do not feel well informed on what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime (44%).
Table 5b. below shows the percentage of respondents from each Community Council area who thought these issues were not a problem in their area. More respondents from Chingford and South Chingford & Highams Park think that rubbish/litter, fly-tipping and fly-posting are not a problem in their area. This finding is consistent with the overall perception of enviro-crime not being a big problem in these areas.

Fly-tipping, in particular, was not considered a problem for those living in North Chingford (56%) nor for those living in South Chingford and Highams Park (39%), compared with the average of 18% across the Borough.

Graph 5b. Issues NOT being a problem By Com. Council
(% - All respondents)

Responses about fly-posting were divided amongst the various age groups with 51% of those aged 18-34 thinking this is a big problem, while this drops to 32% for those aged 35-64 years and 41% for those aged over 65 years.

More BME respondents (52%) thought fly-posting was a problem, compared with white respondents (32%).
Satisfaction with the Council keeping the land clear of litter/refuse

Half of all respondents (48%) were satisfied with the way Waltham Forest keeps the land clear of litter and refuse, while a third were dissatisfied with this (32%; 10% very dissatisfied). One in five (22%) was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Graph 6a. Satisfaction with Waltham Forest keeping the land clear of litter and refuse (% - All respondents)

Satisfaction has risen since the June 2008 survey (42%) but has remained similar to the December 2008 survey (46%).

Fewer respondents from the Walthamstow West area were satisfied with the way the Council keeps the land clear of litter and refuse (37% satisfied), while just under half of these respondents were dissatisfied (46%).

Respondents who felt well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime (53%) as well as those who had seen the campaign (57%) were more likely to be satisfied with this compared to those who felt not well informed (40%) or who had not seen the campaign (49%).
Reporting environmental crime

Respondents were asked the extent to which they report environmental crime. Only 15% said they always report it, while 30% said they sometimes report it. A third of all respondents (35%) said they rarely (17%) or never (18%) report an enviro-crime. A fifth of all respondents said they have not seen an enviro-crime being committed.

Graph 7a. Reporting an enviro-crime
(\% - All respondents)

Respondents aged 65+ years (21\%) and those from Walthamstow West (22\%) were more likely to say they would always report an environmental crime.

Those living in the area for 5 years or less (29\%) were more likely to say they would never report an environmental crime.

No significant differences were found between those who felt well informed or not well informed as to what the Council is doing to tackle the issue, nor amongst those who had seen the campaign compared with those who had not seen it.
Awareness of the Wiping-Out enviro-campaign

In terms of awareness and knowledge of the Council’s ‘Wiping Out’ enviro-crime campaign, nearly a quarter claimed to have seen or heard it and know enough about it. A further third claimed to have seen or heard about it but knew little or nothing about it. Just over two-fifths (44%) had not see or heard of Waltham Forest’s ‘Wiping out’ enviro-crime campaign.

Graph 8a. Awareness of the Enviro-Crime Campaign
(% - All respondents)

Graph 8b below shows the percentage of respondents from various sub groups who have not seen the Enviro-Campaign. The people who have not see the campaign tend to be male (49%), aged 18-34 (62%), BME (56%) people, who live in social housing (56%) or rented/other accommodation (64%) and have moved into the area less than 5 years ago (55%).

Graph 8b. NOT SEEN the Enviro-Crime Campaign
(% - All respondents)
Respondents who were aware of the enviro-crime campaign (510 respondents) were asked which of the three campaigns they had seen around the Borough (photo prompts were used to aid recall). The ‘wiping out’ campaign had the highest level of recall (61%). Nearly four in ten recalled the ‘Love your borough’ campaign (37%) and a similar proportion recall the ‘Shame on you’ campaign (36%).

The highest recall of the ‘wiping out’ campaign was in Walthamstow West (70%) and the lowest in Leyton and Whipps Cross Community Council area (55%).
Attitudes and support for the enviro-campaign

Amongst those aware of the enviro-crime campaign there is majority support for it amongst panellists (93%). Indeed, two-thirds (64%) support it strongly.

- The majority of respondents aware of the campaign (71%) said it made them aware of what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime, while a fifth neither agreed nor disagreed with this and 12% disagreed.

- Over half of those aware of the campaign (58%) said that the enviro-campaign made them more aware of the issues around environmental crime (13% strongly agreeing with this), while a quarter of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed (27%) and 14% disagreed.

![Graph 9a. Impact of the Enviro-Campaign (% - All those who were aware of the enviro-campaign)](image)

Those aged 65 years or over (76%), living in Social Housing accommodation (76%) and those who have moved into the area recently (1-5 years) (70%) were more likely to say that the enviro-campaign has made them more aware of issues around environmental crime in the Borough.

Those living in Social Housing accommodation (81%) were also more likely to say that the enviro-campaign has made them more aware of what the Council is doing to tackle enviro-crime, and so were those living in Leytonstone (81%).
3.2 Community Safety

Influence of fear of crime on quality of life

Respondents were asked to indicate what influence *fear of crime* has on their quality of life, where 1 = no influence at all and 5 = a big influence. The mean or average score was 3.3, with a quarter (26%) of panellists saying it has no or little influence (scoring 1 or 2 on the 5 point scale. Three in ten (29%) scored the middle of the scale, while just under half of all respondents (44%) said it has some (22%) or a big influence (22%) (scoring 4 or 5 on the scale).

In 2005, influence of fear of crime on quality of life was rated at an average of 3.1 from respondents, while this steadily increased in 2007 (3.4) and in 2008 (3.5) and therefore the mean score of 3.3 in 2009 is an improvement on previous years.
Feeling safe in different daily life scenarios

Respondents were asked how safe or unsafe they felt in a series of situations.

Feelings of safety whilst outside in the Borough after dark are polarised with four in ten (39%) feeling safe, and a similar proportion feeling unsafe (41%).

Encouragingly, the majority of respondents feel safe at home either during the day (90%) or after dark (83%). For all other prompted situations, feelings of safety significantly decreases after dark.

- 88% feel safe in their neighbourhood during the day, whilst this drops to 47% for after dark when 42% feel unsafe (13% very unsafe).
- Similarly, 84% feel safe in their local town centre during the day, while this drops to 39% for after dark when half of all respondents (47%) say they feel unsafe (16% very unsafe).
- While 86% feel safe waiting for public transport during the day, this drops to 40% for after dark when half of all respondents (46%) say the feel unsafe (15% very unsafe).
- Finally, 86% feel safe travelling on public transport during the day: this drops to 44% after dark when half of all respondents (39%) say they feel unsafe (13% very unsafe).

Graph 11a. How safe you feel when...?
(% - All respondents)
Trends show a decrease in the percentage of respondents who feel unsafe, both during the day and after dark as shown in the graphs below. The only exception is being at home either during the day or after dark, where the percentage of those who feel unsafe has not seen any change in the past 4 years.

The greatest decrease in feeling unsafe can be found for:

- Waiting for public transport after dark: from 61% in 2005 and 57% in 2007 and 2008 to 42% in 2009
- Going out in the local town centre after dark: from 57% in 2005, 51% in 2007 and 54% in 2008 to 39% in 2009

Graph 11b. Feeling Unsafe after dark - Year Trends
(% - All respondents)

Note: Caution in comparing data from 2009 with previous years, as the 2009 panel has been newly recruited.
Women are statistically more likely to report that they feel unsafe in all these situations after dark than men as shown below.

**Graph 1c. Feeling very unsafe or fairly unsafe By Gender**

(\% - All respondents)

- Outside in WF after dark: Men 48, Women 50
- Out in hood after dark: Men 35, Women 36
- Local town after dark: Men 41, Women 53
- Waiting for PT after dark: Men 37, Women 54
- Traveling in PT after dark: Men 31, Women 46
Chart 11e below shows the percentage of all respondents who said they feel unsafe versus the percentage of respondents with a disability. In all situations, respondents with a disability were significantly more likely to say they feel unsafe, with two-thirds of respondents with a disability feeling unsafe when out in their local town centre after dark (65%) or waiting for public transport after dark (65%).

Although percentages are much smaller, still one in ten residents with a disability feel unsafe:

- at home during the day (10%);
- waiting for public transport during the day (10%); and
- travelling on public transport during the day (11%).

Graph 11d. Feeling very unsafe or fairly unsafe By Disability
(% - All respondents)

Over half of older residents (65+ years) feel unsafe going out in their neighbourhood after dark (54%), going out in their local town centre after dark (58%), waiting for public transport after dark (58%) or travelling on public transport after dark (51%).
Apart from the differences found between men and women, older people and those with a disability, some differences were identified when it comes to specifically going out in the local town centre after dark and when waiting for public transport after dark. The chart below shows these differences in detail but, to summarise, in both occasions:

- White respondents feel more unsafe than Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic respondents;
- Those that are employed (full-, part-, self-employed) feel more unsafe compared with those who are economically inactive (unemployed, students, retired etc.);
- Newer residents in the area (less than 10 years) feel less unsafe than those living in the area for 10 years or more;
- Respondents from the Walthamstow West area feel more unsafe than the remaining areas.

Graph 11e. Feeling unsafe in local town centre after dark & waiting for public transport after dark

By Demographics
(% - All respondents - very + fairly unsafe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Town after Dark</th>
<th>Waiting for PT after Dark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>47.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>43.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>56.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow West</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td>61.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avoidance of situations due to fear of crime

Respondents were also asked if, in general, they avoid a series of situations like answering the door after dark etc. Over two-fifths generally avoid:

- Groups of local young people (54%)
- Going out alone after dark (47%)
- Using public transport alone after dark (44%)
- Answering the door after dark (43%)

Graph 12a. Do you generally avoid...?
(% - All respondents)

A quarter of respondents avoid leaving their house unoccupied, whilst only 1 in 20 avoid going out alone during the day. Trends show a decrease in the past four years, especially when it comes to avoiding groups of local young people (from 73% in 2005 to 54% in 2009) (the remaining reductions in these figures need to be carefully examined for sample consistency between surveys).

Graph 12b. Do you generally avoid – Year Trends

Note: Caution in comparing data from 2009 with previous years, as the 2009 panel has been newly recruited.
The following significant differences were identified between sub-groups:

- Women were more likely to avoid:
  - Going out alone after dark (men 35% cf. women 58%)
  - Answering the door after dark (men 33% cf. women 53%)
  - Using transport alone after dark (men 34% cf. women 53%)

- Respondents aged 65 years or over were more likely to avoid going out after dark (63%), answer the door after dark (56%), groups of young people (68%), using public transport alone after dark (60%).

- Respondents with a disability were more likely to avoid going out after dark (62%), answering the door after dark (57%), using public transport alone after dark (64%) and leaving their house unoccupied (40%), while one in ten (11%) avoid going out during the day.

- Respondents living in South Chingford and Highams Park were more likely to avoid using public transport alone after dark (56%).
Concern regarding specific crimes

Finally residents were asked to indicate how concerned they are regarding a list of crimes.

Over two-thirds were concerned (very + fairly concerned) about:

- Street robbery (mugging) (76%; 34% very concerned)
- Home burglary (73%; 32% very concerned)
- Car broken into or vandalised (63%; 29% very concerned; -7% from 70% in 2008)
- Drug-related crime (66%; 29% very concerned)

Graph 13a. Indicate the level of concern for...?
(combined: not very concerned + not at all concerned; % - All respondents)

Over half of all respondents were concerned about:

- Having their vehicle stolen (57%; 25% very concerned)
- Drunk people causing them a problem at night (55%; 21% very concerned; -6% from 61% in 2008)
- Bogus callers (52%; -6% from 58% in 2008)
- Damage to property (50%; -7% from 57% in 2008)
- Violent attack (53%)
- Road rage (52%; -5% from 57% in 2008)
The majority of respondents were 'not concerned' (i.e. not at all + not very concerned) about:

- Being bullied at school/workplace (not concerned 62%)\(^1\)
- Being harassed because of their colour, race, religion or sexual orientation (61%)
- Being assaulted because of their colour, race, religion or sexual orientation (59%)
- Being sexually harassed (59%)
- Being insulted or bothered by people who live close by (55%)
- Being sexually assaulted (55%)

Differences between sub-groups in the five situations that respondents rated highest in terms of being concerned (very + fairly concerned) are described below.

**Street robbery**

Street robbery was the highest rated issue of concern amongst respondents with three-quarters (76%) being concerned about this. Women (81%) were more concerned than men (71%), and so were those who are economically inactive (80%; economically active 73%) and those who live in social housing (82%).

**Having your home burgled**

This was the second highest rated issue of concern amongst respondents with three-quarters (73%) saying they are very or fairly concerned about this. Concern was not significantly different amongst socio-demographic groups indicating this is an issue that concerns the whole community.

**Having your car or other vehicle broken into or vandalised**

63% of all respondents were concerned about this, however this rises to 79% amongst those who use a car as their main means of transport and 72% for those who live in Walthamstow West.

\(^1\) NB. Members of panel were aged 18+ years and very few are still in full-time education.
Drug related crime

Two-thirds were concerned about this (65%) and this rises to 75% for respondents with a disability. Concern about drug related crime was significantly different between the various areas as shown in the graph below.

Concern about drug related crime was highest amongst residents of Leyton & Whipps Cross (73%) and of Walthamstow West (70%), while this drops to 59% for North Chingford and 60% for Leytonstone.

![Graph 13b. Concern for drug-related crime By Area](image)

Having a car or other vehicle stolen

57% of respondents were concerned about having their car or other vehicle stolen, while this rises to 65% for those living in Walthamstow West and to 72% for those who use a car as their main means of transport.

Other interesting statistically significant differences include:

- Concern about bogus callers rises with age from 41% for those aged under 35 years, through 51% for those aged 35-54 years and 65% for those aged 55-64 years to a high of 71% for those aged over 75 years.

- Theft from a shed or garage is low for Leyton and Whipps Cross (24%), Leytonstone (37%) and Walthamstow and Lea Bridge (37%) while this rises to 47% in Walthamstow West and South Chingford and Highams Park areas and 51% in North Chingford.

- Over half of those living in social housing (54%) are concerned with drunk people causing them a problem during the day compared with all respondents (38%).
These respondents are also more concerned about arson to their home, land or outbuildings (42% compared with 30% overall)

- People living in social housing (62%) or renting (65%) are more worried about other types of violent attack compared with home owners (49%).

- 56% of people who walk or cycle to work are concerned about having their bicycle stolen, compared with 34% overall.

- 63% of respondents who use a car as their main means of transport are concerned about road rage (overall 51%).

- Respondents with a disability (31%) and Black and Minority Ethnic respondents (25%) are more concerned about being bullied in school, college or the workplace compared with those without a disability (19%) and white respondents (16%).

- Concern about being harassed because of skin colour, race, religion or sexual orientation, a quarter of respondents was concerned overall (23%), however a third of BMEs were concerned about this (31%; white 16%), and there was a higher level of concern amongst the Muslim community (40%).

- Finally, a third of BME respondents are concerned about being assaulted because of their colour, ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation (34%; white 16%), while half of Muslim respondents were concerned (49%).
3.3 Anti-Social Behaviour

Extent to which different types of anti-social behaviour are a problem

Respondents were asked to indicate how much of a problem specific anti-social behaviours are. The majority of respondents thought that the following were a problem (very big + fairly big problem):

- Parents not taking responsibility for their children (68%; 32% very big problem; -8% from 76% in 2008)
- Not treating people with respect and consideration (67%; 29% very concerned)
- Teenagers hanging around on the streets (60%)
- People using or dealing drugs (58%)
- People being drunk or rowdy in public places (53%)
- Vandalism (51%; -11% from 62% in 2008)

Graph 14a. How much of a problem do you think the following are...?
(% - All respondents)
Most respondents thought that abandoned or burnt out cars (72%), noisy neighbours (64%) or people sleeping rough (52%) were not a problem (i.e. not a very big problem + not a problem at all).

Opinion on specific anti-social behaviours as a problem were divided for the following aspects:

- Graffiti (48% very/fairly big problem – 43% not very big/at all a problem)
- Damage to property/vehicles (45% very/fairly big problem – 42% not very big/at all a problem)
- People being attacked because of their skin colour, ethnic origin, religion or sexual orientation (38% very/fairly big problem – 42% not very big/at all a problem)

Differences between sub-groups in the five situations that respondents rated highest in terms of being a problem (very + fairly big problem) are described below.

Parents not taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children

Opinions were similar across socio-demographic groups regarding this issue being a problem (67%), with the only exception being that slightly fewer younger respondents (18-34 years) thought this to be a problem (60%).

People not treating other people with respect and consideration

Opinions were again similar across most socio-demographic groups with two thirds saying this is a problem (67%). No differences were found between BME and white respondents, younger and older people, whilst fewer Muslim respondents thought this to be a problem (59%).

Teenagers hanging around in the streets

An interesting finding regarding whether teenagers hanging around in the streets is a problem is that younger people (18-34 years) were more likely to consider this a problem (66%) compared with older people aged 65 years or over (55%).

People using or dealing drugs

Black and Minority Ethnic respondents were more likely to indicate that people using or dealing drugs is a problem compared with white people (white 54%; BME 64%). Three-quarters living in social housing (74%) indicated that people using or dealing drugs is a problem, whilst this drops to circa 54% for home owners, those renting and others.

65% of young respondents aged up to 24 years thought this was a big problem, while seven in ten Muslim respondents (72%) thought this was a big problem.
Some significant differences in drug dealing/using being a problem were also found between the various Community Council areas, as shown in the graph below. Respondents from Leytonstone and Whipps Cross (67%) were more likely to say this is a problem, while those from North Chingford (46%) and those from South Chingford and Highams Park (47%) were less likely to do so.

![Graph 14b. How much of a problem is people using / dealing drugs?](image)

**People being drunk or rowdy in public places**

Over half of all respondents thought drunk and rowdy people in public places was a big problem while this rises to 71% for those living in Social Housing and 62% for Muslim respondents.

Other interesting findings included:

- 39% of respondents with a disability thought noisy neighbours to be a big problem compared with 29% for all respondents;
- 61% of those living in social housing thought vandalism to be a big problem compared with 52% overall;
- Half of BME (47%) and Muslim respondents (52%) thought that people being attacked because of their skin colour, origin, religion or sexual orientation was a big problem, compared with 30% of white respondents;
- While a third of all respondents (34%) thought people sleeping rough on the streets is a big problem, this rises to 41% for BME respondents and 58% for those living in social housing. Not surprisingly, given their geographic location in terms of...
Walthamstow Town Centre, respondents from Walthamstow and Lea Bridge (44%) and Walthamstow West (46%) were more likely to think this is a big problem.

Abandoned or burnt out cars was a big problem for 17% of respondents from Walthamstow West but only 6% for those from North Chingford.

**Extent to which anti-social behaviour is a problem in the local area**

Six in ten (58%) thought that anti-social behaviour is a very big (16%) or a fairly big problem (42%). A third of respondents thought that this is not a very big problem (31%) or that it is not a problem at all (2%), while 8% had no opinion. This is similar to the 2008 finding when 60% consider this a big problem and 35% said this was not a big problem/no problem at all.

**Graph 15a. How much of a problem do you think Anti-social behaviour is in your local area?**

(\% - All respondents)

Respondents who were well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in the area were more likely to think anti-social behaviour in their local area is not a big problem, compared with those who did not feel well informed (not a problem: well informed 44%; not well informed 28%).
Respondents aged 18-34 years (68%), BME respondents (63%) and those living in social housing (71%) were more likely to say anti-social behaviour was a very big or fairly big problem, while respondents from North Chingford (46%) were less likely to do so.

Graph 15b. Anti-social behaviour being a very/fairly big problem By Demographics
(% - All respondents)
Being informed about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour

Finally, all respondents were asked how well informed they feel about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour in their area. A third of all respondents (32%) said they are well informed (very well 3% + fairly well 29%), while two-fifths said they are not very well informed (44%) and a quarter said they are not well informed at all (25%).

This is an increase of 8% from the 2008 survey when only a quarter of respondents (24%) felt well informed about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour.

Graph 16a. How well informed do you feel about what the Council is doing to tackle Anti-social behaviour in your local area? (% - All respondents)

More than three-quarters of those aged 18-34 (77%) say they are not very well or not at all informed about what the Council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour while this drops to 55% for those aged 65 years or over.

81% of respondents from Leyton and Whipps Cross said they do not feel well informed, while this percentage drops to 66% for the remaining 5 Community Council areas.
Appendix A. Technical Information

CELLO mruk was commissioned by Waltham Forest Council to recruit a Residents’ Panel. The recruitment of the Panel utilises 3 methodological approaches;
   a) postal,
   b) face-to-face,
   c) re-recruitment of existing members.

A mini survey was attached to the recruitment questionnaire and 939 residents took part in the survey. The questionnaire was developed and designed by the London Borough of Waltham Forest in conjunction with CELLO mruk research. The surveys are carried out to help the Council and its partners measure public opinion on several areas. The specific topics covered were:

- Tackling Environmental Crime
- Attitudes on Crime
- Attitudes on Anti-social Behaviour

The data has been weighted for analysis purposes. Weighting helps to ensure a more representative result as not all panel members return their questionnaire after each stage. The data has been weighted by age, gender and ethnicity.

All percentages in the tables and charts within this report are rounded to the nearest whole number and calculations are based on the number of respondents who answered each question (valid responses), i.e. excluding missing responses. The number of respondents is represented by n.

When the reported figures result from adding up two categories (e.g. very satisfied + fairly satisfied = satisfied) these figures might vary by ± 1% due to the rounding process. For example, 2.5% very satisfied plus 27.5% fairly satisfied equals 30.0%. When these figures are rounded in the report, this results to, very satisfied 3% plus fairly satisfied 28% equals 31%.
The table below shows the number and percentage of respondents achieved in each sub-group. It also shows the 95% confidence intervals for all sub-groups and the whole sample for a variety of responses.

For example, if 50% of the survey sample is satisfied with a service, we can be 95% confident that between 47% and 53% (i.e. result ± confidence interval, 50% ±3%) of residents of the whole borough are satisfied with this service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>No of respondents (weighted)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%/50% C.I. ± %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Economically Active</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economically Inactive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Housing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in the Borough</td>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Council</td>
<td>Leyton and Whipps Cross</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leytonstone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Chingford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Chingford and Highams Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthamstow and Lee Bridge</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walthamstow West</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>