

Tilley Award 2006

Application form

Please ensure that you have read the guidance before completing this form. By making an application to the awards, entrants are agreeing to abide by the conditions laid out in the Guidance. Please complete the following form in full and within the word limit. Failure to do so could result in disqualification from the competition.

Completed application forms should be e-mailed to Tricia Perkins;
patricia.perkins@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

All entries must be received by noon on Friday 28th April 2006. No entries will be accepted after this time/date. Any queries on the application process should be directed to Tricia Perkins on 0207 035 0262. Any queries regarding other aspects of the awards should be directed to Michael Wilkinson on 0207 035 0247 or Lindsey Poole on 0207 035 0234.

Please tick box to indicate whether the entry should be considered for the main award, the criminal damage award or both;

Main award Criminal Damage Award Both Awards

1. Details of application

Title of the project : Crime Reduction Environment Week (CREW)

Name of force/agency/CDRP: Hampshire Constabulary

Name of one contact person with position/rank (this should be one of the authors): PC Steve Postlethwaite

Email address: prime.team@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

Full postal address: PRIME Team, Community Safety Department, Police HQ, Romsey Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5DB

Telephone number: 01962 814880

Fax number: 01962 871193

Name of endorsing senior representatives(s) Simon Cole

Position and rank of endorsing senior representatives(s): ACC Territorial Operations

Full address of endorsing senior representatives(s): Police HQ, Romsey Road, Winchester, Hampshire, SO22 5DB

2. Summary of application

In no more than 400 words please use this space to describe your project. Include details of the problem that was addressed a description of the initiative, the main intervention principles and what they were designed to achieve, the main outcomes of project particularly in relation to the problem, evidence was used in designing the programme and how the project is evaluated.

The Problem

Persistent problem areas around volume crime, fear of crime, run down/neglected areas and community cohesion were evident across Hampshire. There was often a lack of co-ordinated direction resulting in well intentioned isolated pockets of activity by different partners taking place in different areas at different times. As a consequence the communities quality of life often suffered.

Analysis

With the advent of the Crime and Disorder Act there was a willingness which developed into an eagerness for various agencies to work in partnership. Strategies were formulated, meetings arranged but there was little evidence of real joined up activity in delivering services to the community. There was a need to identify a process that would provide a structured approach that was transferable and marketable; more importantly provided identifiable and sustainable outcomes not just outputs.

Response

Crime Reduction Environment Week (CREW) was initiated in Southampton in 2003, then rolled out across Hampshire and the IOW in 2004. CREW often requires no additional funding it's a process that effectively utilises existing organisational activities providing cleaner, safer neighbourhoods in specific areas, usually where there has been a problem from environmental issues around damage and graffiti to crime and disorder or anti-social behaviour, that affects the quality of life for those living in that neighbourhood.

CREW effectively returns neighbourhoods back to the community: the streets and parks are cleaner, free of graffiti and abandoned cars; local criminals and those involved in anti-social behaviour have been given diversionary activities or arrested; communities in 'hard to reach' areas become empowered through the provision of graffiti cleaning kits, neighbourhood watch or the establishment of community or resident groups thus promoting greater social cohesion, inclusion and sustainability.

Assessment

CREW is now completely multi-agency assisting communities that suffer with poor quality of life, it has provided immediate and significant respite from environmental signals that increase the fear of crime; CREW has delivered quality interventions in manageable chunks; when all CREW activity over the last 24 months is assessed it represents a significant and voluminous quality contribution; by meeting the needs of our communities, for now, and for the future.

CREW is now mainstreamed into many CDRP strategies/LPSA targets and various partners' service plans. This process has now ensured sustainability of service delivery. A quote to the co-ordinator from one elderly resident at the Seafield CREW, Gosport was;

"I have been waiting for 20 years for something like this to happen around here"

3. Description of project

Describe the project following the guidance given in no more than 4000 words

Scanning

In April 2004, Hampshire Constabulary launched its 'Creating Safer Communities' campaign in response to central Government's publication of a wide range of papers concerning community engagement, cohesive communities and creating safer communities:

"The key to success is building a relationship of mutual trust and respect between people, their communities, the police and the other public bodies involved in making our communities safer places to live and work.

*This means a police service which works with communities and individuals to identify their needs; public agencies that listen and respond to what communities, families, victims and young people tell them about anti-social behaviour; and willingness from all to share responsibility for tackling the problem."*¹

The campaign was supported by a structured marketing drive aimed at informing members of the public what the Force was doing to reduce crime and disorder and the fear thereof within their area.

Police/Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP's) were given responsibility for developing their own local responses on how the 'Safer' agenda was to be delivered; as a result of community and partner consultation CREW (Crime Reduction and Environment Week) was created as a multi-agency programme of activities to complement and augment the 'Safer' campaign, aimed at tackling crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) as well as delivering environmental improvements in specific areas in line with research on signal crimes².

*"Run down areas with few facilities can often become a target for anti-social behaviour, blighting neighbourhoods and leading to further decline."*³

There was a lack of strategic direction resulting in pockets of activity by different partners in different areas at different times; communities were unlikely to notice the difference this activity was making, as a result, quality of life issues and public reassurance opportunities were not fully explored.

The objectives within year 1 were to;

1. Introduce CREW into 80% of the CDRP's
2. 40% of CDRP's to run more than 3 CREW's
3. Improve partnership working
4. CREW to be mainstreamed within strategies
5. At least 2 CREW's to be partner lead
6. Deliver sustainable solution

Analysis

The 'Broken Windows' theory⁴ as well as recent research on behalf of the National Reassurance Programme by Dr Martin Innes et al from Surrey University regarding the impact of signal crimes and disorder forms a significant contribution to the methodology employed in respect of CREW

¹ Home Office website: <http://communities.homeoffice.gov.uk/civil/safety-justice/safer-communities/?version=1>

² Home Office National Reassurance Programme

³ Home Office Website: http://press.homeoffice.gov.uk/press-releases/Tackling_Grime_And_Crime_Across_?version=1

⁴ Broken Windows Theory Atlantic Monthly Wilson & Kelling 1982

events. Resources for all public service organisations are always limited with demand outstripping supply; CREW allows for significant resources to be employed intensively over a relatively short period of time in targeted areas of our communities where the interventions are most needed to improve quality of life.

Research was carried out looking at good practice both in force and nationally and internationally. There was evidence of 'one off' activity that was primarily around enforcement, but nothing around sustained, structured multi agency working that also addressed environmental, social and crime issues on a regular and targeted programme e.g. Clean sweep⁵, Operation Cubit⁶.

There is a National programme in America called 'Weed and Seed'⁷ this was considered to be too costly and time consuming to implement and would not meet our needs.

Location

The Crime Reduction Environment week (CREW) methodology was first employed in Southampton in late 2003 under the guidance and direction of Chief Inspector Beau Fisk; the arrangements and organisation of CREW was subsequently delivered by the Community Safety Unit at Southampton City Council. On the completion of 10 CREW events across Southampton; detailed analysis that took place in November 04 which evidenced that crime and anti social behaviour (ASB) were dramatically reduced, not only during the week of the CREW but also long after the CREW had been completed.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)⁸ clearly identifies the need for achieving sustainable communities that are safer and cleaner by stating projects should be;

- ✓ Run by Partnerships
- ✓ Meet social, economic and environmental needs in a joined-up way
- ✓ Meet needs of existing and future generations
- ✓ Promote social cohesion

And, that communities should be: -

- ✓ Active, inclusive & safe
- ✓ Well run
- ✓ Environmentally sensitive
- ✓ Well designed
- ✓ Well connected
- ✓ Thriving
- ✓ Well served
- ✓ Fair for everyone

Locally it was also identified that there was no local point of contact for the community to raise concerns, contact relevant partners or receive feedback on activities being completed.

Analysis of the pilot activity had also shown that the smaller the area (around 200 houses) the greater possibility of success. Some areas in the past had proved to be too large, this served to

⁵ Operation Clean Sweep a Nationally adopted operation aimed at cleaning up Criminal Damage – An example of activity in Hartlepool.

http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/site/scripts/documents_info.php?documentID=100&pageNumber=1#navbox

⁶ Operation Cubit aimed at untaxed and abandoned cars-
<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/vehiclecrime33.htm>

⁷ Weed and Seed, a community-based strategy sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)- The [Executive Office for United States Attorneys](#) provides U.S. Attorneys with general executive assistance and direction, policy development, administrative management direction and oversight, operational support, and coordination with other components of DOJ and other federal agencies.

⁸ Office of Deputy Prime Minister – Creating sustainable communities
<http://www.odpm.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1139865>

not only stretch the resources available and reduce the impact but also the visual impact of many agencies working closely together was lost.

Victim

Initial analysis of victims required lateral thought as generally victims are seen as those who are a victim of crime, anti social behaviour (ASB) or people within the community who fear being a victim of crime.

Analysis of the Southampton CREW events received excellent feedback from local residents, media, councillors and those involved at the delivery end of CREW who felt that the whole experience was rewarding and provided a unique experience to actively collaborate with partner agencies with an outcome focus rather than developing strategies and policies at meetings.

The community/residents were victims. In understanding the crime triangle the underlying causes were identified,

- They often had no local guardians
- Activity was not fed back
- They felt neglected and powerless to deal with local issues
- Their perception was that reported problems were not being dealt with

However those people who were actively working in their core business areas from a wide range of partners could also be viewed as a 'victim' as their work whilst well intentioned often went unrecognised by large sections of the community for the following reasons

- They were generally small scale
- Formed activity that when observed was often seen in isolation to the needs/concerns of the community
- Good work/activity was not recognised
- With limited resources/funds did not always achieve the desired outcome
- Often worked in isolation (other necessary and relevant work wasn't 'joined up')

Offender

The offenders identified through the analysis were not offenders in the normal sense of the word (i.e. criminals) they were also some of the partners. This project was started in order to address key areas of weaknesses in partnership working around;

Criminals – targeted work around

- Arrest warrants
- Persistent Priority Offenders (PPO)
- Antisocial behaviour Contracts/orders
- Criminal activity

Partners – around improving

- Service delivery.
- Corporate identity/delivery.
- Pooled resources/finance.
- Proven methodology in applying 'Good Practice'.
- Joined up delivery.
- Maximising and sustaining benefits.
- Dissatisfaction of communities from a perception of lack of activity around crime and disorder and quality of life issues.

During the analysis of the problem these were seen as key success criteria in the assessment/evaluation stages of the project. A major problem prior to CREW was that community concerns were not addressed and prioritised.

As a result the CREW activity in Southampton was assessed and areas were added to further strengthen its delivery in line with the ODPM recommendations.

Responses

CREW is a concept aimed at providing a flexible methodology that allows sustained delivery of local needs in a structured format. The format enables the projects to be delivered without additional funding which is crucial in ensuring the programmes sustainability. This is achieved by linking individual organisations ongoing work, as this is often uncoordinated, fragmented and often carried out in isolation. The resulting coordinated partnership activity thereby utilised existing resources in a far more beneficial way. This is supported with a 'How to plan a CREW' booklet (see appendix 1)

Many of the responses hit more than one side of the crime triangle and are therefore not specifically separated in sections under victim, offender and location.

Environmental Visual Audits⁹ (EVA) were completed, any photographs then acted as a historical document and then as part of the overall assessment later compared with photographs taken post-CREW. The photographs can then be displayed in a communal building if there is one available for the information and benefit of the community.

A planning meeting takes place 2 - 4 weeks prior to the CREW event depending on circumstances. At that meeting they decide how they are going to link into the underlying causes, the size of the area being targeted is decided and a date is set by which all the parties must have identified which activities they are going to carry out and a timetable is later compiled (see appendix 2 - Seaford schedule).

A venue is identified as a base where all the partners and any members of the community can meet up, it also engenders teamwork and collaboration between the community and participating partners.

A flip chart message board is made available for the week, to record untaxed cars, ad hoc bits of information around locations of graffiti and rubbish, or other pieces of information could be recorded by the community and partners for the attention of the relevant agency.

CREW branded tabards are worn by those involved (excluding uniformed personnel), in hot periods similarly branded caps and banners are provided; this achieves two main objectives;

- ✓ It makes the CREW activity more 'visibly present' to the local community so they can see something different is going on and there is a CREW in their area;
- ✓ It allows those Partners involved in the CREW to 'see' each other thus enhancing the Team aspect of CREW – remember, some people from different agencies may have never met each other before.

The key to any CREW is community involvement and awareness that CREW is taking place (see appendix 3 -CREW leaflets); recent examples have included litter sweeps by local school children, a fashion show put on the older kids with prizes and a neighbour volunteer as a reference point for advice on gardening etc. Badges are also provided for local shopkeepers, publicans, restaurants etc in the area. These display the CREW logo with the words '**I'm in the CREW**' thereon; the badges are also made available for local children as well as residents. This,

⁹ Environmental Visual audits are a simple method of recording baseline information via a tally style walk through record or photographs as recommended by the National Reassurance Programme on recording signal crimes.

together with the ongoing intensive Partnership activity helps to promote greater community spirit and a more socially cohesive and caring community.

A matrix has also been developed so that agencies can identify measures taken against some of the key performance indicators as agreed under various strategies including the Local Public Service Agreements, Community Safety Strategy etc. (see appendix 1 last page of document). Common responses include;

- ✓ Extended police family - City Patrol, Accredited Community Support Officers (ACSOs) complete Joint patrols with police officers. Targeting of fly posters, trade waste, graffiti, dog mess and wanton damage to the environment are crucial areas of concern to local communities that are addressed during a CREW. Neighbourhood wardens assist with the EVA's, community intelligence, reports of defective street lighting.
- ✓ Local Authority - Environmental health complete checks on restaurants, fast food, trade waste and fly tipping. Trading standards complete checks on underage sales alcohol, cigarettes, fireworks. Education complete truancy sweeps conducted by Education Welfare Officers. Refuse and recycling provide a crucial support role in cleaning the environment by targeted refuse collections – larger items, location of discarded drugs paraphernalia, cans/bottles of alcohol all of which seriously impact the residents feeling safe and secure as users of our open spaces.
- ✓ Probation - Effective and structured use of Community Service Orders assist with the removal of graffiti, fly posters, routine cleaning of public areas, improvements to overgrown footpaths, parks and woodland (where appropriate) make the area feel safer, greener and cleaner.
- ✓ DVLA - assist in cleaning the area of unsightly vehicles that often litter roads, verges and parking areas by completing tax checks, vehicle removal to improve public confidence.
- ✓ Fire Service - provide smoke alarm advice, fire-setters club / wok [chip] pan fire / smoke filled rooms public demo's etc all aimed at reducing the risk of fire related incidents.
- ✓ Police - Execution of Warrants, bail checks, targeted high Visibility Policing (HVP), visits to persons on ASBO's, Priority Prolific Offenders. Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) targeting vehicles involved in crime, support for domestic violence, Drugs, Crime Reduction advice / repeat victimisation / vulnerable victims are among key people supported by the partnership.
- ✓ Housing Associations - "Drop in" centres are identified for the partners use to provide a central point of contact and advice not only for the length of the CREW week every effort is made to continue to provide the services into the future.
- ✓ Health / Primary Care Trust - Nutrition advice, smoking, drugs & substance misuse, general health issues, DV provide valuable advice and support in areas that are historically hard to reach and impact on.
- ✓ Voluntary Organisations: Neighbourhood Watch / Residents Associations are mobilised to support the set up schemes in the hard to reach areas.
- ✓ Drug And Alcohol Teams provide focused drugs / Alcohol advice/ young people/ advice on the variety of support and treatment available.
- ✓ In order to provide some early assessment of CREW a full day de-brief conference was planned for 22nd June 2005 for all partners. The aim was to identify good practice and any inhibitors analyse the findings and review CREW delivery.

Assessment

Objective 1 & 2

All the objectives for the project were achieved, CREW was rolled out across the whole of Hampshire and the IOW from April 2005 and a total of;

- ✓ 41 CREWs have been completed to date
- ✓ 100% of CDRP have run at least 2 events
- ✓ 43% (6) of CDRP's completed 3 plus events

Whilst local assessment of CREW was recommended within the 'How to plan a CREW' document this was found to be limited with only a few areas providing any longer term assessment. Therefore, a first stage¹⁰ evaluation of CREW was carried out and completed by the force corporate services department who had no involvement in CREW. It was carried out during February and March 2006 in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the CREW process and to establish the achieved outcomes to date. The research methods employed were entirely qualitative; interviews¹¹ were conducted with a number of key stakeholders in the CREW process from both inside and outside of the organisation.

Interviews were conducted with CREW co-ordinators¹² from across the Force and with specific individuals identified as key to the CREW process by the co-ordinators themselves. A number of core issues were identified as being crucial to the CREW process.

Objective 3 – Improved Partnership working

It is not only the physical achievements of CREW in the cleaning up of areas – i.e. graffiti removal, repairing damage, picking up litter, removing abandoned or untaxed vehicles, tidying up parks and open spaces by cutting back trees, borders and hedges - which drew praise; the strengthening of partnership working facilitated by the organising and running of CREW events was perceived to be its greatest accomplishment. As one interviewee said,

“Building partnerships and working together has been the most positive step. It means we now all know who we can go to for help when we need it.”

Effective joint working has evolved over time and many agreed that it worked largely due to the personalities involved in each area. For example, one local authority co-ordinator said,

“Our CREW team has been established for two years or so and so it works well as everyone knows each other. It is a stable team with a good rapport between the members.”

The CREW debrief was very successful with over 100 attendees culminating in identifying some early lessons learnt that were fed back into the delivery of future CREW events in particular;

- ✓ The willingness of non police partners being lead organisations
- ✓ The need to keep CREW areas small
- ✓ Ensure the community are kept in 'the loop'
- ✓ Planning a CREW takes a lot of time

¹⁰ The second stage, consisting of assessing the impact of CREW amongst residents in some of the areas in which a CREW has taken place, will be conducted throughout May 2006

¹¹ Either face to face or via a short self-completion email questionnaire

¹² All CREW co-ordinators were contacted and invited to participate in the evaluation; however, not all of them contributed to the findings

Objective 4 - Mainstreaming CREW

CREW has achieved strategic significance for a number of the partner agencies involved, enabling, in particular, local authorities to concentrate on their priorities as set down in their Community Safety strategies:

“CREW has been incorporated into the Community Safety Strategy of many agencies”
(Constabulary CREW co-ordinator)

From the Constabulary’s perspective, CREW supports many of its policing priorities, as defined by HMIC, in particular the following:

Citizen Focus – PPAF Domain A, 1B - Neighbourhood policing and community engagement
Reducing Crime – PPAF Domain 1, 2C – Working with partners to reduce crime
Promoting Safety – PPAF Domain 3, 4A - Reassurance¹³

Objective 5 - Ownership of CREW

This issue emerged during the consultation process when a substantial proportion of interviewees questioned whether CREW should remain as a police-led initiative or fall under the jurisdiction of local authorities. As one Constabulary CREW co-ordinator said,

“It may be more appropriate for the council to take the lead as their remit is wider than ours.”

Support for councils to take on CREW from the Force co-ordinator was stronger in those areas in which the local council had previously run schemes similar to CREW which were then superseded by it. In three of the 14 CDRP areas, it is the local authority who provide the lead and the co-ordination for CREW events, which a number of Constabulary co-ordinators felt established a precedent:

“The first CREW was an example of true partnership working, but I feel now that the police have started the process, the council should step in and take over.” (Constabulary CREW co-ordinator)

“It is low level crime which is being dealt with by CREW so there should be more Housing and Community Safety type involvement. CREW needs heavy influences from the council to work so they should lead.” (Constabulary CREW co-ordinator)

Consultees from non police organisations all felt that CREW was currently a partnership initiative in which all involved agencies take responsibility and should remain so in the future:

“CREW is not police owned – each agency has ownership of some part of the project. Where you have ownership, you have an interest.” (Local Authority Officer)

Objective 6 - Sustainability

Views on the long-term sustainability of work commenced during CREWs varied greatly between interviewees; whilst in the majority of areas, there was little or no post-CREW activity and this was a source of regret to the CREW co-ordinators, some consultees felt that the very nature of CREW was based on it being “a quick in, quick out” exercise aimed at leaving a “positive footprint” in the areas which have been identified as those which would potentially benefit from such a multi-agency intervention, i.e. that the impact of the CREW itself was sufficient and long-term measures are not required. Others disagreed and felt that the initial CREW event should be the start of a longer process:

¹³ HMIC Baseline Assessment Framework, 2005

“Sustainability is linked to persons/organisations being made aware of what problems were resolved and the steps needed to prevent a reoccurrence. Otherwise there is an acceptance that when an area gets ‘dirty again’ somebody else will come and tidy it up.” (Local Authority Officer)

In those areas where intervention has been maintained after a CREW event, on the part of the police it would seem to be based around improved liaison between local officers and the community such as the undertaking of PRIMES¹⁴ in the areas post-CREW to better enhance understanding of the day to day problems affecting an area, rather than action based approaches. Other agencies have adopted a more proactive approach with Hampshire Fire and Rescue (HFRS) and Trading Standards being the two agencies cited most frequently by consultees as those who had identified opportunities for long term involvement in a number of CREW areas.

Measuring CREW's success

The majority of interviewees indicated that, although some crude attempts had been made in some areas to assess the impact of CREW, no robust evaluations had been undertaken and, therefore, the outcomes remain uncertain:

“In terms of outcomes, we would like to think that we have improved public satisfaction, decreased anti-social behaviour and that the public feel more reassured but we haven't formally measured these things, so we don't know if they have been achieved.” (Constabulary CREW co-ordinator)

A number of Force co-ordinators had focused on numerical data to try and produce measurements of success for their CREW events. Some had simply counted the number or weight of bags of rubbish collected throughout the CREW or the number of walls cleaned of graffiti and others had carried out some work around comparing crime and ASB figures in the CREW area pre and post event or calls into the Force from the area. Most, but not all, had found that neither of these methods provided much evidence as to the success or failure of a CREW. In one area, detailed analysis has been carried out which compared the cost of policing a CREW area pre and post-event. The outcomes of this work suggest that, in monetary terms, the shared cost to deliver CREW was minimal in terms of the positive impact it had on the area.

The indications of the short term local assessments showed no displacement of activity; in fact anecdotal evidence supports there was often a diffusion of benefit¹⁵ in many CREW locations.

In some areas, interest has been shown in evaluating the ‘softer’ aspects of community engagement – e.g. public reassurance and fear of crime – and some steps have been taken to gather this anecdotal evidence via both formal (feedback forms, focus groups) and informal (word of mouth) means with varying success.

Lessons learned from CREW

Amongst consultees, most identified the need for a long planning phase prior to a CREW as one of the key lessons they had learned from the process thus far. This is in order to allow all participating agencies to identify in advance what resources they are able to commit to the CREW and to define the roles and responsibilities of all involved. The most frequently referred to issue, however, was that of media involvement. Whilst many areas had excellent media support (see appendix 4), in some areas; a few individuals were reporting that the local media had expressed little or no interest in the CREW event, to others feeling that the media had taken their “own

¹⁴ PRIME (Problem resolution In Multi Agency Environments) is Hampshire Constabulary name for Problem Oriented Policing (POP)

¹⁵ Displacement is where activity is displaced from the target area to the surrounding/nearby area, and diffusion of benefit is where the benefit achieved in the target area spreads beyond to the nearby/surrounding area. Clarke, R.V and Weisburg, D. (1994) Diffusion of Crime Control benefits; Observations on the reverse of displacement.

angle” on the CREW which had led to misrepresentation of the event and the people involved in it:

“The downside for...the young people were the way the media portrayed them in the newspapers. The young people were hurt by the comments about them ‘rampaging’ etc...and felt this was exaggerated.” (Youth Service Worker)

Most co-ordinators have deliberately avoided too much advance publicity for the CREW event in order not to alert the public as to the enforcement side of the project – i.e. executing warrants, removal of untaxed/abandoned vehicles, removal of mattresses and sofas and suchlike which have been ‘fly-tipped’ etc – as this can have an adverse effect on the effectiveness of these endeavours, such as encouraging people to ‘fly-tip’ their rubbish in the area prior to the clear up date. However, the work of some of the other involved agencies requires media publicity in order to increase awareness amongst the public and thus, it could happen that the police approach to the media is detrimental to the work of partner agencies.

Conclusion

The consensus concerning these issues notwithstanding and taking into account that the process is still evolving; was that there was potential for CREW to achieve more in the future.




There is a plethora of supporting evidence from the media that also records the feeling of local people in support of the aims and objectives of CREW being achieved. A quote to the co-ordinator from one elderly resident at the Seafield CREW was;

“ I have been waiting for 20 years for something like this to happen around here”

CREW is making a difference and as more CREW’s take place the potential impact on the continued improvements to communities’ increases with every event; from small acorns grow large oak trees and the methodology of CREW is designed the same way.

(4000 words)

Appendix

1	'How to plan a CREW' document.	 Z:\Headquarters\ Community Safety\Pr
2	Example of typical schedule of events (Seafield)	 Z:\Headquarters\ Community Safety\Pr
3	Examples of CREW leaflet	 Z:\Headquarters\ Community Safety\Pr
4	Some examples of coverage of CREW events (Web links to media/partners)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ http://www.bordon-herald-today.co.uk/today/options/news/newsdetail.cfm?id=23789 ➤ http://www.guinnesstrust.org.uk/templates/news/news-item.cfm/383 ➤ http://archive.thisishampshire.net/2005/9/2/94385.html
5	Home Office recognition re CREW impacting on vandalism and criminal damage (p.3)	http://www.together.gov.uk/cagetfile.asp?rid=907