Burglary Prevention

Reactive vs proactive use of CPTED at residential properties in Aotearoa/New Zealand

International POP awards, August 7th-9th 2023



Tēnā Koutou

Emma Ashcroft, Practice Lead Prevention Development

Ngā Pirihimana o Aotearoa/ New Zealand Police

Tēnā koutou, Tēnā koutou, Tēnā koutou katoa Ko Highdown te maunga Ko Pākuratahi te awa Nō Ingarani ahau Ko Worthing te Ūkaipō Kei Whanganui-a-Tara tōku kāinga ināianei Ko Ashcroft tōku whānau Ko Gavin rāua ko Lorraine ōku mātau Ko Emma tōku ingoa E mahi ana ahau ki Pirihimana o Aotearoa He Practice Lead Problem solving ahau He waka eke noa Nō reira tēnā koutou, Tēnā koutou, Tēnā koutou katoa



Prevention Development

Embed a problem solving (POP) approach

- Advice and training for utilising the SARA model and CPTED
- Supporting POP initiatives in districts
- Tools and training frontline staff prevention and community policing teams
- Design, implementation and evaluation of POP initiatives







Scanning the problem

Burglary in Aotearoa/New Zealand



What is the problem?

Residential burglary

~25% of calls for service are for burglary (2016)



Burglary incidence, ICVS 2004-05





Reactive POP

Locks, Lights and Lines of Sight







Scanning

Locks, Lights & Lines of sight



Stakeholders

Problem owner

- Treasury-funded join sector initiative:
 Police focused on preventing victimisation
 Corrections developing programme for offenders (18 25 years old)
- Kāinga Ora (national state housing service)



TE TAI ŌHANGA THE TREASURY







What are the targets?

Who are the victims?

- Largest knowledge gap due to data type
- Anecdotal evidence suggested CRAVED items are the most likely targets

Retrospective analysis

New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey (2014): Some groups may be more vulnerable (e.g., renters – especially Kāinga Ora/ state housing residents, single parents, deprived areas)





Where and when is the problem?

Police districts and season trends

- Considered which areas had highest burglary volume and rates, and repeat burglary volume and rates
- Increase rates across late December-February (Christmas/Summer holiday) – delayed reporting
- Small increase on Thursday Friday and Monday; peaks during daytime hours





Problem statement

Dwelling burglary is an increasing problem resulting in high CFS and impacting a variety of victims, particularly high rates in Bay of Plenty, Canterbury, Eastern and Waikato districts.





Analysis

Locks, Lights & Lines of Sight



What is the problem?

Increasing trend; Repeat dwelling burglary

- MOJ Evidence Brief (2016): Almost ¼ of residential dwellings that experience a burglary will have a repeat
- New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey (2014):
 44% of burglaries were a repeat

National burglary count (2014-2017)





Existing security

CPTED

- New Zealand household security survey (2001):
 Just under half had doors with deadlocks, and/or security lights
 A third had some form of window look
 - A third had some form of window lock
- New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey (2014): 26% of repeat burglary victims did not improve security following the initial victimisation

What works?

Previous responses





Hypothesis

Inadequate CPTED measures, specifically target hardening and surveillance, at dwelling properties increases their vulnerability to burglary.



Response

Locks, Lights & Lines of sight



CPTED measures

Free target hardening, surveillance & maintenance measures

- Door locks
- Window stays
- Sensor lights
- Trimming back vegetation (improve lines of sight)
- Deterrent signage (Canterbury only)





Trial design & process





Costings & timelines

Measures installed

Average cost of measures and installation per house = NZD\$1,220*

Total = NZD\$3.05million**

Installation goal = 7 days after forensics attend
 Average installation time = 30 days



* USD = \$872; GBP = £632; Euro = €750

** USD = \$1.9mil; GBP = £1.5mil; Euro = €1.77mil



Assessment

Locks, Lights & Lines of sight



Outcomes

Repeat dwelling burglary victimisation

Police data: No significant difference in repeat rate

Survey response: Significantly lower repeat burglary rate in the intervention group (7%) compared to control

 Police data: Significantly lower proportion of repeat 'burglaries' in the intervention group were successful (8%) compared to control





Outcomes

Trust & Confidence, Feelings of Safety

- Survey response: Significantly higher trust & confidence (12% 1) and feelings of safety (8% 1) in the intervention group
 - Police empathetic and helpful
 - Feel safe and less anxious at home
 - Happy with measures and installation process
 - Increased awareness prevention and installation of additional security measures
 - installation of additional security measures
 - Prevention of further (successful) burglary

"...About a month or so after the security measures were installed we had an attempted burglary, where the burglar <u>never gained entry</u> and this was <u>because of the new window</u>

<u>stays</u>..."

"... I've had another attempted break in this morning... The <u>lights you</u> <u>installed</u> ... activated at the time which <u>let me know</u> there was someone in the driveway and <u>to call</u> <u>the police</u>..."



Lessons learned

Stakeholder feedback

- CPTED was a clear, practical framework
- Police staff felt bad for control group
- Unable to achieve timely install
 - Quality of burglary reports
 - Delays to and quality of security assessments
 - Booking installation with occupiers
 - Availability of hardware and installers

Where to next?

Revisiting the Scan and Analysis

- Full roll out commenced January 2022
- What other crime prevention measures/activities are needed within Locks, Lights and Lines of sight?
- What other burglary prevention opportunities in other districts?



Proactive POP

Ko Tōu Manawa, Ko Tōku Manawa





Scanning (and Analysis part 1)

Ko Tōu Manawa, Ko Tōku Manawa



What is the problem?

Private property burglary

Volume of outbuilding and outside burglary – including theft of/ from vehicles – equal to dwelling burglary

National burglary by scene and subscene type January 2017 – December 2019





Where and when is the problem?

Suburb level-analysis

- High-levels in two-third of districts
- 3 of the 4 worst suburbs in the whole district from Palmerston North City
- A third of burglaries suburbs start at night
 Sampling analysis: 15% of burglary occurred while guardian(s) present





Targets and how?

Sample analysis

- Electronics, outdoor equipment/ DIY tools and sports gear/ outdoor games most common commodities
- One-fifth of burglary involved theft of or from a vehicle
- Dwellings security lacking; outbuildings exploited
- Method for over half (58%) of vehicle burglaries could not be determine from the narratives



Dwelling Outbuilding Vehicle



Problem statement

Private properties are vulnerable to burglary because they are often insecure or inadequately secured, and place managers are either absent or unable to secure/monitor property.



Analysis part 2

Ko Tōu Manawa, Ko Tōku Manawa







Community Survey

Police conducted (n=193)

- Feel unsafe due to gangs, burglaries and other crime/ personal safety, and dangerous driving.
- Low levels of trust and confidence due to perceived lack of Police presence and/or response to crime.

"[Community connectiveness] combat[s] loneliness and build community... Bring back the community feeling ... Security, support. Friendship. It's priceless!"

Community connectedness



Feel safe or very safe in neighbourhood after dark



Quite a lot or full trust and confidence in Police





Hypotheses

- Insufficient CPTED particularly target hardening and surveillance – at residential private properties and a lack of knowledge about crime prevention makes the community vulnerable to burglary.
- Uncertainty from the community about what Police response involves, a lack of positive interactions with Police and low levels of community connectiveness make the community feel unsafe.





Response

Ko Tōu Manawa, Ko Tōku Manawa



Whanau Ora outcomes

Packages





Burglary prevention package

Measures and process

- Reactive: Victims of residential private property burglary
 - No method of entry requirement
- Proactive: Open to all in trial suburbs
 Agency referrals
 Self referrals





Ko Tou Manawa, Ko Toku Manawa – response outcome prediction

Design

Pre-post, matched-control

- Intervention group: 2 neighbouring suburbs with ~2,200 properties (total)
- Control group: 1 suburb 5-6km away with ~1,200 properties









Assessment (interim)

Ko Tōu Manawa, Ko Tōku Manawa



Progress of Burglary Prevention Package



5 ½ weeks





Indicative outcomes

- Repeat victimisation: Significant difference between intervention suburb (4.5%) and control suburb (13.3%)
- Accumulated rate: Slower increase in total burglary count in intervention suburb
 Does <u>not</u> appear to be driven by the response

"I feel my home is now a solid castle and we feel really safe and comfortable to stay at home." Accumulated burglary rate in intervention and control suburbs across the pre-response period and response period





What's next?

Finishing response phase; full evaluation

- Burglary Prevention Package to be installed at 1,500 whānau properties
 - 31st July 2023: 846
- Other packages
 - Street BBQs alternately organised by different 'squad' members
 - Currently working on how to enable whānau to organise their own events







Summary

Reactive vs proactive response to burglary

- Implementation of a large-scale, in-situ randomised control trial to prevent repeat dwelling burglary was successful – despite COVID-19
- Increasing target hardening and natural surveillance in response to dwelling burglary prevents successful entry in repeat attempts
- Whānau and Police desire a proactive, community-based approach that also supports wider whānau ora/ wellbeing
- Effectiveness in preventing burglary unclear from interim results, however positive feedback from whānau and partners



Acknowledgements

Police – Dr Melissa Smith, Noeline Verheyen, Debbie Kleuskens, Aroha Bray, Tony Dewhirst, Paul 'PJ' Johns, Toni Ferris, Matt Cressey, Mitch Brown, Icey Xu, Insp Darren-Leigh Paki, Insp Ross 'Granny' Grantham, AC Chris DeWattingar (previous staff Nicole Cranshaw, Megan Rosemergy, Dave Iremonger & Reuben Hobbs)

Partners – Danielle Harris (OraKonnect), Materoa Mar, Nikki Walden & Stacey Rennie (Te Tihi), Jodie Matenga-Phillips & Anj Butler(Highbury Whanau Centre), Keith Hilson, Ang Williams & Rebecca Kinloch (Kainga Ora), Denu Sefton (Palmerston North City Council), TPS, Alexander builders, Acumen, McCanics, MH Builders, Metro Property Services, BDF electrical and Mike Murphy Auto-electrical



Ngā mihi/ Thank you!



References

- Bicycle Theft (2008). Retrieved from: https://popcenter.asu.edu/content/bicycle-theft-0
- Ministry of Justice (2014). Crime and Safety Survey 2014, retrieved from: https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/NZCASS-201602-Main-Findings-Report-Updated.pdf
- MOJ Evidence Brief (2016). Retrieved from https://www.justice.govt.nz/assets/Repeat-Burglary.pdfpeat of
- Thefts of and from Cars on Residential Streets and Driveways (2007). Retrieved from: https://popcenter.asu.edu/content/thefts-andcars-residential-streets-driveways-0
- Tseloni, A., Thompson, R., Grove, L., Tilley, N., & Farrell, G. (2017). The effectiveness of burglary security devices. Security Journal, 30, 646-664.
- Van Dijk, J.J.M., van Kesteren, J.N. & Smit, P. (2007). Criminal Victimisation in International Perspective, Key findings from the 2004-2005 ICVS and EU ICS. The Hague, Boom Legal Publishers



Problem solving plan

SARA resource

- Designed to be usable without training or inperson guidance; Prevention Development team support if needed
- Links to other SARA help resources, CPTED and situational crime prevention techniques

Problem Solving Plan

Guidance for Police, community/iwi and agency partners to carry out problem solving.

Help text

Green help text provides information to help complete this document but is not part of the document...You can toggle help text on and off using the buttons throughout this document. The help text will not primt. for a printable copy with all help text displayed click here.

This template uses the four step SARA problem solving approach:

- 1. Scanning- Identify and describe the problem
- 2 Analysis Study the problem to get a better understanding of what is driving it
- 3. Response Consider a range of responses, choose, and implement the most appropriate ones
- 4. Assessment Determine the effectiveness of the response.

Not all problems are suitable for a SARA problem solving approach. Check the problem meets all 6 CHEERS elements to see if it requires a SARA approach.

- Community members (can include individuals, businesses, agencies or other groups) must experience harmful events as a result of the problem
- The Harm experienced can include property loss or damage, injury, death, psychological harm, (Illegal events on their own do not always met this requirement)
- Image: The community must have an Expectation that police should address the problem
- You must be able to describe the types of Events that form the problem (as problems are made up of a number of events g.g. a vehicle that has been broken into)
- The events must be Recurring happening more than once
- The events must have Similarity in terms of offenders or victims or times or circumstances or location

For more information about SARA, including videos, e-learning, and complete examples of this Problem-Solving Plan template click here for SARA resources;





Where is the problem?

When is the problem?





Dwelling burglary (districts of interest only) by month April 2017 – March 2018



Dwelling burglary (districts of interest only) by time April 2017 – March 2018





Outcomes



Trust & confidence in Police and Feelings of safety following burglary in the intervention and control group



Control Intervention



Burglary below national mean.

Above the mean (by less than one standard deviation).

1 standard deviation above the mean (top 33rd percentile) > moderate problem.

- 2 standard deviations above the mean (top 15th percentile) > high problem.
- 3 standard deviations above the mean (top 1st percentile) > severe problem.

Where is the problem?

Average residential private property burglary rate by district





Burglary rates (population ad dwelling) of Central suburbs January 2017 – December 2019

450



Population Rate Dwelling Rate



When is the problem?



N E W Z E A L A N D POLICE Ngā Pirihimana o Aotearoa

What are the targets?





Who is part of the problem?

Victims and area demographics

- Low rate of identified offenders (8%) or suspects (8%) means little is known about motivations and limits opportunities for increasing handlers
- Police commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ The Treaty of Waitangi



Area Victims



Area Vctims



Community perspective

Survey (n=10) and workshops (n=7)

- Value efforts to securing private property
- Prioritise victims by vulnerability (remove biases)
- Better explain Police process and give more prevention advice
- Update whānau about community goings on
- Free neighbourhood events and support to organise events
- Increasing frequency of positive interactions between Pirihimana and rangatahi (youth)

Prihimana perspective

Workshops (n=15)

- 'Prevention' focuses on offenders and not victims/ community
- Aware of (unconscious) bias & apathy to victims
 Aim to attend 100% dwelling burglaries
 Would like to know if advice during attendance is valuable



Community Connectedness Survey

Importance and current strength of community connectedness 40% 35% 30% 25% Axis Title 20% 15% 10% 5% 0% Somewhat Not at all Not very Moderately Very Axis Title

Important Current strength



Feelings of safety in the neighbourhood and at home during the day and night

■ Very Unsafe or Unsafe ■ Neutral ■ Safe or Very Safe



Progress of Burglary Prevention Package



Whānau/households across different stages of the Burglary Prevention Package