



# **Neighbourhood Policing Evaluation**

**London Area Baseline Study**

September 2009

## **Contents**

---

<u>Executive summary</u>	<b>2</b>
<u>Background</u>	<b>4</b>
<u>Methodology</u>	<b>6</b>
<b><u>Case Studies</u></b>	
<b><u>1 Croydon</u></b>	<b>11</b>
<b><u>2 Wimbledon</u></b>	<b>19</b>
<b><u>3 Finsbury Park</u></b>	<b>27</b>
<b><u>4 Seven Sisters</u></b>	<b>35</b>
<b><u>5 Acton Mainline</u></b>	<b>41</b>
<b><u>6 Stratford</u></b>	<b>48</b>
<u>Officer survey findings</u>	<b>55</b>
<u>Appendix</u>	<b>58</b>

**Quality of Service Research Team**

Strategic Development Department

Strategic Services

Force Headquarters

25 Camden Road

London, NW1 9LN

**Tel:** 020 7830 8911

**Email:** btp.qos.researchteam@btp.pnn.police.uk

## Executive summary

Many of the rail staff who took part in the evaluation spoke of feeling neglected by a police service that they perceived to be more engaged with its own organisational agenda than with the needs of its users. This was evidenced by the failure of BTP's current policing arrangements to reflect the needs of staff effectively.

Of great interest was the way in which many staff spoke of their hopes and expectations for the future. The introduction of NP was often described in glowing terms, considered capable of providing the visible, accessible and familiar police presence that staff thought was needed to close the gap that had developed between themselves and BTP. Indeed, the strongest message for NPTs is that staff confidence may appear low, but their expectations are high.

It became clear throughout the evaluation that each site has its own narrative – its own unique collection of challenges, customs and conflicts which can only be understood by talking to those with 'local' knowledge. Indeed, as will become clear throughout the following report, the experiential knowledge of those who work on and regularly use the railways is at present a largely untapped resource. The evaluation provided an opportunity for this story to be shared. It is for this reason that the evaluation has adopted a case study approach and considered each site in isolation (summaries for each site can be found on the last page of each case study).

Yet despite their individual narratives, it is also clear that most, if not all, of the sites involved in the evaluation have certain issues in common. The tendency for current policing arrangements to neglect staff demand has already been mentioned. But it is also true that many of the sites are the subject of a police presence that caters to the needs of larger stations at the expense of smaller ones. Another constant was the scarcity of engagement opportunities at both

formal (i.e. structured meetings) and informal (i.e. chance encounters brought about by proactive patrol) levels. Lastly, but no less importantly, there is a lack of staff confidence in BTP's willingness and capacity to investigate reports. These are all legacy issues that each neighbourhood policing team (NPT) will have to work hard to overcome.

In summary, if NP is to fulfil its promise of delivering 'the Right People at the Right Places in the Right Numbers', then there needs to be a commitment from the new NPTs to comprehensive and meaningful engagement. This will ensure that services responsive to the needs of staff are delivered at the "Right Time".

## Background

In January 2009, Boris Johnson, the Mayor of London, announced the funding of 50 British Transport Police (BTP) officers for the policing of London's suburban train stations. Delivering on one of his key manifesto pledges, Johnson described the 50 new officers, funded through a reduction in the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) press budget, as evidence of his commitment to tackling low-level crime and disorder at London's "worst" stations:

"During the election campaign I made a pledge that I would make London's suburban stations safer, because everyone has the right to travel safely and free from the fear of crime, no matter what part of London they live in...These new officers help to underline our commitment to tackling anti-social behaviour and crime and to ensuring that Londoners can go about their business with a feeling of safety and security" [Boris Johnson, January 6, 2009].<sup>1</sup>

From the outset, the 50 fully warranted officers were mandated with providing a reassuring police presence (especially after dark), enhanced community engagement and locally responsive policing at more than 100 stations and routes in outer London. As a result, the officers were incorporated into BTP's neighbourhood policing programme, Safer Stations, Safer Journey, with the aim of providing a consistent police presence capable of both identifying and responding to local concerns.

The funding of 50 officers has provided BTP with the resources to establish seven new Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) at locations across both North and South London. These teams – which are essentially dedicated

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.conervatives.com/News/News\\_stories/2009/01/Mayor\\_funds\\_more\\_British\\_Transport\\_Police\\_aspx](http://www.conervatives.com/News/News_stories/2009/01/Mayor_funds_more_British_Transport_Police_aspx)

and accountable resources with geographic ownership – have responsibility for policing the following routes:<sup>2</sup>

- **Acton Mainline to Greenford** (operated by First Great Western)
- **Catford/Hither Green to Orpington/St Mary Cray** (operated by Southeastern Trains)
- **East Croydon to Carshalton Beeches including Croydon Tramlink** (operated by Southern Rail)
- **Finsbury Park to Potters Bar** (operated by First Capital Connect)
- **Seven Sisters to Bethnal Green via Hackney Downs and Enfield Town** (operated by National Express East Anglia)
- **Stratford to Romford** (operated by National Express East Anglia)
- **Raynes Park to Stoneleigh and Richmond to Hampton via Kew Bridge** (operated by Southwest Trains).

Significantly, each NPT is made up of an average of six officers, including one Police Sergeant and five Police Constables. In this sense, the structure of the new teams represents a departure from the traditional NP model of one Police Sergeant, two Police Constables and three Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

Finally, in so far that the new NPTs consist only of fully-warranted officers, they represent a new ‘enforcement-based’ approach to the delivery of neighbourhood policing. Traditionally, neighbourhood policing teams have relied on PCSOs to provide the visible, accessible and familiar police presence that is so crucial to successful neighbourhood policing. Naturally, there are likely to be certain strengths, as well as weaknesses, inherent in this approach which future reports will seek to address.

The teams were scheduled to ‘go live’ on the 1 May 2009.

---

<sup>2</sup> The new mayoral-funded NPT covering Catford/Hither Green to Orpington/St Mary Cray was not included in the present study.

## Methodology

In March 2009 the Quality of Service research team was approached by Inspector Tony Lodge to carry out the first stage of an evaluation of six Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs). The purpose of the evaluation is to monitor and support the implementation of the new NPTs over time and in terms of certain key outcomes. The first part of the evaluation – which is the focus of the present report – involves identifying and capturing appropriate baseline measures against which the implementation of neighbourhood policing (NP) can be assessed in the future.

### **DELIVERY MECHANISMS**

Establishing appropriate baseline measures for NP requires the identification of those delivery mechanisms that are intended to bring about change at the neighbourhood level. This involves identifying the various policing activities that NP both encourages and facilitates. These include:

- Visible patrol – the consistent presence of police officers dedicated to a defined geographical area
- Community engagement – accountable personal relationships and intelligence-led identification of community concerns
- Problem-solving – joint action between the police and its partners to tackle community concerns.

These mechanisms have been identified as key to the successful implementation of NP, not just within BTP, but as a national programme.

### **OUTCOME MEASURES**

When deciding upon appropriate outcome measures for neighbourhood policing, it is important to identify what the delivery mechanisms of visible patrol, community engagement and problem-solving are intended to achieve.

In the present study they have been identified as facilitating change in the following ways:

- By raising the profile and awareness of BTP's role and activities
- By enhancing BTP's relationships with its stakeholders and community
- By reducing both crime and the fear of crime
- By enhancing staff feelings of safety
- By solving local problems through locally agreed and driven interventions.

These outcomes can be taken as an indication of whether or not the implementation of neighbourhood policing has been successful. They therefore provide the reference points for the various methods of data collection adopted by the evaluation.

## DATA COLLECTION

In April 2009 the research team embarked upon a wide-ranging process of data collection. This involved collecting data from four different sources:

- Reported crime data
- Group and individual interviews with rail staff
- Face-to-face surveys with 300 passengers
- An email survey of neighbourhood policing constables and sergeants.

Together these provide the evaluation with evidence on the extent to which policing arrangements at the proposed NP sites *already* deliver the outcomes outlined above.

## CRIME DATA

The evaluation was designed to capture baseline measures through a total of four methods of data collection. The first of these – which provides the

evaluation with a range of ‘hard’ measures – involved collecting and analysing crime data for the time period 1 April 2008 to the 31 March 2009.

### **GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS<sup>3</sup>**

The second method – which provides the evaluation’s ‘softer’ measures – consisted of focus groups and interviews with Train Operating Company (TOC) employed staff.<sup>4</sup> There are three main benefits of obtaining a qualitative measure of current policing arrangements to form part of an evaluation. The first is that it allows for an in-depth exploration of the issues from the perspective of those who are most affected by them. Indeed, in so far as TOC employed staff are key stakeholders in neighbourhood policing, it is important to obtain a measure of current arrangements from their perspective. Secondly, to the extent that neighbourhood policing represents a shift towards processes that are less observable in their outcomes, a more sensitive method of data collection is required. Focus groups, unlike the ‘hard’ measures elicited by an analysis of crime data, are particularly well suited to exploring the processes that neighbourhood policing aims to affect.

### **PASSENGER SURVEY<sup>5</sup>**

The third method of data collection involved face-to-face surveys with 186 passengers at stations across the six chosen evaluation sites.<sup>6</sup> Like rail staff, passengers are key stakeholders in BTP’s neighbourhood policing programme, meaning that it was important to ensure their views and experiences were taken into account. The surveys covered such topics as travel habits, perceptions of safety, crime and disorder problems and local policing priorities. As a result, together with providing the evaluation with a range of quantitative measures of passenger perceptions, the surveys also provide the NPT’s with valuable local data. The completed surveys were

---

<sup>3</sup> See Annex A for copies of the focus group and interview guidelines.

<sup>4</sup> There were a total of six focus groups and 12 interviews.

<sup>5</sup> See Annex B for copy of the passenger survey.

<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately no data was returned from the Seven Sisters site. Each site was asked to achieve 50 completed surveys.

returned to the Strategic Development Department (SDD) and analysed using SPSS.<sup>7</sup>

### OFFICER SURVEY<sup>8</sup>

The final method of data collection consisted of an email survey of Police Constables and Sergeants assigned to the new NPTs. These were distributed in the month prior to the NPTs going live, returned to SDD and analysed using SPSS. They included a number of questions aimed at measuring such factors as current job satisfaction, officer attitudes towards neighbourhood policing and their relationships with peers, supervisors and stakeholders. The questions were carefully designed to correspond to a number of job dimensions, including role autonomy, task identity, skill variety and job feedback. The overall aim was to measure how culturally orientated the new NPTs were to the various aspects of neighbourhood policing (and thereby provide a baseline attitudinal measure that any future surveys can be compared with).

---

<sup>7</sup> SPSS is a statistical package used in the analysis of social data.

<sup>8</sup> See Annex C for a copy of the officer survey.

## Case studies

<b>1</b>	Croydon	<b>11</b>
<b>2</b>	Wimbledon	<b>18</b>
<b>3</b>	Finsbury Park	<b>25</b>
<b>4</b>	Seven Sisters	<b>33</b>
<b>5</b>	Acton Mainline	<b>40</b>
<b>6</b>	Stratford	<b>47</b>

## 1. Croydon

**Train Operating Company:** Southern Rail

**Station coverage:** East Croydon; Selhurst; Thornton Heath; Norbury; Streatham Common; Streatham; New Cross Gate; Brockley; Honour Oak Park; Forest Hill; Sydenham; Penge West; Anerley; Crystal Palace; Norwood Junction; West Croydon; Waddon; Wallington; Sutton; Carshalton Beeches.

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

### 1.1. CRIME DATA

**All Crime** (between 01/03/08 and 28/02/09)

Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Crimes	46	41	65	57	62	41	48	90	52	28	31	55
Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Detections	31	35	41	30	43	28	28	65	45	23	19	32

**Detection rate:** 68.20%

**Anti-Social Behaviour** (between 01/03/08 and 28/02/09)

Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Crimes	13	19	24	22	11	6	20	30	15	14	14	20
Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Detections	14	10	21	14	13	6	12	27	15	15	8	19

**Detection rate:** 83.70%

**Staff Assaults** (between 01/03/08 and 28/02/09)

Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Crimes	1	1	1	2	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	1
Month Year	Mar- 08	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09
Detections	0	3	2	0	0	0	6	0	1	1	0	1

**Detection rate:** 85.50%

**N.B.** Apparent anomalies, such as more crimes being detected than reported, are due to the fact that statistics reflect crimes and detections recorded during a specific period. Detections may relate to crimes reported in earlier periods.

## 1.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

### Visibility and engagement

Members of the group described the visibility of BTP officers as being highly dependent on both time and place. One Station Supervisor at Sutton, for instance, reported seeing Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) quite regularly, with them more likely to be seen on trains during the evening. Similarly, one member of staff attending the group from Carshalton reported seeing a PCSO at least twice a week – a degree of constancy which had allowed him to establish a personal rapport with the officer. This had the positive effect of encouraging the member of staff to be more forthcoming with information, since he now felt that he had an officer that could be trusted to act on it, rather than simply pay lip service to it.

Staff at East Croydon, which is the largest and busiest station to be covered by the new NPT, reported seeing BTP officers regularly after 11am. However, for one Station Supervisor at East Croydon, seeing a BTP officer during his night-shift was a rare occurrence, especially so at weekends, which is when he thought a police presence was actually most needed. The Station Supervisor also explained that he and his staff often rely on the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to respond first to emergency calls. In large part this is due to the close proximity of a MPS police station to East Croydon station. Yet despite staff generally finding the response time of the MPS to be quicker than that of BTP, the skill-set of BTP's officers, particularly their knowledge of railway byelaws, was seen as a big motivation for having them attend incidents. With this in mind, it is perhaps not surprising that staff at East Croydon called for a change to BTP shift patterns, particularly during the night and at weekends, so as to better reflect demand.

Although one member of staff from Carshalton appears to enjoy a personal rapport with one particular PCSO, the majority of the group stated that, beyond recognising officers by sight and knowing some by name, their

relationships extended little further. Indeed, the majority of staff contact can be described as informal, such as brief conversations when officers come to use staff facilities. In this sense, the PCSO role appears to be better suited to such informal relations than their fully warranted colleagues, with members of staff keen to comment on their friendliness and affability. However, this may also be due to staff contact with PCs being limited to more formal activities, such as revenue operations, which for one Revenue Protection Officer (RPO) comprised a large part of his job. Thus the type of contact staff have with officers – whether PCSOs or PCs – depends to a large extent on the nature of the formers job role.

### **Staff safety**

All members of the group reported feeling generally safe whilst at work. However, there were still some concerns, particularly at West Croydon and Sutton, which staff felt it was important to raise. Some, for instance, expressed concern over the emptying of ticket machines by lone members of staff and the selling of tickets to drunks on Friday and Saturday nights. A police presence at the times these problems occur, which for the latter is typically after 10pm, was seen as one way of providing staff with reassurance. One member of staff remarked that he regularly receives abuse from passengers just for asking to see a ticket, a problem which, given appropriate powers, he felt he could resolve himself. However, the majority of staff agreed that they would rather have a police presence, since resolving the issue alone was considered too risky. Indeed, there was a feeling amongst RPOs in particular that ticketless travel was a big problem, not in terms of incidence, but because passengers' behaviour was more aggressive and violent. Similar observations were made by staff at East Croydon with regards to students attempting to 'double up' on tickets.

Every member of the group acknowledged that suffering some amount of abuse was an unfortunate but inevitable part of the job. Yet positively, all members of the group recognised the need to report such incidents,

regardless of how serious or trivial, in order to bring them to the attention of TOC management and to amass evidence for use by BTP. However, when the group was asked about the reporting practices of their colleagues, it was clear that, despite being encouraged to report every incident of abuse, there was still a considerable amount of under-reporting. Further discussion revealed that log-books and incident records are being treated, by some staff at least, with a degree of antipathy, with several members of the group relaying stories of how colleagues had described them as time consuming and unproductive. Nonetheless, it is also apparent that there are pockets of good practice, with staff at Sutton, for instance, making sure that every incident gets reported.

Of particular concern for staff was BTP's slow response times. This has led to problems for the majority of the group, for example, being left with no alternative but to allow ticketless, drunken or generally abusive passengers to board trains without challenge. As one Station Supervisor recollects:

"We've had a situation where the train was delayed an hour while we waited for a response...and that only ended because the person decided to get off. BTP never arrived. I was also threatened at Christmas, and I had to make a decision to let someone get on the train, because there was no way BTP would get there in time" (**Station Supervisor at Sutton**).

Interestingly, being forced to let such individuals travel was seen by staff as simply moving the problem on to colleagues at a different station, whilst in the meantime putting other passengers at risk. The problem of slow response times was made worse by abstractions brought about by football policing. For example, a number of staff commented that, when Crystal Palace was playing, BTP were unable to respond to anything they reported.

### Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing

The dominant view within the group towards NP was a positive one. In particular, all staff felt that it was important to enjoy a personal relationship with BTP, so that they could feel confident about letting officers know their concerns. It was remarked that having dedicated officers who were known to staff would help build trust, teamwork and information sharing. Staff were also hopeful that dedicated, accountable policing would lead to more action and follow-up on their reports, something which, if communicated back to them properly, would help build their confidence. The only concern was that a consistent police presence may lead to offenders becoming familiar with officers shift patterns. In fact, one member of staff, referring to problems brought about by night-clubs located close to Sutton station, remarked that incidents always seem to occur shortly after officers had left the scene.

### 1.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS<sup>9</sup>

This section summarises the findings of a short face-to-face survey carried out with passengers on the East Croydon to Carshalton Beeches line. The survey was conducted by officers at various stations along the line shortly before the NPT was scheduled to ‘go live’.

#### Visibility

Respondents were asked how often they see BTP officers patrolling at a particular station and whether they thought that level of visibility was sufficient. Almost two thirds of passengers (60%) reported seeing BTP officers “every now and again” and around a quarter (27%) claimed they saw officers “most times” they travel. Encouragingly, of the passengers who stated they see a BTP officer/PCSO most times they travel, just over two-thirds (67%) felt this to be about the right amount. Respondents who said that they see an officer/PCSO every now and again largely agreed that this

---

<sup>9</sup> A total of 33 surveys were conducted at the Croydon site. Due to resource considerations it was not possible to conduct a representative number of surveys at each station covered by the NPT.

was about the right level of visibility (60%). However, just over a third (35%) of respondents felt this was not enough.

### Safety

In order to assess how safe passengers feel when using the line, a question was included in the survey which asked them to assess their safety at different times of the day. As Table 1 illustrates below, passengers feel reasonably safe when travelling during the daytime and at rush hour; although their feelings of safety begin to decrease significantly during the evening and with only a small percentage feeling safe after 10pm.

How safe do you feel when using the station at:	Safe	Unsafe	Mixed Feelings	% that feel safe
Rush hour [5:30am to 9:30am and 16:30pm to 19:00pm]	30	2	1	91
Daytime [9:30am to 16:30pm]	29	1	1	94
Evening [19:00pm to 22:00pm]	12	7	6	48
Late night [after 22:00pm]	2	7	10	11

Table 1 Passenger safety

When asked what would make them feel safer when using the line, the majority of respondents stated that a higher level of rail staff or police presence would help alleviate their concerns, particularly when travelling late at night.

### Passenger priorities

In terms of what the new NPT should focus on as its main priority, anti-social behaviour (ASB) was the overwhelming response from passengers, with other priorities including the need to clamp down on ticketless travel, alcohol-related disorder and knife crime.

### Passenger hopes for the new NPT

A question was included in the survey which asked respondents what difference they hoped an NPT would make on the line. For the most part,

respondents hoped that the newly formed NPT would create a safer environment for travelling, particularly late at night. Moreover, they also hoped that the new NPT would lead to a reduction in crime and disorder problems, particularly ASB.

#### **1.4. CROYDON SUMMARY**

- **Visibility**

- Does not currently reflect staff demand (i.e. on Friday and Saturday nights at East Croydon)
- Is generally provided by PCSOs and not PCs (the latter being restricted to operations and incident management)
- Is consistent enough for the majority of staff to recognise officers by sight (and some by name)
- *The majority of passengers see officers on this line every now and again*

- **Engagement**

- Has no formal structure (i.e. is generally limited to chance encounters – especially for frontline staff)
- Is more personal at the smaller stations on the line (e.g. Sutton and Carshalton)
- Where meaningful engagement is happening there is some evidence of better information provision (i.e. intelligence reports) by staff

- **Safety**

- Is being threatened by the lack of police presence at the times when it is perceived as most needed
- Risks being undermined by a lack of confidence in reporting procedures
- Is being threatened by slow response times and abstractions caused by football policing
- *Perceptions of safety amongst passengers falls after 10pm*

- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

- Positive – staff see it as having the potential to improve trust, team-working and information sharing
- *Passengers anticipate NP will create a safer environment late at night*

- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**

- A visible patrolling presence that better matches staff demand (particularly at peak hours)
- A perception amongst passengers of a more frequent visible presence
- A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
- An increase in staff confidence in reporting procedures
- An increase in passenger perceptions of safety after 10pm

## 2. Wimbledon

**Train Operating Company:** South West Trains

**Station coverage:** Raynes Park; Berrylands; Surbiton; Motspur Park; Maldon Manor; Tolworth; Chessington North; Chessington South; Worcester Park; Stoneleigh; Richmond; Barnes Bridge; Chiswick; Kew Bridge; Brentford; Syon Lane; Isleworth; Hounslow; Fulwell; Hampton; Wimbledon.

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

### 2.1. CRIME DATA

**All Crime** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	74	67	47	39	63	38	64	48	40	27	31	54
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detection	17	16	14	11	10	9	13	15	13	9	10	5

**Detection rate:** 24.00%

**Anti-Social Behaviour** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	10	5	9	6	5	4	10	5	11	6	9	10
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	1	2	4	4	1	2	5	3	6	3	2	3

**Detection rate:** 40.00%

**Staff Assaults** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	A8g- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	3	0	2	0	4	0	7	2	2	2	0	2
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	5	1	0	0

**Detection rate:** 50.00%

## 2.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

### Visibility and engagement

Staff from Surbiton reported seeing PCSOs on an almost daily basis. However, by this they meant just mornings and evenings, not during midday or late at night. Overall, staff there felt the level of patrol being provided was sufficient, although it was suggested that patrol patterns could better reflect demand (i.e. late-night, especially at weekends). Interestingly, levels of visibility at Wimbledon were slightly lower, with staff reporting the presence of PCSOs only two or three times a week. However, like their Surbiton counterparts, staff at Wimbledon also reported seeing officers during mid-morning and early evening, but rarely during midday or late at night. This was of concern because the majority of problems at Wimbledon were reported to happen after 10:30pm when only a few staff were on duty. As a result, there was a demand at Wimbledon for late-night security provision, something which the station manager was attempting to build a business case for by encouraging staff to report incidents.

It was also remarked that fully-sworn officers were only seen at Wimbledon if they had been called out to an incident or if they were conducting an operation. Yet to some extent, the level of patrol at Wimbledon was mediated by the close proximity of a MPS police station, which staff often relied upon in emergencies. Indeed, like staff at East Croydon, Wimbledon staff reported that officers from the MPS were often the first to respond to emergency calls. On this issue, the station manager at Wimbledon remarked that some staff there feel that BTP never respond to emergencies, or that if they do, their response is too slow. However, the manager clearly recognised the value of continuing to report incidents, not just to secure late-night security, but to make sure that BTP also recognised the need for their services.

With regards to community consultation, it was clear that station managers at both Surbiton and Wimbledon were regularly attending meetings with BTP

representatives, which had allowed them to establish productive personal relationships. Indeed, both station managers spoke positively about these meetings, particularly in terms of their improved structure and greater commitment from those involved to send representatives. The meetings were described as an “excellent format” because they allowed problems to be dealt with in a much more organised way. However, despite station managers suggesting that staff were reassured by having a forum where issues could be raised, discussed and acted upon, it is perhaps telling that no frontline staff in the group attended them. It appears that station managers are expected to attend and speak on behalf of their staff.<sup>10</sup>

In fact, it appears that relations between frontline staff and BTP are less established, with the former having little confidence in the way that reported incidents are dealt with. For example, because they rarely received feedback on the outcome of their reports, staff at Wimbledon felt that BTP had not bothered to investigate them. There were two main reasons why staff felt this way. There was an impression, first of all, that officers were being hindered by an excess of red tape; it was commented, for instance, that the “form filling” involved with processing an arrest would remove officers from patrol for the best part of a day. Secondly, there was recognition among some staff, especially those from Wimbledon, that BTP have limited resources and that this limits their capacity to follow up reports. More positively, however, staff at Surbiton were said to now be reporting incidents more than they had done in the past, with an improvement in BTP’s response – in terms of taking things more seriously – the main cause.

### **Staff safety**

Both station managers mentioned that staff often come to them with concerns about their safety. The manager at Wimbledon, for instance, remarked that

---

<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, the Wimbledon station manager referred to these discussion forums as PACT meetings, which should strictly speaking be reserved for use by NPTs. Indeed, given that at the time of interview there was no NPT covering Wimbledon station, it is unclear why these meetings have been labelled as PACT. This is an issue that may require clarification.

some of his staff had expressed concerns about working on their own, especially when operating the ticket barriers late on a Friday or Saturday night. It was clear that these concerns were inextricably tied up with passenger drunkenness; it was remarked by one member of staff at Wimbledon, for instance, that he was always more safety-conscious at night because problems can develop very quickly. It is probably for this reason that staff at both Surbiton and Wimbledon requested more BTP patrols on Friday and Saturday nights.

Surbiton in particular appears to suffer from a number of crime and disorder problems that pose a threat to staff safety. The manager there reported that they had the highest level of bicycle theft in the country<sup>11</sup> and that this was something that needed addressing. Other problems mentioned were graffiti, vandalism, ticket touting and verbal assaults on the gate-line. With regards to physical assaults, it was not clear what the extent of this problem was at Surbiton, but it was clear that staff linked them to the handing out of penalty fares. In order to address these problems a number of initiatives were underway. Regular patrols had been implemented and a fence erected around the bike zone to prevent cycle thefts. Station lighting had also been improved and CCTV installed. Finally, staff mentioned that a “bike tagging” session had been run at the station, but that more should be conducted in the future if the crime prevention message is to have a real impact.

At Wimbledon, the main issue for staff was anti-social behaviour (ASB), although there was also the occasional incident of ticket touting. With regards to the former, BTP have already introduced extra patrols at school leaving time in an attempt to solve the problem, something which both the station manager and frontline staff were reassured about. Train surfing was also recognised as a growing problem, and although this had been brought to BTP’s attention, it was accepted by staff that policing it would be difficult. The station manager at Wimbledon was also keen to point out the partnership

---

<sup>11</sup> Surbiton has in fact got the 9<sup>th</sup> highest level of bicycle theft in the country.

work that goes on with the local MPS Safe Transport Team. This initiative, which has been ongoing at Raynes Park for the past 16 months, has led to some notable success in preventing youths from congregating on the station forecourt. The impact of the new NPT will therefore have to be interpreted in this context, that is, with the full acknowledgement that there are other individuals, in this case officers from the MPS, who are also providing policing services.

### **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

The dominant view towards NP within the group is perhaps best described as cautiously optimistic. The station manager at Surbiton, for example, thought that the introduction of dedicated teams was a positive move but he was also concerned that the team would operate “in name only”, that is, there would be little substance underlying the ideology. Other members of the group welcomed what they saw as an opportunity to have more contact with local officers and build productive relationships – something which they thought would ensure better feedback on the status of their reports and thereby increase their confidence in BTP.

### **2.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS<sup>12</sup>**

This section summarises the findings of a short face-to-face survey carried out with passengers on the Raynes Park to Hampton line. The survey was conducted by officers at various stations on the line shortly before the NPT was scheduled to ‘go live’.

#### **Visibility**

Two thirds (67%) of respondents said that they see an officer/PSCO patrolling their station “every now and again” while around one quarter (23%) said they “never” see a BTP presence. Positively, of those respondents who reported seeing a BTP presence “most times” they travel, all felt that level of visibility to be about right. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the picture was more mixed when it

---

<sup>12</sup> A total of 45 surveys were conducted at the Wimbledon site.

came to seeing a presence every now and again, with just over half of passengers (52%) feeling this to be about right. Over two-thirds (70%) of respondents who never see a BTP officer/PCSO when they travel on this line felt this was not enough.

### Safety

A similar pattern emerges here as at the East Croydon site; passengers feel fairly safe when travelling during the daytime and at rush hour. However, whilst there is a decrease in the percentage of passengers that feel safe during the evening; this drops to less than half when travelling late at night.

How safe do you feel when using the station at:	Safe	Unsafe	Mixed Feelings	% that feel safe
Rush hour [5:30am to 9:30am and 16:30pm to 19:00pm]	31	2	2	86
Daytime [9:30am to 16:30pm]	36	1	2	92
Evening [19:00pm to 22:00pm]	25	5	6	69
Late night [after 22:00pm]	12	12	6	40

Table 2 Passenger safety

When respondents were asked what would make them feel safer when using the line, the majority of passengers stated that a greater visible police/rail staff presence particularly when using late night services would help to ease such concerns. Other priorities included the need for improved quality of lighting and CCTV at stations along this line.

### Passenger priorities

In terms of priorities for the newly formed NPT, passengers felt attention should be given to problems associated with youth, drunks and graffiti. It was also suggested – perhaps predictably – that the NPT should focus on providing a visible patrolling presence.

**Passenger hopes for the new NPT**

Passengers hope that an NPT will improve their sense of safety through providing greater levels of reassurance. A number of respondents stated that the new NPT would be able to tackle ASB problems currently troubling the Raynes Park to Hampton line. Passengers also hope that an NPT will provide a better police presence, especially on late night train services, with one passenger even stating that the presence of an NPT would make them feel more inclined to travel late at night.

## **2.4. WIMBLEDON SUMMARY**

- **Visibility**

- Varies by station but is generally quite regular (i.e. daily at Surbiton; two or three times a week at Wimbledon)
- Does not currently reflect staff demand (i.e. late-night at weekends)
- Is generally provided by PCSOs and not PCs (the latter being restricted to operations and incident management)
- *Most passengers on this line see officers every now and again*

- **Engagement**

- Tends to occur through formal rather than informal mechanisms (i.e. regular meetings)
- Management speak on behalf of frontline staff at meetings with BTP
- Lack of feedback on reported incidents is undermining staff willingness to make future reports

- **Safety**

- Is being threatened by alcohol fuelled behaviour on Friday and Saturday nights (something which is compounded by staff lone-working)
- Is being addressed through a range of initiatives, including improved lighting, CCTV and partnership work with the MPS Safe Transport Team
- *Desire from passengers for greater late night police presence to alleviate safety fears*

- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

- Staff were cautiously optimistic – want to make sure the NPT delivers on its promise
- *Passengers hopeful that the new NPT will provide a better police presence and be better equipped to tackle ASB*

- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**

- A visible patrolling presence that better matches staff demand (particularly at peak hours)
- A perception amongst passengers of a more frequent visible presence (especially late at night)
- A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
- Better provision of feedback to staff on the status of reported incidents
- Improved staff safety during peak hours

### 3. Finsbury Park

**Train Operating Company:** First Capital Connect

**Station coverage:** Finsbury Park; Haringey; Hornsey; Alexandra Palace; New Southgate; Oakleigh Park; New Barnet; Hadley Wood; Potters Bar.

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

#### 3.1. CRIME DATA

##### All Crime (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	21	26	28	49	31	29	30	51	12	21	14	20
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	10	7	12	18	11	7	28	38	9	6	13	10

**Detection rate:** 50.90%

##### Anti-Social Behaviour (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	11	14	10	23	15	21	12	31	1	3	3	3
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	9	6	9	15	9	4	20	25	3	2	3	2

**Detection rate:** 72.80%

##### Staff Assaults (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	9	1
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	9	0

**Detection rate:** 93.80%

### 3.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

#### Visibility and engagement

Members of the group reported seeing a BTP presence an average of once a week.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, this was restricted to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), with fully-sworn officers only seen when called out to an incident or policing a special event. There was a consensus within the group that this level of visibility was insufficient, since up until a year ago, levels of visibility had been much better. According to one member of the group, the PCSOs responsible for patrolling the line had been moved to a new office based at Kings Cross, which had made it more difficult for them to provide a regular presence. The feeling was that PCSOs were being tasked with checking each station along the route once a week, normally on a Monday, but that the constraints on their time meant they just turned up, checked the log book and left, thus leaving very little time for talking and getting to know staff. This led to staff feeling that the PCSOs were there because they had to be; not because they were concerned with staff welfare.

Interestingly, some members of the group knew a number of MPS officers who used the line to travel into London, which meant they sometimes relied on them to provide assistance (which the officers had been happy to do in the past). Similarly, the close proximity of a MPS station to Finsbury Park often meant that staff there relied on them to respond first to incidents, despite BTP also having a police station close by. It can hardly be confidence building for staff to know that there is a BTP office so close at hand and yet still receive a better response from the MPS. More positively, the PCSOs who did regularly visit stations and travel the line were quite well known to staff, both by name and by sight.

---

<sup>13</sup> Unsurprisingly, reported levels of visibility differed by station, with staff at Finsbury Park, for instance, claiming to see officers two or three times a week. Part of the reason for this was said to be the close proximity of Finsbury Park station to Emirates Stadium and the requirement for a police presence on match days.

With regards to community engagement, the rarity with which PCSOs attended the stations along the route meant that opportunities for engagement were limited, with only station managers regularly having contact (and this was as a result of formal meetings rather than informal approaches). This resulted in frontline staff receiving little or no feedback on incidents they had reported because of poor communication with their managers.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, station managers remarked that regular meetings had not changed their overall impression of BTP, that is, they had simply confirmed their belief that BTP were hindered by a lack of resources. As a result, knowing that an immediate response was unlikely, the station managers saw it as their job to educate their staff as to how best to deal with confrontation.

Of particular concern were remarks by one station manager that staff did not always feel matters had been dealt with even though they had been told otherwise. This lack of confidence was clearly undermining staff willingness to report incidents, with some admitting to not completing incident report forms for verbal assaults, despite being encouraged to do so by their supervisors.<sup>15</sup> One station manager claimed that staff did not fully appreciate what purpose the forms serve but that he was in the process of trying to educate them. It was also clear, however, that the reason why some members of staff were not reporting verbal abuse was not solely a lack of confidence in BTPs response. Indeed, verbal abuse was seen by most in the group as part of the job, which meant it was proving difficult for some staff to establish what was serious enough to merit reporting. Where, in other words, are they to draw the line? Interestingly, this reluctance to report verbal abuse was regarded by some staff as a relatively recent phenomenon, with staff apparently more willing to report during the times when BTP was perceived as providing a better police presence.

---

<sup>14</sup> This was despite comments made by the managers that they always try to pass on feedback from these meetings to their staff.

<sup>15</sup> Major incidents, however, such as physical assaults, were still being logged and reported.

## Staff safety

There was concern expressed by the majority of staff about their personal safety whilst at work. There was frustration, for instance, with BTP's failure to attend incidents on Friday and Saturday nights, which meant that staff often had to deal with incidents themselves. Understandably, this was the source of much annoyance, since few staff felt comfortable with dealing with what they considered to be dangerous situations. This was said to be particularly true of younger staff who were described by some members of the group as panicking and exacerbating confrontations. Other members of staff, particularly Revenue Protection Officers (RPOs), commented on the dangers of working late at night in uniforms that marked them out as "targets". This resulted in them not travelling to certain stations along the line because they considered them unsafe.

Also impacting on staff perceptions of personal safety was BTP's poor response time. Several members of the group admitted calling other police forces, particularly the MPS and Hertfordshire, rather than BTP because they knew they would get a quicker response – which was understandably their first priority. Some staff felt that contacting the MPS or Hertfordshire was the most efficient way of reporting an incident because BTP's control room would just transfer the call to one of those police forces anyway. Indeed, it was clear that for most members of staff it was reassuring to know than an officer could respond within five rather than thirty minutes, regardless of which police force they worked for.

Much of the discussion about staff safety centred on the role of private security. Staff based at Finsbury Park, for instance, spoke of the decision made by First Capital Connect (FCC) to stop employing security staff at the station. However, despite initially fearing that their removal would have an adverse impact on staff safety, the group generally felt that this had not materialised. Nonetheless, private security was seen by most in the group as a resource they would rather have than go without, although an increase in

the number of BTP officers, which according to one station manager was what the money saved from removing private security was going to be spent on, would be preferable.<sup>16</sup>

In terms of crime and anti-social behaviour, it was clear that smoking, drinking and urinating on trains or at stations were the most pressing problems, with staff seeing these as having the capacity to escalate if challenged. Indeed, anxiety about how offenders would react if challenged for engaging in any of these behaviours was a particular concern, with some staff commenting that they often let things go uncontested – something which they recognised was not nice for other law-abiding passengers. They felt that a more responsive BTP would allow them to challenge such behaviour safe in the knowledge that they would be backed up. Other problems on the route included theft from ticket-machines at unstaffed stations, an increase in graffiti (also at unstaffed stations) and fare evasion at Finsbury Park due to it not having any ticket barriers. In fact, there was a consensus within the group that many of the problems on the line were caused by Finsbury Park station's inability to control who entered the network, the logic being that those who avoided paying for fares were also those who engaged in other forms of illegal behaviour.

### **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

The station managers both felt that a dedicated police presence would be of considerable benefit to their staff because the regular contact would allow them to develop relationships and provide them with a mechanism for raising their concerns. However, some members of the group were unhappy at the possibility of the team consisting just of PCSOs, mainly because of concerns over their effectiveness with limited powers. The prospect of fully-sworn officers, however, was very much welcomed. The managers also suggested

---

<sup>16</sup> For some staff, PCSOs were the exception to this rule, with several reporting that they had "lost faith" in PCSOs because of their limited powers.

that their staff would report incidents more consistently if they felt they were being treated seriously and were receiving feedback.

### 3.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS<sup>17</sup>

This section summarises the findings of a short face-to-face survey carried out with passengers on the Finsbury Park to Potters Bar line. The survey was conducted by officers at various stations on the line shortly before the NPT was scheduled to ‘go live’.

#### Visibility

Just over half (56%) of all respondents reported seeing a BTP presence “every now and again” at the station they were surveyed at. Around one quarter (26%) said they “never” see BTP officers on patrol. Of those who see an officer/PCSO every now and again, just over two thirds (68%) feel this to be about right, with one third (32%) describing it as not enough. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the majority of passengers that never see a BTP officer/PCSO when travelling on the Finsbury Park to Potters Bar line feel that this is not enough (89%), desiring a higher level of police presence.

#### Safety

As Table 3 below illustrates, passengers using this line generally feel safe when making journeys during the daytime and evening, but there is a significant drop when travelling late at night.

How safe do you feel when using the station at:	Safe	Unsafe	Mixed Feelings	% that feel safe
<b>Rush hour</b> [5:30am to 9:30am and 16:30pm to 19:00pm]	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Daytime</b> [9:30am to 16:30pm]	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Evening</b> [19:00pm to 22:00pm]	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Late night</b> [after 22:00pm]	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>54</b>

Table 3 Passenger safety

<sup>17</sup> A total of 46 surveys were conducted at the Finsbury Park site.

With regards to what would improve passenger feelings of safety, respondents cited an increase in BTP presence along with an increase in CCTV coverage and better management of groups of youths at stations.

### **Passenger priorities**

The main priority for passengers at Finsbury Park is for the NPT to tackle problems regarding youths who congregate at stations late at night (a number of respondents described this as intimidating). Other priorities include generic ASB and litter problems.

### **Passenger hopes for the new NPT**

The majority of passengers anticipated that an NPT would lead to a reduction in the level of crime and disorder that occurs on the Finsbury Park to Potters Bar line. Additionally, it was hoped that an NPT would allow respondents to feel safer when making journeys, mainly through an increase in police presence. One passenger stated that an NPT would improve their confidence when using the railways.

### **3.4. FINSBURY PARK SUMMARY**

---

- **Visibility**
  - Can be described as infrequent yet consistent by staff – officers are seen an average of once a week
  - Has declined significantly over the past year
  - Is generally provided by PCSOs and not PCs (the latter being restricted to operations and incident management)
  - *Around a quarter of passengers surveyed had never seen BTP patrolling this line*
- **Engagement**
  - Is limited by the infrequent nature of officer visits (although the PCSOs who do visit are known to staff by both name and sight)
  - Is perceived by staff to be a box-ticking exercise
- **Safety**
  - Staff feel that their safety is being threatened by BTP's failure to respond to incidents on Friday and Saturday nights (leading to some staff calling other police forces in preference to BTP)
  - Some staff feel that their uniforms mark them out as targets
  - Anti-social behaviour on trains or at stations is seen as having the potential to escalate if challenged by staff
  - *Heightened safety fears for passengers late at night*
- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**
  - Positive – the consistent and accessible presence offered by NP is seen as providing staff with a mechanism for raising their concerns
  - *Passengers see NP as leading to a reduction in crime and disorder*
- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**
  - A perception amongst both staff and passengers of a more frequent visible patrolling presence
  - A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
  - Community engagement that is regarded by staff as meaningful
  - A perception amongst staff that incidents on Friday and Saturday nights are being responded to promptly

## 4. Seven Sisters

**Train Operating Company:** National Express East Anglia

**Station coverage:** Seven Sisters; Stamford Hill; Stoke Newington; Rectory Road; Hackney Downs; London Fields; Cambridge Heath; Bethnal Green; Bruce Grove; White Hart Lane; Silver Street; Edmonton Green; Bush Hill Park; Enfield Town.

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

### 4.1. CRIME DATA

**All Crime** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	26	21	36	31	16	17	32	21	20	25	15	33
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	10	7	8	14	12	4	12	11	7	5	5	11

**Detection rate:** 36.20%

**Anti-Social Behaviour** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	2	2	7	6	3	5	9	2	5	8	4	13
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	2	1	5	2	0	2	2	2	3	2	5

**Detection rate:** 39.40%

**Staff Assaults** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Detection rate:** 100.00%

## 4.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

### Visibility and engagement

For the most part, the visibility of BTP officers was described by staff as being poor, although it was clear that some stations on the line fared better than others. Staff at Seven Sisters, for instance, remarked that they were now seeing more officers than they had in the recent past – despite this still not reaching their desired level. Similarly, staff at Edmonton Green reported seeing officers standing at the ticket barriers, but there was some confusion within the group as to whether these were MPS or BTP officers. In any event this was said to be a rare rather than regular occurrence. Moreover, some members of staff reported never having seen officers patrolling proactively, which is what staff felt was needed. According to one Revenue Protection Officer (RPO), who spent most of his time travelling the line rather than being based at stations, officers and PCSOs were never seen on trains unless it was a fast weekend one (which was seen as pointless because most of the problems occurred at stations which these trains didn't stop at). The dominant view towards BTP's presence was that the need for officers at Liverpool Street was preventing them from providing a visible presence at stations further along the line.

One member of the group commented that the last six months had seen the introduction of a team of PCSOs but that it had not been successful in providing a consistent police presence. In fact, the member of staff was quite critical of them, claiming that they had a tendency to congregate in teams of three or four rather than patrolling independently (which he thought would cover more ground). It was also mentioned that several plainclothes officers had in the past operated on the line, most notably at Seven Sisters, but that they had since disappeared. Significantly, the plainclothes officers' presence was described in highly positive terms, particularly with regards to the impact it was having on smoking and fare evasion. Finally, in terms of where and

when staff felt a police presence was most required, Seven Sisters between 4pm and 8pm was identified as the most in need.

With regards to community engagement, no one in the group reported having a substantive relationship with BTP, since they simply did not have enough contact with officers for this to be the case. Staff at Seven Sisters and Enfield did mention that officers had come to their stations in order to introduce themselves yet there had been very little contact thereafter. Indeed, officer continuity appears to be a significant problem on the line, with one member of staff reporting that his relationship with an officer at Liverpool Street had been ruined by an organisational reshuffle. Moreover, he criticised the officers who had now become his contacts, a sergeant and an inspector, for never responding to his emails.

Finally, somewhat better relationships were reported between revenue protection staff and BTP, although this was only because of recent developments. According to one RPO, there was now a greater understanding on the part of BTP about what their role involved and the reasons why they need police support, something which had resulted in BTP being more willing to offer help. There were still problems, however, with BTP often cancelling its involvement in operations – for example ticket blocks – at very late notice. Similarly, one member of the group also claimed that BTP would sometimes attend these operations in insufficient numbers, thereby making the operation more difficult to manage.

### **Staff safety**

A number of staff, particularly those who worked in ticket offices, reported being on the receiving end of general anti-social behaviour. This generally took the form of groups of people drinking and smoking at the stations, which was said to intimidate both staff and other passengers, especially when passengers saw that staff were unable to tackle the misbehaviour. Indeed, staff remarked that they would usually let such behaviour go unchallenged, as

to confront it was seen as “asking for trouble”. It was felt that a better relationship with BTP, particularly if it meant a more visible presence and better response times, would give staff the confidence to tackle such behaviour because they knew they would be backed up. For other members of staff, most notably RPOs, the big concern was known criminals. Indeed, it was mentioned that their job often involves asking people for tickets who they knew had previously been involved in serious crime, for instance carrying a knife, which unsurprisingly made RPOs reluctant to challenge them.

According to one station manager, approximately 90% of the staff working on the line are male, which she felt meant they were less likely to be open with their safety concerns – especially when it required communicating them to a female supervisor. However, given the opportunity to express their concerns in the focus group, some became more open, particularly with regards to the problems caused by BTP’s slow response time. The majority of staff admitted to calling the MPS rather than BTP because they knew they would receive a quicker response. They reported being “interrogated” by BTP call centre staff and being asked if they could deal with the incident themselves. For the most part, their primary concern was getting a response before an incident escalated into an assault, but they were aware that threatening behaviour would not be treated as an emergency. Some members of staff had also been put off from reporting incidents because they felt that they were just “logged and forgotten” (an impression conveyed by the lack of feedback from BTP). Taken together these problems have resulted in a widespread lack of confidence in BTP.

In terms of crime and disorder problems, it was reported that the whole line suffered from vandalism (particularly graffiti), urination and illegal posters. This, it was felt, gave other (law-abiding) passengers the impression that the line was uncared for and unsafe. Drug use was also identified as a problem which staff were unwilling to challenge because of the lack of police back-up.

### **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

Providing it was done correctly, by which staff meant adequately resourced, the introduction of a new NPT was seen as a positive step. Indeed, BTP's lack of resources was seen as underlying many of the line's current problems, with individuals who may have been arrested one day returning the next to harass and intimidate staff. A more consistent police presence – which in theory the new NPT will provide – was seen as one way of tackling this problem. Staff were particularly keen for officers to patrol trains during the evening as this would convey a positive message to both themselves and passengers. It was also suggested that the new officers should make an effort to get to know staff as they could be a rich source of intelligence. As one RPO put it: "They need to listen to our experience".

### **4.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS**

No passenger survey data was provided for the Seven Sisters NPT.

#### **4.4. SEVEN SISTERS SUMMARY**

---

- **Visibility**
  - Is generally low although some stations on the line fare better than others
  - Is felt to be most needed at Seven Sisters between 16:00 and 20:00
- **Engagement**
  - Is limited by the infrequent nature of officer visits
  - Has in the past been undermined by organisational restructuring
  - Has recently improved between BTP and RPOs due to the formers better understanding of the latter's role
- **Safety**
  - Staff feel intimidated by and therefore unable to challenge people drinking and smoking at stations
  - Some staff feel unable to challenge individuals who they know have previously been involved in serious crime
  - Staff are more likely to call the MPS when in need of urgent assistance because of BTP's poor response times
- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**
  - Cautiously optimistic – staff can certainly see the benefits of the new NPT provided it is adequately resourced
- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**
  - A perception amongst staff of a more frequent and evenly distributed patrolling presence
  - A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
  - More willingness amongst staff to call BTP rather than the MPS when in need of urgent assistance

## 5. Acton Mainline

---

**Train Operating Company:** First Great Western

**Station coverage:** Acton Mainline; Ealing Broadway; West Ealing; Hanwell; Southall; Hayes and Harlington; Drayton Green; Castle Bar Park; South Greenford; Greenford.

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

### 5.1. CRIME DATA

**All Crime** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	14	22	21	20	18	13	19	18	16	22	16	21
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	3	7	5	8	3	3	4	3	10	6	2

**Detection rate:** 24.50%

**Anti-Social Behaviour** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	1	1	3	4	2	1	4	3	5	3	0	3
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	1	4	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1

**Detection rate:** 43.30%

**Staff Assaults** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	1	0
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08		Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0

**Detection rate:** 53.30%

## 5.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

### Visibility and engagement

Members of the group described the visibility of BTP officers as being highly dependent on both time and place. Staff at Ealing Broadway, for instance, reported seeing PCSOs regularly between 7am and 8pm, with their presence having become more common over the past few months. However, the visibility of BTP officers at Ealing Broadway was also compared with nearby Paddington, since most staff felt that, in terms of footfall at least, the two stations were comparable. The consequence of this, however, was that the level of visibility at Ealing Broadway was described by some staff as inadequate since Paddington had its own dedicated NPT as well as Network Rail security staff.

Yet despite what appears to be a regular BTP presence at Ealing Broadway, many staff there stated that they did not enjoy a personal relationship with any of the officers, knowing them only by sight and not by name. Moreover, the contact that staff did have with officers was mainly a result of incident management, not proactive patrol. In fact, there was an impression amongst the group that BTP officers (especially fully-sworn) only attended stations in response to emergency call-outs, something which they put down to a lack of resources. And when officers did attend, particularly incidents at Ealing Broadway, staff commented that it was generally too late as offenders had often already left the scene. In short, two of the preconditions necessary for staff and officers to build substantive relationships, that is, accessibility and consistency, currently appear to be absent at Ealing Broadway.

Staff with experience of other stations on the line, namely Hayes, Southall and Hanwell, described BTP's presence as unpredictable, although it was noted that officers were more likely to be present at peak times. However, perhaps because the majority of staff in the group were themselves based at stations, BTP officers had only been noticed on platforms and concourses,

not on trains. Yet for the members of the group who were not based at stations, for instance the RCOs, the lack of police presence onboard trains was identified as a deficit in need of rectifying. Significantly, the Revenue Standards Manager (RSM) supported the RCOs' demand for a more proactive approach to patrolling trains, but specifically called for it to be targeted during mid-evenings, because in his experience, problems "don't only occur late at night".

### **Staff safety**

A number of staff, particularly those with experience of working at West Drayton, Southall, Hanwell and Hayes and Harlington, reported receiving a better response from Thames Valley Police (TVP) than from BTP. When the group was asked how often they received a BTP response, answers ranged from four to six out of every ten reports, with TVP and the MPS responding just as, if not more, often. Moreover, when asked to estimate BTP's average response time, staff stated two hours for a non-emergency and 45 minutes for an emergency. Unsurprisingly, BTP's response, in terms of both consistency and speed, was deemed by the majority of staff as inadequate.<sup>18</sup> As a result, some admitted to contacting other forces in preference to BTP, since this was recognised as the best way of securing an efficient and effective response. The management position on this was to "encourage" staff to phone BTP first but not to "push it" since they had a duty to provide a safe working environment.

Staff at Ealing Broadway often requested BTP attendance because of problems at ticket barriers. However, staff also claimed to have been criticised by both their management and BTP for reporting such incidents, since it was felt that staff should be able to deal with relatively minor incidents without police assistance. The Duty Station Manager (DSM) elaborated on this saying that BTP had become "fed up" dealing with matters that station

---

<sup>18</sup> Interestingly, whether or not staff received a BTP response was attributed by some to the level of alert at Paddington, with calls being handed over to the relevant Home Office force when a BTP response was unlikely to be forthcoming.

staff should be able to handle themselves. Interestingly, the response to this from frontline staff was a resentment that management (though not BTP) was unwilling to admit there was a problem, opting instead to put responsibility on staff for better handling of confrontational situations. Whether or not this had made staff more reluctant to report incidents to BTP was unclear.

What had impacted on staff reporting behaviour, however, was the perceived lack of interest from BTP in investigating spitting incidents. One member of the group claims to have been told by an officer that spitting was not an arrestable offence – an admission that was taken by several members of the group to indicate a lack of concern for staff. Indeed, several members of staff claimed that officers would often turn up to an incident, deal with its ticket offence aspect, but ignore that a member of staff had been abused or assaulted. This had resulted in staff themselves becoming “fed up” and deciding not to report similar incidents in the future.

In terms of crime and disorder, Ealing Broadway was recognised by staff as a hotspot, due mainly to the large number of bars and nightclubs that are located close by. Members of the group who worked at Ealing Broadway identified staff assaults as the main problem, with staff either verbally abused or physically assaulted on a daily basis. Such incidents were said to occur mainly after 7:30pm and were seen as requiring an officer based full-time at the station to prevent them. One member of staff suggested that the introduction of a roving patrol between Ealing Broadway and Hayes and Harlington would be productive, particularly at weekends, since this was when the majority of problems occurred. For the other stations on the line, most notably Southall and West Drayton, the main problem was one of anti-social behaviour. As small, unstaffed stations, they were described by staff as being a popular hang-out for “undesirables”, particularly in the evenings.

### Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing

The consistent police presence offered by an NPT was welcomed by all staff, with many in the group comparing it with the use of private security on the Greenford line, which in their view had been responsible for the reduction in the amount of vandalism on trains. For one member of the group, the best way of maximising the impact of the NPT was through the use of “roving patrols”, which would mean that officers were “never too far away”.

### 5.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS<sup>19</sup>

This section summarises the findings of a short face-to-face survey carried out with passengers on the Acton mainline to Greenford line. The survey was conducted by officers at various stations on the line shortly before the NPT was scheduled to ‘go live’.

#### Visibility

Just over half of respondents (56%) reported seeing a BTP officer or PCSO on patrol “every now and again” at the station they were surveyed at. Around one fifth (22%) stated they “never” see a BTP police presence. All respondents who see a BTP officer/PCSO “most times” they travel feel that the level of visibility to be about right. However, respondents who see an officer/PCSO patrolling every now and again were divided in their opinion, with 53% feeling that level of visibility to be adequate whilst 47% described it as not enough. All passengers that said that they never see a BTP presence felt this was not enough.

#### Safety

Surprisingly, a lower percentage of respondents felt safe when travelling at rush hour in comparison to both daytime and evening travel. However, as seen at other sites, the majority of respondents did not feel safe late at night, although this was a small majority at just over half of the sample.

---

<sup>19</sup> A total of 32 surveys were conducted at the Acton Mainline site.

How safe do you feel when using the station at:	Safe	Unsafe	Mixed Feelings	% that feel safe
<b>Rush hour</b> [5:30am to 9:30am and 16:30pm to 19:00pm]	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Daytime</b> [9:30am to 16:30pm]	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Evening</b> [19:00pm to 22:00pm]	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Late night</b> [after 22:00pm]	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>44</b>

Table 4 Passenger safety

### Passenger priorities

The main priority for passengers on the Acton mainline to Greenford line is to see an increase in police presence through a greater number of patrols (with one passenger specifically remarking that they would like to see a greater number of BTP officers on trains). Other priorities include dealing with problems related to youths, drug abuse and ASB.

### Passenger hopes for the new NPT

The most common response from passengers was an anticipation that the NPT would make them feel safer when using the line. It was also hoped that an NPT would act as a deterrent against youths, beggars and those who used and dealt drugs.

#### 5.4. ACTON MAINLINE SUMMARY

- **Visibility**
  - Is regular at larger stations (i.e. Ealing Broadway) but unpredictable at smaller stations (i.e. Hayes, Southall and Hanwell)
  - Is generally provided by PCSOs
  - Is the subject of unfavourable comparisons to nearby stations (i.e. Paddington and Reading)
  - *Around one fifth of passengers surveyed never see BTP on patrol*
- **Engagement**
  - Is limited to incident management (very little results from proactive patrol)
  - Is not sufficient for staff to enjoy personal relationships with officers
- **Safety**
  - Is perceived as being threatened by poor BTP response times (which has prompted some staff to call Thames Valley Police (TVP) in preference)
  - Some staff feel they are being encouraged to deal with incidents they should not have to
  - Ealing Broadway is recognised as a staff assault 'hot-spot' due to its nearby pubs and clubs
  - *The majority of passengers feel safe in the evening but their fears increase when travelling after 10pm*
- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**
  - Positive – similar to the positive impact that private security has had on the line
  - *Passengers hopeful of an increased police presence*
- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**
  - A perception amongst staff of a more evenly distributed presence across all stations
  - A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
  - Evidence of more personal relationships between officers and staff
  - More willingness amongst staff to call BTP rather than TVP when in need of urgent assistance
  - Evidence of measures aimed at tackling the staff assault hot-spot at Ealing Broadway
  - An increase in passenger perceptions of safety after 10pm

## 6. Stratford

---

**Train Operating Company:** National Express East Anglia

**Station coverage:** Stratford; Maryland; Forest Gate; Manor Park; Ilford; Seven Kings; Goodmayes; Chadwell Heath; Romford

**NPT scheduled live date:** 1 May 2009

### 6.1. CRIME DATA

**All Crime** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	29	21	24	38	36	37	44	37	28	28	34	24
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	7	7	10	8	5	45	8	12	10	11	4	9

**Detection rate:** 35.80%

**Anti-Social Behaviour** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	5	6	9	12	8	12	7	9	11	2	6	2
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	3	2	4	2	4	8	2	5	4	3	2	2

**Detection rate:** 46.10%

**Staff Assaults** (between 01/04/08 and 31/03/09)

Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Crimes	1	2	1	2	1	1	11	2	0	1	2	1
Month Year	Apr- 08	May- 08	Jun- 08	Jul- 08	Aug- 08	Sep- 08	Oct- 08	Nov- 08	Dec- 08	Jan- 09	Feb- 09	Mar- 09
Detections	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	9	0	1

**Detection rate:** 68.00%

## 6.2. GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

### Visibility and engagement

Staff described the visibility of BTP officers as being highly dependent on both time and place. The majority of the group reported having seen officers at Liverpool Street but less so at other stations on the line. In fact, one member of the group remarked that there was usually a BTP presence at the stations where officers were based, namely Liverpool Street, Ipswich and Southend, but that they rarely travelled to the smaller stations unless they had been called out to an incident or were conducting a joint operation (i.e. a ticket block). Moreover, when staff spoke of seeing officers, it was clear that for the most part they were referring to PCSOs and not fully-warranted police officers. Overall it was felt that there was a lack of police presence at the stations served by the Metro service.

A number of staff also commented on the lack of police presence on a Friday and Saturday night at Shenfield – a time when revellers were said to “run riot” and threaten staff. According to one Revenue Protection Officer (RPO), this was because these particular times clashed with BTP’s shift changeover, meaning that officers could not respond quickly to calls for assistance. Unsurprisingly, Friday and Saturday nights were said by staff to be when they most needed a police presence, primarily to act as a deterrent, but also to deal with incidents as they came up.

It is perhaps unsurprising, given the lack of police presence, that few members of the group reported having substantive relationships with BTP officers. In fact, the only members of staff who reported having a relationship with officers were a CCTV operator, whose role necessitated regular contact, and the RPOs, whose enforcement work meant they sometimes conducted joint operations with BTP. However, whilst the CCTV operator had enough regular contact to form substantive relationships, the RPOs only had contact once or twice a month, meaning that their relationships with officers were

more marginal. Thus the nature and extent of staff relationships with BTP are highly dependent on their specific job role.

### **Staff safety**

Interestingly, the lack of BTP presence on the line was not seen as posing a threat to staff safety, except for on Friday and Saturday nights when evening revellers were said to “run riot”. As one member of staff described it: “I was at Ilford doing revenue protection at 11pm on the bank holiday and people were just jumping over the barrier and laughing. If there had been a police officer there we could have got them all”. Several other members of the group supported this sentiment, stating that although staff would always look to help each other out, there was only so much they could do without BTP assistance.

It appears that the general lack of concern amongst staff about their safety – at least other than on Friday and Saturday nights – is due to the regular presence of RPOs and Revenue Enforcement Officers (REO) teams. Indeed, it was apparent that the majority of staff were extremely grateful for the presence of these teams, largely as a result of their contribution to crime deterrence and staff reassurance. According to the REOs in the group, their presence was particularly important for members of train crew, since a lot of their time was spent on-board trains. However, just like with BTP, staff felt their presence did not reflect staff demand – with Friday and Saturday nights once again the subject of complaint.

With regards to specific stations on the line, there was a particularly insightful discussion about Maryland, or, as it was ironically referred to by one member of the group, “Scaryland”. Maryland, it seems, has acquired a reputation as a quiet station because of its relatively low crime rate. However, it soon became clear that its low crime rate was not due to their being little crime at the station, but because staff, especially revenue protection and revenue enforcement officers, tend to avoid it because of its problems. As a result,

there was little reported crime there, even though one RPO referred to it as a ‘fare dodger’s paradise’. In fact, there was a consensus within the group that Maryland was the worst station on the line, with people often urinating and defecating on the platforms. However, this was usually dealt with by the station’s cleaners, meaning that the problems went unreported. The story of “Scaryland” clearly illustrates the limitations of official crime data and the importance of local knowledge.

There were also a number of problems on the line which, although not posing a direct threat to staff safety, were alluded to as requiring BTP attention. It was noted, for instance, that there had been several cash machines vandalised at some of the lines unstaffed stations. Such incidents were said to occur every couple of weeks and, somewhat worryingly, none of the group could say whether BTP were aware of the problem. Drug abuse was also identified as being a problem on the line, but especially so at Ilford, Seven Kings, Forest Gate and Maryland, with environmental factors such as poor lighting said to be a contributory factor. However, for most members of staff, drug abuse, as well as many of the other problems on the line, was so prevalent because several of the stations were unstaffed. As one member of the group put it in relation to vandalism: “It’s a big problem and it’s down to the stations being unmanned. In the British Rail days the stations were always staffed 24/7 and the vandalism was a great deal lower” (Supervisor, Ilford).

### **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

The introduction of a dedicated NPT was described by the group as “sensible” since it was seen as having the potential to impact on a number of the current problems affecting the line. Staff were keen to share intelligence with officers about specific crimes as well as pass on their own personal safety concerns. It was also mentioned that a dedicated, accessible and familiar police presence would make the reporting of incidents easier.

### 6.3. PASSENGER SURVEYS<sup>20</sup>

This section summarises the findings of a short face-to-face survey carried out with passengers on the Stratford to Romford line. The survey was conducted by officers at various stations on the line shortly before the NPT was scheduled to ‘go live’.

#### Visibility

Around two thirds (60%) of respondents see a BTP officer/PCSO on patrol “every now and again” whilst just over a quarter (27%) “never” see a policing presence. Like at the Acton Mainline site, respondents who see officers every now and again had mixed views, with almost half (44%) feeling this level of visibility to not be enough. All those who reported not seeing a BTP presence felt this to be not enough.

#### Safety

Respondents feel safest on the Stratford to Romford line when making journeys during rush hour and during the day. Perceptions of safety begin to decrease when travelling in the evening, dropping to their lowest level at night-time.

How safe do you feel when using the station at:	Safe	Unsafe	Mixed Feelings	% that feel safe
<b>Rush hour</b> [5:30am to 9:30am and 16:30pm to 19:00pm]	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Daytime</b> [9:30am to 16:30pm]	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Evening</b> [19:00pm to 22:00pm]	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Late night</b> [after 22:00pm]	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>31</b>

Table 5 Passenger safety

#### Passenger priorities

The majority of respondents stated that the main priority for the newly formed NPT should be to provide a greater police presence, with particular emphasis on higher levels of BTP visibility for late night services. Other priorities for

<sup>20</sup> A total of 30 surveys were conducted at the Stratford site.

passengers include dealing with general ASB, drugs users, youths and alcohol-related problems.

### **Passenger hopes for the new NPT**

Respondents hope that the newly formed NPT will facilitate a safer environment for passengers when travelling on the Stratford to Romford line. In addition, respondents feel an NPT will provide higher levels of visibility, deal with issues relating to groups of youths and tackle alcohol-related problems.

## **6.4. STRATFORD SUMMARY**

- **Visibility**
  - The deployment of officers at Liverpool Street is seen as preventing a visible presence at other stations on the line
  - Is mostly provided by PCSOs and not PCs (the latter being restricted to operations and incident management)
  - Does not currently reflect staff demand (i.e. on Friday and Saturday nights at Shenfield)
  - *One quarter of passengers surveyed never see an officer patrolling on this line*
- **Engagement**
  - Has not resulted in any personal relationships between staff and officers
  - Opportunities for engagement vary according to staff roles
- **Safety**
  - Is threatened by passengers 'running riot' on Friday and Saturday nights
  - Is being enhanced by the 'reassuring' presence of RPOs and REOs (although like BTP this doesn't reflect staff demand)
  - Cannot be determined by official crime data (i.e. "Scaryland")
  - *Passengers safety fears increase at night (after 10pm)*
- **Attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**
  - Sensible – seen by staff as having the potential to improve a number of problems currently affecting the line
  - *Passengers hope that it will help make the line a safer environment for travel*
- **What we would expect to see in six months' time...**
  - A perception amongst staff of a more evenly distributed presence across all stations
  - A visible presence that better matches staff demand
  - A formal community engagement structure that regularly seeks the views of as many frontline staff as possible
  - Evidence of more personal relationships between officers and staff
  - Improved perceptions of staff safety at peak times (i.e. Friday and Saturday nights)
  - An increase in passenger perceptions of safety after 10pm

## Officer Survey

In order to obtain a baseline measure of officer's attitudes towards neighbourhood policing, a survey was distributed, in the month prior to the NPTs going live, to all police constables and sergeants assigned to the six new teams.<sup>21</sup> The survey was designed to measure how culturally orientated the new NPT officers are to the various aspects of neighbourhood policing and therefore provides a baseline attitudinal measure. The survey was completed by a total of 15 officers – a response rate of 38%.

This section outlines the key findings from the survey.

### **Officer role**

Just over half (53%) of those surveyed reported that their current role makes good use of the life skills they bring to their job. Just under two thirds (60%) agreed that their current role makes good use of the skills they have gained as an officer.

Respondents displayed mixed opinions when asked if their current role involves "real" police work; only half (50%) agreed with this statement. Two thirds (67%) of officers surveyed are happy overall with their role.

### **Engagement**

Positively, all of those surveyed felt that their current role allowed them to engage effectively with members of the public. Additionally, a large proportion (87%) agreed that their role within BTP allowed them to successfully engage with rail staff.

### **Involvement**

Officers were asked how they became involved in neighbourhood policing: two thirds (67%) of officers opted to join an NPT through requesting a

---

<sup>21</sup> See Annex C for a copy of the officer survey.

transfer; one fifth (20%) were assigned to an NPT by a supervisor; and just over a tenth (13%) of officers stated other reasons for joining their NPT (this included a transfer from MPS and an assigned attachment).

### **General attitudes towards neighbourhood policing**

Interestingly, when officers were asked if they felt an NPT would be a worthwhile use of BTP resources on the line they were attached to, the majority (87%) of respondents agreed with this statement. However, a number of officers were not confident that BTP had the resources to make neighbourhood policing a success on their line, with only 47% agreeing with this particular statement.

Officers had mixed opinions regarding the concept of neighbourhood policing with only half (50%) of all officers stating that neighbourhood policing involved “real” police work. Almost two thirds of officers (60%) felt that neighbourhood policing is a better method of policing their line than current arrangements.

### **Attitudes towards proposed role in neighbourhood policing**

Officers were asked for their thoughts regarding how their new role would impact on industry partners. Positively, around two thirds (67%) of officers agreed that being part of a NPT would help them be more accessible to BTP stakeholders. A slightly smaller percentage (60%) of officers agreed that being involved in a NPT would help them be more responsive to the needs of BTP stakeholders.

Two thirds of those surveyed (67%) agreed that they have received adequate information about what will be required of them in their new role. However, less than one third (29%) feel that they have received sufficient levels of training to perform their new NP role effectively.

### **Overall satisfaction**

Positively, over three quarters (80%) of all officers stated that, all things considered, they are happy to be part of a NPT on their particular line.