

Please cite the Published Version

Armitage, Rachel and Smithson, Hannah (2007) Alley-gating revisited: the sustainability of resident's satisfaction? *Internet Journal of Criminology*. ISSN 2045-6743

Publisher: New University Press

Version: Published Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/136071/>

Additional Information: This is an Open Access article published in *Internet Journal of Criminology* copyright New University Press.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

ALLEY-GATING REVISITED: THE SUSTAINABILITY OF RESIDENT'S SATISFACTION?

By Rachel Armitage* & Hannah Smithson**

ABSTRACT

Alleys (snickets, ginnels, backways) are particularly common in British industrial cities and were originally designed to allow access to the rear of properties by coalmen and refuse collectors. Although alleys are still useful to allow residents access to the rear of their property without walking through the house, they also provide a means of entry and escape for offenders. Alley-gating is a crime reduction measure that involves the installation of a lockable gate across an alley, preventing access for anyone who does not have a key. This paper presents the findings of a study undertaken to examine the sustainability of Liverpool's Alley-gating scheme (a robust evaluation of Liverpool's scheme was undertaken in 2002 see Young *et al*, 2003; Bowers *et al*, 2004). It specifically reports on the results of a residents' survey undertaken in gated and non-gated areas. The findings are compared with those from 2002. The results suggest that the positive impacts on perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour, and experience of crime and anti-social behaviour have been maintained over a four year period in Liverpool.

* Dr Rachel Armitage and **Dr Hannah Smithson are Senior Research Fellows at the Applied Criminology Centre, University of Huddersfield.

INTRODUCTION

Alleys (snickets, ginnels, backways) are particularly common in British industrial cities and were originally designed to allow access to the rear of properties by coalmen and refuse collectors. Although many alleys are no longer used for their original purpose, they still usefully allow residents to access the rear of their properties without walking through the house. Alley-gating increases the effort involved in offending against protected properties, it increases the chance of apprehension should an offender choose to enter a protected area and it removes an offenders' excuses (Felson and Clarke 1998) for being in a private area. Alley-gating involves the installation of lockable gates across these alleys, preventing access to the alley for those without a key. Although predominantly a crime reduction measure, Alley-gating has the potential to do more than reduce crime; it can increase community confidence, improve the aesthetic appearance of an area, re-invigorate schemes such as Residents' Associations and Neighbourhood Watch and reduce levels of worry and fear about crime and anti-social behaviour.

National crime statistics for England and Wales suggest that for all burglary offences (including attempted burglary), 46 per cent of properties were accessed via the rear (45 per cent were accessed from the front) and for burglary with entry offences, this figure increases to 47 per cent - 43 per cent gaining entry via the front of the property (Flood-Page and Taylor, 2003). Although these national figures suggest that offenders are more likely to access a property via the rear, research in Liverpool specific to predominantly terraced streets suggests that this figure could be as high as 72 per cent (Johnson and Loxley 2001).

Research suggests that many crime reduction measures (particularly situational crime reduction measures) follow a finite life cycle (Berry and Carter, 1992) with the positive effects tending to fade over time unless managed closely. This pattern has been found in many evaluations of CCTV initiatives, for example, Webb and Laycock (1992), Tilley (1993), Brown (1995) and Armitage *et al* (1999). For this reason, it is essential to monitor the sustainability of any crime reduction benefits and to use these findings to inform the future direction of crime prevention policy.

This paper presents the findings of a study undertaken to examine the sustainability of Liverpool's Alley-gating scheme. This scheme had been subject to a robust evaluation in 2002 (see Young *et al*, 2003; Bowers *et al*, 2004), and this article reports on subsequent research which sought to establish whether the crime reduction benefits have been sustained from 2002 to the current research undertaken in 2006. This paper specifically reports on the results of a residents' survey undertaken with a sample of residents living in alley-gated and non-gated areas. The survey examined perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB), perceptions of safety and attitudes towards alleygates. The findings from the current research are compared with those from 2002 to test for sustainability of impacts.

ALLEY-GATING: The Evidence So Far

Does Alley-gating Reduce Crime and Disorder?

Previous studies of Alley-gating schemes and their crime reduction impacts have revealed positive findings. These studies focused mainly on the reduction of burglary in the scheme areas, with reductions ranging from 37 per cent (net of changes in the wider area) to 65 per cent (gross reduction). Research carried out in Liverpool monitored also the possible unintended consequences such as displacement of crime - either tactical, geographical, or crime switch and diffusion of benefits to surrounding areas. These studies are described below:

The Dukeries Alley-gating Project (Hull)

The Dukeries project was initiated in response to local crime pattern analysis, which revealed that the terraced houses in this area were experiencing high levels of burglary with a rear entry *modus operandi*. Using the community safety budget of £9,000 47 gates were installed. Overall, the project resulted in a gross reduction in domestic burglary of 65 per cent¹. In addition to the reductions in burglary, the project resulted in reductions in vehicle crime, fear of crime, fly-tipping and dog fouling and noise from local youths. The project also resulted in greater community involvement from residents, with a Community Association established in the gated area.² (Renewal.net Case Study - Reducing Burglary: The Dukeries Gating Scheme [available online]).

The Abbey Ward Alley-gating Scheme in Merton, London

Reed and Nutley (1998) report the findings of an evaluation of an Alley-gating scheme in one particular ward (Abbey) in Merton, London. Crime pattern analysis revealed that the Abbey ward, which contained 14 per cent of the population, was experiencing 22 per cent of the crime in the borough and that burglary was 50 per cent higher than the next highest ward. The local partnership applied for SRB funding to implement a variety of crime reduction measures, one of which was Alley-gating.

An independent evaluation revealed that in the one year period following the installation of 170 gates, rear entry burglary was reduced by 50 per cent. Reed and Nutley (1998) state that in a one year period, where Alley-gating schemes had been completed, not one burglary via the back alleys was reported.

¹ This figure does not account for the reductions seen in the wider police force area and as such will appear much more significant than the net figures presented.

² See: <http://www.renewal.net/Documents/RNET/Case%20Study/Reducingburglarydukeries.doc>

Alley-gating in Liverpool, Merseyside

Several studies have been conducted on the impact of Alley-gating in Liverpool (Young *et al*, 2003; Bowers *et al*, 2004 and Smithson *et al*, 2007). Young *et al* (2003) report on the impact of Alley-gating in Liverpool between 1999 and 2001, whilst Bowers *et al* (2004) discuss the full impact of the scheme up to June 2003.

Young et al (2003)

This evaluation reports on the impact of 208 gates covering 3442 properties in Liverpool, Merseyside. Crime data for the pre-gated period April 1995 to April 1998 were compared with the implementation/transition period (post 1998) where gates were progressively being introduced. The results revealed that even though not all gates had been introduced, the recorded burglary rate reduced by 50 per cent compared to the years when the gates had not been installed. Analysis of crime data in ten concentric 200 metre buffer zones (up to 2000 metres) revealed that there was some geographical displacement of burglary to the 200, 400, 600, 800 and 1000 metre buffer zones.

Bowers et al (2004)

This paper reported on the impact of 3178 alleygates in 106 blocks (each block typically containing approximately 362 properties). Crime figures for the gated area were compared with a suitable comparison area for periods pre, during and post implementation of the gates. The evaluation also compared crime data in the gated area with seven 200 metre concentric buffer zones to establish whether the scheme was displacing crime to neighbouring areas. In addition, the evaluation examined *modus operandi* data to ascertain whether offenders were changing their offending patterns, whether the scheme was cost effective and finally whether the reductions in crime actually coincided with the periods in which gating was most intense.

The results revealed that, relative to the comparison area, burglary in the gated areas declined by 37 per cent. Importantly, this reduction was net of the general changes in the surrounding areas. Overall, the findings revealed a diffusion of benefit to the areas surrounding the gated zones, therefore the scheme can be judged to have impacted positively on the crime rates for areas that did not receive gates (as well as those that did). The first buffer zone (0-200 metres) experienced a high level of diffusion of benefit, the next three buffers also experienced a diffusion of benefit but less so than the first. In the fifth and sixth zones there was some evidence of displacement and in the seventh there was very little change. The evaluation concluded that the Alley-gating intervention had prevented 875 burglaries and for every £1 spent £1.86 had been saved. Crucially, analysis of the reductions in crime against the levels of intensity of the scheme revealed that the intensity of the implementation was highly associated with the reductions in burglary. This was supported by analysis of offenders' *modus operandi*, which found that following implementation of the scheme, relative to

the comparison area, there was a reduction in the number of burglaries for which access was gained via the rear of the property.

The studies described above are limited by the fact that in the main they concentrate upon aggregate levels of crime reduction. Whilst each of them demonstrate a reduction in crime, namely burglary, the wider potential benefits of Alley-gating - such as increasing community confidence, improving the aesthetic appearance of an area and reducing levels of worry and fear about crime and anti-social behaviour - were not explored in any detail. This paper aims to address these gaps by focusing on these wider impacts and reporting the results of a residents' survey undertaken with a sample of residents living in alley-gated and non-gated areas of Liverpool. In order to assess issues of sustainability, the results will be compared with those of the evaluation of the same Liverpool scheme carried out in 2002 (see Bowers *et al*, 2004).

METHODOLOGY

The following section describes the processes involved in conducting the survey.

The survey

The aim of the survey was to solicit the views of residents living in areas protected by alleygates and in areas where there were no alleygates (acting as a comparison sample). The survey was to be conducted with the same residents of gated properties (as far as possible) that had completed the survey in 2002. In 2002, field workers were provided with the addresses of gated and non-gated properties in Liverpool, and 300 of these addresses were then randomly selected. A random walk approach was used to select respondent households such that each household had a one in seven chance of selection. By 2006 there were so few *suitable* non-gated properties in Liverpool, that the comparison sample was created with residents living in non alley-gated areas in the nearby Metropolitan Council of Sefton. Sefton was identified as being the most demographically comparable area to the gated areas in Liverpool.

The survey devised in 2002 was used in 2006 with some minor adaptations and additions (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the survey). It comprised of 64 questions and the same survey was used for both alley-gated and non-gated areas. The survey focused on the following main themes:

- Residents' perceptions of the area in which they live;
- Fear of crime;
- Perceptions of levels of crime and disorder;
- Attitudes towards alley-gates;
- Security; and
- Physical survey of property characteristics.

The survey involved face-to-face interviews with 302 residents, 188 of whom lived in gated and 144 in non-gated areas. The sample was subject to a maximum standard error of $\pm 5.6\%$ at the 95% confidence level on an observed statistic of 50%. Thus, we can be 95% confident that responses are representative of those that would be given by the total resident population, if a census had been conducted, to within 5.6% of the percentages reported. A geographical ward weight was applied to the data in order to ensure that the responses in the data report were as representative as possible of the resident population as a whole.

Table 1 below illustrates the demographic profile of respondents

Table 1: Respondent Profile

| Demographics and Profile | % of Respondents |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Male | 43% |
| Female | 57% |
| 16-44 years old | 42% |
| 45-64 years old | 32% |
| 65 years+ | 24% |
| Lived at address – up to 5 years | 26% |
| Lived at address – 5-10 years | 11% |
| Lived at address – 10 years+ | 58% |
| Lived in area – up to 5 years | 19% |
| Lived in area – 5-10 years | 9% |
| Lived in area 10 years+ | 61% |
| Owner occupiers | 64% |
| Social renters | 13% |

FINDINGS

Residents' Perceptions of Crime and Disorder in Liverpool

Comparing *experiences* and *perceptions* of crime and anti-social behaviour between residents living in gated and non-gated areas adds another dimension to the assessment of the crime reduction performance of alleygates. As well as comparing experiences and perceptions of crime and disorder, the study also explored residents' opinions surrounding the installation of gates. Comparing experiences and perceptions over a period of four years (2002 to 2006) also allows an assessment of the sustainability of crime reduction performance – this is discussed in more detail in the following section.

The findings from the residents' survey revealed that residents living in gated areas experienced less crime, less ASB and felt safer in their home, the street surrounding their home and in their back alley than residents living in non-gated control areas. In terms of feelings of safety in the home, street and alley surrounding their property, residents living in gated areas felt consistently safer than those living in non-gated areas. For example, 80 per cent of residents living in gated areas (compared to 70 per cent in non-gated areas) felt that the area in which they lived was a safe place to live. Ninety per cent of residents living in gated areas, compared to 81 per cent in non-gated areas, felt safe at home at night and 87 per cent of residents living in gated areas, compared to just 59 per cent in non-gated areas, felt safe in their back alley in the day.

Table 2: Feelings of safety in gated versus non-gated areas

| | Alley-gated | Non-Gated |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Percentage who felt area in which they live was a safe place | 80% N = 150 | 70% N = 80 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe at home in the day | 99% N = 186 | 99% N = 113 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe at home in the evening | 95% N = 179 | 88% N = 100 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe at home at night | 90% N = 169 | 81% N = 92 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe on their street in the day | 95% N = 179 | 91% N = 104 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe in their back alley in the day | <u>87%</u> <u>N = 164</u> | <u>59%</u> <u>N = 67</u> |
| Percentage of respondents who felt unsafe in their back alley during the night | 24% N = 45 | 43% N = 49 |

Note: Figures underlined revealed a statistically significant difference between the gated and non-gated figures, <0.05%.

Table 3 reveals that residents living in gated areas reported consistently lower levels of ASB than those living in non-gated areas. For example, eight per cent of residents living in gated areas and 30 per cent of residents living in non-gated areas, had experienced vandalism in their back alley in the past twelve months. Nine per cent of residents living in gated areas had witnessed drug taking in their back alley within the past twelve months, compared to 39 per cent of residents living in non-gated areas. Residents in gated areas were also less likely (36%) to have witnessed dog fouling in their back alley in the

past twelve months than those living in non-gated areas (66%). For almost all ASB categories the difference between the gated and non-gated areas was statistically significant and in a consistent direction favouring gated areas.

Table 3: Experiences of anti-social behaviour in gated versus non-gated areas

| | Alley-gated | Non-Gated |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced deliberate fires in the back alley in the past twelve months | 2% N = 4 | 5% N = 6 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced vandalism in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>8%</u> N = 15 | <u>30%</u> N = 34 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced graffiti in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>13%</u> N = 24 | <u>28%</u> N = 32 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced youths causing annoyance in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>22%</u> N = 41 | <u>48%</u> N = 55 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced rubbish tipping in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>40%</u> N = 75 | <u>66%</u> N = 75 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced littering in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>41%</u> N = 77 | <u>65%</u> N = 74 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed drug taking in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>9%</u> N = 17 | <u>39%</u> N = 44 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed dog fouling in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>36%</u> N = 68 | <u>66%</u> N = 75 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed prostitution in the back alley in the past twelve months | 1% N = 2 | 1% N = 1 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed people urinating in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>5%</u> N = 9 | <u>21%</u> N = 24 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed unfamiliar people wandering in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>1%</u> N = 2 | <u>16%</u> N = 23 |

Note: Figures underlined revealed a statistically significant difference between the gated and non-gated figures, <0.05%.

In addition to questions relating to experiences and perceptions of crime and ASB, the survey also included questions about residents' perceptions of the alleygates and about any problems which they had experienced since their installation. The results indicate that concerns that Alley-gating causes inconvenience, blocks light, creates a fortress mentality or stigmatises an area are largely unfounded. Large majorities of residents in gated areas felt that the alleygates had: made their street safer (92%); helped tidy up the street (91%); improved the image of the street (83%) and helped them to maintain the alley (85%). Only two per cent felt that the gates had caused access problems; two per cent felt that the gates had caused problems when putting the bins out; no residents felt that the gates had been inconvenient for service suppliers; none felt that the gates made them feel blocked/locked in and only two per cent felt that the gates made the street look ugly/like a fortress.

Opinions surrounding the installation of gates were also largely positive. For example, of the 81 per cent of residents who had lived at the property when the gates were installed, 87 per cent stated that they had been consulted about their installation. An overwhelming majority of residents who had lived at the property at the time of installation stated that they wanted the gates to be installed (94 per cent) and 92 per cent stated that the installation of the gates had not resulted in bad feeling amongst neighbours (just seven per cent suggested that it had).

The physical survey of resident's properties revealed that the gates are being used appropriately and effectively. The survey found that gate was closed in 100 per cent of residences and locked in 99 per cent of cases. In only three per cent of cases was there evidence of damage to gates.

Sustaining the Impacts

This section of the paper presents the findings from the assessment of sustainability. In terms of feelings of safety within the home, street and back alley, feelings of safety appear to have increased since the gates were installed. Focusing upon residents living in gated areas only, the findings revealed that satisfaction with the area, feelings of safety in the home, street and back alley all improved over the four year period of analysis. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Sustainability of feelings of safety in gated areas

| | Alley-gated 2002 | Alley-gated 2006 |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe at home in the day | 91% N = 145 | 99% N = 186 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe in their home in the evening | 90% N = 143 | 95% N = 179 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe in their home at night | 87% N = 138 | 90% N = 169 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe in the back alley in the day | <u>83%</u> N = 132 | <u>87%</u> N = 164 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe in the back alley at night | 28% N = 45 | 48% N = 90 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe on the street surrounding their home in the day | 85% N = 135 | 95% N = 179 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe on the street surrounding their home in the evening | 70% N = 111 | 84% N = 158 |
| Percentage of respondents who felt safe on the street surrounding their home at night | 56% N = 89 | 60% N = 113 |

Note: Figures underlined revealed a statistically significant difference between the gated and non-gated figures, <0.05%.

In terms of experience of crime and ASB, the findings revealed that, for some incidents, reductions were sustained. Table 5 shows the percentage of respondents in gated areas who experienced a crime or anti-social act in both 2002 and 2006. The results reveal that, for the majority of offences/incidents, a lower percentage of respondents reported experiencing that incident in the 2006 survey as compared to the 2002 survey. The offences/incidents which did not show a sustainable reduction included criminal damage,

theft from car, youths causing annoyance, drug taking, dog fouling, prostitution and urinating in the back alley. However, it should be noted that the base numbers for many of these incidents were very low to start with, and one should not therefore place too much emphasis on percentage changes in occurrence.

Table 5: Sustainability of crime and disorder reductions

| | Alley-gated 2002 | Alley-gated 2006 |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced a burglary in the past twelve months | 3% N = 5 | 1% N = 2 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced criminal damage in the past twelve months | 5% N = 8 | 6% N = 11 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced theft of a car in the past twelve months | 4% N = 6 | 3% N = 6 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced theft from a car in the past twelve months | 2% N = 3 | 2% N = 4 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced a theft from person offence in the past twelve months | <u>5%</u> N = 8 | 0% N = 0 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced deliberate fires in the back alley in the past twelve months | <u>8%</u> N = 13 | 2% N = 4 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced vandalism in the back alley in the past twelve months | 13% N = 21 | 8% N = 15 |
| Percentage of respondents who had experienced youths causing annoyance in the back alley in the past twelve months | 20% N = 32 | 22% N = 41 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed drug taking in the back alley in the past twelve months | 9% N = 14 | 9% N = 17 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed dog fouling in the back alley in the past twelve months | 26% N = 41 | 36% N = 68 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed prostitution in the back alley in the past twelve months | 1% N = 2 | 1% N = 2 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed people urinating in the back alley in the past twelve months | 4% N = 6 | 5% N = 9 |
| Percentage of respondents who had witnessed unfamiliar people wandering in the back alley in the past twelve months | 12% N = 19 | 1% N = 2 |

Note: Figures underlined revealed a statistically significant difference between the gated and non-gated figures, <0.05%.

Over all, the results revealed in this section suggest that that residents of gated areas experienced less crime and ASB and felt safer in their home, the street surrounding their home and in their back alley than residents living in non-gated comparison areas. Importantly, for almost all ASB categories the difference between the gated and non-gated areas was statistically significant and in a consistent direction.

In terms of resident's perceptions of the alleygates the findings indicate that alleygates had had a wider impact than just the above. The majority of residents felt that the gates had tidied up the street, improved the image of the street and maintained the alley. None

of the residents felt the gates had had a negative impact i.e. made them feel blocked/locked in. Of significance for their sustainability, the visual survey showed that gates continued to be used appropriately, with residents closing and locking them.

With regard to the sustainability of impacts, the findings indicate that reductions of the experience of crime and ASB and fear of crime and ASB, highlighted in Bowers *et al* (2003), have been maintained for a further four year period in Liverpool. With feelings of safety increasing since the gates were installed and a lower percentage of respondents experiencing crime and ASB incidents compared with 2002.

CONCLUSION

This concluding section briefly reviews the main findings of the report and suggests some directions for future research in the area of alley-gating.

The findings from the 2006 resident survey show that the Liverpool alley-gating scheme had a wider impact than solely the reduction of crime (such as burglary), which is frequently the only outcome measured when evaluating the impact of alleygates. Our research indicates that alleygates have led to an increased satisfaction with the area, reductions in reported levels of ASB and increased feelings of safety. The most striking finding was that for almost all categories the levels of ASB in the gated areas were statistically significantly lower than in the non-gated areas. This is an important finding as ASB incidents were defined as those that took place in the back alley. For example, 'percentage of respondents who had experienced vandalism in the back alley in the past twelve months.' This increases the confidence one can place in the hypothesis that the difference between gated and non-gated areas was due to the installation of gates.

The results of the physical survey also indicate that the installation of the gates had produced positive impacts. The survey found that 100% of gates were closed and 99% were locked, demonstrating that residents are still using the gates appropriately and in the way in which they should be (i.e. locked). There was damage to gates in only three per cent of cases, which illustrates that the gates are being maintained effectively. Whilst this is a positive finding, the maintenance and design of gates is an important area for future research. Gates need to be well maintained (i.e. any damage rectified) for residents to use them appropriately. The design of alleygates could also contribute to their effective and appropriate use. If gates are designed with ease of use in mind in addition to accounting for the aesthetic appearance of the area, they are more likely to be used appropriately.

In terms of the sustainability of impacts over the four year period 2002 to 2006, the results show that satisfaction and safety levels increased amongst residents living in gated areas. Furthermore, for the majority of incidents of crime and ASB, a lower percentage of respondents reported experiencing incidents in 2006 compared with 2002. This is an encouraging finding and one that runs against some other *secured by design* initiatives such as CCTV. Evaluations of CCTV have found diminishing returns after the initial impact (see Webb and Laycock (1992), Tilley (1993), Brown (1995) and Armitage *et al* (1999)). The sustainability of gates is likely due to the fact they provide 100 per cent closure to the defined area, are durable and permanently affect the routine activities of offenders.

The long term efficacy of Alley-gating depends largely upon the co-operation of local residents, and gating will not work if residents prop open the gates or lend their keys to inappropriate non-residents. Although these concerns are valid and should be taken into account when implementing a scheme, measures can be taken to minimise implementation failure and future disputes amongst neighbours. Failure can also be minimised by ensuring that residents want the scheme and that it is not imposed upon them simply because their area meets the specific funding requirements. The findings

presented in this paper reveal that there were high levels of consultation prior to installation, and this resulted in low levels of disputes amongst neighbours. It was found that of the 81 per cent of residents who had lived at the property when the gates were installed, 87 per cent stated that they had been consulted about the installation. An overwhelming majority of residents who had lived at the property at the time of installation stated that they wanted the gates to be installed (94 per cent) and 92 per cent stated that the installation of the gates had not resulted in bad feeling amongst neighbours (seven per cent suggested that it had).

Crime reduction measures such as Alley-gating have the potential to create a fortress-like environment where crime may be reduced, but at the expense of the appearance of the area. The fortress mentality risks increasing fear of crime as well as stigmatisation or labelling of the area. Such concerns have been found to be baseless with regard to the Liverpool scheme we evaluated. Not only did residents in gated areas report lower levels of fear of crime than those in non-gated areas, the research also revealed that none of the 188 residents living in gated areas felt that the installation of gates had made them feel blocked/locked in and only two per cent of the 188 felt that the gates had made the street look ugly/like a fortress. Of the 188 respondents, 90 per cent disagreed with the statement that the installation of gates had resulted in the area being stigmatised and 96 per cent disagreed with the statement that the alleygates had blocked light to the alley.

The findings of this study provide support for the sustainability of alleygates in the Liverpool scheme. It is important to recognise, however, that there are a number of limitations associated with evaluations of this type. Firstly, whilst the results have indicated that the positive reductions in crime and ASB and fear of crime and ASB have been maintained over the period 2002 and 2006, it is acknowledged that there may be alternative explanations for this outcome. For example, it may be that the non alley gated areas differed in significant respects from the alley gated area in terms of variables which might be expected to impact on feelings of safety or experiences of ASB. During the course of the field work, attempts were made to identify variables other than Alley-gating, which might have had an impact on crime and ASB and perceptions of crime and ASB amongst residents. The local CDRP in gated and non-gated areas provided information regarding crime prevention and policing initiatives that had been put in place during the four year period. No information was provided that would suggest that other major initiatives had been introduced. The most important data provided was the significant increase in the number of alleygates installed in Liverpool. By the end of the initial evaluation in 2002/2003, Liverpool had erected 3,178 gates. There are currently 5,200 gates in Liverpool, an increase of approximately 2000 in the four year period.

This methodological problem of establishing an adequate counterfactual is common to evaluations of the long-term impacts of crime reduction initiatives such as alleygates. The figures provided for the number of gates installed between 2002 and 2006 demonstrates that Alley-gating policy in Liverpool was rolled out quickly as the findings from the 2002 study indicated that it was effective. The swift rolling out of such policy affects the ability of the research to establish cause and effect. This highlights the need for policy

makers to recognise the importance of long-term evaluations and to implement and roll out initiatives in a more considered manner.

In order to have more confidence in the comparability of areas, future research could, rather than just undertaking a residents' survey, also carry out a policy audit. Additional questions could be incorporated into the survey relating to resident's knowledge and perception of other crime prevention and policing initiatives. It was beyond the scope of this study to undertake a detailed policy audit amongst relevant and appropriate agencies in gated and non-gated areas.

Secondly, as was discussed in the methods section of this report it was not possible to use the same comparison group in 2006 as was used in 2002. This was due to the fact that the majority of *suitable* housing stock in Liverpool has been gated. Figures provided above illustrate that 2000 gates had been erected in Liverpool since the 2002 study. As a result, a different comparison area had to be identified. The neighbouring borough of Sefton was identified as being the most demographically comparable area to the gated area in Liverpool and importantly, an area in which there was not an Alley-gating scheme.

The results of this study are consistent with other empirical research on Alley-gating and the research has suggested that the impacts of Alley-gating can be maintained. It has provided evidence that alleygates can increase perceptions of safety and satisfaction with area of residence. At the same time, the feared negative consequences of gating, such as increased fear of crime, failed to materialise. The experience of Alley-gating has lessons for future crime prevention theory, policy and practice. In terms of theory, there is a need for greater consideration of the mechanisms by which measures such as Alley-gating work, and why sustainability appears greater than for CCTV, for example. This may be due to issues of coverage, public acceptance and durability. Our findings also point to the need to ensure that Alley-gating is introduced in such a way as to secure residents' consent and cooperation – maintaining and securing gates are largely their responsibility. Finally, if Alley-gating is to play a greater role in crime prevention policy, there is a need for further studies of existing and future schemes, looking at issues of cost, effectiveness in different contexts (e.g. housing stock) and factors associated with sustainability over the longer term.

REFERENCES

- Armitage, R., Smyth, G., and Pease, K. (1999) Burnley CCTV Evaluation. In: K. Painter and N. Tilley (eds.) *Surveillance of Public Space: CCTV, Street Lighting and Crime Prevention*. Monsey New York: Criminal Justice Press: 225-249.
- Berry, G. and Carter, M. (1992) *Assessing Crime Prevention Initiatives: The First Steps, Crime Prevention Unit Paper No 31*. London: Home Office.
- Bowers, K., Johnson, S.D., Hirschfield, A.F.G. (2004) Closing Off Opportunities for Crime: An Evaluation of Alley-Gating. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 10: 285-308.
- Brown, B. (1995) *CCTV in Town Centres: Three Case Studies, Crime Detection and Prevention Series Paper 68*. London: Home Office.
- Brown, B.B. and Altman, I. (1983) Territoriality, Defensible Space and Residential Burglary: An Environmental Analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3: 203-220.
- Brown, B. and Bentley, D. (1993) Residential Burglars Judge Risk: The Role of Territoriality. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 13: 51-61.
- Clarke, R.V. (1992) Introduction. In: R.V. Clarke (ed.) *Situational Crime Prevention – Successful Case Studies*. New York: Harrow and Heston: 3-36.
- Clarke, R.V (Ed.) (1997) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies* (2nd ed.). Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Clarke, R. V. and Newman, G. (2005) Modifying Criminogenic Products: What Role for Government. In: R. V. Clarke and G. R. Newman (eds.) *Designing Out Crime from Products and Systems*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing: 7-83.
- Felson, M. (1998) *Crime and Everyday Life, Second Edition*. California: Pine-Forge Press.
- Felson, M. and Clarke, R.V. (1998) *Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical Theory for Crime Prevention, Police Research Paper 98*. London: Home Office.
- Flood-Page, C. and Taylor, J. (2003) *Crime in England and Wales 2001/2002: Supplementary Volume*. Home Office Statistical Bulletin. London: Home Office.
- Garland, D. (1996) Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Societies. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36: 445-471.

Hamilton-Smith, N. and Kent, A. (2005) The Prevention of Domestic Burglary. In: N. Tilley (ed.) *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Johnson, S. and Loxley, C. (2001) *Installing Alley-Gates: Practical Lessons from Burglary Prevention Projects*. Home Office Briefing Note 2/01. London: Home Office.

Mayhew, P., Clarke, R.V.G., Sturman, A. and Hough, J.M. (1976) *Crime as Opportunity, Home Office Research Study No. 34*. London: Home Office.

McCreith, S. (2003) *Reducing Burglary Initiative Project Summary Ladybarn*. Supplement 6 to Findings 204. London: Home Office.

Reed, J. and Nutley, K. (1998) Biting Back at Crime with the Alley-gaters. In: P. Francis and P. Fraser (Eds.) *Building Safer Communities*. London: The Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.

Renewal.net Case Study - Reducing Burglary: The Dukeries Gating Scheme. [online]. Available at: < URL: <http://www.renewal.net/Nav.asp?Category=:crime>> [Accessed 21 February 2006].

Renewal.net Solving the Problem: Alley-gating. [online]. Available at: <URL: <http://www.renewal.net/Nav.asp?Category=:crime>> [Accessed 21 February 2006].

Smithson, H., Armitage, R., and Rogerson, M. (2007) *Evaluating the Sustainability of Alley-gating in Liverpool*. Report submitted to Liverpool CitySafe.

Sutton, M. (1998) *Handling Stolen Goods and Theft: A Market Reduction Approach*. Home Office Research Study 178. Home Office. London.

Sutton, M., Schneider, J.L. and Hetherington, (2001) *Tackling theft with the market reduction approach*. Home Office Crime Reduction Research Series Paper 8.

Tilley, N. (1993) *Understanding Car Parks, Crime and CCTV: Evaluation Lessons from Safer Cities, Crime Prevention Series Paper 42*. London: Home Office.

Universities of Liverpool, Hull and Huddersfield (2002) *Home Office Reducing Burglary Initiative Final Outcome Report – Liverpool*. London: Home Office.

Universities of Liverpool, Hull and Huddersfield (2005) *Home Office Reducing Burglary Initiative Case Study – Hartlepool*. London: Home Office.

Webb, B. and Laycock, G. (1992) *Reducing crime on the London Underground*. London: Home Office.

Young, C., Hirschfield, A., Bowers, K., and Johnson, S. (2003) Evaluating Situational Crime Prevention: The Merseyside 'Alley-gating' Schemes. *In: D. Kidner, G. Higgs and Sean White (Eds.) Socio-Economic Applications of Geographic Information Science – Innovations in GIS 9*. London: Taylor and Francis. 37-50.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Resident Survey

| |
|---------|
| CASE NO |
|---------|

| |
|-----------|
| STAMP NO: |
|-----------|

Alley gating Survey 2006

Gated properties

| INTERVIEW DETAILS | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|-----------|
| INTERVIEWER NAME : | | | | |
| INT. I.D. NUMBER : | | | | |
| INT. DATE | | | | |
| INT. TIME: (USE 24 HOUR CLOCK) | | INT. DAY (CIRCLE) | | |
| HRS | MINS | MON | TUES | WED THURS |
| | | FRI | SAT | SUN |

INTRODUCTION: Good morning / afternoon. My name is and I am calling from BMG Research. We have been commissioned by Liverpool CitySafe Partnership and the University of Huddersfield to undertake an important study amongst people living in the area.

We are currently conducting surveys with residents living in areas protected by alleygates and in areas where there are no alleygates, and I would be grateful if you could spare the time to take part. All information provided will be treated in the utmost confidence and no details concerning individual residents or households will be presented in any format or released to any other parties. Our analysis will simply compare the results for houses protected with alleygates against those that are not. All respondents will be entered into a prize draw and the first prize is £100, the second prize is £50 and the third prize is £25.

The questionnaire is entirely confidential and your personal details will not be passed on to any organisation. Please note that your responses to the questionnaire will not affect the likelihood of your street being alley-gated so we would be grateful if you could answer as honestly as possible.

| |
|---|
| Check that the respondent is aged 16 or over |
|---|

SC1 We need to interview people who have lived in their property for a considerable amount of time. Have you been in the property for at least twelve months?

1. Yes – **Continue**
2. No – **Thank And Close**

Perceptions of area

Read out: This section asks you some of your views on how you feel about your area.

Q1 Are you generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the area in which you live?

Read out and code one only

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Quite satisfied
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- 4 Quite dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 6 Don't know

Q2 Ideally, would you like to move because of the area?

Code one only

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q3 Would you recommend to a close friend or family member to move in to the area?

Show card 1 and code one

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, probably
- 3 No, probably not
- 4 No, definitely not
- 5 Don't know

Q4 Do you think this area is a good place to bring children up in?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q5 Would you say this area is a safe place?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q6 How frequently do you use your back alley?

Code one only

- 1 Daily
- 2 Weekly
- 3 Monthly
- 4 Less than monthly
- 5 Never
- 6 Don't know

Community participation

Read out: The following questions ask about your relationship with the local community.

Q7 Who in your opinion is primarily responsible for ensuring that there is order in the street? **Do not prompt, then code all that apply and write in below**

- 1 Residents
- 2 The police
- 3 The local authority
- 95 Other **Please specify**

97. Don't know

Q8 How many families in your street are you on first name terms with?

Write in _____

- 96 None
- 97 Don't know

Q9 Do you feel that you can generally trust your neighbours?
Show card 2 and code one only

- 1 Yes, can trust them completely
- 2 Yes, can trust them to some extent
- 3 Neither trust nor distrust
- 4 No, can not trust them very much
- 5 No, can not trust them at all
- 6 Don't know

Q10 Have you been involved in any local campaigns over the last 12 months?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

If yes: Please specify which.

Q11 Looking at this show card, could you tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements that have been made about this area.

Show card 3 and read out statements

| | | Disagree strongly | Disagree slightly | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree slightly | Agree strongly | Don't know |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | People around here are willing to help their neighbours | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | This is a close knit community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | People in this area can be trusted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | People in this area generally get along with each other | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5 | People in this area share the same values | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Fear of crime

Read out: These questions ask for your views regarding your levels of safety over the last 12 months

Q12 How safe do you feel in your home at the following times?

Show card 4 and code one only for each

| | | Very safe | Fairly Safe | Neither safe nor unsafe | Fairly unsafe | Very unsafe | Don't know |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | During the day | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 2 | During the evening | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 3 | During the night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |

Q13 How safe do you feel in your back alley at the following times?

Show card 4 and code one only for each

| | | Very safe | Fairly Safe | Neither safe nor unsafe | Fairly unsafe | Very unsafe | Don't know |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | During the day | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 2 | During the evening | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 3 | During the night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |

Q14 How safe do you feel on your street at the following times?
Show card 4 and code one only for each

| | | Very safe | Fairly Safe | Neither safe nor unsafe | Fairly unsafe | Very unsafe | Don't know |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | During the day | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 2 | During the evening | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 3 | During the night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |

Q15 How safe do you feel in your local neighbourhood (i.e. the local area of several streets, including the nearest corner shop) at the following times?
Show card 4 and code one only for each

| | | Very safe | Fairly Safe | Neither safe nor unsafe | Fairly unsafe | Very unsafe | Don't know |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | During the day | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 2 | During the evening | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 3 | During the night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |

Perceived level of crime and disorder

Read out: The following section asks questions about you, your property and levels of crime. They relate to your experiences over the last 12 months.

Q16 Do you own a car?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No **Go to Q19**
- 3 Don't know - **Go to Q19**

If yes

Q17 Do you regularly park a car on the street?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q18 Do you try to always park outside your own house?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q19 Have you or your property personally suffered from any of the following over the last twelve months? If you have suffered any incidents can you tell us how many you suffered and how many you actually reported to the police?

Show card 5 and code all that apply

| Crime Type | Yes | No | If yes: Number of incidents? Write in | If yes: How many reported to the police? Write in | Don't know | Ref: |
|----------------------|-----|----|---|---|---------------|------|
| 1. Burglary | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Criminal damage | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Theft of car | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Theft from car | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Robbery | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Assault | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 7. Theft from person | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |
| 8. Sexual offences | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | 4 |

If respondent answers yes to 5 or 6 continue, otherwise go to Q21

Q20 A) If you suffered robbery, was this:

Read out and code all that apply

- 1 On your street
- 2 In your house
- 3 In the back alley
- 95 Elsewhere. **Please specify** _____

B) If you suffered an assault, was this:

Read out and code all that apply

- 1 On your street
- 2 In your house
- 3 In the back alley
- 95 Elsewhere. **Please specify** _____

Q21 Are you aware of anyone else on the street suffering from any of the following?
Show card 5 and code one only for each

| Crime Type | Yes | No | Don't know |
|----------------------|-----|----|------------|
| 1. Burglary | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Criminal damage | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. Theft of car | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Theft from car | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Robbery | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Assault | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Theft from person | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Sexual offences | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q22 As far as you are aware, have there been any of the following on your street in the last 12 months?

Show card 6 and code one only for each

| Type of incident | | Yes | No | Don't know |
|------------------|---|-----|----|------------|
| 1 | Deliberate fires – in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | Deliberate fires – elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | Vandalism – in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | Vandalism – elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | Graffiti – in the alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | Graffiti - elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7 | Youths causing annoyance in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8 | Youths causing annoyance elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | Rubbish tipping – in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10 | Rubbish tipping - elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 11 | Littering – in the alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 12 | Littering - elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 13 | Drug taking - in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 14 | Drug taking – elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15 | Dog fouling – in the back alley | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 16 | Dog fouling – elsewhere | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 17 | Noise pollution | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 18 | Neighbour disputes | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 19 | Prostitution | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 20 | People urinating in the alleyway | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 21 | Unfamiliar people wandering around the street | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 22 | Unfamiliar people wandering around the alleyway | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q23 In your opinion, how tidy are the following . . .

Read out and code one for each

| | | Very untidy | Fairly untidy | Neither tidy nor untidy | Fairly tidy | Very tidy | Don't know |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | The street where you live | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | The alleyway adjoining your property | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Health related questions

Read out: These questions concern general issues about your health.

Q24 Have you recently been suffering from any of the following?
Read out and code one only for each

| | Condition | Yes | No | Ref: |
|---|----------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | Heart Palpitations | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | High Blood Pressure | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | Feelings of breathlessness | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | Headache/Migraines | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | Shaking | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Q25 Would you consider yourself a regular user of the following?
Read out and code one only for each

| | Condition | Yes | No | Ref: |
|---|------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | Alcohol | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | Tobacco | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | Soft drugs | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | Hard drugs | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Read out: For the following questions, please provide responses concerned with how you have been feeling in the last few weeks.

Q26 I feel cheerful:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q27 I can sit down and relax quite easily:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q28 My appetite is:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Very poor
- 2 Fairly poor
- 3 Quite good
- 4 Very good
- 5 Don't know

Q29 I can laugh and feel amused:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q30 I have an uncomfortable feeling like butterflies in the stomach:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q31 I'm awake before I need to get up:
Read out and code one only

- 1 For 2 hours or more
- 2 For about 1 hour
- 3 For less than one hour
- 4 Not at all, I sleep until it is time to get up
- 5 Don't know

Q32 I feel tense or 'wound up':
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q33 I have kept up my interests:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, most of them
- 2 Yes, some of them
- 3 No, not much
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q34 I get scared or panicky for no good reason:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, definitely
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not much at all
- 4 No, not at all
- 5 Don't know

Q35 I can go out without feeling anxious:
Read out and code one only

- 1 Yes, always
- 2 Yes, sometimes
- 3 No, not often
- 4 No, I never can
- 5 Don't know

Q36 We would like to hear your views concerning alleygates. Do you agree with any of the following statements?

Show card 12, read out statements and code one for each

| | Statement | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree / disagree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't Know |
|----|---|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Alley gating has made the street safer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | Alley gating has tidied up the street | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | Alley gating has caused access problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | Alley gating has caused access problems specifically related to my disability or that of a member of my family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5 | Alley gating has caused problems in putting the bin out | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6 | Alley gating has caused problems for my pet | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7 | Alley gating has made me feel safer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 | Alley gating has been inconvenient for pedestrians | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9 | Alley gating has stopped unwanted strangers using the street | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10 | Alley gating has been inconvenient for service suppliers – street lighting engineers/ Utilities/ Refuse Collection/ Window Cleaners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | Alley gating has made me feel unsafe and blocked / locked in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12 | Alley gating has improved the image of the street | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13 | Alley gating has made the street look ugly / like a fortress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14 | Alley gating has made it easier to maintain the alley | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Q37 Did you live in this property when the alley gates were installed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Go to Read before Q41

Q38 Were you consulted about the installation of the gate?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

Q39 At that time, were you in favour of the gates being installed?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't remember

Q40 Did the installation of the gates result in any bad feeling amongst neighbours?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't remember

Q41 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements that have been made about alley gates?

Show card 3 and code one for each statement

| | | Disagree strongly | Disagree slightly | Neither disagree nor agree | Agree slightly | Agree strongly | Don't know |
|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | The installation of alley-gates has resulted in the street being stigmatised/labelled as a high crime area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | The noise created by the alley-gates slamming has outweighed the benefits I get from the gates | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3 | The alley-gates have blocked light to the alley | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

About security

Read out: This section asks about security measures that you may / may not have taken.

Q42 Do you have any of the following security measures?
Show card 8 and code one only for each

| | Security Measures | Yes | No | Don't Know | Ref: |
|----|-------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|
| 1 | A burglar alarm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 lever mortise lock on front door | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | 5 lever mortise lock on back door | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | Locking back gate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | Security light at front of property | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | Security light at back of property | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | Window lock | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | Property marking | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | A car alarm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10 | A car immobiliser | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11 | Contents insurance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

About you

Read out: I would now like to ask you some further questions about yourself;

Q43 Record Gender

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Q44 Which of these age groups do you fall into?
Show card 9 and code one only

- 1 16
- 2 17 – 24
- 3 25 – 34
- 4 35 – 44
- 5 45 – 54
- 6 55 – 64
- 7 65 – 74
- 8 Over 75
- 9 Refused

Q45 How long have you lived in the area?

Write in _____ **Years** _____ **Months**

97 Don't know

98 Refused

Q46 How long have you lived at this address?

Write in _____ **Years** _____ **Months**

97 Don't know

98 Refused

Q47 Which of the following best describes your family status?

Show card 10 and code one only

1. Married/living with partner - with dependent children
2. Married/living with partner – without dependent children
3. Separated/divorced/widowed - with dependent children
4. Separated/divorced/ widowed - without dependent children
5. Single – with dependent children
6. Single without dependent children
7. Refused

Q48 Which of the following describes the tenure of your household?

Read out and code one

- 1 Owner occupied
- 2 Rented from a private landlord
- 3 Rented from the Council or a Housing Association
- 4 Other
- 5 Prefer not to say

Q49 Looking at this card, could you tell me the letter describes your **household** income?

Show card 11 and code one only

| Monthly income | | Weekly income |
|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| Less than £5,000 | A | Less than £96.15 |
| £5,000 to £9,999 | B | £96.15 to £192.29 |
| £10,000 to £19,999 | C | £192.30 to £384.60 |
| £20,000 to £29,999 | D | £384.61 to £576.90 |
| £30,000 or more | E | £576.91 or more |

Q50 Would you be willing to participate in a follow up survey?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Don't know

If yes

We need a way of identifying you as an individual, can you give us your name or something else that you will remember in the future?

Thank and close

Read: To verify that you have taken part in this survey and that I have accurately recorded your comments, please could you sign the following statement for me?

'I confirm that this interview has been conducted in a proper manner and that the interviewer has accurately recorded the information I have provided'.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Record address details of respondent

Thank respondent for their help and assistance

RESPONDENT DETAILS:

TITLE: 1 MR 2 MRS 3 MISS 4 MS 5 DR

95 OTHER – **PLEASE SPECIFY:**

SURNAME:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

FORENAMES OR INITIALS:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

ADDRESS ONE:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

ADDRESS TWO:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

ADDRESS THREE:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

POSTAL TOWN:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

POST CODE: - NB: THIS INFORMATION IS ESSENTIAL!

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

PHONE NUMBER – INCLUDE CODE!

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

INSERT RESPONDENT IDENTITY NUMBER HERE

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Physical Survey

Do not ask the residents these questions. Complete them yourself after you have completed a survey.

Q51 Is the property double glazed.

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q52 Is there a burglar alarm on the front of the house?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q53 Are there any crime prevention stickers in the front /door window (property marking only, not neighbourhood watch)?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q54 Are there any neighbourhood watch (or other crime prevention association) stickers in the window or signs in the immediate vicinity of the property?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q55 Is the property on the end of a block?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q56 Is the property in the middle of a block and next to an alley entrance/exit?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q57 Is the road on which the property is located?

Code only one

- 1 Long and straight – e.g can see the last property from the first.
- 2 A very bendy road such that your view of some properties is obscured.
- 3 A curved road
- 4 A cul-de-sac

Q58 Is the property obscured from view at the front by a wall/fence/shrubbery?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q59 Are there traffic calming measures in the road?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q60 Does the property have a gate attached to the end of the alley?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Go to Q63

Q61 Is the gate closed?

Q62 Is the gate locked

Q63 Is there any evidence of damage to the gate?

Q64 What is your opinion of the general maintenance of the alley? Is it . . .

- 1 Very untidy
- 2 Fairly untidy
- 3 Neither untidy nor tidy
- 4 Fairly tidy
- 5 Very tidy
- 6 Don't know