Implementing neighbourhood policing

Scope of practice guidelines

Version 2.0
Scope of practice guidelines

1 Title
Implementing neighbourhood policing

2 Overall approach and intended audience

The College of Policing has recently piloted a new approach to developing practice guidelines using a process that stands in contrast to the way authorised professional practice was previously developed. The new approach will follow the process set out in a draft manual of guidance.

The guidelines will be developed and agreed by an independently-chaired committee, which will be made up of academics, subject matter experts and frontline practitioners. The guidelines will set out a series of strong and conditional recommendations for practice and research that will be informed by the best available evidence. It will be subject to consultation with stakeholders, practitioners and the public before being agreed and released by the College.

The guidelines are primarily aimed at those:

- frontline practitioners who deliver neighbourhood policing
- who are responsible for setting the strategy for neighbourhood policing or supporting its implementation and delivery (e.g. analysts, trainers, supervisors and senior leaders).

The guidelines may also be of relevance to local authorities and other statutory partners as well as voluntary organisations and local community groups who support community safety, and could inform the decisions of the Police Transformation and Reform Board.

This document sets out the background to and scope of the practice guidelines; it describes what will and will not be considered in the guidelines.

3 Need

In its most recent PEEL inspection report on effectiveness, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC 2017) raised concerns that ‘local policing’ had continued to be eroded. It suggested that many forces needed to take urgent action to maintain a proactive and preventative approach to policing. HMIC specifically noted that:

- local policing was the area of operational policing that had seen the most decline, commenting that it was adversely affected public perceptions
- many forces had failed to ‘redefine’ neighbourhood policing in the context of reduced budgets and changing demand
- decisions had been taken to preserve reactive policing over prevention
- neighbourhood policing had suffered from the abstraction of police officers and reduced police community support officer (PCSO) numbers
- local policing teams were often inconsistent, unstructured and not well supported
- there was a general lack of clarity on how to engage with local people
- there was inconsistency in the way forces understood threat, risk and harm in communities, tackled local problems and used anti-social behaviour powers
- the activities of officers and PCSOs was not routinely directed by intelligence and analysis
- many forces did not apply ‘tried and tested’ interventions when tackling local problems
or evaluate their activities.

In response to these concerns and in recognition of the absence of any national guidance and standards, HMIC recommended that the College of Policing develop guidelines on the effective elements of neighbourhood policing (see Box 1 for details).

Box 1. HMIC (2017) recommendation on neighbourhood policing

**Cause of concern**

HMIC found that neighbourhood policing continues to be eroded. The police service is no longer consistently implementing elements of neighbourhood policing known to be effective in preventing and tackling traditional crime, and has not yet applied these to 21st century threats (online crime and so-called hidden and complex crimes).

**Recommendation 1**

- By December 2017, the College of Policing, working with the National Police Chiefs’ Council and the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, should review the existing evidence about what makes effective neighbourhood policing, and develop and issue national guidance setting out the essential elements of neighbourhood policing which all forces should provide. This guidance should cover, but not be limited to:
  - public engagement to inform preventative policing activity;
  - targeted intelligence-led preventative activity and patrolling;
  - effective problem-solving policing to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour;
  - effective involvement of neighbourhood policing in tackling serious and organised crime, in preventing violent extremism and in keeping the most vulnerable members of communities safe;
  - effective multi-agency approaches to local problems;
  - analytical capability to support effective and targeted preventative policing; and
  - capability to review and assess the effectiveness of the action taken, to learn what works and to implement that effectively across the whole force area.

- Immediately after the national guidance has been issued, all forces should review their own approach to neighbourhood policing to determine whether the service they provide to local communities meets these guidelines. As soon as practicable thereafter, they should put into effect any necessary changes to implement the national guidance.

In terms of its response to the HMIC recommendation, the College has identified that it is not possible to achieve all of the elements in the desired timescale. Instead, the College initially proposed a phased approach to the work, and the following extract is taken from the written response provided to HMIC:

The College and NPCC are proposing a phased approach to respond to this recommendation.

The first phase would be to use the existing evidence base to work with a Guideline Committee of academics and practitioners to develop practice guidelines for neighbourhood policing with a target date for consultation by the end of December 2017. At this early stage it is anticipated that the guidelines would cover areas which have been shown to contribute to improving safety, reducing crime/demand and increasing public confidence. These would include:

- Engaging the public to understand problems and inform action;
- Understanding the data and analysis to target activity;
- Identifying effective responses to crime and ASB;
- Assessing the impact of the action taken and adding to the policing evidence base.

The guidelines will assist forces to understand what effective practice looks like and to assess their own performance.

The second phase will involve working with the NPCC and others to address gaps in the existing evidence base and to share what is shown to be good and promising practice. This work will support forces to address changes in the manner by which crime is being committed and support the Policing Vision 2025. Areas that could be explored include:

- effective multi agency place based solutions
- neighbourhood policing approaches to tackling complex issues such as vulnerability and serious organised crime.
- Policing online communities.
- Enhancing analytical capability.

Following feedback on the consultation draft of the scope, the College has decided not to adopt a rigidly phased approach based around the issues and themes of the guidelines (see Section 4). The College remains committed to the target date of the end of December 2017 for consultation on the draft guidelines and April 2018 for their publication. A phase of work will, however, run in parallel and focus on collating and developing supplementary materials which will support implementation but also focus on more recent developments in neighbourhood policing. These materials will be made available as soon as they have been quality assured.

4 Focus

4.1 Overarching focus

Overall, the guidelines will focus on **how best to implement neighbourhood policing**, with an emphasis on those activities and processes most likely to be effective at:

- improving community safety
- reducing crime, disorder and harm
- improving public perceptions
- building stronger ties within communities.

The guidelines will concentrate on what the research literature has suggested have consistently been the ‘defining features’ of neighbourhood policing (see Annex). These features include the police:

- having a visible presence in communities
- seeking to build positive relationships with those communities
- engaging with and listening to people in those communities in order to understand their needs and identify risks within, and to, those communities
- encouraging the flow of intelligence from communities
- analysing the nature, extent and causes of the problems affecting communities
- agreeing priorities for local action
- responding to communities’ needs and risks, by taking a problem-solving approach and early preventative action
- being proactive and working in partnership with other organisations and communities
- being held to account by communities.
The guidelines will not cover organisational structures and resourcing levels or seek to prescribe a model for neighbourhood policing as these are matters for chief constables and PCCs. Other activities carried out by neighbourhood officers that are not consistent with the above defining features (e.g. emergency response) will also be regarded as being out of scope.

The guidelines will not be restricted to implementing neighbourhood policing in particular contexts or in respect of particular types of crime, disorder or harm, but will be framed so that it can be applied in a wider range of situations and in respect to both established and emerging issues.

To support guideline development, the College will carry out rapid evidence assessments (REAs), a call for practice and a knowledge-gathering exercise. The evidence gathered through this work will determine the strength of the recommendations contained in the guidelines. The REAs are likely to gather the strongest evidence but mainly in respect of the more established or core aspects of neighbourhood policing as they will focus on gathering research literature. The call for practice will gather recent case studies and practice examples and the knowledge-gathering exercise will identify insights and experiences of expert practitioners. As a result, these approaches will likely draw together weaker evidence albeit on newer innovations and the more ‘developmental’ aspects neighbourhood policing.

In recognition of the current demands faced by forces, the research evidence, case studies and practice examples, and practitioner insights will be shared as soon as they are ready to be disseminated. Supplementary materials (e.g. case studies, logic models) will also be developed and shared with forces in support of guideline implementation. The nature of these materials and the timescales for their development has yet to be agreed.

4.2 Rapid evidence assessments

REAs are reviews of the research literature that involve following clear procedures to search for, sift and bring together the findings of studies on a particular topic but with the available timescales and resources. The use of transparent methods aims to ensure the reviews are relatively free from bias and can be easily repeated. While this approach is typically used to review quantitative studies, it can also be used with other types of research.

REAs will be carried out with the aim of answering two questions:

- What constitutes effective neighbourhood policing?
- What acts as a facilitator or barrier to the successful implementation of neighbourhood policing?

REA1 should underpin guidelines relevant to the development of force strategies by bringing together the findings of evaluations (or reviews of evaluations) that have shown neighbourhood policing to have had a positive impact on outcomes. The REA will primarily seek to use the EMMIE framework to describe the activities, processes and conditions that contributed to neighbourhood policing having been effective, the situations when it was most likely to ‘work’, and why. The effect that neighbourhood policing had on outcomes will also be summarised.

REA2 should support guidelines for practitioners involved in implementing or supporting the delivery of neighbourhood policing. Its aims will be to bring together findings from a range of quantitative, qualitative and mixed-method studies that have looked at how defining features of neighbourhood policing have been implemented, with a view to identifying what helps and hinders, and whether there are any special considerations in different contexts (e.g. in tackling ASB, crime or terrorism).

When developing the REA procedures, pragmatic decisions will need to be made to ensure the resulting literature is relevant, of an appropriate standard, and of a manageable volume.
Studies are likely to be identified from a combination of published reviews, recommendations from international academic experts, and some limited library database searching. Studies may also have to be excluded because of their design, age and/or location.

4.3 Call for practice

Stakeholders will be invited to share their current practices in relation to the focus of the guideline. The call for practice will be informed by the scope and the subsequent REA questions, with the overarching intention of establishing the approach taken by forces across different policing areas. As part of this information gathering exercise, data or material may also be submitted from partners, providing a useful insight into the impact and challenges present in delivering the desired outcome. Examples of materials or areas considered relevant to be submitted as part of a call for practice include:

- a policing or partnership initiative or intervention
- a problem solving technique that has been applied to a local policing issue
- a summary of local practice
- a project or evaluation
- training or continuing professional development.

By sharing practice, the development of the evidenced-based guideline will be enhanced, and will help the College to be aware of local research, evaluation or assessment work, current or past. It also identifies different force/geographic approaches which can prove useful in exploring why such variance occurs.

The call for practice will be advertised on the authorised professional practice website, and circulated through NPCC, APCC, Local Government Association and Neighbourhood Watch networks, the appropriate communities on POLKA (the Police On-Line Knowledge Area), and social media. In this way the theoretical and practical aspects are drawn together. It allows a gap analysis to take place in terms of the outputs from REAs and the current frontline procedures and approaches. The call for practice can also form the basis for consensus building.

4.4 Knowledge-gathering exercise

Where the social research evidence identified through the REAs is weak or not available, practitioners’ experience and knowledge will be gathered and explored systematically to develop a more operationally-focused evidence base.

As implementation and delivery of neighbourhood policing will vary, it will be important to apply an element of rigor to this process in order, first, to draw out a broad range of practitioner views and experiences and, second, to identify the common principles that practitioners agree sit at the heart of the practice in question. This knowledge gathering and consensus building process can be carried out in a number of ways. One option that has proven useful during guideline pilots has been the 10KV interactive online system used in operational debriefing. Other options include telephone interviews, face-to-face visits or questionnaires to investigate themes arising from the call for practice.
5 Context

5.1 Current evidence base

There is a wide-ranging, international evidence base on neighbourhood policing, related models of policing and their component parts, some of which is summarised in the Annex. The College is aware of several systematic and non-systematic literature reviews on relevant topics. These have tended to examine questions of impact but not exclusively. Examples focus on: neighbourhood policing (2015), community policing (Gill et al 2014), problem-solving1 (Braga et al 2014), community engagement (Lister et al ND, Myhill 2012), legitimacy (Mazerolle et al 2013) and policing terrorism (Thiel 2009). A large number of individual studies have also been published in the UK and elsewhere on topics relevant to neighbourhood policing. A few will have used different evaluation designs to test impact, while very many more will have used a range of qualitative and quantitative methods to explore implementation issues (e.g. its nature and extent as well as barriers and facilitators), particular aspects of neighbourhood policing (e.g. community intelligence) or its role in specific contexts (e.g. countering terrorism and the Prevent programme).

5.2 Current practice

It is difficult to establish a baseline for current practice because force approaches and models of neighbourhood policing differ due to a range of factors such as local need, partnership arrangements and financial constraints. Even where forces have collaborated on significant parts of their organisations, in most instances neighbourhood policing structures have evolved on a force by force basis, and it is indeed financial constraints that have arguably had the most significant impact on these evolving structures. The impact of this can be examined in a number of recent publications.

In 2015, the College of Policing published a ‘practice stock take’. Forces were invited to complete surveys, and this was followed up by site visits by College staff to 15 different forces. The resultant review was designed to identify what was perceived to be working well across the country and to share the most up-to-date practice.

In its conclusion, the review highlighted that forces felt that neighbourhood policing was highly valued by residents, partner agencies, police and crime commissioners (PCCs). It was seen as having value in delivering important operational priorities, such as tackling anti-social behaviour, but also in that it was the right way to provide communities with visible and accessible policing. It found that forces were looking to maintain neighbourhood policing with reduced resources and focus their efforts more effectively to give greater value for money.

As part of its 2016 effectiveness inspection, HMIC examined how forces prevented crime and anti-social behaviour, and the results of this inspection can be seen in a national overview report and force specific inspection reports (HMIC, 2017). It was this inspection that led to the recommendation to produce the practice guidelines which are to be developed by this committee.

HMIC graded two forces as ‘outstanding’, 30 as ‘good’, 10 as ‘requires improvement’ and one force as ‘inadequate’, and saw this as a deterioration from the previous year’s results. Its conclusion was that this was as a consequence of changing priorities leading to reduced resources in neighbourhoods and therefore a reduction of neighbourhood-based teams. In terms of current practice, the HMIC report is useful in that it went beyond resource issues and examined how forces used intelligence to identify risk, work with local communities to understand policing priorities, used a problem solving approach, applied tactics and then sought to learn and improve. Whilst there was clearly some good practice identified (e.g.

---

1 This review looked at problem-solving in a range of contexts, not just in a neighbourhood setting.
Durham’s approach to problem solving) large gaps were found in most areas which, as previously stated, led to their overarching recommendation.

In April 2017, a study by The Police Foundation used data to track the trajectories of neighbourhood policing in England and Wales since 2008 and focused on how forces’ neighbourhood policing models had changed during this time. What is clear from The Police Foundation report is that this changing of structures and variation has had an impact on how forces deliver neighbourhood policing, but the extent to which this is the case is unclear.

In her response to the HMIC recommendation, Chief Constable Sara Thornton concluded “that the structure and resourcing of neighbourhood policing is a matter for forces and their PCCs and that national guidelines should not be confused with a model for neighbourhood policing.” Whilst this is potentially problematic in that current practice and associated performance appears so interwoven with these very issues, it does point to the need for the committee to focus its attention on specific areas of neighbourhood policing (e.g. problem-solving) and examine the evidence of what mechanisms, processes, contexts and implementation factors – rather than structures – support delivery and effectiveness.

5.3 Statistics

The figures below present the latest trends in official data on public perceptions relating to neighbourhood policing.

Figure 1. Public perceptions of the local crime rate

Source: Crime Survey of England and Wales
Figure 2. Public confidence in the local police ('how good a job' question)

Source: Crime Survey of England and Wales

Figure 3. Public perceptions that the police and local council are dealing with the anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in the local area (previous ‘single confidence target’ question)

Source: Crime Survey of England and Wales
Figure 4. Public perceptions of ‘defining features’ of neighbourhood policing

Source: Crime Survey of England and Wales

6 Related guidance

The College has published authorised professional practice on the following related topics:

- Communication and engagement
- Intelligence management, which includes guidance on governance (e.g. tasking and coordinating meetings), products (e.g. problem profiles) and analysis (e.g. SARA).
Annex. The evolution of neighbourhood policing

Defining neighbourhood policing

Neighbourhood policing is often described as the ‘bedrock’ of the British policing, and aspects of it can be traced back to the creation of the Metropolitan Police with its original emphasis on uniformed constables patrolling visibly on foot to fixed points in order to prevent crime. Like ‘bobbies on the beat’, however, ‘neighbourhood policing’ can be seen as a rhetorical device that incontrovertibly represents ‘all that is good’ about policing and harks back to a mythical ‘golden age’. Because of its symbolic power, ‘neighbourhood policing’ is also a term on to which people readily project their own values, experiences and expectations of policing, which means its precise definition can be difficult to pin down. It is an idea that will mean different things to different people at different times. For many people, neighbourhood policing will be most closely associated with a particular model of policing that was introduced across England and Wales during the three-year National Neighbourhood Policing Programme from 2005/06. For others, it might refer variously to a visible and accessible police presence, an organisational philosophy, dedicated geographically-based teams, a mechanism to deliver community-based problem-solving, or simply to whatever activities neighbourhood police officers and PCSOs carry out. Similarly, neighbourhood policing will also be seen to have multiple aims (e.g. to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and violent extremism, reassure people, improve public confidence in the police and/or encourage greater community cohesion and collective efficacy). Moreover, these definitional issues are not helped by the fact that ‘neighbourhood policing’ is often used interchangeably with other terms (like ‘community policing’, ‘reassurance policing’ and ‘local policing’) to refer to the same idea, even though these other terms are sometimes deliberately used to mark out slightly different models of policing.

While it is not possible to resolve all of the definitional issues with neighbourhood policing in this scoping document, this Annex charts the evolution of neighbourhood policing so that guideline committee members share a similar baseline knowledge and common language. From this historical account, it is possible to discern a series of ‘defining features’ that delineate neighbourhood policing from other approaches, and which are summarised in the main body of this document.

From community to reassurance policing

Community policing came to prominence in the UK in the late 1970s, and was closely associated with John Alderson, the chief constable of Devon and Cornwall. While a fairly inclusive and elastic idea (Weatheritt 1988, Tilley 2003), early iterations of community policing tended emphasise the importance of improved police-community relations and the legitimacy of the police and lacked a clear crime focus (Dalglish and Myhill 2004). Crime reduction was generally seen as a secondary aim that would result from improved police legitimacy, rather than a primary aim that would result from officers solving local problems with the public and partner organisations. Interest in community policing grew following the Scarman Report (1981), because it highlighted the role that the police and poor community relations played in the Brixton riots, although police efforts to introduce the model during the 1980s and 90s have been characterised by implementation failure and cultural and organisational marginalisation (Irving et al 1989, Weatheritt, 1988, Fielding, 1995). Since this time, a body of research has emerged on how perceptions of police fairness are more important than perceptions of police effectiveness in shaping the perceived legitimacy of the police, which in turn is associated with people’s willingness to cooperate with the police and obey the law (Tyler 2006, Myhill and
Quinton 2011). In short, the quality of police contact and legitimacy have been shown to affect crime.

In the early 2000s, a small number of chief officers – most notably Denis O’Connor – started to raise concerns about what has since been called ‘the reassurance gap’. They noted that, despite that recorded crime and self-reported victimisation had both been declining since the mid-1990s, the public were generally of the view that crime was continuing to rise locally and nationally (see Figure 1, section 4.2). This idea came to national prominence in HMIC’s (2001) Open all hours thematic inspection, which recommended forces deploy officers who were visible, accessible and familiar in order to increase public perceptions of safety.\(^1\)

Around the same time, Martin Innes started to develop the signal crimes perspective to help explain the reassurance gap. In summary, Innes suggested crimes and disorders acted as warning signals to people about risks to their security and which could also affect people’s feelings, thoughts and behaviour. However, different criminal and disorderly incidents did not signal or communicate the same level of risk to people; some incidents mattered more than others, and at different times to different people in different places. Hence, the presence of signal crimes and disorders locally in people’s immediate environment meant their perceptions were unaffected by sustained reductions in the overall volume of crime nationally. It followed, therefore, that by understanding a) the focus of people’s concerns, b) what it meant to them in terms of their security, and c) how it affected them, the police could identify the signal crimes from the background noise and intervene to reduce those incidents that had a disproportionate effect on the public’s perceptions of risk. Moreover, the actions and mere presence of authority figures (e.g. the police, partner agencies and the community) may act as control signals by having an effect on people’s perceptions, though not always in the direction that was originally intended (e.g. a large group of officers in high visibility jackets inadvertently prompting concerns about public safety).

A new model of policing was initially developed by Surrey Police and the University of Surrey, drawing on the signal crimes perspective and the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy\(^4\), with the aim of addressing the reassurance gap. Following initial pilots in Surrey Police and the Metropolitan Police, this model formed the basis of the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) (see Tuffin et al 2006). The programme was implemented in 16 wards in eight police forces with an expanded set of aims. The NRPP sought to reduce anti-social behaviour, improve quality of life, reduce the fear of crime and improve people’s sense of safety, increase public confidence and improve social capacity. Crime reduction was not a stated objective of the programme, though recognised as a potential benefit.

The NRPP vision set out the activities that were expected to be delivered in the 16 wards. Activities were expected to:

- be targeted (i.e. drawing on the signal crimes perspective and targeting those problems likely to make the biggest difference to public perceptions)

\(^2\) There is evidence to suggest these relationship may also hold in a counter-terrorism context. Survey research has pointed to perceptions of police fairness as increasing the likelihood of members of the Muslim community in London supporting counter-terrorism policing (Hug et al 2011). Analysis of a survey of young black and minority ethnic Londoners – half of whom were Muslim – found that perceptions of police fairness were more relevant to identities of those people who saw themselves as citizens of non-UK countries than those who saw themselves as British, and that this has a stronger effect on their willingness to cooperate the the police (Bradford 2012).

\(^3\) It is interesting to note that HMIC (2001) said resources could be made available to deliver more visible, accessible and familiar policing through additional funding, greater civilisation, use of single-crewing in response and improved demand management. Each of these has become more challenging in recent years.

\(^4\) This programme was implemented by Chicago Police Department from 1993 and the subject of a long running evaluation (Skogan et al 2002; Skogan and Steiner 2004). Defining features were turf re-orientation (e.g. assigning teams of officers to beats), problem-solving (e.g. training in a five-step problem-solving model and beat officer problem-solving being supported by improved links to city services) and community involvement (e.g. responding to community concerns identified at beat meetings and advisory committees).
be community-focused (i.e. listening and responding to community concerns)
secure neighbourhoods (i.e. via the presence of authority figures, visible and accessible police officers and visible improvements to public spaces).

In practice, these activities were translated into three broad delivery mechanisms: foot patrol, community engagement and problem-solving. The sites also made use of a seven-stage model to structure their problem-solving activity. No new resources were made available to the participating forces, though additional funding was provided to a national team that provided extensive and highly structured implementation support.

A Home Office evaluation measured outcomes before and after implementation of reassurance policing in six pilot wards, and compared them with those measured in six control wards that maintained business as usual (Tuffin et al 2006). After 12 months, the programme was found to have had a large positive impact on crime, perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour, feelings of safety and public confidence in the police, but little impact on social capacity. For example, public confidence increased by 15 percentage points in the trial wards, and by 3 percentage points in the control wards. A follow-up study found that the positive changes delivered by the programme after 12 months were largely sustained for a second year despite the absence of national implementation support (Quinton and Morris 2008).

The evaluation (Tuffin et al 2006) showed there was consistency between implementation and outcome change. First, the wards that saw improved public perceptions of juvenile nuisance (which was a consistent problem) had also implemented problem-solving well (e.g. community involvement in identifying and defining the problem, a detailed problem specification, and use of multiple source of information). Second, the wards that saw improved public perceptions of community engagement had also carried out proactive engagement activities in addition to public meetings and surgeries. Finally, the factors associated with improved public confidence in the police were consistent with the NRPP’s delivery mechanisms. People were more likely to be confident if their perceptions of foot patrol, community engagement or local problems (i.e. juvenile nuisance) improved, or had not been a victim of crime.

From reassurance to neighbourhood policing

Soon after the NRPP, the Home Office announced plans for neighbourhood policing to be implemented nationally. The choice of language was a deliberate attempt to reflect the growing complexity of policing, distance the approach from earlier community policing that were not sustained, mark out its distinctive features and bring together a range of initiatives under one banner (e.g. NRPP, community cohesion, micro-beats, and policing priority areas) (Quinton and Morris 2008).

The three-year Neighbourhood Policing Programme (NPP) was launched in 2005/06. Its focus was on ensuring every neighbourhood in England and Wales had a dedicated team by 2008/09, and that the service had recruited 16,000 additional PCSOs by 2007/08. While a national team provided implementation support, the process was less controlled than under the NRPP because of the number of forces involved and the focus on basic command units rather than wards. Each force also had considerable latitude over what was implemented, using guidance issued by the National Centre for Policing Excellence (2006) to develop its own locally tailored approach to neighbourhood policing. The guidance was based around ten key principles (see Box 2) and emphasised the importance of foot patrol, community engagement and problem-solving as delivery mechanisms.

Local adaption meant that the aims of neighbourhood policing were expected to vary locally too. Nevertheless, the primary aim for the national programme was for public confidence to improve (Quinton and Morris 2008). It was also expected that local implementation would

---

5 Including: environmental visual audits and key individual networks.
contribute to continued reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour nationally.

Box 2. Key principles of neighbourhood policing (adapted by Quinton and Morris 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood policing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• is an organisational strategy for the police, partners and the public to work together to solve problems, improve neighbourhood conditions, and increase feelings of security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is integrated with other policing functions (e.g. protective services, investigations and response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• requires evidence-based deployment of neighbourhood policing teams against identified need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• establishes dedicated, accessible and responsive neighbourhood policing teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is locally dependent, and is flexible and adaptive to local conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• requires the police to work with local people to identify the problems that are most important to them, and to influence local policing priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• establishes collaborative partnerships between other agencies and the public for problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• uses the national intelligence model as a basis for deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• requires effective community engagement, communication and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• needs rigorous performance management against local plans and commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were some subtle but important differences between reassurance and neighbourhood policing (Innes 2005 and 2006, Quinton and Morris 2008). Arguably, neighbourhood policing placed greater emphasis on additional police resources, blanket coverage of dedicated teams to defined geographical areas, the delivery of local policing services and crime reduction, and less on public reassurance, signal crime, and using a structured approach to involving the community in problem-solving (i.e. the seven-stage model).

A Home Office evaluation aimed to assess the impact of neighbourhood policing after the first year of the programme (Quinton and Morris 2008). It measured outcomes before and after implementation in five pathfinder basic command units, compared them to those measured in five comparison basic command units. The evaluation did not point to any consistent pattern of change. This could have been due to the quality of implementation, (particularly community engagement and problem-solving) and/or the design of the evaluation. Nevertheless, the evaluation provided further evidence in support for the three delivery mechanisms. It found that people were more likely to be confident in the police if their perceptions of foot patrol had improved, and were less likely to be confident if they had been a victim of crime or their perceptions of foot patrol, community engagement, the police/public working together or police fairness has got worse. Taken together, the findings suggested that foot patrol was necessary but not sufficient on its own to deliver increased public confidence in the police.

Statistical modelling carried out by the Home Office during the three year programme did not find a relationship between implementation and improved outcomes at basic command unit or police force levels (Quinton and Morris 2008, Mason 2009). This, together the evidence on the general barriers to implementing community engagement (Myhill 2012, Lister et al ND) and problem-solving (Bullock and Tilley 2009, Bullock et al 2006), might raise a question as to whether neighbourhood policing was ever fully embedded across the service. National trends in public confidence and other outcomes are, however, broadly consistent with the implementation of neighbourhood policing, though cause-and-effect cannot be established (Myhill and Quinton 2010; see section 4.2).
From neighbourhood to local policing

Evidence on what happened to neighbourhood policing after the NPP ended is more limited. Arguably, at a national level, there had started to be a policy shift towards other aspects of an emerging localism agenda. Key issues here were: the involvement of the public in the planning of local policing services (the Citizen Focused Policing Programme), the accessibility of local policing services (the single non-emergency number), the setting of quality standards for local service delivery (the Policing Pledge) and the focus on public perceptions of local partnership working (the single top-down confidence target). This was followed shortly after with a further shift in policy emphasis towards local accountability through the provision of crime maps and neighbourhood policing information, the aim of the public holding of police to account for delivery at local beat meetings, and the introduction of PCCs. During this period, neighbourhood policing became increasingly associated with a range of other of initiatives and priorities (e.g. place-based neighbourhood management, early intervention and offender management). A link with the Prevent programme was also made, with some evidence suggesting it may have been enhanced or dependent on neighbourhood policing, particularly in respect of community engagement, community intelligence and community impact management (Innes et al 2011).

More recently, neighbourhood policing will have been affected by resourcing levels, concerns about emerging problems (e.g. child sexual exploitation and online crime) and the renewed emphasis on ‘local policing’; a broader description that also encompasses the local delivery of other policing functions such as response and investigations (see Higgins 2017). In this context, it would appear that some forces have faced challenges in maintaining effective proactivity and integrated service delivery (Higgin and Hales 2017). There is also growing evidence of greater diversification of approaches at the local level and neighbourhood policing having a greatly expanded role (College of Policing 2017, Higgins 2017, HMIC 2017).

Looking ahead, the National Police Chiefs’ Council’s (2016) commitment to neighbourhood policing has been underlined in the Policing Vision 2025, which includes a focus on prevention and vulnerability, multi-agency place-based approaches, and local service integration. The work in area is being progressed by its Local Policing Coordinating Committee, chaired by Chief Constable Simon Cole.
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