



UCL

Cross cutting issues in violence: results from the TVCP tranche 3 problem profiles

Amy Burrell
April 2007



Contact: Amy Burrell
JDI Crime Science Laboratory
a.burrell@ucl.ac.uk

Table of Contents

- 1 Executive Summary.....3
- 2 Introduction.....8
 - 2.1 Purpose of the Tackling Violent Crime Programme (TVCP) 8
 - 2.2 Focus of the TVCP..... 8
 - 2.3 TVCP areas 9
- 3 Methodology9
- 4 Format of the profiles.....10
- 5 Violence.....11
 - 5.1 What is counted as violent crime?11
 - 5.2 Data used12
 - 5.3 Time frame considered13
 - 5.4 Offences13
 - 5.5 Location19
 - 5.6 Timing25
 - 5.7 Victims27
 - 5.8 Offenders30
 - 5.9 Responses33
- 6 Alcohol-related offences and the Night-time Economy43
 - 6.1 Alcohol related offences – all violence45
 - 6.2 Alcohol-related domestic violence.....47
- 7 Domestic Violence48
 - 7.1 Defining domestic violence and extracting relevant incidents for analysis48
 - 7.2 Offences49
 - 7.3 Location51

7.4	Timing	53
7.5	Victims	53
7.6	Offenders	56
7.7	Repeat Victimization (RV)	59
7.8	Responses	61
8	Summary and conclusions.....	66
9	References	66
10	Glossary of terms	67

1 Executive Summary

This report aims to provide an overview of cross cutting issues in violence as identified by problem profiles submitted to the Police Standards Unit under tranche 3 of the Tackling Violent Crime Programme (TVCP). This section provides a summary of the key findings.

- It is difficult to accurately identify alcohol-related crime, and evidence is often anecdotal.
- The results of the profiles are not directly comparable. This was because the definitions of violence, the level of data used, the timeframe, and the types of analyses conducted varied across the areas.
- All of the profiles considered recorded crime, and some incorporated data sourced from the ambulance service, the British Transport Police, street wardens, fear of crime surveys, deprivation indices and CCTV.

Trends in violent crime

- Recorded violent crime comprises of three main offence groups; violence against the person (VAP (87%)), robbery (8%) and sexual offences (5%) (Walker et al, 2006).
- These profiles show different trends; for example, Lewisham reported 77% of recorded violent crime to be VAP, 20% to be robbery and 3% sexual offences.
- The percentage of total crime attributable to violent offending varies between areas; most commonly between 20% and 30% of total crime.
- Nine areas reported recent increases in violent crime, whilst three areas reported an overall downward trend.
- Actual Bodily Harm (ABH) is commonly the peak offence but public order, harassment, common assault and Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH) also feature.
- Leicester reported that robbery offences in the city generally fell into one of three categories;
 1. children on children offences outside school or in open recreational areas in the early afternoon,
 2. groups of males preying on a lone person walking home from school or work in the evening, and
 3. a single male offender targeting a drunk victim walking home from the city centre alone at night.
- Property most likely to be stolen in a robbery were mobile phones, cash, bankcards and handbags (City & Holbeck).
- 94% of reported robberies were personal in nature (Waltham Forest).
- Knives are the most common weapon used in violent crime (Birmingham D3 and Waltham Forest).
- Firearms are used infrequently in violent crime however offenders are becoming more willing to use them (Birmingham D3).

- People are becoming more willing to carry and threaten others with coshes, sticks and batons but that they do not necessarily use them (Birmingham D3).
- There is a relatively high rate for use of bricks and stones (and the willingness to use them), reflecting the availability of such weapons (Birmingham D3).
- All assaults with a weapon presented at Leeds General Infirmary reported involved a glass or bottle.
- It was also noted that 40% patients had not reported the assault to police.
- Town and city centres are hotspots for violence, however residential clusters also emerged.
- Top areas for calls for service and crime in centres are often associated with the night-time economy.
- Problems in residential areas are often linked to deprivation, ASB and fighting amongst young people.
- Types of premises highlighted as problematic in relation to violence include licensed premises, hospitals, schools and public transport hubs.
- Violence associated with licensed premises clusters on weekend evenings.
- There are links between the increase in the number of people congregating in an area and a rise in disorder and/or violent crime.
- Hotspots for recorded crime and ambulance call-outs are synonymous and show a correlation between violent crime and licensed premises; violent crime hotspots correspond with those areas with the greatest numbers of licensed premises.
- Peak times; weekday afternoons (3-5pm) associated with schools and busy commuter times, and weekend evenings associated with the night-time economy.
- Violent crime peaks over the summer months.
- Football, particularly the World Cup 2006, was suggested to be a contributory factor to violence.
- Young people are overrepresented as both offenders and victims of violent crime.
- Males were only overrepresented as victims in four profiles, and five areas reported an even split between the sexes. Males were, however, overrepresented as offenders.
- The ethnicity of victims generally reflects the ethnic breakdown of the local population; however some areas note an overrepresentation of ethnic minorities.
- Ethnic minorities, especially Afro-Caribbean's and Asians are overrepresented as violent crime offenders.
- Youth crime and gang culture was highlighted as a factor in some areas.
- Stranger and acquaintance assaults remain a problem especially in night-time economy related incidents.
- One of the primary issues in relation to violence in town and city centres is the dispersal of revellers at the end of the night. Methods of dealing with this include the use of taxi marshals to monitor queues, the re-location of taxi ranks, and increasing the availability of late-night public transport.

- Some areas advocated the use of “alcohol restriction zones” to reduce access to alcohol and the harm associated with it.
- Early intervention; arrests for Drunk & Disorderly offences is reportedly having an impact on public order and assault figures (Leicester).
- Offender based interventions included the use of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs) and drinking banning orders. Targeting young offenders, boosting awareness of release dates for prolific offenders and using council powers to evict recidivist offenders were also noted.
- The benefits of educational programmes were highlighted, especially those relating to bullying, violence, drug and alcohol misuse, the dangers of carrying weapons, and the negative consequences of gang membership.
- School bus patrols and training for bus drivers were suggested to combat violence occurring on the journey to and from school.
- Staggered school times were suggested to limit the number of children congregating in hotspot areas.
- Many profiles highlighted issues surrounding data access and quality, especially in relation to sourcing and securing data and the accurate use of ‘flags’ for alcohol-related crime.
- The benefits of working in partnership were stressed; for example, data sharing, increased resources, and gaining a holistic view of the violent crime problem.
- Media campaigns were considered a useful vehicle to promote personal safety messages.
- A number of suggestions were made with regards to the regulation of licensed premises, primarily in relation to closure, visits to licensed premises, test purchasing, and the use of schemes such as Best Bar None and PubWatch.
- Environmental changes were also suggested including introducing bottle banks to reduce litter and access to potential weapons, the use of toughened glass in pubs and clubs, the introduction of ATM hatched privacy zones to reduce opportunities for fraud and to reassure public, and a white lighting scheme to help better distinguish colours and reduce fear of crime.
- Test purchasing and surrender amnesties were suggested to reduce weapon use.
- Staggered closing times for pubs and clubs were considered to be useful in reducing violence in town and city centres.

Domestic Violence (DV)

- Domestic violence incidents are sometimes difficult to identify within the data set, however many areas noted that DV is flagged.
- All of the profiles which analysed DV used police recorded crime data. Some also included findings based on other data sets including calls for service, housing, the Crown Prosecution Service, and victim support.
- The proportion of violence (or in some cases violence against the person) attributed to DV varies by area; the highest was 27%, the lowest 17%.

- Some areas reported that the increase in overall violence could be largely attributed to DV; for example in Birmingham D3 over 80% of the recorded increase in violence against the person was DV related.
- Peak offences for domestic violence often mirror those reported for overall violence namely ABH, common assault and harassment. However, sexual offences such as rape and sexual assault can also feature higher than average.
- Domestic VAP offences have lower degrees of weapons involvement than non-domestic incidents; instead cases of verbal and mental abuse and physical abuse involving fists and feet are more common.
- The most common premeditated weapon was identified as a knife or dagger (Sheffield).
- Unsurprisingly, residential homes are the prime location of DV offending; however some profiles noted clusters in town and city centres, perhaps associated with the night-time economy.
- DV was found to be more concentrated in deprived areas (i.e. those consisting of high density or low density social housing), however deprivation and poor housing is not a good indicator for the level of domestic VAP which occurs in the area (Birmingham D3).
- Weekend evenings are highlighted as peak times for DV reports for crimes, incidents and/or calls.
- The clustering of DV offending on weekend evenings has led some areas to make a link between DV and alcohol consumption.
- Specific events associated with peaks in DV include Christmas, New Year and the 2006 football World Cup.
- Victims of DV tend to be young adults.
- Females are overrepresented as victims of domestic violence in most areas which discussed victim characteristics. However, Ealing found that only 39% of victims were female. This was not due to data error as 61% were confirmed to be male. Combined with offender characteristics it is suggested that the area has a problem with male-on-male DV.
- Unsurprisingly White people make up the highest volume of DV victims. However, a number of profiles identified that ethnic minority groups were overrepresented as victims when the breakdown of the resident population was taken into account.
- The typical DV offender is a young white male in his twenties or thirties. However, it is noted that young Afro-Caribbean and Asian men are overrepresented as DV offenders.
- Domestic violence by definition is committed by people known to the victim, typically between husbands and wives. However, ex-partners also feature.
- Repeat victims are often difficult to identify due to underreporting and data recording.
- Repeat victims were typically identified using top 10 addresses or victim names.
- The bulk of recommendations made about DV were in relation to intelligence gathering and the need to conduct further analysis on the problem.

- There was concern about the use (and misuse) of the DV flag, and access to representative data was often challenging.
- Media awareness campaigns were popular in relation to DV, in particular ones which target young people and the friends and families of victims.
- A number of recommendations were made about partnership working, particularly with reference to improving facilities and support for victims.
- Offender management was also discussed with emphasis on the importance of identifying and targeting repeat offenders.
- Police training was considered pivotal in many areas; some already have schemes in place, for example the “Today’s Domestic, Tomorrow’s Murder” Initiative in Birmingham.

Summary and conclusions

It was often difficult to draw out cross-cutting issues in violence due to the variation in what was counted as violent crime, the data used and the timeframes considered. However, there were some interesting findings and many preconceptions/assumptions about violence will have been confirmed and/or supported by the results reported in the profiles.

Overall, violent crime clusters in town and city centres on weekend evenings and alcohol is often a contributory factor. Hotspots for violence have also emerged on weekdays between 3-4pm in some areas. This is mostly attributed to young people offending against each other after the school day has ended; however, the vulnerability of commuters has also been highlighted. Trends confirm that residential areas are peak location for domestic violence, and that this type of crime also clusters on weekend evenings.

2 Introduction¹

2.1 Purpose of the Tackling Violent Crime Programme (TVCP)

The aims of the programme are as follows:

- To work intensively with practitioners in a small number of local areas with high volumes of more serious violent crime.
- To improve police and CDRP performance and partnership working, using practitioner support panels to enable better problem-solving of violent crime.
- To use good practice and support mechanisms to improve local strategies, help fund the implementation of those strategies and run additional enforcement campaigns where appropriate.
- To ensure that local priorities and challenges are effectively communicated back to the centre to inform ongoing policy development.
- To identify and develop best practice which can then be disseminated and embedded across England and Wales.

2.2 Focus of the TVCP

TVCP activity focuses on alcohol-related and domestic violence because together these make up the majority of violent crime incidents. Research shows that domestic violence (DV) accounts for 16-25% of all violent crime, and that approximately half of violent crime incidents are alcohol-related. Programme activities aimed at tackling alcohol-related offences are enforcement-based and focus on implementing the lessons learned from the Alcohol Misuse Enforcement Campaigns (AMECs) which ran during 2004 and 2005. To tackle domestic violence the TVCP has linked up with a programme of work for the delivery of the Specialist Domestic Violence Courts (SDVCs). Domestic Violence Enforcement Campaigns (DVECs) run alongside this with the aim of improving evidence gathering and methods of investigating DV.

Geographically the programme focuses on a relatively small number of areas, selected based upon the volume and proportion of violence they account for in their region. The aim is that targeting activity in these areas should produce a reduction in the national level of violent crime. Under the TVCP, the BCUs and CDRPs involved are encouraged to work in partnership to try and reduce violence in their areas.

Performance monitoring initially took place in the form of monthly meetings between the TVCP leads (from Government Offices and police forces) to discuss progress. At the beginning of tranche three, in May 2006, the decision was made to move to regional meetings. All practitioners involved in delivering the programme in the TVCP areas are invited to update on activity, and violent crime data reports (produced using iQuanta information) are also presented. These meetings are an opportunity for all TVCP areas to share good practice with other TVCP participants in their region, and allow areas to learn from the experiences of others. TVCP practitioners are also able to raise any additional issues or concerns with regards to the violent crime agenda with the Programme Team, who can then report these back to the Home Office.

¹ This section has been written using the information provided on the TVCP mini site available online at www.crimereduction.gov.uk

From the end of 2006, the Programme Team and the Home Office have placed a focus on disseminating the good practice developed through the TVCP to those areas which have not been directly involved with the programme, and will support these areas as they incorporate this information into their existing crime reduction schedule.

2.3 TVCP areas

TVCP areas have been chosen according to volume of more serious violent crime. Thirteen Basic Command Units (BCUs), incorporating twelve Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs), joined at the beginning of the programme, followed by twelve BCUs in tranche 2 (covering seven CDRPs) and 14 BCUs in tranche 3 (thirteen CDRPs). See table 1 for details.

Table 1: areas involved in the Tackling Violent Crime Programme

Tranche 1	Tranche 2	Tranche 3
Bolton	Coventry M1	Birmingham D1
Brent	Coventry M2	Birmingham D3
Cardiff	Coventry M3	Bristol
Hackney	Manchester North	Camden
Hull	Manchester South	City & Holbeck (Leeds)
Islington	Salford	Doncaster
Lambeth	Nottingham	Ealing
Liverpool North	Rhondda Cynon Taff	Haringey
Liverpool South	Salford	Kirklees
Southwark	Swansea	Leicester
Wakefield	Wolverhampton G1	Lewisham
Westminster	Wolverhampton G2	Newham
Wirral		Sheffield
		Waltham Forest

3 Methodology

Fourteen areas joined the TVCP at the tranche three stage of the programme. All fourteen were asked to produce a problem profile of their violent crime problem and were provided with guidance notes. This guidance was produced by Dr Rosie Erol, a Senior Research Fellow at the Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science, in 2006 in response to analysis conducted on the quality of problem profiles submitted under the Alcohol Misuse and Domestic Violence Enforcement Campaigns (AMECs and DVECs)².

This work reviews the contents of the problem profiles submitted to the Police Standards Unit by the tranche 3 areas with the aim of identifying cross cutting issues in

² These reports are available to download from www.crimereduction.gov.uk and from www.jdi.ucl.ac.uk

violence. The profiles were read and information input into a coding matrix; the results of the matrix were reviewed and information allocated into themes. This report provides an overview of the findings.

Table 2 provides an overview of information associated with each report, including which force the area belongs to, the date the report was published and the job role of the author(s). In addition it is noted that all but two of the BCUs (Bristol and Leicester) are located within Metropolitan forces.

Table 2: Problem profiles received under tranche 3 of the TVCP

BCU*	Police Force	Date of report	Pages	Author(s)**
Birmingham D1	West Midlands	April - 2006	83	Intelligence Analyst x1
Birmingham D3	West Midlands	31-Jan-2007	73	Intelligence Analyst x1
Bristol	Avon & Somerset	Nov - 2006	17	Unclear
Camden	Metropolitan Police	19-Sept-2006	78	HEO x1
City & Holbeck (Leeds)	West Yorkshire	Unknown	19	Unknown
Doncaster	South Yorkshire	Violence - Unknown; DV - Nov-2006	16; 15	Violence - Unknown DV - Intelligence Analyst x1
Ealing	Metropolitan Police	23-Nov-2006	21	T/Higher Analyst x1
Haringey	Metropolitan Police	20-Nov-2006	74	Intelligence Unit x1
Kirklees	West Yorkshire	20-Nov-2006	31	Senior analyst x1 plus x2
Leicester	Leicestershire	Jan - 2007	58	X2
Lewisham	Metropolitan Police	15-Dec-2006	113	Temporary Crime Analyst
Newham	Metropolitan Police	28-Nov-2006	49	Analysts x2
Sheffield Central	South Yorkshire	Unknown	125	Senior Intelligence Analyst x1
Waltham Forest	Metropolitan Police	Nov - 2006	35	EO x2 and HEO x1

*Basic Command Unit; ** DV refers to Domestic Violence, HEO - Higher Executive Officer, EO - Executive Officer

4 Format of the profiles

The length of the reports, the topics covered and level of detail provided varied across the BCUs. Most areas considered both domestic and non-domestic offending, however, one (Sheffield) only reported findings with reference to domestic incidents. Another area (Bristol) focused on night-time economy (NTE) related violence but did make some mention of DV as well.

Haringey and Waltham Forest made a distinction between DV and non-DV related violent crime and looked at them separately. Others which considered DV looked at all violence (or whatever their definition of violence is) and then extracted DV for further investigation. The level of detail provided about DV varied greatly between areas and was often dependent on issues such as data access, data quality and the number of other topics covered by the report. Overall, eleven profiles, including Bristol, offered a dedicated section to DV, and a further 2 provided a separate report. The Sheffield profile, of course, focused on DV.

All of the profiles made references to alcohol. However, few (for example, Leicester who used keywords to identify alcohol-related offences, and Newham who extracted information using drugs and alcohol feature codes) were able to focus on alcohol-related offending specifically. This is mainly because of the difficulty in accurately identifying alcohol-related crime, and evidence was often anecdotal in areas which couldn't extract alcohol-related crime. More information on the areas' findings associated with alcohol-related violence is provided in a later section of this report.

5 Violence

Many of the results reported in the profiles are not directly comparable. This is for several reasons; firstly the definition of what is counted as violent crime differs between areas (see section 4.1), and secondly each profile presented the results of their analysis using slightly different subsets of the violence data (for example, Birmingham D1 reported findings for all violence then concentrated on hotspots for further analysis, and Haringey reported results for non-domestic daytime, non-domestic night-time, alcohol-related, and domestic violence). Even areas which divided their results in a similar way (for example, Waltham Forest and Leicester both divided offences by domestic and non-domestic) could not be directly compared as they reported different types of results (Waltham Forest reported statistics with reference to time of day, weekday, geographical hotspots and suspect and victim demographics. Leicester, on the other hand, did not report any statistics for non-domestic sexual offences at all instead choosing to report findings and recommendations from a report published on the Crime Reduction website³). These issues must be considered throughout this report.

The results reported in this section (chapter 5) are for all violence (which is, of course, dependent on the areas definition of violence), non-domestic violence or night-time economy violence depending on the area. This chapter reports relevant findings from all of the profiles except Sheffield who only focused on DV.

5.1 What is counted as violent crime?

The Home Office counts all offences categorised as Violence Against the Person (VAP), Sexual Offences and Robbery as violent crime. Eight areas (Lewisham, Waltham Forest, Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Leicester, Doncaster, Kirklees, and City & Holbeck) included all three major categories as violence in their analyses. A further five used VAP offences only (Camden, Ealing, Haringey, Newham, and Bristol). In some areas only select VAP offences were included (in Ealing, Haringey, Leicester, Kirklees, and City & Holbeck), and in others non-violent crimes were considered (for example, Birmingham D1 considered all crime in & around licensed premises including criminal damage, vehicle crime, theft and burglary, and Ealing and Kirklees both included affray and violent disorder). There is no data for Sheffield as their focus was on domestic rather than all violence.

Birmingham D3 produced an overview table of what was included as violent crime and details of sub-categories used for analysis. This provided a full list of offences referred to using section numbers under acts of parliament and/or Home Office codes. This table clearly displayed which offences were included as violent crime and which category they were attributed to for analysis. The table itself did not take up much space but is an invaluable tool for the reader. The author recommends this method to analysts as an easy and effective way of outlining which offences are included in category definitions.

One area reported having difficulty interpreting the guidelines, and there was confusion as to what constitutes VAP (see excerpt):

“Clear guidelines as to dataset were not issued by TP for the compilation of this report. The guidelines vaguely refer to “all violent crime... [including] sexual offences and robbery” however only

³ Guidance for Local Partnerships on Tackling Sexual Violence 2006, available at <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/dv/dv13.pdf>

1.8% of [area name] Robbery offences and 1.7% of Sex offences have received Home Office Classification of 'Violence Against the Person'. There are 153 offences listed within the HO VAP classification. It has not been feasible in the time available to analyse 153 separate crime 'types'. Following consultation with colleagues, the author of this report extracted ONLY offences categorised as HO VAP. It is recommended that, for future reports of this type, HO Class codes are specified for inclusion/ exclusion."

This begs the question of why almost 2% of robberies and sex offences are classed as VAP when they have their own Home Office major classification codes. It is also clear that the analyst is unaware of the fact the robbery and sexual offences are considered to be violent crime categories, which is surprising considering that areas ought to be routinely producing problem profiles for violence. Despite these issues a solution was reached and the author of the report made it clear which categories were subject to analysis. In addition, the recommendation that Home Office class codes are specified for inclusion/exclusion in the analysis is a good one, and would help to eliminate similar problems in the future.

5.2 Data used

All of the profiles reported analyses using police recorded crime data. Often incident reports were also discussed (for example, in Birmingham D1 and City & Holbeck); however it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two. Other police recorded data sets utilised by the profiles were Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) data (Camden, Haringey, Newham, Lewisham), and crime reports from the British Transport Police (City & Holbeck). Transport for London data (Camden, Haringey), ambulance call-out data (Birmingham D1, Camden, Haringey), fear of crime survey data (Camden, Haringey, Leicester), METSTATS (Haringey and Lewisham), and the deprivation indices (Birmingham D1 and Birmingham D3) were also consulted for contextual information and to benefit additional analysis. Camden, Haringey and Newham also reported using extra data sources; Newham reported using Crimint, NSPIS, LASS (London Analysts Support Site), the Newham ASB system (FLARE), national statistics and BCS data, and Haringey utilised OASys and ASSET. Camden incorporated CCTV data, weather information, street warden reports, noise nuisance logs and licensing information. The inclusion of analyses of extra data sets is commendable and led to some interesting findings; however, there were cases where consulting external data had nothing or little to add to existing analysis. Although it is helpful to know which data sets are useful some analysts still included extensive results on the topics when a sentence stating that the data was consulted and proved irrelevant would have been sufficient. Analysts must be aware not to waste their (and their readers) time by including such results. The final point to make about data sets is to state the source effectively; as a non-resident of London it is difficult for the author to determine what is meant by terms such as Crimint and METSTATS as only the shorthand or acronym of the system or service was provided. In addition, knowledge of what ASSET and OASys are is only due to previous experience with the police. Clarification of where areas are accessing data from would be helpful for the reader to put the document findings into context.

5.3 Time frame considered

Most areas choose to concentrate on the last three years' of crime data. Nine focused on the period 1-Oct-03 to 30-Sep-06 (Birmingham D3, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, Haringey, Kirklees, Lewisham, Leicester, Newham, and Waltham Forest) and a further one looked at a similar timeframe (Camden – Jul-03 to Jun-06). Others focused on the most recent year (Ealing - 1-Nov-05 to 31-Oct-06, Birmingham D1 - 1-Apr-05 to 31-Mar-06, and Bristol - 1-Apr-06 to 30-Sep-06).

5.4 Offences

Trends in violent crime

Recorded violent crime comprises of three main offence groups (Walker et al, 2006). The breakdown of offences by major grouping is 87% for violence against the person, 5% percent for sexual offences and 8% for robbery nationally (ibid), however, different areas report variations on this. For example, Burrell & Erol (2006) found that eighty percent of recorded violent crimes were VAP, sixteen percent were robbery (both personal and business) and four percent were sexual offences in their analysis of violent crime in the West Midlands. These profiles show different trends again with Lewisham reporting 77% of recorded violent crime to be VAP, 20% to be robbery and 3% sexual offences. Waltham reported a similar breakdown; 76% for VAP, 21% for robbery and 3% for sexual offences.

The percentage of total crime attributable to violent offending also varies between areas. Ealing reported that 23% of all geocoded offences were violent in nature (excluding robbery), Haringey reported 26%, and Lewisham 30%. Leicester reported a similar proportion with 28% of all offending being attributable to violent offending although they broke this down into assault or harassment (22%), robbery (2%) and sexual offences (2%). Waltham Forest reported that violent crime accounted for 24% of total crime in their area; they also established that VAP accounted for 18% of total offences. Newham found a similar proportion of all crime was attributable to VAP (19%). Camden found a slightly lower proportion of total crime to be attributable to VAP at the beginning of the period (16% in 2003) but reported that this rose to 22% in 2006. Finally, Kirklees reported that assaults accounted for 20% of all crime in the BCU.

The volume of offences are not reported here; as the timeframes and offences included as violent crime differed by area these would just be arbitrary numbers with no context and so will not be useful here. The important trends, increases, decreases and stability, are, however, reported. Nine profiles reported recent increases in violent crime (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Bristol, Camden, City & Holbeck, Haringey, Newham, Leicester, and Lewisham). Birmingham D1 reported that violent crime had increased by 23% in their area between 2004/05 and 2005/06 which is a concern when compared to an overall force trend of a 3% increase. Birmingham D3 echoed their neighbours concern about violence, particularly as it is now attributing to greater and greater proportions of total crime. It was reported that as the D3 BCU has made progress reducing other crime types violent crime is becoming an increasingly large contributor to total crime. This means the BCU needs to focus on the control and reduction of violence as this has become more critical to the BCU achieving reductions and meeting its 5% reduction target for all crime. It was reported that the control strategies for robbery and sexual offending have been effective in maintaining a stable level of recorded offences in each; however, the VAP control strategy has not been effective. It was recommended

that more proactive policing of people who may be carrying weapons/being generally abusive has led to an increase in crime but may have led to a reduction in serious offences and helped to reassure the public. It was also reported that in the years where the BCU records lower violent crime it is largely due to reductions in less serious offences where victims are not physically harmed.

The increases in violent crime in City & Holbeck are confirmed by a number of data sets including BTP data, CAD calls and recorded crime statistics. There has been a steady increase in the average number of offences in the last six months of the analysis period; it currently stands at 519 offences per month compared to an overall monthly average of 425. Recent increases coincide with the start of the TVCP and it is felt that the policy to encourage DV victims to report crime has contributed to this. Recent increases are attributable to a number of different crime types; rises were reported for robbery (now gradually increasing after the end of the Street Crime Initiative in the summer of 2005), common assault and harassment.

Haringey reported a stable trend for violent crime until 2005 after which violence increased between January and June. This was attributed to increases in ABH, harassment and robbery, A 121% increase was noted for Penalty Notices for Disorder (used in section 5 public order offences), and CAD calls were reported to increase year on year. Leicester reported an increase in violent crime between 2003/04 and 2004/05 but this was followed by a fall between 2004/05 and 2005/06. Bristol reported a small increase (0.7%) in violent crime when the April-September 2006 was compared to the same period of the previous year. However, the sector containing the city centre recorded a 7% reduction and violence fell by 12% in the city centre itself. Bristol has achieved continual reduction in city centre violent crime since engaging with the TVCP and associated funding streams. The city centre sector has seen better reductions than the BCU for GBH and ABH, and a better rate of reductions for common assaults. However, harassments are increasing and are the same as for Bristol as a whole.

Lewisham reported that although overall violent crime has increase the number of notifiable offences has fallen. Recorded crime statistics show that common assault increased over time, ABH increased and GBH figures were consistent. Ambulance data indicated a decrease in the number of assaults.

Three areas reported an overall downward trend in violent crime (Doncaster, Kirklees and Newham) with a further one reporting a post-TVCP reduction (Waltham Forest). Doncaster reported that robbery (both personal and business) had increase but that VAP had fallen leading to an overall reduction in violent crime. Kirklees reported that assaults fell by 6% between April-June 2006 and July-September 2006 (a reduction of 9% on April-June 2005). Newham reported an overall downward trend and estimated that the BCU would achieve a 2% reduction in 2006/07. It was also predicted that serious assaults would fall by 17% and that hate crime would fall by 7%. ABH was predicted to increase by 4%. Waltham Forest reported a decrease on the previous year's figures since joining the TVCP in May 2006. Violence had consistently remained lower in contrast to the trend for violent crime to increase year on year. Violence in the first three months after TVCP was reported within the normal statistical variation however there was a big decrease in August (followed by slight increase in September although this was still below the original levels. The fall was attributed to the new interventions introduced under the TVCP with the delay being put down to getting the initiatives up and running. Overall the BCU considered that the TVCP has had a positive impact on violent crime figures. Kirklees also reported reductions following the TVCP; assaults were down 8% since the last TVCP submission. Coupled with an increase in

drunk and disorderly arrests (at the expense of more serious assaults) it is suggested that early interventions can reduce the overall assault figures. However, they also noted that sections 2, 4 and 5⁴ do not feature as much as in 2003 indicating that disputes are now escalating where once a lesser offence would result.

City & Holbeck noted reductions across selected crime types; firstly alcohol-related violence was said to have fallen over the last six months of the analysis period, and secondly the monthly average of section 5 public order offences fell from 61 to 50.

Peak offences

There is a general consensus that the peak offence for violence (or VAP at least) is Actual Bodily Harm (section 47 of the Offences against the Persons Act 1861), although Public Order (sections 4 and 5 of the Public Order Act 1986), Common Assault, Harassment offences and Grievous Bodily Harm (sections 18 and 20 of the Offences against the Person Act 1861) also feature.

Birmingham D3 stated that sections 18, 20 and 47 offences were the most common types of VAP in their area, followed by threatening behaviour, harassment and disorder. They also noted that ABH was the top offence for both domestic and non-domestic related offending. Birmingham D1 also reported ABH to be the top VAP category; 53% of VAP was attributed to ABH, in turn accounting for a massive 44% of all violent crime. This was followed by public order (11% of VAP and 10% of all violence), other assaults (10% of VAP and 8% of violence), harassment (9% of VAP and 8% of violence), and common assault (6% of VAP and 5% of all violence). The proportion of violent crimes attributable to ABH was even higher in hotspot areas (60% in one and 57% in another).

Assaults and harassment accounted for 90% of violent offending in City & Holbeck (leaving the remaining 10% split between murder, manslaughter, sexual offences and robbery). Assaults and harassment also made up the bulk of offences in Camden; 32% of violence was common assault, 29% was ABH, 26% harassment offences, and 3% GBH. In Doncaster the top 5 offence types accounted for 85% of their violent crime; broken down this was 50% ABH, 16% for section 5 public order, 13% for common assaults, 4% for section 4 public order and 2% for personal robbery. An additional five offence categories took the total to 90%.

Waltham Forest reported that the main offences were harassment (30%, n=4078), ABH (28%, n=3756) and Common Assault (27%, n=3670) over the last 3 years. The profile also reported a similar breakdown of offences for the analysis period since the introduction of the TVCP but with an increase in ABH (28% to 37%) and a corresponding decrease in common assault (27% to 29%) and harassments (30% to 29%), which was suggested to be more likely to be due to change in class codes rather than a change in the pattern of offences.

ABH, public order, and common assault feature in various combinations: Leicester reports the top categories in this order (with ABH as being responsible for a third of all non-domestic violence), Ealing puts ABH top followed by common assault and Newham puts common assault top with ABH second. Lewisham reports common assault as the most common offence in 2003/04 but notes at trend towards ABH in the last 2 years. Combined, however, the two offence types account for 67 to 68% of VAP per year. The

⁴ The current author assumes that the profile was referring to sections from the Protection from Harassment Act 1997; however this could not be confirmed by the information provided in the profile. It is also possible that sections 4 and 5 might refer to the Public Order Act 1986.

proportion of offences attributed to these categories differed in Newham with a third of VAP being common assault and a quarter ABH.

Some areas reported recent increases in particular offence types, for example Kirklees noted increases in ABH towards the end of their analysis period. Haringey also reported increases in ABH and attributed this to changes to the counting rules. The rises in harassment and robbery in Haringey were also partially attributed to the changes, although an increase in section 5 public order was also deemed to have impacted on the harassment total. Increases in robbery were seen as a regression to the volume of offences seen pre-the Safer Streets Initiative; it was expected that the rise followed the end of the funding period.

A few profiles reported trends in peak call types, most notably Lewisham and Camden which both placed the top CAD call category as “disturbance in a public place”. Other featured call types included calls for assistance to violence against the person offences, a disturbance in a private place, or a disturbance highlighted by CCTV cameras. A high number of abandoned calls were also noted in Lewisham.

Kirklees considered the volume and nature of calls for service in their hotspots areas. Two hotspot areas recorded high instances of calls for anti-social behaviour & loutish behaviour (a majority of which mentioned groups of young people being noisy and abusive and/or consuming alcohol) and safety welfare concerns (which covers missing persons, children left home alone and concerns for elderly neighbours). Other call types included contact about violent crimes or criminal damage being committed. The third hotspot areas also reported calls about anti-social and loutish behaviour to be the top category, with the majority of these being about groups of drunken individuals being noisy and/or abusive. Sixteen percent of the calls made in this hotspot area were calls to the night-time economy specifically.

Other offences

A number of the profiles reported results in relation to other offences. A brief summary of some of the more interesting findings are included in this section.

Robbery trends were discussed by some of the profiles. Kirklees reported that robbery figures were heavily influenced by the Street Crime Initiative (SCI) and the end of the programme has brought a steady increase in the number of robbery offences. It is believed that the tougher sentences, dedicated courts, specialised offender treatment and partnership work introduced under the SCI all contributed to the reduction in robbery. Since the SCI has ended the impetus has been lost and personal robbery is fast becoming a problem again. Leicester reported that robbery offences in the city generally fell into one of three categories; (1) children on children offences outside school or in open recreational areas in the early afternoon, (2) groups of males preying on a lone person walking home from school or work in the evening, and (3) a single male offender targeting a drunk victim walking home from the city centre alone at night. City & Holbeck discussed stolen property and reported that the property most likely to be stolen in a robbery were mobile phones, cash, bankcards and handbags. It is therefore not surprising that areas such as Waltham Forest attributed the bulk of their robberies to personal, as opposed to business, offences (94% of reported robberies were personal in nature during the period (although they did notice this fell to 92% in the post-TVCP period)).

Waltham Forest also broke down sex offences and found that 25% of reported sexual offences were rapes, the remaining 75% being other sexual offences. Doncaster reported that the top three sex offences were exposure (25%, n=79), sexual assault female (21%, n=65) and rape of a female over the age of 16 (14%, n=44). Some analysis of seasonality was also conducted but it was found to be misleading as reporting is open to bias from historical reports (i.e. where someone reports a sexual offence a while after the offence has taken place). Once these reports were removed it was estimated that there was an average of 34 sexual offences per month in Doncaster over the time period. Kirklees also reported trends in sexual offending and found a dip between August 2004 and August 2005; this was attributed to NCRS changes.

Several areas also discussed racially and/or religiously aggravated offences. In Birmingham D1, for example, there was an overrepresentation of racially aggravated offences in hotspots. Overall racially/religiously aggravated offences only account for 2% of all VAP but they accounted for 3% of VAP in hotspots and a 6% in another. City & Holbeck also considered this category of hate crime and found that a relatively small proportion of these crimes are violent (for example, there were 77 racially/religiously aggravated offences in the outer city of which only 19 were assaults). One of the hotspots did report higher levels of racially/religiously aggravated assaults; however this was attributable to a high concentration of Pakistani and Bangladeshi residents.

Detections and disposals

Some of the profiles reported trends in detection rates over the time period. Kirklees reported a fall in the number of detections in the last quarter of the analysis period compared to previous quarters; 30% in Jul-Sep 2006 compared to 42% for the previous quarter (Apr-Jun 2006) and 44% in the same period of the previous year (Jul-Sep 2005). Bristol reported a reverse of this trend with an increase in detections over time (34% in Apr-Sep 2005 to 45% halfway through 2006).

The Doncaster profile provided detection rates by major offence category; 40% for VAP, 22% for sexual offences, 31% for personal robbery and 44% for business robbery. The overall detection rate for violent crime was 39%. Doncaster also provided details of disposals, with 23% of cases leading to someone being interviewed and released, and the identification of a suspect is made in 18%. A further 18% cases resulted in a caution, 14% were reviewed but there was no additional information available, 6% were dealt with at the magistrates or youth courts and 5% with a penalty notice. In 6% of cases the witness or complainant declined or was unable to give evidence.

Birmingham D3 discussed charging and reported that threats to kill are taken seriously by the police and will usually end with a charge being made. It was also stated that detected incidences of attempted murder, murder and manslaughter will always result in a charge being made. With regards to detections the D3 BCU reported a general reduction in detection rates across several crime types during 2004/05; this was reported to be indicative of a general procedural problem. Detection rates improved in 2005/06 which was attributed to an improvement in police procedures. Finally, the profile found that there was a higher detection rate for child abuse and domestic offences compared to other offences where the victim knew the offence, indicative that the dedicated resources put in place to deal with these particular types of crime have led to improvements in detection rates. However, the profile reported that detection rates are particularly low for hate crime.

Weapon usage

The British Crime Survey (BCS) estimates that only 45% of violent crime involved the use of a weapon (source: Newham profile). However, this appears to vary by offence type as Waltham Forest reported that 50%+ murders, robberies and GBH offences involved a weapon. This is perhaps not surprising as these offences are towards the more serious end of the violent crime spectrum. It is also worth mentioning that Birmingham D3 reported that offences involving young people are more likely to involve weapons.

Knives were identified as the most common weapon involved in violent crime by both Birmingham D3 and Waltham Forest; knives were used in 23-25% of VAP in Birmingham and 18% of all violent offences in Waltham Forest. Knives also emerged as the single largest category of weapon in Leicester (n=369). Other items named included baseball bats, glasses and hammers (there was also a large “other weapon” category (n=424) which encompassed a whole host of miscellaneous categories). On a positive note Newham reported a downwards trend for knife use (although this was accompanied by a slight increase in for “other” weapons), and Haringey expressed concern about the use of knives.

Firearms are used infrequently in violent crime; Waltham Forest reported that just 3% of violent offences involved the use of a firearm, and this encompassed both offences where a firearm was seen and where they were fired. Leicester reported 55 offences of possession of a firearm in the last three years. Fifty-two violent offences using a firearm were identified in the last year of the analysis period of which 12 were ABH offences and 9 were robberies. Newham and Birmingham D3 both reported some positive and some negative findings in relation to firearms. Newham reported that the trend for firearms was stable but the aggravated burglary showed a notable increase in their use. Haringey reported that gun crime was down but the use of imitation firearms is prevalent, and that there was concern about gang activity. Birmingham D3 confirmed that the majority of firearms offences are still for threatening people or possession rather than for firing, however, it was also reported that offenders are becoming more willing to use firearms.

Other weapons mentioned by the profiles included coshes, sticks, batons, stones, and glass bottles. Birmingham D3 reported that people are becoming more willing to carry and threaten others with coshes, sticks and batons but that they don't necessarily use them. The D3 BCU also noted that there was a relatively high rate for use of bricks and stones (and the willingness to use them). It was suggested that this may reflect the ready availability of such weapons and the fact using them requires no forethought. This is likely to make them weapons of choice for any offender who is outside and chooses to react in the heat of the moment. With reference to glass use the City & Holbeck profile reported findings from data collected by Leeds General Infirmary, where 26 out of 1523 assaults recorded weapon use all of which involved a glass or bottle. It was also noted that 40% patients had not reported the assault to police.

The Doncaster profile includes parts of the body as weapons and found that the top weapons category was punching, slapping or hitting with fists or hands, accounting for 34% of weapons used (n=3,982 out of 9,400 cases). The modus operandi (MO) was also discussed with the predominant MO involving threats or physical violence (56%). Other MO categories included the victim/offender being under the influence of drugs, “motive – domestic incident”, “force – bodily pressure”, “more than one offender

involved”, “unprovoked attack”, and “motive-racial” (note that multiple categories could be applied to single incidents).

The use of weapons remains a major cause for concern in many areas; however there is some good news. Birmingham D3 reported that weapon use in both GBH and ABH offences has declined over the past 3 years, and Bristol found that there was no evidence to suggest that the carrying and use of weapons was organised. It was also reported that there are no gang related issues in city centre violence and that weapons are almost never used. As a final point Waltham Forest compared weapon trends pre- and post- the introduction of the TVCP, however there was no dramatic difference in weapons usage for any individual offence category.

5.5 Location

Violent crime clusters in both commercial and residential areas, and links are often made between violence and the night-time economy.

Town and city centres

Town and city centres were highlighted as hotspots for violent crime by all thirteen profiles which considered all violence and/or night-time economy related violence. Newham named busy commercial and commuter areas as prime hotspots, Ealing named shopping and social areas and Bristol reported that the city centre and the streets running off it were primary locations for violence. Leicester highlighted five hotspots for violence one of which was the city centre and another which contains many NTE venues frequented by students; violence hotspots are synonymous with the areas in which people socialise.

City & Holbeck also their highlighted city centre (Leeds) as a hotspot for violence. The most prevalent type of offending in Leeds related to ABH, common assault and harassment (83% of violence in the hotspot). Kirklees, Lewisham, Camden and Doncaster highlighted town centres; Huddersfield centre was hailed the busiest location in the south division of Kirklees and it was established that the two top streets for repeat calls for service contained the highest concentration of NTE venues (the high level of calls for service were directly influenced by high number of assaults which take place here). Lewisham highlighted the town centre as a hotspot for both recorded crime and CAD calls, and Camden found that the Camden Town and Holburn accounted for a quarter of the boroughs crime over the last three years (July 2003 to June 2006) rising to 27% in the last year. Doncaster identified the top streets in the town centre and established that they accounted for 41% of all violent crime in there. Overall, they found that ‘hot streets’ cluster in hotspots (15 out of 24 top streets fell into the top three hotspot areas).

Haringey considered the rate of night-time offences occurring in the prominent night-time hotspot. Eight percent of crimes in this hotspot were identified as night-time offences which only equates to 1.8 offences per week. This indicates that there is only a small NTE problem. Other hotspots were identified in the area, e.g. Tottenham Court Road, and were mostly found to be commercial.

Birmingham D3 found that many hotspot locations for non-domestic VAP are located in commercial shopping areas and often cluster along main roads. These high concentrations of offences reflect the high concentrations of people congregating in and

travelling through these locations, and the high flow of people will increase the number of interactions and thus increase the number of opportunities for 'trigger incidents' to occur. Birmingham D3 reported that the most common VAP (sections 18, 20, and 47) were triggered at locations by the same factors as less serious offences (e.g. disorder). Birmingham D3 also found that non-domestic VAP occurs most frequently at a limited number of public locations which creates hotspots but that offences in dwellings are more dispersed across the BCU.

Birmingham D1 identified three areas (two commercial and one residential) as requiring strategic intervention. Case studies of each area were included in the profile. City & Holbeck reported that one third of offences between April and September 2006 occurred in the city centre and two thirds in the outer districts (34% compared to 66%). The city centre accounted for 42% of violent crime in the same period of the previous year and the decrease is reportedly due to focused attention on the city centre and an increase in reports in the outer districts. Overall the city centre had 20 fewer offences per month in the last 6 months (April to September 2006) compared to the same period of 2005 and the outer districts have seen an increase of 80 offences per month on average. Waltham Forest reported statistics the location of non-domestic ABH and GBH offences; 54% of non-domestic ABH offences occurred in the street, 24% in domestic locations, 15% inside commercial premises, and 5% in licensed premises. Two percent of locations were unknown (data is based on a three year period). The proportions for non-domestic GBH are 61% on the street, 21% in domestic settings, 9% inside commercial premises, 7% on licensed premises and 2% unknown.

Residential clusters

Eight areas reported residential clusters of violence (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, Haringey, Leicester, Lewisham, and Newham). Leicester reported the city centre and the student NTE area as having the highest volumes of violent offences but also named three residential hotspots. Problems in residential areas are often linked to deprivation, ASB and fighting amongst young people. It is noted the student night-time economy area is also home to a large number of student residences. Birmingham D1 reported a residential estate as the third highest area for violence, and City & Holbeck named three residential areas as hotspots for assaults in the outer city. Two of these areas were local authority owned housing estates and the third largely consisted of low value housing with a high percentage of privately owner bedsit accommodation.

Birmingham D3 found areas of high density housing and low density social housing areas (i.e. those suffering from social deprivation) to be hotspots for non-domestic VAP. The profile argued that this *"reflects the higher concentrations of people living in these areas under hard pressed circumstances, who may be unemployed, thus spending less time occupied away from home, be suffering from addictions, and maybe disengaged with law enforcement, taking 'matters in their own hands'."* This is an interesting statement and highlights the need for analysts to be careful when making inferences about the causes of crime. Judgements should not be made without evidence to back up theories; it can not be argued that people living under hard pressed circumstances are more likely to be addicted to substances without the provision of data to illustrate the point. In this instance the statement appears to just be a list of *potential* factors associated with living under hard pressed circumstances and how this might influence

crime, however, some care should be taken to ensure that such statements are not open to misinterpretation by the reader.

Returning to the issue of residential hotspots, Newham found that 43% of VAP show the venue as 'identical to victims address'. Newham reported this to mean that the finding that a significant number of residents feel unsafe walking in the area alone at night is a flawed public perception.

Haringey found that youth crime is linked to problem estates. Upon further analysis it was found that 29 victims of youth crime were from the same school; this means that these youths accounted for 11% of all victims (where a school was entered) and 5% of all school-aged victims. This is important as there are 84 schools listed in the area.

Types of premises

Types of premises highlighted as problematic in relation to violence include licensed premises (Birmingham D1, Bristol, Camden, City & Holbeck, Ealing, Kirklees, Leicester, Doncaster, Haringey, and Birmingham D3), hospitals (e.g. Bristol, and City & Holbeck) and schools (e.g. Leicester, Birmingham D1, and Birmingham D3). Public transport (e.g. Birmingham D1, Camden, City & Holbeck, Ealing, Kirklees, Haringey, and Lewisham) and police stations/custody suites (Lewisham and City & Holbeck) also feature. It is not just the types of premises which are 'hot' but often specific venues (see previous section for Haringey example of a 'hot' school).

Night-time economy venues (e.g. pubs, wine bars, nightclubs and takeaways) are popular hotspots for violent crime. Kirklees reported that offences on one hotspot area could be largely attributed to the night-time economy and that NTE locations changed over the course of the week. They also reported that within this hotspot the top road contains lots of pubs, nightclubs and takeaways and hosts one of the biggest clubs.

Bristol reported that a link between violence and licensed premises is evident as all of the top streets are lined with pubs and clubs. Over three quarters of offences occurred on street or inside a licensed premise; street (54%), nightclub (14%) and pub (8%). It is also noted that five out of the six top venues for violence were bars or clubs, the other one being Bristol Royal Infirmary. City & Holbeck also reported an overrepresentation of licensed premises; nine out of the top twelve locations were licensed premises (the remaining venues being the bus station, hospital and the police custody area). Ealing also reported pubs, clubs and takeaways to be problematic with 43% of offences linked to licensed premises in one street. The top repeat venues were identified and it was established that one venue accounted for 17% of all offences in the hotspot (three venues accounted for a massive 29% of offences). Fifty-three percent of all offences occurred on the street.

Camden found a slight clustering of hot venues with four out of the top ten venues being located in one hotspot area. They also found that nine out of the twelve venues involved in the Best Bar None scheme were located in areas highlighted as high for alcohol-related violence; however, none of these venues were considered to be contributing the problem.

Birmingham also identified the top premises for violence and then concentrated further analysis on specific venues. Focus was placed on NTE venues (three out of five top locations for violence were NTE venues in the biggest hotspot). Analysis concentrated on licensed premises established that the majority of offences linked to licensed premises occur between 10pm and 2am Friday to Sunday, and that the most common

offence committed in or around such venues are woundings (19%) followed by criminal damage (16%). Case studies on specific premises established that the top public house recorded twice as many incidents and offences than any other refreshment location on the BCU. One of the key locations for which a case study was presented was a takeaway; this is a well-known venue and is reported to attract people en route home from other licensed premises. It has been named as a crime generator.

Birmingham D3 found that the numbers of violent crimes in public houses and social clubs have increased over the last 3 years but offending levels remain low and are concentrated in a few premises. Many of these venues hold discos and are considered an alternative to Birmingham city centre by young people.

Leicester quoted nightclubs, bars, and nightclubs as hot venues. The university campus was also highlighted, along with night buses and taxis. The number of licensed premises is increasing in the city centre; there are currently 390 licensed venues in city centre of which 80 have entertainment licenses. The combined capacity of these venues caters for 60,000 customers. There are 166 licensed premises in the student residential area which provide an alternative to the city centre for a night out; these bars are regularly full to capacity. Several nightclubs hold one-off nights which cater for a range of musical tastes, and these nights attract people from across the country.

Problems occur with reference to night buses and taxis when people are waiting for food or transport home. A street has been identified where people flag down cabs ahead of others causing problems, and another has been identified where lots of people's paths cross as they move between venues (note that venues closing later than 2am are fairly widely dispersed geographically). Overall, it was reported that there are key links between the increase in the number of people congregating in an area and a rise in disorder and/or violent crime.

Public transport nodes and routes are often highlighted as places where violent crime clusters. Ealing identified the train station as a hotspot, and Lewisham identified bus stops as prime locations for violence, along with the shopping centre and market place, using CAD calls. Kirklees reported that NTE locations change across the week, and put Tesco and the bus station as the peak locations for violence on Thursday and Friday nights. City & Holbeck also highlighted their bus station, placing it in the top twelve violent crime locations. Haringey had some good news and reported that there are few non-domestic violent crimes on public transport during the day.

Birmingham D1 dedicated a section to crime on bus routes, and found that the majority of violence on buses was committed on one of the arterial roads out of Birmingham. Particular bus numbers emerged as problematic and it was confirmed that these buses use the same routes (i.e. the different bus numbers leave the city using the same arterial road and it is on this road that bus violence is a problem). Camden identified bus nine bus routes along with three tube stations as problematic. It was also reported that 40% of people avoid public transport for fear of ASB, drunkenness and disorder, and that passenger numbers have fallen.

Hospitals also feature as hot locations in some areas; Bristol reported that the Bristol Royal Infirmary was the second hottest venue for violence in the BCU, and City & Holbeck placed their hospital in top twelve premises.

The Birmingham BCUs discussed details with reference to school-related offences. Birmingham D1 identified the worst schools for violent crime, and found that 22% of school-related incidents involved the use of a weapon. Violent crime increases at the start of school terms especially in the autumn/winter and spring terms (September and

January). Neighbouring D3 reported that relatively few offences occur within schools and that such offences have fallen over the last 3 years, which reflects the procedural changes for dealing with violent incidents at school premises. The bad news is that non-domestic VAP is often recorded to involved children attending particular secondary schools (named three) and these trends in crime are responsible for creating hotspots of non-domestic VAP at particular locations.

Some profiles listed the types of hot premises. These are reported here so that the context is not lost by distributing the results throughout the section. Doncaster reported that 40% of offences occurred outside, 31% in a dwelling, 5% in a public house or wine bar, 4% in an alley or footpath, 2% in a nightclub, 2% in a school or college, 1.5% in a play area, 1.5% in a supermarket, 1% in a car park and 1% in a takeaway. Haringey split the data into daytime and night-time and reported the statistics for non-domestic offences occurring in each. Forty-one percent of the venue codes for non-domestic daytime offences were in public spaces. This is compared to 42% at night. Further results for night-time offending report that 31% of offences were committed in a domestic residence (note that the figure is 28% for daytime offences), and 8% in a licensed premise (4% pub and 4% nightclub); the latter result equates to one offence per week. Night-time offences were clustered in specific areas, including the area close to the police station and a major tube station.

Birmingham D3 reported that the majority of non-domestic VAP occurs in the road followed by dwellings (there is evidence that the degrees to which different descriptors are used for different locations are changing as officers attempt to be more accurate in describing offence locations). It was also reported that VAP in public places is of a more serious nature resulting in more harm to the victim than offences committed in non-public places.

Hotspots

Hotspots for violent crime were identified by all thirteen profiles. Hotspots can account for a significant proportion of violence in their areas, meaning that their identification creates excellent opportunities for crime reduction. Doncaster reported that the top ten areas in the location column of the crime report accounted for 60% of violent crime; the top three accounted for a massive 32%. Camden reported that the two largest hotspots account for 27% of all VAP and that violent crime in these hotspots has increased as a percentage of all crime over time.

Hotspots tend to remain consistent over time (e.g. Ealing, Haringey, and Kirklees). Kirklees reported that there had been a reduction in the volume of offences occurring in their biggest hotspot area; however, the specifics of the problem, i.e. location, timings and victimology, had not changed.

Many of the hotspots described by the profiles were linked to the NTE and/or alcohol-related crime. Leicester mapped individual offences in the hotspot areas and highlighted that violent crime hotspots overlap with areas with high concentrations of licensed premises. Lewisham noted a town centre hotspot which contained clusters of alcohol-related violence, and Kirklees identified the top five streets which were all associated with the NTE. The string of premises lining the hottest street in Kirklees accounted for 44% of violence in the last quarter analysed; this was up from 31% in the previous quarter and 42% in the same quarter of the previous year.

Birmingham D1 identified primary and secondary hotspots and found that hotspots for recorded crime and ambulance call-outs were synonymous and show a correlation between violent crime and licensed premises; violent crime hotspots correspond with those areas with the greatest numbers of licensed premises.

Haringey found the hotspots for alcohol-related crime were the same during the day and at night, and unsurprisingly these hotspots correlated with where licensed premises are located. Eighteen percent of night-time violence is generated by people attending licensed premises in hotspots and leaving the areas via public transport. Haringey reported reductions in the traditional night-time hotspots since the introduction of staggered closing times under the Licensing Act 2003. However, the Act has had a negative impact in other areas; one emerging hotspot has found that their venues are attracting more custom through extended licensing hours and that the associated queuing is a precursor for violence. Poor night-time (i.e. post-1am) public transport is also contributing; buses only go in one direction and there are few taxis.

City & Holbeck also identified NTE areas as hotspots. Four areas of the city centre were identified as hotspots for assaults; three of these have a high concentration of pubs and clubs, and although the fourth has few bars it does host a number of takeaways and an unofficial taxi rank. Peak times for violence differed across the hotspots; 8pm onwards for one, 11pm until 3am for the second and 1am to 3am in the other two (the area with the taxi rank is one of the 1-3am peak areas).

Bristol stated that one street and city centre remain the most active areas for violence; however, they have both seen a downward trend between April and September 2006. This has been attributed to later opening hours (introduced under the Licensing Act 2003) being utilised by more licensed premises meaning that there is no longer a rush to move between venues at pub closing time. Bristol also reported an upward trend in an area used as a popular route into the city and another with a growing NTE. The increase in the number of venues in the latter indicates a possible shift from the city centre and means that more and more people are congregating in a compact space.

Birmingham D3 also noted a hotspot in an area synonymous with high volumes of people; the increased number of offences existed even when normalised to the residential population and reflected the high volumes of people who use the area to shop and travel into and out of the main city (Birmingham). The D3 BCU also established that whilst many hotspots for non-domestic VAP also experience ASB and disorder not all ASB/disorder hotspots are hot for non-domestic VAP overall.

Several other areas reported hotspots for specific crime types. Kirklees reported that 67% of offences in their hotspot were ABH, and Doncaster reported that the peak crime types in hotspots mirror those for violent crime overall (i.e. ABH, section 5 public order and common assault). City & Holbeck reported a hotspot area within the city centre for robbery. The city centre was also a hotspot for sexual offences, with 23% of sex offences being reported as occurring there. A secondary hotspot was identified in an outer city centre area (20%); the remaining offences were spread evenly across the other districts. Birmingham D1 also reported sexual offences to be spread across the borough but found that small hotspots appeared in close proximity to transport hubs and licensed premises. Leicester reported hotspots for sexual crime in public conveniences, parks (named two), and the bus station. It was stated that crimes at the bus station can almost certainly be linked to two nightclubs suggesting that many offences are alcohol-related. Finally, Newham identified a hotspot for hate crime.

One area (Leicester) also reported that particular people were vulnerable to assault, namely hospital, ambulance and care staff creating hotspots for violence in hospitals and children's homes.

Waltham Forest discussed the individual aspects of each identified hotspot. Primary and secondary hotspots were identified and it was deduced that there had been a higher concentration of offences in secondary hotspots since the introduction of the TVCP.

The primary hotspot is an all crime hotspot for the borough. It is the main transport and shopping hub, and has the highest footfall in the borough. There is no particular concentration of licensed premises suggesting that the high volumes of people moving through the area explain the consistently high level of VAP. The details of three secondary hotspots were also provided; one is a priority crime hotspot for all crime including ASB. A dispersal zone has recently been introduced but it has not been in place long enough to see a tangible difference in VAP yet. The area contains several licensed premises plus shops and banks which attract people during the day. It is also in close proximity to an estate so residents probably frequent area; one of boroughs main gangs originates from this estate which provides another possible VAP source. Another secondary hotspot has a substantial street crime problem. The area hosts another of Waltham Forests gangs and one of the estates to the south of this hotspot is home to many robbery nominals. The hotspot has many licensed premises and one in particular is notorious for alcohol-related crime. There are also many shops including 24 hour venues and a tube station meaning that the area has a fairly high footfall rate. The final secondary hotspot is a popular congregating point. It boasts several licensed premises, takeaways, a brothel, a transport hub with a bus turnaround and a taxi company. It is also in close proximity to Waltham Forest College and a problematic residential estate.

5.6 Timing

Time of day and weekday

Peaks for violence were predominantly centred around weekday afternoons/early evening and weekend nights.

Nine BCUs highlighted peaks in violence on weekday afternoons, most commonly between 3pm and 5pm but in some cases extending to 8pm. These peaks were often attributed to commuters (Birmingham D3, Ealing, and Camden) or to youth crime and/or the end of the school day (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Ealing, Haringey, Leicester, Lewisham, and Waltham Forest). For example, Haringey reported clusters of offences on routes which were commonly used by young people to travel to and from school, and Leicester combined the peak time (3-5pm) with the location (residential areas) and the age of offenders (peak age 11-17 in outer suburban estates) to reach the conclusion that there might be a link to schools. The final BCU reporting peaks on weekday afternoons was Newham. This report also suggested that youths might be responsible but went on to state that further analysis revealed youth crime only accounted for 13% of VAP, and that when these offences were removed the 4pm peak remained. No explanation could be offered for why adult VAP peaked at 4pm but further analysis was suggested. It is also worth noting that Birmingham D3 established that the 3-4pm was the peak period for the most common serious offences causing the most harm.

All of the profiles reported late night/early morning peaks for violent crime, especially over the weekend (Friday, Saturday and Sunday). Two areas reported peak timebands starting in the afternoon (4pm) and extending to the early hours (Newham and Ealing), and a third split the day into four equal parts stating that the evening (6pm to midnight) and early hours (midnight to 6am) of Friday and Saturday nights were peaks for violent crime (Doncaster). The length of the peak timebands in other areas varied and could start as early as 7pm (Kirklees and Camden) and finish as late as 5am (Kirklees). Typically peak timebands covered the 11pm to 3am period with a focus on the early hours of the morning (for example; Leicester 11pm to 3am, Camden 9pm to 3am in hotspots, and Bristol 11pm to 4am with a peak between 1am and 3:30am). Lewisham, Haringey and Waltham Forest follow the trend for violence in the early hours as they all reported the peak hour to be midnight-1am. Some areas reported peak timebands for other data sets including CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) calls (City & Holbeck, Lewisham), crime logs from the British Transport Police (City & Holbeck) and ambulance call outs (Lewisham), all of which supported the findings of the crime data. Birmingham D1 also considered crime at licensed premises and stated peak times to be between 8pm and 3am Friday to Sunday.

The night-time economy (NTE) and associated alcohol consumption has been commonly cited as contributing to temporal peaks. Kirklees and Leicester noted that late night peaks were NTE related, and Ealing and Birmingham D1 stated that peak times corresponded with the busy periods for licensed premises. Leicester also noted that late night peaks on weekdays could be linked to student nights as mid-week hotspots appear in NTE areas frequented by students. Waltham Forest stated that the late night peak was likely to be alcohol related and also noted that violent crime was more likely to occur in hours of darkness. Bristol highlighted that the peak period for incidents is getting later than in previous years (65% of offences took place between 23:00 and 03:59 (Apr-Sep 2006)). It was suggested that this shift could be attributable to young people going out later⁵, and that this was an effect of the changes to the Licensing Act 2003 which came into effect on 24th November 2005. It was also noted that activity on Thursday night/Friday morning and the early hours of Monday mornings was increasing indicating a trend towards and extended weekends.

Birmingham D3 provide a typical description of the temporal peaks for violence when they identified three distinct time periods are peaks for violent crime: (1) weekdays after school closing time involving mainly young people in public places, (2) early evenings when people return from work/school then go out again either to public places or other peoples homes, (3) weekends after pub closing when people out socialising are at their most intoxicated and returning home. Peaks on Friday and Saturday nights were seen to be indicative that alcohol is a factor in non-domestic VAP even when a large number of offences do not occur within licensed premises. Overall, violent crime is highest at times when the greatest flow of people occurs and when the most people (residents and visitors) are in public places.

Seasonality

Ten profiles highlighted peaks in violent crime over the summer months (June, July and/or August); Birmingham D1, Bristol, Camden, City & Holbeck, Ealing, Haringey, Kirklees, Leicester, Lewisham and Newham. Kirklees and Leicester looked at specific

⁵ Quoted from a survey run by Galaxy Radio that 24% of 18-24 year olds do not leave home for a night out until after 11pm

crime types and both came to the conclusion that the increase in assaults over the summer was due to longer days and warmer weather. Bank holidays were also mentioned (Leicester). Springtime, especially March/April, also saw peaks in some areas (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3 and Ealing) and Leicester noted peaks for both robbery and sex offences in May/June. Kirklees also noted peaks for robbery in the spring but this was only for personal offences; business robberies peaked in the autumn/winter months. Christmas time was also highlighted (Doncaster, and Ealing), although not by Kirklees who found that the Christmas period is always less busy than anticipated due to the preventative measures which are put in place over the festive period. Details of seasonal trends were not included in the Waltham Forest profile.

Contributory factors

A number of the profiles mentioned football, the 2006 World Cup in particular, as a contributory factor in relation to violent crime. Leicester called football matches “potential flashpoints for violence” and Birmingham D1 expressed concern about how the World Cup matches could negatively impact on violent crime. Doncaster considered the volumes of offences occurring on individual days in 2006 and found that the peak day for violent crime (1st July 2006) coincided with England losing to Portugal (n=74 violent crimes). The second highest day was 10th June 2006 (n=73) which is the day on which England played Paraguay. The potential influence is even more marked when the average number of offences per day in 2006 was just 28.8. Overall football was not reflected in the monthly peaks as June saw a decrease compared to May; however, the current author suggests that this provides even more evidence for the football theory as the match days produce very high peaks during a low month.

Doncaster also reported peaks on the 1st January 2006 (n=72) which was attributed to New Year celebrations; a theory which is lent support by the fact that 82% of the offences were committed in the early hours of the morning. The 1st of April also emerged as a peak (n=58).

Returning to football for a moment, Birmingham D3 did not experience any significant football related violence despite hosting premiership and championship games during the analysis period. This success is attributed to effective policing and stewardship of the ground.

Large public events were also highlighted as potentially problematic. Bristol stated that analysis has shown that violent crime activity is often related to the number of people present, in their case when there is a major event in the city or an overflow of people who have attended something in nearby Cardiff. It was also noted that the tendency for violent disorder increases when the weather is favourable, and that overall the type of event and time of day dictate the amount of extra activity caused by such events. Leicester also reported rises in violence during large public events, but also stated that this increase is largely attributable to low-level offences and that it is disproportionately low in relation to the extra volumes of people present in the city centre.

5.7 Victims

Victim and offender information was available in twelve profiles. Sheffield did consider victims and offenders but only for domestic violence, and this is discussed in chapter 6. Birmingham D3 was unable to complete a comprehensive analysis due to time

constraints but the future completion of such analysis formed a key recommendation at the end of the document.

Age

The age banding system used in the analyses varied across areas. However, it was still possible to make some judgements about peak age groups. The overall finding is that young people (youths and young adults) are overrepresented as victims of violent crime.

Bristol and City & Holbeck quoted high figures for young adults as victims of violence with 44% of victims in Bristol being aged 17-29 and 43% in City & Holbeck aged 20-29. Victim age ranges were more spread out in other areas but young adults still emerged as the top group in Birmingham D1 (21% of victims aged 20-25) and Doncaster (26% of victims aged 15-22). Leicester concentrated on victim profiles by hotspot area and found that the peak age range in the city centre and the student area to be 17-25 (40% and 39% respectively). However, the residential hotspots saw younger people as targets (between 22% and 30% aged 11-18). Youths (14-16) also featured prominently as victims of daytime violent crime in Haringey, although night-time offences were more likely to be committed against slightly older groups. Waltham Forest considered victim age by crime type and discovered that under 45s were most likely to be victims of ABH and sexual offences, under 26s of robbery and 16-25 year olds of GBH. Only three profiles stated older adults accounted for the highest proportion of victims (Ealing, Kirklees and Lewisham), and one of these (Lewisham) stated that youths (10-17) were overrepresented as victims of violent crime.

Doncaster also reported that victims were likely to be assaulted by people in their own age group (i.e. 15-22 year olds were attacked mostly by 15-22 year olds) and that this was consistent across all age groups.

Gender

It might be anticipated that males are overrepresented as victims of violent crime. However, only four profiles expressed this (Camden, City & Holbeck, Kirklees and Leicester). Other areas noticed a more even split between the sexes (Birmingham D1 – 49% male, 51% female; Bristol – 53% male; Doncaster – 49% male; 44% female; Ealing – 45-47% female, consistent over time; and Newham – 48% male, 51% female). The results for Lewisham were unclear; males were ranked above females as violent crime victims but no figures were presented by which the size of the difference could be determined.

Some areas made the distinction between daytime and night-time offending and noted differences in target gender, although results were not necessarily consistent across areas. For example, Kirklees noted that 64% of daytime and 55% of night-time victims were male whereas Haringey found that 56% of daytime and 61% of night-time offences were committed against males.

Victim gender was also associated with crime type. ABH, GBH and Robbery were most likely to be committed against male victims (Waltham Forest) whereas females were more likely to be victims of sexual offences (Waltham Forest, and City & Holbeck). The relationship between the victim and offender also appeared to impact on victim gender with female victims more likely to be involved in domestic or acquaintance assaults and male victims more likely to be attacked by a stranger (Bristol).

Ethnicity

The ethnicity of victims generally reflects the ethnic breakdown of the local population. In most areas this means that the majority of victims were white (Bristol, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, Leicester, Lewisham, and Waltham Forest). Other areas, often with a more diverse ethnic makeup, report lower levels of offences against the white population (Birmingham D1, Ealing, Newham, and Haringey) and generally mention either Asian or Afro-Caribbean victims.

Some areas note an overrepresentation of ethnic minorities as victims of crime, the most prominent example being Camden who noted that Asian people were overrepresented in cases of ABH, Common Assault and Harassment, and that the Black population were overrepresented in all categories of violence against the person. Victim ethnicity was not reported by Kirklees.

Other

A number of additional factors were also mentioned in relation to victims. City & Holbeck reported that racial/religiously aggravated assaults were most likely to be reported by young Asian males (in their 20s or 30s), Haringey made a link between repeat victimisation and fear of crime and Newham reported that a quarter of all violent crimes were against repeat victims. Bristol made reference to occupation and discovered that students made up the highest occupational group for victims of offences in their area (10%). Other groups who are placed in vulnerable situations due to their occupation were identified as door/bar staff (2.5%), police officers (1.8%), taxi drivers (1.2%) and bus drivers (0.5%).

Victim injury was also discussed. Lewisham found that 58% of male and 56% of female victims were injured. The level of injury was broken down into minor (40% for males and 43% for females), moderate (15% for males and 12% for females) and serious (3% for males and 1% for females). Ambulance data divided injuries into minor and major and found that most injuries were minor (72%). Of the 16% which were major 45% stab/shoot/weapon wound, 22% eye injury, 21% lacerations and 12% major head injuries. Note that the ambulance data is for all calls not just limited to victims of violent crime (i.e. the offender and the victim might be injured in the same incident and both taken to hospital in an ambulance) although does appear to only incorporate assaults (rather than accidents).

Newham reported that 44% of victims suffered no injury and that just 2% of violent offences resulted in a serious injury (mostly stab wounds, internal bleeding, lacerations and fractures). They did, however, record 45 fatalities, mostly stab wounds and head injuries but also 2 due to gunshot wounds.

There also appears to be a relationship between being a victim of violent crime and becoming an offender later on. Newham found that violent crime is self-sustaining with victims becoming perpetrators and repeat victimisation rates reaching 25%; a finding supported by Camden who reported that 17% of ABH accused and 24% of common assault accused have previously been victims of the same offence.

5.8 Offenders

The terminology used to describe offenders varied, and therefore so did the data source. Offender profiles were generally based on either 'accused' or 'suspect' data; however Birmingham D1, for example, used 'defendant' information. Overall offender profiles were similar to victim profiles for age, gender, and ethnicity for those areas that provided such information (all profiles except Kirklees and, of course, Birmingham D3, and Sheffield)

Age

The age banding used in offender profiles were again non-uniform but it was still possible to determine which general age groups were most likely to be arrested/suspected of committing violent crimes.

Youths and young people are overrepresented as offenders of violent crime. Youth crime is perceived as being a growing problem in some areas; Newham, for example, noted that, not only were 14% of violence against the person offences attributable to 10-17 year olds, but also an upward trend in the volume of violent offending and the degree of violence used. Other findings in regards to youths emerged in Birmingham D1 (where the peak age was 19 accounting for 6% of defendants, and the peak age group 16-19 (accounting for 19% of defendants)), Doncaster (where the peak age was 20 and the core offender age group was 15-22 (35%)), and Leicester (where 11-17 year olds were identified as key offenders in residential hotspots). Violent crime in NTE hotspots were attributed to a slightly older crowd (17-25) in Leicester. In addition, Haringey reported that youths were overrepresented as violent offenders and that young people (15-20) were responsible for a significant proportion of daytime crime. Night-time crime, however, was attributed to a slightly older group (21-30).

City & Holbeck reported that 37% of violent crime was attributed to suspects aged 20-29, although the under 20 and 30-39 categories also featured highly (24% and 20% respectively). Bristol used broad age bands and so little can be said about the findings except that 53% of offences were committed by 16-30 year olds. Waltham Forest considered offender age in reference to crime type and found that ABH was predominantly committed against under 35s, robbery against under 26s, and GBH and sexual offences against 16-25 year olds.

Lewisham identified peak age groups by gender, and for males, by ethnicity. The peak age group for female offenders was 25-60 followed by 10-17 then 18-24. The 25-60 age group was still highest for white males, but the order of the other two groups switched. For afro-Caribbean males the top age group is 10-17, and is followed by 25-60 and 18-24 respectively.

The results of the offender age analysis are unclear for two BCUs. Ealing presents a graph with uneven age banding which clearly shows the 31-39 category as the highest group (followed by 40-65). However, the text then discusses the results when the age groups have been broken down further and hails the 25-30 group as the predominant age band. This is confusing to the reader and begs the question of why the newer analysis (with what one would assume to be equal age banding) was not presented instead. Overall, judgements on predominant age categories were drawn using the text rather than the graph; this puts the top age bracket at 25-30 followed by 18-24.

Camden presented results which were difficult to interpret due to the type of graphic used. The x-axis of one bar chart was used to display all the details of offender age, ethnicity and gender. This, combined with a lack of accompanying text, made it very hard to extract relevant information. The overall impression gained from the graph was that the peak age group was fairly evenly split across all the age groups in the 16-40 range (16-20, 20-25, 26-30, 30-35 and 36-40), however, this view is limited as it is based on the predominant ethnic group/gender combinations displayed in the tallest bars of the chart.

Gender

Males were reported to be responsible for the large majority of violent offending in all of the areas which considered the gender of offenders (Birmingham D1, Bristol, Camden, Doncaster, Ealing, Haringey, Leicester, Lewisham, Newham, and Waltham Forest). This is consistent across all factors cross-referenced, for example, crime type (Waltham Forest), and daytime versus night-time (Haringey). In addition, Ealing noted that the proportion of offences attributed to female offenders fell in recent months (14% for April-October 2006 compared to 19% for the April 1998 to March 2006 period). No information was available for City & Holbeck, Kirklees and Sheffield.

Ethnicity

Ethnic minorities, especially afro-Caribbean and Asians are overrepresented as violent crime offenders. Only four profiles reported that White Europeans accounted for the majority of offenders (Bristol, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, and Leicester), and one of these gave Asian to be the peak category in one of their residential hotspots (Leicester). Ealing and Birmingham D1 also reported White Europeans to be the predominant group (40% and 48% respectively) but also stated high proportions for the Asian group (26% and 25% respectively). In addition, Ealing noted that the percentage of offences attributed to Asians increased to twenty-eight between April and October 2006 (compared to 38% for White Europeans). Camden also noted an overrepresentation for Asian offenders, although this was specifically highlighted for harassment and not other crimes.

Several areas found that afro-Caribbean's were overrepresented as violent crime offenders in their areas. Lewisham reported having twice as many afro-Caribbean offenders than White Europeans, and Camden reported that the afro-Caribbean population was overrepresented as offenders for all violence against the person offences. Haringey and Newham also reported afro-Caribbean's as the top ethnic group (60% of daytime and 40% of night-time offenders in Haringey, and 23% of all offenders in Newham).

Waltham Forest considered crime type when exploring offender ethnicity and found that ABH and GBH offences were likely to be committed by White Europeans or afro-Caribbean offenders. Robberies were largely attributed to afro-Caribbean offenders; in fact 55% of offences were specifically attributed to male afro-Caribbean's under the age of 26. Sexual offences were largely committed by afro-Caribbean or White European males (33% and 25% respectively). The predominant demographic was 16-25 year old afro-Caribbean males (14% of the total). Again, there was no information from Sheffield, Kirklees or City & Holbeck.

Other

A number of the profiles reported additional information with regards to offenders. Ealing reported that their offending population were mostly local but that good transport links to surrounding areas facilitated non-local offenders' access to the area. City & Holbeck examined the occupation of suspects and found that 38% were unemployed, 12% were school children (who were mainly responsible for daytime offences shortly after school on weekdays and early afternoon on weekends), 7% were unspecified and 4% students. The percentage attributed to students may seem significant but is actually unrepresentative of the volume of students (around 70 thousand) living in and around Leeds.

Youth crime and gang culture was highlighted as a factor in some areas. Haringey report a number of gangs operating in their area including the self proclaimed "Lick Man Crew" who have been involved in robbery and GBH, and the "Northumberland Park Killers" who have an arrest record including rape, robbery and armed robbery offences. These are not necessarily organised gangs but more congregations of young people who occasionally commit crime. There are however feuds between some of these groups; problems between the "Tottenham Boys" and the "Wood Green MOB", for example, demonstrate a tension between African-Caribbean and Turkish young people. There are also tensions between Somali gangs which are far more serious and have resulted in multiple stabbings and one murder to date. There are differences in opinion with regards to whether gang tension is drugs related or not but gangs are perceived to be territorial despite not being considered to be organised. Regardless of one's opinion on this matter the fact remains that there has been a significant increase in the number of robberies committed by and against young people in the area, and that the common routes home from school are targeted creating daytime hotspots for violence. Leicester also reported gang behaviour and linked recent robberies to gangs through intelligence and suspect descriptions. They also established that gangs could be identified and linked to specific schools.

Kirklees did not mention gangs specifically but did state that groups of youths, along with racial tension, were trigger factors in one hotspot area. Birmingham D3 also discussed youth crime stating that young people were responsible for a high proportion of non-domestic ABH (and suggested that a reprimand might be a more suitable outcome than charging).

Other identified offender issues included Ealing's warning that it can be difficult to identify priority and prolific offenders due to victim reporting, and their identification of crackhouses as generators for crime.

Leicester provided information from the Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (2004) to outline factors associated with violent offending; being male, behaving anti-socially in the last 12 months, having friends and/or siblings in trouble with police, perceiving parents to have poor parenting skills, spending little time with parents, suspension or expulsion from school, perceiving school to have poor teaching skills/discipline, not trusting the police and bring drunk or taking drunks one or more times per month in last 12 months.

Relationship to the victim

Stranger and acquaintance assaults remain a problem especially in night-time economy related incidents. Bristol stated that the main problem in the city was peer-on-peer

stranger or associate assaults and that in three quarters of cases the victims stated that they either “did not know or knew but were not related to the offender”. Kirklees reported that alcohol-related night-time economy offences were more often linked to stranger offences and Haringey found that night-time GBH offences were more likely to be committed by a stranger than daytime offences. Leicester also report an under-representation of offences with a known offender in the hotspots with large night-time economy areas (8% for the city centre and 16% for area popular for student nights). Higher proportions of offences were committed by people known the victim(s) in residential areas (three residential hotspots reported 18%, 21% and 34% for known offenders). City & Holbeck noted a slightly higher proportion of offenders being known to the victim with almost half of patients attending the hospital reportedly knowing their attacker. Doncaster also investigated the relationship between the victim and the offender and found that 39% of the offences were committed by strangers and 26% by an acquaintance. Smaller percentages were noted for neighbours (4%), common law husbands and partners (4%), friends (3%), husbands (2.5%), boyfriends (2%), sons (1.3%) and brothers (including half siblings) (1%). Newham reported a much higher percentage of offences being attributed to husbands and boyfriends. They found that 43% of VAP accused were the victim’s husband, boyfriend or ex-partner. Furthermore 30% of suspects fell into this category. This may seem unusually high but could be an artefact of the data; only accused and suspected offences were analysed which means that offences committed by a stranger are less likely to be included as they are harder to detect.

Birmingham D3 illustrated how the relationship to the victim can influence detection by reporting that the consistently lower detection rates for non-domestic VAP reflects the difference circumstances involved, i.e. that the attacker(s) are more likely to be strangers and therefore more difficult to identify after the event.

A final interesting finding emerged in Camden who discovered that 46% of their repeat VAP offenders offended against both strangers and people known to them.

5.9 Responses

Dispersal/Patrols

Many of the profiles suggests implementing dispersal orders (Doncaster, Ealing, Leicester, Newham, and Waltham Forest), creating alcohol exclusion zones (Kirklees) and/or placing multi-agency/police patrols in hotspot areas at peak times (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Camden, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, Ealing, Kirklees, Lewisham, and Waltham Forest).

One of the primary issues in relation to violence in town and city centres is the dispersal of revellers at the end of the night. Many of the profiles included ideas on how to effectively achieve this. Newham suggested the use of mounted branch and passive drugs dogs to deter offenders from loitering in hotspots, Birmingham D1 suggested officers could use video cameras to confront licensees about poor practices, and Ealing proposed an increased use of stop search powers. Haringey also suggested using stop and search powers argued that it might be used to disrupt young offenders. Haringey also suggested that improvements to the public transport links would be beneficial. Kirklees stated that taxi marshals would help people get home quickly and Leicester suggested placing taxi ranks close to venues. They also suggested more taxis and

buses were needed to help disperse people from hotspots quickly before conflicts take place and that a safer routes scheme in operation to help people get home safely.

Enforcement

Enforcement options primarily centre around alcohol consumption and controlling access to alcohol. Several areas (e.g. Birmingham D1, Doncaster, Leicester and Waltham Forest) discussed alcohol-restricted areas. Birmingham D1 stated that there had been a “no alcohol zone” in place in one hotspot area since 2005, two further restricted areas put in place more recently and suggested that more were created in hotspots. Leicester reported that a street drinking ban is in place in the centre and Waltham Forest have alcohol bans in problem areas particularly during the festive season and other identified seasonal peaks. Doncaster have Designated Public Place Orders (DPPO) set up in some areas and suggested rolling this out to other NTE areas.

Operations in place aimed at tackling alcohol-related crime include Operation Christmas Cracker (Haringey, December 2005-January 2006) which focused on alcohol-related violence, Operation Fortify (Leicester) an on-going enforcement operation running on Friday and Saturday nights to reduce violence associated with the NTE, the early intervention strategy used in Kirklees where early arrests for Drunk & Disorderly offences is having an impact on public order and assault figures. Leicester also mentioned the introduction of early intervention strategies on Friday and Saturday nights under the TVCP.

Other approaches to tackling alcohol-related violence came from Birmingham D1 (“no-nonsense” [zero tolerance] nights to attempt to reduce and detect crime at peak times), Kirklees (continue targeting Huddersfield centre strategically), and Bristol (who replicated the approaches used during AMEC in late 2005 during the Christmas period in 2006). Bristol also managed to secure additional funding from the Safer Bristol Partnership to allow intelligence-led targeted licensing enforcement activity (the results of which are so far encouraging with 41 police and partnership visits yielding 25 positive results plus warnings for a number of minor contraventions).

Leicester reported that operations had been put in place under the TVCP to tackle football related offending. These “football operations” were aimed at controlling fans behaviour as they entered the city centre pre- and post-match. Birmingham D1 discussed anti-social behaviour as a precursor to violence including the use of profane language, littering and urinating in the street. The profile also suggested that fast food venues should be reminded of their responsibility to deal with litter.

Waltham Forest and Leicester both recognised that proactive tasking should be aimed towards the predicted seasonal changes in offending (for example, Leicester stated that interventions are best placed in May as this has been identified as the peak month for offending). Birmingham D3 stated that the BCU should focus its violent crime prevention activity on VAP offences and that there should be continued emphasis placed on the detection of offences to reduce RV particularly for hate crime.

Other enforcement policies included issuing Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) (Kirklees), regulating minicabs (Lewisham), target hardening hotspot areas (Ealing), the increased use of search arches and section 60s where appropriate (Waltham Forest), an active policy of victimless prosecutions (Birmingham D1) and the use of passive drugs dogs in night-time economy areas at the weekend (Lewisham).

Finally, the use of offender-based enforcement interventions were discussed. Birmingham D1, Doncaster, Ealing, Leicester, and Waltham Forest all mentioned ASBOs (Anti-Social Behaviour Orders), ABCs (Acceptable Behaviour Contracts) and/or drink banning orders as potential methods of removing the offender from the offending environment. Ealing suggested the use of ASBOs and ABCs, and Waltham Forest advocated the increased use of ASBOs on conviction as well as prior to conviction for repeat offenders and the increased proactive use of these orders. Birmingham D1 are considering the use of ASBOs to tackle persistent aggressive and drunk behaviour. They also suggested that section 6 of the Licensing Act 1902 (which allows the police to ban individuals who've been convicted of three or more alcohol-related offences within 12 months from buying alcohol in a licensed premise for 3 years) should be used more often. Leicester outlined to use of the "Behave or Be Banned" scheme and Doncaster suggested the using drink banning orders to keep priority and prolific offenders out of town centres and other NTE areas.

Offender management

Aside from the use of ASBOs, ABCs and drinking banning orders, offender management often centred around alcohol/drug treatment programmes (e.g. Doncaster, Lewisham, and Ealing) or the use of banning orders or similar to remove them from the offending environment (e.g. Bristol). However, emphasis was also placed around conducting more in depth analysis of offenders to identify prolific offenders and potential triggers for violent behaviours (Doncaster, Kirklees, Lewisham, and Waltham Forest).

Other ideas were to target young offenders (11-17) who have been identified on outer suburban estates (Leicester), boosting awareness of release dates for prolific offenders (Waltham Forest) and using council powers to evict recidivist offenders from council premises.

Schools and 'Gangs'

The benefits of educational programmes were highlighted by a number of profiles. The educational initiatives were mostly aimed at children and young people attending secondary level institutions and covered topics such as bullying (Birmingham D3), violence (Doncaster and Birmingham D3), drug and alcohol misuse (Waltham Forest), the dangers of carrying weapons (Leicester and Waltham Forest) and the negative consequences of gang membership (Birmingham D1 and Waltham Forest).

Doncaster set up with colleges and sixth forms about alcohol and violence as this age group makes up the majority of offenders. Birmingham D1 suggested creating a committee to co-ordinate anti-violence programmes at schools, and that this committee should incorporate all partner agencies. It was also recommended that the sessions highlighting the negative consequences of gang membership should be led by police officers. Neighbouring BCU Birmingham D3 suggested that the inputs should include an anti-bullying message and incorporate details of how incidents occurring on the way home from school are also unacceptable. Educational interventions were already in place and a stricter crime recording policy was set to be promoted at one school; another school was set to warn pupils of the serious consequences of committing violent offences.

Waltham Forest wished to educate young people about the downside of gang culture, alcohol and drug use, and weapons. This initiative included sessions on healthy

alternative lifestyles and provided a positive focus for young people with emphasis on activities such as sport, music and other artistic activities and how to get involved in these. Leicester also stated that educational activities were already in place to try and tackle gang behaviour. Enforcement policies were also in place at peak times (such as the end of term) and the Split Second campaign (a DVD and teaching package which highlights issues of weapons and gun crime) has been made available to every school in the city.

The Safer Schools Initiative was mentioned specifically by a couple of the areas; Haringey, for example, is using its resources to try and tackle a robbery problem amongst youths. Birmingham D1 also runs a Safer Schools Initiative. This involves the regular presence of police officers and/or PCSOs on school premises to act as a deterrent and to facilitate intelligence gathering. There is also evidence of police presence in school management theme groups, and there are regular meetings between teachers and police to discuss violence issues. There is an onus on schools to prevent violence through promoting mutual respect and procedures in place to help identify pupils who repeatedly abuse teachers.

Waltham Forest are also running a Safer Schools initiative alongside others such as Positive Activities for young people, "Prison! Me! No Way!", "Defending da hood" and "parents against violence". These initiatives aim to interact with youngsters at an early stage and dissuade them from associating with established gang members at the beginnings of the relationship. Other gang-specific aims are to identify gang hierarchies and preventing any young person joining a gang. Diversionary activities are also used to try and discourage young people from getting involved in crime.

Haringey report gangs operating in their area, primarily based on and around 'problem' estates. This is being tackled by the Focus Desks and Stop & Search tactics are being used to try and disrupt gang activities. Although the overall contribution to violent crime is relatively small there is still concern about the violence associated with gangs and the impact of the environment and older offenders on younger members' behaviour. The need for early intervention was stressed and engagement with Somali community leaders is recommended to try and deal with some of the gangs operating in the district. Youth initiatives have also been suggested, however, the area must be aware that some youth clubs can attract robbers and violent youths and there have been problems in the past with people travelling too and from youth centres.

The dispersal of pupils at the end of the school day is also a challenge, and there are a number of suggestions made surrounding the transport network. These included training for bus drivers and teachers (Birmingham D1), after school bus patrols (Birmingham D1), the employment of a schools officer to shadow pupils to main transport hubs during the two hours after school closing (Lewisham), and school bus schemes to drop children at their residences (Lewisham).

Other interventions associated with schools include violence prevention include staggering school closing times to prevent congregations of children in hotspot areas (Lewisham), knife searches at the YMCA and in key schools and colleges (Waltham Forest) and the introduction of school-based officers to provide regular intelligence regarding violent crime in their school of organised and non-organised gang activity (Birmingham D3; note that school based officers to be deployed to all secondary schools in the BCU).

Finally, Birmingham D3 stressed the importance of identifying school rivalries and the locations where out of school violence occurs, and Lewisham aimed to identify children

and youths who are suspects for violent crime and live in violent homes. Liaison with partner agencies is needed to provide alternative domestic environments for children in such circumstances (i.e. living in a violent home).

Intelligence and Analysis

The first two issues to be dealt with in regards to intelligence-gathering and analysis are data access and data quality. The profiles suggested a whole host of potential data sources which would aid analysis if data access was granted. The most popular source of information would be ambulance call-out data and/or A&E attendance (cited by City & Holbeck, Camden, Birmingham D3 and Bristol), especially in relation to alcohol-related offences. Camden expressed an interest in accessing all data on alcohol-related incidents held by the PCT and Bristol is in the process of seeking access to information on the number of people passing through Bristol Royal Infirmary with alcohol-related injuries. Birmingham D3 stated that Ambulance data would enable analysts to confirm hotspots of violent crime and could perhaps provide some insight into how to boost reporting rates for the most vulnerable victims. Birmingham D3 also discussed health related data expressing an interest in accessing mental health information and DIP (Drugs Intervention Programme) data. Mental health information was cited as having the potential to establish the level of violent offences committed by people with mental health problems. DIP data would reveal how many people who came into custody for violent offences were suspected of being under the influence of drugs. It may also provide further insight into how drug use may be a trigger for violence.

The final potential source of information cited by Birmingham D3 was for School and Youth Intervention data. The current peak in violent Crime at school closing time was suggestive that violence associated with school. Information should be collated regarding current interventions, education and diversion projects across the BCU to determine which ones have been most effective and which could be most usefully transferred to the schools in hotspot locations. One last area to suggest data sources was Ealing who posited consideration for CCTV evidence and that downloading telephone evidence may be beneficial.

The second major issue is data quality; analysis is only as good as the information it is based on. The biggest concerns were in relation to the use (or misuse) of flags (e.g. Waltham Forest, Birmingham D3, and Doncaster) and the difficulty of accurately identifying alcohol-related incidents for analysis (e.g. Doncaster, Birmingham D3, Camden and Lewisham). Waltham Forest argued that data quality needs to be improved especially in relation to the use of flags. The profile also identified a corporate need to address discrepancies between internal systems within Metropolitan to ensure accurate data collection. Doncaster highlighted that the “repeat victim” MO needed to be input correctly to minimise manual sifting, and that there is a need to develop and integrate drug and alcohol flags to provide accurate identification of alcohol and drug related violence. The education of police officers about use of drugs and alcohol flags is also required. In a similar vein Birmingham D3 indicated that promotion of the use of UIV (under the influence violence), AI (alcohol involved) and DV (domestic violence) intelligence signal markers to officers and input crime screeners is needed. This would assist with completion if errors or omissions were identified. Camden identified a need for corporate guidance on how to interrogate the crime system for a consistent alcohol-related violence picture and plumped for the better recording of alcohol-related crimes.

Lewisham highlighted a need to incorporate the level of alcohol consumption into searchable fields within the crime system.

The profiles posited many ideas for future research and the associated intelligence gathering. Dealing with intelligence first, there are a number of issues about which the profiles suggested collecting additional intelligence. Several profiles made recommendations for collecting additional source information about alcohol and/or the night-time economy. Firstly, it is of interest that Kirklees reported that the AMECs assisted in gathering new intelligence during premise visits, patrols and arrests. This is perhaps a method of data gathering which other areas may find useful.

One popular method of intelligence gathering is the use of head mounted cameras (headcams); these were mentioned as evidence gathering tools in Bristol and Camden, and Birmingham D1 reported the use of digital cameras to record victim injury to facilitate prosecutions. Bristol reported that headcams have been successful in increasing uncontested charging decisions and diffusing potentially inflammatory violent crime situations, and Camden suggested providing door staff with headcams.

Camden suggested visits to takeaways after 1am to build a database of the local NTE and its associated problems. The creation of a noise nuisance database of licensed premises, including information on addresses and the type of noise pollution, was also posited. Birmingham D1 require intelligence on licensed premises selling alcohol to underage, or binge, drinkers alongside information on the people and places (i.e. licensed premises) contributing to drink-driving offences on the BCU. A greater knowledge of the movements of offenders prior to alcohol-related incidents was also being sought.

With regards to alcohol consumption and the offending population, Birmingham D3 suggested intelligence de-brief interventions be conducted for drunk, violent offenders who come into custody to find out where they had been drinking. This would help the police to target irresponsible designated premises supervisors who can then be approached to reduce the amount of alcohol they serve.

Birmingham D1 argued that the BCU needed to gather intelligence to help identify priority and prolific offenders operating in hotspot areas. Birmingham D3 suggested a similar strategy although this was targeted at gathering intelligence on gangs (membership and involvement in crime) in one hotspot area. Birmingham D3 also stressed that an examination of the victim and offender data should be conducted to gain and insight into who is committing offences, and who is being victimised so that that enforcement and prevention measures can be targeted (this analysis was not done for the profile examined by the current report due to time constraints).

Additional information was also sought about particular offences. For example, Birmingham D3 found that detection rates were particularly low for hate crime and sought further information related to the types of hate crimes reported to the police in an effort to provide insight as to why detection rates are a problem. Kirklees reported that violent crime generally is a target for improving intelligence flow, and that robbery is being targeted with a dedicated patrol car to ensure immediate intelligence is gathered from the onset of the robbery offence. This has improved intelligence submissions and has prevented false reporting through the implementation of stringent protocols at alleged robbery sites. With reference to Kirklees it is also noteworthy that they employ a nominated person to scrutinise all violent crime to ensure accurate NCRS recording; this aims to check that Kirklees are 'getting it right' at the initial criming stage.

Newham also have concerns about data standards and wished to audit crime reports for all VAP offences to ensure that they are being met. Newham were also keen that crime generators were identified and dealt with; in one area this would include the immediate closure of a crack house and action around sex workers who frequent the area. Newham also recommended that consideration should be given to Cozart testing⁶ for violent offences to establish if links exist between substance abuse and violent crime.

Further analysis was also recommended in relation to alcohol. Kirklees suggested performance measurement of arrests for drunk & disorderly offences and Leicester wished to investigate the prevalence of fake IDs acquired through the internet. Leicester also recommended analysis of factors associated with door staff (e.g. the number per licensed premise versus the number of assaults they experience). Doncaster recommended analysis to consider whether the extended licensing houses have increased violent crime.

Waltham Forest recommended analysing the potential impact of drug and alcohol abuse on victims and suspects of violent crime and also asked what causes people to commit violent crime (addictions, peer pressure family pressure etc). Analysis of trends and patterns surrounding schools, school children and gangs was also recommended. Waltham Forest wanted to identify the hierarchy and members of gangs, and Birmingham D1 posed a number of research questions in relation to gangs as well as schools. These included:

- What are the motives for violence on buses?
- Are persistent offenders committing crime on buses in schools?
- Is there a link between school and bus violence?
- Are school children carrying weapons?
- Is violence on buses and/or outside schools attributable to same school or is it pupils from rival schools fighting each other?
- Is the fighting organised? Is there an active gang community within the schools?
- Are big gangs recruiting from local schools/colleges?

Birmingham D1 also noted that research and analysis is currently being hampered by poor crime recording of location addresses and MOs; some locations have multiple addresses recorded, some of which are fictitious or inaccurate.

Offenders are a popular topic for further analysis; Camden recommended work on journey-to-crime for offenders living in or near hotspots as well as work on victims and offenders (for example, examining information on cross allegation and retaliation offences). Doncaster recommended some research into disposal methods of violent crime with the aim of establishing why some offenders are interviewed where others are not.

Additional analyses of the times and places where violence peaks is also required. Doncaster wished to analyse the use of temporary pedestrian zones, and Waltham Forest wished to identify potentially vulnerable areas using demographic factors, for example, the ethnicity, age and SES breakdown of an area. It would also be beneficial to locate data which may assist with updating population statistics as the last Census was in 2001. Birmingham D3 suggested additional analysis of offending at peak times

⁶ The Cozart® RapiScan is an on-site, drugs and abuse testing system that can detect the presence of two drugs (opiates and cocaine) from a single oral fluid sample with a reader to interpret the results.

as this would provide further information of the factors influencing this offending and give indications as to how interventions may best be made.

Lewisham recommended intelligence-led targeting (for hotspots, offenders and offender profiling) and encouraged the examination of potential links between violent crime and specific events, for example, Halloween, Christmas, New Year, and sporting events (local, national and international). Camden identified peaks at Christmas in one hotspot area and recommended tasking patrols appropriately in light of this information. The profile also identified a hot bus route and recommended strategic patrols of this.

Other analysis recommended by the profiles include the continuation of violent crime analysis tasking (Lewisham), a review of the contribution of hate crime to total violent crime (Lewisham) and in-depth regression analysis of the potential effects of weather on crime patterns (Camden).

Several profiles highlighted the benefit of utilising existing good practice to reduce violent crime. Waltham Forest wished to know which early intervention strategies are the most effective in reducing levels of violent crime and sought best practice (both internally and externally) about how interventions work in areas which attract large volumes of people. Doncaster wished to compare their BCU with others in tranche 3 to encourage sharing of best practice and to see what has worked in other areas.

Partnership working

Partnership work is crucial to achieve long-term reductions in crime and the police regularly meet with members of many different external organisations; examples may include the local council, residents groups, local businesses, Trading Standards and, of course, the other emergency services (ambulance crews, A&E departments and the fire service). Another potential partner is the media who can play an important role in disseminating crime prevention advice and personal safety messages.

One reason why partnership work is so critical to crime reduction is the potential for sharing information. Data sharing protocols are often difficult to achieve but can prove invaluable to analysts; not only does it facilitate analysis and create a fuller picture of the crime problem but it can also prevent duplication of work. Lewisham recommended that local organisations and partner agencies were approached to discuss the availability of information with reference to street wardens, public opinion, football surveys, and transient population statistics. They also wished to see access to information on the number and/or percentage of mental health patients in the area and their potential impact on violent crime. The profile argued that there should be continuous collaborations between partner agencies such as the Primary Care Trust (PCT), the CDRPs, the probation service, housing, social services, and local charities and community groups. Ealing also advocated association with housing departments (to aid in evictions) as well as the use of youth clubs.

Waltham Forest also listed a number of potential partners particularly with reference to current public reassurance schemes. These include Street wardens, Neighbourhood Watch, BTP patrols and street and shop watch. Other partners include ASB caseworkers, support services (e.g. police volunteers, victim support, and drug and alcohol treatment), legal services, Operation Payback and ALERT. Waltham Forest believes in a multi-agency approach to offenders.

Joint visits are a popular example of partnership working; for example, Birmingham D1 recommended joint visits by the Fire Service, Environmental Health officers and local

authority licensing officers regarding compliance with relevant legislation, and Leicester discussed the test purchasing of off-licenses and bars (the last series was conducted in November 2006; one out of eleven failed and the server received an £80 fine).

Kirklees reported that their tasking process ensures partner agencies (e.g. CCTV) are informed of any intelligence regarding violent crime and share information on current hotspots and trends. Kirklees look to partners for support with regards to improving transport out of the centres in the early hours and for work with fast food outlets.

Camden also works with partners on the transport issue; they have drawn Transport for London's (TfL) attention to two problem routes and are working to get TfL and the TOCU (Transport Operational Command Unit) involved in work on another route. There are plans to advertise the presence of covert patrols on these routes. Camden feed calls to their appropriate partner (e.g. BTP) and there are plans to liaise Security and Specials and the Royal Free Hospital regarding Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) incidents. It was also recommended that an A&E co-ordinator be employed to gather additional patient information to aid analysis. Camden will also task partners to conduct a visual audit of the NTE in Camden (including factors such as vomit and ASB deposits).

Partnership resources can be utilised tackling ASB. Birmingham D3 stated that efforts to reduce ASB and disorder in places which are hotspots for both would prove an effective use of police and partner resources. Interventions by police and partners in ASB hotspots should continue as it is apparent that ASB hotspots may be a trigger for violent crime in residential hotspots. Waltham Forest also puts ASB on the agenda for Safer Neighbourhood Teams along with alcohol.

Alcohol-related enforcement schemes are also popular in partnerships. Birmingham D1 BCU discussed their partnership with the local council to extend the alcohol exclusion zones to stop people drinking in public places. They also continue to use problem-solving approach with partners (e.g. DAT) to minimise impact of alcohol-related crime and ASB (based on good practice). Haringey discuss the local alcohol strategy but point out that there are no resources associated with it because of all the money being spent on drugs schemes. Haringey also state that they employ effective partnership working and engagement with the local community based on good practice.

Kirklees has some involvement with CCTV and talks about a multi-agency approach being implemented through AMEC. They have launched a £50K initiative called "Kirklees Bar Code" which encompasses a massive advertising campaign to highlight the problems involving drinking and violence. It is aimed at 16-24 year olds in particular and includes slogans to get people thinking about consequences of alcohol-related violence. The messages are displayed on beer mats, billboards and posters.

Media campaigns

Other areas also use the media to disseminate ideas about alcohol-related violence and responsible drinking. Birmingham D1, for example, promoted a focused responsible drinking campaign in key areas, and campaigns to spread safety messages are not limited to pubs and clubs instead incorporating other key premises such as off licenses and takeaways. The media marketing campaign is targeted at potential victims to heighten awareness of the risks associated with drunkenness, binge drinking and drink spiking.

Lewisham also host media campaigns about alcohol-related violence as well as some targeted around DV and youth-on-youth crime. Leicester publicises the dangers of

excessive alcohol consumption alongside personal safety messages (targeted at potential offenders and victims) about the consequences of sex without consent. There is a drive to raise awareness of reality of sex offending to educate the public and try to tackle fear of crime. Crime prevention advertising campaigns are also popular and current initiatives include messages about mobile phone security and the IMMOBILISE website⁷ (where you can register electrical items to aid property recovery and detection) advertised in minicabs.

Doncaster suggested a pre-emptive press release to warn the public of the trend for sexual offences to increase over the summer months, and Waltham Forest stated that continued and increased publicity regarding intolerance of hate crime including domestic, racial and homophobic violence is necessary. Finally, Haringey stated that publicity of the successes of Operation Blunt would be worthwhile whilst Birmingham D1 suggested that news of convictions should be publicised internally and locally (e.g. via newspapers, local radio, and the intranet) to act as a deterrent.

Licensed premises and environmental issues

There were many suggestions with regards to the regulation of licensed premises, primarily in relation to closure (e.g. Ealing, Kirklees, City & Holbeck, Birmingham D3, and Lewisham), visits to licensed premises and test purchasing (e.g. Kirklees, Birmingham D3 and Waltham Forest) and the use of schemes such as Best Bar None and PubWatch (e.g. Birmingham D1, City & Holbeck, Kirklees, and Leicester). Meetings with Licensees were also advocated (e.g. Birmingham D1, Kirklees).

Many other ideas were also outlined by the profiles. Camden suggested that door staff could remain until crowds dispersed, issuing door staff with search wands and the use of toughened glasses. The police are also supportive of the use of plastic/polycarbonate glasses in Bristol but there is currently no consistent policy regarding their use.

Birmingham D1 approached the problem of glass differently suggesting that the introduction of bottle banks in the streets might be considered to remove potential weapons; it would also act to reduce litter. The profile also reported that effective action continues to be taken against badly managed premises on the D1 BCU and that there should be a radio link between West Midlands Police and licensed premises.

Doncaster considered asking victims/offenders where they were last served alcohol to help crackdown on premises serving drunk patrons. It would also be a good idea to create better liaisons with door staff to ascertain greater co-operation and refusal of entry to drunks. With reference to the environment the profile suggested it would be useful to look at hotspots and re-evaluate lighting and CCTV, and to consider the use of temporary pedestrian zones. The introduction of taxi queues and the use taxi/bus marshals was also posited. Kirklees also considered transport options and suggested that meet and greet stations at transport drop off points such as the bus station might be useful.

Haringey want to review the door policy and queuing at licensed premises. A license extension is being introduced for one venue to reduce demand for access to other venues. Lewisham wish to obtain information on the capacity of licensed premises and examine the potential effect upon disturbances and crime levels. The profile also calls for continuous regulation of door staff and training programmes for staff.

⁷ <https://www.immobilise.com>

Leicester outlined a whole host of recommendations including to need to investigate the trend of cocaine use in bars, the introduction of ATM hatched privacy zones to reduce opportunities for fraud and to reassure public, and white lighting scheme to help better distinguish colours (yellow lights make it hard to distinguish colours, i.e. clothing) and reduce fear of crime (the light is not stronger but it feels brighter); lights are to be placed in order of priority based on established hotspots. Waltham Forest also suggested that crime prevention design advice should be implemented in identified areas, although gave no details of this would entail. Waltham Forest also highlighted that enforcement help might be obtained through the street services team, housing and the noise nuisance team.

Weapon usage

A few suggestions were made in relation to weapon use. Operation Blunt is already in force London-wide under the TVCP, however, other suggestions were also made. Newham recommended a knife surrender campaign, and Haringey suggested test purchasing weapons. Haringey also advocated search powers for teachers and the use of search arches in schools and at events such as the Tottenham carnival, as well as the use of metal detectors in licensed premises. Kirklees discussed the availability of weapons suggesting that the enforcement of alcohol exclusion zones would reduce the access to glasses and bottles which can potentially be used as weapons.

Other

Other initiatives for tackling violence included support for victims (Lewisham), a robust response to firearms (Ealing) and emphasis on capitalising on forensic opportunities (Ealing). Doncaster recommended that focus should be placed on identifying the needs of the victim, especially those vulnerable to repeat victimisation, and referring then to the relevant agencies. It was also suggested that concerned parties should be made aware that racial incidents are prone to increase during July. City & Holbeck suggested refocusing attention on street robbery as this was on the increase again. Camden suggested exploring whether it is possible to increase the number of bus services running through hotspot areas to decrease overcrowding issues, and Bristol stated that extended opening hours and actions to improve the environment appear to be having a positive impact. Crime prevention schemes advocated by Waltham Forest included the employment of crime prevention officers, a crime prevention van, the use of high-risk murder panels and the lip balm initiative.

Waltham Forest warned that if VAP is not addressed, and recommendations not adhered to then the borough risk missing targets and local community may lose faith in police ability to prevent and reduce crime.

6 Alcohol-related offences and the Night-time Economy

As discussed in previous sections of this report all of the profiles discussed issues surrounding alcohol consumption and/or the night-time economy in relation to violence. This includes the profile for Sheffield (which has been excluded thus far due to its focus on DV) as there is some discussion about how alcohol might relate to domestic violence incidents.

The first and foremost issue to consider in relation to analysing how alcohol might be related to violent crime is the problem of accurately extracting incidents in which alcohol was involved. Alcohol-related offences are supposed to be flagged in the crime system in many police forces. However, a number of profiles which referred to alcohol flags stated that they could not be relied upon as an accurate method of extracting data for analysis (e.g. Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Camden, Ealing, Leicester, and Lewisham). The alcohol flag needs to be better utilised by the police officers completing crime reports and the data inputters. Leicester reported that only 34% of offences were flagged as alcohol-related, however an additional 33% were classed as unknown. When these offences and those categorised as *not* alcohol-related were removed, the potential for alcohol-related crime rose to a massive 83% of total violence. Birmingham D3 reported that valuable information regarding the role that alcohol and drugs may play in violent offences is being lost though the under-use and misapplication of SIMs (Special Interest Markers) and that West Midlands Police records do not make the distinction between whether it was the victim, offender(s) or both who were intoxicated. Camden and Ealing made similar comments about the use of the “suspect drinking” and “victim drinking” flags. Camden stated that the *“intrinsic problem with analysis of alcohol related violence is the lack of definitive codes for data extraction and the under utilisation of the MV and MF (suspect drinking and victim drinking) flags”*, and Ealing reported that although the locations for violent offending suggested that violence is *“closely linked with alcoholic consumption”*, it is problematic to conduct reliable analysis as this is dependent on officers entering the correct features (i.e. MF – Suspect Drinking, and MV – Victim Drinking) into the crime reports. Lewisham went one step further to suggest that the *level* of alcohol consumption should be incorporated into searchable fields within the Crime Reporting Information System (CRIS) alongside information on how the offence is determined to be alcohol-related. On a positive note Lewisham also reported that the use of the alcohol-related flag has improved since 2005 coinciding with introduction of the Licensing Act and a boost in publicity surrounding the benefits of using alcohol flags.

So, in light of this problem how did the profiles identify alcohol-related offences? A variety of methods were presented and examples of these are outlined below.

Despite the potential problems with used data fields flagged as alcohol-related a few of the profiles chose this method to identify alcohol-related crimes; Newham used drugs and alcohol feature codes, Leicester used the “under influence drink/drugs” and “alcohol related” codes from the MO field, and Lewisham reported statistics for alcohol-related flagged non-domestic crime. Doncaster created an alcohol-related marker using keywords as there is no existing marker available on the crime system; an alcohol marker was created if (i) the Intoxication Status was “Under The Influence Of Drink/Drugs” or (ii) the MO Description was either “Offender/Victim Under The Influence Of Drink Or Drugs” or “Drink/Food Spiked With Drugs/Alcohol” or (iii) the Text contained any of the keywords “Drunk”, “Drink”, “Alcohol” or “Beer”. Camden also identified alcohol-related offences using keywords; phrases included “drunk”, “drinking”, “beer”, “street drinker”, “wine”, “licensed premise”, “landlord”, “licensee”, “public house”, “PH”, “intox” and “alcohol”. Birmingham D1 approached the problem in a slightly different way analysing crime occurring at licensed premises. Ealing used a similar method making assumptions about which offences are alcohol-related based upon location and timing.

6.1 Alcohol related offences – all violence

As discussed above it is often difficult to accurately extract alcohol-related offences. Some profiles tried to analyse the problem but found it hard to do so due to these issues; some results were still reported though. Newham, for example, extracted all of the offences with an alcohol or drug related feature code. Only 4% of all VAP were found to have such a code indicating that there is a problem with data recording. However, it was reported that 83% of the codes relate to the suspect drinking. There is anecdotal evidence that drugs play a role in violence however no data was available to substantiate this. Waltham Forest also reported that the alcohol and drugs flags are under-utilised. In light of this the analyst tried to extract the relevant offences using the keywords “alcohol” and “drunk” but as this only equated to 2% of violence (1% of VAP, 0% of robberies and 4% of sex offences) this was not considered to accurately reflect the problem.

The proportion of offences considered to be alcohol-related varies by area; this may be partially due to differences in definitions of what constitutes alcohol-related crime, and/or how accurately the area have managed to extract the information; however, the results are interesting nonetheless. As reported previously Leicester estimated that as many as 83% of offences might be alcohol-related. Doncaster reported that the offender was under the influence of drink or drugs in 33% of cases; the offender was *not* under the influence in 37% of cases, and the victim or witness was unable to determine alcohol/drug consumption in 30%. In a tiny percentage of cases (0.3%) the victim or witness was unwilling to disclose the information. Ealing assumed alcohol was involved based on the location and used crime reports to confirm that 20% of offences are alcohol-related. It was also established that offender drinking was reported in 6% of offences, and victim drinking in 1.5% of cases. Lewisham reported that only 3% of total offences were recorded to be alcohol-related; of these 66% related to the suspect drinking (29% were victim drinking and 5% were alcohol consumed). Haringey found that 5% of reports had an alcohol feature code, and that 10-20% of non-domestic daytime and 15-25% of non-domestic night-time offences were alcohol-related. It was also reported that 11% of non-domestic daytime GBH offences referred to the suspect drinking; this is compared to only 2% for ABH and common assault. The percentage of reports where suspect was drinking increased to 14% for non-domestic night-time GBH reports. Overall, Haringey found that GBH and harassment were more likely to be linked to alcohol than other offences.

Alcohol-related crime is commonly associated with the NTE, and many of the profiles reported that alcohol-related crime clusters in and around licensed premises. For example, Birmingham D1 reported a positive correlation between the NTE and high levels of violent crime. The primary hotspot and the top licensed premise were both identified as requiring the greatest interventions in relation to alcohol-related violence. It was also reported that there are currently two alcohol restricted zones in operation and that OASIS logs and recorded crime both revealed that problems in and around licensed premises are highest when establishments close and people are likely to congregate outside. Birmingham D3 analysed alcohol-related crime using crimes committed in or around licensed premises plus reports made to the licensing officer, and subsequently named hotspots of licensed premises. Leicester reported that the pattern of ABH in licensed premises mirrors their individual capacities and generated rates of ABH per 1,000 people using the maximum capacity as a denominator. No link was found between high levels of violence and later opening hours. It was suggested that further analysis will need to consider other factors such as the number of door staff.

Lewisham identified the town centre as a hotspot for non-domestic alcohol-related crime and reported that CAD calls referring to drunkenness are highest in areas where licensed premises are clustered. Camden and Haringey also reported on CAD calls for drunkenness. Haringey reported that drunkenness accounts for a small proportion of total calls but Camden found that calls about drunkenness have increased by 44% since 2003/04. In Leicester, a hotline number has been in operation in the City Centre since October 2006 and calls associated with non-domestic violence are mostly "rowdy and inconsiderate/drink related".

Kirklees reported different trends for alcohol and did not make as firm a link between alcohol and violence as other areas. Although alcohol-related crime featured in the primary hotspot it was not considered to be a main instigating factor in violence. In the secondary hotspots lots of the ASB calls for service mentioned alcohol, and alcohol is considered to play a larger role in ASB than other types of offending (i.e. violence). The one finding which does link alcohol and violence is the finding that a large number of night-time assaults on the main road in the city's NTE area are alcohol-related.

Hotspots for alcohol-related crime commonly overlap with hotspots for all violence (e.g. Lewisham), suggesting that alcohol may have a direct impact on the size and nature of a hotspot. Ealing stated that it is clear alcohol consumption is linked to crime in the principal hotspot for violence as 43% of offending in this area is directly connected by venue to licensed premises.

Haringey reported that the street drinkers and mental health patients who congregate in one area which can cause problems. However, it was also reported that Haringey does not suffer from alcohol and/or night-time economy-related crime in the same way as other places as only 9% of alcohol-related crime was located in the top hotspot. In relation to licensed premises it was estimated that 50-60% of licensed premises sell to underage people. It was also reported that most stakeholders do not think that the Licensing Act 2003 has led to an increase in violent crime as conditions apply to all new licensing options and licensees seeking extended opening hours seem keen to work with the police and community safety teams. Overall staggered closing was seen as having a positive impact.

Other locations where alcohol-related crime was reported to be a problem were hospitals (City & Holbeck) and transport hubs (Camden).

Some profiles considered the peak timing of alcohol-related offending. Lewisham reported that alcohol-related offences cluster late at night and in the early hours of the morning especially on Saturdays and Sundays. The peak time for non-domestic alcohol-related crime was 11pm to 4am at weekends and 11pm to 1am during the week (except Wednesdays when the peak starts at 5pm. Haringey reported that alcohol-related hotspots remain consistent over the day (i.e. daytime and night-time alcohol-related offences cluster in the same places). Alcohol is seen to be a contributor to weekend violence not particular area or venue has been identified as a generator.

Seasonal factors were also considered. Bristol reported that the NTE/alcohol-related problem was ongoing, but found that the summer period often brought sporadic, and sometimes large, outbreaks of alcohol-fuelled disorder. These are generated by community parties and barbeques. Ealing predicted an increase in alcohol-related violence for the coming Christmas period (2006).

The characteristics of victims and offenders of alcohol-related crime were reported by some profiles. Lewisham, for example, reported that victims of alcohol-related crime were most likely to be White (male or female), and that victims of non-domestic alcohol-related crime were most likely to be 25-60 or 18-24 (for men and women). Suspects for non-domestic alcohol-related crime tend to be White or Afro-Caribbean males aged 25-60 or 18-24. Leicester also discussed offenders and quoted some results from the 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey to try and understand why young people drink. The survey found that offenders aged 10-25 say that they commit almost half of their violent offences because they are upset or annoyed, and that only 9% of offences were linked to alcohol. Other reasons for committing violence given in survey include self-defence (30%), revenge (17%), and for fun or a buzz (12%).

With regards to Leicester itself the profile reported that alcohol was mentioned in several hotspot areas including the city centre and the student NTE area. However, it was also reported that only 72% of over 18s in Leicester have consumed alcohol in last 12 months compared to 90% for the adult population of England. This was partially attributed to the South Asian community many of whom abstain from alcohol. Leicester have identified that a high proportion of offenders are aged 11-17. Combined with the potential for 83% of offences to be alcohol-related suggests that underage drinking could be a contributory factor. This needs to be considered alongside intelligence about off-licenses which sell alcohol illegally.

Haringey reported on the alcohol consumption of offenders and offender based interventions associated with alcohol. Five out of the top ten priority and prolific offenders have alcohol mentioned in the crime report, and two out of ten have an ASBO banning them from drinking in a designated area.

Finally, Lewisham reported on weapon use and injury in alcohol-related offences. Twenty-three percent of alcohol-flagged violent crimes (non-domestic) included the use of a weapon. Of these a quarter were knives and over a third were listed as "other tool/weapon". Injury statistics were split by gender; 71% of male victims of alcohol-flagged non-domestic crime suffered injuries, of which 41% were minor, 23% moderate and 7% serious). A smaller proportion of female victims suffered injury (60%); 45% of these were minor, 13% moderate and 2% serious.

6.2 Alcohol-related domestic violence

A number of the profiles discussed the potential relationship between alcohol and domestic violence (Bristol, City & Holbeck, Doncaster, Haringey, Leicester, Lewisham and Sheffield). The proportion of DV reported to be associated with alcohol varied across the areas; Lewisham reported that the suspect had drinking in 10% of DV flagged crimes, Leicester found offender alcohol and drug use in 17% of offences, Sheffield reported that 43% of offenders were considered to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the incident (note 30% were recorded as not under the influence) and City & Holbeck considered alcohol as a contributory factor in 55% of assaults. Bristol presumed (from a dip sample and feedback) that a large proportion of DV offences are alcohol-related; however this is difficult to demonstrate conclusively as a link is not included in Home Office data collection and counting rules and there are no statistics available which relate to the prevalence of drug use in DV.

Haringey estimated that 20% to 40% of DV is linked to alcohol, and that DV hotspots for alcohol-related crime are the same as hotspots for DV overall. Analysis of visitors to DV

help centres revealed that 66% reported that neither they nor the perpetrator had an alcohol problem. Thirty percent did, however, report the perpetrator to have either a drugs or alcohol problem.

Lewisham reported that alcohol accounts for 24% of DV sexual assault, 13% of DV rape of a female offences, and 12% DV GBH with intent.

Doncaster reported that 76% of DV offences occurred in a dwelling, and that 60% of total DV in dwelling was alcohol-related. Eight percent of DV occurs in the road, 51% of which are alcohol-related. Four percent of DV is in a council dwelling, 68% of which is alcohol-related. Three percent of DV occur outside a dwelling, 43% of which are alcohol-related, and 2% of DV occur in a pub of which 83% are alcohol-related. It is impossible to know whether any DV incidents occurred after victim/perpetrator got home from pubs/clubs. Doncaster also reported that the number of offences recorded as alcohol-related has risen from around 50% to 68%, with an average of 59%, over the past 12 months, and that offences with suspects who are common law husbands/partners and boyfriends are most likely to be alcohol-related (over 70%); where suspects are ex/estranged common law husbands or partners this falls to 44%.

Leicester reported seasonal peaks in alcohol-related offences where the offender was under the influence with peaks over the festive period and during the summer (July and August). The top wards for DV offences where the offender was under the influence were identified. Only 1% of DV offenders were under the influence of drugs at time of offence; however, this may soon increase as consistent data recording has only recently been introduced.

7 Domestic Violence

Eleven profiles offered one or more dedicated sections to domestic violence (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Bristol, City & Holbeck, Camden, Ealing, Haringey, Kirklees, Lewisham, Newham, and Waltham Forest), and a further 2 provided a separate report (Doncaster and Leicester). The Sheffield profile, of course, focused on domestic violence (DV).

7.1 Defining domestic violence and extracting relevant incidents for analysis

Several profiles provided a definition of domestic violence (n=3), two of which were the standard ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) definition⁸. The remaining definition looked similar to the ACPO one but was not credited to anybody.

It was sometimes difficult to determine which data had been utilised to explore incidents of domestic violence. However, in many areas the use of a domestic violence flag or marker was hailed to have been used to extract the relevant information (Doncaster, Ealing, Leicester, Sheffield and Waltham Forest). There was a caveat to this marker though as some areas warned that it was dependent on accurate recorded and that procedures had only recently been put in place to ensure this takes place. For example, Doncaster stated that the domestic violence marker could only be relied upon as

⁸ The ACPO definition of domestic violence is “any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults aged 18 or over, who are or who have been intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender or sexuality”. Family members are defined as mother, father, son, daughter, sister, brother and grandparents, whether directly related, in-laws or step family (ACPO 2005, source: Leicester profile).

accurate after April 2006. In order to explore trends beyond this the analyst extracted DV offences based on the ACPO definition using keywords (“Husband”, “Wife”, “Father”, “Mother”, “Son”, “Daughter”, “Brother”, “Sister”, “Common Law”, “Ex”, “Great/Grand”, “Boyfriend” or “Girlfriend”). It was also ensured that the suspect/accused and the victim(s) were over 18. The DV marker is useful when it is used properly and Sheffield remarked that it was useful as it allowed both crime and non-crime incidents to be extracted for analysis.

Timeframes tended to match the period explored for all violence; Sheffield used the period April to September 2006. Datasets were also similar to those utilised for overall violence although some areas sourced new data to explore DV; Birmingham D1 used OASIS logs, Kirklees included calls for service and information from the VIVID (Vulnerable and Intimidated Victims Database) system, and City & Holbeck utilised a whole range of source material including information from Housing (2005), the Crown Prosecution Service (2005-2006), victim support (2005), Leeds woman’s aid (2005), HALT (voluntary sector DV support agency), Sahara (voluntary sector DV support for African and Asian women, 2005-2006), and Behind Closed Doors (voluntary sector agency supporting women and children who are victims of DV, 2005-2006).

7.2 Offences

Domestic violence as a percentage of all crime

The proportion of total offences attributed to domestic cases varies by area. Leicester reported that 8% of total crime was domestic; this is high compared to Sheffield (3%) and Bristol (4.5%). The proportion of all violence attributed to domestic offences ranged from 17 to 33%; DV accounts for 17% of all violent crime in Doncaster, 18.5% in Bristol, 20% in Birmingham D1, and 22% in Leicester. DV accounts for 20% of VAP in Haringey, 21% in Camden and between 25-27% in Birmingham D3. Newham recorded that DV accounted for a third of VAP, and City & Holbeck report that 24% of assaults are domestic.

Trends

Trends in DV vary by area. Doncaster reports that levels of DV have been steadily falling since June 2006 whereas Birmingham D1 report inconsistent levels of offending over the 05/06 financial year. Camden noted that DV fell between 2004 and 2006 overall despite increasing in two of the hotspot areas.

Birmingham D3 reported that the increase in DV over the last three years was primarily responsible for the increase in violent offences recorded between 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 when over 80% of the recorded increase in VAP could be attributed to an increase in DV offences. This reflects either an increase in victim willingness to complain/report/persist with complaints, positive police action to bring DV offenders to justice or a combination of these factors. DV crimes are predominantly violent offences and a far greater proportion of these offences lead to serious harm in the victim than non-domestic crimes.

Bristol also reported an increase in DV over the last few years. Awareness has been raised by the presence of a DV car in the city centre on weekend nights and there had been an increase in arrests and a decrease in RV. Unfortunately resource constraints

mean it has been difficult to maintain the momentum of having a dedicated DV car on duty covering the city on Friday & Saturday nights. City & Holbeck reported on the numbers of women seeking help from different agencies in Leeds including women's aid. This is undoubtedly useful for the local area but of no interest to report here. Post-TVCP trends are however; the number of DV incidents recorded per month (p/m) has been increasing since start of TVCP, exceeded 350 p/m in July (compared to 250p/m in February and March 2006). This reflects the focus on encouraging reporting. There has also been an increase in positive disposals alongside the increase in reports.

Leicester quoted results from the Leicester City residents' survey (2005) which reported an increase in DV incidents from 10.34 to 11.19 incidents per 1000 population. As the number of reports to the police is decreasing this suggests that a high proportion of offences are not reported and/or recorded.

Sheffield established that there were more than 3,000 DV incidents between April and September 2006 (nearly 1,000 were recorded as violent crimes, 300 plus were other crimes, and just over 1,000 were non-crime incidents); only 3% of these cases deemed as high risk, 47% were classed medium risk and 51% low risk. The rate of DV offences was estimated to be 16.92 per day (5.3 per day for violent crimes, 1.6 for other crimes, and 9.8 per day for non-crimes). Overall the levels of serious violent crime flagged as DV have remained stable over the past three years and account for less than 1% of all recorded incidents of DV. Public order and harassment have risen substantially since April 2006 (when the Domestic Violence Crime and Victims Act 2004 was introduced), and less than 40% of all recorded crime and non-crime flagged as DV are violent.

Peak offences

Peak offences for domestic violence often mirror those reported for overall violence or VAP namely ABH, common assault and harassment (Birmingham D1, Doncaster, Ealing, Lewisham, and Waltham Forest). However, sexual offences such as rape and sexual assault can also feature higher than average (Lewisham and Waltham Forest). In fact in Lewisham sexual assault on a female was the highest recorded alcohol-related domestic offence, followed by rape and GBH with intent.

Weapon usage

Birmingham D3 found that domestic VAP have lower degrees of weapons involvement than non-domestic incidents; instead cases of verbal and mental abuse and physical abuse involving fists and feet are more common. This is supported by findings in Doncaster in which the use of fists or hands to punch or slap the victim was the most common 'weapon' in domestic violence (63% of cases). Birmingham D3 went on to state that when weapons were involved in domestic incidents they were likely to be knives. Overall, weapon involvement in domestic VAP was more spontaneous than for all VAP suggesting that the offenders use what is at hand rather than selecting a weapon before the event (Birmingham D3). Sheffield also reported that premeditated

weapon use was rarely observed in DV (3-4%)⁹. The most common premeditated weapon was identified as a knife or dagger.

Sheffield also found a high correlation between domestic incidents and the use of body parts when a weapon was used; 62% of DV incidents involving a weapon were quoted to be body parts. Overall, approximately half of DV incidents in Sheffield reportedly involved a weapon. This is in stark contrast to Leicester who only reported 7% of their DV incidents to be weapons-involved. However, it is unclear whether Leicester includes cases where the victim is attacked using body parts; hands, fists, feet etc are not mentioned as separate categories in the weapons table but could be classified as "other". Leicester also noted that seven DV incidents involved a firearm and that the number fell with each passing year (4 in 2003/04, 2 in 2004/05 and just 1 in 05/06).

Other interesting findings emerging from Sheffield include the statement that 96% of weapons-involved were recorded as actual offences as opposed to non-crime recordable (note that weapons were listed in other DV crimes, e.g. criminal damage, which may have skewed the figures). Escalation was also considered and one case where weapon use escalated from the use of body parts to a cigarette lighter was identified.

7.3 Location

Residential homes are the prime location of DV offending (Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3, Camden, Doncaster, Ealing, Haringey, Kirklees, Leicester, Newham, Sheffield, and Waltham Forest) and in many cases specific housing estates were highlighted. Camden, for example, reported that 84% of DV cases occurred in the home, Doncaster found 80% took place in or outside a dwelling and Waltham Forest reported 80% of cases took place in a domestic location. Some areas made a distinction between the inner and the outer city regions. Sheffield found that 86% of DV offences outside the city centre occurred in non-public places and that 99% of these were in a dwelling. Doncaster found that between 86-88% of offences in residential hotspots were in a dwelling compared to just 33% in the town centre. Just under a third of DV can be attributed to home addresses in Sheffield which the profile considered indicative that the majority of offences are linked to resident population.

Interestingly, Waltham Forest found where location was a domestic premise victims stated the offence location was their home address (same across all offence types) in 84% of cases, and the suspects address in 12% (same across all offence types). In only 507 reported offences was it stated that both the offender and victim lived at the address where the offence took place (9% of all domestic premises). This suggests that living with the perpetrator reduced the chances of reporting the offence to the police.

Hotspots were often located in residential estates, and in many cases these were often deprived areas. Haringey found that DV offences generally occurred in low value or council owned property, and Ealing mentioned that two of their hotspot areas were socially deprived. Birmingham D1, Birmingham D3 and Sheffield discussed the potential role of deprivation in a bit more detail.

Birmingham D1 makes a link between high areas of deprivation and the level and locations of hotspots for DV. The primary hotspot estates are both areas of condensed

⁹ Premeditation was determined by (1) weapon type, (2) location of weapon use, and (3) premeditated use away from offenders home address.

social housing with a number of high-rise, multi-occupancy tower blocks. It is therefore assumed that there is at least a slight correlation between social housing make-up and the volume of DV incidents in the area. Analysis of the Multiple Index of Deprivation was conducted to establish the social make up and well being of D1 area; the results found that there were high rates of unemployment which correlated with DV hotspots and a correlation between income and DV, albeit slightly weaker (one hotspots falls into the top 1% of income deprived wards in England, and two more fall into top 5%). A minimal correlation was found between health and DV hotspots, with two hotspots falling into the top 5% for poor health in England, and another in the top 20%. Overall the worst estate for DV falls into top1% deprived areas in England.

Birmingham D3 found that although DV is more concentrated in deprived areas (i.e. those consisting of high density or low density social housing) deprivation and poor housing is not a good indicator for the level of domestic VAP which occur in the area. The profile also considered ASB and disorder hotspots and found that it does not escalate into non-domestic VAP. However, these locations coincide with DV hotspots which reflects the hard pressed nature of the communities and the lack of facilities for youths in the area. Overall, neighbourhoods with high DV rates are not necessarily high for non-domestic VAP.

Sheffield identified hotspots using the 100 natural neighbourhoods by which their area was divided and found that the nine hotspot areas all fall into the top quartile of the most deprived neighbourhoods. They also found that 50-75% of the housing stock was social housing in hotspot areas and that key support services were located in and around hotspot areas (although they questioned whether this was because there was more DV or because reporting rates were better due to access to services).

Other locations identified as DV hotspots were town and city centres (Doncaster and Sheffield). Sheffield found that the majority of DV in the city centre occurred in a public place and of these 58% were non-licensed (e.g. roads), and 11% were licensed. Sixty-seven percent of incidents in non-licensed occurred on main or minor roads which suggests that a large number of incidents recorded on non-licensed public places and roads is indicative of people continuing their argument following ejection from licensed places. The inclusion of the city centre as a hotspot is unusual because it has a low permanent resident population, however it is suggested that the high transient population, and the prevalence of alcohol and NTE are contributory factors. Doncaster also found links between their urban centre and the NTE; 28% of DV occurred in or outside a NTE venue (i.e. a pub, club, working men's club, hotel, or takeaway).

Other factors identified by the profiles in relation to location included Camden's finding that VAP (domestic and non-domestic) offenders and victims' addresses cluster in DV areas and Newham's finding that nearly half of all VAP (domestic and non-domestic) occurs in the victims home. Sheffield found that 31% of victims of DV in a public place were also listed as victims elsewhere indicating that some incidents are part of a sequence that may spill over from the home onto a public area. Haringey noted that hotspots for alcohol-related domestic offences were the same as those for DV overall and Ealing reported that two of their hotspot estates had a reputation for the sale of class A drugs.

7.4 Timing

Time of day and weekday

Weekend evenings are highlighted as peak times for DV reports (crimes, incidents and/or calls) and were identified by City & Holbeck, Haringey, Lewisham, Doncaster, Leicester, Birmingham D1, Bristol and Waltham Forest and problematic times. Peak times of day are generally later on weekend nights than on weekday evenings (Lewisham, for example, reported peaks at 1900-0100 on weekdays by 2300-0100 at weekends). Fewer reports are made on weekdays; Leicester reports a Tuesday trough whereas it's Wednesday in Birmingham D1. Bristol and Waltham Forest both report peaks for DV on weekend nights and an even spread of offences across the rest of the week. However, Waltham Forest also reports lunchtime peaks but none at 3-4pm which is a peak period for total VAP. This latter finding lends support to the hypothesis that offences committed at these times are committed by youths after school closes.

The clustering of DV offending on weekend evenings has led some areas to make a link between DV and alcohol consumption. Birmingham D3 states that as domestic VAP most commonly occurs in the early hours at the weekend this is suggestive that alcohol is a factor (offenders will often have been socialising and consuming alcohol, either within or outside the home and will be at their most intoxicated). Haringey found peaks for domestic alcohol-related crime on Friday and Saturday afternoons and evenings. Leicester attributes the peaks to a variety of social factors including alcohol consumption. Other factors highlighted as associated with the weekends is that this is when families are together for longer periods and also that child access by separated parents is likely to take place at the weekend.

Other specific events associated with peaks in DV included Christmas, New Year and the 2006 football World Cup (Doncaster and Sheffield). Doncaster, for example, found that peak days for DV were Christmas Eve, New Years Eve and Boxing Day and that the peaks in June coincided with the days England played in the World Cup.

One final noteworthy finding is from Kirklees, who found that that 50% of their daytime offences were attributable to DV in four out of five divisions in the south of their area.

Seasonality

Only a few profiles discuss seasonal trends in relation to DV. Birmingham D3 states that seasonality for domestic (as opposed to non-domestic) VAP is more pronounced and that there is a peak in February. However, Leicester reports a dip in incidents in February and records peaks in Aug and Dec instead.

7.5 Victims

Not all of the profiles included victim and/or offender statistics. Some details were recorded and these are summarised over the next two sections.

Age

Comparing peak age groups can be difficult because different people set different thresholds for each group. However, it was possible to compare the results for Bristol

and City & Holbeck (Leeds); who both found the top age categories to be 16-24, 25-34 and 35-44 albeit in different orders. City & Holbeck reports that 25-34 accounted for 30% of DV victims, followed by 16-24 year olds (27%) and then 35-44 (25%). In contrast, Bristol reported the top category to be 35-44 (25%) followed by 25-34 (25%) then 16-24 (23%). Other age groups highlighted by Bristol were 45-54 (11%), under 15s (5%), 55-64 (3%), and 65-74 (1%). In the remaining 7% of cases the age of the victim was unknown.

Sheffield also highlighted young adults as the predominant victims of DV. The age profile of victims was stated to be similar to that of offenders (which put 18-27 year olds as the top category followed by 27-38 then 38-47).

Kirklees took a slightly different approach to assessing peak age by exploring the characteristics of their top 11 repeat victims. Of these 11 people six were in their thirties, 2 in their forties, two aged 19-25 and one in their seventies.

Some areas provided peak age bands but they were so wide that they prove useless. Ealing, for example, highlights that young people are at risk stating the peak age group to be 20 to 45 year olds. Waltham Forest provided an even wider age band of sixteen to forty-five which is not helpful when trying to establish who you might want to target with crime reduction initiatives. Lewisham split the dataset into male and female victims but still provided age bands which were much too large (25-59 and 18-59 respectively).

Leicester also cross-referenced victim age and gender but broke the age categories down into smaller groups. The top four categories were the same for both males and females; 20-29 (24% for male and 33% for female victims), 30-39 (18% and 24% respectively), 10-19 (18% and 15% respectively) and 40-49 (16% and 15% respectively). Older males were also at risk (5% of male victims were 50-59, and 2% were 60-69). Elderly males appeared to be a low risk group with less than 1% of offences being committed against each of the 70-79, 80-89, 90-99, and 100-109 groups. Thirteen percent of cases with a male victim had no age attached and there was no mention of under tens being targeted. In contrast, 10% of female victims were under 10 years old. A further 7% were 50-59 and 1% were either 60-69, 70-79 or 80-89. No other age categories were included for females.

Gender

Females are overrepresented as victims of domestic violence in most areas which discussed victim characteristics (Bristol, Camden, City & Holbeck, Haringey, Kirklees, Leicester, Lewisham, Sheffield and Waltham Forest), although the proportion of female victims differed. Bristol and Sheffield reported that 90% of DV victims were female whereas Haringey and Leicester reported slightly lower proportions (82% and 77% respectively). All of the top eleven victims in Kirklees were also confirmed as female. Lewisham noted that 73% of DV victims were female despite the fact they only account for 52% of the population.

Ealing was the only area in which the trend was reversed; only 39% of DV victims were reported to be female. Initially it was expected (by this author) that the gender field had not been completed accurately but interestingly the profile confirmed that the remaining 61% of victims were male. The profile also reported a prevalence of male offenders suggested that many of these DV incidents are male on male violence.

Ethnicity

Unsurprisingly White people make up the highest volume of DV victims. However, a number of profiles identified that ethnic minority groups were overrepresented as victims when resident population was taken into account.

Areas such as City & Holbeck and Sheffield quote very high proportions of White victims (95% and 85% respectively). However, Ealing and Haringey report much lower levels (40% and 39% respectively). These areas report similar levels of victimisation for ethnic minority groups as for White groups; 28% of victims in Ealing are Asian, and 24% Afro-Caribbean. Thirty-seven percent of victims in Haringey were also Afro-Caribbean. This might in some way reflect a more varied ethnic mix resident in the area but overrepresentation within the ethnic minority community is still evident. Other areas reporting overrepresentation of ethnic minority victims include Waltham Forest (Afro-Caribbean) and Camden (where Asians are overrepresented for common assault, GBH and harassment DV crimes, and Afro-Caribbean's who are overrepresented in all VAP categories). Lewisham also mentions Afro-Caribbean victims but states the highest volume of offences is attributed to White victims (36% of victims were White females).

Although the majority of reported DV offences were against White people in Sheffield, the area did note that statistics for the financial year 2005/06 indicated a higher percentage of ethnic minority victims accessing services than are recorded on the police system (which only found 6% of victims were Afro-Caribbean and 5% Asian). This was seen to be indicative of a problem with underreporting and it was suggested that this could be due to a number of reasons including fear, a lack of confidence in the police and language barriers.

Leicester analysed their information a little differently to other areas, again looking for within group trends between males and females. Breaking the male and the female groups down by ethnicity Leicester established that the within group trends were similar with 61% of males and 65% of females being White, 20% of males and 19% of females being Asian, and 8% of males and 7% of females African-Caribbean. Other minority ethnic groups (for example, Oriental, Dark European or Arab) accounted for less than one percent each. Nine percent of cases were missing the victim ethnicity information for each gender group.

Other

Some areas cross-referenced victim age, gender and/or ethnicity (results for Leicester, for example, are included above); Waltham Forest was one such area. Thirty percent of victims were identified as White females aged 16-45, and a further 22% were Afro-Caribbean females 16-45. The individual group with the highest number of victims was the White female 26-35 category. Haringey discussed an additional factor with reference to victim demographics; nationality. Only 35% of victims had a nationality entered on the crime report (n=755) but it was still felt to be worth reporting. The largest group was "British" (60%) but fifty-nine other nationalities were used by victims to describe themselves in the timeframe. The highest minority nationality was Turkish accounting for 5% of the 755 persons. Sheffield also discussed an extra factor in relation to victims namely employment status; 17% were described as employed and 38% as economically inactive. Although the level of economic inactivity may seem higher it was noted that the victims generally held a higher economic position than offenders. This was touted as a possible trigger for violence.

Victim injury was mentioned by some of the profiles. Sheffield reported that 38% of domestic victims were injured; with section 47 ABH accounting for the higher proportion of injuries. Serious woundings (section 18 GBH with intent and section 20 GBH) accounted for 1.4% of injuries. Camden reported that there was *no* victim injury in 65% of domestic assaults. In contrast Lewisham reported that 65% of cases resulted in victim injury (49% minor, 15% moderate and 1% serious). However, Lewisham did report that the percentage of victims injured has decreased over time.

It is difficult to determine the real level of DV and the underreporting of domestic violence is a major concern for police forces. Ealing highlighted that there is danger of underreporting because victims know the offender, and perhaps fear repercussions. Birmingham D3 found that only 42% of calls to the police are made by victims reconfirming fears of underreporting. However, Birmingham D3 found that DV victims (who are often afraid to report abuse and retract earlier statements) are likely to proceed with their complaint and assist the police if the offence is more serious.

Waltham Forest found that there had been an increase of 22% in the average level of reporting during the timeframe however they suggested that as many DV incidents never come to police attention this increase in reported offences could be indicative of better policing. Waltham Forest also noted a lag between the times offences occurred and when they were reported; 5, 480 offences reported within the timeframe occurred within the timeframe, however a further 157 didn't. Unfortunately no details of when these 157 occurred (i.e. in the weeks leading up to the timeframe starting or years before) in the profile. Further to this point Leicester reported that the risk of crime and the actual number of reports don't necessarily match up. In this BCU the two wards highlighted by a local residential survey (2005) as high for DV had low number of DV reports associated with them. Leicester highlighted the need to encourage these people to report incidents.

7.6 Offenders

The typical DV offender is a young white male in his twenties or thirties.

Age

Peak ages were highlighted as 25-34 (35%), 35-44 (30%) and 16-24 (22%) in City & Holbeck, and 18-27 (35%), 27-38 (33%) and 38-47 (24%) in Sheffield. Haringey reported similar peak ages with 35% of offenders being 21-30 and 31% 31-40. They also stated the average age to be 32 and revealed that 90% of suspects were aged between 17 and 50 years old. It was also established that the most common group of female suspects were older than the most common group of male suspects. Ealing also reported offenders to be young adults in their twenties and thirties, and Waltham Forest reported the (rather broad) 16-45 peak age category again.

Lewisham combined age, gender and ethnicity to report that 75% of Afro-Caribbean and 74% of White male offenders were aged 25-59. A further 20% in each category were aged 18-24. Kirklees reported on their top ten DV offenders and reported that it consisted of one female in her twenties, one in her forties and one in her fifties. The remaining seven offenders were males; two in their twenties, two in their thirties, two in their forties and one in his fifties.

Leicester also considered the breakdown of age by gender and reported that 44% of female offenders were aged 20-29, 34% were 30-39, 17% were 10-19, 6% were 40-49 and 2% 50-59. Proportions for male offenders differed with 31% aged between 20-29, 30% 30-39, 18% 40-49, 11% 10-17, and 2% 50-59. No age was recorded for the remaining 7%.

Gender

Many of the profiles confirmed that males are the primary perpetrators of reported DV (i.e. Waltham Forest, Camden, Ealing, Haringey, Kirklees, Leicester, Doncaster, Lewisham and Sheffield). The proportions differed slightly by area, for example, males made up 88% of the offending sample in Leicester, 85% in Ealing, 82% in Haringey, 80-85% in Doncaster and 70% in Kirklees. Interestingly Doncaster also examined the gender of offenders by time of year and found that the percentage of male offenders rose during July and August and suggested that this might reflect the football World Cup. The percentage of female offenders rose in December; peak dates were the 6th, 31st and 24th December perhaps linking to Christmas and New Year.

Lewisham noted an overrepresentation of Afro-Caribbean males in relation to DV; this group were associated with 42% of DV flagged offences despite only accounting for only 13% of the population. In contrast White males were underrepresented accounting for 28% of cases and 33% of the resident population.

Sheffield considered the relationship between the victim and offender alongside the offenders' gender. They found that 90% of current partners and 91% of ex-partners responsible for DV were male. It was also established that when a partnership breaks down and the offender enters "ex" status the level of actual violent incidents attributed to males rises from 89% to 94%. Female offenders account for approximately 10% of DV incidents in Sheffield. Females in "ex" relationships use less violence than those in "current" relationships. Males account for 78% of offenders in other familial relationships. Sheffield also considered data from the Sheffield Domestic Abuse Forum (SDAF) and found that records showed a higher proportion of offenders were female (28%) than police records did. This finding was questioned and it was suggested it might be due to intra-familial assaults (e.g. mother and daughter) than due to violence between partners and ex-partners.

Ethnicity

The largest offending group is White but again Asian and Afro-Caribbean groups are overrepresented. City & Holbeck reported that 91% of offenders were White, whereas Sheffield put the figure closer to 80% with an overrepresentation of ethnic minority groups. Ealing reported that 37% of offenders were White, 28% Afro-Caribbean and 29% Asian with the figure for Afro-Caribbean's being disproportionately high. Camden also found that Asian and Afro-Caribbean males were overrepresented. Lewisham and Waltham Forest both reported the top ethnic groups to be Afro-Caribbean followed by White. Haringey reported 42% of offenders to be Afro-Caribbean, 30% to be White and 16% as Dark Europeans, and found that Afro-Caribbean suspects were younger than suspects belonging to other ethnic groups.

Leicester considered age, gender and ethnicity together and found that 81% of female offenders were White, 9% were African-Caribbean, 9% Asian and 1% 'other'. The distribution of male offenders was spread across more groups with 63% being classed

as White, 21% as Asian, 13% as African-Caribbean, 2% as 'other', 1% as Dark European, less than 1% Arab and less than 1% Oriental.

Other

Waltham Forest combined age, gender and ethnicity to identify peak offending groups and found that 23% of offenders were White males aged 16-45 and 27% were Afro-Caribbean males also aged 16-45. The highest individual offending groups was Afro-Caribbean males aged 26-35. It is noted that these results are impacted by reporting problems plus some suspect forms are incomplete, however the profile considered all suspects named as being involved with DV and not just those charged with an offence. Another offender factor was Haringey's finding that 81% of offenders had a home address in their area.

A few areas discussed police action, arrest rates and detections. Birmingham D3, for example, reported an increase in the level for charging for domestic-related wounding and GBH offences and suggested that this might be attributed to positive police action to bring DV offenders to justice. Bristol reported having an arrest rate target of 25% with actual rates fluctuating between 24% and 30% between April and October 2006. With regards to detections Doncaster revealed that 58% of offences resulted in a detection. Disposals (in no particular order) included cautions, a visit to the magistrate or youth court and some cases to the Crown Court. In some cases the witness declined to give evidence, the magistrate and others were awaiting court disposal at the time the analysis was conducted. Doncaster also noted that section 47 ABH offences resulted in more cautions than common assault and had fewer unknown disposals. Leicester reported that in 31% of DV cases the perpetrator was charged with the offence, they received a caution in 13%, the complaint was withdrawn in 7% and no further action was taken in 2%.

Several profiles posited possible triggers for DV. Bristol mentioned alcohol and drug use, relationship breakdown, child issues (e.g. access to childcare, new pregnancy), social and personal circs (tenure type, SES, unemployment), personality (jealousy, controlling, feelings of inadequacy, mental health issues), social triggers (sports events, birthdays) and Waltham Forest quoted money (11% of cases), recently separated (11%), child access (9%), partners family (7%), alcohol (7%), jealousy (6%) from the results of a previous DV problem profile which considered a representative sample of DV between September 2005 and August 2006. Leicester named factors associated with offending as being male, being aged 20-29, having a history of DV in the family unit, being brought up by people with poor parenting skills, financial problems poor social skills, unemployment, alcohol and drug misuse, poor standard of education, expulsion/suspension from school. Sheffield identified two types of DV offenders; borderline/emotionally dependent and anti-social/narcissistic. Sheffield also noted that 41% of offenders were economically inactive and 26% employed (the majority of these being low-level/skilled jobs).

Relationship to victim

Domestic violence by definition is committed by people known to the victim. Domestic violence commonly occurs between family members particularly between husbands and wives (e.g. in Ealing). Haringey reported that 74% of DV was committed by a current or ex-partner, with a further 23% committed by immediate family. Ex-boyfriends are the

most common individual relationship (32%). Lewisham report that 48% of DV is committed by a current partner 29% by an ex-partner, 6% by other blood relations and a further 17% by people who have another form of relationship with the victim. Sheffield reports similar proportions with 48% of DV flagged incidents involving a current partner, 36% an ex-partner and 17% or other familial relationships (of the 78% who are male, 49% of which are sons, 21% brothers and 8% fathers). Doncaster reports that common law husbands or partners and previous/estranged common law husbands or partners are suspects in 42% of all DV, and that husbands and boyfriends account for a further 23%. Doncaster also consider DV within same sex partnerships; 30 offences were identified (accounting for 1.6% of all DV offences) and they found that female same sex partnerships were more likely to feature (although they acknowledged this could be influenced by reporting and the small sample size). Waltham Forest also established that the offender was likely to have close relationship with the victim either as partners or through other familial links. Fifty-two different relationships were noted of which 45% involved a current partner and 31% an ex-partner.

7.7 Repeat Victimisation (RV)

Repeat victimisation (RV) is very important to consider in the context of domestic violence. Many of the profiles discussed repeat incidents of DV (Birmingham D1, Bristol, Doncaster, Haringey, Kirklees, Leicester, Newham, Lewisham, Sheffield and Waltham Forest), albeit the level of detail varied.

Repeat victims can be difficult to identify if the cases are not logged as repeats. Doncaster reported that they identified 211 repeat victims using their full name and date of birth, however only 16 offences (out of the 515 attached to these victims) were tagged as RV. Of the 211 repeat victims, 145 reported two DV offences, 45 reported three offences, 16 reported four, four reported five and one reported six. Doncaster also attempted to assess the level of progression of DV by looking at the correlation between the number of offences and the level of seriousness. They found that 186 out of the 211 repeat victims suffered at least one of the following: ABH, endanger life/administer poison, rape (female over 16 years of age), robbery, sex assault on a female, threat of murder, or wounding (sections 18 and 20). Of these 186 victims 42 (23%) suffered escalating violence. Doncaster also reported on disposal outcomes by repeats.

Newham reported that a quarter of all violent crimes were against repeat victims (mostly female and/or White) and that 40% of DV victimisations were experienced by repeat victims. Eighty-five percent of repeat victims are female, accounting for 87% repeats. They also reported that seven out of eight repeat VAP offender have also been victims of VAP in the last three years, and that all are male, 87% were aged 34-41, and many related to DV. Lewisham also reported on the gender of repeat victims and found that repeat victim statistics were similar to the overall age, gender, ethnic breakdown of DV victims; 43% were White females, and 37% were Afro-Caribbean females. Thirty-five percent of female repeat victims were White aged 25-59, 12% were White aged 18-24, 28% were Afro-Caribbean aged 25-59 and 13% were Afro-Caribbean aged 18-24. The number of repeat victims was found to have increased over time.

Haringey considered RV to be a real problem for DV and made a link between RV and fear of crime. Over the three year analysis period they found that 25% of victims experienced 2 or more offences (14 victims reported over 7). It was also reported that

36% of people who visited the DV support centre were repeat victims; only two repeat visitors were male, and 13% had mental health issues. Repeat offenders were also mentioned; only one in eight was heavily involved in other criminal activity and it was noted that he had learning difficulties.

Leicester defined RV as suffering from 2 or more incidents in a 12 month period. They found that 22% of DV in one hotspot area was attributable to RV; however three areas which do not feature as overall DV hotspots have high rates of RV. Waltham Forest identified 2,007 DV victims using the victim pages in the last year of the analysis period; however only 233 reported more than one incident. Analysis using the crime records identified 1,360 repeat victimisations. The mean number of offences was 2.71 in the last 12 months but the maximum reported was 21.

Birmingham D1 established the top 10 addresses for repeat victimisation but was surprised to find that these did not match with those for the top offenders. In light of this, it is suggested that they might find the Waltham Forest findings on victim and offender addresses interesting, i.e. the theory that living with the perpetrator reduced the chances of reporting the offence to the police. Birmingham D1 also gave details of the cases of the top two repeat victims and the associated offenders.

Sheffield reported that RV in the area reflected the national picture for RV. Of the 2,075 males listed as DV offenders 434 were classed as repeat assailants. The rate of recidivism was high, ranging between 2 and 13 incidents for the 6 months examined (one nominal had 10 actual violent crimes listed against them in the period, although it is not known if they are all DV). The top 10 recidivists, defined as "any assailant with three or more violent domestic offences, plus other incidents with a domestic flag", were identified. They were all male, the average age was 31.5, with a range of 20 to 41, 80% were economically inactive, all had a chaotic intoxication status, most were partners or ex-partners of the victims (note that there were often multiple listings with varied ex versus partner status perhaps indicative of fluid state of relationships), and one had a chequered criminal history and incidents extended beyond partner to other members of the family. One case appeared to have a direct link to the NTE as incidents were almost exclusively violent and seem to be clustered in the city centre in the evening indicating that alcohol and the NTE could be trigger factors. More than 350 repeat victims, defined as "any victim with four or more incidents during the period Apr-Sep 2006", were identified and over half have seen a reduction in incidents since start of analysis period. Eleven out of the thirteen repeat victims were White, and two were Afro-Caribbean. The average age was 35.5, with a range of 20-66. Eleven were economically inactive. Almost all had number of different types of DV incidents attached to them signifying the unpredictable nature of DV. A number also appeared to display an escalating pattern (e.g. non-crime recordable offences at the start of the period and ABH at the end. Around fifty percent of identified high repeat situations have a violent offence listed as the last offence in the past 12 months; however many have harassment, criminal damage and/or non-recordable crimes reported early on suggesting escalation is a problem.

7.8 Responses

Intelligence and Analysis

The bulk of recommendations made about DV were in relation to intelligence gathering and the need to conduct further analysis on the problem. The first issue is in relation to the use (or misuse!) of the DV flag. Birmingham D1 highlighted the need to encourage the accurate use of special interest markers, and Leicester suggested that the recording systems need to be reorganised to make DV a separate entity (to facilitate analysis). Doncaster stressed that the MO “repeat victim” ought to be fully utilised, and suggested that creating a special interest marker to help flag alcohol-related offences. Doncaster also argued that the sexuality of the complainant would be useful to capture, as did Sheffield.

There were a number of other issues with regards to data accuracy. Doncaster also stated that victims names need to be double checked to ensure they are spelt correctly and that the disposal method needs to be recorded more accurately (over half of DV disposals are currently unknown). The profile also highlighted that the causes of DV need to be better recorded so that offenders and victims can be helped and referred to relevant third party agencies. Finally, where concerned parties have been out drinking prior to the DV event the LPs they were in should be captured in the crime report. Sheffield remarked upon the number of inaccuracies in addresses in the data recorded and stated that the premises type did not always reflect the changing face of housing; it was suggested that, ideally, ownership should be categorised as Social, Private-owned, private - rented, and business. Sheffield also reported that more than 600 women accessed the four DV support projects during 2005/06, which are all located in the more deprived areas of the city, but that the addresses of the victims were not recorded. This information would be useful to see where DV might cluster geographically. Recording victim refusal to co-operate on DV register (along with standardised set of reasons) would aid analysis and help plan specific interventions to prevent uncooperativeness (Sheffield). Birmingham D1 highlighted a need to address disparity between the top 10 list for addresses and offenders as only four currently match up.

Data sources and access to information was discussed by a few profiles. Doncaster and Sheffield recommended a reassessment of analysts current access to DV information; Doncaster argued analysts should be given DV screens on the crime system for analytical purposes and Sheffield stated analysts needed access to the domestic register. Sheffield also promoted the benefits of enhancing the data sharing protocol between agencies to help enable disclosure of information to the police, and argued that the recording of high risk cases must be standardised across both BCUs to enable analysis. It was also suggested that a link should be enforced between the crime system and the offender database (OIS - offender intelligence system) with regards to DV to allow for holistic data capture of RV and case history. Access to health service and ambulance data was also suggested. Sheffield have also been working on enhancing recording and data gathering with regards to the use of ‘hard’ evidence such as photos and 999 tapes. Camden suggested gathering detailed information on premises type to enable operational groups to target correct people and improve the recording and reporting of DV; the theory is that there may be a predominance of council properties being DV addresses in DV hotspot areas. Bristol mentioned head-mounted video cameras (headcams) as evidence-gathering tools.

Further research was suggested in a number of areas. Birmingham D1 wished to ensure that DV is further incorporated into the tactical assessment and that further

research is conducted to establish the correlation between DV and animal abuse (liaison with Birmingham CDRP and the Force CSB reveals no existing data sharing policy with the RSPCA). Further intelligence is needed on the lifestyle of offender (for example, where do they drink? is there evidence of harm to other members of the family or household pets? are they unemployed? do they have drugs problems?). Newham suggested that consideration given to Cozart testing (see footnote 6 for an explanation) for violent offences to establish if links between substance abuse and violent crime exist, and Lewisham highlighted the need to identify children and youths who are suspects for violent crime and/or live in violent homes.

Sheffield outlined a whole range of areas in which future analysis would be beneficial. Suggestions included analysis of the number of incidents directly attributed to sporting events, the correlation between binge drinking, major sporting events and DV, the attrition of offenders and how can peaks in detection rates help inform future cases.

A review of how cases and evidence are handled was also suggested. Recommendations were specifically made about what to analyse about offenders and victims. Information sought about offenders was whether they can be categorised using the two types (borderline/emotionally dependent and anti-social/narcissistic), why females offend (self-defence, retaliation, dually violent relationships, and/or familial abuse?), why Asian females are overrepresented as assailants (28% of known perpetrators were identified as Asian females by the Ashiana DV project), and as well as ethnic minority groups overall. Sheffield also wish to establish why violence is higher when male perpetrator is ex rather than current partner, and why most perpetrators are young (is it because offences committed by older people are underreported or because people enter into living together earlier, for example).

Qualitative interviews with sons/brothers/fathers were recommended to identify early trigger factors and assist early multi-agency intervention. Analysis on entire criminal history of DV offenders and the nature of intoxication (i.e. alcohol and/or drugs) would also be helpful. Long term pattern analysis in relation to previous cases and trigger factors and plugging intelligence gaps (through a dedicated analyst and/or standardised recording procedures) could assist in prevention and enforcement interventions. Ongoing work to improve response times, and data sharing protocols with DV projects would be useful.

Research in relation to victims centre around data quality (the relationship of assailant to victim column is completed but not the victim to assailant one), employment status (female victims more economically active than male assailants, why? Is this a trigger factor? Also workplaces would be useful to identify for awareness campaigns) and a need to identify when children are present (as this is said to increase likelihood of violence against women).

Research suggestions were also made in relation to geography. For example, why is there an overrepresentation of DV in deprived areas? Investigation of DV in public places and licensed premises is also needed; do offenders and victims of DV occurring on public places live close to the offence site? Are the offences part of a series? There is a need to explore the linked between DV and licensed premises. Twelve percent of incidents had location recorded as both at a dwelling and a licensed premise. If this is accurate, it suggests that incidents took place in the residential/living area of the public house, and are therefore attributable to the licensees who run the establishment or their families. If this were the case, 12% would appear to an over-representation of domestic violence/incidents taking place between those living and working in the

alcohol/entertainment industry. Stressful working hours and the availability of alcohol may fuel such incidents. This is an intelligence gap that if filled could provide a useful avenue for prevention and awareness campaigns. Analysis of weapon use is also needed; for example, whether there is an escalation or increase in frequency of weapon use after the first DV incident. This is important as it has implications for victim injury.

Other intelligence and analysis based recommendations include adding further information to the DV intranet page to help officers develop a better understanding of specific HH or offenders should they be called to the address (Birmingham D1), and the suggestion that police resourcing should be led by analysis (i.e. reflect peaks during football tournaments, bank holidays and Christmas).

Finally, Kirklees identified that calls for service are a good indicator of early problems that can develop into serious DV situations. They also indicate a reluctance to get the police involved but a willingness to report low level behaviours such as anti-social behaviour. This area is ripe for development in terms of early intervention and preventative measures in relation to DV. Kirklees also discussed their DV team in relation to intelligence gathering stating that the new DV unit has improved the continuity of intelligence by attending at the cells when a DV suspect is arrested. The importance of increasing intelligence gathering in relation to DV was also stressed.

Media Awareness Campaigns

Media awareness campaigns were suggested by a number of profiles as a means of publicising domestic violence and encouraging victims to come forward and report the crimes committed against them. Three areas suggested awareness campaigns should be set up which target young people. Lewisham highlighted the importance of encouraging respect amongst youths to try and prevent DV before it starts, and Waltham Forest highlighted the introduction of the 'Ashiana' DV schools programme. Sheffield advocated multi-agency awareness campaigns within schools and colleges and targets at both victims and offenders. The theory is that changing or shaping cognitive behaviour in the early stages is one of the most effective interventions for DV.

Waltham Forest and Lewisham also suggested more general media campaigns centred around an intolerance to DV, and Leicester suggested that the friends and relatives of DV victims should be targeted so that they can encourage victims to come forward and report DV. Leicester proposed increased publicity of support services, and a campaign to increase public awareness and educate people on consequences of DV. They also highlighted a need to increase awareness of different forms of DV.

Partnership work and support for victims

Working in partnership and providing support to DV victims formed a large proportion of recommendations about how to tackle DV.

Leicester suggested by working in partnership with other agencies the police aim to protect the victim, remove the risk of further attack, offer support and reassurance, fully investigate criminal offences and facilitate access to other agencies. Support mechanisms such as Police Domestic Violent Liaison officers, Police dedicated violence unit, Women's Aid, Social Services, RESPECT, GPs, Health visitors, Drug and Alcohol Treatment counselling, Victim Support, Connexions, Bridges, Family Welfare Association, LCC Housing, and Going Forward (support for young victims of DV) were

highlighted as being in place. Current initiatives also included the use of head-mounted cameras (headcams), the Security Keep Safe (ASK) project (which provides additional security measures for the home), and the employment of a DV co-ordinator (help improve policies and partnership working). Birmingham D3 suggested that further staff should be assigned to the DV team. Kirklees recommended that all repeat addresses needed to be dealt with through a partnership approach to reduce the number of calls for service.

Leicester also stated that a clear definition of problem is needed and recommended that the distribution of multi-lingual leaflets, the securing of sustainable funding for resources, and provision for non-court mandated perpetrator programmes would be helpful. More services should be offered to male victims of DV, and counselling services needed for victims of prolonged DV as psychological effects can be severe. Overall, improved services for victims will raise confidence and encourage reporting.

Partnership working through the introduction of a "one-stop-shop" staffed by support agency workers and trained police officers working together has enabled greater disclosure of offences to the police in Sheffield, especially since some of the staff are multi-lingual. There is a need to raise awareness in victims who are yet to seek help and dedicated resources have been provided to assist in targeting hard-to-reach communities and target the overrepresentation of DV within mixed-ethnicity relationships featuring minority male assailant and white female victim. More practical help is also being offered in the form of target hardening the homes of vulnerable victims and encouragement to keep self-report diaries.

Lewisham has also been promoting counselling, emergency refuges and support networks and charities for those at risk of DV. The area aims to provide support for victims, and there is a continuous collaboration between partner agencies such as housing, probation services, social services, charities and community groups. Liaison with these partner agencies will help provide alternative domestic environments for children and youths identified as suspects for violent crime and/or live in violent homes.

Bristol highlighted the success of dedicated services for victims. The profile reported that the TVCP had raised awareness of DV and that this had contributed to a substantial rise in arrest rates for DV this year. Although the effect of DVEC is difficult to demonstrate, 90 interventions were carried out over 14 week period with 40% arrest rate and a linked 80% detection rate. The feedback from one victim contacted during the DVEC was that "it is the best service and support I have ever received". Waltham Forest reported that four harm reduction plans for DV had been put in place under the TVCP; these were aimed at victims who had experience high levels of repeat victimisation and were hailed as useful.

The Birmingham D1 profile suggested that the police might want to consider use of pendant alarms to vulnerable women identified by the DV officer. The scheme has been successfully piloted by Merseyside Police, and has been found to help prevent imminent assaults by alerting to police to attend and remove the offender. It is also a deterrent for the offender. The DV officer will also encourage victims to call the police themselves instead of someone else doing it. Birmingham D1 also encouraged the implementation of a policy of victimless prosecutions where admissible evidence is available (e.g. CCTV) showing disorder relating to an assault where the victim will not press charges. City & Holbeck also proposed targeted activity on vulnerable victims and pursuing victimless prosecutions. The use of MARACS was also suggested but gave no indication of what this refers to.

Offender Management

The identification and management of offenders was also discussed. Lewisham stressed that repeat offenders should be targeted, and Leicester outlined the details of Operation Puppy which is aimed to reduce queues of DV incidents waiting to be dealt with, increase DV detection rates, promote early intervention with repeat offenders, and offer police training. Waltham Forest discussed the success of the DV arrest team highlighting that 30 suspects had been arrested between June and October 2006 and that high-risk murder panels had been set up. Kirklees also discussed the DV unit stating that it had recently undergone a 'revamp', and is now becoming more involved in dealing with suspects instead of pure focus on the victim.

Some areas discussed the possibilities surrounding altering offender behaviour. Birmingham D3 suggested initiatives should be set up to engage with repeat offenders who have yet to be prosecuted. This could include anger management type courses that could be offered to offenders as a means of avoiding intense police attention. Sheffield also wished to alter offender behaviour through trying to counteract the chaotic lifestyles of perpetrators. Sheffield also made recommendations about how to target resources appropriately (including the identification of key times, the development of a patrol strategy, collecting information on the non-domestic related offences committed by DV perpetrators and utilising duty down time to check on and reassure victims).

Doncaster planned to offer offenders advice on alcohol misuse, anger management and communication to help prevent DV incidents caused by drinking and/sparked by trivial matters, and Newham suggested using local council powers to evict recidivist offenders from council premises (designed to be a disruption techniques to prevent future violence. City & Holbeck also mentioned offenders in their recommendation but just said "top 20 offenders"; it is assumed that they mean identify and target key offenders but the details of how they plan to do this are missing from the profile.

Police Training

Several profiles highlighted the importance of police training and provided details of which skills they wished for officers to be trained in. Waltham Forest acknowledged a level of training in the staff who manned the DVEC car (hailed a useful resource) and planned to extend DV training to station reception officers, CAD room staff and police officers up to and including inspectors.

In June 2006 West Midlands Police planned to implement the DV Risk Assessment (in response to new legislation) with the aim that this would lead to greater understanding of the nature and extent of DV as it would assess the risks and threats posed to victims of DV. As part of the implementation the Birmingham D1 BCU suggested that all officers should be made aware of the new risk model and its significance.

Birmingham D3 provided a good example of how training is implemented with their description of the "Today's Domestic, Tomorrow's Murder" initiative:

"The delivery of the training "Today's Domestic, Tomorrow's Murder" to all officers and the implementation of policy that completion of a Vulnerable and Intimidated Witness log for all domestic-related incidents since April 2006 has led to an increase in the number of domestic-related crimes including Domestic-related Violence Against The Person. As a consequence, it has also resulted

in an increase in the recorded number of offences involving repeat victims and an increase in the repeat victimisation rate”

This paragraph highlights a number of positive results of implementing such training, included increasing awareness of the problem and boosted reporting rates.

Leicester stressed that intelligence gaps need to be identified and that recording and monitoring programmes need to be improved. Training programmes should be implemented to facilitate this.

8 Summary and conclusions

It was often difficult to draw out cross-cutting issues in violence due to the variation in what was counted as violent crime, the data used and the timeframes considered. However, there were some interesting findings and many preconceptions/assumptions about violence will have been confirmed and/or supported by the results reported in the profiles.

Overall, violent crime clusters in town and city centres on weekend evenings and alcohol is often a contributory factor. Hotspots for violence have also emerged on weekdays between 3-4pm in some areas. This is mostly attributed to young people offending against each other after the school day has ended; however, the vulnerability of commuters has also been highlighted. Trends confirm that residential areas are peak location for domestic violence, and that this type of crime also clusters on weekend evenings.

9 References

- Burrell, A. & Erol, R. (2006). *Violence in the night-time economy: tracking hotspots over time*. Report submitted by the Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science to the Police Standards Unit, October 2006.
- Erol, R. (2006). *Alcohol Misuse Enforcement Campaign: Problem Profile Analysis*. Report to the Home Office Police Standards Unit.
- Erol, R. (2006). *Domestic Violence Enforcement Campaign: Guidance on Problem Profiles*. Report to the Home Office Police Standards Unit.
- Walker, A., Kershaw, C., & Nicholas, S. (2006). *Crime in England and Wales 2005/06. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 12/06*. London: Home Office.

10 Glossary of terms

A&E	Accident & Emergency
ABC	Acceptable Behaviour Contract
ABH	Actual Bodily Harm
AMEC	Alcohol Misuse Enforcement Campaign
ASB	Anti-Social Behaviour
ASBO	Anti-Social Behaviour Order
ASSET	Assessment tool used by Youth Offending Teams to identify the needs of offenders
BCU	Basic Command Unit
BCS	British Crime Survey
BTP	British Transport Police
CAD	Computer Aided Dispatch
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CDRP	Crime & Disorder Reduction Partnership
CRIMNT	An Information System used by the Metropolitan Police Service
CRIS	Crime Reporting Information System
CSB	Crime Support Bureau
DAT	Drugs Action Team
DIP	Drugs Intervention Programme
DPPO	Designated Public Place Order
DV	Domestic Violence
DVEC	Domestic Violence Enforcement Campaign
FLARE	The Anti-Social Behaviour system for Newham
FPN	Fixed Penalty Notice
GBH	Grievous Bodily Harm
HO	Home Office
LASS	London Analysts Support Site
METSTATS	No definition was found in the literature but it is assumed that it is a statistics system run by the Metropolitan Police
MO	Modus Operandi
NCRS	National Crime Recording Standard
NSPIS	National Police Information System
NTE	Night-Time Economy
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OASIS	West Midlands Police Command and Control System
OCJS	Offending, Crime and Justice Survey
OIS	Offender Intelligence System
PCSO	Police Community Support Officer
PCT	Primary Care Trust

PPO	Prolific or Priority Offender
RSPCA	Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
RV	Repeat Victimisation
SCI	Street Crime Initiative
SDAF	Sheffield Domestic Abuse Forum
SDVC	Specialist Domestic Violence Court
SES	Socio-Economic Status
SIM	Special Interest Marker
TfL	Transport for London
TOCU	Transport Operational Command Unit
TVCP	Tackling Violent Crime Programme
VAP	Violence Against the Person
VIVID	Vulnerable and Intimidated Victims Database
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association