Candidate Number: Pol 1444

Philip John Etheridge

Fitzwilliam College

Supervisor: Dr Timothy Coupe and Mr John Parkinson

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE CAMBRIDGE HARM INDEX (CHI) TO CRIME DATA IN SOUTH YORKSHIRE

Submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the Master's Degree in Applied Criminology and Police Management

December 2015

<u>Abstract</u>

Are we policing the right places at the right times? To assist the task of targeting the right places, crime analysts have historically relied on mapping crime concentrations based upon unweighted crime-count data, however was this the best method available towards tackling crime that caused the most harm? Another approach was needed to balance out the potentially misleading way traditional crime analysis was done. To address the imbalance, the desire for a universal weighted crime seriousness index has been emerging from a number of researchers.

This study looked at almost 500,000 reported crimes within South Yorkshire between 2010 and 2015. This exploratory study used longitudinal analysis to identify patterns and differences in crime in spatial and temporal distribution, when assessed in single crime-counts and when it is assessed as crime-harm, following applying a weighted crime seriousness index. The study compared and contrasted spatial distribution when crime-count and crime harm were mapped in South Yorkshire. Underpinning the research was the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index and comprehension of predictable concentrations of crime and harm (Sherman 2013). It is hoped the study will mature the debate towards a harm-focussed, intelligence-led, evidenced-based approach to policing to ensure, that with a degree of suitable confidence, that we are keeping people safe by targeting the right places at the right times.

The study reached two notable conclusions: - Firstly, that crime and place are connected both in terms of crime-count and crime-harm. It demonstrated that both crime-count and crime-harm exist in concentrated places, supporting previous research, albeit that these may not be the same places. Within 4.4% of geographical area existed 50% of crime-count and within 3.4% of geographical area exists 50% crime-harm. Secondly, the research found that there are temporal differences between crime-count and crime-harm across the day, week, and months and even over the time of the study.

Acknowledgements

I am hugely indebted to a number of crucial people who, without their help, I would not have had the courage to submit a piece of work of this magnitude.

This has been one of the most demanding, but ultimately rewarding projects, I have ever undertaken and so I begin my acknowledgements with my wife Sharon, who believed I could achieve this and supported me whilst at Cambridge. I also want to acknowledge my grown-up children, both who are undergraduates at the Universities of Durham and Hull, who gave me the push I needed to return to academic studies.

I also wish to acknowledge my first and second year tutors at the University of Cambridge, Sir Denis O'Connor, John Parkinson and Dr Tim Coupe, whose wise, often blunt words, of wisdom kept me sane in my periods of academic despair.

Lastly, I wish to thank South Yorkshire Police analysts Karen Jackson and Melanie Cook who believed and supported the work I had proposed, to Chief Supt Rachael Barber who ultimately sanctioned my absences from my senior investigating officer role and, ultimately, to fellow detective Joe Chappell who painfully proof read my written work.

Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Contents	4
List of Tables	6
List of Figures	7
Introduction	9
Literature Review 1	4
Literature Review Introduction1	4
Crime and Place 1	4
Crime Seriousness1	6
Crime Seriousness Scale1	7
Cost of Crime 2	1
Canadian Crime Severity Index2	4
Pennsylvania Offense Gravity Score2	4
Cambridge Crime-harm Index 2	5
Crime Theory	7
Temporal Analysis	8
Crime Mapping2	9
Crime Mapping Techniques	0
Methods	2
Context	2
Definitions of Terms	3
Data Selection	3
Data Sources	4
Data Issues and Limitations	6
Procedure3	7
Formulating the Crime-harm Index Weightings	8
Excluded Offences	9
Spatial and Temporal Analysis4	0
Data Presentation4	2
Results	4

Description of Data	. 45
Redistribution of Crime-harm	. 45
Spatial Distribution and Mapping of Crime-count and Crime-harm	. 52
Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - South Yorkshire	. 53
Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Doncaster	. 55
Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Barnsley	. 60
Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Rotherham	. 65
Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Sheffield	. 70
Temporal Analysis of Crime-count and Crime-harm	. 75
Hourly	. 75
Weekly	. 79
Day and Night	. 83
Monthly	. 87
Over Time	. 91
Summary of Spatial Analysis - Matrix of Crime-count and Crime-Harm	. 94
Discussion	. 96
Theoretical Implications	. 96
Policy Implications	. 99
Research Implications	102
Limitations of the Study	104
Conclusions	107
References	111
Appendices	117
Appendix A: Dot Distribution Map Showing Crime-harm Locations 2010 to 2015	117
Appendix B: Spatial Ellipse Map Showing Crime-harm Concentrations 2010 to 2015	117
Appendix C: Choropleth Mapping Showing Crime-count and Crime-harm Values	118
Appendix D: Grid Thematic Mapping Showing Crime-count and Crime-harm Values	119
Appendix E: List of Crime-harm Index Values for Criminal Offences England and Wales	121

List of Tables

Table 1:	Annual crime records compared to missing geo-coded records
Table 2:	Crime-count and crime-harm with Cambridge crime-harm index values
Table 3:	Force crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages. 2010-1545
Table 4:	Doncaster crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-1548
Table 5:	Barnsley crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-1549
Table 6:	Rotherham crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-15. 50
Table 7:	Sheffield crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-15 51
Table 8:	Summary of violent/sexual crime and contribution to total harm
Table 9:	Doncaster – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count 59
Table 10:	Barnsley – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count64
Table 11:	Rotherham – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count69
Table 12:	Sheffield – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count74
Table 13:	Daily cycles summary of crime-count and crime-harm including peak times78
Table 14:	Weekly distribution summary of crime-count and crime-harm committed rates82
Table 15:	Distribution summary of crime-count and crime-harm by day /night
Table 16:	Distribution summary of crime-count and crime-harm by month90
Table 17:	Crime-count and crime-harm rates including trajectory 2010-201594
Table 18:	Summary matrix of crime-count and crime-harm rates from analysis94

List of Figures

Figure 34: Grid thematic map – top 32 crime-count and crime-harm locations70
Figure 35:Kernel density estimates map of Sheffield for crime-count
Figure 36: Kernel density estimates map of Sheffield for crime-harm 71
Figure 37: KDE map for Sheffield city centre for crime-count and crime-harm
Figure 38: KDE map for Highfield for crime-count and crime-harm
Figure 39: KDE map for Burngreave for crime-count and crime-harm 73
Figure 40: Co-existence of highest ranked crime-count and crime-harm locations in Sheffield . 74
Figure 41: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in South Yorkshire75
Figure 42: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Doncaster76
Figure 43: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Barnsley
Figure 44: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Rotherham77
Figure 45: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Sheffield
Figure 46: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for South Yorkshire
Figure 47: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Doncaster
Figure 48: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Barnsley
Figure 49: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Rotherham
Figure 50: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Sheffield
Figure 51: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in South Yorkshire 83
Figure 52: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Doncaster84
Figure 53: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Barnsley
Figure 54: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Rotherham85
Figure 55: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Sheffield85
Figure 56: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in South Yorkshire87
Figure 57: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Doncaster
Figure 58: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Barnsley
Figure 59: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Rotherham
Figure 60: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Sheffield
Figure 61: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm South Yorks91
Figure 62: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Doncaster 92
Figure 63: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Barnsley92
Figure 64: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Rotherham93
Figure 65: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Sheffield93
Figure 66: Distribution matrix of locations of crime-count and crime-harm
Figure 67: Weekday - Daily crime-count and crime-harm plotted with resource levels 100
Figure 68: Weekend - Daily crime-count and crime-harm plotted with resource levels 101

Introduction

Evidenced-based policing needs to be at the forefront of what the police do in respect of reducing crime and keeping people safe. Sherman (2013) describes evidenced-based policing as a method of making decisions about "what works" in policing, establishing which practices and strategies accomplish policing objectives in the most cost-effective manner.

When examining ways to understand if policing methods really do lead to keeping people safe, Sherman *et al.* (2014) argued that reducing crime is not always the best public safety metric, because all crimes are not created equal. The summation of crimes into a singular total had long been challenged as misleading. When variations in crime-count totals were routinely compared from one period to another, researchers contemplated the appropriateness of such a metric to endeavour to understand whether our communities were becoming safer or not? Sherman (2007) identified, "The persistent culture of summing up individual crimes has a detrimental effect on the effectiveness of crime reduction strategies and privileges strategies that focus on reducing numbers rather than those that concentrate on harm". Sherman *et al.* (2014) realised that counting crime singularly meant that when it came to assessing risk, allocating police and partner agency staff or being held to account, there had to be a better alternative, that took full cognisance of the concept of harm.

This study introduces South Yorkshire Police to the concept of viewing the way it interprets crime data towards the idea of crime-harm. The research will facilitate an exploratory study of the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index (CHI) to crime data in South Yorkshire. The Cambridge Crime-harm Index is seen as a suitable metric to overcome the complication of measuring crime seriousness. The crime-harm index derives its weighting using day's imprisonment values, taken from Sentencing Guidelines starting points for England and Wales.

The study will be written in a series of chapters, this first chapter will form the introduction. This will direct the reader to the statement of purpose of the study and the type of research undertaken in order to contribute to answering the critical research questions.

The specific aim of the research is to explore the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to South Yorkshire Police's crime data, using longitudinal analysis. By doing this, the research will show the potential differences or similarities in spatial and temporal distribution of single crime-counts (un-weighted) and to crime-harm counts (weighted), by the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. The study will explore the theory relating to predictable concentrations of crime (Sherman 2013) and to see how they compare with those predictable concentrations of harm (Sherman *et al.* 2014). It will use the methodology of analysing large retrospective datasets, establishing what has taken place in the past, to inform and direct future actions (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Chainey *et al.* 2008). It will achieve this cost-effectively, by analysing this research data using existing computer-mapping software.

The significance of the research is its potential application in identifying and targeting those places and times where most harm is caused to people within South Yorkshire. It will target specific locations, allowing others to develop the most appropriate, proportionate and cost-effective response, capable of being tested and tracked in the future (Sherman 2013). Going forward, the Cambridge Crime-harm Index could be adopted as an agreed standard metric to judge the efficacy of assessing harm.

Five years of South Yorkshire's audited geo-coded crime data will be used within this study. The research data will span 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2015, a period of relative operational and organizational stability for South Yorkshire Police, before the onset of austerity cuts and restructuring of front line policing to meet these.

The exploratory study will set out to address three research questions. Firstly, is crime-harm and place spatially connected and concentrated in South Yorkshire, or alternatively, does crime-

harm occur randomly? Secondly, using appropriate mapping techniques, what similarities and differences exist between traditional crime-count maps (centred around single crime-count clustering – 'hot-spots') and crime-harm maps (applying the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to illustrate crime-harm clustering – 'harm-spots'). Thirdly, is there a temporal association with crime-count and crime-harm - what are the trends and patterns, including trajectory, over time?

The research will not restrict itself to the analysis of mapping. It will use other techniques to highlight, not just where crime-count and crime-harm are concentrated, but relevant commission times (day, month or year). Additionally, it will assess which crime types reveal the most harm concentrations, comparing these low volume, high harm crimes concentrations with the more traditional distribution of high volume, low harm crime concentrations. It will utilise "hot-spot" and 'harm spot' mapping techniques that will help determine where crime (or harm) may happen next, using data from the past to inform future actions (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Chainey *et al.* 2008).

In the author's own Force, police commanders have slavishly followed a mantra of red, amber and green performance targets, set by central government, the most recent national target being to singularly 'cut crime' (May 2012). Ratcliffe (2014) understood the harm measurement dilemma, observing that police forces 'either examine less serious misdemeanours independent of serious crime, retaining the serious crime category as the primary culpability statistic for midlevel police commanders; or they choose to ignore it completely'. Is South Yorkshire Police really making a difference in keeping our cities and communities safe, or just participating in a valueless numbers crime performance game? In this game, 'green' performance in reducing crime is seen as good, but this does not always correlate to 'safer' communities or reductions in that crime, which ultimately causes people the most harm.

This research will provide support to the underlying principles and priorities found within the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan (2013-2017). Entitled,

'Putting Safety First', the overarching mission statement is for 'South Yorkshire to be, and feel, a safe place to live, learn and work'. Tackling Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour, one of the three strategic priorities, includes reference to the suggestion of crime-harm by:

- Effective action tackling crime and anti-social behaviour
- *Target response to those that cause the most harm* in the community and intervention with others before they enter the criminal justice system
- *Prioritising the crime and behaviours that cause the most harm* in the community
- Achieving the right outcomes for victims of crime and disorder

The use of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index provides *one* method to measure performance in crime-harm, allowing the Police and Crime Commissioner to develop an agreed, reliable, accurate picture and measure of crime-harm, allowing local accountability and benchmarking against other forces.

Whilst extensive research exists relating to the concept of predictable concentrations of crime and associated mapping of crime, there is only a small amount of published research in relation to the mapped crime-harm. Notably, Myers (2014) in Thames Valley and Weinbourn (2015) in Birmingham, West Midlands are pioneers in mapping crime-harm using the Cambridge Crimeharm Index, whilst post-graduates at the University of Cambridge. This is South Yorkshire Police's introduction to the use of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. This research will provide a valuable insight into the spatial and temporal distribution of crime-count and crime-harm at Force and District level. Using the Cambridge Crime-harm Index will aid momentum in achieving national validity and acceptance of such an index (based on sentencing guidelines) to provide a standard measurement of crime–harm for police forces within England and Wales.

Chapter two of the study will review the theory and literature that underpins the research, for both the spatial and temporal occurrence of crime-harm and its subsequent representation in both mapping and charts. The literature review will begin with a definition of 'harm' and describe previous attempts to measure crime seriousness/harm. Alternate well-reported crimeharm indices will also be briefly reviewed, examining their strengths and weaknesses; before explaining why the Cambridge Crime-harm Index will be used in this study. Lastly, the use of appropriate mapping techniques will be discussed and how the selected choice provides clarity to the research findings.

Chapter three will focus on methodology. It will begin by outlining the study's research questions, before providing the basis of any broad definitions used. It will continue by examining data extraction methods, data manipulation techniques and the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. It will discuss problems and limitations within the research data, explain the included/excluded offences used and describe what steps were made to overcome these issues. The approach to the mapping techniques used in this study will conclude this chapter.

Chapter four will present the research analysis results across Force and District levels for crimecount and crime-harm, using appropriate charts and maps. The findings of temporal association, including year, month, day and time, will also be presented using tables, charts and graphs.

Chapter five will provide a discussion of the research findings, from the perspective of implications towards theory, policy and research. It will examine the feasibility of this evidenced-based approach to targeting predictable concentrations of harm. To conclude, there will be a synopsis of the study and its key findings.

Literature Review

Literature Review Introduction

This literature review examines published literature relating to crime-harm, exploring the development of its concept over time and is written in two distinct sections. The first section begins by summarising research literature that associates crime and place. The examination of research in crime seriousness, including attempts to cost crime, is then explored, before moving on to the evolution of the concept of crime-harm. A brief synopsis follows of principal crime-harm indices and their application. The selection rationale for the use of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index as an appropriate vehicle to underpin this study is then discussed. This section concludes with crime theory and previous research around temporal analysis. The second section of the literature review will focus on the development and application of crime mapping techniques to support targeting areas of the most crime-harm.

Research will concentrate around published articles in English located within mainly, but not exclusively, libraries attached to University of Cambridge (or on-line resources); including course literature, unpublished works and theses relating to the concept of crime-harm, harm indices and the Cambridge Crime-harm Index.

Crime and Place

Eck and Weisburd (1995) highlighted the importance of place-orientated crime prevention strategies developed from research concerning "hot-spots' of crime. With other pioneering researchers, they demonstrated that crime did not occur evenly across the urban landscape; rather it concentrated in relatively small places that generate half of all criminal events (Pierce, Spaar and Briggs 1988; Sherman, Gartin and Beurger 1989; Weisburd, Maher and Sherman 1992). Research into "hot-spots' of crime within Minneapolis, for example, found that 50% of

the crime in Minneapolis occurred in 3.5% of street addresses. Robbery and assault calls were concentrated at 2.2% and 7% of all places respectively (Sherman *et al.* 1989).

Focusing limited resources into these small numbers of high crime locations, whilst ignoring areas with less crime, appears to be the panacea for police managers. Zero-crime or low-crime areas will almost look after themselves, whilst focusing efforts in these small, enduring, high-crime clustered locations could result in an overall crime reduction across any city or police force (Weisburd *et al.* 2004).

Developing research and innovative use of new technologies provided police leaders with the ability to identify these enduring 'deviant places' in terms of concentrations of single crimecounts (Sherman 1995). Sherman (1995) highlighted the importance of crime's relationship with place, revealing crime to be six times more concentrated amongst *places* than it is amongst individuals. Focussed police actions at these specific locations could prevent crime and disorder in crime 'hot-spots', without any resultant crime displacement (Braga 2001; 2002) (Eck 1997; 2002). Braga (2008), following a systematic review, concluded that focussing police efforts in high crime areas ('hot-spots') was a good method of preventing crime. Skogan and Frydl (2004) agreed there was "strong empirical support for the 'hot-spots' policing approach to crime prevention". Displacement of crime was negligible and many neighbouring areas discovered unintended crime prevention benefits came with 'hot-spot' policing in neighbouring areas, however some researchers, (Guerette and Bowers 2006) argue that it is probably is there, but too difficult to measure. Wikstrom (1995) gave an alternate proposal that the most effective way of preventing those crimes causing the most harm to individuals is to tackle disorder; suggesting a degree of symbiosis between crime-harm and disorder.

Concentration of crime-harm, on the other hand, is a newer concept. There is limited research providing clarity as to whether crime-harm follows the same concentration characteristics as that for crime-count (Myers 2014; Weinborn 2015). Despite his research around 'hot-spot'

policing, Sherman (2014) was one of the first to admit that there was something inherently wrong with the simple summing up of different crimes. Crimes were not all of equal value in terms of harm. He argued the imbalance towards crime- harm of current crime-reduction strategies, forwarding that crime harm rates address this concern of using un-weighted crime figures as measure of crime and its impact on the community (Sherman 2007).

Much of the literature relating to crime-harm is found within crime seriousness. Three interrelated issues can be identified that describe crime-harm by way of crime seriousness. Firstly, What is meant by crime seriousness? Secondly, how can perceptions of crime seriousness be measured? Thirdly, is there consensus about crime seriousness?

Crime Seriousness

Hall (1960) described the reason why most actions, we now call crimes, have been criminalised is due to the fact that harm serves as "the fulcrum between criminal conduct and the punitive sanction." Eser (1966) defined harm in the context of a "violation of some legally protected interest, playing a key role in determining criminality". He recognised that harm acquires certain gravity and quality and appreciated the sound base for differential punishment in relation to the harm inflicted. Warr (1989) described crime having two components, a wrongful act and its harmfulness, later supported by the work of Stylianou (2003), culminating with Tusikov and Fahlman (2009) describing harm as being a "negative consequence from an adverse event".

Ratcliffe (2014) acknowledged the difficulty with measuring the overall harm of criminal activity, stemming from the seemingly intractable task of attempting to compare the qualitative impact of one event with another. Sproat (2014) argued that within policing, "notions of harm and harm reduction are poorly defined, interpreted differently and have competing methods of measurement". He went on to state in the absence of a reliable harm measure, then any organisation set up to implement 'harm reduction' is set up to fail and is left with a credible excuse for procrastination rather than action (Sproat 2014).

Ratcliffe (2014) argued that the inability to measure crime-harm left police managers in a difficult position, being directed to reduce crime without any consideration to reducing harm. Paoli and Greenfield (2013) added that despite harm being an essential substantive element within most crimes, criminological research was insufficient around criminal harm, particularly its identification, evaluation or comparison. Researchers that have attempted to study crime-harm, empirically or systematically, have restricted themselves to defining perceived seriousness and the costs of crime, with some work around drug related harm and criminal victimisation.

Crime Seriousness Scale

Thurstone and Chave (1929) made one of the first attempts to develop a crime seriousness scale, by means of paired comparison. They produced a large number of dyads, by random offence coupling, from which survey respondents decided which of the two offences in each dyad was more serious. The offence seriousness measure was derived from the frequency that offences were judged more serious than others.

Sellin and Wolfgang (1964) sought a common metric for harm, recognising that crimes did not carry equal weight in terms of seriousness and harm of offending. Using the Uniform Crime Reporting system, in use in the United States, they were able to develop a crime seriousness scale, based on crime category and magnitude. This subsequent crime seriousness scale allowed criminologists to assess changes in seriousness and the amounts of criminal behaviour (Wellford and Wiatrowski 1975).

The construction of the crime seriousness index involved gauging public perception to crimeseriousness. Sellin and Wolfgang (1964) surveyed a combination of criminal justice professionals and college students to reflect perceptions of harm and seriousness attached to crime types. The survey considered 141 offences, resulting by ranking them according to perceived

seriousness. The ranking range included murder (assigned 26), assaults requiring hospitalisation (assigned 7), down to assaults receiving minor or no injury (assigned 1).

The calculation of the index score was undertaken using several adopted assumptions. The first assumption related to the calculation of index from criminal events from police report against the criminal code. They contained offences of high/constant reportability, namely offences that inflict bodily harm and/or theft, damage or destruction of property. The index score considered aggravating factors such as the degree of post-crime medical treatment needed and/or the amount of money involved in any loss or damage. Forcible entry and intimidation were also factors affecting the overall index score.

Maltz (1975) was critical of Sellin and Wolfgang's (1964) survey process, questioning the use of a survey mechanism to determine index weightings. Rose (1966) questioned the lack of diversity of the survey individuals, suggesting a lack of representation with the generalised population. He went onto question the index's second assumption, the formulation of the harm scores by simple addition, a process that lacked any formal testing or validation. Pease *et al.* (1974) also highlighted issues relating to the scoring system used to rank harm. Firstly, they questioned whether the scale used was an accurate harm discriminator between most and least serious offences. They also questioned the validation for the assumption of adding up harm from multiple offence crimes. Pease *et al.* (1974) concluded that double offences did not always compute in the public's eyes, as double the harm. Their own research found that 31.8% of respondents perceived double offences to be twice as serious, inferring that the additivity assumption was flawed. To date, the concept of additivity remains unresolved and is a major criticism of Sellin and Wolfgang's (1964) work.

Other researchers, Normandeau (1966) and later Ackman *et al.* (1968) partially replicated the work of Sellin and Wolfgang (1964), finding that despite its criticism, there was broad agreement about their ranking of seriousness of offences. Normandeau's replication supported

this using a group of 232 students, whilst Ackman's replication, using 2348 students, showed a strong correlation. This replication underpinned the future development of a bespoke seriousness index for Canada.

Pease *et al.* (1974) further criticised the Sellin and Wolfgang (1964) crime seriousness scale when Normandeau (1970) looked at its worldwide replication across eight sample nations. Pease *et al.* (1974) highlighted that such a ratio scale, with a fixed zero point and equal intervals between scale points, demonstrated inherent differences with worldwide replication, claiming the range of ratio scores and their variations differed. The effects of the notional one dollar theft was scaled less in wealthier countries than it was in poorer countries. Therefore, when subsequent index ratio scores are derived from this point, then inherent differences between offences become apparent and, the notion of a universal metric for crime seriousness, severely questioned.

Rossi *et al.* (1974) argued that to be of practical or theoretical use, a measure of crime "seriousness" required society consensus about the order of seriousness of specific criminal acts and should be reflected in the criminal code, the criminal justice system and the actions of law enforcement agencies. Rossi *et al.* (1974) replicated Sellin and Wolfgang's crime severity index during his Baltimore Crime Seriousness Study. He achieved reliability and found strong correlation between those surveyed and perception of crime seriousness.

Welford and Wiatrowski (1975) questioned survey participants across 37 offence descriptions, taken from the Measurement of Delinquency (Sellin and Wolfgang 1964). Again, their replication of the original research, revealed impressive correlation and provided strong support of the additivity assumption, proscribed as a minimum replication condition. Newman's (1976) replication found strong comparisons across six counties in respect of perceived crime seriousness.

McCleary *et al.* (1981) and Pontell *et al.* (1985) extended the work of Rossi *et al.* (1974) Both conducted further survey replication, using criminal justice workers and police chiefs, again demonstrating good replication of the initial finding of the Rossi *et al.* (1974) study.

Wolfgang *et al.* (1985) progressed his research relating to the measurement of severity, using victim surveys in the place of official police statistics, criticising both their accuracy and bias in the light of victim survey data and their representation of crime as a "simple sum of reported incidents". He produced crime seriousness scores for a full set of offences and published it by way of the National Survey Of Crime Severity (NSCS), using 204 offences, ranking them from low to high harm crimes. It was innovative in that it introduced the concept of a standardised weighted crime index. Parton *et al.* (1991) warned that the magnitude estimation scales require training of the participants, however despite this, there was generalised agreement about the interpretation of crime seriousness. Wolfgang *et al.* (1985) conceded that the issue of additivity, whilst contentious, remained unresolved and whilst the assumptions were not tested empirically, in practice the discrepancy was minimal.

Warr's (1989) Dallas study reported that the issue of crime seriousness was a complex variable and not straightforward, with those surveyed often assigning different weights to the concept of crime seriousness, in different circumstances. Blum-West (1985) and Hansel (1987) supported this observation, additionally criticising survey methods as 'one-dimensional' and stating that the term "seriousness" lacked specification.

Roberts (1992), Levi and Jones (1985) and O'Connell and Whelan (1996) replicated crime seriousness surveys from Spark *et al.* (1977). The former study found there was little variation or discrepancy between different populations, whilst the latter two studies discovered the police and public shared similar rankings of crime seriousness. Victim based crime was considered more serious than property based crime. O'Connell and Whelan (1996) identified 'badness' and 'individual impact' as two factors underlying perceptions of seriousness. Both surveys also found that over a relatively short period of time, such as a decade, public perceptions to crime seriousness remains relatively unchanged. Changes that do take place outside this time-scale do so with changes in public opinion (e.g. child sexual exploitation) or decriminalisation of some offences (e.g. abortion and offences relating to homosexuality).

Stylianiou (2003) undertook a systematic review of the methodological issues around measurement of crime seriousness. It illustrated the complexity across the studies to achieve overall consensus on the perception of crime seriousness. All review studies found violent offences were perceived more serious than property offences. Victimless crime was generally considered the lowest of harm. Relative consensus (as opposed to absolute consensus) existed across the research, even in some population sub-groups, particularly on the higher ranked crime. Where consensus was not apparent, particularly around victimless crime, Kwam *et al.* (2002) found that consensus generally existed across sub-groups of gender, age and education level.

From the literature discussing crime seriousness, the use of survey alone is a complex, contentious, but overall a workable solution. Its main weakness is that it neglects the cost of crime and relies heavily on survey methods. The next part of the literature review will explore the concept of assessing crime-harm utilising a cost of crime approach.

Cost of Crime

There are numerous published articles and literature relating to the cost of crime, used as a means to demonstrate the inequality in crimes, showing how some crimes has a greater harm impact than others. This review contains only a brief synopsis. Literature has generally split itself across the following areas; costs caused by criminal conduct, costs borne by society in response to either deterrence or punishment and those costs incurred by the offender themselves (Cohen and Piquero 2009).

Cohen (1988) developed a methodology for estimating the cost of crimes based around jury awards for suffering, pain (mental and/or physical injury) and reductions in quality of life, plus 'out-of-pocket' losses. In 1997, he estimated the external cost for a career criminal as \$1.3 to \$1.5 million, the worst offenders costing as much as \$36 million. Miller *et al.* (1996) research calculated the victim-related costs to crime (murder \$4.6 million, rape \$135,000, vehicle crime \$5,500).

Cohen (1998) estimated three main components of crime costs – victim costs, criminal justice cost (enforcement, justice and incarceration costs) and lost productivity of the offenders, whilst incarcerated. 'Fear' of crime, actions or costs taken by public to avoid the risk of crime, as well as the residual loss to the community in terms of social cohesion were not considered in Cohen's 'bottom-up' approach. Cohen *et al.* (2004) utilized a 'top-down' approach to estimate the public's willingness to pay to reduce crime. Heaton (2010) was critical of this method as he considered it hypothetical – as long as the respondent never had to pay. Using this approach, the cost of a murder was estimated at \$11.8 million (2004 values).

Cohen (1998) combined estimates of the value of life with crime-related death rates to obtain the risk of death from crime. Cohen then went onto combine the values for risk of death, pain and suffering with direct losses to obtain a total cost to victims for ten different types of crime. By continuing his work, Cohen was able to further estimate the costs to victims of rape, robbery, assault, car theft, burglary and larceny. An effective harm scale had been formulated on the basis of cost to the victim.

Whether it is calculating victimisation costs by jury awards or by the willingness-to-pay approach, both approaches have received criticism. Zimring and Hawkins (1995) were critical of the former, stating that victims often inflated the value of pain and suffering, whilst Winterdyk (2000) said that willingness-to-pay information is often received from surveys, which are often self-serving and limited in value.

Brand and Price (2000), in their work for the UK Home Office in relation to the cost of crime, broke down the total cost of crime into costs in anticipation of crime, costs as a consequence of crime and costs responding to it. Costs were measured using the British Crime Survey and Commercial Victimisation Survey, plus additional costs information obtained from the security and insurance industries. Costs for the criminal justice system were taken from existing cost models within the Home Office.

Average costs of crime varied, but property crime was generally substantially lower than personal injury offences, with homicides estimated at £1 million (2000 values). The study acknowledged the limitations in the data and the inability to cost the 'fear of crime' with any great accuracy, but it did show which offences were the most costly and by interpolation many of them caused the most harm.

Ratcliffe (2014) described the challenges to assessing harm by cost of crime. The first was the fact that monetary values required yearly readjustment leaving harm determination vulnerable to inflationary pressure. Secondly, since the police do not recoup cost of crime reduction directly, there is little understanding of the cost to society. Thirdly, many of the significant harm crimes are of low volume and difficult to assign calculable costs to. Lastly, the general cost of crime is often attached to sweeping categories of crime such as homicide and robbery, and limitations exist not being able to distinguish between types of crimes within these large categories.

Finally, whether by crime seriousness or cost of crime, Ashworth (2006) re-affirmed that the task of identifying seriousness and harm is complex and problematic, so a universally accepted method was required. To achieve this, this next section will compare well-reported crime severity indices, designed to differentiate crimes with unequal harm effect.

Canadian Crime Severity Index

Babyak *et al.* (2009), working for Statistics Canada, brought into operation the Police-Reported Crime Severity Index (PRCSI). Instead of counting each crime equally, it applied a weighting to each crime based on severity, using average court sentences from actual cases. By example, murder would be weighted to 7,042 with possession of cannabis weighted to 7 (Statistics Canada 2009).

Court data was accepted as objective, nationally representative, part of a regular on-going data collection, used the same coding structure as the micro-data collected for Uniform Crime Reporting Survey (UCR) and was able to deal with legislation changes over time. Using the UCR, an overall national crime rate was calculated, by summing up the number of crimes and dividing by the population. The evolution of this version produced the summation of weighted-crimes, replacing single crime-counts, sufficiently robustly adapted, to remove 'outlier' court sentences from the final useable data.

Critics of the index suggested court sentences given to adults and youths differ, revealing variations for individual offences. Additionally, the index did not account for conditional sentences, fines and probation, only for incarceration. The rarity of some offences revealed insufficient data to weight that violation; proxy weights had to be used against similar type offences. There was some variation between province jurisdictions, different offences were dealt with and sentenced in inconsistent ways. Lastly, using average sentences necessitates periodic review of average sentences over time (agreed at every five years), to raise or reduce the weighting for each crime.

Pennsylvania Offense Gravity Score Crime Index

This study also pursued a method of assessing crime-harm, using an index of offences. Each offence was assigned a point value pursuant with a gravity score, ranging from 1 to 15. The gravity score is a non-mandatory guideline derived from the Pennsylvania Commission on

Sentencing. Misdemeanours would range from 1 to 3, felonies range from 5 to 8, with murder scoring 14, the highest score of 15 being reserved for offenders committing murder below the age of 18 (Ratcliffe 2014). Variation options existed within the methodology for criminal conspiracies and attempts to score less, with crimes aggravating factors such as previous convictions or ethnic intimidation, being scored more.

The dataset derives from a single police database called INCT, which contains all reported crimes <u>and</u> incidents evaluated by police officers towards the creation of an official police report. The INCT also records every traffic accident, every police traffic and pedestrian stop.

Strengths of this system include consistent sentencing guidelines and the fact that the range of incidents exist beyond those reported as crimes to the police, but weaknesses are seen with the weightings themselves, suggesting that a scale from 1 to 15 is not sufficiently discriminatory. When comparing burglary (gravity score 5) with murder (gravity score 15), critics argue whether three burglaries are equivalent to one murder in respect of harm? Additionally, does recording every officer stop and road traffic accident reveal a true, consistent metric of harm?

Cambridge Crime-harm Index

Sherman *et al.* (2014) acknowledged the challenge that not all crimes were equal; some crimes carried more harm. Sherman *et al.* (2014) identified that to make such an assumption would provide distortion to police managers and others when assessing risk, allocating resources and ultimately accountability. The present crime-count system adds disproportionate influence to high-volume low-seriousness crimes. The Cambridge University team sought to produce a metric that would provide a 'bottom line for crime', something Sherman (2013) referred to as a 'common currency' to view levels of harm from city to city, allowing more meaningful national public safety comparison. Sherman (2013) argued that the summing up of weighted crime-counts and dividing by population estimates and using fixed sentencing guidelines would create

a standardised metric that 'can be justified on good democratic grounds as reflecting the will of the people'

The Cambridge Crime-harm Index, which will underpin this study, offers simplicity, clarity, stability and some legitimacy, with no additional costs. It works by translating all offences reported to the police (by victims or witnesses) into total day's imprisonment for that offence, if one offender were to be convicted of committing it, with no aggravating or mitigating factors. It uses England and Wales Sentencing Guidelines (defined by the Criminal Justice Act 2003) for an offender's first conviction, or time-equivalents for crimes that receive probation or even a fine. For community sentences and/or probation, the minimum tariff is converted from days/hours into equivalent numbers of days to provide a weighting. For offences that carry a fine as their starting point, the weighting is calculated by the number of days it would take the offender to pay the fine working at minimum wage for an adult.

The imprisonment 'starting point' of any offence is used, providing an approximation of 'pure weight' of harm (Sentencing Guidelines 2008). This contrasts other indices that use actual sentence received, given that the actual sentence figure may be influenced by the offender, their past convictions or other aggravating factors, thereby distorting a consistent number for the actual offence itself. The 'starting point' for murder is 15 years, which when converted into days imprisoned provides a weighted score of 5475. For common assault the 'starting point' is one-day imprisonment, differences in harm between the two offences are in the ratio of 5475:1.

Sentencing Guidelines' weightings offer the index objectivity, consistency and attempt to reflect public opinion, although no public opinion surveys have been carried out in the UK. In the United States, Jacoby and Cullen (1999) did this for U.S. sentencing guidelines, demonstrating a high correlation (Pearson r=0.95) between actual sentence length and citizens sentence length preferences. That said; the weighting is consistent across offences, not influenced by judiciary sentencing or to an individual offender's circumstances. Index legitimacy is through the existence of Sentencing Guidelines, which have some democratic consensus, including opinion polls, public scrutiny, debate by interested stakeholders, as well as public officials and media scrutiny.

Compared with the other two indices mentioned above, this index is devoid of emotive facts from either survey teams or judiciary decision, providing a degree of future-proofing and ensuring (subject to the legislating of mandatory sentences for certain crimes) more objectivity to year-on-year crime-harm comparison data. The index is the least expensive to administer, costing only the basic costs in preparing and presenting geo-coded crime data in a spread sheet alongside the Crime-harm values mentioned above and for these reasons will be utilised in this study. The next part of the literature review will examine the theory underpinning crime and place.

Crime Theory

The study of criminal events at places is influenced and supported by three complementary theoretical perspectives: rational choice theory (Cornish and Clarke 1986), routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979) and environmental criminology (Brantingham and Brantingham 1981; 1991).

Rational choice theory assumes that "offenders seek to benefit themselves by their criminal behaviour; that this involves the making of decisions and choices, however rudimentary on occasion these choices may be; and that these processes, constrained as they are by time, the offender's cognitive abilities, and by the availability of relevant information, exhibit limited rather than normative rationality" (Cornish and Clarke 1987). This theory is often combined with routine activity theory to explain criminal behaviour during the criminal event (Clarke and Felson, 1993). Routine activity theory suggests that a criminal act occurs when a likely offender converges in space and time with a suitable target (e.g. victim or property) in the absence of a capable guardian (Cohen and Felson 1979). Rational offenders come across criminal

opportunities as they go about their daily routines and make decisions whether to take action. According to Eck and Weisburd (1995), it does so because offenders engage in routine activities. Just like other, non-offending individuals, offenders move between home, school, work, shopping, and recreation. As they conduct their normal legitimate activities, they become aware of criminal opportunities. Thus, criminal opportunities that are not near areas offenders routinely move through are unlikely to come to the attention of offenders, criminal opportunities found at places that come to the attention of offenders have an increased risk of becoming targets.

Environmental criminology, also known as crime pattern theory, explores the distribution and interaction of targets, offenders, and opportunities across time and space (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1991). It is important in understanding the nature of crime at places because it combines rational choice and routine activity theory to explain the spatial distribution of crime. Supporting the theory underpinning the geography of crime, Brantingham and Brantingham (1981) identified four dimensions, namely; legal, victim, offender and spatial, describing the spatial element as "a discreet location in time and place at which all the other three dimensions intersect and a criminal event occurs". The process of making targets less available in various ways has become known as situation crime prevention (Clarke 1992).

Temporal Analysis

Temporal analysis can be used to identify cycles of activities that have tremendous influences on crime problems. Different crime locations have different activities that can contribute to its associated problems. Charting the pattern or rhythm of crime or disorder incidents can assist in the identification of important activity cycles that could be contributory to the problem.

Ratcliffe (2002) realised that despite improvements in the ability to precisely map crime by location using geo-coded data, there was little exploration of the temporal component of crime 'hot-spots' and therefore less for 'harm-spots'. Many crimes do not lend themselves easily to

temporal classification, as in the case of high volume property offences, where the victim or the police do not know the exact occurrence time. Despite the issues relating to knowledge of exact crime commission time and whilst it follows from the above crime theory that crime follows opportunity, it does not necessarily follow that that opportunities remain constant over time. Opportunities are unevenly distributed across time <u>and</u> space, and the availability of motivated offenders and suitable targets change for many locations throughout the day (Brantingham and Brantingham 1984).

Ratcliffe (2002) identified three forms of temporal clustering. Events that appear relatively evenly spread across the day, were termed diffused. Events that showed clustering within a specific time range were termed focused, whilst events that show tight packing around small periods of time were called acute.

Whilst temporal analysis may not be able to predict the patterns of behaviours of offenders, it does provide a better indication of the behaviour of victims and their routine activity, to provide a greater understanding of the locations where offences may take place, during what key times.

Crime Mapping

Police departments have historically shown crime patterns and trends using crime mapping. With the appropriate crime theory, analytical crime mapping can be the best means of translating and communicating vital crime data / information to police managers and the community effectively and efficiently (US Department of Justice 1999).

Crime mapping using modern computers and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) has simplified the process and allowed researchers to understand crime places, knowing where crime has been committed in the past to forecast where it will be committed in the future. (Eck and Weisburd 1995, Chainey and Ratcliffe 2005).

GIS is a computerised system that allows geographical information layering to produce detailed descriptions of conditions and analyses of relationships among variables. Geo-coding, the ability to assign a specific location with longitudinal and latitudinal information, is the most common way of getting crime related data into GIS, allowing specialist software to produce maps.

There are a variety of mapping techniques to assist the crime analyst. The most popular include point mapping, spatial ellipses, thematic mapping, grid system maps and kernel density estimation.

Crime Mapping Techniques

Point Mapping (see Appendix A)

This is the most basic of mapping and involves the visual examination of a series of geo-coded points distributed on a standard map. Problems with point mapping include the viewer having to visually interpret what they are looking at and the fact that some points overlap each other whilst some stack on top of each other, making the concentration of activity opaque.

Spatial Ellipses (see Appendix B)

Spatial and Temporal Analysis of Crime (STAC) was an early example of this mapping technique, involving the location of the densest concentrations on a map, fitting a 'standard deviational ellipse' to each cluster or points. The ellipses indicate, through their size and alignment, the nature of the underlying crime clusters. Critics believe this system is difficult to operate and can be misleading given crime 'hot-spots' do not form naturally into convenient ellipses.

Thematic of Geographical Boundary Areas (Choropleth mapping see Appendix C)

Choropleth mapping represents spatial distribution of crime events against boundary areas, providing management information across administrative or political boundaries, such as Lower Super Output Area, police district or individual beat). Aggregated crime offences within the areas are ranked and shaded according to density. Strengths include production speed, ease of interpretation and data-linking to other datasets such as population size or Multiple Deprivation Indices. Weaknesses revolve around the shapes of the maps, the reader could mistake a large area heavily shaded to be full of crime, when the reality is that only a small part of that total area may be so, with the remainder being crime free.

Grid Thematic Mapping (see Appendix D)

This mapping technique addresses the problems associated with heterogeneous geographical regions, utilising uniform grids (or quadrats) that are ranked and shaded. This allows all areas used for thematic mapping to be comparable against each other. Rapid and easy identification of 'hot-spots' are viewed as strengths. Limitations include that 'hot-spots' are sometimes restricted from being displayed, leading to misinterpretation of the overall crime severity. The resolution of the mapping can be poor, often 'blocky' in appearance.

Kernel Density Estimates

This mapping technique is regarded as the most suitable spatial analysis for crime data visualisation and uses algorithms based on distances between points. Software improvements, accuracy perception of 'hot-spot' identification and the aesthetic look of the map, place it ahead of other mapping techniques. Crime offences are aggregated within a search radius, specified by the user. A continuous surface is produced which represents the density or volume of crime, without having to conform to geometric shapes, such as ellipses (Chainey *et al.* 2008), enabling easier identification of 'hot-spots' and adequate appreciation of intensity of events in the analysed area.

Of all the mapping techniques, this study will principally utilise kernel density estimates for the visualisation of crime-count and crime-harm concentrations, however grid thematic will be used to identify and compare areas of co-location of high crime-count and crime-harm clusters.

Methods

This chapter considers the methods used to test the research questions. This chapter will begin with some organisational context to the research, before defining and describing the nature and quality of the data used. It will continue by describing the design methods used to manipulate and interpolate the data to answer each research question. Finally, it will describe how results will be reported, including presentation of the findings, concluding by assessing both research reliability and validity.

Context

South Yorkshire covers a geographical area of 599 square miles (HMIC 2015); subdivided into four administrative boroughs - Sheffield, Doncaster, Rotherham and Barnsley. The current population is 1.36 million people, a growth of 7% within the last decade. The population density is 2,240 people per square mile.

Crime is slightly higher than the national average (HMIC 2015), but has fallen over the last five years from 100,000 crimes per year to 80,000 crimes per year. Following the decline of the mining and heavy industry, South Yorkshire became one of the United Kingdom's most deprived areas. The Force's budget is around £238 million; 75% derives from central funding with 25% from local funding. The Government's Comprehensive Spending Review seriously affected business, with £53 million efficiency savings already made and a further £33 million to find within the near future.

The application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to existing South Yorkshire Police crime data is a new concept for the Force. In South Yorkshire, whilst targeted police patrols at concentrated, identified areas of crime 'hot-spots' (Sherman *et al.* 2014) is becoming established, the identification, quantification and measurement of crime-harm, whilst on strategic research agenda, has lay dormant for some time. South Yorkshire is not alone. At the

time of writing, there are only a few other examples of research within the United Kingdom where the Cambridge Crime-harm Index has been used for this identification by way of mapping. Myers (2014) and Weinborn (2015), post-graduate students at Cambridge University, applied the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to crime data from Thames Valley and West Midlands, respectively. In the former case, three years' crime figures (2011-2014), whilst in the latter, fifteen years' crime figures (1998-2012) were mapped using the described application.

Definition of terms

It is important to begin by defining some key terms that feature within this study. Crime-count is the singular addition of South Yorkshire's reported crime that it is subject to audit against National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS) and included as part of national records at the Home Office. Crime-harm, in the context of this study, is the resultant weighted crime-count following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to crime offences. It produces a total harm value based on equivalent days imprisonment referenced to Sentencing Guidelines for England and Wales.

Data Selection

This research utilised South Yorkshire Police crime data for the last five financial years, covering the period 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2015. At the macro level, this research is representative, spatially - the whole of South Yorkshire, and temporally - across five financial years. At the micro level, spatial representation is at individual identifiable quarter-mile square grid-locations and temporal representation of hourly intervals.

The selection of five years of crime data enables the use of large data sets, allowing the crime data results to show a degree of data-stability over time (Weisburd *et al.* 2004). The crime-harm weighting applied to a crime of homicide or grievous bodily harm is so dramatic in small datasets, it has a disproportionate impact on the data and when mapped, produces outliers,

distorting the overall crime-harm picture. Five years' crime data from April 2010 to the end of March 2015 represents a degree of organisational stability with little structural change. Reacting to strict financial funding pressures, South Yorkshire Police is now undertaking a programme of change, where organisational structures and policing priorities are being reviewed and revised. The selected data's rationale, both in size and duration, supports the study's theoretical framework and its duration period reduces the possibility of findings being attributed to new working methods or vast organisational change.

Data Sources

South Yorkshire Police uses a bespoke computerised Crime Management System (CMS2) to record and store crime data utilising an Oracle database. Various reporting methods allow crime-related incidents to enter the Force, including call-centres, emails, police reports and victim (or victim representative) contact. Crime is recorded on the balance of probabilities and conforms to National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS), providing a standardised method of crime recording. CMS2 stores the computerised recorded crime on a number of individual registers, capable of storing crime and non-crime data. This research will concentrate and extract data from the '01' register that relates purely to part- audited recorded crime as defined by National Crime Recording Standards and submitted, monthly, to the Home Office.

Research parameters for crime data for this research were set at the first date the offence was reported as *being committed*. To address the problem of extended time spans (unknown commission times), when performing temporal analysis of crime, this research adopted the methodology of using a mid point halfway between offence start date/time and offence end date/time, as a means of achieving a single temporal point to assign to the event (Anderson *et al.* 1995, Ratcliffe and McCullagh 1998). This will allow the inclusion of property offences where precise offence time is often unknown by the victim.

The same set parameters will exclude historic crimes occurring outside the research dates, albeit having been reported within. This is relevant, given that sexual offence reporting has seen a sharp rise in recent years. High profile historic sexual offence inquiries such as Operation Yewtree (nationally) and Operation Stovewood, in South Yorkshire (Jay 2014) have produced increased victim confidence to approach law-enforcement agencies, thus resulting in greater crime reporting. These recently reported historic reports are excluded from this study; unless the date they occur is within the five-year limit set.

Crime data used in this research was extracted from South Yorkshire Police's Crime Management System (CMS2) via Oracle Discoverer 9i data extraction tool into Microsoft Excel spread-sheet format for data manipulation, cleansing and for future analysis. An analyst assisted this research to deal with crime data extraction, cleansing the geo-coded crime data, formulation of the crime-harm index weightings and statistical manipulation for the final findings. The analyst aided the production of agreed crime data for both crime-count and crimeharm into appropriate mapping and tabular forms.

Crime data was initially extracted at 08:30am on 25th April 2015 to conduct a pilot of the research, capturing only one year's crime data. This initial pilot served as a pre-mortem (Klein 2007) and was used to analyse projected implementation of the full study to consider unanticipated obstacles, allowing early identifications of problems and their proposed rectification. It also tested and validated the crime data to establish if the aims of the study could be achieved, including the production of preliminary findings. No mapping was undertaken during this pilot phase. The pilot's findings were presented to the University of Cambridge Criminology Executive in September 2015. The crime data used for the whole study was re-run on at 08.00am on 1st July 2015 incorporating all data inclusive of April 2010 to March 2015, a welcomed by-product allowing more cleansed geo-coded crime data to be included within the research.

Data Issues and Limitations

Due to the methods of data extraction, including anomalies with the geo-coding of data, any crime data figures are <u>only</u> accurate at the time they are captured. Changes in the crime data could occur beyond the above date for various reasons. This includes late re-classification of a crime, or by subsequent new information becoming available suggesting that no crime was committed; the crime would be subsequently 'no-crimed'. Albeit negligible, any changes to the data used following the above date was not captured within the research.

Many of the Force's applications, including crime data, use Geographical Information System (GIS). This is a system designed to capture, store, manipulate, analyse, arrange and present various types of spatial and geographical data. GIS can relate unrelated information by using 'location' as the key index variable. Crime data in South Yorkshire captures both, 'time' as dates/times of occurrence, but also 'location' as x and y coordinates representing latitude and longitude.

Table 1 numerically tabulates the final research data (following excluded offences) showing annual crime records numbers and missing/unknown geo-codes (2527 offences, 0.6% error). Missing and unknown GIS coded records exist for a number of reasons.

Table 1: Annual crime records com	pared to missing ge	eo-coded records.
-----------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Year	Records	Missing or Unknown	Percent
2010/2011	93,152	226	0.2%
2011/2012	91,907	179	0.2%
2012/2013	84,922	167	0.2%
2013/2014	83,977	286	0.3%
2014/2015	84,840	1,669	2.0%
Total records	438,798	2,527	0.6%

Geo-coding occurs when the crime location is given a specific easting and northing code as taken from Ordinance Survey. This is achieved by the data being extracted using the 'ARC ESRI'
location hub tool using Quick Address Search (QAS) and Address Layer (AL2) software to apply the geo-codes to specific addresses. By this process, unsuccessfully geo-coded addresses, return to CMS2 where a further 'previous address search' assigns previous known geo-codes to the address locations. Crime locations without valid geo-codes beyond this point are manually checked and assigned geo-codes using post code locations.

Some crime location data, where no precise locations exist, are 'placed in suspense' at the 0 easting and 0 northing location. This location crime data will not be represented in the mapping of crime-count or crime-harm. A scheduled weekly audit of absent geo-coded crime data ensures that corrected location crime data eventually reach a plateau of around 0.2% to 0.3% error. A re-assessment of the research crime data occurred between the pilot and the actual research data run, revealed the number missing geo-codes from 3870 down to 2527 by this weekly automated and manual audit process. This reduced the amount of missing data, increasing the population size used in this study to 99.4% of all available (non-excluded) crime offences.

Temporally, whilst most committed times are known and recorded, property offences (where the victim is uncertain of actual committed time) utilizes the methodology of assuming average committed times. This is also seen as a limitation in the data as precise offence time is not known, although despite these limitations, the data is consistent throughout the study.

Procedure

The intention of this study is to explore the use retrospective datasets to identify and develop a greater understanding of the spatial and temporal distribution (or concentration) between crime-count and crime-harm. This involves the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index (Sherman et al 2014) to existing crime data and then applying the outcomes to crime mapping, comparing/contrasting them and other suitable tables or figures. This research used [ARC Map ESRI 10.2] computer-mapping software to produced crime-count and crime-harm maps. Other

results/findings have been manipulated and formatted using Microsoft Excel tools to produce figures, graphs and tables. Visual comparison then took place between the two sets of crime maps (crime-count and crime-harm) in order to observe similarities/differences. This was undertaken at Force Level, District Level and by specific local examples.

Formulating the Cambridge Crime-harm Index Weightings

Following the initial data extraction, the raw research geo-coded crime data was then grouped into aggregated crime categories, using the Cambridge Crime-harm Index (Table 2). Each crime was recorded as numeric crime-count and crime-harm value, the latter following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index weighting. (Appendix E refers).

The left hand side of this table shows Home Office group, Home Office class and code, Home Office description, offence code. The right hand side of the table shows the calculated harm value, its aggregated crime group for the purpose of this research and whether the offence was included / excluded from the research. The Harm Groups selected for this research are shown below, subdivided into 19 groups. A brief summary of the inclusion / excluded offences are illustrated in table 2 and relates to 8% of all offences from the five-year data set.

Harm Group	Crime	Harm	Excluded crimes	Total crimes
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	515	1,879,750	8	523
ASSAULT	52,357	1,097,080	231	52,588
BURGLARY DWELLING	37,449	617,505	-	37,449
BURGLARY OTHER	41,280	623,304	5	41,285
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	1,060	1,934,500	3	1,063
DRUGS	-	-	21,527	21,527
FRAUD & FORGERY	-	-	2,851	2,851
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	2,673	3,902,580	61	2,734
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	146	799,350	2	148
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	87,481	1,331,280	35	87,516
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	1,474	55,094	4,186	5,660
OTHER VIOLENCE	976	196,860	28	1,004
POSSESSION	-	-	1,941	1,941
PUBLIC ORDER	-	-	7,132	7,132
ROBBERY	4,723	1,723,895	3	4,726
SEXUAL OFFENCES	5,259	3,608,708	198	5,457
STALKING & HARASSMENT	5,197	103,560	1,346	6,543
THEFT & HANDLING	138,784	1,882,775	930	139,714
VEHICLE CRIME	59,424	811,925	75	59,499
Grand Total	438,798	20,568,166	40,562	479,360

Table 2: Crime-count and crime-harm with Cambridge crime-harm index values.

8%

Excluded Offences

In line with Sherman *et al.* (2014) 'included offences' in this research were those crimes reported to the police by victims and witnesses only. Police-identified enforcement offences, including certain wildlife offences and public order offences were excluded from the study, but violent disorder and riot are included. Possession offences, such as firearms offences, knives and drug offences and other regulatory offences were also excluded from the final research crime data. Criminal use of firearms and weapons was included. Forgery, fraud offences and certain document offences were excluded on the basis that their actual location was transient and uncertain. Offences involving the administration of justice and criminal driving offences were also excluded as were other excluded where the effect of location do not contribute the harm picture, such as abstracting electricity, breach of legislative criminal orders, modern slavery, trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation and handling stolen goods.

The pilot run revealed a disproportionate increase in crime-count and crime-harm concentrations to an uninhabited, geographical area in rural Doncaster, caused by the presence of the county's main three prisons. As such, offences occurring *within* the prisons were excluded from the research, given that the prisons have bespoke police resources assigned to them.

Although the rationale behind the Cambridge Crime-harm Index is described earlier in this study, the weightings for the Crime-harm Index have been manually taken from Sentencing Guidelines (2008) and the Crown Prosecution Service website (2013). Reference to previous Cambridge University research (Bland 2014 and Weinborn 2015) quality assured the crime-harm index weightings formulated within the study; attempts and conspiracy offences were assumed to have the same sentencing guidelines for the substantive offences. The calculation and referencing of each sentencing guideline that formulated the crime-harm index weighting are shown in Appendix A.

Spatial and Temporal Analysis

To begin to address the research questions, the first part of the research compared and contrasted crime-count and crime-harm distribution, following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. Following data manipulation using tools/functions within Microsoft Excel, the distribution was presented in tabular form showing harm group and their composite numeric and percentage distribution. This was also produced graphically showing harm group on the y-axis and percentage of crime-count (represented in purple) and crime-harm (represented in red), sharing the x-axis. The distribution was arranged within the graph, favouring a Pareto distribution for crime-harm to show the "power few" offences (Sherman 2007).

The second part of the research then visually compared crime-count and crime-harm (following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index), in the context of spatial distribution. This was achieved by the application of the crime data for crime-count and crime-harm using the ARC Map ESRI 10.2 computer-mapping software to produce point maps, spatial ellipse maps, choropleth maps, grid thematic maps and kernel density maps. Examples of all mapping types on the research data, to highlight their strengths and weaknesses, are shown within the Appendices A-D.

Two types of maps were used for the spatial analysis research to present the research and promote its findings. Kernel density estimate maps, created from the ARC Map ESRI 10.2 computer-mapping software, produced maps of crime-count and crime-harm at Force, District and selected local areas. Kernel Density Estimates are calculated using algorithms and provide an estimate of the proportion of total incidents that that can be expected to occur in any given map location. It involves overlaying an area of interest with a fine rectangular grid. It then calculates an estimate of the density of incident in each grid cell, which is based on a weight function, the kernel. For the Force and District maps, bandwidth was set at 400m with cell size

set at 40m, with localised examples, requiring higher resolution, band-width was set at 40m, with 4m cell size.

Grid thematic mapping was used to support statistical analysis used to locate and reveal spatial distribution of the following areas. Firstly, areas of high crime-count/high crime-harm, then areas of high crime-harm/low crime-count, then areas of high crime-count/low crime-harm and lastly areas of low crime-count / low crime-harm. Additionally, this process would identify areas revealing no crime during the research period.

Following data manipulation of using tools/functions within Microsoft Excel, this data used the quarter-mile square grids (one-quarter mile by one-quarter mile). It then ranked the highest crime-count grids and highest crime-harm grids by crime-count percentage and crime-harm percentage. For crime-count, the upper 50% were classed as high crime-count, whilst the lower 50% were classed as low crime-count. For crime-harm, the upper 50% were classed high crime-harm harm, with the lower 50% classed as low crime-harm.

These identifiable geographical areas were then arranged by descending ranked order and counted using the Microsoft Excel spread-sheet. They were placed into areas of high crime-count/high crime-harm, then areas of high crime-harm/low crime-count, then areas of high crime-count/low crime-harm and lastly areas of low crime-count / low crime-harm, the accumulation total of grid numbers, total square miles, percentage crime and percentage crime-harm being reported.

Grid thematic mapping was used to support statistical analysis to demonstrate the potential existence of the co-location of those geographic areas exhibiting high crime-count and high crime-harm. This was achieved again using tools/functions within Microsoft Excel using ranked pairs of the top locations of crime-count (by percentage) and the top locations of crime-harm (by percentage. The highest 32 quarter-mile square grids locations, by percentage, for both crime-count (showing its crime-harm percentage) and crime-harm (showing its crime-count

percentage) were located and arranged in the spread sheet according to descending crime-harm percentage values. The number of locations grids where both crime-count and crime-harm appear in the highest 32 will result in a co-location. The subjective selection of 32 quarter-mile square grids provided the study to examine the top two square miles of geography in each District.

The third part of the research focussed on temporal distribution of crime-count and crimeharm. From the extracted research data this was achieved again using tools/functions within Microsoft Excel to display the results in graphical form. All results were reported at Force level and District Level, showing harm percentage crime-count on the left y-axis with percentage crime-harm on the right y-axis. Time duration, in hours, days, night/day, month or annual, was recorded on the x –axis, crime-count shown in purple with crime-harm shown in red.

Data Presentation

Visual representations of crime-count and crime-harm are reported by way of kernel density estimate mapping. The use of grid thematic mapping in the statistical evaluation revealed the visual and statistic identification of co-locations of crime-count and crime-harm within the top 32 locations of crime-harm. Kernel density estimate mapping provided better discrimination of 'hot-spots' and/or 'harm-spots' as aggregation of offences create a continuous surface representing the density of either crime events or crime-harm events across a chosen geographical area. Grid thematic mapping allowed all mapped areas to be comparable against each other in a uniformed grid which, although is good for 'hot-spot' identification, can appear artificial in its visualisation. The use of a quarter-mile, square grids (0.0625 square miles representing approximately 400m x 400m) provided geographical identification and location sufficiently large enough for police commanders to recognise the area and be able to examine the issues within.

In the final manipulation of the research data, following on from Myers (2014), the data was arranged and ranked to show the breakdown of specific areas according to crime-count and crime-harm. When examining the ranked percentages of crime-count and ranked percentages of crime-harm, "High crime-count/High crime-harm" was assigned to grid-locations fulfilling >50% count, >50%harm. "High crime, Low harm" was assigned to grid-locations fulfilling >50% count, <50%harm. "Low crime, High harm" was assigned to grid-locations fulfilling <50% count, <50%harm. "Low crime, Low harm was assigned to grid-locations fulfilling <50% count, <50%harm. Those areas that failed to record a crime during this research period were also recorded.

For the purpose of this research, the boundary areas selected and visually represented will be Force level (South Yorkshire), Police District Level (Sheffield, Rotherham, Doncaster and Barnsley). By exception, to provide better visual impact to the crime-count and crime-harm distribution in mapping, the results will show some smaller, local areas. Throughout this research, crime-count will be shown in purple, with crime-harm shown in red. KDE mapping will show high intensity as red and low intensity as blue, with intermediate spectrum colours displaying the range. Temporal data will be presented from 6am – 6am, Monday to Sunday, April to March to represent the 'police' day, week and financial reporting year,

Reliability of the data in this research is strong as it uses what Ruane (2006) described as 'concrete, observable evidence to support a claim about the world'. The use of crime and geocoded locations are consistent, precise measures that are highly reliable under repeat conditions. The validity of the dataset ensures, subject to the excluded offences, the maximum population size that can be mapped 99.4% of all crime data. Limitations with the design included the lack of a standard list of offences to include or exclude, however the design suggested makes this research subject to ready replication across other police forces.

Results

The results chapter of this research divide into a number of sections. The first section will begin with descriptions of key features within the data to provide context for the results. The next section begins with the introduction of the statistical distribution of crime-count and then crime-harm, when the Cambridge Crime-harm Index is applied, presented at a Force level and District level, namely Doncaster, Barnsley, Rotherham and Sheffield.

- 1. Is crime-harm and place spatially connected and concentrated in South Yorkshire, or alternatively, does crime-harm occur randomly?
- 2. Using appropriate mapping techniques, what similarities and differences exist between traditional crime-count maps (centred around single crime-count clustering 'hot-spots') and crime-harm maps (applying the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to illustrate crime-harm clustering 'harm-spots').
- 3. Is there a temporal association with crime-count and crime-harm what are the trends and patterns, including trajectory, over time?

Figure 1 - Research questions

The next sections of the results address each research question, shown in figure1, in turn.

The chapter utilizes a considerable amount of material in the form of maps, figures, tables and appendices and so each results section concludes with a brief summary of the results, subdivided by each research question.

Description of Data

The final cleansed dataset contained 438,798 crime event records. These were recorded on its Crime Management System, within South Yorkshire Police's jurisdiction between 1st April 2010 and 31st March 2015 and include crimes under formal NCRS definitions that are formally reported to the Home Office. The reported crime data was grouped into its aggregate crime type and multiplied by the equivalent days imprisonment value derived from the Cambridge Crime-harm Index (Sentencing Guidelines 2008, Appendix A). The composition of groupings, including offences such as attempts and conspiracies, is discussed in the methods section.

Redistribution of Crime-harm

It is important to commence the results section by examining the prevalence of crime types and their distribution, by volume, in single crime-count and by crime-harm. It is interesting to note that high-volume, low-harm crimes are the most prevalent in single crime-count, where as a different distribution profile exists in crime-harm, revealing offences of high-harm, low-volume.

Harm Group	Crimes	Harm	Crime %	Harm %
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	515	1,879,750	0.1%	9.1%
ASSAULT	52,357	1,097,080	11.9%	5.3%
BURGLARY DWELLING	37,449	617,505	8.5%	3.0%
BURGLARY OTHER	41,280	623,304	9.4%	3.0%
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	1,060	1,934,500	0.2%	9.4%
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	2,673	3,902,580	0.6%	19.0%
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	146	799,350	0.0%	3.9%
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	87,481	1,331,280	19.9%	6.5%
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	1,474	55,094 0.3		0.3%
OTHER VIOLENCE	976	196,860	0.2%	1.0%
ROBBERY	4,723	1,723,895	1.1%	8.4%
SEXUAL OFFENCES	5,259	3,608,708	1.2%	17.5%
STALKING & HARASSMENT	5,197	103,560	1.2%	0.5%
THEFT & HANDLING	138,784	1,882,775	31.6%	9.2%
VEHICLE CRIME	59,424	811,925	13.5%	3.9%
FORCE	438,798	20,568,166	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5. Force entite-count and entite-narm value data, melduing percentages.	Table 3: Force	crime-count an	d crime-harm	i value data,	including	percentages.
---	----------------	----------------	--------------	---------------	-----------	--------------

The numeric values of total un-weighted crime-count and weighted crime-harm values are shown in Table 3. The highest volumes recorded in the Force for crime-count were: theft and handling (31.6%), low level criminal damage/arson (19.9%), assault (11.9%), vehicle crime (13.5%), burglary other (9.4%) and burglary dwelling (8.5%). Cumulatively these offences accounted for 94.8% of all crime-count offences. By volume, violent/sexual crime accounted for 16.8% of crime, whilst non-violent/sexual crime accounted for 83.2% of crime.



Figure 2: Force crime-count and crime-harm distribution by percentage 2010-2015

Following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to the crime data, the distributed pattern of crime (from the perspective of harm) changed. Using crime-harm, these 'power few' crimes now concentrate into a small group of violent/sexual offences.

These crime offences, in order of crime-harm, show grievous bodily harm (19.0%), sexual offences (17.5%), criminal use of weapons (9.4%), theft/handling (9.2%), arson/damage endangering life (9.1%), robbery (8.4%) and assault (5.3%). Taking ALL violent/sexual crime, by volume, accounted for 77.1% of crime-harm. Non-violent crime accounted for 25.9% of harm.

Taking <u>only</u> the following cohort of violent/sexual crimes revealed crime-harm distribution in grievous bodily harm (19.0%), sexual offences (17.5%), criminal use of weapons (9.4%), arson with intent to endanger life (9.1%), robbery (8.4%) and homicide (3.9%). This grouping of this cohort of offences, totaling *67.3% of all crime-harm*, was found in *3.3% (by volume)* of all the total crime-count.

The overall effect of applying the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to South Yorkshire's crime data (Figure 2) shows grievous bodily harm and sexual offences have the highest individual percentages of crime-harm. When viewed from the perspective of harm, there is a large swing from traditional low harm, high volume property type offence (such as criminal damage and theft offences) to low volume, high harm crimes such as serious violent crime and sexual offences (including rape).

The data illustrates that any attempt to map South Yorkshire, or its Districts, in respect of crimecount alone, will be heavily influenced by the concentrations of non-violent crime offences (83.2% of crime-count). Any attempt to map South Yorkshire in respect of crime-harm alone will be heavily influenced by concentrations of violent/sexual crime offences (73.7% of harm).

The next pages will show the distribution of crime-count and crime-harm at District level. A similar distribution pattern to that of the Force appears across the four Districts. This is shown in Tables 4,5,6 and 7 and Figures 3,4,5 and 6.

Table 4: Doncaster crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-15.

Harm Group	Crimes	Harm	Crime %	Harm %
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	130	474500	0.1%	9.6%
ASSAULT	15027	315220	13.7%	6.3%
BURGLARY DWELLING	9510	159095	8.7%	3.2%
BURGLARY OTHER	11895	179451	10.8%	3.6%
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	223	406975	0.2%	8.2%
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	657	959220	0.6%	19.3%
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	26	142350	0.0%	2.9%
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	20590	313925	18.8%	6.3%
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	410	11554	0.4%	0.2%
OTHER VIOLENCE	334	75144	0.3%	1.5%
ROBBERY	718	262070	0.7%	5.3%
SEXUAL OFFENCES	1490	988075	1.4%	19.9%
STALKING & HARASSMENT	1528	30500	1.4%	0.6%
THEFT & HANDLING	34063	464335	31.0%	9.3%
VEHICLE CRIME	13152	184095	12.0%	3.7%
DONCASTER	109753	4966509	100.0%	100.0%



Figure 3: Doncaster crime-count and crime-harm distribution by percentage 2010-15

Harm Group	Crimes	Harm	Crime %	Harm %
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	81	295650	0.1%	9.1%
ASSAULT	8332	174550	12.7%	5.4%
BURGLARY DWELLING	4458	73305	6.8%	2.3%
BURGLARY OTHER	6755	101667	10.3%	3.1%
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	185	337625	0.3%	10.4%
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	441	643860	0.7%	19.9%
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	24	131400	0.0%	4.1%
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	14842	226125	22.6%	7.0%
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	225	8520	0.3%	0.3%
OTHER VIOLENCE	165	25421	0.3%	0.8%
ROBBERY	454	165710	0.7%	5.1%
SEXUAL OFFENCES	890	658338	1.4%	20.3%
STALKING & HARASSMENT	810	16160	1.2%	0.5%
THEFT & HANDLING	19634	260395	29.9%	8.0%
VEHICLE CRIME	8328	117280	12.7%	3.6%
BARNSLEY	65624	3236006	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5: Barnsley crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-15.



Figure 4: Barnsley crime-count and crime-harm distribution by percentage 2010-15

Harm Group	Crimes	Harm	Crime %	Harm %
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	110	401500	0.1%	11.1%
ASSAULT	9410	197390	12.2%	5.4%
BURGLARY DWELLING	5295	97300	6.8%	2.7%
BURGLARY OTHER	8006	121458	10.4%	3.4%
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	176	321200	0.2%	8.9%
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	520	759200	0.7%	21.0%
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	20	109500	0.0%	3.0%
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	16655	253440	21.5%	7.0%
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	295	9143	0.4%	0.3%
OTHER VIOLENCE	153	24909	0.2%	0.7%
ROBBERY	626	228490	0.8%	6.3%
SEXUAL OFFENCES	918	629817	1.2%	17.4%
STALKING & HARASSMENT	955	19000	1.2%	0.5%
THEFT & HANDLING	23645	306580	30.6%	8.5%
VEHICLE CRIME	10525	144775	13.6%	4.0%
ROTHERHAM	77309	3623702	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6: Rotherham crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentages 2010-15



Figure 5: Rotherham crime-count and crime-harm distribution by percentage 2010-15

Harm Group	Crimes	Harm	Crime %	Harm %
ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	194	708100	0.1%	8.1%
ASSAULT	19588	409920	10.5%	4.7%
BURGLARY DWELLING	18186	287805	9.8%	3.3%
BURGLARY OTHER	14624	220728	7.9%	2.5%
CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	476	868700	0.3%	9.9%
GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	1055	1540300	0.6%	17.6%
HOMICIDE incl Attempt	76	416100	0.0%	4.8%
LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	35394	537790	19.0%	6.2%
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	544	25877	0.3%	0.3%
OTHER VIOLENCE	324	71386	0.2%	0.8%
ROBBERY	2925	1067625	1.6%	12.2%
SEXUAL OFFENCES	1961	1332478	1.1%	15.2%
STALKING & HARASSMENT	1904	37900	1.0%	0.4%
THEFT & HANDLING	61442	851465	33.0%	9.7%
VEHICLE CRIME	27419	365775	14.7%	4.2%
SHEFFIELD	186112	8741949	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7: Sheffield crime-count and crime-harm value data, including percentage 2010-15



Figure 6: Sheffield crime-count and crime-harm distribution by percentage 2010-15

Table 8 below shows the results summary with the cumulative results for the Force showing that 3.3% of the most serous violent/ sexual offence contributed to over two-thirds of all harm (67.3%)

District	Total Reported Crime	Violent Crime Offences	Violent Crime (% of total crime)	Contribution of Violent Crime to Harm Total (%)
Doncaster	109753	3244	3.0%	65.1%
Barnsley	65624	2075	3.2%	69.0%
Rotherham	77309	2370	3.1%	67.6%
Sheffield	186112	6687	3.6%	67.9%
FORCE	438798	14376	3.3%	67.3%

Table 8: Summary of violent/sexual crime and contribution to total harm

This distribution is replicated, with little variation, in all Districts ranging from 3.0% to 3.6% violent/sexual crime of total crime contributing to between 65.1% to 69% of crime-harm total.

Spatial Distribution and Concentration of Crime-count and Crime-harm Research Questions 1 and 2

This next section of the study will show results to answer the following research questions.

Is 'crime-harm' and place spatially connected and concentrated in South Yorkshire, or alternatively, does 'crime-harm' occur randomly?

Using appropriate mapping techniques, what similarities and differences exist between traditional crime maps (centered around single crime-count clustering – 'hot-spots') and 'crime-harm' maps (applying the Cambridge Crime-harm Index to illustrate crime-harm clustering – 'harm-spots').



Spatial Distribution Of Crime-count and Crime-harm in South Yorkshire

Figure 7: Map Showing the geography of the county of South Yorkshire

Figure 7 shows the geography of South Yorkshire. The map shows the administrative districts of Barnsley in the northwest, Doncaster in the northeast, Rotherham in the southeast and Sheffield in the southwest. The M1 motorway (shown in blue) dissects Rotherham and Sheffield districts and M18 motorway (shown in blue) dissects Rotherham and Doncaster Districts.

The use of kernel density estimate (KDE) mapping to the research crime data produced two maps. Figure 8 shows the KDE mapping for crime-count, with figure 9 showing the KDE mapping for crime-harm. As can be seen from visual comparison, both maps show similarities and some differences, but these are best explored at District Level. Mapping for the four administrative Districts follows next.



Figure 8: Kernel density estimates map of South Yorkshire for crime-count 2010-15.



Figure 9: Kernel density estimates map of South Yorkshire for crime-harm 2010-15.



Spatial Distribution Of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Doncaster District.







Figure 12: Kernel density estimates map of Doncaster for crime-count 2010-15.



Figure 13: Kernel density estimates map of Doncaster for crime-harm.

Figure 10 above shows a map representing the geography of Doncaster District, with figure 11 showing Doncaster's top 32 grid-locations for crime-count and crime-harm. The town centre has high concentrations of both, but more interestingly there are outlying villages that are high in crime-harm without corresponding high crime-count concentrations.

The application of kernel density estimate mapping to the research crime data produced two maps. Figure 12 shows the KDE mapping for crime-count, with figure 13 showing the KDE mapping for crime-harm. As can be seen from visual comparison, both maps show similarities and some differences.

Figures 14, 15 and 16 represent KDE mapping of crime-harm and crime-count at the selected local levels of Doncaster town centre, Mexborough and Balby.



Figure 14: KDE map for Doncaster town centre for crime-count and crime-harm.







Figure 16: KDE map for Balby for crime-count and crime-harm.

Crimes	Harm	Rank count	Rank harm	% crime	% harm	Place
5,322	202,779	1	1	4.8%	4.2%	TOWN CENTRE
1,193	104,246	4	2	1.1%	2.1%	TOWN CENTRE
1,347	83,190	3	3	1.2%	1.7%	TOWN CENTRE
924	65,615	6	4	0.8%	1.3%	BALBY
603	61,992	19	5	0.5%	1.3%	MEXBOROUGH
696	61,122	11	6	0.6%	1.3%	BALBY
613	54,164	17	7	0.6%	1.1%	HYDE PARK
2,392	53,762	2	8	2.2%	1.1%	TOWN CENTRE
475	50,393	34	9	0.4%	1.0%	WHEATLEY
466	47,263	35	10	0.4%	1.0%	HYDE PARK
853	46,355	7	11	0.8%	0.9%	TOWN CENTRE
422	39,908	43	12	0.4%	0.8%	HEXTHORPE
1,015	39,907	5	13	0.9%	0.8%	TOWN CENTRE
750	38,765	9	14	0.7%	0.8%	MEXBOROUGH
600	35,587	20	15	0.5%	0.7%	EDLINGTON
372	35,210	56	16	0.3%	0.7%	CARCROFT
548	35,061	23	17	0.5%	0.7%	HEXTHORPE
319	34,058	73	18	0.3%	0.7%	MEXBOROUGH
510	31,900	26	19	0.5%	0.7%	BALBY
659	31,115	14	20	0.6%	0.6%	TOWN CENTRE
392	30,901	50	21	0.4%	0.6%	WHEATLEY PARK
511	29,675	25	22	0.5%	0.6%	MOORENDS
664	29,329	13	23	0.6%	0.6%	WHEATLEY
604	28,526	18	24	0.6%	0.6%	HYDE PARK
510	27,725	26	25	0.5%	0.6%	BENTLEY
338	26,301	69	26	0.3%	0.5%	BALBY
498	25,460	30	27	0.5%	0.5%	STAINFORTH
682	24,827	12	28	0.6%	0.5%	THORNE
827	24,625	8	29	0.8%	0.5%	BELLE VUE
422	24,545	43	30	0.4%	0.5%	HYDE PARK
343	24,338	66	31	0.3%	0.5%	MEXBOROUGH
380	23,592	54	32	0.3%	0.5%	TOWN CENTRE

Table 9: Doncaster – T	p 32 ranked locations of	f crime-harm com	pared to crime-count
------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	----------------------



Figure 17: Diagram of co-existence of highest ranked crime-count and crime-harm locations in Doncaster

Table 9 shows the top 32 ranked crime-harm gridlocations (by %) and their subsequent comparison to crime-count grid-locations (by %). Within these two square miles exists 24% of all crime-count and 30% of all crime-harm. Grey shading = high crimeharm areas without associated high crime-count

In this comparison, 22 grid-locations (52% by area covering 1.4 square miles) shared a co-existence between the highest crime-count and the highest crime-harm. (Figure 17).



Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm - Barnsley District

Figure 18: Map Showing Geography of Barnsley District



Figure 19: Grid thematic map - top 32 crime-count and crime-harm locations



Figure 20: Kernel density estimates map of Barnsley for crime-count.



Figure 21: Kernel density estimates map of Barnsley for crime-harm.

Figure 18 above shows a map representing the geography of Barnsley District, with figure 19 showing Barnsley's top 32 grid-locations for crime-count and crime-harm. The town centre has high concentrations of both, but more interestingly there are outlying villages that are high in crime -harm without being high in crime-count.

The application of kernel density estimate (KDE) mapping to the research crime data produced two maps, shown above. Figure 20 shows the KDE mapping for crime-count, with figure 21 showing the KDE mapping for crime-harm. As can be seen from visual comparison, both maps show similarities and some differences.

Figures 22, 23 and 24 represent KDE mapping of crime-harm and crime-count at the selected local levels of Barnsley town centre, Wombwell and Goldthorpe.



Figure 22: KDE map for Barnsley town centre for crime-count and crime-harm.



Figure 23: KDE map for Wombwell town centre for crime-count and crime-harm.



Figure 24: KDE map for Goldthorpe town centre for crime-count and crime-harm.

Crimes	Harm	Rank count	Rank harm	% crime	% harm	Place
3,197	125,383	1	1	4.9%	4.0%	TOWN CENTRE
1,423	76,922	2	2	2.2%	2.4%	TOWN CENTRE
966	65,008	4	3	1.5%	2.1%	TOWN CENTRE
580	44,462	7	4	0.9%	1.4%	TOWN CENTRE
545	44,447	11	5	0.8%	1.4%	TOWN END
976	40,014	3	6	1.5%	1.3%	TOWN CENTRE
569	37,658	9	7	0.9%	1.2%	TOWN CENTRE
874	36,446	5	8	1.3%	1.2%	GOLDTHORPE
376	33,935	25	9	0.6%	1.1%	OLD MILL
396	33,899	20	10	0.6%	1.1%	MEASBROUGH DYKE
575	32,326	8	11	0.9%	1.0%	GOLDTHORPE
513	31,255	13	12	0.8%	1.0%	WORSBROUGH COMMON
364	31,165	28	13	0.6%	1.0%	WOMBWELL
364	30,885	28	14	0.6%	1.0%	THURNSCOE
246	29,738	55	15	0.4%	0.9%	CUDWORTH
318	29,663	35	16	0.5%	0.9%	GOLDTHORPE
292	29,332	40	17	0.4%	0.9%	WOMBWELL
251	28,480	50	18	0.4%	0.9%	WORSBROUGH DALE
378	27,475	24	19	0.6%	0.9%	GOLDTHORPE
338	27,335	33	20	0.5%	0.9%	TOWN CENTRE
559	25,892	10	21	0.9%	0.8%	CUDWORTH
382	25,765	22	22	0.6%	0.8%	WORSBROUGH BRIDGE
345	25,098	31	23	0.5%	0.8%	ATHERSLEY NORTH
791	25,045	6	24	1.2%	0.8%	OLD MILL
507	24,899	14	25	0.8%	0.8%	TOWN END
214	22,966	71	26	0.3%	0.7%	HONEYWELL
391	21,680	21	27	0.6%	0.7%	WOMBWELL
201	21,640	82	28	0.3%	0.7%	WOMBWELL
344	21,014	32	29	0.5%	0.7%	ROYSTON
349	20,982	30	30	0.5%	0.7%	ATHERSLEY NORTH
461	20,720	17	31	0.7%	0.7%	LOCKE PARK
248	20,060	52	32	0.4%	0.6%	CUDWORTH

Table 10: Barnsley – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count



Figure 25: Diagram of co-existence of highest ranked crime-count and crime-harm locations in Barnsley

Table 10 shows the top 32 ranked crime-harm gridlocations (by %) and their subsequent comparison to crime-count grid-locations (by %). Within these two square miles exists 24% of all crime-count and 30% of all crime-harm. Grey shading = high crimeharm areas without associated high crime-count

In this comparison, 24 grid-locations (75% by area covering 1.5 square miles) shared a co-existence between the highest crime-count and the highest crime-harm. (Figure 25).



Spatial Distribution for Crime-count and Crime-harm - Rotherham District

Figure 26: Map showing geography of Rotherham District





Figure 28: Kernel density estimates map of Rotherham for crime-count.



Figure 29: Kernel density estimates map of Rotherham for crime-harm.

Figure 26 above shows a map representing the geography of Rotherham District, with figure 27 showing Rotherham's top 32 grid-locations for crime-count and crime-harm. The town centre has high concentrations of both, but more interestingly there are outlying villages that are high in crime -harm without being high in crime-count.

The application of kernel density estimate (KDE) mapping to the research crime data produced two maps, shown above. Figure 28 shows the KDE mapping for crime-count, with figure 29 showing the KDE mapping for crime-harm. As can be seen from visual comparison, both maps show similarities and some differences.

Figures 30, 31 and 32 represent KDE mapping of crime-harm and crime-count at the selected local levels of Rotherham town centre, Masborough and Clifton.



Figure 30: KDE map for Rotherham town centre for crime-count and crime-harm



Figure 31: KDE map comparing crime-harm with crime-count in Masborough and Clifton

Crimes	Harm	Rank count	Rank harm	% crime	% harm	Place
1,814	101,342	1	1	2.4%	2.8%	TOWN CENTRE
954	96,110	4	2	1.2%	2.7%	EASTWOOD
1,665	71,932	2	3	2.2%	2.0%	TOWN CENTRE
1,208	51,899	3	4	1.6%	1.5%	TOWN CENTRE
543	40,942	9	5	0.7%	1.2%	MASBROUGH
194	40,834	123	6	0.3%	1.1%	WATH ON DEARNE
531	39,465	11	7	0.7%	1.1%	HOLMES
480	36,666	14	8	0.6%	1.0%	TOWN CENTRE
378	33,735	30	9	0.5%	0.9%	PARKGATE
383	31,935	26	10	0.5%	0.9%	EAST HERRINGTHORPE
387	31,187	24	11	0.5%	0.9%	GREASBROUGH
450	29,685	16	12	0.6%	0.8%	TOWN CENTRE
549	29,232	8	13	0.7%	0.8%	EASTWOOD
561	26,502	7	14	0.7%	0.7%	DINNINGTON
468	26,450	15	15	0.6%	0.7%	CLIFTON
206	25,832	113	16	0.3%	0.7%	SWINTON
443	25,769	19	17	0.6%	0.7%	MALTBY
314	24,302	54	18	0.4%	0.7%	THURCROFT
219	24,165	98	19	0.3%	0.7%	RAWMARSH
280	24,120	66	20	0.4%	0.7%	MASBROUGH
383	22,999	26	21	0.5%	0.6%	BRADGATE
447	22,400	17	22	0.6%	0.6%	SWINTON
343	21,712	34	23	0.4%	0.6%	MALTBY
336	21,505	39	24	0.4%	0.6%	EASTWOOD
322	21,475	42	25	0.4%	0.6%	RAWMARSH
254	21,400	81	26	0.3%	0.6%	WINGFIELD
407	21,370	22	27	0.5%	0.6%	EASTWOOD
431	21,232	20	28	0.6%	0.6%	EASTWOOD
157	20,960	155	29	0.2%	0.6%	MOORGATE
320	20,870	44	30	0.4%	0.6%	HOLMES
154	20,786	159	31	0.2%	0.6%	DINNINGTON
308	20,462	55	32	0.4%	0.6%	CANKLOW

Table 11: Rotherham – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count



Figure 32: Diagram of co-existence of highest ranked crime-count and crime-harm locations in Rotherham

Table 11 shows the top 32 ranked crime-harm gridlocations (by %) and their subsequent comparison to crime-count grid-locations (by %). Within these two square miles exists 24% of all crime-count and 30% of all crime-harm. Grey shading = high crimeharm areas without associated high crime-count

In this comparison, 19 grid-locations (42% by area covering 1.2 square miles) shared a co-existence between the highest crime-count and the highest crime-harm. (Figure 32).



Spatial Distribution of Crime-count and Crime-harm in Sheffield District

Figure 33: Map showing geography of Sheffield District



Harm



Figure 35: Kernel density estimates map of Sheffield for crime-count.



Figure 36: Kernel density estimates map of Sheffield for crime-harm.

Figure 33 above shows a map representing the geography of Sheffield District, with figure 34 showing Sheffield's top 32, grid-locations for crime-count and crime-harm. The city-centre has high concentrations of both, but more interestingly there are outlying towns/villages that are high in crime -harm without being high in crime-count.

The application of kernel density estimate (KDE) mapping to the research crime data produced two maps, shown above. Figure 35 shows the KDE mapping for crime-count, with figure 36 showing the KDE mapping for crime-harm. As can be seen from visual comparison, both maps show similarities and some differences.

Figures 37, 38 and 39 represent KDE mapping of crime-harm and crime-count at the selected local levels of Sheffield city-centre, Highfield and Burngreave.



Figure 37: KDE map for Sheffield city centre for crime-count and crime-harm


Figure 38: KDE map for Highfield for crime-count and crime-harm



Figure 39: KDE map for Burngreave for crime-count and crime-harm

Crimes	Harm	Rank count	Rank harm	% crime	% harm	Place
4,778	239,313	1	1	2.6%	2.8%	TOWN CENTRE
2,836	152,010	3	2	1.5%	1.8%	TOWN CENTRE
3,448	119,375	2	3	1.9%	1.4%	TOWN CENTRE
2,664	109,841	4	4	1.4%	1.3%	TOWN CENTRE
1,704	74,345	6	5	0.9%	0.9%	TOWN CENTRE
1,636	71,200	7	6	0.9%	0.8%	HIGHFIELD
620	70,351	31	7	0.3%	0.8%	GLEADLESS VALLEY
1,375	69,830	10	8	0.7%	0.8%	BROOMHALL
810	68,867	18	9	0.4%	0.8%	GRIMESTHORPE
2,385	66,466	5	10	1.3%	0.8%	TOWN CENTRE
1,328	62,395	11	11	0.7%	0.7%	BURNGREAVE
624	62,149	30	12	0.3%	0.7%	SHARROW
517	55,482	55	13	0.3%	0.7%	BURNGREAVE
523	55,236	50	14	0.3%	0.6%	WICKER
649	54,734	29	15	0.4%	0.6%	BROOMHALL
681	53,555	26	16	0.4%	0.6%	DARNALL
740	47,695	23	17	0.4%	0.6%	NETHERTHORPE
924	47,265	15	18	0.5%	0.6%	HIGHFIELD
569	46,775	44	19	0.3%	0.5%	HIGHFIELD
486	44,858	63	20	0.3%	0.5%	DARNALL
802	44,002	19	21	0.4%	0.5%	HIGHFIELD
1,191	43,392	12	22	0.6%	0.5%	HILLSBOROUGH
327	42,980	142	23	0.2%	0.5%	BATEMOOR
411	42,115	101	24	0.2%	0.5%	MANOR
589	41,780	40	25	0.3%	0.5%	NETHERTHORPE
1,152	39,404	13	26	0.6%	0.5%	TOWN CENTRE
518	39,343	54	27	0.3%	0.5%	SOUTHEY GREEN
920	39,030	16	28	0.5%	0.5%	PARSON CROSS
410	38,760	103	29	0.2%	0.5%	NETHERTHORPE
577	38,273	42	30	0.3%	0.4%	FIRTH PARK
481	37,946	66	31	0.3%	0.4%	LOWEDGES
447	37,027	81	32	0.2%	0.4%	HIGHFIELD

Table 12: Sheffield – Top 32 ranked locations of crime-harm compared to crime-count



Figure 40: Diagram of co-existence of highest ranked crime-count and crime-harm locations in Sheffield

Temporal Analysis of Crime-count

Table 12 shows the top 32 ranked crime-harm gridlocations (by %) and their subsequent comparison to crime-count grid-locations (by %). Within these two square miles exists 26% of all crime-count and 27% of all crime-harm. Grey shading = high crimeharm areas without associated high crime-count

In this comparison, 20 grid-locations (45% by area covering 1.3 square miles) shared a co-existence between the highest crime-count and the highest crime-harm. (Figure 40)

and Crime-harm

Research Question 3

In this next section, the exploration of crime-count and crime-harm in a temporal capacity will be undertaken to answer, *is there a temporal association with crime-count and 'crime-harm' and what are the trends and patterns, including trajectory, over time?*

Following analysis of five years of crime data, the results are presented in the following subsets of temporal analysis. The prepared figures, to illustrate the findings, show the distribution of 100% of either crime-count or crime-harm over the time period specified.

Results of the research are presented at Force level and District level and include, analysis by hour within a day, analysis by days within a week, analysis of day versus night, monthly analysis over a calendar year, culminating in the yearly analysis and trajectories of crime-count and crime-harm over the full five years. A summary table of the key finding will conclude each individual subset of the temporal analysis.



Figure 41: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in South Yorkshire

Figure 41 shows the temporal distribution of crime-count and crime-harm over the course of twenty-four hours for South Yorkshire, based on first time committed. The results show that between the hours of 06.00 hrs. and 19.00 hrs. crime-count and crime-harm follow a similar trajectory, with the crime-harm trajectory mirroring the crime-count trajectory, albeit slightly below it, ranging from 0 to a brief 2.7% spread. Both crime-count and crime-harm peak at around 12.00hrs, crime-harm levels rising until they meet that of crime-count, before returning to follow a trajectory slightly below crime-count. The crime-count trajectory peaks at around 17.00hrs when of 7.8% crime-count is recorded.

At 20.00 hrs., crime-harm trajectory intersects the crime-count trajectory. As crime-count generally falls throughout the evening and early hours, crime-harm, maintains its rising trajectory, before increasing from 6.7% to 12.1%, before returning to 5.0% between the hours of 22.00 hrs until 01.00 am, producing three-hours peak. After this point, crime-harm reduces in intensity at a slightly slower rate than the crime trajectory, meeting crime-count rate at 06.00 hrs.



Figure 42: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Doncaster



Figure 43: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Barnsley



Figure 44: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Rotherham



Figure 45: Graph showing daily crime-count and crime-harm rates in Sheffield

The results at District level show a general degree of consistency with that of the Force. Crimecount rises during the day and peaks at around 17.00hrs before declining through evening and into the night. Crime-harm, by contrast, rises steadily through the day and overtakes crimecount commission rate at about between 18.00 hrs. and 19.00hrs. Crime-harm then peaks sharply between 9pm to around 1am, the peak lasting between 3 and 4 hours, after which crime-harm declines to a low at around 06.00am, but still at a commission rate about that of crime-count.

Table 13: Summar	y of daily c	ycles of crime-count	and crime-harm	including peak times
------------------	--------------	----------------------	----------------	----------------------

District	Peak Crime Time	Cross over time	Harm > Crime	Duration	Peak Time	Peak Duration
Doncaster	17:00	20:00	20:00 - 06:00	10 hours	22:00 - 01:00	3 hours
Barnsley	17:00	19:00	19:00 - 07:00	12 hours	22:00 - 01:00	3 hours
Rotherham	17:00	18:00	18:00 - 06:00	12 hours	22:00 - 01:00	3 hours
Sheffield	17:00	18:00	18:00 - 07:00	13 hours	21:00 - 01:00	4 hours
FORCE	17:00	19:00	19:00 - 06:00	11 hours	22:00 - 01:00	3 hours

Temporal Analysis Results – By Week

Analysis of the data for crime-count and crime-harm was undertaken to establish patterns that occurred during the week. The following figures, Figures 46 to 50 represent the findings for the whole Force and each district separately.



Figure 46: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for South Yorkshire

The Force results showed crime remained constant throughout the working week (around the 13-14% mark). Crime increased Friday into Saturday to 17.4%, reducing slightly to 16.0% on Saturday into Sunday, with Sunday into Monday being the lowest recorded day with 12.3 %.

In contrast, crime-harm fluctuated slightly through the working week from 12.0% to 13.0% and was below the crime rate for that same period. At weekends, however crime-harm exceeds crime-count during Friday into Saturday to 18.0%, peaking at 18.9% on Saturday into Sunday, with Sunday into Monday showing a reduction to 13.0%. Lowest day recorded for crime-harm is Wednesday into Thursday with 11.8%.



Figure 47: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Doncaster



Figure 48: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Barnsley



Figure 49: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Rotherham



Figure 50: Chart showing weekly crime-count and crime-harm for Sheffield

	Peak Crime				Peak Harm		Lowest Harm	
District	Days	Peak Crime Rate	Lowest Crime Days	Lowest Crime rates	Days	Peak Harm rate	Days	Lowest Harm rate
	(6am - 6am)		(6am - 6am)		(6am - 6am)		(6am - 6am)	
Doncaster	Fri/Sat	17.0%	Sun/Mon	12.6%	Sat/Sun	19.0%	Wed/Thu	11.2%
Barnsley	Fri/Sat	17.7%	Sun/Mon	12.7%	Fri/Sat	19.8%	Tue/Wed	11.4%
Rotherham	Fri/Sat	18.0%	Sun/Mon	12.5%	Sat/Sun	19.2%	Mon/Tue	11.5%
Sheffield	Fri/Sat	17.3%	Sun/Mon	11.8%	Sat/Sun	18.5%	Wed/Thu	12.0%
Force	Fri/Sat	17.4%	Sun/Mon	12.3%	Sat/Sun	18.9%	Wed/Thu	11.8%

Table 14: Summary of weekly distribution of crime-count and crime-harm committed rates.

There was a degree of consistency across each District when analyzing the results across the working week. Crime-count commission rates were at there highest on Friday into Saturday, commission rates ranging between 17.0% to 18.0%. Lowest crime days were Sunday into Monday across all Districts ranging from 11.8% to 12.7%.

Across Districts, crime-harm, in contrast, showed peaks on Saturday into Sunday with the exception of Barnsley, which showed Friday into Saturday. Crime-harm commission rate exceeded that of crime-count and peaked on these peak days at a rate ranging between 18.5% to 19.2%. Lowest crime-harm commission rates ranged between 11.2% to 12.0%, lowest days being Wednesday into Thursday, with the exceptions of Barnsley and Rotherham.

Temporal Analysis – Day versus Night

Analysis of the data for crime-count and crime-harm was undertaken to establish patterns that occur, contrasting day and night. The following figures, Figures 51 to Figure 55 represent the findings for the whole Force and each district separately.



Figure 51: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in South Yorkshire

At the Force level, the data shows that the split between day and night committed-crime, as defined above is 46% in the day with 54% at night.

By contrast, crime-harm divides into 34% in the day with 66% reported during the evening into the early hours, so for every crime-harm event occurring in the day, there are double the occurrence during the evening/night.



Figure 52: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Doncaster



Figure 53: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Barnsley



Figure 54: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Rotherham



Figure 55: Chart showing night and day for crime-count and crime-harm in Sheffield

The table below summarizes the findings and includes individual subsets divisions for GBH, sexual offences and criminal use of weapons.

District	Crime DAY	Crime NIGHT	Harm DAY	Harm NIGHT
Doncaster	47.2%	52.8%	35.3%	64.7%
Barnsley	44.9%	55.1%	33.2%	66.8%
Rotherham	45.0%	55.0%	33.1%	66.9%
Sheffield	46.9%	53.1%	34.5%	65.5%
All crime/harm	46.3%	53.7%	34.2%	65.8%
GBH	25.3%	74.7%	25.3%	74.7%
All Sexual Offences	39.6%	60.4%	28.8%	71.2%
All Criminal Use of Weapons	36.8%	63.2%	36.8%	63.2%

Table 15: Distribution summary of crime-count and crime-harm by day /night.

Again consistency existed across the District for crime-count showing an almost 50:50 split of distribution between day and night, revealing slight variation of between 6% to 10% to comparable crime-count rates in the evening into night.

In the Districts, crime-harm, by contrast consistently showed a commission rate of one third of offences being committed in the day, with twice that amount, namely two thirds, of crime-harm being reported in the evening into night. By exception for crime types, GBH revealed 75% crime-harm commission during the evening/night.

Temporal Analysis – by month

Analysis of the data for crime and crime-harm was undertaken to establish pattern that occur contrasting across the whole year, on a month-by-month basis. The following figures 56 to 60 represents the findings for the Force and Districts.



Figure 56: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in South Yorkshire

The results show an almost constant reporting of crime at levels of 8.0% to 8.6% with little variation across the calendar year.

In contrast, crime-harm fluctuates between 7.6% and 8.7%. Peaks for crime-harm occur in July/August, the briefly October and then in December. Lowest month for harm is November, with an outlier peak (slightly greater than July's) occurring in December.

Although there is slight variation from the Force's distribution in each District's results the variation is minimal to suggest that over the calendar year, season variation is not vast enough to make comment about.



Figure 57: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Doncaster



Figure 58: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Barnsley



Figure 59: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Rotherham



Figure 60: Graph showing monthly crime-count and crime-harm rates in Sheffield

District	Peak Month	Peak Crime Rate	Lowest Crime Month	Lowest Crime rates	Peak Harm Month	Peak Harm rate	Lowest Harm Month	Lowest Harm rate
Doncaster	May	8.8%	Dec & Feb	7.8%	Aug	9.3%	Nov	7.5%
Barnsley	Jul	8.6%	May	8.0%	lut	9.3%	Nov	7.3%
Rotherham	Oct	8.8%	Feb	7.6%	Oct	9.3%	Nov	7.7%
Sheffield	Oct	8.7%	Dec	8.1%	May	9.0%	Feb	7.5%
All crime/harm	Oct	8.6%	Feb	8.0%	Aug	8.7%	Feb	7.6%
GBH	Dec	9.9%	Sep	6.9%	Dec	9.9%	Sep	6.9%
Sexual Offences	Jan	9.7%	Feb	6.3%	Jan	10.6%	Feb	6.8%
Criminal Use of Weapons	Jun	9.9%	Jun	9.9%	Dec	6.8%	Dec	6.8%

Table 16: Distribution summary of crime-count and crime-harm by month

Table 16 provides a summary, for Force, Districts and selected crime-harm groups, of the highest and lowest months of committed crime-count and crime-harm, including rates, throughout the year.

Temporal Analysis Over Time

This next part of the temporal analysis shows the trajectory of crime-count and crime-harm over the period of the research, from 2010 to 2015. (Figures 61 to 65).

Although the graph scales are different for each variable, from the perspective of crime-count, it can be seen that crime-count (recorded at 93,152 in 2010) has generally fallen over at least four of the five years, the most recent year has shown the crime-count to rise slightly (recorded at 84,840 in 2015). The overall trajectory, despite the final slight increase, is a reduction year-on-year in crime-count, representing an overall reduction in crime of **8.9%** during five years.



Figure 61: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in South Yorks

Crime-harm, on the other hand, over the same period showed an initial reduction in harm from 2010 to 2013 (recorded as 4153839 harm count down to 3788465 crime-harm), representing an 8.7% reduction. Thereafter, the past two years that shown an increase in crime-harm (recorded as 4526609 harm count), representing a 19.5% increase. The overall effect of crime-harm over the five years shows an increase of **8.9%** harm. The research revealed the gap between crime-count and crime-harm is widening.



Figure 62: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Doncaster



Figure 63: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Barnsley



Figure 64: Graph showing year-on-year change - crime-count and crime-harm in Rotherham





District	Crime-count Rate Fall	Lowest Year CC	Highest Year CC	Crime-harm Rate Rise	Lowest Year CH	Highest Year CH
Doncaster	12.9%	2012 / 13	2010 / 11	2.0%	2012 / 13	2013 / 14
Barnsley	2.1%	2013 / 14	2010 / 11	14.4%	2012 / 13	2014 / 15
Rotherham	3.9%	2012 / 13	2010 / 11	5.1%	2011 / 12	2013 / 14
Sheffield	10.9%	2014 / 15	2011 /12	12.5%	2013 / 14	2014 / 15
FORCE	8.9%	2013 / 14	2010 / 11	8.9%	2012 / 13	2014 / 15

Table 17: Crime-count and crime-harm rates including trajectory 2010-2015.

Summary Of Crime-count and Crime-Harm Matrix

Table 18: Summary matrix of crime-count and crime-harm Rates from analysis

Quarter mile Square Grid Locations with one or more crimes	Percentage of Total Area	Number of Quarter-Mile Square Grids	Total Square Miles Coverage
High Crime-count Greater than 50%	4.4% of Total Area	433	27.0
High Crime-harm Greater than 50%	3.4% of Total Area	338	21.1

Percentage of Total Area	Number of Quarter- Mile Square Grids	Total Square Miles Coverage	Contribution to Crime Count or Crime Crime Totals
1.0% of Total Area	100	6.3	Crime-count=23%
1.0% of Total Area	100	6.3	Crime Harm = 26%

Top 50% comparison for crimecount and crime-harm shows co-location in 276 areas (17.3 sq. miles)

38% of crime-count

44% of crime- harm

Highest 100 - grid areas comparison for both crime-count and crimeharm - co-location in 60 areas (3.75 sq. miles).

16% of crime-count

19% of crime-harm

Figure 66: Distribution Matrix of Locations of Crime-count And Crime-harm (Myers 2014)



Discussion

The results presented in the previous chapter reveal some interesting findings, illustrating how crime-count and crime-harm are spatially and temporally distributed, including associations between concentrations. They begin the debate - are the areas that the police currently target, actually those areas that cause the most harm? Questioning if the police are aware of the existence of these harmful areas, and looking forward, stimulates thought to the practical use this research may have in reducing crime-harm and making people safe.

This chapter will discuss the theoretical, policy and research implications of the findings presented within this study. It will look at how the findings contribute to the existing literature around crime-count, crime-harm concentrations and temporal analysis. It will then look at the policy implications for policing, before moving onto the implications for future research. The chapter concludes with comments relating to the limitations and strength of this study.

Theoretical Implications

The identification and analysis of crime-harm is a new concept for South Yorkshire Police. This study offers a new perspective, allowing for development of debate about the concept of crime-harm. It provides <u>one</u> method to quantify crime-harm and provides an alternate to inform crime performance data, from the perspective of crime-harm. It provides a degree of measurement certainty around crime-harm, allowing Police to assess correctly if their actions are actually making the public safer.

Paoli and Greenfield (2013) identified that the world of criminology had not particularly concentrated on criminal harm; it struggled with its identification, evaluation or comparison. This research attempts to address this position. Ratcliffe (2014) stated that a more holistic approach to the effective measurement of harm would be advantageous for policing. He suggested that rather than asking how much crime exists, a better question would be, how much harm is caused by crime? He described that the future goal for any police force should be towards harm focussed, intelligence-led, evidenced-based policing.

In its aim to understand the concept of crime-harm, this research used historic crime data and applied the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. The study selected this index, having explored the difficulties faced by researchers unable to find consensus in a process capable of being able to identify, evaluate and compare crime-harms. Exploration of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index revealed its effectiveness to achieve this. Performing this task in a cost effective manner, other than the analyst's time, this research was conducted using existing data and current computer software designed to manipulate and map data.

The research, when examining crime-harm, revealed a shift in distribution of crime from high volume, low harm un-weighted crime-count to low volume, high harm, weighted crime-harm, following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index. This research identified the existence of a selection of *"power few"* offences that drive crime-harm (Sherman 2007). This small cohort of offences, some **3.3%** of total crime-count, consisting of grievous bodily harm (19.0%), sexual offences (17.5%), criminal use of weapons (9.4%) arson with intent to endanger life (9.1%), robbery (8.4%), and homicide (3.9%) were responsible for two-thirds of all harm.

To answer the first research question, this research supports the findings of previous research by Weinborn (2015) and Myers (2014), showing that crime-harm and place are spatially connected, existing in concentrated places in the same way that crime-count concentrates. When crime-count and crime-harm are mapped, the research analysis showed that 50% of crime-count concentrated in **4.4%** of geography. This supported previous research conducted, referred to in the literature review (Pierce, Spaar and Briggs 1988; Sherman, Gartin and Beurger 1989; Weisburd, Maher and Sherman 1992). The spatial analysis of crime-harm showed that 50% of crime-harm concentrated in a much smaller area - **3.4%** of geography. The research revealed that **51.3%** of geography was crime-free.

In answer to the second research question, visual comparison of the crime-count and crimeharm mapping revealed crime-harm appears broadly concentrated, within areas of medium to high crime. Closer inspection of the local KDE maps, suggested that crime-harm concentrated areas are sharper in focus than the crime-count equivalent. This may be due in part to the disproportionate weight that occurs at a low volume, high harm event.

There are, of course, some areas of high concentrations of crime-count, where there is little evidence of crime-harm concentrations and, by contrast, some locations of low crime-count concentration where crime-harm concentrations are high. This was best revealed on the local KDE maps, particularly in Doncaster and Sheffield. This final point might be the most significant, given the way police resources are allocated to high concentrations of low harm, high volume offences. These areas, highlighted in the local KDE maps, could potentially miss the attention of the police, yet be 'hot-beds' of crime-harm.

Although the kernel density estimates maps at the macro scale show many similarities in those areas exhibiting high crime-count concentrations and areas of high crime-harm concentration, clearly the closer detail suggests otherwise. For that reason, it felt prudent to examine this further. This was achieved by arranging quarter-mile square grid locations for crime-count and locations for crime-harm, by descending percentage values. Both lists were then compared and re-ranked to highest 32 locations in terms of descending crime-harm percentage values. The highest 32 areas for crime-harm were then reported. Whilst there were many areas where high-harm and high-crime co-exist (such as town centres), this research revealed high-harm locations within Districts that had nowhere near as high-ranking position as crime-count. The research showed that Districts, crime-count and crime-harm concentrated locations sometimes did exist together, but generally they proved to exist separately. Barnsley was the closest, 75% of these locations co-existed. The other Districts showed Doncaster 52%, Rotherham 42% and Sheffield 45%.

The implications are where crime-count and crime-harm co-exists, police may target these places, use problem-solving methodologies and potentially the same tactics to engage with both crime-count and crime-harm. However, in areas where crime-count and crime-harm do not co-exist, then, for crime-harm, new tactics and re-deployed resources are needed to address the concerns.

To answer the third research question, this research progressed criminology's examination of the relationship between crime and time, supporting research suggesting crime's uneven distribution across time and space (Ratcliffe 2002). Temporally, the research revealed crime-count and crime-harm follow different trajectories throughout the day, week, year, and over the research period. Daily, the pattern is *diffused* where crime-count steadily rises and declines, peaking at 17.00 hrs. Crime-harm follows a different trajectory, overtaking the committed rate of crime-count at around 18.00-19.00 hrs. - remaining high through the night. Night-time offences are *focused* as twice that of daytime commission rates, with *acute* intense peaks occurring between 22.00 hrs. and 01.00 hrs.

Over the week, crime-count and crime-harm differ in their distributed occurrence, with peak days being *focused* at different parts of the end of the week into the weekend. The calendar year revealed more parity between crime-count and crime-harm with less significant differences between the two groups. Lastly, over the five years of this study period, the overall Force trajectory of crime-count showed a general *fall* of 8.9%. The trajectory of crime-harm, by contrast showed a general *rise* of 8.9%, but over the last two years, the gap between crime-count trajectory and crime-harm trajectory is widening.

Policy Implications

South Yorkshire's Police and Crime Plan (2013-2017) highlighted the prioritisation and subsequent reduction of harm as one of the key priorities. Ruane (2006) stated,' if we are wrong in identifying the "causes" of some social phenomenon, any of the policies built around our

causal model will be misguided'. In a more accountable world, with fewer resources, it is important to ensure that whatever activity the police prioritise, it is achieved by the most cost-effective means.

Spatially, this research identified those places within South Yorkshire contributing to the most harm, and temporally, when crime-harm is likely to occur. The research could lead to the reexamination of the resourcing profile based on harm and not demand. Are there sufficient resources working in any twenty-four hour period to match the research time profile? Are they deployed to those areas where the most harm is found? Are resources and managers aware of their high harm concentrated areas and have they the professional curiosity to take the extra step forward, to begin to understand the reasons for the occurrence of high crime-harm within these areas?

Figures 67 and 68 show crime-count (purple) and crime-harm (red) occurrence for a given day in Sheffield. The first graph shows weekday and the second graph shows weekend. Overlaid onto both graphs is the green line showing resource demand.



Figure 67 – Weekday - Daily Crime-count and Crime-Harm plotted with Resource Levels



Figure 68 – Weekend - Daily Crime-count and Crime-Harm plotted with Resource Levels

It is apparent in both graphs, that there are areas, particularly in the evening, when resource levels are insufficient to meet the influx of crime-harm. On weekdays this is between 19.00 hrs. and 01.00 hrs. Weekends show insufficient resources between 00.00hrs and 04.00 hrs. For crime-count, the same resource gap appears between 12.00 hrs. and 19.00 hrs.

The research could lead to re-designing our strategic and tactical profiles, based on harm reduction. This would range from daily tasking and coordinating meetings, to monthly strategic performance meetings, up to the force performance meetings with the Police and Crime Commissioner. This is not criticism of the existing structures and governance meetings, just that this research could move away from a total crime-count reduction mindset and bring crimeharm onto the agenda as a headline feature.

The research found a small cohort of low volume, high harm offences responsible for two-thirds of all harm. Are specialist departments sufficiently resourced to deal with this? Are crime reductions strategies surrounding these offences aware of the concept of crime-harm concentrated at specific identifiable locations? Are they cognisant of crime-harm and its association with time and, if so, what resource plans exist, both within the police and partners, to attempt to tackle it? There are no clear-cut answers and alternate positions exist in respect of harm-based resourcing. Wikstrom (1995) and Innes (2005) tackle the concept from a different stance stating that addressing minor crime or 'signal crimes' would help prevent serious harm offences; signals that 'shape how people think, feel or act in relation to their security'.

Research of the crime-harm maps and analysis revealed villages/towns at the extremities of the District boundaries of Doncaster, Barnsley and Rotherham displaying high crime-harm, often without high crime-count. Town or city centres showed the highest crime-harm concentrations, but what is happening in the above locations along the Don/Dearne Valley? These locations can be found in the thematic grid maps and the tables 9,10,11 and 12 showing co-existence locations. Many of these locations are policed from centralised policing locations. Is this affecting the type of service they are receiving, exposing these areas to less police resources? Alternatively, are these 'self-policing' locations - either not reporting crime or only contacting the police for the most serious of crimes, thereby distorting the crime-harm?

Ratcliffe (2010) suggests "the identification of concentrations or clusters of greater criminal activity has emerged as a central mechanism pre-cursive to targeting a criminal justice and crime prevention response to crime problems". He continues by highlighting that the identification of such clusters is only the starting point for more detailed analysis, both theoretically and from a crime prevention perspective. He infers that this targeted research should the norm, subjected to a standardised methodology. Whilst some basic hot-spot analysis work has been undertaken using low harm, high volume offences, there is no awareness of previous attempts to identify crime-harm concentrations.

Research Implications

Whilst this study has provided answers to the research questions set, there are further questions raised, suggesting further research. This research has limited itself to identifying locations where crime-harm exists and when it is likely to happen. It has shown that crime-harm

exists in concentrated locations, mirroring those similar findings for crime-count concentrations (hot-spots). The research has shown temporal distribution of crime-harm, revealing it to be different to that of crime-count, but what makes these locations particularly harmful and why is harm concentrated at certain times of the day?

The value of identifying concentrated areas of crime-count and crime-harm is only one solution in the tackling of crime or crime-harm. Knowledge of these locations becomes more relevant when applying findings from other areas of criminology research. These identifiable spatial concentrations become more interesting when viewed with the knowledge that a small number of offenders are responsible for a large proportion of crime (Farrington 1992) and that a small number of victims endure repeat victimisation (Polvi *et al.*1991; Farrell and Pease 1993; Ellingworth *et al.* 1995; Spelman 1995).

This research provides district police commanders with their first perspective of crime-harm in their Districts. Further research is needed around the composition of these harmful areas, to discover what, within these concentrations of crime-harm, makes them so harmful. To prevent crime-harm from occurring, police commanders need to know when and where, but also to identify potential victims and offenders. For this research to be a truly predictive tool in the prevention of crime-harm, all these facets will need exploring.

Victim and offender characteristics such as gender, age, ethnicity, disability, occupation and relationship to offender/victim are just some of the areas of research that could be explored, building on this research. Additionally, working with statutory partners, establishing what is particularly unique about these concentrated areas of crime-count and crime-harm. Considerations around education, employment figures, population make-up, ethnic diversity and deprivation are just some of the areas this research could be developed. This research does not explore the breakdown between private and public locations, arguing that different approaches and tactics are required for either scenario.

Prevention strategies could be devised within these locations bespoke to those crime types that cause the most harm, those affected by becoming victims or to target those who offend and cause the most harm to the community.

The type of research suggested would be a large, but not impossible undertaking for the Force. The dataset used in this research, over five years, required a vast amount of cleansing, to allow manipulation. Other databases around victim and offender would also require the same amount of cleansing and manipulation.

Limitations of the Research

Whilst great care went into establishing which retrospective analysis should be used to conduct this research, reflection after the event, reveals some of the limitation within the research.

This research used crime data over five years. Other research, notably Weinborn (2015), selected larger data sets. Larger data sets would potentially show the enduring nature (or not) of concentrations of crime-harm over time. South Yorkshire Police began computerised crime data on 16 October 1992 (although usable crime data is only available from April 1995). Should this research be attempted again using larger dataset, technology would restrict future research to a maximum only twenty years of data, assuming that all of this crime data is geo-coded.

The rationale behind the resolution of the data at quarter-mile square grids has been explained earlier. However, higher resolution of the grids could reveal more precision within the overall findings. It is accepted that even within these quarter-mile square grids, there will be areas of high concentration, areas of low crime and areas showing no crime. An increased resolution of the analysis gridding could reveal even higher theoretical concentrations of both crime-count and crime-count spatially.

The crime data used in this research assumes that every crime is recorded appropriately in the correct crime category. National Crime Reporting Standards (NCRS) provides an auditable

methodology to provide some safeguard around the accuracy and reliability of the crime data. National Crime Reporting Standards (NCRS) have been in place in England and Wales, since April 2002, to promote greater consistency between police forces, when crime- recording and to providing a victim-oriented approach. NCRS attempts to eradicate variation in recording practices between forces, which can ultimately obstruct efforts for forces to understand its crime problems and effectively serve their communities.

The research also operates using recorded crime (those offences where the police are notified). There are many cases where offences take place when police are not notified. There are locations across the county where communities are more content to report, whilst others report crime only when it crosses a moral threshold of acceptance. The difference between the 'true' value of crime and that reported is unknown, but when examining results, compared with specific locations, this should be considered.

Temporal analysis revealed two distinct acute peaks, one at mid-day and one around midnight. Whilst both peaks are present, their actual intensity is potentially questionable and subject to further research. Whilst the results show the presence acute peaks within the results, the methodology for temporally averaging the commission time, potentially artificially inflates their intensity. For example, a person reporting a crime committed sometime on Monday will see the average of 12 noon being recorded, whilst someone reporting a crime committed overnight may see this averaged out to reveal an average either side of midnight.

The use of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index at the level needed for this research required the author to supplement the existing research of Sherman *et al.* (2014) with data contained within the Sentencing Guidelines (2008). Some crime-harm index assumptions were made around crime offences, particularly when recorded as attempts or conspiracies. Additionally, the inclusion and exclusion list of criminal offences described in the methodology, whilst robustly described by the author, lends itself to subjective interpretation when attempting to generalise

the research across England and Wales. For national replication, the need for proscribed operating rules is required, including what is exactly meant by those offences that are reported to the police from 'victim and witnesses' Sherman *et al.* (2014).

Despite the limitation, the research retains strong data accuracy and reliability as police crime data are subject to local audit and recorded against national standards (NCRS). The Cambridge Crime-harm Index uses nationally accepted Sentencing Guidelines, as defined by statute. It provides a consistent metric for understanding the differences in harm by the standard of day's imprisonment (or equivalent) in contrast to other methods of attempting to identify and measure crime severity (harm) by indices or other means. Validity of the crime index would be enhanced if it were subjected to public opinion validation. This would provide both the justification and legitimacy to allocate fewer resources to certain crime, whilst focussing on crime-harm.

This research analysed 99.4% overall included crime population. Safeguards using such a high level of population will ensure forces that participate in the national picture are not omitting, by poor working practice or deliberately, high harm low volume offences that have a dramatic effect of the overall crime-harm picture. Sherman *et al.* (2014) was aware of this suggesting the Cambridge Crime-harm Index could be a metric that would increase the integrity of recording crime by focusing on smaller numbers of highly visible crime, reducing but not eliminating to game and distort crime data.

Conclusions

Ratcliffe (2014) suggested that the policing's goal is harm focussed, intelligence-led, evidencedbased policing. Researchers have found the ability to effectively identify and measure the severity of crime has proved challenging, due, in part, to a lack of a consistent mechanism to identify and measure crime severity. The Cambridge Crime-harm Index is *one* such mechanism, providing police forces in England and Wales a suitable, consistent metric. Its application has provided answers to the research questions set and helped to answer the question 'are the police keeping people safe from the crime that causes the most harm?'

This research examined 438,798 crimes committed over the past five financial years (2010 to 2015). The study succeeded in introducing South Yorkshire Police to a new mechanism to interpret its own crime data and demonstrated a robust, consistent metric aimed specifically towards the concept of crime-harm. The study's application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index (CHI) to crime data in South Yorkshire, allowed it to answer the research questions set and reach observations in respect of the spatial and temporal distribution of (un-weighted) crime-count and (weighted) crime-harm data.

Having considered other methods of measuring crime severity within the literature review and examined alternate weighted crime indices, the Cambridge Crime-harm Index, was seen as a suitable, robust and simplistic metric to overcome the complication of measuring crime severity/harm. It offers a method of complementing existing performance measures of crime, providing a credible alternative to quantify crime, by way of its harm; addressing some of the traditional crime-count limitations (Sherman *et al.*2014). Its use of day's imprisonment (or equivalent), taken Sentencing Guidelines starting points for England and Wales, makes it a transparent, consistent and easily transferable harm index that could become an appropriate force and national metric to assess crime-harm.

This exploratory study, used the theoretical framework around the comprehension of predictable concentrations of harm (Sherman 2013) and the use of large retrospective data-sets to inform future actions (Chainey et al. 2008) replicating and supporting previous research; showing that crime-count and crime-harm can be found concentrated in identifiable spatial locations within geographical areas. Although this was not specifically tested, five years of crime data provided a strong suggestion of enduring crime-count and crime-harm concentrated locations.

Using a resolution of quarter-mile square grids, the research showed that 50% of crime-count in South Yorkshire is concentrated in 4.4% of geographical area, 27.0 square mile (433 grids). It also showed that 50% of crime-harm in South Yorkshire is located in 3.4% of geographical area, 21.1 square miles (338 grids). The research also revealed that no crime exists in 51.3% of geographical area, 308 square miles (4939 grids). The study also demonstrated that at District level, although there is some co-existence, the highest concentrated areas of crime-count generally <u>do not</u> coincide with those highest concentrated areas of crime-harm.

These concentrated locations of crime-count and crime-harm were appropriately mapped, revealing differences and similarities. The application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index revealed that un-weighted crime maps were heavily influenced by high volume, low harm offences. Weighted crime-harm maps, following the application of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index, were heavily influenced by low volume, high harm violent/sexual offences. Indeed, the Sherman (2007) 'power few' offences of the most serious violent and sexual offences consisted of a subset of 3.3% of total offence-volume that contributed for almost two-thirds of all crime-harm.

This final part of the study showed that crime-count and crime-harm have different temporal concentrations when examined from the perspective of day, week, year and equally and trajectory across the research period. The research revealed that crime-count builds and
declines relatively smoothly throughout the working day, peaking at around 17.00hrs. Key peak days are Friday and Saturday. Crime-harm committed rate was found to be lower in the day than that of crime-count, but then overtook it after 19.00hrs, when there is twice the rate of committed crime-harm offences at night than in the day. Weekends, consisting of Friday, Saturday and Sunday are key peak days.

Over the five years of this study period, at force level, the overall trajectory of crime-count showed a general fall of 8.9%. At the force level, the trajectory of crime-harm, by contrast showed a general rise of 8.9%, but more worrying over the last two years the, gap between crime-count trajectory and crime-harm trajectory is widening. By the metric of the Cambridge Crime-harm Index, the research shows, from a South Yorkshire perspective, people are not as safe from the crime that causes them most harm.

The immediate implications of this research is to inform police commanders of these spatial and temporal concentrations, to enable them to target those areas that cause the most harm to people within South Yorkshire. It should provide them with information to select the most appropriate and proportional response to tackling and investigating those crimes with the most harm. With additional analytical resources, incorporating longer data sets and more resolute mapping definition, this study could have revealed a greater precision in it findings of concentrations.

Whilst the study is pioneering within South Yorkshire, this research could be adopted by the force as a recognised metric to measure and assess direction of travel in reducing crime that causes the most harm to the public. The research could be further enhanced by examination of crime characteristics within these concentrated areas of both crime-count and crime-harm. Knowledge of victim and offender characteristics and, working with statutory partners, exploring the unique or common characteristics embedded within these concentrated areas of crime-count and crime-harm, has to be the direction of travel. Prevention strategies could be

109

devised within these locations bespoke to those crime types that cause the most harm, those affected by becoming victims or to target those who offend and cause the most harm to the community.

Sherman (2013), at the introduction to this study, described evidenced-based policing as a method of making decisions about "what works" in policing, establishing which practices and strategies accomplish policing objectives in the most cost-effective manner. This study will assist in providing the appropriate evidence base to ensure that South Yorkshire Police knows, the time, days and the locations where crime-count and crime-harm are more likely to occur - to properly direct its staff, coordinate with partners and amend its approach to ensuring that it achieves the Police and Crime Plan priority of 'South Yorkshire will be, and feel, a safe place to live, learn and work'.

References

Ackman, D.D., Normandeau, A. and Turner, S. (1967). Measurement of Delinquency in Canada. *Journal of Criminal Law Criminology and Police Studies*. 58, 330-337.

Anderson, D., Cheney, S., and Pease, K. (1995). Biting Back: Tackling Repeat Burglary and Car Crime. *Police Research Group: Detection and Prevention Series*. Paper 58: 1-57

Ashworth, A. (2006). Principles of Criminal Law. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*. Fifth Edition.

Babyak, C., Alvai, A., Collins, K., Halladay, A. and Tapper, D. (2009). The Methodology of the Police-Reported Crime Severity Index. Statistics Canada.

Bland, M. (2014) Targeting Escalation in Common Domestic Abuse: How Much, If Any? : University of Cambridge Thesis – M.St. Applied Criminology and Police Management. Unpublished

Blum-West, S.R. (1985). The Seriousness of Crime: A Study of Popular Morality. *Deviant Behaviour*. Vol.6 p 83-89.

Braga, A.A. (2001). The Effects of 'hot-spot' Policing on Crime. *Sage Social Science Collection* p 104-125

Braga, A.A. (2002). Problem-Orientated Policing and Crime Prevention. Monsey, New York: *Criminal Justice Press*.

Braga, A.A. (2008). Crime Prevention Research Review No.2: Police Enforcement Strategies to Prevent Crime in 'hot-spot' Areas. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Orientated Police Services.

Brand, S. and Price, R. (2000). The Economic and Social Cost of Crime. UK Home Office Research Study 217.

Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1981). Environmental Criminology. Waveland Press, Prospects Heights.

Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1984). Patterns in Crime. McMillian, New York.

Brantingham, P.J. and Brantingham, P.L. (1991). Environmental Criminology. Second Edition. Waveland Press, Prospects Heights.

Chainey, S. and Ratcliffe, J. (2005) GIS and Crime Mapping. Chichester: Wiley.

Chainey, S., Tompson, L., and Uhlig, S. (2008). The Utility of Hotspot Mapping for Predicting Spatial Patterns of Crime. *Security Journal* (2008) 21, 4–28. doi:10.1057/palgrave.sj.8350066

Clarke, R.V. (1992). Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies. New York, NY: Harrow and Heston.

Clarke, R.V., and Felson, M. (1993). Introduction: Criminology, Routine Activity and Rational Choice. In: R.V., Clarke and Felson, M. (eds), *'Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances in Criminology Theory 5'*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Press.

Cohen, L.E., and Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A routine Activity Approach. *American Social Review*, 44: 588-608.

Cohen, M.A. (1988). Pain, Suffering and Jury Awards: A Study of the Cost to Victims. *Law Society Review* 22(3) p.537-555.

Cohen, M.A. (1990). A Note On The Cost Of Crime to Victims. Urban Studies. 27: pp125-132

Cohen, M.A., Rust, R.T., Stephen, S. and Tidd, S. (2004). Willingness to Pay for Crime Control Programs. *Criminology* 42(1); p 89-110

Cohen, M.A., and Piquero, A.R. (2009). New Evidence on the Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth. J Quant *Criminol*. Vol.25 pp. 25-49.

Cornish, D.B., and Clarke, R.V. (1986). The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cornish, D.B., and Clarke, R.V. (1987). Understanding Crime Displacement: An Application of Rational Choice Theory. Criminology 25:933-47

Crown Prosecution Service (2013). Sentencing Manual accessed 15th July 2015 from <u>http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/s_to_u/sentencing_manual/</u>

Eck, J.E. and Weisburd, D.L. (1995). Crime Places and Crime Theory. *In Crime and Place*. Monsey, N.Y: Criminal Justice Press

Eck, J. (1997). "Preventing Crime at Places" in Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. ed. University of Maryland, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Washington D.C.: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

Eck, J. (2002). "Preventing Crime at Places", in Evidenced-Based Crime Prevention, ed. Lawrence Sherman, David Farrington, Brandon Walsh and Doris Layton MacKenzie. New York: Routledge.

Eck, J.E., Chainey, S., Cameron, J.E., and Wilson, R.E. (2005). Mapping Crime: Understanding 'hot-spots'. U.S. Department of Justice

Ellingworth, D., Farrell, G., and Pease, K. (1995). A Victim is a Victim is a Victim? *British Journal of Criminology* 35(3): 360-365

Eser, A. (1966). The Principle of 'Harm' in the Concept of Crime: A comparative Analysis of the Criminally Protected Legal Interests. *Dunquesne University Law Review* 4 (1966) 345-417

Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1993). Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimisation and its Implication for Crime Prevention. *Police Research Group: Crime Prevention Unit Series*, Paper 4, 32pp Farrington, D.P. (1992). Criminal Career Research in the United Kingdom. *British Journal of Criminology* 32(4) 521-536

Guerette, R.T. and Bowers, K. (2009). Assessing the extent of crime displacement and diffusion of benefits: A review of situational crime prevention evaluations. *Criminology*, 47(4): 1331-1368

Hall, J. (1960). General Principles in Criminal Law. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill

Hansel, M. (1987). Citizen Crime Stereotypes – Normative Consensus Revisited. *Criminology* Vol.25 p455-485.

Heaton, P. (2010). Hidden in Plain Sight. What Cost of Crime Can Tell Us About Investing in Police. RAND Occasional Paper. Online at http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/OP279.html

H.M.I.C (2015). PEEL Inspection for South Yorkshire Police. Online – accessed 20th December 2014. Available from

Innes, M. (2005). What's Your Problem? Signal Crimes and Citizen Focussed Problem Solving. Criminology and Public Policy. Volume 4, Issue 2, Pages 187-200

Jay, A. (2014). Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham (1979-2013). Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Jacoby, J.E. and Cullen, F.T. (1999). The Structure of Punishment Norms, Applying the Rossi-Berk Model. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. Northwestern University, School of Law. Vol. 89 (1).

Klien, G. (2007). Performing a Project Pre-Mortem. Harvard Business School.

Kwam, Y.K., Chiu, L.L., Ip, W.C. and Kwam, P. (2002). Perceived Crime Seriousness – Consensus and Disparity. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Vol. 30 pp. 623-632.

Levi, M. and Jones, S. (1985). Public and Police Perceptions of Crime Seriousness. Social Problems. 28: 279-89

Maltz, M.D. (1975). Measures in the Effectiveness for Crime Reduction Programs. *Operations Research* 23(3): 452-474.

May, T. and Home Office. (2012) The Strategic Policing Requirement. Home Office / H.M.S.O

McCleary, R., O'Neil, M.J, Epperlein, T., Jones, C. and Gray, R.H. (1981) Effects of Legal Education and Work Experience on Perceptions of Crime Seriousness. *Social Problems*, vol. 28, pp. 276-289

Miller, T.R., Cohen, M.A. and Wiersema, B. (1996) Victim Cost and Consequences: A New Look. Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Office of the Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Myers, M. (2014) Mapping the Crime-harm Index: Exploring the Differences between Traditional Crime Mapping and Harm Mapping: University of Cambridge Thesis – M.St. Applied Criminology and Police Management. Unpublished

Newman, G.R. (1976). 'Comparative Deviance: Perception and Law in Six Cultures. Elsevier. New York

Normandeau, A. (1966). Measurement of Delinquency in Montreal. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. Volume 57, Issue 2.

Normandeau, A (1970). Crime Indices for Eight Countries. *International Criminal Police Review*. 234 : 15

O' Connell, M. and Whelan, A. (1996). "Taking Wrongs Seriously: Public Perceptions of Crime Seriousness. *British Journal of Criminology*. Vol. 36. No. 2.

Paoli, L. and Greenfield, V.A. (2013). Harm: A neglected Concept in Criminology, A Necessary Benchmark for Crime-Control Policy. *European Journal Of Crime, Criminal Law And Criminal Justice*. Vol: 21 Pages 359-377

Parton, D.A., Hansel, M. and Stratton, J.R. (1991). 'Measuring Crime Seriousness: Lessons from the National Survey Of Crime Severity. *British Journal of Criminology*. Vol. 31, pp. 72-35.

Pease, K., Ireson, J. and Thorpe, J. (1974). Additivity Assumptions in the Measurement of Delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology* 14 (3): 256-263

Pease, K., Ireson, J. and Thorpe, J (1975). Modified Crime Indices for Eight Countries. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. Volume 66, Issue 2 pp. 209-2014

Pierce, G.L., Spaar, S. and Briggs, L. (1988). The Charter of Police Work: Strategic and a Tactical Implications. Boston: Northeastern University, Center for Applied Social Research

Polvi, N., Looman, T., Humphries, C. and Pease, K. (1991). The Time Course of Repeat Burglary Victimization. *British Journal of Criminology* 31(4): 411-414

Pontell, H.N., Granite, D., Keenan, C., and Geis, G. (1985). Seriousness of Crimes: A survey of the Nation's Chiefs of Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol.13. pp.1-13

Ratcliffe, J.H., and McCullagh, M.J. (1998). Identifying Repeat Victimization with GIS. *British Journal of Criminology* 38(4): 651-662.

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2002). Aoristic Signatures and the Spatio-Temporal Analysis of High Volume Crime Patterns. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. Vol.18, No.1

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2010). The Spatial Dependency of Crime Increase Dispersion. MacMillan Publishers. *Security Journal*. Vol. 23 (1), 18-36

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2014). Towards an Index for Harm-Focussed Policing. *Policing*. Oxford University Press. pp. 1-19

Roberts, J. (1992). 'Public Opinion, Crime and Criminal Justice', in M.Tonry ed., *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, vol. 16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rose, G.N.G. (1966). Concerning the Measurement if Delinquency. *British Journal of Criminology* 414.

Rossi, P.H., Waite, E., Bose, C.E. and Berk, R.E. (1974). The Seriousness of Crime: Normative Structure and Individual Differences. *American Sociology Review*. Vol.39 p224-237.

Ruane, J.M. (2004). Essential of Research Methods – A Guide to Social Science Research. Blackwell Publishing. 3:32-46

Sellin, T. and Wolfgang, M. (1964). The Measurement of Delinquency. Montclair: Patterson Smith (reprinted, 1978, with an introduction by S, Turner)

Sentencing Council. (2011). Assault: Definitive Guideline. London: Sentencing Council of England and Wales

Sentencing Guidelines Council. (2008). Magistrate's Court Sentencing Guidelines: Definitive Guideline. Sentencing Guidelines Council

Sherman, L.W., Gartin, P., and Beugar, W. (1989) 'Hot-spots' of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place. Criminology 27: 27-56.

Sherman, L.W. (1995). The Police. In *Crime*, ed. James Q Wilson and Joan Petersilia. San Francisco: ICS Press.

Sherman, L.W. (1998). Evidence-Based Policing. Washington DC: Police Foundation. *Ideas in American Policing Series*. <u>www.policefoundation.org</u>

Sherman, L. W. (2007). The Power Few: Experimental Criminology and the Reduction of Harm. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 3(4), 299-321.

Sherman, L.W. (2013). Targeting, Testing and Tracking Police Services: The Rise of Evidencedbased Policing, 1975 – 2025. In Tonry, M. Editor Crime and Justice Vol.43. Crime and Justice in America, 1975 – 2025. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2013.

Sherman, L.W., Neyroud, P.W. and Neyroud, E.C. (2014) The Cambridge Harm Index (CHI): Measuring total harm from crime based on sentencing guidelines, Version 2.0. Cambridge Police Executive Programme.

South Yorkshire PCC (2013). South Yorkshire Police and Crime Plan 2013/17. Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

Sparks, R., Gelnn, H. and Dodd, D (1977). Surveying Victims. London : Wiley

Spelman, W. (1995). Once Bitten, Then What – Cross-sectional and Time-course Explanations of Repeat Victimization. *British Journal of Criminology* 35(3): 363-383

Sproat, P. (2014). 'Landscaping the Policing of Organised Crime'. In Brown, J.M.(ed.), *The Future of Policing*. New York: Routledge, pp 252-268.

Skogan, W. and Frydl, K. (2004). Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence. Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Statistics Canada (2009). Measuring Crime in Canada. Introducing the Crime Severity Index and Improvements to the Uniform Crime Reporting Survey. Ministry for the Interior

Stylianou, S. (2003). Measuring Crime Seriousness Perceptions: What We Have Learned and What Else Do We Need To Know. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 31 p37-56

Thurstone, L.L and Chave, E.J. (1929). 'Measurement of Attitudes'. University of Chicago Press.

Tusikov, N. and Fahlman, R.C. (2009). 'Threat and Risk Assessments'. In Ratcliffe, J.H. (ed.), *Strategic Thinking in Criminal Intelligence*, 2nd edn. Sydney: Federation Press, pp. 147-164

US Department of Justice (1999). Crime Mapping – Principle and Practice. National Institution of Justice

Warr, M. (1980). 'What is the Perceived Seriousness of Crimes', Criminology. 20: 185-204

Weinborn, C. (2015) Achieving More for Less. The Crime-harm Index Applied to Birmingham. University of Cambridge. Unpublished towards PhD. In Criminology

Weisburd, D.L., Maher, L., and Sherman, L.W. (1992) Contrasting Crime General and Crime Specific Theory: The Case for the 'hot-spots' of Crime. *Advances in Criminology* Theory 4: 45-69

Weisburd, D.L., Bushway, S., Lum, C., Yang, S.M. (2004). Trajectories of Crime at Places: A Longitudinal Study Of Street Segments in the City Of Seattle. *Criminology* 42 [2].

Wellford, C.F. and Wiatrowksi, M. (1975) On the Measurement of Delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Volume 66 Issue 2 Article 4

Wikstrom, P.H. (1995) Preventing City Centre Street Crimes. In: M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington (eds,). Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention. *Crime and Justice: A review of Research,* vol. 19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Winterdyk, J.A. (2000). Canadian Criminology. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada.

Wolfgang, M.E., Figlio, R. M., Tracy, P. E., & Singer, S. I. (1985). 'The national survey of crime severity'. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Zimring, F.E., and Hawkins, G. (1995). Incapacitation: Penal Confinement and the Restraint of Crime. New York: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A– Dot Distribution Map Showing Crime (Harm) Locations 2010 to 2015



Appendix B – Spatial Ellipse Map Showing Crime-Harm Concentrations 2010 to 2015



Appendix C - Choropleth Map Showing Crime-Count and Crime-Harm Concentrations 2010 to 2015



Choropleth Map Showing the Harm Values recorded in South Yorkshire across medium SOAs from April 2010 to March 2015





Appendix D – Grid Thematic Mapping Showing Crime-count and Crime-harm Values



Appendix E: List of Crime-harm Index Values for Criminal Offences England and Wales

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	28.1	28A	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	2810	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	15	-	BURGLARY DWELLING	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	15
BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	28.2	28B	ATTEMPTED BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	2815	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING - ATTEMPTED	15	-	BURGLARY DWELLING	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	15
BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	28.3	28C	DISTRACTION BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	2820	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING - DISTRACTION	15	-	BURGLARY DWELLING	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	126
BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	28.4	28D	ATTEMPTED DISTRACTION BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	2825	BURGLARY IN A DWELLING - ATTEMPTED DISTRACTION	15	-	BURGLARY DWELLING	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	15
BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	29	29	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY IN A DWELLING	2900	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY DWELLING	730	-	BURGLARY DWELLING	MCSG 01/10/14	CROWN 2 YEARS	730
BURGLARY IN OTHER BUILDING	30.1	30A	BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING	3010	BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING	15	-	BURGLARY OTHER	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	15
BURGLARY IN OTHER BUILDING	30.2	30B	ATTEMPTED BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING	3015	BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING - ATTEMPTED	15	-	BURGLARY OTHER	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	15
BURGLARY IN OTHER BUILDING	31	31	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY IN A BUILDING OTHER THAN A DWELLING	3100	AGGRAVATED BURGLARY OTHER THAN DWELLING	357	-	BURGLARY OTHER	MCSG 01/10/14	CROWN 51 WEEKS	730
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	56.1	56A	ARSON ENDANGERING LIFE	5601	ARSON ENDANGERING LIFE	3650	-	ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	CSP Website	10 YEARS CROWN	3825
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	56.2	56B	ARSON NOT ENDANGERING LIFE	5602	ARSON NOT ENDANGERING LIFE	20	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	30
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	58.1	58J	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5818	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE TO A DWELLING (C&D ACT 1998 S30(1)(2))	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	58.1	58J	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5819	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE- OTHER BUILDING (C&D ACT 1998 S30(1)(2))	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	58.1	58J	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5821	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE- VEHICLE (C&D ACT 1998 S30(1)(2))	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	58.1	58J	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5822	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE- OTHER (C&D ACT 1998 S30(1)(2))	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	58.1	58J	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5823	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED CRIMINAL DAMAGE	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	59	59	THREAT OR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5911	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - THREAT TO COMMIT	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	0.64
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	59	59	THREAT OR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5912	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	0.64
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	59	59	THREAT OR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5913	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT (CDA 1971 S 3)	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	0.64
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - ARSON / THREAT / EQUIP	59	59	THREAT OR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL DAMAGE	5914	MAKING/ HAVING EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCE UNDER SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	30
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - DWELLING	58.2	58A	CRIMINAL DAMAGE- TO DWELLINGS	5701	CRIMINAL DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE-TO DWELLINGS (EXCLUDES ARSON)	3650	-	ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	CSP Website	10 YEARS CROWN	3825
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - DWELLING	58.2	58A	CRIMINAL DAMAGE- TO DWELLINGS	5801	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO DWELLINGS	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - MOTOR VEHICLE	58.4	58C	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO VEHICLES	5703	CRIMINAL DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE - TO VEHICLES (EXCLUDES ARSON)	3650	-	ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	CSP Website	10 YEARS CROWN	3825
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - MOTOR VEHICLE	58.4	58C	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO VEHICLES	5803	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO VEHICLES	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER	58.5	58D	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER	5704	CRIMINAL DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE - OTHER	3650	-	ARSON/DAMAGE ENDANGERING LIFE	CSP Website	10 YEARS CROWN	3825
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER	58.5	58D	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER	5804	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER PROPERTY (NOT BUILDINGS)	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
CRIMINAL DAMAGE - OTHER BUILDING	58.3	58B	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO OTHER BUILDINGS	5802	CRIMINAL DAMAGE - TO OTHER BUILDINGS	15	-	LOW LEVEL ARSON/DAMAGE	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	35	35	BLACKMAIL	3500	BLACKMAIL	365	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	62.1	62A	VIOLENT DISORDER	6501	VIOLENT DISORDER	15	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		LOW CO	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6601	AFFRAY	15	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6603	PLACING OR DISPATCHING ARTICLES TO CAUSE BOMB HOAX	365	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6622	PUBLIC NUISANCE	365	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
ROBBERY - BUSINESS	34.1	34A	ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY	3403	ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY	365	-	ROBBERY	CSP Website	12 months CROWN	365
ROBBERY - BUSINESS	34.1	34A	ROBBERY OF BUSINESS PROPERTY	3405	ATTEMPT ROBBERY BUSINESS / ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO ROB - BUSINESS PROPERTY	365	-	ROBBERY	CSP Website	12 months CROWN	10
ROBBERY - PERSONAL	34.2	34B	ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY	3404	ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY	365	-	ROBBERY	CSP Website	12 months CROWN	365
ROBBERY - PERSONAL	34.2	34B	ROBBERY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY	3406	ATTEMPT ROBBERY PERSONAL / ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO ROB - PERSONAL PROPERTY	365	-	ROBBERY	CSP Website	12 months CROWN	10
SEXUAL OFFENCES	17.1	17A	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A MALE AGED 13 AND OVER	1713	ASSAULT ON A MALE BY PENETRATION - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003 S2	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	17.1	17A	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A MALE AGED 13 AND OVER	1715	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A MALE - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003 S3	30	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	15
SEXUAL OFFENCES	17.2	17B	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A MALE CHILD UNDER 13	1714	ASSAULT MALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY PENETRATION - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003 S6	1460	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	4 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	17.2	17B	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A MALE CHILD UNDER 13	1716	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON MALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003 S7	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.3	19C	RAPE OF A FEMALE AGED 16 AND OVER	1908	RAPE OF FEMALE AGED 16 YRS OR OVER	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.3	19C	RAPE OF A FEMALE AGED 16 AND OVER	1912	ATTEMPT RAPE OF FEMALE AGED 16 YRS OR OVER	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.4	19D	RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16	1907	RAPE OF FEMALE AGED UNDER 16 YRS	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.4	19D	RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16	1911	ATTEMPT RAPE OF FEMALE AGED UNDER 16 YRS	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.5	19E	RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13	1916	RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY A MALE	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	2920
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.5	19E	RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13	1918	ATTEMPTED RAPE OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY A MALE	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	2920
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.6	19F	RAPE OF A MALE AGED 16 AND OVER	1910	RAPE OF MALE AGED 16 YRS OR OVER	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.6	19F	RAPE OF A MALE AGED 16 AND OVER	1914	ATTEMPT RAPE OF MALE AGED 16 YRS OR OVER	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	1825
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.7	19G	RAPE OF A MALE CHILD UNDER 16	1909	RAPE OF MALE AGED UNDER 16 YRS	1825	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	5 YEARS	2920
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.8	19H	RAPE OF A MALE CHILD UNDER 13	1917	RAPE OF A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY A MALE	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	2920
SEXUAL OFFENCES	19.8	19H	RAPE OF A MALE CHILD UNDER 13	1919	ATTEMPTED RAPE OF A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY A MALE	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	2920
SEXUAL OFFENCES	20.1	20A	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A FEMALE AGED 13 OR OVER	2003	ASSAULT ON A FEMALE BY PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	20.1	20A	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A FEMALE AGED 13 OR OVER	2005	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A FEMALE	30	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	15
SEXUAL OFFENCES	20.2	20B	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13	2004	ASSAULT ON A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 YRS BY PENETRATION	1460	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	4 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	20.2	20B	SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13	2006	SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13YRS	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2102	CAUSING OR INCITING A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2103	CAUSING OR INCITING A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2104	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2105	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2110	ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY IN THE PRESENCE OF CHILD UNDER 13 (OFFENDER 18 OR OVER)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2111	CAUSING A CHILD UNDER 13 TO WATCH A SEXUAL ACT (OFFENDER 18 OR OVER)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2112	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 - PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2113	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 - PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2114	CAUSING OR INCITING A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2115	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2116	ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY IN THE PRESENCE OF CHILD UNDER 13 (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2117	CAUSING A CHILD UNDER 13 TO WATCH A SEXUAL ACT (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2122	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 - NO PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2123	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 - NO PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2124	CAUSING OR INCITING A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	21	21	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 13	2125	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE CHILD UNDER 13 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION (OFFENDER UNDER 18)	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.1	22A	CAUSING SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT	2202	CAUSING A FEMALE PERSON TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT - PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.1	22A	CAUSING SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT	2203	CAUSING A MALE PERSON TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT - PENETRATION	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.1	22A	CAUSING SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT	2204	CAUSING A FEMALE PERSON TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.1	22A	CAUSING SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT	2205	CAUSING A MALE PERSON TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITHOUT CONSENT - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2206	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16 - PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2207	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE CHILD UNDER 16 - PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2208	CAUSING OR INCITING A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2210	ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY IN PRESENCE OF CHILD UNDER 16	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2211	CAUSING A CHILD UNDER 16 TO WATCH A SEXUAL ACT	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2218	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16 - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2219	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE CHILD UNDER 16 - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2220	CAUSING OR INCITING FEMALE CHILD UNDER 16 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	22.2	22B	SEXUAL ACTIVITY INVOLVING A CHILD UNDER 16	2221	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE CHILD UNDER 16 TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2304	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD FAMILY MEMBER - OFFENDER AGE 18 OR OVER AT TIME OF OFFENCE AND VICTIM 13 - 17 - PENETRATION	1460	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	4 YEARS	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2305	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE CHILD FAMILY MEMBER - OFFENDER AGED 18 OR OVER AT TIME OF OFFENCE AND VICTIM 13 - 17 - PENETRATION	1460	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	4 YEARS	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2312	SEX WITH AN ADULT RELATIVE (OFFENDER AGED 16 OR OVER, RELATIVE AGED 18 OR OVER) - PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEARr	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2313	SEX WITH AN ADULT RELATIVE: CONSENTING TO PENETRATION (OFFENDER AGED 16 OR OVER, RELATIVE AGED 18 OR OVER)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2324	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD FAMILY MEMBER - OFFENDER AGED 18 OR OVER AT TIME OF OFFENCE AND VICTIM UNDER 13 - NO PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2326	INCITING A FEMALE CHILD FAMILY MEMBER TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - OFFENDER AGED 18 OR OVER AT TIME OF OFFENCE AND VICTIM 13 - 17 - NO PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	23	23	INCEST OR FAMILIAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	2328	INCITING A FEMALE CHILD FAMILY MEMBER TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - OFFENDER AGED 18 OR OVER AT TIME OF OFFENCE AND VICTIM UNDER 13 - NO PENETRATION	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	70	70	SEXUAL ACTIVITY ETC. WITH A PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER	7001	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER IMPEDING CHOICE - PENETRATION	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	70	70	SEXUAL ACTIVITY ETC. WITH A PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER	7003	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER IMPEDING CHOICE - NO PENETRATION	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	70	70	SEXUAL ACTIVITY ETC. WITH A PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER	7004	SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER IMPEDING CHOICE - NO PENETRATION	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	70	70	SEXUAL ACTIVITY ETC. WITH A PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER	7007	CAUSING OR INCITING A MALE PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER IMPEDING CHOICE TO ENGAGE IN SEXUAL ACTIVITY - NO PENETRATION	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	70	70	SEXUAL ACTIVITY ETC. WITH A PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER	7017	CARE WORKERS: SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A MALE PERSON WITH A MENTAL DISORDER - PENETRATION	2920	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	8 YEARS	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	71	71	ABUSE OF CHILDREN THROUGH PROSTITUTION AND PORNOGRAPHY	7101	ARRANGING OR FACILITATING THE COMMISSION OF A CHILD SEX OFFENCE	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	CSP Website	6 MONTHS CROWN	365
SEXUAL OFFENCES	71	71	ABUSE OF CHILDREN THROUGH PROSTITUTION / PORNOGRAPHY	7106	PAYING FOR SEX WITH A FEMALE CHILD 16 OR 17	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	365

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
SEXUAL OFFENCES	71	71	ABUSE OF CHILDREN THROUGH PROSTITUTION AND PORNOGRAPHY	7108	CAUSING OR INCITING CHILD PROSTITUTION OR PORNOGRAPHY - CHILD 13 - 17	365	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	1 YEAR	365
SEXUAL OFFENCES	71	71	ABUSE OF CHILDREN THROUGH PROSTITUTION AND PORNOGRAPHY	7115	PAYING FOR SEX WITH A MALE CHILD UNDER 16 - PENETRATION	182	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	26 WEEKS	365
SEXUAL OFFENCES	73	73	ABUSE OF POSITION OF TRUST OF A SEXUAL NATURE	7307	ABUSE OF POSITION OF TRUST: SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD. (OFFENDER IS AGED 18 OR OVER AND VICTIM IS 13 - 17)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	73	73	ABUSE OF POSITION OF TRUST OF A SEXUAL NATURE	7313	ABUSE OF POSITION OF TRUST: SEXUAL ACTIVITY WITH A FEMALE CHILD. (OFFENDER IS AGED 18 OR OVER AND VICTIM IS UNDER 13)	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	182
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.1	88A	SEXUAL GROOMING	8801	MEETING A FEMALE CHILD FOLLOWING SEXUAL GROOMING ETC. (OFFENDER AGED 18 OR OVER AND VICTIM UNDER 16)	547	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	18 MONTHS	365
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.1	88A	SEXUAL GROOMING	8802	MEETING A MALE CHILD FOLLOWING SEXUAL GROOMING ETC. (OFFENDER IS 18 OR OVER AND VICTIM IS UNDER 16)	547	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	18 MONTHS	365
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.3	88C	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SEXUAL OFFENCES	8805	ADMINISTERING A SUBSTANCE WITH	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	10
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.3	88C	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SEXUAL OFFENCES	8806	COMMITTING AN OFFENCE WITH INTENT TO COMMIT A SEXUAL OFFENCE	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	10
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.3	88C	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SEXUAL OFFENCES	8807	TRESPASS WITH INTENT TO COMMIT A SEXUAL OFFENCE	730	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	2 YEARS	730
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.4	88D	UNNATURAL SEXUAL OFFENCES	8803	INTERCOURSE WITH AN ANIMAL BY A MALE	196	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	6 MONTHS CROWN	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.5	88E	EXPOSURE AND VOYEURISM	8809	EXPOSURE	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	0.3
SEXUAL OFFENCES	88.5	88E	EXPOSURE AND VOYEURISM	8810	VOYEURISM	20	-	SEXUAL OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	0.3

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	39	39	THEFT FROM THE PERSON OF ANOTHER	3900	THEFT FROM THE PERSON OF ANOTHER	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	40	40	THEFT IN A DWELLING OTHER THAN FROM AUTOMATIC MACHINE OR METER	4000	THEFT IN A DWELLING OTHER THAN FROM AUTOMATIC MACHINE OR METER	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	41	41	THEFT BY AN EMPLOYEE	4100	THEFT BY EMPLOYEE	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	6
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	42	42	THEFT OF MAIL	4200	THEFT OF MAIL BAGS/POSTAL PCKTS OR UNLAWFULLY TAKE AWAY/OPEN MAIL BAG	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	0.6
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	43	43	DISHONEST USE OF ELECTRICITY	4300	ABSTRACTING ELECTRICITY	10	-	THEFT & HANDLING		Excluded	
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	44	44	THEFT OF PEDAL CYCLE	4400	THEFT OF PEDAL CYCLES	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	0.6
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	44	44	THEFT OF PEDAL CYCLE	13718	TAKE/RIDE PEDAL CYCLE WITHOUT CONSENT	10	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	5
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	46	46	SHOPLIFTING	4600	THEFT FROM SHOPS AND STALLS	15	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	47	47	THEFT FROM AUTOMATIC MACHINE OR METER	4700	THEFT FROM AUTOMATIC MACHINES AND METERS	20	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	49	49	OTHER THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING	4511	THEFT FROM OTHER VEHICLE	10	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	49	49	OTHER THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING	4900	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS THEFTS NOT CLASSIFIED ELSEWHERE	10	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	49	49	OTHER THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING	13002	UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF CONVEYANCE OTHER THAN MOTOR VEHICLE OR PEDAL CYCLE (DOES NOT INCLUDE BEING FOUND WITH A CONVEYANCE THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN STOLEN)	30	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	30

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	49.1	49A	THEFT MAKING OFF WITHOUT PAYMENT	5325	MAKING OFF WITHOUT PAYMENT	10	-	THEFT & HANDLING	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	37.2	37.2	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING	3702	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING CAUSE INJURY, DAMAGE TO PROPERTY/VEHICLE	30	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	126
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	37.2	37.2	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING	13101	AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING-VEH DAMAGE VALUE £5000 OR UNDER	20	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	30
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	45	45	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	4510	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	10	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	48	48	THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF MOTOR VEHICLE	4801	THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE	30	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	30
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	48	48	THEFT OR UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF MOTOR VEHICLE	13001	UNAUTHORISED TAKING OF MOTOR VEHICLE	15	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	LOW CO	30
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	126	126	INTERFERING WITH A MOTOR VEHICLE	12600	INTERFERENCE WITH MOTOR VEHICLE	10	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	1
TOTAL OFFENCES AGAINST VEHICLES	126	126	INTERFERING WITH A MOTOR VEHICLE	82506	TAMPERING WITH MOTOR VEHICLE	10	-	VEHICLE CRIME	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	1
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	1	1	MURDER	101	MURDER PERSONS AGED 1 YEAR AND OVER / GENOCIDE OR CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	5475
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	1	1	MURDER	102	MURDER PERSONS AGED UNDER 1 YEAR	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	5475
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	2	2	ATTEMPT MURDER	200	ATTEMPTED MURDER / ATTEMPTED GENOCIDE OR CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	4380
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	3.1	3A	CONSPIRACY TO MURDER	302	CONSPIRACY / SOLICITING TO COMMIT MURDER / CONSPIRING / PROCURING OR INCITING COMMISSION OF GENOCIDE OR CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	5475

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	3.1	ЗА	CONSPIRACY TO MURDER	303	ASSISTING OFFENDER BY IMPEDING HIS APPREHENSION OR PROSECUTION IN A CASE OF MURDER/ CONCEALING COMMISSION OF GENOCIDE OR CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	5475
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	3.2	3B	THREATS TO KILL	301	THREATS TO KILL	20	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.1	4.1	MANSLAUGHTER	401	MANSLAUGHTER	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	3825
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.1	4.1	CORPORATE MANSLAUGHTER	410	CORPORATE MANSLAUGHTER	5475	-	HOMICIDE incl Attempt	CSP Website	15 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.4	4.4	CAUSING DEATH OR SERIOUS INURY BY DANGEROUS DRIVING	404	CAUSING DEATH BY DANGEROUS DRIVING	1095	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.4	4.4	CAUSING DEATH OR SERIOUS INURY BY DANGEROUS DRIVING	412	CAUSING SERIOUS INJURY BY DANGEROUS DRIVING	1095	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.6	4.6	CAUSING DEATH BY CARELESS DRIVING UNDER INFLUENCE OF DRINK OR DRUGS	406	CAUSING DEATH BY CARELESS DRIVING WHEN UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF DRINK OF DRUGS	550	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.7	4.7	CAUSING OR ALLOWING DEATH OF CHILD OR VULNERABLE PERSON	411	CAUSE OR ALLOW A CHILD OR VULNERABLE ADULT TO SUFFER SERIOUS PHYSICAL HARM	1095	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	3 YEARS	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	4.8	4.8	CAUSING DEATH BY CARELESS OR INCONSIDERATE DRIVING	408	CAUSING DEATH BY CARELESS OR INCONSIDERATE DRIVING	20	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	5.4	5D	ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO CAUSE SERIOUS HARM	501	WOUNDING WITH INTENT TO DO GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM - OAPA 1861 SECTION 18	1460	-	GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	CSP Website	4 YEARS	1460
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	5.5	5E	ENDANGERING LIFE	514	POSSESSION OF FIREARM WITH INTENT TO INJURE	1825	-	CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	Find law	5 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	5.5	5E	ENDANGERING LIFE	504	ATTEMPTING TO CHOKE ETC IN ORDER TO COMMIT INDICTABLE OFFENCE	730	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	Excluded	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	5.5	5E	ENDANGERING LIFE	510	ADMINISTERING POISON SO AS TO ENDANGER LIFE	730	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	Weinborn	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	5.5	5E	ENDANGERING LIFE	511	CAUSING DANGER TO ROAD - USERS	3	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	Weinborn	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	830	HARASSMENT - (PFHA SECTION (4)) PUTTING PEOPLE IN FEAR OF VIOLENCE	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	19594	HARASSMENT - (PROTECTION FROM HARASSMENT ACT 1997 SECTION 2)	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.12	8M	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT (EXCLUDES OFFENCES UNDER 9B)	856	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT (C&D ACT 1998 S. 32(1)(A),(3))	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.12	8M	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT (EXCLUDES OFFENCES UNDER 9B)	858	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED PUT PEOPLE IN FEAR OF VIOLENCE S. 32(1)(B),(4))	10	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	802	ADMINISTERING POISON WITH INTENT TO INJURE OR ANNOY	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	806	ASSAULT OCCASIONING ACTUAL BODILY HARM (OAPA SECTION 47)	20	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	810	WOUNDING OR INFLICTING GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM WITHOUT INTENT	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	15
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	820	ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO RESIST ARREST (OAPA SECTION 38)	15	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	821	OWNER OR PERSON IN CHARGE ALLOWING DOG TO BE DANGEROUSLY OUT OF CONTROL IN ANY PLACE IN ENGLAND OR WALES (WHETHER OR NOT A PUBLIC PLACE) INJURING ANY PERSON OR ASSISTANCE DOG	20	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND A	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	822	DANGEROUS DOG INJURE PERSON - NON PUBLIC PLACE	15	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	182

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	891	INFLICTING GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM WITHOUT INTENT (PART EXCLUDING LESS SERIOUS WOUNDING WITHIN CLASS 8G) (OAPA SECTION 20)	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	15
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	892	MALICIOUS WOUNDING (OAPA SECTION 20) PART CODE - EXCLUDING GBH WITHIN 8F	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	357
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	804	CAUSE BODILY HARM BY FURIOUS DRIVING	84	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	Weinborn	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.14	8P	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT WITH INJURY	859	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED WOUNDING OR GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	1460	-	GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	CSP Website	Category 3 4 yrs CROWN	1460
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.14	8P	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT WITH INJURY	860	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT OR ASSAULT OCCASIONING ACTUAL BODILY HARM, C&D ACT 1998 S. 29(1)(B),(2)	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.14	8P	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT WITH INJURY	881	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED (WOUNDING OR GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM, C&D ACT 1998 S. 29(1)(A),(2)) (PART CODE - EXCLUDES LESS SERIOUS WOUNDING WITHIN 8J)	1460	-	GRIEVOUS BODILY HARM	CSP Website	4 YEARS	1460
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.14	8P	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT WITH INJURY	882	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED MALICIOUS WOUNDING (PART CODE - EXCLUDES GBH WITHIN 8H), C&D ACT 1998 S. 29(1)(A),(2)	30	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	HIGH CO	357
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.15	8Q	STALKING	865	STALKING INVOLVING FEAR OF VIOLENCE	10	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.15	8Q	STALKING	866	STALKING INVOLVING SERIOUS ALARM/DISTRESS	10	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.2	9B	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS	855	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED INTENTIONAL HARASSMENT, ALARM OR DISTRESS SECTION 31(1)(B)	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10

	Home	Home	Harra Office Description	Offence	Offeren Deserted	FINAL			SOURCE OF	Natas	INITIAL
Home Office Group	Code	Class	Home Office Description	Code		VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	VALUE	Notes	VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.2	9B	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS	6691	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED FEAR OR PROVOCATION OF VIOLENCE SECTION 31(1)(A)	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.2	9B	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS	12582	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED HARASSMENT, ALARM OR DISTRESS SECTION 31(1)(C)	20	-	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.1	10A	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS WITH INTENT	813	POSSESSING FIREARM OR IMITATION FIREARM WHILE COMMITTING OR BEING ARRESTED FOR OFFENCE SPECIFIED IN SCHEDULE 1 OF THE FIREARMS ACT	1825	-	CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	Find law	5 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.1	10A	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS WITH INTENT	816	POSSESSING FIREARM OR IMITATION FIREARM WITH INTENT TO COMMIT INDICTABLE OFFENCE OR RESIST ARREST	1825	-	CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	Find law	5 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.1	10A	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS WITH	823	POSSESSING FIREARM OR IMITATION FIREARM WITH INTENT TO CAUSE FEAR OF VIOLENCE	1825	-	CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	Find law	5 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.3	10C	POSSESSION OF OTHER WEAPONS	811	POSSESSION OF OFFENSIVE WEAPON WITHOUT LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR REASONABLE EXCUSE	1825	-	CRIMINAL USE OF WEAPONS	Find law	5 YEARS CROWN	0
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	11.1	11A	CRUELTY TO CHILDREN / YOUNG PERSONS	1103	CRUELTY TO AND OR NEGLECT OF CHILDREN	84	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	MCSG 01/10/14	12 WEEKS	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	11.1	11A	CRUELTY TO CHILDREN / YOUNG PERSONS	1200	ABANDONING CHILD AGED UNDER TWO YEARS	84	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS	12 YEARS	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	13	13	ABDUCTION OF CHILD	1301	ABDUCTION OF CHILD BY A PARENT (TAKEN OUTSIDE UK)	2044	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	Weinborn	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	13	13	ABDUCTION OF CHILD	1302	ABDUCTION OF CHILD BY PERSONS OTHER THAN A PARENT	486	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	Weinborn	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	36	36	KIDNAPPING ETC	3601	KIDNAPPING	547	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CSP Website	18 MONTHS CROWN	1460
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	36	36	KIDNAPPING ETC	3603	FALSE IMPRISONMENT	547	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CSP Website	18 MONTHS	1460

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	37.1	37.1	CAUSING DEATH BY AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING	3701	CAUSE DEATH BY AGGRAVATED VEHICLE TAKING	196	-	OTHER VIOLENCE	CPS Website	Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	104	104	ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY ON A CONSTABLE	10423	ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY ON A POLICE CONSTABLE	15	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	15
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	104	104	ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY ON A CONSTABLE	10433	OBSTRUCT POLICE OFFICER	15	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND B	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	105	105A	ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY	10500	COMMON ASSAULT	20	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND A	0.3
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	105.2	105B	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED ASSAULT WITHOUT INJURY	857	RACIALLY OR RELIGIOUSLY AGGRAVATED COMMON ASSAULT OR BEATING (C&D ACT 1998 S. 29(1)(C),(3))	20	-	ASSAULT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND A	10
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9203	DRUGS - IMPORT CLASS A DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9204	DRUGS - IMPORT CLASS B DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9205	DRUGS - IMPORT CLASS C DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9210	DRUGS - PRODUCE (EXCLUDES CANNABIS ON OR AFTER 1 APRIL 2004)	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9221	DRUGS - CLASS B CANNABIS - PRODUCTION (INCLUDES CULTIVATION) OR BEING CONCERNED IN PRODUCTION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9223	DRUGS - CLASS B MEPHEDRONE INCLUDING CATHINONE DERIVATIVES - PRODUCTION OF OR BEING CONCERNED IN THE PRODUCTION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9230	DRUGS - SUPPLY/OFFER TO SUPPLY (EXCLUDES CANNABIS ON OR AFTER 26 JANUARY 2009)	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9241	DRUGS - CLASS B CANNABIS - SUPPLYING OR OFFERING TO SUPPLY A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9243	DRUGS - CLASS B MEPHEDRONE INCLUDING CATHINONE DERIVATIVES - SUPPLYING OR OFFERING TO SUPPLY A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9270	DRUGS - POSSESS WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY (EXCLUDES CANNABIS ON OR AFTER 26 JANUARY 2009)	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9281	DRUGS - CLASS B CANNABIS - POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9282	DRUGS - CLASS B SYNTHETIC CANNABINOID AGONISTS - POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9283	DRUGS - CLASS B MEPHEDRONE INCLUDING CATHINONE DERIVATIVES - POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9349	DRUGS - CONCEAL/TRANSFER PROCEEDS OF DRUG TRAFFICKING	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9351	DRUGS - ACQUISITION POSSESSION OR USE OF PROCEEDS OF TRAFFICKING	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9355	DRUGS - METHYLAMPHETAMINE (CRYSTAL METH) - PRODUCTION OR BEING CONCERNED IN PRODUCTION	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9361	DRUGS - METHYLAMPHETAMINE (CRYSTAL METH) - SUPPLY OR OFFER TO SUPPLY OR BEING CONCERNED IN	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9366	DRUGS - KETAMINE - SUPPLY OR OFFER TO SUPPLY OR BEING CONCERNED IN	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9370	DRUGS - CLASS C PIPERAZINES (INCLUDING BZP) - POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9377	DRUGS - GHB - POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9378	DRUGS - KETAMINE - POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO SUPPLY	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9386	SUPPLY/BEING CONCERNED IN THE SUPPLY OF A DRUG SUBJECT OF A TEMPORARY CLASS DRUG ORDER	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.1	92A	TRAFFICKING IN CONTROLLED DRUGS	9389	OBSTRUCTING A PC IN EXERCISE OF S23A (6) POWER TO DETAIN OR SEARCH A PERSON, VEHICLE OR VESSEL REGARDING A DRUG THE SUBJECT OF A TEMPORARY CLASS DRUG ORDER	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.3	92C	OTHER DRUG OFFENCES	9310	DRUGS - PERMIT PREMISES TO BE USED FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSE (EXCLUDES CANNABIS ON OR AFTER 26 JANUARY 2009)	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.3	92C	OTHER DRUG OFFENCES	9321	DRUGS - CLASS B CANNABIS - PERMITTING PREMISES TO BE USED FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.3	92C	OTHER DRUG OFFENCES	9323	DRUGS - CLASS B MEPHEDRONE INCLUDING CATHINONE DERIVATIVES - PERMITTING PREMISES TO BE USED FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.3	92C	OTHER DRUG OFFENCES	19344	DRUGS - INTOXICATING SUBSTANCE, SUPPLY OF	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9250	DRUGS - POSSESS (EXCLUDES CANNABIS ON OR AFTER 1 APRIL 2004)	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9263	DRUGS - CLASS B MEPHEDRONE INCLUDING CATHINONE DERIVATIVES - POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9367	DRUGS - METHYLAMPHETAMINE (CRYSTAL METH) - POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9371	DRUGS - GHB - POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9372	DRUGS - KETAMINE - POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.4	92D	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (EXCLUDING CANNABIS)	9374	POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG - KHAT	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
DRUGS	92.5	92E	POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED DRUGS (CANNABIS)	9261	DRUGS - CLASS B CANNABIS - POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED DRUG	0	Excluded	DRUGS		Excluded	0
FORGERY	60	60	FORGERY OR USING PRESCRIPTION	6021	FORGERY OR COPYING OF DRUG PRESCRIPTION	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	60	60	FORGERY OR USING PRESCRIPTION	6022	USE, COPY FALSE DRUG PRESCRIPTION	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6121	FORGERY/COPYING OF FALSE INSTRUMENT OR MENTAL HEALTH DOCUMENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6122	USING FALSE INSTRUMENT OR COPY OF FALSE INSTRUMENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6123	POSSESS FALSE INSTRUMENT/MATERIALS TO MAKE FALSE INSTRUMENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6124	MAKE COUNTERFEIT COIN OR NOTE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6125	USE/PASS ETC COUNTERFEIT COIN/NOTES AS GENUINE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6126	POSSESS COUNTERFEIT COIN OR NOTE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61	61	OTHER FORGERY ETC	6128	REPRODUCE BRITISH CURRENCY NOTE OR MAKE IMITATION BRTISH COINS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
FORGERY	61.1	61A	POSSESSION OF FALSE DOCUMENTS	6134	IDENTITY CARDS - WITH INTENT KNOWINGLY POSSESS FALSE / IMPROPERLY OBTAINED / ANOTHERS ID DOCUMENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61.1	61A	POSSESSION OF FALSE DOCUMENTS	6136	IDENTITY CARDS - POSSESS / CONTROL A FALSE / IMPROPERLY OBTAINED ID CARD OR WHICH RELATES TO ANOTHER OR APPARATUS ETC FOR MAKING ID CARDS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61.1	61A	POSSESSION OF FALSE DOCUMENTS	6138	IDENTITY DOCUMENTS - POSSESS / CONTROL IDENTITY DOCUMENTS WITH INTENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	61.1	61A	POSSESSION OF FALSE DOCUMENTS	6140	IDENTITY DOCUMENTS - POSSESS / CONTROL A FALSE / IMPROPERLY OBTAINED / ANOTHER PERSONS IDENTITY DOCUMENT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81401	FRAUD/FORGERY ETC. ASSOCIATED WITH DRIVING LICENCE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81402	FRAUD/FORGERY ETC. ASSOCIATED WITH INSURANCE CERTIFICATE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81403	FRAUD/FORGERY ETC. ASSOCIATED WITH REGISTRATION/LICENSING DOCS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81406	FRAUD/FORGERY ETC. ASSOCIATED WITH TEST CERTIFICATE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81407	PARKING DOCUMENTS - MISHANDLING / FAKING PARKING DOCUMENTS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FORGERY	814	814	VEHICLE/DRIVER DOCUMENT FRAUD	81410	FORGE / ALTER / USE / LEND / MAKE DOCUMENT / AUTHORITY TO DRIVE / CARD / LICENCE / CERTIFICATE WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	51	51	FRAUD BY COMPANY DIRECTOR, ETC	5103	FRAUDULENT TRADING, FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.2	53B	PRESERVED OTHER FRAUD AND REPEALED FRAUD OFFENCES (BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRAUD ACT 2006)	5332	DISHONESTLY RETAIN WRONGFUL CREDIT	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.2	53B	PRESERVED OTHER FRAUD AND REPEALED FRAUD OFFENCES (BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRAUD ACT 2006)	5335	UNAUTHORISED ACTS WITH INTENT TO IMPAIR, OR WITH RECKLESSNESS AS TO IMPAIRING, OPERATION OF COMPUTER ETC	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.2	53B	PRESERVED OTHER FRAUD AND REPEALED FRAUD OFFENCES (BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRAUD ACT 2006)	5354	UNAUTHORISED ACCESS TO COMPUTER MATERIAL	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.2	53B	PRESERVED OTHER FRAUD AND REPEALED FRAUD OFFENCES (BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRAUD ACT 2006)	5356	CHEATING / MAKING FALSE STATEMENT / ACTING WITH INTENT TO DEFRAUD TO THE PREJUDICE OF HM AND PUBLIC REVENUE	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.2	53B	PRESERVED OTHER FRAUD AND REPEALED FRAUD OFFENCES (BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRAUD ACT 2006)	5399	OTHER FRAUDS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.3	53C	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION CHEQUE, PLASTIC CARD AND ONLINE BANK ACCOUNTS (NOT EBAY OR PAY PAL)	5340	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION CHEQUE, PLASTIC CARD AND ONLINE BANK ACCOUNTS (NOT EBAY OR PAY PAL) - DISHONESTLY MAKE FALSE REPRESENTATION TO MAKE GAIN FOR SELF/ANOTHER OR CAUSE LOSS TO OTHER/EXPOSE OTHER TO RISK	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.3	53C	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION CHEQUE, PLASTIC CARD AND ONLINE BANK ACCOUNTS (NOT EBAY OR PAY PAL)	5388	CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CHEQUE OR CREDIT CARD FRAUD	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.4	53D	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION AND OTHER FRAUDS	5346	OBTAINING SERVICES DISHONESTLY	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.4	53D	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION AND OTHER FRAUDS	5387	CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD (APART FROM CHEQUE AND CREDIT CARD FRAUD)	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.4	53D	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION AND OTHER FRAUDS	5389	FRAUD BY FALSE REPRESENTATION AND OTHER FRAUDS - DISHONESTLY MAKE FALSE REPRESENTATION TO MAKE GAIN FOR SELF/ANOTHER OR CAUSE LOSS TO OTHER/EXPOSE OTHER TO RISK	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.5	53E	FAILING TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION	5341	DISHONESTLY FAIL TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION TO MAKE A GAIN FOR SELF/ANOTHER OR TO CAUSE LOSS TO OTHER/EXPOSE OTHER TO A LOSS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	53.6	53F	ABUSE OF POSITION	5342	FRAUD BY ABUSE OF POSITION	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
FRAUD AND FORGERY	55	55	BANKRUPTCY	5512	MAKE A FALSE REPRESENTATION FRAUDULENTLY DO / OMIT TO DO A THING FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING APPROVAL OF CREDITORS	0	Excluded	FRAUD & FORGERY		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8103	FIREARMS-POSSESS ETC. FIREARM / AMMUNITION WITHOUT CERTIFICATE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8104	FIREARMS - POSSESSING ETC. SHOTGUN WITHOUT CERTIFICATE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8117	FIREARMS - POSSESSING OR DISTRIBUTING PROHIBITED WEAPONS OR AMMUNITION	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8126	FIREARMS - CARRYING LOADED FIREARM OR ANY OTHER FIREARM (WHETHER LOADED OR NOT) OR LOADED SHOTGUN OR ANY OTHER FIREARM EXCEPT IMITATION FIREARM OR AIR WEAPON TOGETHER WITH AMMUNITION SUITABLE FOR USE IN THAT FIREARM IN A PUBLIC PLACE ETC.	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8135	FIREARMS - POSSESSION OF FIREARMS BY PERSONS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED OF CRIME	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8170	FIREARMS - POSSESSING OR DISTRIBUTING PROHIBITED WEAPONS DESIGNED FOR DISCHARGE OF NOXIOUS LIQUID ETC	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8171	FIREARMS - POSSESSING OR DISTRIBUTING FIREARM DISGUISED AS OTHER OBJECT	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	10.2	10B	POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OFFENCES	8177	FIREARMS - CARRYING A LOADED OR UNLOADED OR IMITATION FIREARM OR AIR WEAPON IN PUBLIC PLACE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	33	33	GOING EQUIPPED FOR STEALING, ETC	3300	GOING EQUIPPED	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	33.1	33A	MAKING, SUPPLYING OR POSSESSING ARTICLES FOR USE IN FRAUD	5343	POSSESS / CONTROL ARTICLE(S) FOR USE IN FRAUD(S)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	33.1	33A	MAKING, SUPPLYING OR POSSESSING ARTICLES FOR USE IN FRAUD	5344	MAKE / SUPPLY ARTICLE(S) FOR USE IN FRAUD(S)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	33.1	33A	MAKING, SUPPLYING OR POSSESSING ARTICLES FOR USE IN FRAUD	5355	MAKING, SUPPLYING OR OBTAINING ARTICLES FOR USE IN OFFENCE UNDER SECTIONS 1 OR 3	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	832	BREACH OF ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER AND INTERIM ASBO (ORDER MADE TO PROTECT FROM HARASSMENT ALARM OR DISTRESS) (C&D ACT 1998 S. 1(10))	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6604	COMMUNICATING FALSE INFORMATION ALLEGING PRESENCE OF BOMB	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6608	BREACH OF SEX OFFENDER ORDER TO BE USED WITH BREACH OF SEX OFFENDER ORDER (SOPO) AND INTERIM SEX OFFENDER ORDER (INTERIM SOPO)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6615	HOAXES INVOLVING NOXIOUS SUBSTANCES OR THINGS	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6617	FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NOTIFICATION ORDER - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6618	NOTIFIES POLICE, UNDER NOTIFICATION ORDER, WITH FALSE INFORMATION - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6619	BREACH OF RISK OF SEXUAL HARM ORDER (RSHO) AND INTERIM RSHO - SEXUAL OFFENCES ACT 2003	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6620	BREACH OF FOREIGN TRAVEL ORDER	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6621	COMMITTING OR CONSPIRING TO COMMIT, AN ACT OUTRAGING PUBLIC DECENCY	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6623	RACIAL HATRED - USE OF WORDS OR BEHAVIOUR OR DISPLAY OF WRITTEN MATERIAL INTENDED OR LIKELY TO STIR UP RACIAL HATRED	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--	-----------------	--	----------------	----------	------------------------------	--------------------	----------	------------------
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6624	RACIAL HATRED - PUBLISHING OR DISTRIBUTING WRITTEN MATERIAL INTENDED OR LIKELY TO STIR UP RACIAL HATRED	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6638	BREACH OF A RESTRAINING ORDER ISSUED ON ACQUITTAL	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6639	BREACH OF NON MOLESTATION ORDER	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6685	FAIL TO COMPLY WITH NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS OF SEC 108 (1)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6686	FAIL TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS RE NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES UNDER SEC 109(1) OR 6 (B)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6694	FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A SERIOUS CRIME PREVENTION ORDER	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6698	BREACH OF A CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	66	66	OTHER OFFENCE AGAINST THE STATE OR PUBLIC ORDER	6699	OTHER OFFENCES AGAINST STATE AND PUBLIC ORDER (NOT RECORDED ELSEWHERE)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	67	67	PERJURY	6700	PERJURY	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	69	69	OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ACT	6902	CONVEYANCE OF PROHIBITED ARTICLES INTO / OUT OF PRISON - LIST A ARTICLES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	69	69	OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ACT	6903	CONVEYANCE OF PROHIBITED ARTICLES INTO / OUT OF PRISONS - LIST B ARTICLES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	69	69	OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ACT	6905	WITHOUT AUTHORITY POSSESS INSIDE A PRISON AN ITEM SPECIFIED IN SEC 40D (3B)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	79	79	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	7901	CONSPIRACY / ATTEMPT TO PERVERT JUSTICE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	initial Value
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	79	79	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	7902	INTIMIDATING JUROR/WITNESS/PERSON ASSISTING INVESTIGATION OF OFFENCES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	79	79	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	7903	HARMING, THREAT TO HARM WITNESS/JUROR/PERSON ASSISTING INVESTIGATION	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	79	79	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	7904	INTIMIDATING OR INTENDING TO INTIMIDATE A WITNESS	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	79	79	PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE	7905	HARMING OR THREATENING TO HARM A WITNESS	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	80	80	ABSCONDING FROM LAWFUL CUSTODY	8000	ABSCONDING FROM LAWFUL CUSTODY	274	-	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	81	81	OTHER FIREARMS OFFENCES	8115	FIREARMS-SHORTEN SHOT GUN OR OTHER SMOOTH BORE GUN	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	81	81	OTHER FIREARMS OFFENCES	8173	OFFENCE IN RELATION TO THE UNLAWFUL IMPORTATION OF ANY WEAPON OR AMMUNITION OF A KIND MENTIONED IN SECTION 5 (1) (A) (AB) (ABA) (AC) (AD) (AE) (AF) OR (C) OF FIREARMS ACT 1968	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	86	86	OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ETC.	8602	TAKE OR TO MAKE INDECENT PHOTOGRAPHS OR PSEUDO PHOTOGRAPHS OF CHILDREN.	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	86	86	OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ETC.	8610	POSSESSION OF AN INDECENT OR PSEUDO PHOTOGRAPH OF A CHILD	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	86	86	OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ETC.	8611	POSSESSION OF EXTREME PORNOGRAPHIC IMAGES - AN ACT WHICH THREATENS A PERSONS LIFE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	86	86	OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ETC.	8614	POSSESSION OF EXTREME PORNOGRAPHIC IMAGES - A PERSON PERFORMING AN ACT OF INTERCOURSE OR ORAL SEX WITH AN ANIMAL (WHETHER DEAD OR ALIVE) (BESTIALITY)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	86	86	OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS ETC.	8615	POSSESSING PROHIBITED IMAGES OF CHILDREN	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0

		-			-						-
Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	95	95	DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS-TERORISM ETC.	9510	FALSIFIES, CONCEALS, DESTROYS OR OTHERWISE DISPOSES OF ETC. DOCUMENTS HE KNOWS OR SUSPECTS ARE RELEVANT TO INVESTIGATION BY SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE OR OFT INTO OFFENCE S 183	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	95	95	DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS-TERORISM ETC.	9556	INTENTIONALLY OBSTRUCTING AN AUTHORISED PERSON IN THE EXERCISE OF POWERS UNDER PT.3 OF SCH.3 (SEIZURE IN CASES OF IMMINENT DANGER OF SERIOUS POLLUTION)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	95	95	DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS-TERORISM ETC.	80902	MAKING FALSE STATEMENT OR WITHHOLDING MATERIAL INFORMATION IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE ISSUE OF A CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	95	95	DISCLOSURE, OBSTRUCTION, FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS-TERORISM ETC.	81408	MAKING FALSE STATEMENT OR PRODUCES, PROVIDES, SENDS OR OTHERWISE MAKES USE OF A DOCUMENT KNOWING TO BE FALSE ETC.	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	96	96	WILDLIFE CRIME	9903	CONTROL OF TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES - OFFENCES RELATING TO THE PURCHASE AND SALE OF SPECIMENS LISTED IN ANNEX A TO COUNCIL REGULATIONS (EC) NO 338/97	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	0	NOT YET CLASSIFIED	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	7815	IMMIGRATION - REGISTRATION CARD- HAS FALSE REG CARD/ARTICLES IN POSSESSION WITHOUT EXCUSE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	8203	FRAUDULENT EVASION OF DUTY AN OFFENCE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROHIBITION OR RESTRICTION ON THE IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF ANY WEAPON OR AMMUNITION OF A KIND MENTIONED IN SECTION 5 (1) (A) (AB) (ABA) (AC) (AD) (AE) (AF) OR (C) OF FIREARMS 1968	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	8400	TRADE DESCRIPTIONS ETC. OFFENCES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9100	PUBLIC HEALTH OFFENCES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9806	ILL TREATMENT OR WILFUL NEGLECT OF A PERSON LACKING CAPACITY BY ANYONE RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT PERSONS CARE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9830	USING DATA FOR UNAUTHORISED PURPOSE; DISCLOSING DATA TO UNAUTHORISED PERSON ETC (TRIABLE EITHER WAY OFFENCES)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9833	SOUGHT TO ENGAGE / OFFERED TO ENGAGE / ENGAGED IN REGULATED ACTIVITY FROM WHICH BARRED	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9874	SERIOUS CRIME ACT 2007 - INTENTIONALLY ENCOURAGING OR ASSISTING COMMISSION OF AN INDICTABLE OFFENCE [NOT MURDER]	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9912	MISCONDUCT IN A PUBLIC OFFICE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9923	CUSTOMS AND EXCISE - FRAUDULENT EVASION OF DUTY ETC	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9929	ASSIST OFFENDER (INDICTABLE OFFENCE ONLY (EXCLUDES MURDER))	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9930	ASSIST OFFENDER (OFFENCE TRIABLE EITHER WAY)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9943	BEING DRUNK ON AN AIRCRAFT OR ENTERING AN AIRCRAFT DRUNK	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	0
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9971	TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT 1984 SECS 5,28,29,42(1),44,45,46,53(2)(3)(4),101.	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9979	A PERSON SHALL NOT RECKLESSLY OR NEGLIGENTLY ACT IN A MANNER LIKELY TO ENDANGER AN AIRCRAFT OR ANY PERSON THEREIN	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9980	A PERSON SHALL NOT RECKLESSLY OR NEGLIGENTLY CAUSE OR PERMIT AN AIRCRAFT TO ENDANGER ANY PERSON OR PROPERTY	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9983	POSTAL SERVICES ACT 2000 PROHIBITION ON SENDING BY POST OF CERTAIN ARTICLES	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9986	ILL TREATMENT OF PATIENTS - MENTAL HEALTH ACT 1983	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	9987	ASSISTING PATIENTS TO ABSENT THEMSELVES WITHOUT LEAVE ETC - MENTAL HEALTH ACT 1983	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	99	99	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCE	99999	OTHER MISC. CRIME RECORDABLE OFFENCE	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES	802	802	DANGEROUS DRIVING	80200	DANGEROUS DRIVING (RTA 1988 SECTION 2, RTA 1991 S. 2)	0	Excluded	OTHER NOTIFIABLE OFFENCES		Excluded	
RAPE INCIDENTS	13100	N100	REPORTED INCIDENT OF RAPE	10001	REPORTED INCIDENT OF RAPE - VICTIM (OR THIRD PARTY ACTING ON THEIR BEHALF) HAS NOT CONFIRMED THE OFFENCE OR CANNOT BE TRACED	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
RAPE INCIDENTS	13100	100	REPORTED INCIDENT OF RAPE	10003	REPORTED INCIDENT OF RAPE - OFFENCE COMMITTED IN AND TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER POLICE FORCE AREA	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	24	24	PROCURATION	2417	PROSTITUTION - CAUSING OR INCITING PROSTITUTION FOR GAIN	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	24	24	PROCURATION	2418	PROSTITUTION - CONTROLLING PROSTITUTION FOR GAIN	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	24	24	PROCURATION	2419	PROSTITUTION - KEEPING A BROTHEL USED FOR PROSTITUTION	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	27	27	SOLICITING OR IMPORTUNING BY A MAN	16701	SOLICITING ANOTHER FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING THEIR SEXUAL SERVICES AS A PROSTITUTE IN A STREET OR PUBLIC PLACE	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	72	72	TRAFFICKING FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION	7201	TRAFFICKING INTO THE UK FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
SEXUAL OFFENCES	72	72	TRAFFICKING FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION	7202	TRAFFICKING WITHIN THE UK FOR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION	0	Excluded	SEXUAL OFFENCES		Excluded	
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	38	38	PROFITING FROM OR CONCEALING KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCEEDS OF CRIME	3801	PROCEEDS OF CRIME ACT 2002 - CONCEALING ETC CRIMINAL PROPERTY	0	Excluded	THEFT & HANDLING		Excluded	
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	38	38	PROFITING FROM OR CONCEALING KNOWLEDGE OF THE PROCEEDS OF CRIME	3803	PROCEEDS OF CRIME ACT 2002 - ACQUISITION USE AND POSSESSION OF CRIMINAL PROPERTY	0	Excluded	THEFT & HANDLING		Excluded	
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	54	54	HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	5401	HANDLING/RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS	0	Excluded	THEFT & HANDLING		Excluded	
THEFT AND HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	54	54	HANDLING STOLEN GOODS	5402	UNDERTAKE/ASSIST IN RETENTION, REMOVAL, DISPOSAL ETC OF STOLEN GOODS	0	Excluded	THEFT & HANDLING		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	829	HARASSMENT - (PFHA SECTION (3)) BREACH OF CONDITIONS OF INJUNCTION AGAINST HARASSMENT	0	Excluded	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	831	HARASSMENT - (PFHA SECTION (5)) BREACH OF A RESTRAINING ORDER	0	Excluded	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	871	DISCLOSE PRIVATE SEXUAL PHOTOGRAPHS AND FILMS WITH INTENT TO CAUSE DISTRESS	0	Excluded	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	MEDIUM CO	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.11	8L	HARASSMENT	872	SENDING LETTERS ETC WITH INTENT TO CAUSE DISTRESS OR ANXIETY	0	Excluded	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.13	8N	ASSAULT WITH INJURY	852	FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION ACT 2003 - EXCISE, INFIBULATE, AID, ABET, COUNSEL	0	Excluded	OTHER VIOLENCE		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	8.15	8Q	STALKING	19512	PURSUE COURSE OF CONDUCT IN BREACH OF SEC 1 (1) WHICH AMOUNTS TO STALKING	0	Excluded	STALKING & HARASSMENT	MCSG 01/10/14	BAND C	10
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.1	9A	PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS (POA 1986 SECS 4,4A&5)	12509	PUBLIC ORDER - CAUSE INTENTIONAL HARASSMENT, ALARM OR DISTRESS (POA 1986 S. 4A)	0	Excluded	PUBLIC ORDER		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.1	9A	PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS (POA 1986 SECS 4,4A&5)	12511	PUBLIC ORDER - FEAR OR PROVOCATION OF VIOLENCE (POA 1986 S. 4)	0	Excluded	PUBLIC ORDER		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	9.1	9A	PUBLIC FEAR ALARM OR DISTRESS (POA 1986 SECS 4,4A&5)	12512	PUBLIC ORDER - HARASSMENT ALARM OR DISTRESS (POA 1986 S. 5)	0	Excluded	PUBLIC ORDER		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.3	10C	POSSESSION OF OTHER WEAPONS	828	POSSESSION OF OTHER OFFENSIVE WEAPON ON SCHOOL PREMISES WITHOUT LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR REASONABLE EXCUSE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.3	10C	POSSESSION OF OTHER WEAPONS	861	THREATEN WITH AN OFFENSIVE WEAPON IN A PUBLIC PLACE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.3	10C	POSSESSION OF OTHER WEAPONS	863	THREATEN WITH AN OFFENSIVE WEAPON ON SCHOOL PREMISES	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.4	10D	POSSESSION OF ARTICLE WITH BLADE OR POINT	826	HAVING AN ARTICLE WITH A BLADE OR POINT IN A PUBLIC PLACE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.4	10D	POSSESSION OF ARTICLE WITH BLADE OR POINT	827	HAVING AN ARTICLE WITH A BLADE OR POINT ON SCHOOL PREMISES	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.4	10D	POSSESSION OF ARTICLE WITH BLADE OR POINT	862	THREATEN WITH A BLADE OR SHARPLY POINTED ARTICLE ON SCHOOL PREMISES	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	

Home Office Group	Home Office Code	Home Office Class	Home Office Description	Offence Code	Offence Recorded	FINAL VALUE	EXCLUDED	HARM GROUP	SOURCE OF VALUE	Notes	INITIAL VALUE
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	10.4	10D	POSSESSION OF ARTICLE WITH BLADE OR POINT	864	THREATEN WITH A BLADE OR SHARPLY POINTED ARTICLE IN A PUBLIC PLACE	0	Excluded	POSSESSION		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	106	106	MODERN SLAVERY	7819	TRAFFICKING PEOPLE INTO THE UK FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPLOITATION	0	Excluded	OTHER VIOLENCE		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	106	106	MODERN SLAVERY	9925	KNOWINGLY HOLD ANOTHER PERSON IN SLAVERY / SERVITUDE	0	Excluded	OTHER VIOLENCE		Excluded	
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	106	106	MODERN SLAVERY	7204	INTENTIONALLY ARRANGE/FACILITATE THE ARRIVAL IN / ENTRY INTO THE UK/ ANOTHER COUNTRY OF A PERSON WITH A VIEW TO THEIR SEXUAL EXPLOITATION	0	Excluded	OTHER VIOLENCE		Excluded	

Candidate Number: POL 1444