



21 October 2010

To: Members of the South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership

Dear Sir / Madam

This is a supplement to the previously-published agenda for the meeting of **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP** on **MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2010**, containing the report which had not been received by the original publication deadline.

Yours faithfully

**IAN SENIOR**

Democratic Services Officer, South Cambridgeshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership

**Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.**

---

## AGENDA

7. **Strategic Assessment (Michael Soper)**

**PAGES**  
**1 - 74**

This page is left blank intentionally.



**South Cambridgeshire  
Community Safety Partnership  
2010 Strategic Assessment**

## **Executive Summary**

- Crime has decreased in South Cambridgeshire by 15.9% in the last year.
- Most types of crime have seen a decrease in quantity
- There is a rising concern around rural crime in the district

### **Victims Section – Summary**

The main elements of victimisation can be summarised as:

- Emotional & physical impact on the victim;
- Likelihood of repeat victimisation;
- Risk / vulnerability of the victim.

Creating a model based around these factors identifies the following victim groups in South Cambridgeshire:

- Victims of domestic violence;
- Victims of anti-social behaviour / criminal damage.

A further scan of commercial victims identified the following victim groups:

- Farm premises

An analysis into incidents of domestic violence in the district found:

- There is a recorded reduction in the number of incidents for the first time in a number of years.
- The Histon and Impington ward has had the highest count of domestic violence over the past three years.
- It should be noted that the number of incidents recorded in Bourn ward have increased as the settlement of Cambourne has grown.

The main findings for ASB victims were:

- Generally the public perception of ASB in South Cambridgeshire is very low.
- The rate of ASB incidents is also relatively low compared to other districts.
- Survey evidence points to a very small group of people experiencing daily, repeat incidents of ASB
- Repeat locations of police ASB fall into three groupings one of which is residential locations

The main findings for Burglary victims were:

- Burglary has reduced over the last twelve months
- Despite this change the family group position over the last 12 months remains poor with South Cambridgeshire being the third worst within the family group.
- The majority of victims can from the Histon & Impington ward, followed by Bourn and Gamlingay.

An additional scan of commercial victims of crime identified:

- Typical victim groups were:
  - Farms (mainly the victims of theft)
  - Shop owners (mainly victims of shop lifting)
  - Service Stations (mainly the victims of fuel theft, driving off without paying)
- Between 2006/07 and 2009/10 offences committed on farms have increased by 53 (79%).
- Unlike other districts, licensed premises do not feature on the list, reflecting the very low level of violent crime in the district.

The main findings for 'hate crime' victims were:

- Hate crimes continue to be at a relatively low level. The main types of reported offences that occur in South Cambridgeshire are related to race.

## **Offenders - Summary**

The typical offender in South Cambridgeshire is classified as a white male in their twenties. However, there are specific differences in offender commonalities when examining different offence types, including some similarities unique to the South Cambridgeshire District.

Almost 50% of offenders so far this financial year have committed offences under the classification of violent crime. For this crime type, offenders are:

- Male, white, average age of 28 years
- Located in the Histon & Impington and Bourn wards.

With regards to drug use, 89% of offenders were arrested for cannabis use. These offenders were typically:

- Male, white, and on average aged around 25 years.

With regards to criminal damage, the majority of offenders are still male, however there is a notably higher proportion of female offenders. This is even more the picture when examining theft and handling (65% of which is shoplifting), where 25% of offenders are female.

There are a vastly reduced number of drug offenders in this district as compared to others.

Further analysis on specific crime types can be made once the district priorities are identified.

With regards to those on probation:

- 15% of offenders countywide were in South Cambridgeshire between September 2009 and August 2010.
- In August 2010, 127 were in custody/on license/under a county order.
- Offenders were typically in their early 20s.
- Higher Tier offenders were older and more likely to be male.
- The majority of South Cambridgeshire probation clients were Tier 2 offenders – a picture unique to this district.

Over the long term there has been a drop in the number of clients for the Youth Offending Service. Reflecting this there has been a drop in the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system over the longer term as well.

Analysis from this section suggests that age plays a part in the severity of the offender. Connecting analysis from this area and others, we identify that:

- Males aged under 18 are more likely to commit more minor ASB or criminal damage.
- Males aged between 18 and 24 are more likely to commit “medium” crimes such as thefts and drug misuse.
- Males aged over 24 are more likely to reoffend, committing more violent crime and being associated with disorder within the night-time economy.
- The number of female young offenders is not falling.
- Typical crimes for females tend to be shoplifting and criminal damage.

The more complicated profile of offending in South Cambridgeshire identifies the key statutory groups that are already being worked with and receiving additional services to ordinary contact with the probation service. These are:

- PPO (5)
- MAPPA Clients (642 in Cambridgeshire)
- DIP Clients (problematic substance misusers) (2)

For the above, the client group’s needs are reasonably known at best but significant gaps still exist. What is even less clear are the needs of the wider group of offenders, in addition to the above who will come under the heading of Integrated Offender Management.

## **Places - Summary**

### Theft from Motor Vehicles

District-wide, the overall numbers of vehicle crimes have fallen, however the number of vehicle interferences has risen. With regards to thefts from motor vehicles:

- Cambourne, whilst noting only minor fluctuations in crime levels overall, has seen the number of thefts from motor vehicles more than double in 2009/10 as compared to the previous year (rising from 20 to 43 crimes).
- There appears to be no common themes to the locations for fuel thefts
- When mapping those recorded in lay-bys, only one principal cluster for offences in South Cambridgeshire is identified – the A14 truck route north of the Girton interchange, and northwest of the city of Cambridge.
- There are some small clusters of lay-by offences in areas to the north of the city of Cambridge at Histon and Horningsea (2 offences each) and Barrington (2 offences) to the south-west of the city.

For Cambourne, the majority of crime falls under the criminal damage recording.

### Arson

The arson overview below picks up the following:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge
- Cambourne

- Sawston
- Some places are known locations for fly-tipping

### Criminal Damage

In the past twelve months the number of criminal damage offences recorded in South Cambridgeshire have decreased from 1,375 (Sept 08 to Aug 09) to 1,054 (Sept 09 to Aug 10). However criminal damage remains a high volume offence that is experienced by many people.

The following locations:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge (Milton / Histon)
- Cambourne
- Sawston
- Cottenham

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the partnership consider:

### ***Offenders***

- That the partnership consider measures aimed at those committing violent offences as indicated above:
  - Males aged under 18 (for minor, non-night time economy related violence)
  - Males aged 18-24 for drug misuse, theft and handling, and some fraud.
  - Males aged 25+ for more severe violent offences.
- That the partnership consider measures aimed at those committing ASB
  - Males aged under 18 (for minor, ASB offences)
  - More serious repeat offenders for ASB of any age
- That the partnership prioritise information gathering about the wider group of offenders to be included within the IOM process as information gaps exist.

### ***Victims***

- The victims of domestic violence
- The victims of burglary (due to poor family group position)
- Business victims of crime:
  - Farms / Farmers (possibly to be addressed at County level)

### ***Places***

- Crime in Cambourne with a view to understanding how to prevent the development of offending in new communities
- Crime on the fringes of Cambridge, including Histon & Impington, and working jointly with the Cambridge City partnership on shared issues such as dwelling burglary.

**CONTENTS**

<u>Executive Summary</u> .....	2
<u>Victims Section – Summary</u> .....	2
<u>Offenders - Summary</u> .....	3
<u>Places - Summary</u> .....	4
<u>Recommendations</u> .....	6
<u>Introduction</u> .....	9
<u>Progress from 2009</u> .....	11
<u>OFFENDERS</u> .....	16
<u>Offenders Section – Summary</u> .....	16
<u>Offender Management: Prevent, React, Rebuild</u> .....	18
<u>General Offender / Offence Profile</u> .....	19
<u>Offenders on Probation – Post-Arrest</u> .....	21
<u>Reducing Reoffending</u> .....	23
<u>Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)</u> .....	25
<u>Young Offenders</u> .....	26
First Time Offenders .....	26
Clients within the Youth Offending System .....	27
Youth Crime and the PPO Scheme: “Deter” Strand .....	28
Custodial Sentencing .....	29
Disposals / Leaving the System .....	30
<u>Drug Misuse</u> .....	31
<u>Alcohol Misuse</u> .....	33
<u>VICTIMS</u> .....	35
<u>Victims Section – Summary</u> .....	35
<u>Victims: Support and Protect</u> .....	37
Repeat Offences .....	38
Translating the model to South Cambridgeshire .....	39
<u>Victims of Domestic Violence</u> .....	41
Number of Incidents Reported to the Police .....	41
<i>Referrals to the IDVAS Service</i> .....	42
Crimes with a Domestic Violence Marker .....	43
The location of domestic violence in South Cambridgeshire .....	43
Work of the IDVAS Service .....	43
<u>Victims of Anti-Social Behaviour</u> .....	44
Perception of Repeat Victimisation .....	44
Repeat Locations of ASB .....	45
<u>Victims of Burglary</u> .....	47
Profile of victims using police recorded data .....	47

Profile of victims.....	49
<u>Commercial Victims of Crime</u> .....	50
Crime committed on Farms.....	50
<u>Victims of Hate Crime</u> .....	52
<u>Victims of Hate Crime</u> .....	53
<u>PLACES</u> .....	54
<u>Places Section - Summary</u> .....	54
<u>Place: Manage and Protect</u> .....	55
<u>Cambourne – All Crime</u> .....	58
Recorded Crime in Cambourne .....	58
<u>Fuel Thefts and Lay-By Thefts in South Cambridgeshire</u> .....	60
Fuel Thefts.....	61
Other Lay-By Thefts.....	62
<u>Vehicle Crime</u> .....	64
Theft from Vehicles .....	64
Theft of Vehicles .....	65
<u>Arson</u> .....	66
<u>Criminal Damage</u> .....	67
<u>Crime and the Economy</u> .....	68
<u>Appendix 1: Neighbourhood Survey</u> .....	69
<u>Appendix 2: Model of the Costs of crime to the Victim, Home Office 03/04</u> ...	73

## Introduction


### **Purpose**

The Partnership is required to carry out an annual strategic assessment of the district, analysing patterns and levels of crime, disorder and substance misuse. The purpose of the assessment is to present and interpret a summary of intelligence analysis for the partnership area in order to help the partnership strategy group to set priorities and review the partnership plan.

This document indicates changes in performance since the 2009 Strategic Assessment, interprets identified trends in crime, and assesses progress made against the current plan. It summarises the analysis undertaken to assist the partnership in setting short, medium and long-term goals. The structure of the 2010 Assessment has changed from previous years.

### **Structure**

For 2010 it was decided to alter the structure of the Strategic Assessment. Until now, the assessments have taken a crime-specific focus, analysing each crime type, outlining frequency, and giving a general overview of statistics. The 2010 approach is illustrated by the “Crime Problem Analysis Triangle” (PAT):



The model stems from the Routine Activity Theory<sup>1</sup>. The theory states that crime is normal and levels of crime are dependant on the opportunities available. The role of victims, their environment, and the context around which a crime occurs is considered to be more important and have greater impact on the likelihood of a crime occurring than social issues such as poverty or financial depression. The PAT incorporates this, looking at the opportunity structure around a crime or set of crimes. The concept is that for a crime to occur, it is necessary to have the following (see inner light blue triangle above):


- A suitable victim – either a person or an object, suitably vulnerable and offering an attractive ‘reward’.
- An appropriate place – for example a deserted park, or an unlit alleyway.
- A ‘likely’ offender – with a motive, and present with the target at the right place, and the right time.

<sup>1</sup> (Cohen & Felson, 1979)

For each of these elements there is a deterrent, as highlighted in the outermost triangle, and it is the deterrent that the CDRP will need to consider. By analysing victims, places and offenders in turn, we aim to identify commonalities and trends, and offer guidance on points where a handler, manager or guardian could be placed to reduce the level of crime.

**Process**

The process for the assessment is as follows:




All the parts are important but the key is to remember that the entire process must be followed through for the assessment to be effective. This document will act as the precursor to the district identifying areas to prioritise in the coming year.

## Progress from 2009

### Cambridgeshire Constabulary Recorded Crime Data South Cambridgeshire

	Earlier Period		Later Period		Numeric Change
	From	To	From	To	
	Sep-08	Aug-09	Sep-09	Aug-10	
All Crime	6,693		5,630		-1,063
Serious Acquisitive Crime	3,928		3,412		-516
Burglary Dwelling	1,541		1,314		-227
All Robbery	561		490		-71
Vehicle Crime	41		31		-10
Aggravated vehicle taking	939		793		-146
Theft from vehicle	12		7		-5
Theft of a Vehicle	742		674		-68
Handling Stolen Goods	185		112		-73
Most Serious Violence	11		4		-7
Homicides	41		45		4
Wounding Endangering Life	2		5		3
Grievous Bodily Harm without Intent	29		28		-1
Assaults With Less Serious Injury	9		11		2
All Recorded Violence with Injury	370		348		-22
Serious Sexual Offences	411		394		-17
Rapes	66		46		-20
Sexual Assaults	16		11		-5
Other Serious Sexual Offences	44		32		-12
All Violent Crime	6		3		-3
All Violence Against the Person	978		1,003		25
All Sexual Offences	851		903		52
All Robbery	86		69		-17
Criminal Damage	41		31		-10
All Damage to Dwellings	1,375		1,054		-321
All Damage to Other Buildings	232		151		-81
All Damage to Vehicles	141		123		-18
All Other Damage	610		452		-158
Arson	344		277		-67
All Theft and Handling	48		51		3
Shoplifting	2,254		2,105		-149
Theft from the Person	137		103		-34
Theft in a Dwelling	16		21		5
Theft of Pedal Cycles	76		76		0
Other Classified Thefts & Handling	242		244		2
Vehicle Interference	757		821		64
All Racially Aggravated Crime	87		47		-40
All Racially Aggravated Violence	30		33		3
All Racially Aggravated Harassment	4		13		9
All Racially Aggravated Damage	21		15		-6
All Drugs Offences	5		5		0
Drugs (Trafficking)	307		161		-146
Drugs (Simple Possession)	30		26		-4
Drugs (Other Offences)	773		435		-338

**iQuanta Barchart MSG - Crimes per 1000 Residents**  
**Cambridgeshire - South Cambridgeshire CDRP**  
**All Crime**  
**01 Sep 2009 - 31 Aug 2010**



CDRP	Crimes per 1000 Residents
Lincolnshire - North Kesteven	33.700
Sussex - Horsham	37.505
<b>Cambridgeshire - South Cambridgeshire</b>	<b>39.512</b>
Gloucestershire - Tewkesbury	40.731
Surrey - Waverley	40.885
Gloucestershire - Cotswold	42.568
Derbyshire - Derbyshire Dales	44.390
North Yorkshire - Harrogate	44.721
Surrey - Mole Valley	44.801
Suffolk - Suffolk Coastal	47.140
Gloucestershire - Stroud	47.973
Essex - Uttlesford	48.587
Thames Valley - South Oxfordshire	55.800
Thames Valley - West Berkshire	78.031
Thames Valley - South Buckinghamshire	82.839
<b>Cambridgeshire - South Cambridgeshire MSG</b>	<b>4</b>

## **Scanning**

An initial exercise in scanning for each CDRP/CSP involved looking up respective crime figures and comparing the relative performance of each district area.

A series of 'Scanning' matrices based upon the previously agreed priorities for 2009 were completed. These indicated whether trends in the volumes of certain issues gave cause for concern or suggested impact on the community. This will prove useful as a preliminary exercise to identifying or confirming areas of concern or high impact in crime, disorder and other community safety issues.

Each of the 5 CDRP/CSP areas is examined in turn, to confirm existing priorities and to identify gaps between the initial scan and other scanning opportunities. For example, using MS-Excel worksheets to determine crime and disorder issues coming to a peak, concerns over bench-marking, etc. All conclusions are based on examination of police recorded volumes; in some instances, incidents recorded by the county fire and rescue service; and, where appropriate, the estimated volumes of population and households have been drawn into calculations.

### **Scanning for 'Gaps'**

This document will now consider crime and disorder issues in turn. Matrices for the CSPs follow and contain more detailed information, including reasons why crime, disorder and other community safety issues might remain or be included as an issue for the forthcoming Strategic Assessment period or might now be disregarded. The following two pages outline the crime and disorder priorities for the district, comparing progress historically and by most similar family groupings.

Crime & Disorder Priority	2009	2010	Concern		High Impact on the individual?	EMERGING, INCREASING, UNCHANGED, or DECLINING
			ST	LT		
Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC)	Y					Remarkably unchanged in almost four years, reductions in Vehicle Crime have been met by similar recorded increases in Dwelling Burglaries. Robbery, the other contributor to SAC, remains low in volume.
Dwelling Burglary (SAC)	Y	R		Y	Y	Recorded volumes have increased in each of the past 4 years. The PTHH is the highest of any of the 4 rural districts. The underlying factors need to be understood.
Vehicle Crime (SAC)	Y					Some significant reductions in recorded volumes in each of the past 2 years and therefore may no longer be seen as a priority.
Domestic Violence	Y	R	Y	Y	Y	The current requirement is to have 'a repeat Domestic Violence Incident rate of no more than 28% using the Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) service as the measure'. Results so far show Repeat Rate to run very closely to and even failing this target.
All Violent Crime		R	Y	Y	Y	Little change in 'Assaults with Less Serious Injury' in each of the past 4 years, 'Most Serious Violence' unexplored, Sexual Offences showing sharp increase. Some work may need to be undertaken to understand these features.

Crime & Disorder Priority	2009	2010	12 MONTHS			3 MONTHS		
			Apr 09 to Mar 10	Jul 09 to Jun 10	Jun 09 to Aug 09	Sep 09 to Nov 09	Dec 09 to Feb 10	Mar 10 to May 10
Serious Acquisitive Crime (SAC)	Y		13	13	n/k	n/k	n/k	12
Dwelling Burglary (SAC)	Y	Y	13	13	12	11	12	12
Vehicle Crime (SAC) - Theft Of MV	Y		5	4	11	3	3	5
Vehicle Crime (SAC) - Theft From MV			13	13	9	12	12	13
Domestic Violence	Y	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
All Violent Crime		Y	2	3	n/k	n/k	n/k	5

1<sup>st</sup> position indicates most favourable position in comparison to other Most Similar Family Group Members whilst 15<sup>th</sup> position indicates least favourable position.

14 other Most Similar Family Group Members	
Derbyshire – Derbyshire Dales	Suffolk – Suffolk Coastal
Essex – Uttlesford	Surrey – Mole Valley
Gloucestershire – Cotswold	Surrey – Waverley
Gloucestershire – Stroud	Sussex – Horsham
Gloucestershire – Tewkesbury	Thames Valley – South Buckinghamshire
Lincolnshire – North Kesteven	Thames Valley – South Oxfordshire
North Yorkshire – Harrogate	Thames Valley – West Berkshire

## **OFFENDERS**

### **Offenders Section – Summary**

The typical offender in South Cambridgeshire is classified as a white male in their twenties. However, there are specific differences in offender commonalities when examining different offence types, including some similarities unique to the South Cambridgeshire District.

Almost 50% of offenders so far this financial year have committed offences under the classification of violent crime. For this crime type, offenders are:

- Male, white, average age of 28 years
- Located in the Histon & Impington and Bourn wards.

With regards to drug use, 89% of offenders were arrested for cannabis use. These offenders were typically:

- Male, white, and on average aged around 25 years.
- There are a vastly reduced number of drug offenders in this district as compared to others.

With regards to criminal damage, the majority of offenders are still male, however there is a notably higher proportion of female offenders. This is even more the picture when examining theft and handling (65% of which is shoplifting), where 25% of offenders are female.

Further analysis on specific crime types can be made once the district priorities are identified.

With regards to those on probation:

- 15% of offenders countywide were in South Cambridgeshire between September 2009 and August 2010.
- In August 2010, 127 were in custody/on license/under a county order.
- Offenders were typically in their early 20s.
- Higher Tier offenders were older and more likely to be male.
- The majority of South Cambridgeshire probation clients were Tier 2 offenders – a picture unique to this district.

Over the long term there has been a drop in the number of clients for the Youth Offending Service. Reflecting this there has been a drop in the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system over the longer term as well.

Analysis from this section suggests that age plays a part in the severity of the offender. Connecting analysis from this area and others, we identify that:

- Males aged under 18 are more likely to commit more minor ASB or criminal damage.
- Males aged between 18 and 24 are more likely to commit “medium” crimes such as thefts and drug misuse.
- Males aged over 24 are more likely to reoffend, committing more violent crime and being associated with disorder within the night-time economy.
- The number of female young offenders is not falling.

- Typical crimes for females tend to be shoplifting and criminal damage.

The more complicated profile of offending in South Cambridgeshire identifies the key statutory groups that are already being worked with and receiving additional services to ordinary contact with the probation service. These are:

- PPO (5)
- MAPPA Clients (642 in Cambridgeshire)
- DIP Clients (problematic substance misusers) (2)

For the above, the client group's needs are reasonably known at best but significant gaps still exist. What is even less clear are the needs of the wider group of offenders, in addition to the above who will come under the heading of Integrated Offender Management.

## **Recommendation**

- That the partnership consider measures aimed at those committing violent offences as indicated above:
  - Males aged under 18 (for minor, non-night time economy related violence)
  - Males aged 18-24 for drug misuse, theft and handling, and some fraud.
  - Males aged 25+ for more severe violent offences.
- That the partnership consider measures aimed at those committing ASB
  - Males aged under 18 (for minor, ASB offences)
  - More serious repeat offenders for ASB of any age
- That the partnership prioritise information gathering about the wider group of offenders to be included within the IOM process as information gaps exist.

## **Offender Management: Prevent, React, Rebuild**

If we are to understand the background of a crime, it is important to understand the commonalities in offenders' backgrounds. From this we can then identify areas to focus upon, in terms of both prevention with respect to potential offenders, and reacting to reduce a specific type of offending that appears to be on the increase. We can then move forward with an offender to rebuild, or redesign their environment where possible to reduce the chance of reoffending – this process can also feed into preventative measures for potential offenders as well as those existing in the system.

One of the main aims of policing is to catch offenders. When looking at all overall crime detection rates Cambridgeshire is on a par with our most similar counties, with 30% of sanction detections per crime detected across Huntingdonshire and Fenland, and 25% in East, South, and Cambridge City.<sup>2</sup> This percentage increases or decreases depending on crime type. Understanding common characteristics between perpetrators of crime may indicate their offending-related needs, which can help the police and other partners predict potential crimes and identify routes to addressing individual offender (and potential offender) issues, therefore reducing crime overall. Common features between adult offenders tend to fluctuate from one offence from another – for example it likely takes a very different personality to commit murder than to shoplift.

The following section explores various characteristics of adult offenders by analysing a wide variety of sources. These include local data from the Police, the Drugs Intervention Programme, the PPO Team, Probation, and other partner agencies. Profiles of young offenders are then examined by extrapolating of data from the Youth Offending Team and the PPO 'Deter' Strand.


---

<sup>2</sup> Source: iQuanta 14/09/2010 (Previous financial year)

## General Offender / Offence Profile

Between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010, 2,370 offenders were identified within Cambridgeshire. Of these, 1,925 (81%) were male; offenders had an average age of 27½; and 1986 (84%) were white. 7.6% of offenders came from South Cambridgeshire. Locations were identified through contact addresses – for the majority this was a home address, but some were addresses of relatives or businesses. 14 repeat offenders recorded in this time, most of whom were female, and all for theft and handling offences.

181 of Cambridgeshire's offenders were recorded as being from South Cambridgeshire between April and July 2010, though it should be noted that this figure can be affected by those committing more than one crime, who may therefore be double counted. This is especially the case when examining those committing fraud and forgery offences. As you can see, within south Cambridgeshire there are two age peaks for offenders – firstly at approximately 20 years old, and secondly at 27 years of age.



157 offender records noted an ethnicity. Of these, 95% were white and 88% were White British. This is a lower percentage than when looking at the general population, suggesting that minority ethnic groups are over-represented within the criminal justice system. 82% are male, and the majority reside within the Histon & Impington ward. The most common crimes are violent crimes (48.1%) followed by drugs offences (19%).

### Violent Crime

Of the 87 offenders logged under "violent crime", all but two were for violence against the person. 81% were male, and where it was recorded, 84% were of a white ethnicity. Most offenders were recorded as being from the Histon & Impington and Bourn wards. The average age was just under 29 years. 30% of all violent crimes were for ABH, with a further 28% for Assault/Battery. The 2010 ERPHO Health Profile for South Cambridgeshire<sup>3</sup> found that, when looking at Recorded violence

<sup>3</sup> [ERPHO Health Profiles](#)

against the person crimes crude rate per 1,000 population in 2008/09, the district was performing close to the top for violent crime in Strategic Health Authorities across the country, with a count of 5.7 crimes as compared to 4.8 nationally.

#### Drugs Offences

The issue of recorded drugs offenders is examined in greater detail later in this document. However, from the police-recorded data we can construct the following offender profile: 35 of the 181 offenders in South Cambridgeshire were for drug offences. 89% were for the possession of cannabis. Only one referred to an offence not connected to cannabis use (cocaine). Only 24 had an ethnicity recorded, of which 92% were White British. 94% were male. The average offender age was 25, with the oldest offender being 48 and the youngest being 16 years old.

#### Criminal Damage

There were 21 offenders recorded as having committed criminal damage – 12% of all crimes in South Cambridgeshire for this three-month period. 76% were male, all were registered as being of a white ethnicity and the average offender age was 25½ years old, with ages ranging from 11 to 54 years.

#### Theft & Handling

11% of offenders in South Cambridgeshire were registered under the theft and handling banner. Of these, where ethnicity was recorded, all offenders were white, and 75% were male. 65% of these crimes were for shoplifting. There are a notably higher proportion of female offenders within this offence group. The average offender age is just under 29 years old, with the oldest offender being 54 and the youngest being 15 years old.

#### Burglary

There were seven offenders who committed a burglary in this period, amounting for just under 4% of the district's crime. Five of these were dwelling burglaries. All were male, and, where recorded, all were white British. The average offender was aged 23 years old, with all being under 30.

#### Fraud and Forgery

Of the five "Fraud and Forgery" offenders, 60% were male, 80% were of white ethnicity and the average age of an offender was 27½ years old. Three related to making off without payment.

#### Other Offences

There were six offenders recorded under "other offences" - 3% of all South Cambridgeshire offenders. 83% were of a white ethnicity, all were male, and the average age was 35½ years.

Further analysis into specific types of crime can be made once priorities are identified for the forthcoming year.

## Offenders on Probation – Post-Arrest

Within Cambridgeshire, 38,224 crimes were committed between the months of September 2009 and August 2010<sup>4</sup>. This is compared to 42,315 between September 2008 and July 2009 (a decrease of 9.7%).

Area	County	City	Hunts	Fenland	E Cambs	S Cambs
Number of crimes	<b>38,224</b>	13,837	8,604	6,718	3,435	5,630
%	<b>100%</b>	36.2%	22.5%	17.6%	9%	14.7%


Population (mid-2009 RG figures)	<b>600,800</b>	119,100	164,600	93,300	80,300	143,600
Crimes per 1,000	<b>63.62</b>	116.18	52.27	72.00	42.78	39.21

The following information was collated for offenders on probation. Between April 2009 and August 2010, 277 offenders were recorded by the probation services as being from within South Cambridgeshire. Throughout Cambridgeshire (and Peterborough), 429 records did not have a location noted so it is likely that the total district figure will be higher. The highest proportion of South Cambridgeshire offenders were known to the probation service for having committed violent offences (27%). 16% were for public order or riot offences.

Within South Cambridgeshire, 127 were either in custody, on license, or under a community order in August 2010. As with all areas, the majority were under a community order (44%). A significant number of cases either do not have a postcode recorded or are not mapped, especially with regards to those in custody.

As at August 2010, there was one persistent offender connected with probation in the district, who was also a Tier 4 offender. Of the 11 Tier 4 offenders, all were male and nine were of white ethnicity. Two were considered to be highly likely to reoffend. None were considered to have an accommodation need, and all were considered to have relationship and thinking needs that would risk leading to reoffending is not addressed. Of the 56 Tier 3 probation clients, 88% were male and 94% white (4 refused). Where recorded, 20% were considered to be very likely to reoffend. With regards to the 60 considered to be Tier 2 offenders, 90% were male and 92% white. 8% were considered likely to reoffend.


A scaled needs analysis of offenders registered with probation is conducted, assessing potential areas of intervention that could be made to support the offender. For August 2010, the majority of South Cambridgeshire offenders were judged to be in need of interventions with regards to their thinking. Concerns around offender lifestyles and relationships were also raised. The chart to the right outlines the percentage of clients within probation, with



<sup>4</sup> Information taken from CADET

each judged need within each district. It should be noted that these will not add up to 100% since some clients will receive no interventions, whilst others will receive more than one.

Countywide, a significant majority of offenders with probation are considered to be Tier 3 clients. However, this is not the case in south Cambridgeshire, with 47% being Tier 2 and then 44% being Tier 3. Again, a very high percentage of clients are not allocated to a district. By examining the interventions offered to probation clients we see that the majority are judged to have needs around their thinking, behaviour, and relationship perception.



Looking at the ages of clients, for all groups the majority were judged to have needs relating to thinking, lifestyles and relationships. Accommodation was considered to be the least prevalent issue. However, for all issues there was a significantly higher degree of concern for those aged between 25 and 29, as demonstrated in the graph below for all Cambridgeshire clients.


## Reducing Reoffending

The PPO (Prolific and Priority Offender) scheme works alongside the ‘prevent, react, rebuild’ process, with a deter strand working with young offenders, a ‘catch and convict’ strand targeting those committing crimes, and a ‘rehabilitate and resettle’ strand aiming to work with offenders to tackle underlying problems to prevent re-offending.

For the purposes of the five Strategic Assessments, the PPO Teams conducted an audit into the current caseloads for the districts, assessing the typical characteristics of each client in a similar form to that of probation, looking at offender needs and the interventions provided. Offenders both within the community and in custody are offered support on the PPO Scheme. Interventions are provided to those on the scheme, in the form of offender management through the Criminal Justice System, or through wider support schemes. Interventions address issues such as:

- Accommodation
- Benefits and finance
- Addressing drug and alcohol problems
- Maintaining relationships
- Education and training
- Mental and physical health
- Attitudes thinking and behaviour

The graph below outlines the number of PPOs within the district since September 2008. Whilst numbers have declined the cohort has remained unchanged in size since March.



Currently, in September 2010, we have five clients on the PPO scheme – three in custody, and two based in the community. Of these, the average age was 20 years. All were males of White British ethnicity. Two have children, and all are unmarried. One client is recorded as having underlying alcohol misuse issues. All clients are registered as having problems with drug use, and seven have problems with Class A drugs, typically heroin. However, all register their primary drug as being Cannabis. Three of those five on the PPO scheme are registered for domestic burglary offences. In addition, one youth offender client is recorded in September as being on the “Deter” PPO cohort.

Interventions based on identified needs are offered to those on the PPO scheme. These are broken down into set categories as outlined below:

Intervention Type	Housing	Education & Training	Mental & Physical Health	Drug & Alcohol Problems	Benefits & Finance	Maintaining relationships / family support	Attitudes, Thinking & Behaviour
No. Clients	4	3	3	3	4	3	5

The issue of greatest concern appears to be around a client's attitude, thinking and behaviour. However, all other types of intervention are considered to be significantly important for this group.

## **Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)**

MAPPAs were introduced in 2001 and bring together the Police, Probation and Prison Services into what is known as the MAPPA Responsible Authority. These arrangements support the assessment and management of the most serious sexual and violent offenders. The Cambridgeshire MAPPA Annual Report 2008/09 provides useful statistical information on how MAPPA manages the risk posed by some of the county's sexual, violent and other dangerous offenders<sup>5</sup>. The report is also available from the local Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Probation Trust. Unfortunately we were unable to collect data around the common characteristics of different types of offenders with MAPPAs for this year. The following is countywide data taken from public reports.

The following statistics around MAPPA clients are taken from data recorded as at 31st March 2010. Data recording methods have been revised to improve accuracy around the number of MAPPA-eligible offenders living in the community. The chart below lists the number of offenders eligible for MAPPA, and highlights the number of MAPPA clients considered to be Level 2 and 3 offenders across Cambridgeshire.

	No. of MAPPA eligible offenders at 31-March-09	Offenders managed via MAPP meetings	
		Level 2	Level 3
Registered Sexual Offenders	472	58	7
Violent Offenders	167	30	4
Other Dangerous Offenders	3	10	0
Total	642	98	11

Of those 98 Level 2 offenders, 26 were returned to custody, 24 for a breach of license, and two for a breach of a SOPO<sup>6</sup>. Of the 11 Level 3 offenders, one was returned to custody for a license breach. One Level 2 offender was charged with a serious further offence.

South Cambridgeshire falls within the Southern division of the police, which held 166 registered sexual offenders. Of 31 SOPOs applied for across the county, all were issued as full orders, with one also being issued as an interim order.

<sup>5</sup> Cambridgeshire Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) 2008-09  
<http://www.probation.homeoffice.gov.uk/files/pdf/Cambridgeshire%20MAPPA%202009%20Report.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Sexual Offences Prevention Order

## Young Offenders


### Introduction

There are a variety of reasons why children and young people get involved in illegal behaviour. These include a lack of education, poor family relationships, having family members or peers who have offended, and misuse of substances. Further detail around this can be found through the national YJB research which gives information both on risk factors and on the other factors that may reduce the chance of a young person offending<sup>7</sup>. There is a distinct connection between those in the youth justice system and gender, with almost all clients across the county being male.

Looking at the most dangerous offenders, it must be noted that not every MAPPA client is an adult. On the rare occasions that the offender is under eighteen then the relevant Youth Services will become involved with MAPPA. Youth Offending Services are multi-disciplinary in their approach and bring with them a wide range of providers able to work with Young Offenders.

### First Time Offenders

2009/10 saw 624 first time offenders join the criminal justice system, 95 within South Cambridgeshire. This number does not include those from out of county. The significant majority of first time offenders are white, however the percentage for this ethnic group are on the decrease, from 95% countywide in 2006/7 to 90.8% in 2009/10. Other groups have therefore seen an increase, most notably with those of mixed ethnicity. Ethnicity records are not currently broken down by district. There has been a steady increase in those whose ethnicity is unknown. The graph below outlines the ethnicity of non-white offenders countywide.



<sup>7</sup> <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/Prevention/>

With regards to gender, the majority of first time offenders in South Cambridgeshire are male (68% males in 2009/10). However, this is a decrease from 2006/07 (75%) owing to an increase in the number of females offending, with the prime increase being in those aged 16. In South Cambridgeshire, the percentage of female first time offenders actually rose to just under 50%.


Specific details around client ages is not yet recorded at a district level, however, countywide, the majority of male offenders are aged between 15 and 16, with a wider spread of ages between 9 and 18. There has been a notable drop in those aged 11, 14 and 15 years of age, with the only increase from 2006/07 being with those aged 17. It is clear that the numbers of males involved with the offending service has greatly influenced the drop in cases over the past four years, as we see case numbers falling from 630 to 367. The majority of females are aged between 13 and 14, with few aged under 11. Of most interest is the fall in those aged 13 and 15 years between 2006/7 and 2009/10. There has, however, been an increase in those aged 16 years.

Within South Cambridgeshire, the number of first time entrants has decreased by 34% between 2006/7 and 2009/10, to a level below the county average of a 37% drop. A majority appear to be residing in the CB23 and CB24 areas of the district. For 2009/10, 32% of first time entrants were female, similar to the county average of 34%. However, unusually, in 2008/9 49% were female.

### **Clients within the Youth Offending System**

Unlike the number of first-time entrants into the youth offending system, the number of young people remaining within the system has remained roughly the same over the past four years.

In the final quarter of 2009/10, 95% of young people who offend had access to suitable accommodation across Cambridgeshire. When looking at this in the context of our statistical neighbours, we are fourth worst out of ten. For the full financial year of 2009/10, 533 of 578 (92%) were deemed to be in suitable accommodation, a drop of 2.1% from the previous year. We are the only district in our comparable county group who has seen a decline.




The number of engaged offenders in Cambridgeshire has decreased over the past four years. The number of males in the system has seen the most significant reduction – however they still make up over half of all offenders. What is of greatest concern is that the number of females within the system has not fluctuated at all over the past four years, and as a result makes up a significantly higher portion of offenders.

**Youth Crime and the PPO Scheme: “Deter” Strand**

PPO Schemes are intended to tackle those offenders who have been identified as committing the most crime and causing the most harm within the local community. It is a crime reduction programme with a focus on reducing re-offending. For consideration for adoption on to the Deter Strand, the Youth Offending Service will identify those most at risk of reoffending and serious harm to others, who will be required to engage in an ‘enhanced’ or ‘intensive intervention’.

Looking at typical first offence crimes within this group, criminal damage has remained the most common crime across all four years. In 2009/10 it accounted for approximately 25% of all crimes. Common assault came second (13%). For 2008/09 there was less significant difference between crimes, with no specific leading crime type. For 2007/08, 20.4% of crimes were recorded as criminal damage, and for 2006/7, this crime type accounted for 24.5% of incidents.



Between 2006/07 and 2009/10, 15 clients were recorded on the "Deter" scheme. There is evidence that some of these may also have been on the scheme in previous years. In 2009/10 there were 6 clients. This amounted for 11.5% of county clients. Of these 6, ages range between 13 and 18, with an average age of 16. All clients for 2009/10 were white, which is the same as in all three previous years.

More recently, in September 2010 one South Cambridgeshire client was held under the "Deter" strand with the YOS, as shown below. This was the only female recorded in the southern division, and was also the youngest, aged 14. Countywide, the number of clients registered within the "Detect" strand of the PPO scheme have remained largely stable, ranging from 49 in 2006/07 to 52 in 2009/10. The majority are white (92.3% for 2009/10) males (again, 92.3% for 2009/10). PPO offender ages peak at around 17 and 18, with an average age of just under 17 years. The chart below outlines the situation for the Southern Police Division in September 2010.

Client	CPRP	Age	Gender	Children	Ethnicity	Index Offence
A	City	17	Male	No	White - British	Affray
B	City	18	Male	No	White - British	Burglary Dwelling
C	City	17	Male	Yes	White - British	Burglary Dwelling
D	City	15	Male	No	White - Irish	Vehicle Crime
E	City	16	Male	No	White - British	Burglary Dwelling
F	E Cambs	17	Male	No	White - British	Burglary Non Dwelling
G	S Cambs	14	Female	No	White - British	Robbery

### Custodial Sentencing

Looking at those sentenced to custody countywide between 2006 and 2009, we see numbers have been gradually decreasing, from 37 in 2006/07 to 27 in 2009/10. The majority are given detention and training orders (custody) – 81.5% in 2009/10 – and the remainder receive a Section 91 Order. The most common offences resulting in custody over the past four years have been either dwelling robbery or general affray. For 2009/10, 92.6% of offenders were male, and all but two were white. The most common age-gender group was 17 year old males (59.3%).

As outlined in the chart below, the minority of those sentenced come from South Cambridgeshire.

District	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Fenland	12	14	8	2
Huntingdonshire	11	8	13	15
Cambridge City	9	4	11	7
East Cambs	5	5	2	1
<b>South Cambs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>27</b>

### Disposals / Leaving the System

In 2009/10, 79 young people from South Cambridgeshire concluded final warnings, community-based penalties or custodial sentences. This accounts for 18% of clients countywide. This is not a significant change from the number recorded in 2006/07 (70), however it is a significant increase from the two years in between (48). Of these 79, 92% were white, demonstrating how disproportionately other ethnic groups are represented within the youth offending system when compared to ethnic proportions in the country's population as a whole<sup>8</sup>. 84% moved out into suitable accommodation, with 65% moving back to parents or relatives.

---

<sup>8</sup> [NI 44 guidance, Audit Commission](#)

## Drug Misuse

There is evidence that some crimes are carried out with the specific goal of feeding a drug habit<sup>9</sup>, or would not have occurred had the offender not been under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Within the offending population there is evidence to suggest that drug use is significantly higher than in the wider population as a whole. The Home Office has researched the links between crime and drugs to identify any underlying trends, and to evaluate existing treatment programmes and assess the social and economic costs of drug use when looking at criminal activity.

The Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) was introduced in 2003 with the aim of directing adult drug-misusing offenders into drug treatment, and reducing offending behaviour. The focus is around Class A drug misusers. Historically, according to police data, the number of drug offences decreased by 39% (194 cases) when comparing the months of September to August for 2007/08 and 2008/09. Looking more recently, this improvement has continued with a drop of a further 146 offences (48%) in 2009/10<sup>10</sup>.

As at 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010, there were 124 clients registered with the DIP. Of these, the average age was 34 years. 86.3% were male, with the vast majority being from the United Kingdom and being of white ethnicity. The bulk of referrals came either as a result of a DRR (24.2%), from prisons through CARAT workers (31.5%), or through a self-referral – this could often be as part of a pre-hearing arrangement to demonstrate a desire to improve factors surrounding a crime committed. 5 of the 30 self-referrals also had an offence recorded against their file.


The current number of clients per district breaks down as follows:

<b>Current CDIP Caseload - Sep 2010</b>		
<i>CDRP</i>	<i>No. on scheme</i>	<i>Rate per 1000 population</i>
City	41	0.35
E Cambs	11	0.14
Fenland	32	0.34
<b>Huntingdon</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0.23</b>
S Cambs	2	0.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>0.21</b>

In total, of the 124, eight had no offence recorded against their file. Of the 116 that did, the offence breakdown was as follows. There is a distinct increase in the number of shoplifting offences.

<sup>9</sup> Home Office research around drug offending

<sup>10</sup> Data taken from October CORA/CADET



Countywide, 52% of clients were recorded as having children. Of these, 20.2% were recorded as having one child, and 13.7% as having two, 11.3% as having three, and some clients recorded as having up to six children. With regards to accommodation, 61% were judged to be in settled accommodation – i.e. to own a home, or to be living permanently with family. 23% were deemed to be in temporary accommodation (such as staying with friends), and 15% as having no fixed abode (sleeping on the streets or sofa-surfing).

With regards to drug use, heroin was by far the most prevalent drug, both locally and countywide, with 69% noting it as their primary drug (85 clients). A minimal number included cannabis, crack and cocaine in their more commonly taken drugs.

Only two of the 124 clients recorded with CDIP came from South Cambridgeshire, as compared to 4 clients in September 2009. These were both childless middle-aged white males, guilty of minor thefts/robberies, with relatively stable housing. Due to the low number of South Cambridgeshire clients, drug-misusing offenders connected to the CDIP should not be an area for significant focus within South Cambridgeshire.

## Alcohol Misuse

Alcohol use is a common part of every-day society, especially when looking into the night-time economy. Alcohol is connected to a variety of crimes, including ASB, violent crimes, domestic violence, racial crimes, and criminal damage.

Emergency departments within hospitals are often involved in the treatment of alcohol-related injuries. Addenbrookes A&E, based in Cambridge City, estimates that alcohol contributes to over 40% of admissions, and therefore takes up much of A&E and ambulance support services' time, as well as having a notable financial impact on the NHS. Nationally, the Cardiff Model has been developed to identify how NHS services can make effective contributions to the prevention of alcohol-related harm through partnership working. The aim is for A&E departments to work with CSPs within their area, sharing information wherever possible about the locations, timings and frequency of events. This data can then be used to target police efforts, and thereby reduce violence outside licensed premises and reduce the numbers of A&E admissions. Addenbrookes already make use of this scheme as do many other hospitals, and it will be rolled out to other hospitals within the region over the coming years. Hinchingsbrooke do not currently make use of this scheme and it is a recognised information gap across the CSP partners. However its implementation has been included as part of the hospital's 'front-of-house' redesign project, and will be picked up over the coming months.

According to a September press release from Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, between August 2009 and July 2010, there were an estimated 136 inpatients with a primary diagnosis relating to alcohol, 453 with a secondary diagnosis, and a further 138 A&E attendances. The estimated costs are highlighted below:

Primary Diagnosis	Discharges / Attendances	Finance Estimate
Yes	136	£153,821
No	453	£730,010
<b>Total</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>£883,831</b>


<b>A&amp;E</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>£11,304</b>
----------------	------------	----------------

The 2006 National Treatment Agency's Models of Care for Alcohol Misusers (MoCAM) gives estimated percentages of the national population that are problem drinkers. We can reflect these numbers against mid-2009 population estimates to get an idea of the local picture. The following table breaks down the Cambridgeshire population accordingly. Figures are rounded to the nearest 100. The majority of drinkers are considered to be "low-risk", with only 4.6% having what is considered to be harmful drinking habits or worse. The Office for National Statistics indicates that 90% of adults (16+) do not experience problems with alcohol consumption.

	MoCAM %	Cambridgeshire	South Cambridgeshire
Non-drinkers	12	<b>72,100</b>	17,200
Low-risk drinkers	67.1	<b>403,100</b>	96,400
Hazardous drinkers	16.3	<b>97,900</b>	23,400
Harmful drinkers	4.1	<b>24,600</b>	5,900
Moderately dependent drinkers	0.4	<b>2,400</b>	600
Severely dependent drinkers	0.1	<b>600</b>	100

The ERPHO Health Profile for South Cambridgeshire<sup>11</sup> measures a variety of indicators around health, lifestyle, community living and others. It found that this district had a rate for binge drinking (over 6 units for women or 8 units for men on a single occasion in the last week) just below the national average. When looking at the number of hospital stays for alcohol-related harm, it recorded South Cambridgeshire as also being just above the national average, with 1,460 patients per 100,000 population in 2008/9. Information around alcohol-related harm is also gathered from the East of England Ambulance Trust and A&E departments in order to get as clear a picture as possible of residents misusing alcohol.

Criminal activity related to alcohol has decreased over recent years, as demonstrated in the charts below. Unfortunately data has not yet been released beyond 2007.



Data has recently become available regarding the types of ambulance call-outs made across Cambridgeshire since 2008, including a specific analysis of alcohol-related calls.

<sup>11</sup> [ERPHO Health Profiles](#)

## VICTIMS

### Victims Section – Summary

The main elements of victimisation can be summarised as:

- Emotional & physical impact on the victim;
- Likelihood of repeat victimisation;
- Risk / vulnerability of the victim.

Creating a model based around these factors identifies the following victim groups in South Cambridgeshire:

- Victims of domestic violence;
- Victims of anti-social behaviour / criminal damage.

A further scan of commercial victims identified the following victim groups:

- Farm premises

An analysis into incidents of domestic violence in the district found:

- There is a recorded reduction in the number of incidents for the first time in a number of years.
- The Histon and Impington ward has had the highest count of domestic violence over the past three years.
- It should be noted that the number of incidents recorded in Bourn ward have increased as the settlement of Cambourne has grown.

The main findings for ASB victims were:

- Generally the public perception of ASB in South Cambridgeshire is very low.
- The rate of ASB incidents is also relatively low compared to other districts.
- Survey evidence points to a very small group of people experiencing daily, repeat incidents of ASB
- Repeat locations of police ASB fall into three groupings one of which is residential locations

The main findings for Burglary victims were:

- Burglary has reduced over the last twelve months
- Despite this change the family group position over the last 12 months remains poor with South Cambridgeshire being the third worst within the family group.
- The majority of victims can from the Histon & Impington ward, followed by Bourn and Gamlingay.

An additional scan of commercial victims of crime identified:

- Typical victim groups were:
  - Farms (mainly the victims of theft)
  - Shop owners (mainly victims of shop lifting)
  - Service Stations (mainly the victims of fuel theft, driving off without paying)
- Between 2006/07 and 2009/10 offences committed on farms have increased by 53 (79%).

- Unlike other districts, licensed premises do not feature on the list, reflecting the very low level of violent crime in the district.

The main findings for 'hate crime' victims were:

- Hate crimes continue to be at a relatively low level. The main types of reported offences that occur in South Cambridgeshire are related to race.

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the partnership consider:

- The victims of domestic violence
- The victims of burglary (due to poor family group position)
- Business victims of crime:
  - Farms / Farmers (possibly to be addressed at County level)

## **Victims: Support and Protect**

The reason why the strategic assessment looks in detail at the victims of crime is that understanding how people become victims helps us to prevent crime and repeat victimisation happening in the future. There can also be particular focus on victim support. Not everyone has the same chance of being a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour. Some people are victims of the same offences over and over again. Victimisation is multi-dimensional. In order to summarise the main trends for the strategic assessment we have identified three factors to take into account, these are discussed below.

### **Cost to the victim**

A number of reports have attempted to spell out the costs of crime. Those with the most credence have been carried out by the Home Office in 2000<sup>12</sup> and 2005<sup>13</sup>. These reports concluded that:

- The most costly crimes are those with a large physical/emotional impact;
- Violent crime and the emotional and physical impacts of it accounted for the largest fraction of costs to the individual
- The current burden of crime to the individual in England & Wales was estimated to be £36.2bn in 2003/04.

Setting aside the material loss from offences such as burglary, gauging the emotional impact is considered much more important as this is the main impact we are seeking to avoid on the victim. These impacts can be considerable, especially for violence offences. The approach taken by the Home Office reports to measure this is to translate the health outcomes crime into estimated losses of Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs), and then into monetary terms.

In order to convert the QALY losses into monetary amounts they need to be mapped onto some monetary estimate of the value of a QALY. There are a variety of means of estimating such values. The method chosen by the Home Office is based on direct elicitation of money values for a relatively modest loss of health from a representative sample of the population. The value of a QALY was estimated (in 2003/04) at £81,000. Applying this figure to the estimate of QALY loss gives the monetary estimates of the emotional and physical impacts of violent crimes. Appendix 2 shows a model of the costs of crime developed by the Home Office.


### **Vulnerability of the Victim**

People have different levels of perception when asked about crime. Firstly there is the imbalance between perceived vulnerability and actual risk. For many years the British Crime Survey has shown that there are major differences between asking people to assess their risk of being a victim and the actual risk. People tend to overestimate how likely it is they will be a victim by a considerable margin (see the graph below)

---

<sup>12</sup> The Economic and the Social Costs of Crime, Home Office Research Study 217

<sup>13</sup> The Economic and the Social Costs of Crime against Individuals and Households 2003/04, Home Office Online Report 30/05



Different groups in the population worry about crime to different extents. Women are more concerned than men (particularly about violent crime), people in the 16-24 age group worry more and seem to understand the increased risk for their age group, people from ethnic minorities worry more as do people with disabilities.

There are also some key indicators of fear of crime; one is if someone has already been a victim and the second is their perception of their local area. People who have a very high perception of anti-social behaviour have a very high perception that they will be victims of a range of other offences<sup>14</sup>.

### Repeat Offences


Understanding repeat victimisation and taking action about it is not straight forward. There are a number of reasons for this<sup>15</sup>:

- Although repeat rates are higher than expected; for things like burglary they still represent a minority of all cases;
- Calculating repeat rates are not straight forward;
- Repeat events are dealt with by different individuals;
- Our systems are not good at identifying repeats;
- Talking about repeat victimisation is perceived to increase the fear of crime (people like the truth to be comforting) and brings the expectation that it will be dealt with;
- Those repeatedly victimised may be from groups unlikely to report incidents;
- There is a preference for targeting repeat areas or 'hotspots' rather than working with individuals.

The following graph shows the repeat victimisation rates for major crime types as recorded by the British Crime Survey 2009/10. As you can see, some offences such as domestic violence have a much high repeat rate compared to things such as theft from the person.

<sup>14</sup> See *British Crime Survey, Table 5.08, 2009/10*

<sup>15</sup> *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten, Repeat Victimisation and Its Implication for Crime Prevention*, Farrell & Pease, 1993, Police Research Group, Crime Prevention Series Number 46.



(British Crime Survey, 2009/10)

It should also be noted that as well as varying between offences, the repeat rate also varies over time with some research showing higher repeat rates in the first month following an offence compared to six months later<sup>16</sup>.

### Translating the model to South Cambridgeshire

In order to make these concepts useful for the strategic assessment and the partnership we needed to synthesise these concepts down into a single picture of victimisation. In order to do this we took the following steps:

1. Identify a key group of offences (mainly ones that have featured as priorities in the past)
2. Gather information on the cost / repeat victimisation rate / offence rate in South Cambridgeshire (as a proxy for risk<sup>17</sup>)
3. Show this information graphically.

The result is the graph shown overleaf. It provides some very interesting pointers to the victim groups of most concern:


- Victims of domestic violence: high cost, high repeat rate, high incident rate
- Victims of ASB / Criminal damage: low cost, high repeat rate, high incident rate
- Victims of all violence: high cost, low repeat rate, high incident rate

For the remainder of the 'Victims' section we will focus on the first two of these groups. We will also look at the victims of burglary as this is of concern at a County Level (national indicator 16) and do a separate scan for the commercial victims of crime and the victims of hate crime which do not fit into the model.

<sup>16</sup> Once Bitten, Twice Bitten, Repeat Victimisation and Its Implication for Crime Prevention, Farrell & Pease, 1993, Police Research Group, Crime Prevention Series Number 46.

<sup>17</sup> If time allowed a more robust model would to weight the rates by the population characteristics of the district e.g. proportion of population in vulnerable groups.

### Assessment of the serious of offences committed against victims



## Victims of Domestic Violence

### Introduction


For the last Strategic Assessment we reported that South Cambridgeshire had seen a 37% increase in the number of police recorded domestic violence incidents (a total of 1,350).

In 2007 the Research Group<sup>18</sup> reported that an estimated 5,800 females<sup>19</sup> were victims of partner 'threat or force' in *Cambridgeshire* in any one year (based on the findings of the British Crime Survey). Excluding the most serious cases it is estimated that these victims experienced 22,400 'threat or force' incidents each year. The report also identified that a small number of victims would experience a high degree of abuse on an almost daily basis. In addition, it suggested there is a significant gap between the number of people coming to the attention of the agencies each year (an estimated 1560) and the number of people estimated to be victims.

Since this report considerable effort has been put into establishing new services for people who are victims of domestic violence. We have worked at encouraging reporting of incidents and engagement with services, and have set up Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) to deal with the most serious cases.

### Number of Incidents Reported to the Police

The number of domestic violence incidents reported to the police in recent years are shown in the graph below. There has been a slight increase in the last 12 months.



For the first time in a number of years the Strategic Assessment reports a reduction in the number of incidents recorded in South Cambridgeshire compared to the year

<sup>18</sup> An Analysis of Domestic Violence using a Range of Partnership Data to Support the Establishment of a 'Domestic Abuse Centre' for Cambridgeshire, Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group, Soper & Roberts 2007.

<sup>19</sup> Male victims were also measured in the report but there is considerable doubt about the validity of estimates of male victims of domestic violence derived from the BCS.

before. Other districts in the County have also shown a similar pattern with the incident rate either slowed in terms of increase or actually reduced.

**Police-recorded domestic violence incidents in Cambridgeshire:**


	Cambridge District (B)	East Cambridgeshire District	Fenland District	Huntingdonshire District	South Cambridgeshire District
Count of DV incidents Sept08-Aug 09	1691	697	1635	2111	<b>1350</b>
Count of DV incidents Sept09-Aug 10	1771	734	1625	1898	<b>1230</b>
<b>Change</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>-213</b>	<b>-120</b>
Rate of DV incidents Sept08-Aug 09	14.7	8.9	17.9	13.0	<b>9.6</b>
Rate of DV incidents Sept09-Aug 10	14.9	9.1	17.4	11.5	<b>8.6</b>
Change	0.2	0.2	-0.5	-1.5	<b>-1.0</b>

There are a number of possible explanations for this trend:

1. Recording / measuring problems (although no new difficulties have been identified).
2. Improvement in the economic situation since the sharp economic downturn some 18 months ago.
3. Reaching near the saturation point of the numbers of victims who are willing to engage with services or who have engaged with services in the past.

It is the last of these points that is of most interest. We have been working for a number of years to improve reporting. From data provided by the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service (IDVAS) we know that although 482 cases were referred to the service between April 2010 and September 2010 only 49% of the victims (236) actually engaged with the service after being offered help. Of those who engaged with the service approximately half had used the service before (were repeat clients) so only 110 new clients were picked up out of 482 cases.

***Referrals to the IDVAS Service, April – Sept 2010, showing gap in engagement***



Overall we are left with an idea where we have reached a point where engagement can not be extended any further or moving back a stage, more incidents identified without additional work on highly specialist outreach services with groups that we know are more difficult to engage with and get incidents reported from such as more recent migrants from Eastern European countries.

### Crimes with a Domestic Violence Marker

For the time periods Sept 2007 to Aug 2008 there were **118** crimes, and for Sept 2008 to Aug 2009 there were **177** crimes, identified that had occurred in South Cambridgeshire that had involved either partners or ex-partners. The vast majority of these were either violent offences or criminal damage. For the most recent comparable twelve month period there were **206** offences identified. Set against a backdrop of a falling number of incidents it suggests we are dealing with DV crime more effectively.

### The location of domestic violence in South Cambridgeshire

Over the last three years the ward with the highest count of domestic violence crimes have been consistent this is:

- Histon & Impington

Although it should be noted that the number of incidents recorded in Bourn ward have increased as the settlement of Cambourne has grown.

### Work of the IDVAS Service

One of the noticeable elements of domestic violence is the large number of different agencies that are involved in dealing with the most serious cases. The table below shows the number of referrals to the IDVAS service over the last few quarters. Over the most recent time period there were 135 referrals made for cases from South Cambridgeshire.

<b>CSP</b>	<b>2009-10 Q1</b>	<b>2009-10 Q2</b>	<b>2009-10 Q3</b>	<b>2009-10 Q4</b>	<b>Total 2009/10</b>	<b>2010-11 Q1</b>	<b>12 month total</b>	<b>12 month Rate per 1000</b>
Cambridge City	68	86	80	58	<b>292</b>	79	303	2.5
East Cambridgeshire	35	30	26	21	112	23	100	1.2
Fenland	58	50	54	50	<b>212</b>	38	192	2.1
Huntingdonshire	59	51	52	71	233	95	269	1.6
South Cambridgeshire	34	30	31	41	<b>136</b>	33	135	0.9
<i>Cambridgeshire</i>	<b>254</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>999</b>	<b>1.7</b>

## Victims of Anti-Social Behaviour

### Introduction

The main introduction to this chapter mentioned that people's experience of anti-social behaviour (ASB) really does cloud their view of their local area and their perceived likelihood of being a victim of crime<sup>20</sup>. The main victim chart also helped identify the key problems with anti-social behaviour; although each incident is relatively minor it is the cumulative impact of those incidents on a repeat victim / community that can be so damaging.

### Perception of Repeat Victimization

There are a number of different ways to measure repeat victimisation. Within our Strategic Assessment survey we asked people how often they have been the victim of ASB. **[Authors note: Paper responses are still coming in for this survey, so results may change accordingly]**

As part of the Strategic Assessment, it is useful to collect the public's perception of their communities. Typically, this would have been done by analysing the nationally coordinated Place Survey, which contacts a certain number of people in each district asking their opinion on a variety of issues, including some around anti-social behaviour. Since this survey has now been disbanded, it was agreed that the districts would carry out an independent survey, the fully results of which are outlined in Appendix A. One of the questions revolved around ASB impact. The chart below outlines one general perception:

#### *HOW OFTEN DOES ASB AFFECT YOU?*

<i>Every day:</i>	22	3.5%
<i>Several times a week:</i>	58	9.2%
<i>Once or twice a month:</i>	135	21.4%
<b><i>Rarely:</i></b>	<b>326</b>	<b>51.7%</b>
<i>Never/ No opinion:</i>	90	14.3%


It should be noted that the sample in this case was scientific due to the high number of responses received, (631). There were a small number of people from South Cambridgeshire who identified that ASB affected them everyday (22). There were also a larger group of people (58) who said that ASB affected them several days a week.

People were also asked what the ASB issues of most concern were and whilst none were raised as being highly significant issues, 'vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles' and the 'antisocial use of vehicles (incl. motorbikes), e.g. illegal parking or speeding' were noted as being of most concern.

---

<sup>20</sup> British Crime Survey 2009/10, the Home Office.


Generally the public perception of ASB in South Cambridgeshire is very low. The graph below shows the results of the latest police confidence survey.



Over a period of a rolling twelve months South Cambridgeshire had the lowest percentage of people who had a very high perception of ASB. This relatively low perception of ASB has persisted for most of 2010. Overall these results are reflected in the 2007 Place Survey which also identified that the perception of ASB was very low in the district<sup>21</sup>. This view needs to be balanced with the extent to which ASB features within the neighbourhood priorities in South Cambridgeshire.

### Repeat Locations of ASB

We also examined the repeat locations of ASB within the district using the police recorded incidents. Repeat locations ranged from 551 different places that had two incidents to 1 place that had 54 incidents. The distributions of repeat incidents of ASB are shown below:




<sup>21</sup> South Cambridgeshire Strategic Assessment 2009

An examination of the repeat places throws up two different types of repeat place:

- Repeat, facility/building
- Repeat locations for youth / vehicle related nuisance

Below is a map showing the distribution of top twenty repeat locations for incidents of ASB.



## Victims of Burglary

### Introduction


During the most recent 12 month period (Sept 2009 to August 2010) there were 487 dwelling burglary victims in South Cambridgeshire. These victims can be segmented by where they come from and who they are. The location information with the 'Place' section of the strategic assessment identified that the following wards were of concern with regard to the volume of dwelling burglary:

- Histon & Impington (41)
- Bourn (33)
- Gamlingay (28)
- Cottenham (23)
- Papworth & Elsworth (26)

Together these wards account for 151 (31%) of all burglary in South Cambridgeshire. Beyond the geographical profiling there are two ways of profiling the victims of dwelling burglary. The first way is to use the information recorded about the victim by the police when the offence was reported. The second way is to use the postcode of the victims to sort them into groups according to the MOSAIC household classification.

### Profile of victims using police recorded data

Looking at the age profile for victims (see below) the largest group of people reporting that they have been burgled falls within the 31-40 age range. This is consistent with the MOSAIC analysis shown later in this section. Of some interest is the 11% of victims aged over 70 years.




**Count and % of Distraction Burglary, Sept 2009 to Aug 2010**

Offence	Cambridge District (B)	East Cambridgeshire District	Fenland District	Huntingdonshire District	South Cambridgeshire District
Burglary in a Dwelling	893	197	303	377	472
Distraction Burglaries	10	11	15	13	15
% distraction burglaries	1.1%	5.6%	5.0%	3.4%	3.2%
Rate of distraction burglaries Per 1000 people aged 65+	0.71	0.80	0.83	0.54	0.65


Looking at the incidence of distraction burglary compared to all burglaries there does not appear to be a notable incidence compared to other districts in Cambridgeshire.

**Long term trend of Burglary (CADET, Police Monitoring System Sept 2010)**



The long term trend for burglary is down with a -12.7% (-71) reduction in Burglary Dwelling, from 561 offences to 490. Despite this change the family group position over the last 12 months remains poor with South Cambridgeshire being the third worst within the family group.

**iQuanta Barchart MSG - Crimes per 1000 Households  
Cambridgeshire - South Cambridgeshire CDRP  
Domestic Burglary  
01 Sep 2009 - 31 Aug 2010**




**Profile of victims using MOSAIC combined with police recorded data**

MOSAIC is a household labelling tool that enables us to apply broad descriptions to each household based on a range of social and financial data.

Profiling all the victims of burglary using MOSAIC produces the following victim profile. From this it is clear that some groups of the population are represented more often than others as victims of burglary. The immediate cause for this is the general profile of households in East Cambridgeshire although knowing precisely who the victims are and what they are like does help to shape initiatives aimed at improving home security.

**Burglary Victims in South Cambridgeshire (12 month sample) by 2009 MOSAIC code**




**The two main victim groups for burglary in East Cambridgeshire**

**Successful professionals living in suburban or semi-rural houses. Types 13, 14, 15, 16. Total of 189 victims.**



- Key Features**
- Suburban or semi-rural
  - Executive and managers
  - Small businesses
  - Senior positions
  - Significant equity
  - Married with children
  - Comfortable
  - Good education
  - Theatre / arts
  - Car ownership

**Families with young children living in modern homes. Types F22, 23, 24. Total of 80 victims.**



- Key Features**
- Families
  - Young children
  - Good incomes
  - Comfortable homes
  - Home life balance
  - Ethical products
  - Consumer credit
  - Reliant on cars
  - Internet and telephone banking

## Commercial Victims of Crime

### Scanning

In order to identify the priority order of business victims of crime, various methodologies were tried. In the end we decided to use the simplest method available. The police have recorded the location type of each crime so we used a subset of this information to count how many offences had occurred over the previous 12 months at either a commercial or agricultural location. One draw-back to this approach is that it would not identify crimes that affected businesses committed away from business locations e.g. theft in transit of goods. However none of the other possible methods covered this satisfactorily either. Another draw back is that some crimes which are identified would not necessarily be committed against the business e.g. a purse theft at a large supermarket or an assault at a licensed club.

### *The top five for Crime Committed at Commercial / Agricultural Locations Sept 2009 to Aug 2010 in South Cambridgeshire*


Location Type	Location Sub-Type	Number of offences (Sept 09 to Aug 10)	As a % of all offences committed at commercial premises.
AGRICULTURAL	FARM	120	13%
COMMERCIAL	SUPERMARKET	100	11%
COMMERCIAL	SHOP	95	10%
COMMERCIAL	SERVICE STATION	92	10%
COMMERCIAL	OTHER	89	9%

The table above shows that the main commercial locations for crime are farms; we will consider this issue in more detail on the following pages. Supermarkets and shops are the next highest locations; the vast majority of these offences are 'theft from shops' often known as shop lifting. The fourth highest offence location was service stations, South Cambridgeshire has at least two serving major transport routes, the A11 and the M11/A14. It is noticeable that licensed premises do not feature on the list, reflecting the very low level of violent crime in the district.

### Crime committed on Farms

The initial scan identified that farms were top of the businesses locations for crime. Looking back over the past few years the trend has been for a general increase in farm crime in the County and especially in South Cambridgeshire. Between 2006/07 and 2009/10 offences committed on farms have increased by 53 (79%).

Crimes committed at a Farm Locus	Strategic Assessment Year			
	2006/07*	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
East Cambridgeshire	78	79	93	78
Fenland	53	77	95	92
Huntingdonshire	85	90	94	116
South Cambridgeshire	67	75	110	120
<b>Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>406</b>
* Year of 40 arsons				




**A scan of the offences committed on farms over the last twelve months**

Offence	Count	%
All Violence	1	1%
Burglary (shed/garage/other)	32	27%
Criminal Damage	22	18%
Theft	45	38%
Other	7	6%
Theft from a motor vehicle/tractor	7	6%
Theft of motor vehicle / Tractor	6	5%
	120	-

A scan of offences identifies that the main ones committed at farms fall into two categories; general theft and burglary of outbuildings. Of the items stolen, it is clear that the purpose is for economic gain, with metal and fuel thefts making up 49% of what is stolen. There are a few farms that have been repeat victims but the offences are widely scattered suggesting a mobile group of offenders.

**Items stolen from South Cambridgeshire Farms, Sept 2009 to August 2010**


Stolen Property	Count of things stolen	% things stolen
Caravan	2	2%
Diesel	16	17%
Livestock / produce / hay	5	5%
Machinery	3	3%
Metal / batteries	26	28%
Misc	27	29%
Tack	0	0%
Tools	1	1%
Tractor	5	5%
Trailer	6	6%
Vehicle	3	3%



## Victims of Hate Crime

Below is the trend for all racially aggravated crime in South Cambridgeshire at present the trend is as it has been for a number of years. Very low numbers of offences are reported and there is only a very slight upward trend.

### Trend in all racially aggravated crime in South Cambridgeshire



Below is a summary of the incidence of all hate crime including racially motivated offences and offences committed against other minority groups for reasons of sexuality, faith or disability.

The main types of reported offences that occur in South Cambridgeshire are related to race.

Hate Type	Cambridge District (B)	East Cambridgeshire District	Fenland District	Huntingdonshire District	South Cambridgeshire District	Total
Disability	1	0	1	2	0	4
Faith	6	0	2	1	2	11
Gender	1	1	0	0	0	2
Race	87	11	31	56	27	212
Refugee	1	0	0	1	0	2
Sexual Orientation	13	1	4	6	1	25
Transgender	3	1	0	0	3	7
Traveller	0	1	1	0	1	3
Total	112	15	39	66	34	266
Rate per 1000 Pop	0.95	0.19	0.42	0.40	0.24	0.45

## **PLACES**

### **Summary**

#### **Theft from Motor Vehicles**

District-wide, the overall numbers of vehicle crimes have fallen. With regards to thefts from motor vehicles:

- Cambourne, whilst noting only minor fluctuations in crime levels overall, has seen the number of thefts from motor vehicles more than double in 2009/10 as compared to the previous year (rising from 20 to 43 crimes).
- There appear to be no common themes to the locations for fuel thefts
- When mapping those recorded in lay-bys, only one principal cluster for offences in South Cambridgeshire is identified – the A14 truck route north of the Girton interchange, and northwest of the city of Cambridge.
- There are some small clusters of lay-by offences in areas to the north of the city of Cambridge at Histon and Horningsea (2 offences each) and Barrington (2 offences) to the south-west of the city.

#### **Criminal Damage**

In the past twelve months the number of criminal damage offences recorded in South Cambridgeshire have decreased from 1,375 (Sept 08 to Aug 09) to 1,054 (Sept 09 to Aug 10). However criminal damage remains a high volume offence that is experienced by many people.

The following locations:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge (Milton / Histon)
- Cambourne
- Sawston
- Cottenham

#### **Arson**

The arson overview below picks up the following:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge
- Cambourne
- Sawston
- Some places are known locations for fly-tipping

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the partnership considers:

- Crime in Cambourne with a view to understanding how to prevent the development of offending in new communities
- Crime on the fringes of Cambridge, including Histon & Impington, and working jointly with the Cambridge City partnership on shared issues such as dwelling burglary.

## Place: Manage and Protect

### **Introduction**

The geographical distribution of crime is uneven. More crime occurs in some places than others and different crimes occur in different places. As a result, by examining the “place” element of offending we can identify commonalities between offence and location. That said there is the potential for crime everywhere, therefore within this selection we have needed to be selective about which places we have considered.

### **Place Scanning**

The questions we have asked ourselves are:

- Which places in South Cambridgeshire have the highest *volumes* of crime?
- Which places in South Cambridgeshire have the highest *rate* of crime?
- Are there any settlements that have a relatively high rate or volume of crime?
- Are there any geographical factors that are unique to South Cambridgeshire compared to elsewhere?
- Are there any factors in addition to crime that we need to consider the ‘place’ element of?

### **Approach**

The approach to considering the volume of crime recorded in each of these settlements might be to attempt to exactly define the town or village bounds or limits on a map, in other words the degree to which inhabited dwellings extend from a central or focal village or town centre point.

In some cases this might be easy since the boundaries or limits of a single district council ward might already cover these bounds or limits. However it is noticeable in the area covered by South Cambridgeshire District Council that the bounds or limits for wards that include larger settlements also reach out into surrounding rural areas.

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGE DISTRICT 2009-10**  
**RECORDED CRIME BY VOLUME**

Households 2009	Population 2009	District Ward	SERIOUS ACQUISITIVE CRIME (SAC)			VIOLENT CRIME (VC)			OTHER ACQUISITIVE CRIME						TOTAL RECORDED CRIME	CRIME OTHER	FRAUD AND FORGERY	DRUG OFFENCES	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	THEFT OTHER	CYCLE THEFT	BURGLARY OTHER	RETAIL THEFT	THEFT OTHER	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	DRUG OFFENCES	FRAUD AND FORGERY	CRIME OTHER	TOTAL RECORDED CRIME	Pct
			BURGLARY DWELLING	THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	ROBBERY	SAC/VC*	MOST SERIOUS VIOLENCE	ASSAULTS WITH SERIOUS INJURY	ALL OTHER VIOLENCE AGAINST PERSON	SEXUAL OFFENCES	BURGLARY OTHER	RETAIL THEFT	CYCLE THEFT																
1,880	4,650	Balsham	10	1	18	1	5	5	5	18	1	25	11	8	7	1	110	1.9%												
2,190	5,110	Bar Hill	19	5	38	3	6	20	1	20	1	39	35	3	30	1	240	4.1%												
1,080	2,400	Barton	18	2	10	1	8	8	5	20	2	26	15	3	2	2	125	2.1%												
1,900	5,250	Bassingbourn	13	7	11	4	40	37	8	20	6	26	30	10	4	2	215	3.6%												
3,750	8,570	Bourn	42	7	46	1	30	37	5	38	11	60	92	10	13	5	410	6.9%												
930	2,500	Caldecote	3	1	4	1	6	3	5	10	2	21	18	9	9	1	84	1.4%												
970	2,340	Comberton	8	1	4	4	4	6	1	11	4	13	1	2	2	55	0.9%													
3,280	7,940	Cottenham	29	3	23	2	28	23	1	39	2	52	73	9	3	2	302	5.1%												
1,100	2,640	Duxford	6	4	18	4	4	4	2	5	1	17	42	4	1	1	109	1.8%												
980	2,500	Fowlmere and Foxton	8	2	8	2	9	1	1	16	1	11	8	2	2	2	68	1.2%												
1,970	4,450	Fulbourn	24	5	28	1	17	31	2	20	7	32	41	8	2	3	231	3.9%												
2,080	4,980	Gamlingay	17	6	36	1	14	12	1	40	13	44	68	5	4	3	275	4.7%												
1,750	4,240	Glinton	14	4	10	4	6	6	1	12	10	17	30	7	7	1	117	2.0%												
1,040	2,710	Hardwick	15	3	7	1	1	8	1	11	2	9	5	1	3	1	67	1.1%												
990	2,410	Harston and Hauxton	13	15	13	5	9	9	3	16	1	24	14	2	4	1	101	1.7%												
1,160	2,720	Hasingfield and The Everdens	11	2	9	1	1	3	3	9	1	10	7	2	1	1	56	0.9%												
4,100	9,620	Histon and Impington	47	9	48	2	37	42	7	31	7	46	71	14	17	6	509	8.6%												
1,990	4,720	Linton	6	4	12	7	7	5	4	16	1	3	28	10	6	2	143	2.4%												
1,140	2,470	Longstanton	6	1	9	1	21	8	2	16	2	13	18	3	3	2	101	1.7%												
2,340	5,500	Melbourn	18	6	14	5	7	5	1	17	5	21	42	3	7	1	158	2.7%												
1,040	2,600	Meldreth	5	1	6	2	7	8	2	10	7	12	27	4	2	1	94	1.6%												
1,870	4,290	Milton	11	11	27	1	28	28	2	20	6	22	82	6	14	2	324	5.5%												
970	2,230	Orwell and Barrington	5	17	17	3	3	3	1	6	1	7	7	1	2	1	53	0.9%												
2,030	4,820	Papworth and Elsworth	23	6	16	1	4	16	1	31	4	41	34	2	3	3	182	3.1%												
3,030	7,100	Sawston	17	7	20	3	24	43	5	21	1	19	72	42	2	4	319	5.4%												
1,010	2,610	Swavesey	5	1	13	3	7	11	4	12	5	15	12	3	3	4	92	1.6%												
1,280	2,660	Teversham	28	2	17	2	3	11	4	10	14	13	26	3	1	2	132	2.2%												
990	2,280	The Abingtons	14	4	14	4	4	6	2	19	4	16	13	14	14	2	130	2.2%												
990	2,410	The Mordens	7	2	17	3	3	5	1	23	3	16	10	1	3	1	88	1.5%												
3,150	7,020	The Shelfords and Stapleford	31	4	24	1	8	13	4	30	5	23	29	21	4	4	209	3.5%												
1,210	2,730	The Wilbrahams	18	8	21	11	11	8	2	19	2	19	24	5	6	5	143	2.4%												
2,330	5,610	Waterbeach	25	14	34	4	12	24	4	25	7	15	47	5	8	5	288	4.9%												
1,140	2,600	Whittesford	10	1	18	2	2	3	3	9	2	4	11	14	9	2	92	1.6%												
2,820	6,870	Willingham and Over	25	13	39	3	15	13	4	31	7	47	69	8	5	1	287	4.9%												
60,480	143,550	TOTALS	551	147	649	24	45	376	473	651	104	246	908	1,189	216	198	5,909	100.0%												

Key   > = 100   > = 50

**Notes**

- The definition for **SERIOUS ACQUISITIVE CRIME** includes Burglary Dwelling, All Vehicle Crime (Theft Of and From) and All Robbery Offences.
- The definition for **VIOLENT CRIME** includes ALL Robbery Offences, ALL Sexual Offences and ALL Violence Against Person (VAP), to include all incidents both Most Serious and less Serious involving Injury, and all other VAP incidents. Police recorded crime is in a state of constant flux as some recorded incidents are later shown to be 'No Crime' committed. For this reason there may be slight variations between totals in this table and latest recorded police statistics.
- District wards where the count of recorded crime is between 50 and 100 recorded offences in the entire period are shaded yellow, district wards where count is 100 recorded offences or more are shaded red.

**South Cambridgeshire Recorded Crime by District Council Ward and Crime Banding 2009-10**

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT 2009-10**  
**RECORDED CRIME PER THOUSAND HOUSEHOLDS (PTTH) / PER THOUSAND PERSONS (PTP)**

Households 2009	Population 2009	District Ward	VIOLENT CRIME (VC)										OTHER ACQUISITIVE CRIME									
			PTTH	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTTH	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP	PTP
			BURGLARY DWELLING	THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE	THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	ROBBERY	MOST SERIOUS VIOLENCE	ASSAULTS WITH LESS SERIOUS INJURY	ALL OTHER VIOLENCE AGAINST PERSON	SEXUAL OFFENCES	BURGLARY OTHER	RETAIL THEFT	CYCLE THEFT	THEFT OTHER	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	DRUG OFFENCES	FRAUD AND FORGERY	CRIME OTHER	TOTALS			
1,880	4,650	Balslham	5.3	0.2	3.9	0.6	0.2	1.1	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.7	1.5	0.2	23.7			
2,190	5,110	Bar Hill	8.2	1.0	7.4	0.6	1.2	3.9	0.2	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.2	47.0			
1,080	2,400	Barton	17.6	0.8	4.2	0.4	2.5	3.3	2.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.3	0.8	0.8	52.1			
1,900	5,250	Bassingbourn	6.8	1.3	2.1	0.1	0.8	7.6	7.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.9	0.8	0.4	41.0			
3,750	8,570	Bourn	11.2	0.8	5.4	0.4	3.5	4.3	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.2	1.5	0.6	47.8			
930	2,500	Caldecote	3.2	0.4	1.6	0.4	2.4	1.2	2.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	33.6			
970	2,340	Comberton	8.2	0.4	1.7	0.4	1.7	2.6	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	33.5			
3,280	7,940	Cottenham	8.8	0.4	2.9	0.3	3.5	2.9	0.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1	0.4	0.4	38.0			
1,100	2,640	Duxford	5.5	1.5	6.8	0.8	1.5	1.5	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.5	0.4	0.4	41.3			
980	2,500	Fowlmere and Foxton	8.2	0.8	3.2	0.2	0.8	3.6	0.4	16.3	16.3	16.3	16.3	16.3	16.3	3.2	0.4	0.8	27.2			
1,970	4,450	Fulbourn	12.2	1.1	6.3	0.2	3.8	7.0	0.4	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	1.8	0.4	0.7	51.9			
2,080	4,980	Gamlingay	8.2	1.2	7.2	0.2	2.8	2.4	0.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	1.0	0.8	0.6	55.2			
1,750	4,240	Girton	8.0	0.9	2.4	0.4	0.9	1.4	0.2	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	0.5	1.7	0.4	27.6			
1,040	2,710	Hardwick	14.4	1.1	2.6	0.4	0.4	3.0	0.2	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	0.4	1.1	0.4	24.7			
990	2,410	Harston and Hauton	13.1	0.7	3.3	0.4	2.1	3.7	0.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	0.4	1.1	0.4	24.7			
1,160	2,720	Haslingfield and The Eversdens	9.5	0.9	5.0	0.2	0.4	1.1	0.7	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	2.6	0.7	0.4	20.6			
4,100	9,620	Histon and Impington	11.5	0.8	2.5	0.2	1.5	1.1	0.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	1.5	1.8	0.6	52.9			
1,990	4,720	Linton	3.0	0.8	2.5	0.1	1.5	1.1	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	2.1	1.3	0.4	30.3			
1,140	2,470	Longstanton	5.3	0.4	3.6	0.4	8.5	3.2	0.8	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	0.8	1.2	0.8	40.9			
2,340	5,500	Melbourn	7.7	1.1	2.5	0.8	1.3	0.9	0.2	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3	0.5	1.3	0.8	28.7			
1,040	2,600	Meldreth	4.8	0.4	2.3	0.4	2.7	3.1	0.8	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	1.5	0.8	0.4	36.2			
1,870	4,290	Milton	5.9	2.6	6.3	0.2	1.6	6.5	6.5	0.5	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	1.4	3.3	0.5	75.5			
970	2,230	Orwell and Barrington	5.2	0.7	7.6	0.6	1.3	1.3	0.4	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	0.4	0.9	0.5	23.8			
2,030	4,820	Papworth and Elsworth	11.3	1.2	3.3	0.2	0.8	3.3	0.2	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.3	0.4	0.6	0.6	37.8			
3,030	7,100	Sawston	5.6	1.0	2.8	0.4	3.4	6.1	0.7	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	5.9	0.3	0.6	44.9			
1,010	2,610	Swavesey	5.0	0.4	5.0	0.4	1.1	4.2	1.5	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9	1.1	1.1	0.6	35.2			
1,280	2,660	Teversham	21.9	0.8	6.4	0.8	1.1	4.1	1.1	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	1.1	0.4	0.8	49.6			
990	2,280	The Abingtons	14.1	1.8	6.1	0.8	1.8	2.6	0.9	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	1.8	6.1	0.9	57.0			
990	2,410	The Mordens	7.1	0.8	7.1	0.1	1.2	2.1	0.6	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	0.4	1.2	0.4	36.5			
3,150	7,020	The Shelfords and Stapleford	9.8	0.6	3.4	0.1	0.3	1.1	1.9	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	3.0	0.6	0.4	29.8			
1,210	2,730	The Wilbrahams	14.9	2.9	7.7	0.7	4.0	2.9	0.7	15.7	15.7	15.7	15.7	15.7	15.7	2.2	2.2	0.9	52.4			
2,330	5,610	Waterbeach	10.7	2.5	6.1	0.7	2.1	4.3	0.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	0.9	1.4	0.9	51.3			
1,140	2,600	Whittlesford	8.8	0.4	6.9	0.4	0.8	1.2	0.8	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	2.7	5.4	3.5	35.4			
2,820	6,870	Willingham and Over	8.9	1.9	5.7	0.4	0.1	2.2	1.9	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	1.2	0.7	0.1	41.8			
60,480	143,550	TOTALS	9.1	1.0	4.5	0.2	0.3	2.6	3.3	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8	1.5	1.4	0.4	41.2			

Key   PTH/PTP +100%   PTH/PTP +50%

Notes

- The definition for **SERIOUS ACQUISITIVE CRIME** includes Burglary Dwelling, All Vehicle Crime (Theft Of and From) and All Robbery Offences.
- The definition for **VIOLENT CRIME** includes ALL Robbery Offences, ALL Sexual Offences and ALL Violence Against Person (VAP), to include all incidents both Most Serious and less Serious involving Injury, and all other VAP incidents.
- Rate of crime for all crimes types, including Totals, but excluding Burglary Dwelling and Burglary Other, are calculated Per Thousand Population (PTP); the latter are calculated Per Thousand Households (PTTH). District wards where the rate of crime (PTTH/PTP) is between 50% and 100% greater than the average for the entire district are shaded yellow; district wards where rate of crime is over 100% greater than average are shaded red.

**South Cambridgeshire Recorded Crime by District Council Ward and Crime Banding 2009-10**

### Cambourne – All Crime

- a) Cambourne is a recent residential development in South Cambridgeshire. Is there anything happening here in recorded crime?
- b) Is there any justification, looking at any of the principal trunk routes in South Cambridgeshire (to include the M11, A11, A14) and respective service stations and lay-bys to support an issue or problems in fuel theft or thefts from lorries?
- c) The number of Sexual Assaults recorded in South Cambridgeshire appears to be increasing year by year over the past 4 years. Is there an apparent reason for this?

### **Recorded Crime in Cambourne**

Cambourne lies to the far west of the South Cambridgeshire district, in the ward of Bourn. Cambourne is the principal development in the ward that also includes the villages of Bourn, Caxton, Croxton and Eltisley. According to the Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group the 2009 estimate for the number of dwellings in this district ward numbered 3,750 and the population numbered 8,570. At 2.29 residents per household, this is slightly less than the average number of residents per household for this district council area at 2.37.


During the financial year 2009-10 the number of crimes recorded in Bourn ward amounted to 6.9% (or 410) of the total crimes recorded for the entire district. This was second only to Histon and Impington ward, which accounted for 8.6% (or 509) of total crimes. These wards have the largest populations in South Cambridgeshire.

Particularly high levels of Serious Acquisitive crime were recorded in Bourn ward during the financial year 2009-10 from Dwelling Burglary (42) to Thefts (60) and also Thefts from Motor Vehicles (46). The volume of recorded Criminal Damage was also high (92).

However when the recorded volume of crime per thousand population (PTP) in Bourn ward is compared to all other district wards in South Cambridgeshire the ward stands in only 11<sup>th</sup> position with 109.3 recorded crimes PTP while Milton ward stands out with the highest rate of 173.3 PTP.

In Cambourne itself Cambridgeshire Constabulary recorded **555** crimes during the two year period Apr 2008 to March 2010. The chart shows some of the peak volumes of recorded crime in Cambourne during that period. Total crime recorded was at its highest during the nine month period Apr to Dec 2009 before returning to volumes experienced during 2008.

Notably, in the two most recent quarterly periods Serious Acquisitive Crimes were at their highest recorded levels in any period. These are driven by Thefts from Motor Vehicles, which numbered **17** in each period. More dwelling burglaries were recorded in villages elsewhere in Bourne ward (40) than in Cambourne (33) during the two year period.



**Cambourne - Summary of Recorded Crime by Quarter - 2009-10**

**CAMBOURNE RECORDED CRIME 2008-10**

CRIME TYPE	Q1 2008-09	Q2 2008-09	Q3 2008-09	Q4 2008-09	Q1 2009-10	Q2 2009-10	Q3 2009-10	Q4 2009-10	TOTALS
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	4	9	4	3	6		17	17	60
BURGLARY DWELLING	3	5	4	4	8	3	4	2	33
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE		2	2			4			8
ROBBERY		1	1				1		3
THEFT OTHER	14	10	15	10	11	16	13	5	94
BURGLARY OTHER	6	4	5	1	6	5	3	6	36
RETAIL THEFT	4	1	1	7	4	2	2	2	23
CYCLE THEFT	1	2		3	3	2	2	1	14
ASSAULTS WITH LESS SERIOUS INJUF	8	4	8	4	8	9	8	7	56
MORE SERIOUS VIOLENT CRIME	5	6	5	4	10	6	5	8	49
SEXUAL OFFENCES	1	1				4		1	7
CRIMINAL DAMAGE	13	18	15	21	18	23	18	10	136
DRUG OFFENCES		1	2		1	1	4	1	10
FRAUD AND FORGERY	2	2	1	3	3	3	2	2	18
CRIME OTHER	2	2			2	2			8
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>555</b>


**Cambourne - Summary of Recorded Crime by Quarter - 2009-10**

## Fuel Thefts and Lay-By Thefts in South Cambridgeshire

This issue primarily concerns business crime and the tactical awareness and intelligence required by police forces in order to subvert or overturn potentially lucrative thefts from some of the numerous large transport operations undertaken daily across the county.

It does not necessarily directly affect communities living within the county. In many cases Cambridgeshire is only a single point in a longer journey, where the county is simply the most convenient or direct route to other destinations.

Therefore whilst considering this issue, which in itself is serious, the potential cost to the county as a whole should not be overlooked. Here is a map that displays the principal trunk routes for South Cambridgeshire whilst also including its border with Huntingdonshire.



South Cambridgeshire district has a number of major trunk route interchanges that surround the city of Cambridge. These are marked on the mapping as follows:-

**CG – Caxton Gibbet**  
**DX – Duxford**  
**FW – Four Wentways**  
**GT – Girton**

**HX – Hauxton**  
**ML – Milton**  
**SC – Stump Cross**

## Fuel Thefts

Of the **179** Thefts From Motor Vehicles recorded by police in the three month period April to June 2010 in South Cambridgeshire, a total of **109** had a least one item of property recorded in the property register.

In total **437** items of stolen property were recorded for these 109 offences. In some instances multiple items of the same property are recorded.

The cost of fuel for the private motorist as well as business and commercial hauliers has increased considerably in recent months and consequently its desirability for the offender. Generally fuel is obtained by one of two means, either by loosening/cutting the fuel supply pipe or by siphoning off fuel after removing the fuel filler cap.

**6** thefts of **diesel** and **no** thefts of **petrol** have been recorded in this three month period. However it should also be remembered that a nationwide survey found that less than half of Thefts from Motor Vehicles were reported to the police. Further detail is supplied in the table.

Time From	Time To	Location Road	Location Town	Description
03-Apr-10	04-Apr-10	NEW ROAD	GILDEN MORDEN	Diesel siphoned overnight from 2 unattended buses in a car/lorry park.
20-Apr-10	21-Apr-10	GREEN END	GAMLINGAY	Diesel siphoned from the tanks of 3 white Leyland DAF lorries parked in a wire-fenced yard.
06-May-10	07-May-10	NEW ROAD	MELBOURN	Security light damaged and diesel stolen from a vehicle parked at a farm
01-May-10	17-May-10	ST AUDREYS CLOSE	HISTON	Fuel pipe to tractor cut and diesel removed at an unspecified location type.
19-Jun-10	19-Jun-10	A14	BOXWORTH	Fuel stolen from a lorry whilst parked at a service station.
19-Jun-10	20-Jun-10	.	BABRAHAM	Half tank of fuel removed from a lorry and quarter tank from another whilst parked at an unspecified commercial location.

### Theft from Motor Vehicle – Diesel Thefts, South Cambridgeshire – Apr to Jun 2010

- It appears most locations specified above are within the range or reach of the intending fuel thief and no locations are off-limits as highlighted in the text descriptions in the table.
- There appear to be no common themes to the locations for fuel thefts.


## Other Lay-By Thefts

In the table are listed the location 'types' for all Thefts from Motor Vehicles where recorded in South Cambridgeshire over the two year period **July 08 to June 2010**.

LOCATION	Jul-Sep 2008	Oct-Dec 2008	Jan-Mar 2009	Apr-Jun 2009	Jul-Sep 2009	Oct-Dec 2009	Jan-Mar 2010	Apr-Jun 2010	TOTALS		
BLANK	48	65	37	37	28	39	26	30	310	310	21.4%
AGRICULTURAL FARM	5	1		1	2	1	1	2	13		
AGRICULTURAL OTHER	1	1						1	3	16	1.1%
COMMERCIAL	2	3	1		2	2	1		11		
COMMERCIAL BANK/BUILDING SOCIETY				1					1		
COMMERCIAL BUILDERS MERCHANT					1				1		
COMMERCIAL BUILDERS YARD		3						1	4		
COMMERCIAL BUILDING SITE							2		2		
COMMERCIAL NEWSAGENT							2		2		
COMMERCIAL GARAGE	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	16		
COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL ESTATE	5	3	1	1		2	1		13		
COMMERCIAL LICENSED CLUB								1	1	116	8.0%
COMMERCIAL LICENSED PREMISES	4	2	1	1			1	1	10		
COMMERCIAL OFFICE						1	1	1	3		
COMMERCIAL OTHER	4	6	3		2	3	4	2	24		
COMMERCIAL TAKE AWAY				1					1		
COMMERCIAL RESTAURANT/CAFE	1				1				2		
COMMERCIAL SERVICE STATION			1				2	2	5		
COMMERCIAL SHOP	3		1			1	1		6		
COMMERCIAL SUPERMARKET			2			2	5	2	11		
COMMERCIAL WAREHOUSE				1	1		1		3		
CONVEYANCE CAR	9	3	6	3	2	1		4	28		
CONVEYANCE GOODS	1			1	2	1			5	35	2.4%
CONVEYANCE OTHER			1		1				2		
EDUCATIONAL COLLEGE	1	1			1		1		4		
EDUCATIONAL NURSERY		1							1		
EDUCATIONAL OTHER						1			1	19	1.3%
EDUCATIONAL PRIMARY SCHOOL			1			5	1	3	10		
EDUCATIONAL SECONDARY SCHOOL	1	1			1				3		
OPEN SPACE						1			1		
OPEN SPACE LAKE								1	1		
OPEN SPACE WASTE GROUND	1				1				2	13	0.9%
OPEN SPACE WOOD			2		1			6	9		
PUBLIC PLACE					2			1	3		
PUBLIC PLACE FOOTPATH		2							2		
<b>PUBLIC PLACE LAY-BY</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>15.9%</b>
PUBLIC PLACE OTHER	2	1	4		2	1	1	2	13		
PUBLIC PLACE RAILWAY						1	1		2		
PUBLIC PLACE ROAD	18	11	9	16	8	16	5	14	97		
PUBLIC PLACE STREET	9	11	11	9	11	8	12	14	85		
PUBLIC UTILITIES CAR/LORRY PARK	12	12	13	10	10	18	18	20	113		
PUBLIC UTILITIES HALL		1		1				2	4		
PUBLIC UTILITIES HEALTH CENTRE/CLINIC		1							1	128	8.9%
PUBLIC UTILITIES HOSPITAL		1		2	1	1			5		
PUBLIC UTILITIES OTHER		2		1	1			1	5		
RECREATIONAL CLUB			1						1		
RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY CENTRE		1				1	1	2	5		
RECREATIONAL PAVILLION			1						1	25	1.7%
RECREATIONAL OTHER		1	1		1	2	1	2	8		
RECREATIONAL PARK		1			2	1	1	5	10		
RELIGIOUS		1							1		
RELIGIOUS CHURCHYARD		1						1	2		
RELIGIOUS CREMATORIUM		2		4					6	18	1.2%
RELIGIOUS CEMETERY			1				1		2		
RELIGIOUS CHURCH					1	1	2	3	7		
RESIDENTIAL FARM HOUSE					1				1		
RESIDENTIAL HOME (OLD PEOPLES)		3			1				4		
RESIDENTIAL RESIDENTIAL CARAVAN						1			1		
RESIDENTIAL	11	2	9	4	3	4	2	3	38		
RESIDENTIAL BUNGALOW	10	4	4	2	7	4	3	1	35		
RESIDENTIAL COTTAGE	1				1	1			3		
RESIDENTIAL FLAT - FIRST & OTHER FLOORS	4	1		3	2	4		5	19		
RESIDENTIAL FLAT - GROUND FLOOR		1			1	1		1	4	536	37.1%
RESIDENTIAL HOTEL	3	2	2	1				1	11		
RESIDENTIAL HOUSE	31	27	26	23	14	34	14	16	185		
RESIDENTIAL HOUSE (DETACHED)	17	19	13	13	12	13	4	9	100		
RESIDENTIAL HOUSE (SEMI-DETACHED)	13	10	6	11	15	18	7	8	88		
RESIDENTIAL HOUSE (TERRACED)	7	8	5	6	2	8	2	1	39		
RESIDENTIAL MOBILE CARAVAN				1					1		
RESIDENTIAL OTHER	3	1	2			1			7		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>1,446</b>		

### Theft from Motor Vehicle by Location, South Cambridgeshire – Jul 2008 to Jun 2010

**28** (or 1.9%) thefts are recorded to have occurred in lay-bys although as many as 310 or just over one-fifth of offences have no recorded location 'type'.



In a mapping of Thefts from Motor Vehicles recorded in lay-bys there is only one principal cluster for offences in South Cambridgeshire:

- On the A14 trunk route north of the Girton interchange (with the M11) and north-west of the city of Cambridge in an area between the villages of Bar Hill, Dry Drayton and Girton (4 recorded offences), although offences are not necessarily recorded at one specific place.

None of these offences have involved fuel theft; instead side curtains have been slashed or containers opened in order to remove goods. In one instance number plates were unscrewed and stolen (likely to be used, for the purpose of concealing true identity, on another vehicle).

There are some small clusters of offences to the north of the Cambridge City in the Histon and Horningsea wards (2 offences each) and the Barrington ward (2 offences) to the south-west of the city.

There appear to be no principal clusters on either A11 trunk route or M11 motorway that run either side (east and west) of the city of Cambridge.


Police occasionally have issues in correctly marking lay-by offences on maps owing to remoteness of some locations or familiarity with the area where an offence has occurred.

## Vehicle Crime

The following information is taken from a recently published problem profile for vehicle crime in South Cambridgeshire

### Theft from Vehicles

The chart below indicates volumes of Thefts from Motor Vehicles (TFMV) recorded each month in South Cambridgeshire. Bars in the chart have been colour-coded to reflect intensity of offences (lower volumes in cool colours, high volumes in warm colours).



**Recorded Theft from Motor Vehicle (TFMV) – South Cambridgeshire - 2006-10**

These indicate some ‘hot’ periods in activity, most recently in the three month period Oct 09 to Dec 09. However it is also worth noting that, apart from an exceptional month in February 2010 when only 29 offences were recorded, recent trends indicate that there are almost always at least fifty such offences recorded every month.


### Breakdown of Offences – Village / Ward Location

Given the number of settlements in South Cambridgeshire it is hardly surprising that there is a lack of consistency in the hotspots for theft from vehicles. A number of places have experienced a spate of ‘theft from’ offences but these have not persisted for long in any particular place.

- Settlements to the north of Cambridge City appeared to be vulnerable to offences of Theft from Motor Vehicles (Bar Hill, Cottenham, Girton, Milton and Waterbeach) particularly from mid-2008 onwards.
- More recently a higher number of offences have been recorded Cambourne.

### Theft of Vehicles

The chart below indicates volumes of Thefts of Motor Vehicles (TOMV), including Taking Without Owner's Consent (TWOC) recorded each month in South Cambridgeshire. Bars in the chart have been colour-coded to reflect intensity of offences (lower volumes in cool colours, high volumes in warm colours).



#### Recorded Theft of Motor Vehicle (TOMV) – South Cambridgeshire - 2006-10

These indicate a number of 'hot' periods in activity but no more than one per day, on average, even in the 'hottest' periods of activity and frequently much less. During the five month period Oct-09 to Feb-10 some of the lowest volumes of these offences have been recorded in South Cambridgeshire than at any time over the past four years.

- There are some exceptions. Milton has the highest incidence Per Thousand Population (PTP) of Thefts of Motor Vehicles at 4.4 PTP. Milton is the only location where Thefts of Vehicles have been recorded during every quarter in the past two years.
- Willingham and Waterbeach have both experienced high volumes of Thefts of Motor Vehicles in the six month period between April and September 2009. Together with Milton these three locations are located to the north of Cambridge City.
- A fourth contender for concern is Sawston. Located to the south of Cambridge City, thefts have been recorded here every quarter excepting the most recent quarter.


## Arson

By far the most accurate record of arson is provided by the fire-service rather than the police. However incidents of arson within the twelve month period are too sparse to provide suitably detailed hotspot maps. Therefore the following maps have been produced using 17 months data, which includes all of 2009/10 and the first five months of 2010/11 to the end of August 2010.

The arson overview below picks up the following:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge
- Cambourne
- Sawston
- Some places are known locations for fly-tipping

### Fire Service Recorded Arson Overview for South Cambridgeshire




## Criminal Damage

In the past twelve months the number of criminal damage offences recorded in South Cambridgeshire have decreased from 1,375 (Sept 08 to Aug 09) to 1,054 (Sept 09 to Aug 10), a reduction of 23%. However criminal damage remains a high volume offence that is experienced by many people.

The criminal damage overview below picks up the following locations:

- Main concentrations are around the outskirts of Cambridge (Milton / Histon)
- Cambourne
- Sawston
- Cottenham


Unsurprisingly there are similarities between the patterns of Arson and Criminal damage. The map below gives an overview of police-recorded criminal damage hotspots for South Cambridgeshire.



## Crime and the Economy

Despite the suggestion last year that “Journalists are falling over themselves to find signs of ... the credit crunch crime wave<sup>22</sup>”, the availability of evidence supporting the claim is limited. This section summarises economic trends and identifies narratives linking crime and the economy, testing those of relevance to Cambridgeshire Community Safety Partnerships. Locally, the clearest sign of the recession has been an increase in unemployment. In August 2010<sup>23</sup> the claimant count unemployment rate for Cambridgeshire was 2.1%, down from 2.5% one year previously, but up from 1.3% in August 2008.

Within the county the unemployment rate has risen most in Fenland, which is the only district with an unemployment rate equal to England (3.5%). As the graph below<sup>24</sup> shows, the greatest numerical increase in claimants has been in Huntingdonshire.



Unemployment locally has risen less than across England overall; Cambridge City has less poorly than most areas, with a rise in unemployment from just 1.3% in August 2008 to 2.2% at the peak in October 2009. The number of JSA claimants across Cambridgeshire has fallen in recent months, and the private sector has appeared increasingly buoyant. However, a decline in the number of job vacancies across Greater Cambridge<sup>25</sup> suggests that the upturn in the private sector is beginning to be affected by the economic uncertainty around the existing and anticipated public sector cuts in funding and employment. Results from the latest business confidence surveys<sup>26</sup> paint a mixed picture and imply weakening prospects for the East of England in the coming months. Furthermore, the fall in numbers claiming Jobseeker's Allowance across the East of England has come to an end, providing further evidence of a weakening in the labour market across the region. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the scale of the reduction in public sector funding and employment – the economic ‘pinch’ – is starting to bite, with a number of public sector bodies giving a forewarning of significant job losses to come.

<sup>22</sup> Andy Tighe, BBC Home Affairs Correspondent, BBC News, 16<sup>th</sup> July 2009, Report on release of British Crime Survey 2008/09 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8153392.stm>

<sup>23</sup> Office for National Statistics Claimant Count

<sup>24</sup> Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group

<sup>25</sup> Greater Cambridge Partnership Quarterly Economic Review July 2010

<sup>26</sup> Insight East Monthly Labour Market Briefing September 2010

**Appendix One: Neighbourhood Survey**

**[Author's note: Results are subject to change as we are still receiving paper responses. To be appropriately analysed and developed into a Perceptions Section when evaluation is possible]**

## South Cambridgeshire Community Safety - Neighbourhood Survey Draft Results

**RESPONSES**

631 received

**YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD***How safe do you feel during the day?*

<b>Very safe:</b>	426	67.5%
Fairly safe:	176	27.9%
Neither safe nor unsafe:	20	3.2%
Fairly unsafe:	7	1.1%
Very unsafe:	2	0.3%

*How safe do you feel after dark?*

Very safe:	154	24.4%
<b>Fairly safe:</b>	308	48.8%
Neither safe nor unsafe:	95	15.1%
Fairly unsafe:	61	9.7%
Very unsafe:	13	2.1%

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM ARE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

- MAIN ISSUES OF CONCERN = - Facilities and activities for young people  
- Care, facilities and activities for the elderly

Feeling isolated in your community

A very big problem:	10	1.6%
A fairly big problem:	41	6.5%
Not a very big problem:	193	30.6%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	373	59.1%
No opinion:	14	2.2%

Facilities and activities for young people

A very big problem:	54	8.6%
<b>A fairly big problem:</b>	206	32.6%
Not a very big problem:	193	30.6%
Not a problem at all:	66	10.5%
No opinion:	112	17.7%

Difficulties with neighbours

A very big problem:	24	3.8%
A fairly big problem:	39	6.2%
Not a very big problem:	174	27.6%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	386	61.2%
No opinion:	8	1.3%

Care, facilities and activities for the elderly

A very big problem:	31	4.9%
A fairly big problem:	101	16%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	241	38.2%
Not a problem at all:	98	15.5%
No opinion:	160	25.4%

Lack of 'community spirit' where you live

A very big problem:	17	2.7%
A fairly big problem:	76	12%
Not a very big problem:	255	40.4%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	263	41.7%
No opinion:	20	3.2%

Other: please specify below (75 responses)

A very big problem:	29	12.8%
A fairly big problem:	21	9.3%
Not a very big problem:	12	5.3%
Not a problem at all:	13	5.7%
No opinion:	152	67%

**CRIME TYPES****HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS:**

**MAIN ISSUES OF CONCERN** = None of great significant concern, however:

- Dwelling burglaries
- Vehicle crimes (incl. thefts)

**Dwelling Burglary**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	39	6.2%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	128	20.3%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	368	58.3%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	83	13.2%
<i>No opinion:</i>	13	2.1%

**Drug abuse**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	23	3.6%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	77	12.2%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	300	47.5%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	153	24.2%
<i>No opinion:</i>	78	12.4%

**Personal Robbery (E.g., mugging)**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	11	1.7%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	16	2.5%
<i>Not a very big problem:</i>	289	45.8%
<b><i>Not a problem at all:</i></b>	297	47.1%
<i>No opinion:</i>	18	2.9%

**Domestic Violence**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	10	1.6%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	31	4.9%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	232	36.8%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	203	32.2%
<i>No opinion:</i>	155	24.6%

**Vehicle Crime (break-ins or damage)**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	24	3.8%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	147	23.3%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	348	55.2%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	90	14.3%
<i>No opinion:</i>	22	3.5%

**Criminal Damage**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	32	5.1%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	129	20.4%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	328	52%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	105	16.6%
<i>No opinion:</i>	37	5.9%

**Vehicle thefts**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	18	2.9%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	74	11.7%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	358	56.7%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	144	22.8%
<i>No opinion:</i>	37	5.9%

**Arson**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	11	1.7%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	25	4%
<i>Not a very big problem:</i>	217	34.4%
<b><i>Not a problem at all:</i></b>	307	48.7%
<i>No opinion:</i>	71	11.3%

**Cycle thefts**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	41	6.5%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	132	20.9%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	287	45.5%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	124	19.7%
<i>No opinion:</i>	47	7.4%

**Shoplifting**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	17	2.7%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	42	6.7%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	246	39%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	197	31.2%
<i>No opinion:</i>	129	20.4%

**Alcohol-related violence and disorder**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	38	6%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	102	16.2%
<b><i>Not a very big problem:</i></b>	316	50.1%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	124	19.7%
<i>No opinion:</i>	47	7.4%

**Other: Please specify below (64 responses)**

<i>A very big problem:</i>	17	7.7%
<i>A fairly big problem:</i>	26	11.8%
<i>Not a very big problem:</i>	21	9.5%
<i>Not a problem at all:</i>	18	8.2%
<i>No opinion:</i>	138	62.7%

**ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR****HOW OFTEN DOES ASB AFFECT YOU?**

Every day:	22	3.5%
Several times a week:	58	9.2%
Once or twice a month:	135	21.4%
<b>Rarely:</b>	326	51.7%
Never/ No opinion:	90	14.3%

**HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM IS:**

**MAIN ISSUES OF CONCERN** = None of great significant concern, however:

- Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles
- Antisocial use of vehicles (incl. motorbikes), e.g. illegal parking or speeding

## Noisy neighbours or loud parties

A very big problem:	27	4.3%
A fairly big problem:	47	7.4%
Not a very big problem:	235	37.2%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	318	50.4%
No opinion:	4	0.6%

## Groups loitering around the streets

A very big problem:	32	5.1%
A fairly big problem:	94	14.9%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	263	41.7%
Not a problem at all:	237	37.6%
No opinion:	5	0.8%

## Rubbish or litter lying around

A very big problem:	49	7.8%
A fairly big problem:	150	23.8%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	316	50.1%
Not a problem at all:	109	17.3%
No opinion:	7	1.1%

## Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles

A very big problem:	38	6%
A fairly big problem:	125	19.8%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	309	49%
Not a problem at all:	147	23.3%
No opinion:	12	1.9%

## People using or dealing drugs

A very big problem:	20	3.2%
A fairly big problem:	59	9.4%
Not a very big problem:	219	34.7%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	238	37.7%
No opinion:	95	15.1%

## People being drunk or rowdy in public places

A very big problem:	32	5.1%
A fairly big problem:	85	13.5%
Not a very big problem:	235	37.2%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	248	39.3%
No opinion:	31	4.9%

## Abandoned or burnt out cars

A very big problem:	4	0.6%
A fairly big problem:	12	1.9%
Not a very big problem:	172	27.3%
<b>Not a problem at all:</b>	405	64.2%
No opinion:	38	6%

## Antisocial use of vehicles (including motorbikes), e.g. illegal parking or speeding

A very big problem:	97	15.4%
A fairly big problem:	189	30%
<b>Not a very big problem:</b>	231	36.6%
Not a problem at all:	97	15.4%
No opinion:	17	2.7%

## Other: Please specify (39 responses)

A very big problem:	10	4.8%
A fairly big problem:	15	7.2%
Not a very big problem:	13	6.3%
Not a problem at all:	19	9.2%
No opinion:	150	72.5%

ANY OTHER CONCERNS:

*177 comments: These will be highlighted in the presentation*

**ABOUT YOU**

Male: 312 49.8%  
Female: 314 50.2%

AGES:

*Under 16: 0 0%*  
*16-24: 11 1.7%*  
*25-39: 96 15.3%*  
*40-74: 466 74.1%*  
*75+: 56 8.9%*

ETHNICITY

*White: British: 548 89.5%*  
*White: Irish: 6 1%*  
*White: Other: 19 3.1%*  
*Asian/Asian British: 9 1.5%*  
*Black/Black British: 2 0.3%*  
*Chinese: 1 0.2%*  
*Mixed Background: 3 0.5%*  
*Other ethnic group: 24 3.9%*      *59 responses*

PLACE OF BIRTH

*Various, 410, including:*

## APPENDIX 2: Model of the Costs of crime to the Victim, Home Office 03/04

Offence category	Costs in anticipation of crime (£)				Costs as a consequence of crime (£)							Costs in response to crime (£)		2003 prices	
	Defensive Expenditure	Insurance Administration	Physical and Emotional Impact on Direct Victims	Value of Property Stolen	Property Damaged/ Destroyed	Property Recovered	Victim Services	Lost Output	Health Services	Criminal Justice System	Average Cost (£)	Number of Victims	Total Cost (£)	Average Cost (£)	Number of Victims
Violence against the person	1	1	5,472	-	-	-	9	1,648	1,347	1,928	10,407	1,928	10,407	1,928	10,407
Homicide	145	229	860,380	-	-	-	2,102	451,110	770	144,239	1,458,975	144,239	1,458,975	144,239	1,458,975
Wounding	1	1	4,554	-	-	-	7	1,166	1,348	1,775	8,852	1,775	8,852	1,775	8,852
Serious wounding	1	1	4,554	-	-	-	7	1,166	1,348	14,345	21,422	14,345	21,422	14,345	21,422
Other wounding	1	1	4,554	-	-	-	7	1,166	1,348	978	8,056	978	8,056	978	8,056
Sexual offences	3	5	22,754	-	-	-	32	4,430	916	3,298	31,438	3,298	31,438	3,298	31,438
Common assault	0	0	788	-	-	-	6	269	123	255	1,440	255	1,440	255	1,440
Robbery	0	21	3,048	109	12	-19	16	1,011	483	2,601	7,282	2,601	7,282	2,601	7,282
Burglary in a dwelling	221	177	646	846	187	-22	11	64	-	1,137	3,268	1,137	3,268	1,137	3,268
Theft	59	52	192	281	69	-36	1	10	-	217	844	217	844	217	844
Theft - not vehicle	-	33	118	175	17	-13	1	3	-	301	634	301	634	301	634
Theft of vehicle	546	370	800	2,367	349	-542	1	47	-	199	4,138	199	4,138	199	4,138
Theft from vehicle	116	50	266	240	126	-11	1	20	-	50	858	50	858	50	858
Attempted vehicle theft	65	21	194	-	154	-	1	11	-	65	510	65	510	65	510
Criminal damage	13	36	472	-	212	-	2	6	-	126	866	126	866	126	866

This page is left blank intentionally.