



**CLEVELAND
POLICE**
Putting People First

**Presentation to the
Safer Stockton Partnership
Tuesday 27th August 2013**

Criminal Damage

Insp Andy Fox

Introduction

- Outline/context of presentation
- “Headlines”.
- Performance Measures.
- Criminal damage as a proportion of overall crime (systems used SOLAR and performance management).
- Information presented in number form and detections.
- Damage by offence type as a proportion of overall damage.
- Criminal Damage by ward as a percentage of all damage Offences (top 5 in red).
- Repeat Victims.
- Top five wards with 100 or more offences for Jan -Dec 2012.
- National Intelligence Model.
- Safer Stockton Partnership Response.
- Partnership Challenges 2012/13.

Headlines

- Financial Year 2012/13 down 9% on previous year (2257 Crimes)
- 1977 repeat victims (2012/13) compared to 2126 (2011/12)

Performance Measure.

- **Reduce Criminal Damage:**
- Maintain a reduction in offences of criminal damage by achieving a reduction year on year.
 - Financial Year 2010/11 down 20% on previous year. (2324 Crimes)
 - Financial Year 2011/12 up 6% on previous year (2472 Crimes)
 - Financial Year 2012/13 down 9% on previous year (2257 Crimes)
- **Reduce the number of repeat victims of criminal damage:**
- All repeat victims to be visited to identify cause and implement actions to reduce victimisation. Aim for a reduction in numbers year on year.


Criminal Damage as a proportion of overall crime.

OFFENCE HO CATEGORY	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
01 - Violence Against The Person	19.45%	19.21%	17.36%	19.64%	16.89%
02 - Sexual Offences	1.54%	1.53%	1.73%	1.76%	2.10%
03 - Burglary	11.27%	10.60%	11.50%	12.01%	10.77%
04 - Robbery	0.47%	0.58%	0.68%	0.58%	0.61%
05 - Theft and Handling Stolen Goods	33.63%	36.14%	39.05%	37.75%	41.56%
06 - Fraud and Forgery	1.84%	2.00%	2.13%	2.42%	1.00%
07 - Criminal Damage	24.61%	21.49%	21.57%	20.26%	19.64%
08 - Drug Offences	5.45%	6.88%	4.71%	4.29%	5.21%
09 - Other Offences	1.74%	1.57%	1.29%	1.30%	1.18%
10 - NFIB Fraud	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.04%

Offence HO Category	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Grand Total
01 - Violence Against The Person	2997	2443	2160	1973	2022	11595
02 - Sexual Offences	174	194	172	196	179	915
03 - Burglary	1676	1413	1192	1305	1247	6833
04 - Robbery	121	59	65	77	60	382
05 - Theft and Handling Stolen Goods	5272	4218	4062	4438	3912	21902
06 - Fraud and Forgery	370	230	225	242	244	1311
07 - Criminal Damage	4129	3090	2417	2451	2060	14147
08 - Drug Offences	583	685	774	535	448	3025
09 - Other Offences	241	218	177	146	137	919
NK - Unknown	1	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total	15564	12550	11244	11363	10309	61030

07 - Criminal Damage Detections
2008 - 17%
2009 - 18%
2010 - 18%
2011 - 18%
2012 - 16%

Damage by offence type as a proportion of overall crime.



Criminal Damage by ward as a percentage of all damage Offences

Wards	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
STOCKTON_TOWN_CENTRE	10.55%	12.87%	10.98%	11.80%	12.85%
MANDALE_AND_VICTORIA	8.06%	8.90%	9.10%	8.34%	9.22%
HARDWICK	8.09%	7.91%	7.22%	7.06%	6.84%
NEWTOWN	7.86%	6.33%	7.92%	7.37%	7.98%
PARKFIELD_AND_OXBRIDGE	5.63%	5.05%	5.67%	7.06%	6.63%
STAINSBY_HILL	6.15%	5.55%	5.75%	6.71%	4.25%
NORTON_NORTH	6.37%	5.34%	4.98%	5.97%	7.05%
BILLINGHAM_EAST	4.79%	5.59%	5.79%	6.71%	4.97%
ROSEWORTH	4.11%	5.55%	4.73%	3.91%	5.18%
BILLINGHAM_SOUTH	3.85%	4.97%	4.49%	4.26%	5.08%
BILLINGHAM_CENTRAL	3.85%	3.23%	3.84%	4.39%	3.42%
NORTON_SOUTH	5.24%	3.52%	3.22%	2.46%	3.11%
VILLAGE	3.91%	3.48%	3.88%	2.59%	4.35%
BISHOPSGARTH_AND_ELM_TREE	2.59%	2.44%	2.53%	2.81%	1.76%
YARM	2.49%	2.28%	2.49%	2.24%	2.59%
EAGLESCLIFFE	2.04%	2.61%	1.96%	2.41%	1.97%
BILLINGHAM_NORTH	1.78%	2.44%	2.37%	1.71%	1.55%
GRANGEFIELD	1.84%	1.32%	2.49%	1.97%	1.66%
FAIRFIELD	1.33%	1.86%	1.92%	1.89%	1.76%
NORTON_WEST	1.49%	1.41%	1.59%	1.54%	1.24%
BILLINGHAM_WEST	1.46%	1.32%	1.39%	0.97%	1.24%
INGLEBY_BARWICK_EAST	1.23%	1.45%	1.18%	1.18%	0.73%
UNKNOWN	1.49%	1.08%	1.18%	0.35%	1.14%
INGLEBY_BARWICK_WEST	1.16%	1.08%	0.90%	1.10%	1.14%
HARTBURN	1.04%	0.91%	0.94%	1.36%	0.73%
NORTHERN_PARISHES	0.84%	0.83%	0.49%	0.79%	0.93%
WESTERN_PARISHES	0.61%	0.46%	0.90%	0.83%	0.62%
AYRESOME	0.16%	0.25%	0.12%	0.22%	0.00%

Repeat Victims

For the two year period **2011 – 2012**, there were 2126 individual victims of criminal damage recorded against 2279 offences.

299(13%) of these individuals suffered more than one offence of damage during this same period. 452 of the 2279 offences (20%) were recorded against these repeat victims.

For the Financial year **2012-2013**, there were 1977 individual victims of criminal damage recorded against 2099 offences.

242 (12%) of these individuals suffered more than one offence of damage during this same period. 364 of the 2099 offences (17%) were recorded against these repeat victims.

**THIS SHOWS A REDUCTION IN REPEAT VICTIMISATION FOR
DAMAGE FROM 2011-2012 to 2012-2013**

2012 – 2013 Financial Year: Offences and Wards.

- 2257 Damage offences recorded for 2012-2013 compared to 2472 for 2011-12. A reduction of 215 offences – or 9%
- Financial year detection Rate was 16.9% with a total of 329 offences detected. This compares to 439 detected offences in the previous financial year where the detection rate was 17.8%
- First Two Months of 2013-2014 there were 367 offences compared to 334 offences for the same period in 2012-2013, an increase of 9.9%. The detection rate for the same period stands at 16% (0.9% less than 2012-13).
- The top eight wards with more than 20 offences for April and May 2013 are:
 - **Stockton Town Centre 48**
 - **Mandale and Victoria 41**
 - **Billingham South 28**
 - **Parkfield and Oxbridge 26**
 - **Newtown 26**
 - **Norton North 25**
 - **Hardwick 23**
- Peak Times: 18:00 – 01:59hrs.
- Peak days: Saturdays and Sundays



**CLEVELAND
POLICE**
Putting People First


Halloween/Bonfire Night Analysis



2004-2005
Crime and Disorder Partnerships



All Crime/Criminal Damage 10 Oct – 6 Nov 2012



1




2004-2005
Crime and Disorder Pa

Earliest Datetime




Incidents of Criminal Damage

Criminal Damage&Arson



Year on year comparison


Criminal Damage 10 Oct - 6 Nov



34% increase from 2010 - 2012


Reported Criminal Damage

Day by day comparison




Anti-Social Behaviour

Incidents of ASB between 10.10.12&06.11.12



Locations of Damage/ASB



Police Response

- 3 separate Operational Orders written for Mischief Night, Halloween and Bonfire Night
- Full consultation and involvement of all partners
 - ASB Team
 - Enforcement
 - Fire Service
 - Youth Services
 - Housing

Police Response (cont)

- All Neighbourhood Officers change T.O.D to finish at midnight
- Full briefing given to all parties
- Analysis produced to identify hotspots
- High visibility patrols
- Shop keepers visited
- Schools visited
- Diversionary activities

Proposals

- Advertising
- Social Media
- Targeting of specific offenders (Voluntary curfew)
- Dispersal Orders
- Dedicated command room
- Greater use diversionary activities (cost)
- Press

SSP - Response

Victim, Offender, Location.

The task of the SSP remains to establish a method to identify what it is going to do to tackle the identified issues of criminal damage as a partnership and what it is going to initiate to call upon the public to play a part in this (e.g. community intelligence networks) etc.

The threat has mainly come at times when there has been events such as Mischief night through to November 5th with schools also being on holiday.

From midday 30/10 to 1330 hrs on the 31/10 all of the CR6's (criminal damage) reported within that time period = 58 Crimes:

SSP need to consider for the above:

- What can the partnership do to help prevent a repeat? Publicise, schools?
- Yearly campaign with perhaps wrist bands criminal damage wrecks lives”
- Public: What can they do? Community leaflets? NHW?
- Third dimension is the police response to victims, offender and location. Intelligence led, all neighbourhood staff on duty, planned approach with other agencies.

2013/14 - Partnership Challenges.

- Where do we foresee the risks/gaps
- What's our current approach and its success and how does it impact on finance.
- What as a partnership can we do to build upon future success.
- Increased population = potential for dwelling damage = housing providers response.