Crime and Drugs Audit 2004
London Borough of Hounslow

Working in partnership to make Hounslow a safer place to work, live and visit.
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Foreword

Crime affects everyone and consistently rates as a key concern for residents. The Hounslow Community Safety Partnership – the multi-agency partnership made up of the Council, Fire Brigade, Police, Primary Care Trust, Probation, and other partners – works together to reduce crime and the fear of crime in the borough. Our shared aims and goals are written in the borough’s Crime Reduction Strategy as well as the targets by which we measure our success. The current Strategy ends in March 2005. This Crime and Drugs Audit 2004 is an important part of the process in deciding what should be included in the next Crime Reduction Strategy for 2005 to 2008.

The Audit is a comprehensive report about anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder, and drugs in the borough over the past three years. It gives us the facts. We have also consulted on the Audit and included a summary of the Audit in the borough’s magazine *hm* to give residents an opportunity to say what they think. The facts, the findings from the consultation, and your concerns will be used to plan the next strategy for reducing crime and drugs over the next three years.

In Hounslow, we recognise that our greatest asset is the richness and diversity of our local population and the Partnership has worked hard to promote community cohesion and develop a settled community, with a common vision and sense of belonging. In this Audit, we have tried to consider the impact of crime and drugs on all our communities and consultation has involved more groups and individuals than ever before, including many considered ‘hard-to-reach’.

We know crime and the fear of crime are important factors that impact upon how we feel about our community and neighbourhoods. Making the borough a safer place for all communities is the Partnership’s top priority. In the next three-year strategy, the Crime and Drugs Audit 2004 will be the basis from which we measure that achievement.

Mark Gilks
Council Chief Executive

Ali Dizaei
Police Borough Commander

*Joint Chairs of the Hounslow Community Safety Partnership*
The Hounslow Community Safety Partnership would like to thank the following organisations for their contribution to this Crime and Drugs Audit:

- British Airports Authority;
- British Transport Police;
- Brentford County Court;
- Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow Gay Men’s Project;
- Government Office for London;
- Hounslow Council;
- Hounslow Drug and Alcohol Action Team;
- Hounslow Homes;
- Hounslow Primary Care Trust;
- Hounslow Racial Equality Council;
- London Ambulance Service;
- London Fire Brigade;
- London Probation Service;
- Metropolitan Police Service;
- National Treatment Agency;
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister;
- Office for National Statistics;
- Refuge;
- Victim Support Hounslow;
- Youth Offending Service;
- West London Learning and Skills Council.
Executive summary

Introduction

Crime affects everyone and consistently rates as a key concern for residents. The Crime and Drugs Audit 2004 is a comprehensive report about crime and drugs in the borough over the past three years.

It has been produced by Hounslow’s Community Safety Partnership: a multi-agency partnership that is made up of the Council, Fire Brigade, Police, Primary Care Trust, Probation and other partners who work together to reduce crime and drugs in the London Borough of Hounslow.

The Partnership will use the Audit - and feedback from residents - to plan its strategy for reducing crime and drugs over the next three years.

Crime and the fear of crime are important factors that impact on how we feel about our community. Making the borough a safer place for all communities is the Partnership’s top priority.

In Hounslow, we recognise that our greatest asset is the richness and diversity of our local population. The Partnership has worked hard to promote community cohesion and develop a settled community, with a common vision and sense of belonging.

This Audit considers the impact of crime and drugs on all our communities. All residents can help to make the borough a safer place. Please take the opportunity to fill out the questionnaire at the end of this Audit summary and tell us about your priorities for tackling crime.

Crime in Hounslow

The level of crime in Hounslow is decreasing. There was a 7% reduction in crime during the past year. This equates to about 200 fewer crimes per month.

The Audit spans a very difficult time for policing in Hounslow. Like most London Boroughs, Hounslow’s monthly statistics showed crime rising after the New York terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. Crime remained high until the following September as local police officers continued to be diverted to central London.

This helps explain why crime increased. Recent reductions were insufficient for us to see a reduction in crime over the whole three year period of this Audit, (2001 to 2004) with crime increasing by 2% overall.

Crime in Hounslow was not as high as it was in some other London Boroughs.

The graph compares total crime per 1,000 population rates for those boroughs considered ‘most similar’ to Hounslow. In comparison to these boroughs, however, Hounslow had one of the higher crime rates; the average crime rate was 126 crimes per 1,000 people compared with Hounslow’s figure of 143 crimes.

An initial analysis of all crimes in Hounslow identified six priority areas of high volume crime.

- High volume property crimes were motor vehicle crime (26% of all crime) and burglary (11%), of which the majority were domestic burglaries.
- High volume crimes against the person were violent crime (22%) and to some extent street crime (5%).
- Criminal damage (8%) is
included in the section on anti-social behaviour. As anti-social behaviour is a major concern for residents, it is a priority in this Audit.

- As a separate offence, drugs made up only 2% of all crime in the borough, but crime is often alcohol or drug-related. These categories of crime can be seen in the pie chart as accounting for significant portions of all recorded crime.¹

**Motor vehicle crime**

Motor vehicle crime in Hounslow is now at its lowest level in five years. Over the three years of this Audit the number of crimes fell by 7%.

- Nearly 50% of these crimes were theft from motor vehicles, and the number of crimes in this category fell by 8% during the three years.
- A further 32% were intentional or reckless criminal damage to motor vehicles, and crimes in this category were down by 12%.
- Motor vehicles were stolen or taken without consent in 19% of the crimes. Up 4%, this is the only offence to have increased.

**When does motor vehicle crime happen?**

- Motor vehicle crimes were often committed overnight.
- Thefts from motor vehicles were generally higher in the summer.
- Criminal damage happened more often in the winter.

**What is the cost of motor vehicle crime?**

- The total cost in the borough over the past three years was estimated at more than £18 million.
- For each crime, individuals paid an average of £620 in insurance and the cost of objects stolen, and a further £240 in time off work and quality of life.
- It cost businesses £680 for every theft from a motor vehicle.

**Where does motor vehicle crime happen?**

- Theft from motor vehicles was most common in Chiswick and Heston. Hounslow Town Centre was also a hotspot for theft of motor vehicles.

**Figure 3. Percentage change in the borough’s priority crimes between 2001/02 and 2003/04.**

**Figure 4. Motor vehicle crime ‘hotspot’ map, April 2001 to March 2004.**

¹High volume crimes not included in this Audit are ‘other theft and handling offences’ as this crime category covers a number of unrelated offences. Neither will fraud and forgery be included as banks are mainly dealing with this.
vehicle and £9,700 if a motor vehicle was stolen.

**What are we doing?**
- We have purchased an overt CCTV van with an automatic number plate reading facility to help identify stolen, untaxed and uninsured vehicles.
- ‘Safer Streets’ proactive police operations are focusing on motor vehicle crime.
- Making motor vehicle crime a ‘priority crime’ for police.

**Domestic burglary**
Domestic burglary peaked in 2003/04. This is due to increases of 7% and 8% each year over the period of this Audit. Domestic burglary now makes up 7% of all crime.

Since March 2004, however, as a result of reorganising how burglaries are investigated, there has been a month on month reduction in offences. A reduction of 26% was achieved during the period between March and September 2004, compared to the same period last year.

- 6% of domestic burglaries were deception burglaries (for example, when someone pretends to be from a utilities company to gain entry to a person’s home). Victims were usually aged over 70 years.
- 93% involved a burglar physically breaking-in to steal property.
- Just over 1% of burglaries involved injury to the householder (aggravated burglary).

**Where does domestic burglary happen?**
- During the past three years, it was a problem in and around Turnham Green Terrace, Chiswick High Road and Hounslow West.

**When does domestic burglary happen?**
- During the three-year Audit period, most domestic burglaries were committed during the day when people were out.
- Other peaks included after lunch, during the school run in the afternoon, and early evening onwards.
- Typically, more burglaries happened in winter, except in 2003/04 when the hot summer led to a higher than normal number of burglaries in July and August as people left doors and windows open in the hot weather.

**What is the cost of domestic burglary?**
- In total, domestic burglary cost more than £14 million during the Audit period.
- On average, burglars stole £830 worth of property per burglary.
- It is estimated that every domestic burglary had an emotional cost to victims of £600 and that a further £430 was spent on security and insurance.

**What are we doing?**
- Domestic burglary is a priority area in the current Crime Reduction Strategy 2002-2005. The Council, Police and voluntary agencies have worked together to provide crime prevention advice and support to victims of deception burglary.
- The Police also have formed a dedicated burglary unit to investigate crimes and arrest burglars quickly.
- In agreement with the Police, one of the Council’s local public service agreements is to reduce domestic burglary by 25%.
- A crime prevention advice pack is given to all victims of burglary.

**Figure 5. Domestic burglary ‘hotspot’ map, April 2001 to March 2004.**
Violent crime

Violent crime increased by 13% in the past three years. This was mainly due to changes in how crimes are recorded.

In April 2002, Police adopted the new National Crime Recording Standards that resulted in an increase in reporting of such crimes. This impacted on the figures for 2002/03 as shown below. The 13% rise, however, was significant and may represent an actual rise in violent crime in the borough.

- Nearly 50% of all violent crime happens in the home and is committed by partners and members of the family. Domestic violence increased by 15% in 2002/03 and 16% overall during the three-year Audit period.
- 37% were violence against the person offences, typically acts or threats of violence by strangers that were not racially motivated or homophobic. These types of offences increased most in 2002/03 by 25% and by 26% overall during the Audit period.
- 10% of violent crimes were racially motivated. During this Audit, race crimes fell by 27%.

Where does violent crime happen?

- Domestic violence is a general problem across the borough. One in four women are subject to domestic violence and there are a number of areas where there is little or no reporting.
- Stranger violence and race crimes generally happened in Hounslow Town Centre and to some extent Chiswick and Feltham town centres.
- Some race crimes were also concentrated in and around several Council estates.

When does violent crime happen?

- Patterns of domestic violence reflected times when partners and families are together, typically at weekends.
- More domestic violence was reported from 7pm onwards.
- Stranger violence and race crimes were usually committed on a Friday, Saturday and Sunday.
- Between 3pm and 4pm on weekdays, there was a peak in stranger violence (usually threatening behaviour) that was associated with schools finishing.
- Offences were more likely to involve physical violence in the evening. Many of these crimes were alcohol-related.
- Race crimes were less predictable, but were more likely to happen later in the day.

What is the cost of violent crime?

- Violent crime cost more than £389 million in Hounslow in the period 2001 to 2004.
- The cost of violent crime is usually between £18,000 and £19,000 per incident, the majority of which is a cost to the victims.

What are we doing?

- An outreach worker supports victims of domestic violence at Feltham Community Safety Unit, based at Feltham Police Station.
- Making homes of victims of domestic violence safer, to help them remain in their own homes.
- Provision of a ‘survivor pack’ to all victims of domestic violence.
- High visibility Police patrols in town centres late in the evening and on weekends.
- Setting up community (third party) reporting centres for race crimes.

Street crime

Street crime decreased by 20% over this Audit period. Like most other London Boroughs, however, Hounslow experienced a rise in street crime and mobile telephone thefts in 2001/02. After that peak, the number of street crimes dropped 4% in 2002/03 and by a further 17% in 2003/04.

- Although 51% of street crimes were muggings, reports fell between 11% and 12% each year.
- Pick-pocketing (23% of all street crime) nearly halved between 2001/02 and 2003/04. It is now at its lowest level for five years.
- Snatches make up more than 20% of all street crimes. It was the only street crime offence to go up in the past three years.
Where does street crime happen?
- Hounslow Town Centre and to a lesser extent Chiswick and Feltham town centres.
- Analysis suggested that crime occurred around tube stations across the borough, including Hounslow West, Hounslow Central and Turnham Green.

When does street crime happen?
- Pick-pocketing offences increased sharply from 10am onwards and peaked between 2pm and 3pm. Pick-pocketing reports fell just as sharply from 3pm onwards.
- Mugging and snatches peaked later - between 4pm and 5pm – remaining high from this time onwards.

What is the cost of street crime?
- The cost of muggings alone was estimated at more than £12 million.
- Loss of property in a mugging was usually quite small in value, on average £310 per crime. However, the cost of time off work, health and general emotional well being was estimated much higher, at £3,016.

What are we doing?
- Street crime is a priority area in the current Crime Reduction Strategy 2002-2005.
- It is also a Police priority crime and successful Police operations have led to the reductions in street crime seen in this Audit.
- Anti-Social Behaviour Orders are being used against identified persistent offenders.
- Police have improved their immediate actions following a report of a mugging.

Anti-social behaviour
Anti-social behaviour went up 10% during this Audit period, mainly because of better recording.
- 43% of all anti-social behaviour was environmental, and the dumping of motor vehicles accounted for more than half of these offences.
- 25% of environmental anti-social behaviour was noise nuisance.
- Nearly a third of anti-social behaviour was more malicious. That category included threatening behaviour, and criminal damage. In the case of hoax calls to the London Fire Brigade, these offences endangered lives.
- 25% was disorderly behaviour and this type of behaviour makes people avoid public spaces like town centres and parks.

Where does anti-social behaviour happen?
Anti-social behaviour is a general problem across the borough.
- Dumping of motor vehicles and setting cars alight was committed in parks and open spaces, for example around Bedfont Lakes, during the Audit period.
- Threatening behaviour and criminal damage was most common in Hounslow and Feltham town centres and on some Council estates.
- Deliberate fires handled by the London Fire Brigade were more of a problem on open spaces and some Council estates.

When does anti-social behaviour happen?
- Some anti-social behaviour is seasonal. Complaints of noise nuisance and fires on open land increased in the summer.
- Some anti-social behaviour, including criminal damage and hoax calls, happened at the weekend.
- Typically, anti-social behaviour was committed late in the afternoon and during the evening.

What is the cost of anti-social behaviour?
The cost to services alone is estimated at £18 million for the three years.
Summary

What are we doing?

- There are now three area-based Anti-Social Behaviour Action Groups. A person committing anti-social behaviour is referred to an Action Group where a multi-agency panel decides how to best deal with them.
- Twenty-five anti-social behaviour orders have been taken out to tackle persistent offenders.
- Hounslow Homes has set up a central and specialised anti-social behaviour team and the Police have dedicated resources to an anti-social behaviour unit.
- In the past three years the Council and partners have introduced new services. There also have been improvements in existing services (for example, Wing Security now deals with abandoned vehicles on behalf of Hounslow Homes).
- Hounslow Council removes 71% of abandoned vehicles within three days.

Alcohol and drugs

In Hounslow, drugs now seem less of a problem than alcohol. There were 4% fewer drug offences in 2003/04 than in 2001/02. The number of ambulance responses to drug overdoses were also down by 4%. Meanwhile, alcohol-related incidents were up, with Police recording a 4% rise and ambulance responses increasing by 9%.

Drug offences and service responses remained an inadequate measure of the extent of drug and alcohol problems in the borough. While we know how many people received treatment, we do not know how many people – across the borough - used illegal drugs or abused alcohol.

Police response data does not indicate the seriousness of alcohol-related incidents. We know that violent crime at night and in town centres were more likely to result in physical harm. This is assumed to be alcohol-fuelled.

Of those arrested by the Police for drug offences:
- 68% of drugs on them were class C, typically cannabis.
- 28% were class A: cocaine, crack cocaine and heroin.

There is also evidence that more than half of all acquisitive crime (for example theft and burglary) is committed to fund drug use. Acquisitive crime made up 50% of all crime.

In 24% of ambulance alcohol-related call-outs patients were unconscious or passing out. When ambulances were called to drug overdoses, patients were already in a serious condition.

Where do alcohol and drug-related incidents happen?

Alcohol:
- Mainly in the town centre areas of Chiswick, Feltham, Hounslow and Hounslow West.

Drugs:
- Most ambulance call-outs were to Hounslow Town Centre.
- There were high numbers of calls in some parts of Hanworth and Bedfont wards.

When do alcohol and drug-related incidents happen?

Alcohol:
- Mainly Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays.
- Ambulance responses increased gradually over the day.
- Police responses increased significantly from 6pm onwards.
Drugs:
• Incidents increased over the day, but peaked early in the evening between 5pm and 6pm, and then again between 9pm and 10pm.

What are we doing?
• A number of awareness campaigns about specific drugs and drug use in specific communities are ongoing.
• Training for professionals and students about drugs and problem drug use.
• Improved alcohol and drug treatment services to help those seeking assistance.
• An Arrest Referral Scheme and Drugs Treatment and Testing Orders have been implemented.
• The Police and partner agencies, closely supervise prolific and persistent offenders with drug dependency.
• Re-structured drug and alcohol services for young people.

Victims of crime
The majority of victims were aged between 25 and 44 years old, with 30 to 34 being the most frequent. Victims of violent or street crime, however, are most commonly aged between 20 and 24 years.

The Audit also revealed that:
• Victims of less serious violent crimes were typically aged between 15 and 17 years, while victims of more serious violent crimes were older.
• Women were typically victims of domestic violence. Many were aged 20 to 24 years and 30 to 39 years.
• Women were much more vulnerable to the street crime of pick pocketing than men.

Who do I contact if I want to know more?
The Community Safety Team supports the Community Safety Partnership in its statutory duty to undertake a crime and drugs audit and write, implement and monitor a crime reduction strategy. Further information can be found on Hounslow Council’s website (http://www.hounslow.gov.uk/home/a-z_services/c/community_safety.htm). Alternatively the Community Safety Team can be contacted by:

Letter
Community Safety Team
London Borough of Hounslow
The Civic Centre,
Lampton Road,
Hounslow TW3 4DN

Email
Community.Safety@hounslow.gov.uk

Fax
020 8583 2466

Telephone
020 8583 2503
What is a crime audit?
The Crime and Disorder Act (1998) places a legal responsibility on the Council, Fire Brigade, Police, Primary Care Trust, Probation and other partners to work together to reduce crime and drugs in Hounslow. To do this, every three years we undertake a review of crime and drugs in our area known as a crime audit. We then consult with as many people as possible on the findings of the audit and ask them about their concerns. From this, we write up a strategy saying how we plan to make the borough safer. This is called the crime reduction strategy. It is based on what we have found out, both from our own analysis and also from what you tell us.

What is in a crime audit?
A crime audit includes information provided by a number of agencies in the borough including the Council, Fire Brigade, Health Services, Police, Probation and many others. Where possible, the information covers a three-year period, and in the case of this Audit, from April 2001 to March 2004. In some places there are gaps in the information we have been able to obtain and we have indicated where this is the case.

It is also important that we are aware of how we are doing compared with national trends, London as a whole, and other similar local authorities in London and elsewhere. The Government calls this benchmarking and this Audit includes benchmarking data mainly from the British Crime Survey.

This Audit presents its results in the ‘Findings’ chapter. This section begins with an overview of crime trends in the borough. There are then sub-sections on each of the six priority crimes: motor vehicle crime, domestic burglary, violent crime, street crime, anti-social behaviour, and alcohol and drugs. Each section lists the main points, and then typically introduces the main crime categories and benchmarks Hounslow’s performance, before looking at when and where crimes are committed, victims and the accused.

Is this the borough’s first crime audit?
This is the London Borough of Hounslow’s third crime audit. Each time we have tried to make improvements and produce an audit more comprehensive than the previous one. This time we are trying to improve the process by looking in more depth at substance misuse, (hence the title of the Audit), as well as looking at anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder. This is because the Hounslow Community Safety Partnership wants to provide an integrated approach to tackling these problems that are linked.

An audit is not just about numbers. A large part of the audit and strategy process involves looking at what we as a Partnership have done to tackle the problems that we identified three years ago. The Crime Audit 2001 identified a number of cross cutting themes. These were:

- The importance of developing and improving information collection and data-sharing between agencies;
- The need to recognise the fast-changing ethnic composition of the borough;
- The need for a co-ordinated multi-agency approach to common crime problems;
- Focussing on crime “hotspot” locations to tackle specific types of crime;
- Setting realistic and achievable targets;
- Securing funding or other
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2As amended by sections 87 and 98 of the Police Reform Act (2002)
resources to take initiatives forward;
• More effective monitoring of how the Local Authority is implementing Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder act;
• A victim-focussed approach.
It also identified a number of specific areas for the Partnership to concentrate on. These were:
• Tackling street crimes;
• Reducing the fear of crime;
• Dealing with town centre crimes;
• A multi-agency approach to tackle and reduce anti-social behaviour;
• Positive actions to tackle the increased levels of race crime and domestic violence;
• Increasing the confidence of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities to report hate crimes to the Police;
• Practical measures to reduce the high levels of crime committed by young people;
• Tackling the use of illegal drugs and drugs markets.

What is the Hounslow Community Safety Partnership?
The Hounslow Community Safety Partnership is the term that we use to describe all the partnerships that are working together to reduce crime and disorder and substance misuse in the London Borough of Hounslow. The three main partnerships that make up the Community Safety Partnership are the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, the Drug and Alcohol Action Team and the Youth Offending Service.

How do the crime audit and crime reduction strategy link to other plans?
The London Borough of Hounslow’s key strategic document is the Community Plan. The Community Plan belongs to the whole community and is not just a Council document - it sets out a blueprint for the kind of place in which we all want to live and work. There are six key themes within the Community Plan, one of which is “A Safer Community.” The aims that are highlighted within the Community Plan need to be reflected within the new Crime Reduction Strategy.

The other key local strategic document that influences this Audit and the next Strategy is the Council’s Executive Business Plan. Hounslow Council is made up of 60 Councillors elected every four years, who are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. The Executive forms the part of the Council responsible for the most significant service decisions. The Executive is made up of the Leader of the Council, the Deputy Leader and up to nine other Councillors. Each Executive member has a personal portfolio allocated in line with the Council’s ten priorities. One of these priorities is “Promoting Community Development, Cohesion and Safety”, which is where the work of the Community Safety Partnership
fits in. Every year the Executive produces a business plan. There are a number of other national and local plans, policies and legislation that impact on the work of the Community Safety Partnership. The main ones are:

- Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy for England, 2004;
- The Anti-Social Behaviour Act, 2003;
- Building Communities, Beat Crime, 2004;
- The Children’s Act, 2004;
- Domestic Violence Crime and Victims Act, 2004;
- The Home Office Strategic Plan, 2004-2008;
- Hounslow Community Safety Partnership Improvement Plan;
- Hounslow Council’s Corporate Equality and Community Cohesion Plan, 2005-2008;
- Hounslow Council’s Corporate Performance Assessment;
- London Borough of Hounslow Alcohol Strategy (draft);
- London Borough of Hounslow Anti-Social Behaviour Interim Strategy;
- London Borough of Hounslow Community Cohesion Strategy;
- London Borough of Hounslow Drug Intervention Programme;
- London Borough of Hounslow Drug Treatment Plan;
- London Borough of Hounslow Policing Plan;
- London Borough of Hounslow Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme Strategy;
- London Borough of Hounslow Youth Justice Plan;
- London Borough of Hounslow Youth Strategy;
- London Domestic Violence Strategy, 2001;
- National Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan;
- National Drugs Strategy, 2002;
Methodology

This section explains how we took forward the task of preparing and collecting information for this Crime Audit. It also highlights the challenges that we met along the way.

**Who worked to produce the crime audit?**

Initially we put together a small Audit team. The core members of the team were mainly from the Council’s Community Safety Team: the Team Manager, the Information Policy Manager, the Partnership Analyst and the Police Partnership Inspector. The other member of the team was the Senior Police Analyst. Between them, these officers had the essential skills and knowledge required to take the Crime Audit forward. This included project management skills, knowledge of the last Audit and Strategy, research knowledge and skills such as applied research methods, some criminology knowledge and data analysis skills.

**What is involved in writing a crime audit?**

Undertaking a crime audit and strategy is very involved. The Audit team began planning back in March 2004 and started talking with our partners about what information and data to include. We then began collecting the information and data and preparing the information and data for crime analysis from April 2004 onwards. In July 2004 we looked at what we had collected and what information and data, if any, were missing that we needed.

In September 2004, the Community Safety Partnership set a number of questions to ask a panel of residents, who are a representative sample of Hounslow’s population.

It included a question on the fear of crime as well as the types of crime and anti-social behaviour that were of concern and worried them.

We also published a summary of the Crime and Drugs Audit 2004 in the October 2004 edition of the borough magazine, *hm*. There was a questionnaire at the end of the Summary document asking residents for their opinions.

In addition, the Community Safety Team along with other officers presented the summary of the Audit at meetings, including the five Area Committee public meetings held between October and December 2004. At the same time, an independent consultant spoke to specific groups and individuals. The consultant will prepare a full report on what was said, so it can be considered as we write the next Crime Reduction Strategy.

Figure 8 summaries the main stages involved in writing the Audit and Strategy.

**Figure 8. Timetable of the stages involved in the Audit and Strategy process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-AUDIT STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIME AUDIT STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST AUDIT STAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 9. Overview of the data sources used in the Crime and Drugs Audit 2004.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford County Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Transport Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow Gay Men's Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Drug and Alcohol Action Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Racial Equality Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Probation Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Treatment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Support Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Social Behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hate Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol and Drugs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family law applications and court injunctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour orders issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed acceptable behaviour contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless domestic violence cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about littering and fly tipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools self-reporting of racist incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about neighbourhood nuisance (e.g. noise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of alcohol treatment clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of drug treatment clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about abandoned vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence and racial harassment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to vandalised property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial harassment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault-related calls for assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-related calls for assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for assistance to drug overdoses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax call outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance call outs to suspicious fires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-sentencing reports and court sentencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage committed in Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate crime committed in the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences in Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of victims of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and other violent offences committed in Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough counts of hate crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of those accused of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 calls relating to disorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 calls for domestic violence and racial incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 calls to drunken and disorderly incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough counts of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough counts of firearm offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected borough counts of the number in alcohol treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected borough counts of the number in drug treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of young offenders (10-17 years) residing in Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What data was obtained and used?

The Audit uses a number of sources, including published data (for example successive British Crime Surveys) and some other pre-prepared data, such as counts of crime for London Boroughs, typically for benchmarking purposes. Mostly, however, this Audit uses data exchanged locally as agreed in the Community Safety Partnership’s information sharing protocol. This allows for the sharing of information about cases and incidents of anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and substance misuse after all personalised information is removed using specialist software called Omni-data.

In this Audit, the Police data continues to provide much of the information about crime and disorder, victims and those accused of crime. Other data providers however have complemented Police data by filling in gaps (for example the British Transport Police about crime on the railways) and, or by providing more information about particular groups (for example the Youth Offending Service and Victim Support Hounslow).

Moreover the Community Safety Partnership has been working hard with its partners to develop a broader intelligence-base from which to work. Multi-agency work for instance on the hate crimes of domestic violence, race crime and homophobic incidents provide a more comprehensive understanding of these crimes that are typically under-reported to the Police.

This Audit is also the first time that the Community Safety Partnership has explicitly looked at anti-social behaviour and substance misuse. The Council, Hounslow Homes and the London Fire Brigade are just as likely to respond to complaints and calls for assistance about anti-social behaviour as the Police and these data providers have made important contributions to these sections of the Audit. Finally, the Drug and Alcohol Action Team and London Ambulance Service data has helped develop a more rounded picture of problematic alcohol and drug use than is possible from just using Police data.

The table in figure 9 lists all the data providers and a brief description of the data. We would like to thank all the data providers who have contributed to this Audit.

How was the data analysed?

The audit and strategy process broadly follows a problem solving approach known as SARA. This stands for Scan, Analysis, Response and Assess. The Audit itself is a broad and shallow scan of the data to identify priorities, before undertaking a more narrow and deep analysis of these priorities. The Strategy is then the response to the Audit findings and the success of crime reduction initiatives to deliver the Strategy are continually assessed.

The initial scan made use of published Police monthly crime statistics and analysed it by the main Home Office classification of crime. It identified those crimes that were high volume crimes and, or showed an unfavourable rate of crime compared to other similar London Boroughs as priorities. Unfortunately, the main Home Office classifications were too broad for the purposes of this Audit, especially the largest classification of all, Theft and Handling.

The scan was therefore rerun to look at motor vehicle crime separately from other theft and handling and criminal damage offences.

The analysis then looked at all the relevant datasets and using standard crime analysis techniques explored more thoroughly the priority crimes. Broadly it examined when and where crimes happened (including looking at trends over time and geographical patterns using computer mapping), as well as targets or victims of crime and offenders of crime mainly by using Microsoft Excel. This is a standard approach to crime analysis: location, and victim and offender profiles are seen to make up three sides of what is called the problem analysis triangle.

Moreover anti-social behaviour is a priority in this Audit because it is a major
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3Hounslow Community Safety Partnership, 2000, Joint Information Sharing Protocol
concern for residents. The Community Safety Partnership was also required to consider substance misuse. Therefore these priorities were not included in the scan, but were analysed.

**What are the limitations of the crime audit?**

The data sources used in this Crime Audit are not perfect. All the data included in this Audit is of recorded cases or incidents.

Firstly not all incidences are brought to the attention of relevant agencies, and the British Crime Survey, for example, tells us that people do not always report crime because some of the crimes are seen to be too trivial. In many instances of anti-social behaviour, people may not know who to report an incident to, or no one may report incidents if communities as a whole are affected, for example by graffiti. Not surprising it is difficult to assess the extent of problematic alcohol and drug use in the borough as people may not consider they have a problem with alcohol or are unlikely to report illegal drug misuse.

Secondly, not all reported incidences are recorded. Again the British Crime Survey tells us how much reported crime the Police records and it varies depending on the type of crime with property crimes typically much better recorded. It is more difficult to know how complete are other data sets.

Moreover recording practices can change. The Police adopted the new National Crime Recording Standards in April 2002 and nationally there has been some evaluation of its impact. Other agencies also make changes to recording practices that may be less well documented, evaluated and difficult to analyse meaningfully. Or even, an agency begins to record a type of incident for the first time and it is not possible to look at changes over time.

Except for the Police, not all the agencies collate the information to do a full problem analysis triangle. While many of these agencies collate details of when and what happened, there is typically less or no information about who was involved. This poses problems of how to deal with the under-lying causes of anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and substance misuse and there are therefore gaps in this Audit. This is a particular problem for analysing anti-social behaviour in the borough.

Some incidents or cases of crime and disorder will be double-counted if it has been recorded by two or more agencies. This is a notable problem with hate crime where the Community Safety Partnership has been encouraging reporting of hate crime to the Police, other statutory agencies and voluntary and community groups. The Community Safety Partnership is working hard in this complex legal area to develop systems that can flag-up repeat reporting to different agencies.

Finally, there are a number of data sources not included in this Audit. The Community Safety Partnership is continually adding to the data sources it uses to understand the extent of crime and disorder in the borough, but there are always others that can be included. This Audit is another opportunity to review what has been done and look forward to what we want to achieve for the next Audit in 2007. This is discussed further in the final chapter.
Introduction
Anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and substance misuse needs to be understood in context. This section introduces the London Borough of Hounslow and its diverse population.

Where is Hounslow?
Hounslow is an outer London borough situated in West London. To the east is the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Ealing to the north, Hillingdon to the west and Richmond upon Thames to the south as can be seen on the map in figure 10.

Geographically, Hounslow is a large borough covering 23 squares miles and stretches from Chiswick in the east to Heathrow Airport, the international gateway to London, in the west. It is well served by public transport and ideally located for national transport links, with easy access to major roads and motorways linking Central London and the City to the south west, Wales, the Midlands and beyond via the M4, M25 and M4.

Diversity in Hounslow
The Local Authority serves a population of 212,341 and is one of the UK’s most diverse, multi-ethnic boroughs with a black and minority ethnic population of over 35% (see figure 11 for each wards’ percentage of black and minority ethnic population). The largest community is from the Indian sub-continent, who have been in the borough since World Ward II, and there are sizeable Asian communities in Heston and Cranford and Central Hounslow. There are also growing African, Caribbean, Chinese and Arabic communities. These communities make up between 5% and 9% of the population across the borough.

Further waves of migration continue up to the present day and there is a growing refugee community with many people from Somalia. Somali is one of the fastest growing languages that school children speak at home. It has increased four-fold since 1995 and it is the fifth most common language that pupils speak at home. More recently many people from the former Yugoslavia have settled in the borough. Albania, for example, was included separately in the annual pupils’ language survey for the first time in 2003. It is more difficult to...
provide an accurate figure of Hounslow’s transient populations of refugees and asylum seekers, and travellers. The most up-to-date research commissioned in 2001 estimated there were between 7,100 and 8,200 asylum seekers and refugees in the borough. This is between 3.3% and 3.9% of the resident population.

Figure 12. Fastest growing languages spoken at home by over 200 pupils in Local Authority schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog/Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Percentage of students achieving 5 or more A*-C GCSEs by gender, ethnicity and social background.

Table 1: Percentage of students achieving 5 or more A*-C GCSEs by gender, ethnicity and social background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not traveller</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked after children</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not looked after children</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travellers make use of various privately owned sites in the borough and the Local Authority maintains an official traveller site for 19 families. However, the total number of travellers temporarily residing in the borough is not known, but in schools there are approximately 200 traveller children enrolled at any one time. Many of the children are from an Irish Heritage ethnic background. The travelling community in Hounslow is considered to be relatively small.

Hounslow’s diverse communities speak over 120 different languages, and in the schools there are 13 languages spoken by more than 200 pupils across the Local Authority. The number of speakers of minority languages has grown rapidly over the last 10 years and some of the fastest growing languages are shown in figure 12. In addition, more than 1,000 pupils speak Gujerati, Panjabi or Urdu at home. In 2004, 53% of pupils surveyed spoke English at home.

The wide range of faith groups is manifested thorough the diversity of places of worship throughout the Borough – churches, chapels, gurdwaras, mosques, synagogues and temples. The Census 2001 found 52% of residents said they were Christian, but there were significant proportions of the population who were Hindu (8%), Muslim (9%) and Sikh (9%).

The age of the population also varies across Hounslow. There are more under sixteen year olds living in the West and Heston and Cranford areas of the borough, and this does not change when differences in population sizes are taken into account (refer back to figure 11). Moreover, there are more people over 60 living in the Western borough, but as a rate of population it is very similar across the whole borough.

For all age groups, the black and minority ethnic population will make up an increasing proportion of the population. The number of children age 5 to 14 years from black and minority ethnic communities is expected to increase 12% from 11,414 in 2001 to 12,794 in 2006. The number of black and minority ethnic elders (aged 65 years or more) in Hounslow is likely to increase 29% from 3,877 to 4,991 in the same period.

*Renewal SRB, 2001, Refugees in West London*
Schools, employment and skills

Hounslow school results shows improvement in all ages in recent years. In secondary schools, attendance is consistently better than the National average and the percentage of pupils gaining five good passes at GCSE has gone up by 7% since 2000 (see figure 13). Boys and girls are performing better than they did in 2000, as are pupils from different ethnic groups. Moreover, many of these ethnic groups are performing better in 2004 than the National results for 2003, except for pupils from white British ethnic groups.

The results for traveller and looked after children can be misleading as there were less than 10 pupils a year sitting GCSE examinations in the borough. However, traveller and looked after children did not perform as well as other pupils and this is likely to impact upon their aspirations and opportunities later in life.

There is much concern in the borough about disaffected young people, such as those who are not in education, employment or training. The Connexions Service is the main agency working with these young people aged 16-18 living in the borough and offers a range of support in partnership with the Learning and Skills Council. In December 2004, 372 or 6.18% of these young people were not in education, employment or training. In 2003, it had been 7%. Many of these young people face significant barriers to learning, including the lack of basic skills and an incomplete education leading to no GCSE qualifications. White working-class males, black males, care leavers, young offenders, and teenage mothers are significantly represented in this population of young people not in education, employment or training.

Thousands of Hounslow’s residents are employed in Gateway industries such as transport, aviation, accommodation, catering, and high tech companies. Logistics and freight movement are key components in this sector, with DHL and airline subsidiaries amongst the local leading players. Heathrow airport is another significant employer. Manufacturing industry also remains a major force with hundreds of firms employing thousands of people, while new businesses are being created all the time. The breakdown of employment by sector is summarised in figure 14.

Hounslow residents generally enjoy a low rate of unemployment, but average earnings are amongst the lowest in the capital. In April 2004, there were 3,336 job centre claimants, constituting 2.3% of working age people. This compares to the regional figure of 3.0% and 3.5% for London as a whole. Much of this unemployment was short-term with 1.32% claimants unemployed for over 2 years. This compares to a regional figure of 5.6%.

There is however a significant ‘skills gap’ in the current workforce with many employers experiencing difficulties in recruiting staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>London West Learning Skills Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and wholesale distribution</td>
<td>22,552</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and catering</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communication</td>
<td>17,498</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediaries</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, renting &amp; business activities</td>
<td>23,610</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8,522</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>8,179</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>11,233</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5West London Learning and Skills Council, 2002, Hounslow: Annual Business Inquiry
6The following is from West London Learning and Skills Council, 2002, Hounslow: Annual Business Inquiry
Education Service focus on working with partnership organisations to reach non-traditional learners. The success of this is that 45% of Further Education learners are from Learning and Skills Council’s disadvantaged categories.

**Deprivation**

Deprivation refers to unmet needs caused by a lack of social and material necessities and is not just financial. Examples include diet, health, clothing, housing, household facilities, environment and work. Historically, deprivation has been concentrated in Metropolitan areas, and in London typically the inner and eastern London Boroughs. The latest Government research, however, continues to show that there are parts of Hounslow that are deprived.

The most deprived areas in Hounslow have broadly remained the same since 2000. This can be seen by comparing the two maps in figure 15. There are notable and persistent areas of deprivation in the wards of Bedfont, Brentford, Hanworth, Heston West and Isleworth. The Indices of Deprivation 2004 has the advantage of being more precise and for the first time it shows areas of deprivation within many of the wards in the borough and 3 areas in Hounslow are in the top 10% most deprived areas in England. These are located in Feltham West, Hanworth and Isleworth.

Many of the underlying factors of deprivation are also the underlying factors affecting differences in people’s health. These health inequalities show up differences between groups of the population in the types of ill-health and success rates of treatment as well as health care caused by deprivation and individual lifestyle choices. For example, nationally the majority of diseases are common in people from the lowest social classes. In Hounslow, the Hounslow Primary Care Trust has found:

- The average household income in Hounslow (2001) was slightly over £25,000, less than the London average (£27,000). There are considerable differences in household income between different parts of Hounslow.

- The South Central area of Hounslow has the largest population in unsuitable housing. Overall, white people make up the largest group of people in unsuitable housing but people from black and mixed heritage communities have the largest proportion of people living in unsuitable housing.

- School exclusion rates are highest in the following ethnic groups: Travellers of Irish heritage; Mixed heritage: White and Black Caribbean; Black and Black British: Caribbean; and Any Other Black.

- Air quality is poor in parts of the borough.

**Developments**

A number of major developments are currently underway or planned for the borough, including three town centre regeneration projects and the construction of a fifth terminal at Heathrow Airport. Major developments are set to regenerate three of the key town centres of Brentford, Feltham and Hounslow. Outline permission has been granted for a mixed-use development in Brentford town centre, with the Council continuing to facilitate regeneration of this area. In Feltham and Hounslow town centres, planning permissions

---

7 Office of Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, *The English Indices of Deprivation (Revised)*
8 It is important to be aware that the Government’s measure of deprivation is a relative measure ranking areas from the most deprived (ranked 1) to the least deprived. Deprived areas are those areas containing a large number or proportion of deprived people.
have been granted for mixed-use developments comprising retail, offices, leisure and recreational facilities and housing along with improvements in public transport and accessibility that will encourage daytime and more nighttime activity in town centres. The redevelopment in Feltham town centre is already underway with the Hounslow town centre development proposed to start in 2005.

These major developments will result in a substantial increase in the number of households in the borough. 826 homes were built in 2003/04. The percentage of affordable homes being built has increased from 14% in 2002/03 to 21% in 2003/04.

In the west of the borough, Heathrow’s fifth terminal is currently under construction. At the peak of the development in 2006 there will be a total of 6,000 workers employed on the fifth terminal. Approximately 1,000 of these will be office based workers and 5,000 site workers. Many of these workers (49% according to a recent employee survey) live out of the borough, but spend the week in Bed and Breakfasts and private rented accommodation locally. Once completed, the fifth terminal will create 16,500 more jobs in addition to the airport’s present employment of 68,000 people. Heathrow Airport will continue to dominate the economy in Hounslow.

**Local perceptions on crime and disorder**

The Community Safety Partnership has frequently asked residents for their opinions on anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder, and the fear of crime in the borough. Tackling anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder is consistently a high priority for residents and one, they say, will make the most difference to living in Hounslow.

Survey returns show people are beginning to feel safer in Hounslow (see figure 16). The percentage of respondents feeling very or fairly safe outside during the day went up from 78% in 2002/03 to 80% in September 2004. The results for people’s sense of safety after dark are more ambivalent. We can say that people’s fear of crime increases significantly after dark and that Hounslow residents’ sense of safety outside during the day and after dark in recent surveys remained below that of London as a whole.

Further analysis of the September 2004 survey shows that women, the disabled and respondents from black and minority ethnic backgrounds felt less secure when out during the day. Fear of crime among vulnerable groups is summarised in figure 17. This survey also identifies geographical differences between areas. More respondents living in Chiswick (94%) felt safe during the day than those in Heston and Cranford (72%). Despite fewer respondents feeling safe outside after dark, the pattern in the responses were much the same.

![Figure 16. Residents’ fear of crime survey results](image1)

![Figure 17. Fear of crime among vulnerable groups](image2)
Figure 18. Residents’ victimisation and fear of victimisation for selected categories of crime survey results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having your home broken into and something stolen.</td>
<td>7% 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having your house damaged by vandals.</td>
<td>4% 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having your car broken into and something stolen or taken off it.</td>
<td>3% 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having your car stolen.</td>
<td>3% 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being mugged and robbed in the street.</td>
<td>1% 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being physically assaulted or attacked in the street.</td>
<td>1% 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these.</td>
<td>81% -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other findings highlight the difference between the chance of victimisation and the fear of crime. Figure 18 brings together the most comparable results from two surveys and shows the percentage of respondents who were victims of certain crimes in the last year and the percentage of residents concerned that they could be victims of these crimes. The results show first that someone’s fear of crime is much higher than the likelihood of them being a victim of crime. Second that there is no straightforward cause and effect between victimisation and the fear of crime. For instance, reducing crime and disorder and therefore lowering the likelihood of someone being a victim will not necessarily reduce the fear of crime. This is an area of work that the Community Safety Partnership will need to research further.

Summary

Hounslow is an outer, West London Borough and is one the UK’s most diverse, multi-ethnic boroughs that is projected to become even more diverse. Children in Local Authority schools are achieving more and progress is being made to help disaffected young people in the borough. Employment remains strong and the three town centre regeneration projects and Heathrow’s fifth terminal will generate even more jobs. There however remain the challenges of low pay and a ‘skills gap’ and persistent areas of high deprivation in the borough. Finally, Hounslow residents’ feelings of safety remain below that of London, and certain groups and neighbourhoods feel less secure than others. Reducing anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and substance misuse is consistently a high priority for residents.
Findings

This section now examines the findings of the Crime Audit. It examines the general crime trend in the borough, before discussing the priority crimes we have identified of motor vehicle crime, domestic burglary, violent crime, street crime, anti-social behaviour, and alcohol and drugs.

Hounslow’s crime trends

Main Points
- Crime in Hounslow decreased by 7% in the last year.
- The number of crimes, however, peaked in 2002/03 when local police officers were diverted to central London, because of the threat of terrorism.
- Over the whole Audit, crime has increased by 2%.
- Hounslow’s crime rate in 2003/04 is once again below that of London, but the borough has the third highest crime rate in its Home Office’s group of ‘most similar’ boroughs.
- Initial analysis identifies six high volume priority crimes that accounted for significant portions of all recorded crime.

The level of crime in Hounslow is decreasing. The number of offences peaked in 2002/03 when the Police recorded 32,842 crimes, before falling to 30,416 offences in 2003/04 (see figure 20)\(^1\). This was a 7% reduction in crime over the past year and equates to about 200 fewer crimes per month.

The Audit, however, spans a very difficult time for policing in Hounslow. Like most London boroughs, Hounslow’s monthly statistics showed crime rising after the New York terrorists attacks of 11 September 2001. Crime remained high until the following September as local police officers continued to be diverted to central London. This helps explains why crime increased between 2001/02 and 2002/03 in the borough. Recent reductions were insufficient for us to see a reduction in crime over the whole three-year period of this Audit (2001 to 2004) and overall crime has increased by 2%.

The 2003/04 figures for Hounslow are encouraging. Figure 21 compares the rates of crime for the nation, region and the borough. Not surprising Hounslow’s annual crime rate is above that for England and Wales, because the Capital has the highest rate of crime in the UK. It is therefore better to assess Hounslow’s performance to the London region generally. In 2002/03 Hounslow’s crime rate was greater than that for London as a whole, but crime has since fallen in the borough, and once again Hounslow is below the London crime rate.

The Government also likes to compare crime rates between similar boroughs. The Home Office have grouped Hounslow with a number of other similar boroughs.

\(^1\)This does not include notified offences recorded by the British Transport Police, which totalled 706 over the 3 years. Given the low number of offences, British Transport Police data is not discussed further in this Audit.
borders, including 12 London boroughs (see the profile of Hounslow on page 17 and figure 22 for the list of these London boroughs). Hounslow’s rate of 143 crimes per 1,000 population is not the highest in this grouping, but it is the third highest crime rate and it is much higher than the group’s average crime rate of 126 crimes per 1,000 population.

An initial scan of all crimes in Hounslow identified six priority areas of high volume crime. These are:

- High volume property crimes of motor vehicle crime (26% of all crime) and burglary (11%) (of which the majority were domestic burglaries);
- Criminal damage (8%), which is included in the section on anti-social behaviour;
- High volume crimes against the person of violent crime (22%) and to some extent street crime (5%);
- And as a separate offence, drugs made up only 2% of all crime in the borough, but crime is often alcohol or drug-related.

These categories of crime account for significant portions of all recorded crime and this can be seen in the pie chart in figure 23. High volume crimes not included are ‘other theft and handling offences’ as this is a general crime category covering a number of unrelated offences. Neither will fraud and forgery be included as banks are mainly dealing with this.

Many of the high volume, priority crimes committed in Hounslow follow the borough crime trend of peaking in 2002/03 and falling in 2003/04. Burglary is an exception and its year on year rise is due to more domestic burglaries. As a percentage, however, priority crimes of motor vehicle crime, street crime and Ambulance responses to drug-related crime have fallen, while all other priority crimes have risen by more than 2% over the period of this Audit. Figure 24 summarises these changes. The graph shows the percentage increase or decrease in 2003/04 from that recorded in 2001/02.
Motor vehicle crime

**Main Points**
- Motor vehicle crime is now at its lowest level in five years.
- While there are fewer thefts of motor vehicles, there are more thefts from motor vehicles in Hounslow than London generally.
- 47% of motor vehicle crime was theft from a motor vehicle.
- Motor vehicle crime was concentrated in Chiswick, Heston and Hounslow town centre.
- Many motor vehicle crimes were committed overnight.
- This crime costs the borough £18 million a year.

**Introduction**
Motor vehicle crime in Hounslow is now at its lowest level in five years. Motor vehicle crime covers both motor vehicle related theft (and this includes interfering with a motor vehicle with the intention of stealing a motor vehicle or steal from it; theft of, or taking a motor vehicle without permission; and theft from a motor vehicle) as well as criminal damage to a motor vehicle.

**Benchmarking**
Motor vehicle crime still remains a concern in Hounslow. While there were fewer thefts of motor vehicles in Hounslow compared to other London boroughs, the borough has a greater problem with property stolen from motor vehicles than London generally. This can be seen in figure 25. Despite this, the borough achieved its national target to reduce motor vehicle crime in 2003/04 as highlighted in figure 26.

**Statistics**
The trend in motor vehicle crime has not always been downward (see figure 27). The Police recorded 7,681 motor vehicle crimes in 2001/02. It peaked in 2002/03 to a total of 8,025, before then falling to 7,142 offences in 2003/04. The five-year reduction was 11% and over the three years of this Audit the number of motor vehicle crimes fell by 7%.

Most of the crimes were thefts from motor vehicles (47% as can be seen in figure 28) and the number of crimes in this category fell by 8% during the three years. A further 32% were intentional or reckless criminal damage to motor vehicles, and crimes in this category was down by 12%. Motor vehicles were stolen or taken without consent in 19% of the crimes. Up 4%, this was the only offence to have increased.

**Place and time analysis**
Thieves from motor vehicles was most common in Chiswick and Heston, whereas Hounslow town centre was a hotspot for theft of motor vehicles. However, the stealing and taking of motor

---

**Figure 25. National, regional and borough number of motor vehicle crimes (theft of and theft from) per 1,000 population, April 2001 to March 2004.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England &amp; Wales (excl London)</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 26. Hounslow’s Best Value targets and actual performance for motor vehicle crime, April 2001 to March 2004.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of motor vehicle crimes per 1,000 population</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Value targets</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27. Motor vehicle crime yearly trend, April 1999 to March 2004.**
and 2003/04 than the winter months and typically more criminal damage happens in the winter. This generalised seasonal pattern however was interrupted by a substantial increase in all motor vehicle crimes from April 2002 to September 2002. Many motor vehicle crimes are committed overnight. ‘From time’ peaked between 6pm to 7pm and ‘to time’ peaked at 8am to 9am, typically when people parked cars and returned to them the next day. This is shown in the graph in figure 29. The ‘from time’ of theft of motor vehicles and taking without permission and theft from motor vehicles also increases after 9am and picks up again over lunch and late afternoon as people leave cars when they go to work or go shopping.

Victim and accused profile
A summary of victims and those accused of motor vehicle crime is shown in figure 30.

Cost of crime
• The total cost in the borough over the past three years is estimated at more than £18 million.
• For each crime, individuals pay an average of £620 in security, insurance and the cost of objects stolen, and a further £240 in time off work and quality of life.
• It cost businesses £680 for every theft from a motor vehicle and £9,700 if a motor vehicle is stolen.

What are we doing?
• We have purchased an overt CCTV van with an automatic number plate reading facility to help identify stolen, untaxed and uninsured vehicles.
• ‘Safer Streets’ proactive police operations are focusing on motor vehicle crime.
• Making motor vehicle crime a ‘priority crime’ for the Police.

Table: Victim and accused profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Accused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>60% Male</td>
<td>93% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical age</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>10-17 &amp; 18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>69% White</td>
<td>70% White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The Police record the times between when a crime was committed. For many property crimes, victims can report when they left their property and when, upon their return, their property had been broken into, stolen or damaged.
Domestic burglary

Main points
- Hounslow’s burglary rate is higher than that for London as a whole.
- Domestic burglary peaked in 2003/04, but since March 2004 there has been a month on month reduction.
- 93% of all burglaries involved someone physically breaking-in to gain entry.
- Burglary hotspots coincide with areas of married couples (with children) and cohabiting couples (without children) and areas with a high proportion of private rented flats, apartments and maisonettes.
- Most domestic burglaries were committed during the day when people were out.
- Domestic burglary cost more than £14 million during the Audit period.

Introduction
Domestic burglary made up 6% of all crime during this Audit. A domestic burglary is said to have occurred when a person enters someone’s home (or part of someone’s home) as a trespasser, with intent to steal, rape, cause criminal damage or grievous bodily harm. A domestic burglary may be aggravated, if a person has a weapon, a firearm (real or otherwise) or explosives. Entry may also be achieved by some form of deception, i.e. pretending to be a water board official. This is referred to as burglary by deception in this Audit.

Benchmarking
Hounslow has not been successful in reducing domestic burglary and because of this, the borough compares unfavourably to London generally. While Hounslow has experienced an upward trend in the number of burglaries per 10,000 households, there have been successive, annual reductions across London (see figure 31). Consequently in 2003/04 Hounslow’s domestic burglary rate was well above that of London as a whole. Neither has Hounslow achieved its National Best Value target as shown in figure 32.

Statistics
Domestic burglary peaked in 2003/04 when the Police recorded 2,131 domestic burglaries. Figure 33 shows that this is due to increases of 7% and 8% each year over the period of this Audit from a five year low of 1,843 offences recorded in 2001/02. Domestic burglary now makes up 7% of all crime.

Since March 2004, however, as a result of reorganising how burglaries are investigated, there has been a month on month reduction in offences. A reduction of 26% was achieved during the period between March and September 2004, compared to the same period last year.

Figure 31. National, regional and borough number of domestic burglaries per 10,000 households, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales (excl London)</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32. Hounslow’s Best Value targets and performance for domestic burglary, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of domestic burglaries per 1,000 households</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Value targets</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6% of domestic burglaries were burglaries by deception. Offenders typically target vulnerable victims and in Hounslow, victims were usually aged over 70 years (85% of all victims) and female (68%). 93% involved a burglar physically breaking-in to steal property. The predominance of break-ins can be seen in

Figure 33. Domestic burglary yearly trend, April 1999 to March 2004.
the pie-chart in figure 34. Just over 1% of burglaries involved injury to the householder (aggravated burglary).

**Place and time analysis**

During the past three years, domestic burglary was a problem in and around Turnham Green Terrace, Chiswick High Road and Hounslow West. These hotspots are clearly visible on the map in figure 35. All three hotspots have a high percentage of married households (often with children) or cohabiting couples (without children). In the Turnham Green hotspot there was a higher proportion of private rented accommodation, comprising flats, maisonettes and apartments. These are mainly conversions or attached to businesses, such as flats above shops.

Typically, more burglaries happened in winter, except in 2003/04 when the hot summer lead to a higher than normal number of burglaries in July and August as people left doors and windows open in the hot weather.

Most domestic burglaries were committed during the day when people were out. The time graph in figure 35 shows a general downward trend in the ‘from time’ between 9am and 10am as people leave their homes. Other peaks included after lunch, during the school run in the afternoon and early evening onwards. The ‘to time’ increased over the day and peaked between 6pm and 7pm, when many people return home.

**Victims and accused profile**

A summary of victims and those accused of domestic burglary is shown in figure 36.

**Cost of crime**

- In total, domestic burglary cost more than £14 million during the Audit period.
- On average, burglars stole £380 worth of property per burglary.
- It is estimated that every domestic burglary had an emotional cost to victims of £600 and that a further £430 was spent on security and insurance.

**What are we doing?**

- Domestic burglary is a priority area in the current Crime Reduction Strategy, 2002-2005. The Council, Police and voluntary agencies have worked together to provide crime prevention advice and support to victims of domestic burglary.
- The Police also have formed a dedicated burglary unit to investigate crimes and arrest burglars quickly.
- In agreement with the Police, one of the Council’s local public service agreements is to reduce domestic burglary by 25%.
- A crime prevention advice pack is given to all victims of burglary.
**Violent crime**

**Main Points**
- Violent crime made up 30% of all recorded crime in this Audit.
- Violent crime increased by 13% in the past three years. This was mainly due to changes in how crimes are recorded.
- 37% of violent crime were violence against the person offences, which increased most in 2002/03 by 25% and by 26% overall.
- Nearly 50% of all violent crimes are domestic violence, and the number of incidents of domestic violence increased by 16% during the three-year Audit period.
- 10% of violent crimes were racially motivated.
- Violent crime cost more than £389 million in Hounslow in the period 2001 to 2004.

**Introduction**
Violent crime is committed when an individual feels threatened, is harassed or physically attacked. It includes violence against the person offences such as serious crimes like homicide and less serious offences causing injury (for example actual bodily harm) or no injury (for example common assault) as well as sexual offences.

Hate crimes are also violent crimes, and this Audit looks at three of the main forms of hate crime: domestic violence, and incidents that are racially motivated or of a homophobic nature. This adopts a broader definition of violent crime that takes account of how victims perceive crime. Using this broader definition of violent crime, violent crime made up 30% of all recorded crime in this Audit. Together, hate crimes made up 60% of violent crimes committed in the borough (see figure 37).

The number of violent crimes peaked in 2002/03 when in April 2002 the Police adopted the new National Crime Recording Standards that resulted in an increase in reporting such crimes.11 This impact is shown in figure 38. The increase of 13% over the past three years, however, was significant and may represent an actual rise in violent crime in the borough.

The following sub-sections now focus on violence against the person offences (excluding hate crime) and the hate crimes of domestic violence, race crime and homophobic crime separately.

**Violence against the person**

**Introduction**
In this Audit, violence against the person offences excludes hate crime. Therefore, these crimes are typically threats or acts of violence by a person with whom the victim is maybe acquainted with or a stranger. Figure 39 shows the majority of violence against the person crime are common assault or threats of violence that does not result in injury, and when ambulances are called to an assault incident, it is more often to treat minor injuries.

---

11Nationally the new standards impacted significantly upon violent crime and it is likely that this impact continued for some time (see Simmons Jon, Legg, Clarissa and Hosking, Rachel, 2003: National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS): an analysis of the impact on recorded crime. Companion volume to Crime in England and Wales, Home Office Online Report).

12The figures presented here will not reconcile with the published Police statistics for the borough. Published statistics include hate crimes.
Findings

Figure 40. Violence against the person crime recorded by the Police and number of assaults treated by the Ambulance Service yearly trend, April 2001 to March 2004.

![Graph showing trend in violence against the person crime over financial years 2001/02 to 2003/04.]

Figure 41. Violence against the person crime ‘hotspot’ map and time analysis, April 2001 to March 2004.

![Map showing distribution of violence against the person crime in different areas of the borough.]

Figure 42. Summary profile of patients treated by the Ambulance Service, victims and those accused of violence against the person crime, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Accused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>66% Male</td>
<td>65% Male</td>
<td>78% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical age</td>
<td>15-34</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>66% White</td>
<td>61% White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics
Police statistics show violence against the person offences went up year on year from 2,878 crimes in 2001/02 to 3,621 in 2003/04, with much of the increase in 2002/03 (see figure 40). These types of offences went up in 2002/03 by 25% and by 26% overall during the Audit period. London Ambulance Service incidents of assault show a peak in 2002/03, but a reduction overall. This suggests that while recording standards have impacted on crime statistics, some of the increase in 2002/03 may reflect a rise in the number of incidents.

Domestic violence

Introduction
Domestic violence is any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) between adults who are or have been intimate partners or family members, regardless of gender. 49% of all violent crime is domestic violence, and Hounslow has consistently had one of the highest rates of domestic violence in London (see figure 43).

Statistics
Police figures show domestic violence has increased by 15% in 2002/03 and 16% overall during the three-year Audit period. This is also supported by figures provided by the national Refuge organisation for the calendar years 2002 and 2003. Other services in the Borough record little change (Hounslow Homes) or a reduction (the Council’s Homeless Persons Unit). All the figures for the different agencies are available in figure 44. Of all the domestic violence incidents reported to the Police, 40% of them were classified as violence.

### Number of incidents per 1,000 population and Rank (1=highest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Place and time analysis

National research says one in four women are subject to domestic violence, and domestic violence is a general problem across the borough. There are however a number of areas where domestic violence is better reported, often associated with social housing where neighbours are likely to report disturbances and victims report to and are supported by social landlords. This explains some of the hotspots of domestic violence showing in figure 46. More general areas that are increasingly reporting domestic violence include Cranford, Feltham North and Hounslow Heath.

Patterns of when domestic violence incidents happen generally reflect times when partners and families are together, typically on an evening and at weekends (see figure 46). The number of domestic violence incidents increases after 7pm. 31% of incidents of domestic violence happened either on a Saturday or a Sunday.

### Victim and accused profile

There is a high proportion of repeat victimisation. It has however been falling from 34% in 2001/02 to 28% in 2003/04. Figure 47 profiles victims and those accused of domestic violence.

### Race crime

**Introduction**

A racist incident can take many forms including physical attack, verbal abuse and insults, threats and intimidation, graffiti, damage to property or belongings or a persistent or isolated incident. Race crime is defined as 'any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person'. Hounslow

---

**Findings**

**Figure 43.** Comparison of closely ranked London boroughs to Hounslow of domestic violence incidents per 1,000 population, April 2001 to March 2004.

**Figure 44.** Domestic violence incidents and cases recorded by different agencies yearly trend, April 2001 to March 2004.

---

*The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report quoted in Metropolitan Police Service, 2001, Racial violence: understanding and responding to hate crime factsheets*
Findings

Figure 46. Domestic violence incidents ‘hotspot’ map and time analysis, April 2001 to March 2004.

Figure 47. Summary profile of victims and those accused of domestic violence incidents, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Accused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>69% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical age</td>
<td>20-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>62% White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 48. Comparison of closely ranked London boroughs to Hounslow of racially motivated incidents per 1,000 population, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 49. Racially motivated incidents and cases recorded by different agencies yearly trend, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Police incidents</th>
<th>Hounslow Homes cases</th>
<th>Hounslow Racial Equality Council cases</th>
<th>School incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has consistently had one of the highest rates of racially motivated incidents in London (see figure 48).

Statistics

In Hounslow, a number of agencies collate statistics on race crime in the borough. The yearly totals are available in figure 49. Police data shows racially motivated incidents have steadily fallen by a third over the Audit period. In actual numbers this is a drop of 291 incidents over the three years from 1,069 reports in 2001/02 to 778 in 2003/04. There are concerns as to whether this reflects a reduction in race crime in the borough, under-reporting or no reporting due to falling confidence in statutory agencies. There is insufficient evidence elsewhere to answer these concerns. The Schools data is very useful, but measures a reduction in the school population only.

The Police mainly classified racially motivated incidents as violence against the person (48%) and a further third recorded as other notifiable crime with 33% of this figure recorded as an alleged Public Order Section 5 offence. Public Section Order 5 is defined as words that ‘may cause alarm, harassment or distress’. The other main categories of race crime are shown in figure 50. Over the Audit we have seen an increase in the proportion of race crimes directed at individuals and families and fewer incidents of criminal damage. In Schools, the majority of racist incidents were derogatory name calling (65%).

Place and time analysis

There is a general consensus among the different agencies that race crime is more of a
problem in the centre and west of the borough. Police data and casework handled by Hounslow Homes identified Feltham West as a hotspot for racial motivated crime. Further analysis also highlights high levels of incidents reported to the Police in Syon, Cranford and Bedfont wards (see figure 51) whereas Hounslow Homes identified problems in the wards of Hanworth, Brentford and Chiswick.

The Police data also shows race crime is more often committed on Fridays and Saturdays with more than a fifth of all incidents occurring on these days. Unfortunately, due to the low numbers of racial motivated incidents recorded, hourly analysis only shows a broad upward trend from midday onwards and peaking by 11 pm (see figure 51 again).

Victim and accused profile
There is a high proportion of repeat victimisation. It has however been falling from 24% in 2001/02 to 15% in 2002/03 and 2003/04. Figure 52 profiles victims and those accused of racially motivated incidents.

Racist incidents at school were generally perpetrated by boys (78%) from white ethnic backgrounds (63%) and directed at other boys (67%) from black and minority ethnic backgrounds (77%), usually of the same year group.

Homophobic crime

Introduction
Homophobic crime can include threats or acts of violence and intentional damage to property attributed directly to social intolerance towards those who are (or perceived) not to be straight
d2.

Homophobic crime is under-reported, and a recent survey across the 3 boroughs of Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham and Hounslow show the extent of this under-reporting

The survey found that 36% of respondents had been victims of homophobic crime. 61% of the respondents however did not report the incident mainly due to lack of confidence in reporting to the Police and 74% of victims did not seek further support.

Statistics
Police data recorded a total of 175 homophobic incidents in Hounslow over the past 3 years. The number of reported incidents declined each year from 61 incidents in 2001/02 to a total of 56 incidents in 2003/04. Over this period, Hounslow was still the ninth or tenth highest
London borough for reported homophobic crime as can be seen in figure 53.

Homophobic incidents were more often threats of violence, intimidation and harassment. The pie chart in figure 54 provides a full breakdown of the types of offences that were of a homophobic nature. A high proportion of the offences (39%) could not be classified, but the victims felt they were being harassed or distressed by malicious phone calls.

In the recent survey, 85.5% of homophobic incidents were of a verbal nature. The Police data is again limiting in describing the impact of an incident on a victim. Whereas the survey gives some idea of how distressing, such offences are to the victims. Nearly 1 in 4 respondents categorised their last experience as very serious. 29% of those surveyed found the last incident deeply distressing.

The survey also examined domestic violence in the context of intimate, same-sex relationships. This type of crime has been very difficult to extract from Police data. The survey revealed 1 in 5 respondents had been affected by domestic violence by a family member (31%) or by a partner (20%) or ex-partner (30%).

Victim and accused profile
Geographical and victim profiling suggested a high level of repeat victimisation with clusters of incidents involving victims of similar profiles. It also highlighted areas where gay men come together in the borough. Figure 55 profiles victims and those accused of homophobic incidents.

The Gay Men’s Project survey also helps understand more about the relationship between victims and offenders. While most offenders were strangers or passer bys, the victim knew other offenders either through work or from around the local neighbourhood.

All violent crime: cost of crime
- Violent crime cost more than £389 million in Hounslow in the period 2001 to 2004.
- The cost of violent crime is usually between £18,000 and £19,000 per incident, the majority of which is a cost to the victim.

All violent crime: what are we doing?
- An outreach worker supports victims of domestic violence at Feltham Community Safety Unit, based at Feltham Police Station.
- Making homes of victims of domestic violence safer, to help them remain in their own homes.
- Provision of a ‘survivor pack’ to all victims of domestic violence.
- High visibility Police patrols in town centres late in the evening and on the weekends.
- Setting up community (third party) reporting centres for race crimes.
Street crime

Main points
• Street crime decreased by 20% over the Audit period.
• The majority of street crimes were muggings and this fell by 11% and 12% each year.
• Street criminals usually committed crime in town centres.
• There is a clear time of day pattern for the different kinds of street crime. Pick-pocketing peaks between 2pm and 3pm, while other street crimes occur later in the day.
• Muggings alone were estimated to have cost £12 million over the three years.

Introduction
Street crime decreased by 20% over this Audit period. Street crime is made up of robbery, what many people refer to as 'mugging' (theft of personal property with use/threat of personal violence outside of the home). It also includes snatch offences (i.e. handbag forcibly snatched from a person's grasp) and pick-pocketing. With the exception of pick-pocketing, some element of force is used or threatened.

Other robbery (business robbery) is, for example, theft from a shop, where some element of force is used or threatened. Business robberies only accounts for 5% of all street crime, so this report concentrates on muggings, snatches, and pick-pocketing.

Benchmarking
Benchmarking data is only available for robberies. As can be expected of an outer London borough, Hounslow's rate of robbery is below that of London as a whole and in 2003/04 Hounslow met its National target to reduce robberies (see figures 56 and 57).

Statistics
Like most other London boroughs, Hounslow experienced a rise in street crime and mobile telephone thefts in 2001/02. This is shown in figure 58. After the peak in 2001/02 of 1,815 recorded offences, the number of street crimes dropped 4% in 2002/03 and by a further 17% in 2003/04, when the Police recorded 1,453 street crimes. This averages to 4 robberies a day across the whole borough.

The breakdown of the different offences that make up street crime is presented in figure 59. It shows 51% of street crimes were muggings, although reports fell between 11% and 12% each year. Pick-pocketing (23% of all street crime) nearly halved between 2001/02 and 2003/04. It is now at its lowest level for five years. Snatches make up more than 20% of all street crimes. It was the only street crime offence to go up in the past three years.

Figure 56. National, regional and borough number of robberies per 1,000 population, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales (excl London)</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 57. Hounslow's Best Value targets and actual performance for robbery, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of robberies per 1,000 population</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Value targets</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 58. Street crime yearly trend, April 1999 to March 2004.

Figure 59. The main categories of street crime, April 2001 to March 2004.
Place and time analysis
Street crime relies upon a high volume of pedestrian traffic. It therefore happens in Hounslow Town Centre and to a lesser extent Chiswick and Feltham town centres. Further analysis suggested that crime occurred around tube stations across the borough, including Hounslow West, Hounslow Central and Turnham Green. Street crimes happen at definite times. Pickpocketing offences increased sharply from 10am onwards and peaked between 2pm and 3pm. Pickpocketing reports fell just as sharply from 3pm onwards. Mugging and snatches peaked later – between 4pm and 5pm – remaining high from this time onwards. The place and time analysis can be seen in figure 60.

Victim and accused profile
A summary of victims and those accused of street crime is shown in figure 61.
### Findings

#### Anti-social behaviour

**Main Points**
- Anti-social behaviour went up 10% during this Audit period, mainly because of better recording.
- 43% of all anti-social behaviour was environmental, and the dumping of motor vehicles accounted for more than half of these offences.
- Nearly a third of anti-social behaviour was of a malicious nature. That category included threatening behaviour and criminal damage (including arson).
- 25% was disorderly and this type of behaviour makes people avoid public spaces like town centres and parks.
- Anti-social behaviour is a general problem across the borough, but with specific geographical and time patterns depending on the type of anti-social behaviour.
- Anti-social behaviour cost services in the borough an estimated £18 million for the three years.

**Introduction**

Anti-social behaviour went up 10% during this Audit period, mainly because of better recording. This Audit uses the definition agreed in the London Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy adopted by many of the regional agencies. This definition separates anti-social behaviour into three main categories of:

- Environmental anti-social behaviour;
- Interpersonal or malicious anti-social behaviour (and this is just called malicious in this Audit);
- Public space anti-social behaviour.

It was not possible to collect all the relevant datasets for the different types of anti-social behaviour in time for this Audit. Further work is therefore needed to fully understand the nature and extent of anti-social behaviour in the borough. Figure 62 describes the data that was collected and how it was divided into the three above categories of anti-social behaviour.

As the pie chart shows in figure 63, 43% of all anti-social behaviour was environmental. Nearly a third of anti-social behaviour was of malicious nature. Finally 25% was disorderly and this type of behaviour makes people avoid public spaces like town centres and parks.

The following sub-sections now focus on environmental anti-social behaviour and malicious anti-social behaviour separately. Much of public space anti-social behaviour is drunken behaviour and drug-related.

---

**Figure 62. Overview of anti-social behaviour data sources used in the Crime and Drugs Audit 2004.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malicious anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>Environment anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>Public space anti-social behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Transport Police</td>
<td>Hounslow Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>Hounslow Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage on railways/ the underground</td>
<td>Signed acceptable behaviour contracts</td>
<td>Repairs to vandalised property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow Homes</td>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoax call outs</td>
<td>Appliance call outs to malicious fires</td>
<td>All criminal damage committed in the borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harassment committed in the borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other violence committed in the borough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 63. The main categories of anti-social behaviour, April 2001 to March 2004.**

---

Figure 64. Environmental anti-social behaviour yearly trend, April 2001 to March 2004.

![Environmental anti-social behaviour yearly trend graph]

Number of incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (financial years)</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>11,975</td>
<td>12,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 65. The main categories of environmental anti-social behaviour, April 2001 to March 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td>6,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about noise nuisance</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>2,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about littering and fly tipping</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about graffiti</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see figure 64). This is an increase of 2,976 incidents or 32%. The annual total for the main forms of environmental anti-social behaviour is listed in figure 65. It shows environmental anti-social behaviour has gone up mainly because complaints about littering and fly tipping have trebled over this Audit and due to the Council improving its services to report and deal with graffiti.

**Statistics**

Reported incidents of environmental anti-social behaviour have increased in the borough from 9,320 in 2001/02 to 12,296 in 2003/04 (see figure 64). This is an increase of 2,976 incidents or 32%. The annual total for the main forms of environmental anti-social behaviour is listed in figure 65. It shows environmental anti-social behaviour has gone up mainly because complaints about littering and fly tipping have trebled over this Audit and due to the Council improving its services to report and deal with graffiti.

**Environmental anti-social behaviour**

Introduction

Environmental anti-social behaviour covers behaviour that deliberately or through carelessness degrades the local environment. The main forms of environmental anti-social behaviour include many of the types of complaints received by the Council, and the dumping of motor vehicles accounted for more than half of these offences. A further 25% was noise nuisance.

Statistics

Reported incidents of environmental anti-social behaviour have increased in the borough from 9,320 in 2001/02 to 12,296 in 2003/04 (see figure 64). This is an increase of 2,976 incidents or 32%. The annual total for the main forms of environmental anti-social behaviour is listed in figure 65. It shows environmental anti-social behaviour has gone up mainly because complaints about littering and fly tipping have trebled over this Audit and due to the Council improving its services to report and deal with graffiti.

**Place and time analysis**

Figure 66 presents three maps of the different types of environmental anti-social behaviour. It includes a map on abandoned vehicles; littering, fly tipping and graffiti; and then one map for noise nuisance. These environmental anti-social behaviours have very different geographical patterns.

Dumping of motor vehicles and setting cars alight was often committed in parks and open spaces, for example around Bedfont Lakes and Hounslow Heath during the Audit period. A number of hotspots also centre around Council estates in the borough. This is partly explained by the data included from Hounslow Homes, who only pick-up abandoned vehicles on Council property.

Some environmental anti-social behaviour is seasonal. Complaints about abandoned vehicle peaks in July and August and is no obvious pattern for fly tipping, littering and graffiti. Complaints of noise nuisance increased, for example in the summer. Much environmental anti-social behaviour probably happens on a weekend. There are however difficulties in accurately recording when environmental anti-social behaviour happens. Typically the Council receives more complaints on Mondays and Tuesdays than any other day of the week. It is likely that environmental anti-social behaviour happening on a weekend is reported the next working day or so.

It is possible to do day of week analysis of the complaints the Council receive about noise, 37% of which are due to intrusive domestic music. Most complaints are made about unacceptable noise on the weekend, mainly because of private parties.

The other two types of anti-social behaviour are more concentrated in the town centres of the borough. The Council received the most complaints about fly tipping, littering and graffiti reported in and around Hounslow town centre and to some extent the other town centres in the borough. Chiswick is a hotspot for noise nuisance.

Figure 66 also contains various time analyse of the main types of environmental anti-social behaviour.

Some environmental anti-social behaviour is seasonal. Complaints about abandoned vehicle peaks in July and August and is no obvious pattern for fly tipping, littering and graffiti. Complaints of noise nuisance increased, for example in the summer. Much environmental anti-social behaviour probably happens on a weekend. There are however difficulties in accurately recording when environmental anti-social behaviour happens. Typically the Council receives more complaints on Mondays and Tuesdays than any other day of the week. It is likely that environmental anti-social behaviour happening on a weekend is reported the next working day or so.

It is possible to do day of week analysis of the complaints the Council receive about noise, 37% of which are due to intrusive domestic music. Most complaints are made about unacceptable noise on the weekend, mainly because of private parties.

---

The large number of complaints in January will be affected by the Council’s limited service over Christmas and the New Year.
**Findings**

**Public space anti-social behaviour**
- 32%

**Environmental anti-social behaviour**
- 43%

**Malicious anti-social behaviour**
- 25%

---

**Figure 63**

**Number of incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (financial years)</th>
<th>2001/02</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 66**

**Complaints about noise nuisance.**

- **Time (day of week and time of day)**
  - Sun: 1,160
  - Mon: 390
  - Tue: 367
  - Wed: 346
  - Thu: 380
  - Fri: 760
  - Sat: 1,329

---

**Complaints about littering, fly tipping and graffiti.**

- **Time (financial years)**
  - Apr: 600
  - May: 800
  - Jun: 1,000
  - Jul: 1,200
  - Aug: 1,400
  - Sep: 1,600
  - Oct: 1,800
  - Nov: 2,000
  - Dec: 2,200
  - Jan: 2,400
  - Feb: 2,600
  - Mar: 2,800

---

**Complaints about abandoned vehicles.**

- **Time (financial years)**
  - Apr: 600
  - May: 800
  - Jun: 1,000
  - Jul: 1,200
  - Aug: 1,400
  - Sep: 1,600
  - Oct: 1,800
  - Nov: 2,000
  - Dec: 2,200
  - Jan: 2,400
  - Feb: 2,600
  - Mar: 2,800
Malicious anti-social behaviour

Introduction

Malicious anti-social behaviour is acts directed against specific individuals, groups or organisations that causes harassment, alarm or distress. In the case of hoax calls to the London Fire Brigade, these incidents by agencies about harassment, alarm or distress.

Statistics

The number of recorded incidents by agencies about malicious anti-social behaviour reported to the Police of criminal damage (7%) and harassment and other violence (28%) compared to 2001/02.

Other incidents of malicious anti-social behaviour generally show a reduction over the Audit period. Hounslow Homes repairs to vandalised property has more than halved from 936 in 2001/02 to 451 repairs in 2003/04. The London Fire Brigade received 136 fewer hoax calls in 2003/04 than in 2001/02. Only the number of fires of a

Criminal damage except to a motor vehicle.

In the case of hoax calls to the London Fire Brigade, these incidents by agencies about harassment, alarm or distress. The London Fire Brigade, these incidents by agencies about harassment, alarm or distress. These offences endanger lives.

Malicious anti-social behaviour includes certain types of behaviour counted elsewhere in this Audit, such as some violence against the person crime and criminal damage to a motor vehicle. While this data is recorded in this section, it is not discussed and readers are encouraged to refer to the sections on violent crime and motor vehicle crime for a fuller understanding of malicious anti-social behaviour in the borough.
suspicious cause went up. This includes fires that the Fire Brigade can substantiate as malicious and fires that are doubtful, but are likely to have been started maliciously. The yearly figures can be seen in figure 68.

Place and time analysis
The main forms of malicious anti-social behaviour can be separated into criminal damage (reported to the Police and to Hounslow Homes repairs centre) and anti-social behaviour handled by the London Fire Brigade. There are therefore two maps in figure 69. Agencies are also better at knowing when offences happened as shown in the time charts.

Criminal damage reported to the Police was most common in Hounslow and Feltham town centres as well as on some Council estates. Criminal damage was more often a problem later in the evening from 4pm onwards, and particularly on a Friday and Saturday night. On these days of the week, the behaviour is likely to be alcohol-fuelled.

Hounslow Homes only service Hounslow Council’s tenants. All vandalism reported to Hounslow Homes therefore happens on Council property. Hounslow Homes also operates a limited service over the weekend, but there are more reports made on Monday and Tuesday than the other days. This suggests that much of the vandalism is committed on a weekend.

Hoax calls to the London Fire Brigade were concentrated in Hounslow town centre. Whereas malicious or suspicious fires handled by the London Fire Brigade were more of a problem on open spaces in the west of the Borough and some Council estates and in the summer months. For the Fire Brigade, from 4pm to 8pm is a critical time when they received the most hoax calls and attend more fires of a suspicious nature. Sunday is the exception, when a significant proportion of hoax calls and malicious or suspicious fires are attended to from midday to 4 o’clock. Saturday and Sunday were also higher than expected for hoax calls and malicious or suspicious fires.

Victim and accused profile
The Police routinely collate data on the victims and offenders of criminal damage.
This is the profile in figure 70.

Cost of anti-social behaviour
• The cost to services alone is estimated at £18 million for the three years.

What are we doing?
• There are now three area-based Anti-Social Behaviour Action Groups. A person committing anti-social behaviour is referred to an Action Group where a multi-agency panel decides how to best deal with them.
• Twenty-five anti-social behaviour orders have been taken out to tackle persistent offenders.
• Hounslow Homes has set up a central and specialised anti-social behaviour team and the Police have dedicated resources to an anti-social behaviour unit.
• In the past three years the Council and partners have introduced new services. There also have been improvements in existing services (for example, Wing Security now deals with abandoned vehicles on behalf of Hounslow Homes).
• Hounslow Council removes 71% of abandoned vehicles within three days.

Alcohol and drugs
Main Points
• Alcohol and drugs are a problem in Hounslow but they are different and separate problems.
• Alcohol-related problems are associated with high street areas and to some extent so are drug-related incidents.
• Alcohol abuse is more likely to happen at the weekend and later in the evening, whereas drug misuse is likely to occur earlier in the evening.

Introduction
Alcohol and drugs can become a problem for individuals who come to the attention of the Criminal Justice System through alcohol-related disorder or by committing drug and drug-related offences. An individual may also seek medical attention due to alcohol and drug excesses. Alternatively family, friends and the individual may recognise that s/he has a problem and seek treatment. There are many others who do not, and we do not know how many people across the borough use illegal drugs or abuse alcohol.

Alcohol and drugs are a problem in Hounslow but they are different and separate problems. There is no robust way of estimating how many people abuse alcohol and drugs in the borough. National research suggests more than 1 in 10 crimes in the borough is drug-related, either committed under the influence of drugs or to pay for a person’s addiction. There is also evidence to suggest that more than half of all acquisitive crime (for example theft and burglary) is committed to fund drug use. Acquisitive crime makes up 50% of all crime.

Benchmarking
According to treatment benchmarking data, there are fewer people in treatment in Hounslow for alcohol and drugs compared to the West London region. The British Crime Survey data shows there are fewer drug offences committed in Hounslow. Moreover, Hounslow’s rate of drug offences has changed very little compared to the London region, which has recorded an increase in the number of drug offences per 1,000 population. In the borough there were 4% fewer drug offence in 2003/04 than in 2001/02. These measures and the results in figure 71 are however imperfect and unreliable.

Statistics
Emergency services responses by the Police and Ambulance Service suggests drugs now seem less of a problem than alcohol. The differences in the service responses are shown in figure 72. Alcohol-related incidents were up, with the Police recording a 4% rise and ambulance responses increasing by 9%. The number of ambulance callouts peaked in 2002/03 due to a large number of calls between May and November 2002. Meanwhile the number of ambulance responses to drug overdoses were down by 4%. Ambulances however may not be called in all incidents, because of fear that the Police will get involved.

Service responses and activity are also an inadequate measure of the extent of the alcohol and drug problems in the borough or the trend in alcohol and drug abuse. The Police response data does not indicate the seriousness of alcohol-related incidents, but we know that violent crime at

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Number of treatment cases per 10,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>West London: 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>West London: 12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Number of drug offences per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>England &amp; Wales (excl London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>2001/02: 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>2002/03: 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>2003/04: Not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
night and in town centres is more likely to result in physical harm. This is assumed to be alcohol-fuelled. In 24% of London Ambulance Service alcohol-related call-outs patients were unconscious or passing out. Patients were usually male and aged between 18 and 49 years old.

Of those arrested by the Police for drug offences 68% of drugs on them were class C, typically cannabis. 28% was class A: cocaine, crack cocaine and heroin. In Hounslow the most popular way of smoking heroin is in ‘spliffs’. This is unusual as in other boroughs where there is a large Asian community this method of use is virtually unheard of.

Furthermore, the London Ambulance Service data does not discriminate between legal and illegal drugs or accidental and deliberate overdoses. When ambulances were called to drug overdoses, patients were all ready in a serious condition. The findings above should be treated with caution.

**Place and time analysis**

Alcohol incidents mainly happen in the town centre areas of Chiswick, Feltham, Hounslow and Hounslow West. While most ambulance call-outs to drug overdoses were to Hounslow Town Centre, there were a high number of calls in some parts of Hanworth and Bedfont wards. This is despite many of those seeking treatment living in Cranford and Heston and Central Hounslow areas.

Alcohol-related incidents mainly happen on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. The time of day when the Police and Ambulance response to calls is shown in figure 73. Although ambulance responses increased gradually over the day, Police responses to alcohol-incidents increased significantly from 6pm onwards. Both services responses peak by about midnight. Ambulance responses to drug overdoses increased over the day, but peaked early in the evening between 5pm and 6pm, and then again between 9pm and 10pm.

**Drug user profile**

There is a greater prevalence of men committing drug offences than women, and to a lesser extent more men seek treatment than women in Hounslow. In contrast London Ambulance Service responded to the same number of women as men. The London Ambulance Services data does not differentiate between drug overdoses on prescribed or illegal drugs. Therefore the data is not comparable.

The age of drug users is shown in the graph in figure 74. The Criminal Justice System deals typically with younger drug users between twenty and twenty-four, although a significant proportion of offenders are aged from fifteen to twenty-nine. Those treated by the Ambulance Service or seeking treatment are slightly older aged 25 years onwards to 39 years old.

The Criminal Justice Statistics and the Treatment Statistics show a similar proportion of people from white or black and minority
Findings

Victims of crime

Main points
- The Police recorded between 34,700 and 37,000 offences a year when someone was a victim of crime.
- It is estimated that there were more than 4,100 offences a year committed against businesses. However, not all crimes have victims. Certain types of crime are ‘victimless’, namely drug offences, going equipped to steal, and credit card fraud as banks normally accept the costs of credit card fraud.
- People suffer emotionally, psychologically, and sometimes physical harm and sometimes the loss of valubables as a consequence of crime. Government research has tried to calculate all the costs of crime for different types of crimes, and this research has been used in this Audit to calculate the cost of crime in the borough.
- The findings of the Audit are summarised in figure 75. In total, crime cost the borough more than £451 million in the last 3 years.
- Certain types of crime are not all crimes have victims.

In Hounslow from April 2001 to March 2004, the Police recorded between 34,700 and 37,000 offences a year when someone was a victim of crime. It is estimated that there were more than 4,100 offences a year committed against businesses. However, not all crimes have victims. Certain types of crime are ‘victimless’, namely drug offences, going equipped to steal, and credit card fraud as banks normally accept the costs of credit card fraud.

People suffer emotionally, psychologically, and sometimes physical harm and sometimes the loss of valubables as a consequence of crime. Government research has tried to calculate all the costs of crime for different types of crimes, and this research has been used in this Audit to calculate the cost of crime in the borough.

The findings of the Audit are summarised in figure 75. In total, crime cost the borough more than £451 million in the last 3 years.

Violent crime makes up the majority of the cost of crime in Hounslow for the three years, for which the physical and emotional costs far exceed any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Crime</th>
<th>Total cost (£ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle crime</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic burglary</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>£389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and drugs</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>£451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 74. Age profile of problematic drug users who enter the Criminal Justice System, overdose and treated by the Ambulance Service, or seek drug treatment, April 2001 to March 2004.

This will include individuals who were victims of more than one crime and offences where there were two or more victims. Unfortunately the number of victims of crime is not available and therefore we cannot calculate the repeat victimisation rate for the borough.

From April 2001 to March 2004, there were between 3,500 and 4,400 offences where the Police did not record a victim’s gender, age or ethnicitc. These are mostly businesses, but it is likely that some small businesses will be recorded as individuals.

stolen or damaged property. In 2002/03, 9,532 people in the borough accessed services provided by Victim Support Hounslow. This fell in 2003/04 by 10% to a total of 8,597. Many people used the services of Victim Support Hounslow after being a victim of burglary (27%), grievous bodily harm or actual bodily harm (19%) or theft (19%). The pie chart shows the breakdown of all the offences in figure 76.

The Police statistics show men are more often recorded as victims of crime, but women are more likely to be victims of violent crime and street crime (called crime against the person) than property crime (see figure 77). Crime against the person, however includes a number of crimes committed mostly against women, for example domestic violence and pickpocketing that explains why this might be.

Younger people are also more at risk of crime against the person. The number of offences for crime against the person peaks for the age group 18 to 29 years old. A large number of victims of offences however are also aged 10 to 17 years old. 21% of all victims are 17 years old or under.

For property crime, the number of offences peaks later for the age group 30 to 39 years old. There are very few offences involving young people (4%), and instead the number of offences increasing substantially for the age group 18 to 29 years old.

Black and minority ethnic victims are disproportionately victims of violent crimes and street crimes, such as all the violence against the person offences, which is probably due to a number of factors.
Offenders

Main points
- In Hounslow, the number of offences ‘cleared-up’ by the Police went up from 3,965 in 2001/02 to 4,593 in 2003/04.
- Police statistics show most crime is committed by men and by people aged between 20 to 24 years old.
- There has been a reduction in the number of young people offending and re-offending in the borough.
- The Probation Service has seen an increase in post-custody supervision and an emphasis on community rehabilitation.
- The Community Safety Partnership has identified 30 prolific and other persistent offenders to target prolific offenders associated with drug misuse.

The profile of those accused of crime can be seen in figure 78. Police statistics show men committed over 80% of crimes over the audit period and this increased to over 90% of the high volume priority crimes of street crime, motor vehicle crime and domestic burglary. A notable exception is that women were just as likely to commit pick-pocketing as men.

Those committing offences were typically aged between 15 and 24 years old, and the highest offending age group was 20 to 24 years old. A significant number of crimes were committed by 18 years old. There was however a sizeable proportion of offences committed by people under the age of 17 years old. 25% of all offenders are 17 years old or under.

Many young offenders committed motor vehicle crimes (and specifically theft of or taking a motor vehicle without authority) and street crimes. Older age groups generally committed the other types of offence of theft from a motor vehicle, interference and criminal damage.

The average age of domestic burglars decreased during the Audit period data. In 2001/02, 22% of burglars were aged between 15 and 19. This increased to 45% of burglars in 2003/04.

Black and minority ethnic offenders are disproportionately offenders of crimes against the persons and more so for street crime than violence against the person offences.

Rehabilitate and Prevent
There are a number of different specialists agencies, working in partnership and including the Police, to rehabilitate offenders and prevent re-offending in Hounslow.
- The Youth Offending Service works with young people (10-17 years old) reprimanded or warned by the Police, or sentenced by the court.

Figure 78. Age, gender and ethnicity profile of those accused of property crime and crime against the person, April 2001 to March 2004.
Figure 79. Number of people and offences committed by young people reprimanded or warned by the Police, or sentenced by the court, 2001 to 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Number of young people</th>
<th>Number of offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Probation Service seeks to reduce the offending of adult offenders given community sentences, or those released from prison.
- There is a prolific and other priority offender programme to reduce prolific offending associated with drug misuse.
- This section examines the different categories of offenders in turn.

Youth Offending Service
Despite a marginal increase in the number of 10-17 year olds in the population since 2001, crime recorded against young people normally resident in the London Borough of Hounslow has fallen markedly and continues to fall\(^2\). In the calendar year 2001, there were 497 young people offending, committing 1,065 offences. In 2004, the number of young people fell to 363 and the number of offences to 776 (see figure 79).

In 2004, 81% of the young people were men and 70% were from a white ethnic group. The number of young offenders increased substantially from 13 onwards as can be seen in figure 80.

The Youth Offending Service is recording positive trends. Involvement in education is improving, more young people have been engaged in restorative justice and 83% of young people are in satisfactory accommodation compared with 64% last year. The involvement of young people in final warning programmes is consistently high. Considerable progress has been made towards reaching the target for remanded young people. Custody rates in Hounslow are the lowest of the London boroughs. There are however challenges in relation to submission of pre-sentence reports, and those in relation to Detention and Training Order where the availability of meeting slots remains an issue.

Re-offending analysis of the cohort of young people identified in 2001 and followed up after 12 and 24 months shows re-offending patterns in figure 81.

The table in figure 81 suggests that the early intervention is a good method of halting re-offending in the short term, and the effect remains quite positive in to the second year. This cohort group includes reprimanded young people and those who have received final warnings.

The second cohort group that includes fines and reparation orders shows that half so dealt with re-offended within the following 12 months. However, that figure

Findings

The same effect is seen with the community penalty group. Nationally, and Hounslow is no exception, the offending behaviour of young people who have progressed to the stage of community penalties is proving the hardest to impact, and 70% re-offending in this element of the cohort is a matter of concern. However, it is also encouraging that on the basis of this early analysis this has not increased in the second year.

Figure 82 shows the re-offending after 12 months of the 2002 cohort. This suggests that the impact of community penalties after 12 months has risen encouragingly in the most recent cohort we can look at.

The Probation Service

There has been an increase of the volume of pre-sentence reports resulting in higher levels of supervision by the Probation Service in Hounslow over this Audit. The main increase has been in post-custody supervision.

The emphasis has been working with offenders in the community as can be seen in figure 83. The Probation Service ensure that those sentenced to community rehabilitation orders are required to attend offending behaviour programmes which address either general offending or specific problems, such as alcohol-related offending. The Probation Service has also been active in offering basic skills tuition to offenders, as there is a clear link between improvement in basic skills level and reductions in re-offending.

Offenders sentenced to a Community Punishment Order are required to perform between 40 and 240 hours of unpaid work to benefit the local community. Offenders have been involved in projects such as painting and decorating the homes of the elderly and in schools, gardening projects and recycling projects.

Over the Audit about 16% of offenders were given a custodial sentence. 88% of cases are men, and the majority of cases aged between 18 and 29 years old. 62% of offenders dealt with by the Probation Service were from a white ethnic background. This can be seen in figure 84.

Prolific and other priority offenders

The Prolific and other Priority Offender programme is a coherent initiative in three complementary strands to reduce crime by targeting those who offend most or otherwise cause most harm to their communities. The three strands are ‘prevent and deter’, ‘catch and bring to justice’ and ‘rehabilitate and resettle’. It will replace the existing National Persistent Offender Scheme.

Hounslow have identified 30 prolific and other priority offenders. A profile of these offenders can be seen in figure 85. 5 or 17% of the offenders are women, 16 or 53% are from a black and minority ethnic group and the majority are aged between 18 and 24 years old.

In addition, there are further 20 in the ‘prevent and deter’ strand, divided into high and low risk. These will be regularly reviewed and change as offender profiles or the potential for someone to offend changes.
Figure 84. Age, gender and ethnicity profile of adult offenders living in Hounslow, April 2001 to March 2004.

Figure 85. Age, gender and ethnicity profile of Prolific and Other Priority Offenders in Hounslow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old or under</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and minority ethnicity</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the main issues from the findings of the crime audit?

Firstly, this Audit acknowledges the diversity of Hounslow’s population and the need to promote community cohesion. The discussions about anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder and substance misuse have been put into the context of an increasingly diverse and multi-ethnic borough.

Then, one of the main issues from the findings is the reduction in crime in Hounslow in the last year by 7%. Crime had peaked in 2002/03 due to local police officers being diverted into central London. This Audit demonstrates the importance of keeping police resources, and the Safer Neighbourhood’s programme -- the pan-London strategy to create a number of policing teams at neighbourhood-level -- prevents local policing from being removed off borough is therefore very welcomed.

The Audit also shows the success of reducing motor vehicle crime and street crime in the borough. Motor vehicle crime however was the largest crime category in the Audit and Hounslow’s performance compared to the London region for theft from motor vehicles is high. Similarly, the most violent form of street crime – robbery – made up over half of audited street crime. The Audit does provide a detailed analysis of the geography and timing of the street crime that should allow for some specific targeted activity.

More is needed to reduce domestic burglary. Hounslow’s upward trend in the number of domestic burglaries is in contrast to the regional London trend of consecutive reductions. Consequently domestic burglary peaked in 2003/04 and the borough is at risk of not meeting its Public Service Agreement target.

The Audit highlighted the necessity of keep tackling violent crime. Violent crime increased by 13%, although this was mainly due to changes in how crimes are recorded. Other data clearly shows Hounslow consistently has the highest incidence of domestic violence and race crime in London and to some extent a high level of homophobic incidents.

Anti-social behaviour went up 10% mainly due to better reporting. For the first time, the Community Safety Partnership has begun to examine the facts about anti-social behaviour in the borough and successfully managed to put together a more complete picture of the problems. This section of the Audit re-affirms the importance of reducing environmental and malicious anti-social behaviour in the borough.

Finally the Audit has discussed the difficulties of measuring the extent of alcohol and drug abuse in the borough, yet, identified critical areas of work that the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and the Drug and Alcohol Action Team need to address together, such as social drinking and disorderly and violent behaviour in the borough’s town centres.
What needs further investigation?

There is a need for more work to be done on generators of crime. The Audit is very descriptive about where and when incidents happen, but says little about what causes anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder, and substance misuse. Analysis and research needs to think more about people’s economic, social and material circumstances, lifestyles, motivations as well as markets, such as for stolen goods and drugs.

More research is also needed on number of areas identified in this Audit. These include fear of crime, anti-social behaviour and more collaborative research around alcohol and drugs.

On anti-social behaviour, there needs to be more work about who commits anti-social behaviour. Many agencies collect data about where and when anti-social behaviour is committed and who is making the report, but not often who is committing the anti-social behaviour. There may be reasons why this data is not collected, such as it being too costly to investigate. It would still be useful to find out more about who is committing what kinds of anti-social behaviour and the communities that are affected.

Finally, further work needs to be done on understanding and managing the risk of victimisation and the risk of offending in the borough. This will help the Community Safety Partnership put in place preventative strategies as well as practical initiatives to reduce the likelihood of victimisation as well as work with those at risk of offending.

Are there any strategic information improvements?

The Community Safety Partnership needs to make better use of the information produced by the various partners. There are a number of information officers analysing and writing reports that are not circulated beyond their own organisation and that could be used to understand changes in trends and patterns as well as help explain them. The next step would be to contribute to each other’s reports. This is particularly relevant between the Council and the Police, who through the introduction of the National Intelligence Model produce regular audits about crime and disorder in the borough called Strategic Assessments.

To help circulate information, the Community Safety Partnership need to find ways to communicate with all community safety practitioners, including those in the community and voluntary sector. This ought to complement national and regional sources about crime trends; crime reduction initiatives and successes; and good practice at a local level. It should also assist sharing of personalised information about those at risk of being victims of crime or offending.

Finally the Community Safety Partnership needs to improve its sharing of information around children and young family services in the borough, the courts and offenders after they have been convicted. This should build upon much of the good work around identification, referral and tracking of children at risk and the renewed focus on offenders through the prolific and other priority offender programme.

What happens next?

The Community Safety Partnership will now write the next Crime Reduction Strategy, 2005-2008. The strategy will set out what stakeholders and residents from the recently completed consultation and the Community Safety Partnership want to see happen in the next three years. This will then involve all partners working closely together to agree action plans and implement crime reduction initiatives to achieve the aims and targets included in the Strategy.

The Audit will remain an important reference document for the next three years. And the findings of the Audit provide the baseline from which the Partnership wants to improve upon.
If you would like this document in audio-tape, Braille or interpreted in your own language, please call 020 8583 2503 or email: community.safety@hounslow.gov.uk

Who do I contact to find out more?

Further information can be found on Hounslow Council's website (http://www.hounslow.gov.uk/home/a-z_services/c/community_safety.htm).

Alternatively, the Community Safety Team can be contacted by:

Letter  Community Safety Team, London Borough of Hounslow, The Civic Centre, Lampton Road, HOUNSLOW TW3 4DN
Email   Community.Safety@hounslow.gov.uk
Telephone 020 8583 2503
Fax       020 8583 2466