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- Havering is one of 32 boroughs that make up Greater London

- Approx. 242,000 permanent residents over 43 square miles (23 square miles of protected green belt surrounds the urban area)

- Most ethnically homogenous London borough (83% White British, compared to 55% for London)

- Less deprived

- Holds title of “Luckiest town” in the UK for number of National Lottery winners
Scanning
Scanning - Background

- Urban Decline 1990’s Romford Town Centre (central business district)
- Lack of amenities and reduced footfall after dark
- High fear of crime after dark (perceived as a no-go area)
- Romford Urban Strategy (1996-2006)
  - Relaxed Planning policies
  - Stimulated growth of late night venues
• 41 restaurants, 21 bars/pubs and 4 nightclubs

• Huge social and economic benefits

• Romford key regional Metropolitan Centres

• Key role in London’s night time economy (NTE)

• 1.1m+ night time economy visitors annually (Fri/Sat)
Scanning – New Challenges

- Night time violence and disorder linked to burgeoning NTE

- By 2009/10 Romford Town had:
  - Highest rate of violence per 100,000 visitors for regional centres
  - Highest volume of violence outside the West End
  - A 3-year increase of +27% for recorded violence

*Figure 2 Rate of Violence in Metropolitan Centres 2009/10 (Source Metropolitan Police crime data and GLA Workday population estimates)*
• A priority for the partnership

• Negative media attention

• 37% of residents thought drunk and rowdy behaviour was a problem

• Just 55% of residents felt safe after dark
Scanning – Impact

- Disproportionate amount of violence occurring within NTE – the 80/20 rule
- High socio-economic cost of £5.1m
- Data triangulation highlights significant under-reporting to police
- Impact on victims extends beyond the initial event (i.e. health)

Outcome of assault patient data for those attending Accident & Emergency departments (ER) in Havering 2012-13
Analysis
Analysis – Data sources

- Victim / Offender / Location analysis

- Data sources:
  - Metropolitan Police violence data
  - Ambulance & Hospital violence data
  - Officer & front line worker statements
  - Details of investigations reports
  - Academic Research
Analysis – Background

• 11-15,000 18-24 year olds each Fri/Sat Night

• High proportion of “binge drinkers”

• Intoxication = exposure to risk

• Irresponsible drinks promotions
Analysis – Victims

• 18-29 year old males

• 85% of victims had consumed alcohol

• 58% could not remember the circumstances

• Half of victims from outside Havering

• Typically involving persons unknown to one another
### Type of Injury (%, LAS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Injury</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Injury</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts / Bruising</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Injury (includes eye injury, abdominal, concussion)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laceration / Weapon Wound</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis – Offenders

- 18-29 year old males
- Suspects believed to be intoxicated
- Police time dominated by prisoners in custody
- Minimal risk of apprehension and punishment
Analysis – Locations

- Violence takes place predominantly in the street
- An acute temporal pattern

% VWI by time 2008-2010

- 3% from 9am to 12pm
- 7% from 12pm to 3pm
- 7% from 3pm to 6pm
- 6% from 6pm to 9pm
- 17% from 9pm to Midnight
- 52% from Midnight to 3am
- 8% from 3am to 6am
- 1% from 6am to 9am
Analysis – Locations and crime script
Analysis – Overview of specific problems

Victims
• Inadequate safeguards for intoxicated people
• Higher cost and risk of injury from glass/bottles
• Customers enter Romford already intoxicated (potential offenders also)

Offenders
• Activity was aimed towards detecting offences late rather than removing potential offenders (or victims) at an early stage
• No fear of consequences of behaviour

Locations
• Unregulated space and street furniture leads to crowding
• Closing times of venues mean large numbers leave together
• Insufficient transport to remove people at the end of the night
Response
Response – Previous responses

- Educating people about harmful drink levels – not immediate
- Saturation policing - ineffective
- Best Bar None – didn’t address issues outside
Response – Safeguards against the intoxicated

- Extending guardianship, removing vulnerable targets
  - Radio-link system
  - Safe Haven (Deeper lounge) (10pm-3am)
  - Street triage (10pm-4am)
  - Marshall taxi rank (10pm-3:30am)
Responses – risk of serious injury

- Controlling tools and weapons
  - Toughened glass / polycarbonate glasses
  - Restrictions on times and locations of waste removal
  - Street Pastors securing discarded bottles brought into town
Responses – addressing intoxication

- Removing excuses
  - Mandatory licensing conditions
    - Banning drinks promotions
    - Raising minimum price
  - Local regeneration and highways policies
    - Licence required for advertising boards
Responses - offenders

- Removing excuses, denying benefits, reducing anonymity
Responses - offenders

• Controlling access, strengthened formal surveillance
  • CCTV
  • ScanNet/ClubScan
Responses – locations

• Prevention through design, increasing effort, reducing provocations, control access and screen exits

• Reduction of street furniture and ‘clutter’

• Licensing (tables, chairs, outside space)
Responses – locations

- Control access and screen exits
- Staggered closing times
- Encouraging late licences

Red – premises open until midnight 1am
Blue – premises open until 1am-2am
Green – premises open until 3am
Purple – facilities open later than 4am
Assessment
Assessment - safeguards

- Street Triage
  - 10 persons per month treated for injuries on site
  - 57% referred via radio-link from other frontline workers
  - 29% reduction in alcohol related ambulance call-outs since (274 down to 191)
- Prevention of serious injury by glass/weapon
  - From 20 per year to average of 3 per year
Assessment – removing offenders and consequences

• 103 persons banned in first 12-months

• Periods of 3-weeks to 5-years

• Increase in offences with suspect (almost doubling to 70%)

• Sanctioned detections increased from 36% to 55% (not incl. bans)

• Dramatic reduction in victims not wishing to proceed (from 33% to 3%)
Assessment – concentration of incidents

Figure 15 Map showing before and after hotspot concentrations of violence in Romford
Assessment – comparator data

Rate of Violence Per 100,000 Night Time Visitors (London Ambulance Service)

- Romford Town
- Metropolitan Centre average (London)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Romford Town</th>
<th>Metropolitan Centre average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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