

Urban crime rankings

Blair Gibbs

Andrew Haldenby

REFORM

May 2006

The Authors

Blair Gibbs is the Crime Research Officer at *Reform*. He studied at Merton College Oxford before joining *Reform* in March 2005.

Andrew Haldenby is Director of *Reform*. He established *Reform* with Nick Herbert in 2001.

Reform

Reform is an independent, non-party think tank whose mission is to set out a better way to deliver public services and economic prosperity.

We believe that by reforming the public sector, increasing investment and extending choice, high quality services can be made available for everyone.

Our vision is of a Britain with 21st Century healthcare, high standards in schools, a modern and efficient transport system, safe streets, and a free, dynamic and competitive economy.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	
1. Crime in England and Wales	8
2. Measuring crime	12
3. Methodology	18
4. Key findings	24
5. Crime in London	27
6. Policy recommendations	29
Appendix	32
- Tables	
References	

Executive Summary

- The publication of information is a key means to improve the performance of public services. For services such as health and education, it allows users to exercise choice between providers, often supported by advisers such as GPs. There has been a dramatic increase in consumer information for health and education in recent years. For services such as policing, where choice does not apply, it allows local communities to compare the performance of different police units and to demand better performance.
- The performance of public law and order agencies in England and Wales needs improvement. Despite recent falls, on the latest surveys crime remains amongst the highest in the developed world. The Cabinet Office Strategy Unit has described England and Wales' performance on violent crime as a "weakness" compared to other countries. The latest British Crime Survey results show that crime ceased to fall in the calendar year 2005.
- Accurate, relevant and easily intelligible local data on crime would put pressure on police forces to improve. At present, however, such data is not available:
 - Police recorded crime is a measure of all crime reported to the police and subsequently recorded by them as an offence. Police recorded crime at the national and regional level is published quarterly.
 - The Home Office has recently begun to record crime by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs), based on local government boundaries. It does not however publish a ranking of CDRPs. Few individual police forces present detailed data on recorded crime in their area.
 - The annual British Crime Survey is a national survey based on 40,000 adults living in private households. While it records many crimes not reported to the police, such as domestic violence and failed burglaries, it does not record many others including crimes against children and shoplifting. .
 - Performance assessments for each police force (PPAF) are published annually by the Home Office. While full of useful data, the results are opaque to the general reader and resist comparisons between forces on the key issue of crime levels in urban areas.
- The independent Statistics Commission has recently criticised the crime statistics for England and Wales. In December 2005 it said: "We think there is a need to explore alternative ways to convey trends in crime concisely and unambiguously – whilst being mindful of the need to avoid adding to public confusion." In January 2006 the Home Office announced a major cross-party review of how crime statistics are compiled and published to increase public understanding of crime trends.
- A better way to present statistics on crime may be to measure crime by city. Cities are understandable geographical units in a way that local

authority areas or police force areas are not. They also contain the highest levels of crime.

- A similar American project, by the researchers Kathleen O’Leary Morgan and Scott Morgan, now in its twelfth year of publication, has shown that presenting crime data by city can have a powerful incentive effect on local agencies. The Prosecutor of Camden County, New Jersey, the city with highest crime in the last two years, has commented that the publication of the rankings “helped to coalesce the Camden Police Department, an array of law enforcement agencies at the county, state and federal levels, the Camden community and its neighbors to focus on the crime problem with new vigor and to find solutions.”
- *Reform* has therefore compiled data on levels of recorded crime in 2005 for each city in England and Wales with a population of over 100,000. Information where necessary for specific offences was obtained using Freedom of Information requests to police forces.
- The crimes covered were: murder, rape, assault, burglary, robbery, car crime and gun crime. These were chosen to allow accurate comparisons and to follow the precedent set by the American edition. These offences were deemed to be readily understandable and popularly associated with the main types of crime perceived as a threat to one’s property or person. And so while it does not cover some high frequency crimes such as criminal damage or drug offences, it can be taken as a starting point. Together the offences surveyed typically represent a third (34 per cent) of all property crime and more than two thirds (69 per cent) of all violent crime.¹
- Crime levels were divided by population numbers (drawn from the 2001 Census or, for the individual London boroughs, from the Office for National Statistics 2004 mid-year estimates).
- The results produced the following key findings:
 - Dramatic variation between the best and worst performers. At 115.5 crimes per 1,000 population, Nottingham had almost four times the level of crime as the safest towns in the rankings: Southend, which recorded 30.9 crimes per 1,000 population, and Poole, with 32.7 crime per 1,000 populations.
 - Dramatic variation between towns of similar size. Nottingham’s crime rate of 111.5 crimes per 1,000 population can be contrasted with the much better performance of towns of around 250,000 people such as Wolverhampton (49.1/1,000) or Reading (43.4/1,000).
- In terms of the different categories of individual offences, the results found:

¹ These percentages relate to the seven categories of offences surveyed as a proportion of the respective recorded crime figures for the whole of England and Wales for the financial year 2004-05, as published in Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, ‘Crime in England and Wales 2004-05’, *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

- Nottingham had the highest number of murders per 100,000 population, followed by St Helens. Brighton and Hove and Cambridge had no murders in 2005.
 - Nottingham had the highest levels of vehicle crime per 1,000 population, followed by Manchester. Ashford and Eastbourne had the lowest.
 - Portsmouth had the highest number of rapes per 10,000 population, followed by Peterborough. Exeter and Swansea had the lowest.
 - Leicester had the highest number of assaults per 1,000 population, followed by Bradford. Southend and York had the lowest.
 - Stockport had the highest number of burglaries per 1,000 population, followed by Leeds and Nottingham. Norwich had the lowest rate.
 - Manchester had the highest number of robberies per 1,000 population, followed by Nottingham. Ashford and Poole had the lowest.
 - Bradford had the highest number of gun crimes per 10,000 population, followed by Leeds. Dudley and St Helens had the lowest.
- It could be argued that the London boroughs should be included as “cities” since each has a population of over 100,000. If so the results for London also show a wide variation between the safest boroughs (Sutton, Kingston upon Thames and Richmond), and the most dangerous (Westminster, Hackney, Islington and Southwark).
 - These rankings can be compared with the Home Office’s data on crime by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRP) and the performance assessments for police forces. The CDRP data shows that local authorities such as Nottingham, Leeds, Stockport and Oldham have comparatively high levels of crime across a range of offences. The performance assessments for police forces for “reducing crime” give Nottinghamshire Police and Greater Manchester Police poor results and Essex Police an excellent result.
 - More importantly, the evidence contained in this report makes clear that while some areas of the country have relatively low, or at least not exceptional levels of crime, a number of our larger towns and cities remain high crime areas with a variation between the worst and the safest which is all too easily masked by national figures.
 - The findings suggest that the Home Office’s key target – that the crime in high crime areas should fall more quickly than in other areas – is insufficiently challenging. It is, however, local rather than central initiatives that will have the greatest impact on crime
 - As in Camden, New Jersey, the data presented here should provoke much greater efforts on the parts of local communities, and their police forces, in areas of high crime. Such efforts could focus on understanding the good practice of forces such as the Essex Police and techniques pioneered by police forces in the United States.

- These efforts would be greatly accelerated if the police were made accountable for their performance. *Reform* has previously argued that local police authorities do not make forces accountable to their communities, with the result that there is little incentive to improve performance. New forms of accountability should drive the change in police performance that many British cities need.

1. Crime in England and Wales

According to the British Crime Survey, for the last decade the crime trend overall in England and Wales has been downwards. Since 1995, the overall volume of crime has fallen by 44 per cent. In large part this has been aided by particularly pronounced falls in two main crime categories: burglary and vehicle theft. The numbers of burglaries and car thefts have both fallen by 57 per cent since 1995.²

**Table 1: Crime as measured by the British Crime Survey
1995 – 2004-05**

Offences	1995	2001/02	2004/05	Percentage +/- 1995-2004-05
Common Assault	2,923,000	1,724,000	1,488,000	-49
Burglary	1,770,000	969,000	756,000	-57
Robbery	339,000	356,000	255,000	-25
Mugging (Snatch theft)	419,000	430,000	347,000	-17
All vehicle theft	4,350,000	2,494,000	1,886,000	-57
Vandalism	3,366,000	2,603,000	2,564,000	-24
All BCS crime	19,351,000	12,618,000	10,850,000	-44

Source: Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, Crime in England and Wales 2004-05, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05, Home Office, July 2005.

The latest crime figures for the last quarter of 2005 show overall crime to be “stable”. British Crime Survey interviews during the 12 months ending December 2005 showed a total of 10.8 million BCS crimes committed against adults living in private households. This was the same level as for the preceding 12 month period. The overall level of crime recorded by the police in October to December 2005 was also stable compared with the same period in the previous year.³ This is the first year in which crime has not fallen since the early 1990s.

The BCS has provided further evidence that shows generally higher rates of crime in urban areas throughout the developed world. In Britain, the Home Office has conducted victimisation studies as part of the British Crime Survey

² It is worth noting that in respect of property crimes, there is a broad consensus that the biggest cause of the decline in vehicle theft and burglary was independent of the criminal justice system. As a direct consequence of people and car manufacturers paying for better anti-theft protection (the ICVS confirmed that Britons invest in more burglar alarms than elsewhere in the developed world) and the changing nature of the black market in stolen goods today (in particular, the much lower resale value of items like VCRs and televisions), the pay-offs associated with this type of property crime have changed and made it less lucrative.

³ Bangs, M. and M. Kaya, “Crime in England and Wales: Quarterly Update to December 2005”, *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 06/06*, Home Office, 27 April 2006.

which illustrate that across most categories of crime, rates in urban and inner-city areas (although at no more detailed a level than this) are between two and three times higher than in rural areas.

Table 2: Crime rates in urban and rural areas compared			
Area type	% victims once or more		
	All vehicle theft	All BCS burglary	All BCS violence
Inner-city	15.3	5.3	5.8
Urban	10.3	3.3	4.4
All non-rural	10.8	3.6	4.6
Rural	6.5	1.9	2.7
All households/adults	9.7	3.2	4.1
<i>Source: Crime in England and Wales 2003-04, Table 6.04</i>			

Several studies have speculated on the cause of higher crime rates in cities.⁴ The attraction of cities for the criminal class include the higher pecuniary benefits for crime in large cities and the greater opportunity to profit from crime (including contextual factors like access to black-markets and other avenues to profit quickly from criminal action) although, this would not explain higher rates of crime for offences such as rape or assault in cities. The attraction of urban environments for criminals may therefore also be linked to lower arrest probabilities, and greater anonymity and hence lower chance of recognition and police detection in communities where populations are mobile and residency more temporary. The higher concentration of licensed premises and late-night entertainment venues would also clearly play a part in higher rates of violence in cities compared with rural locations.

True level of crime

The independent think tank Civitas has shown that the real level of crime is much higher than the British Crime Survey suggests.⁵ Because the BCS is based on interviews with adult house holders, it omits offences against those under 16 and offences against businesses and manufacturers, such as shoplifting. It also omits illegal drug use, murder (where no victim is available for interview), sexual offences and offences against those living in institutions. We can get a sense of the scale of this “missing” crime with the results of other Home Office surveys.

The Commercial Victimization Survey (CVS) carried out by the Home Office in 1994 and 2002 gives some guide to the volume of crime in these

⁴ See for example, Glaeser, E. L. and B. Sacerdote, ‘Why is there more crime in cities?’, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107 (6), December 1999.

⁵ Green, D. and B. Cackett, *Do the official figures tell the full story?*, Civitas, 2005.

categories.⁶ The survey found 14,648,000 thefts by retailers' customers or unknown persons in 2002 but true levels of shoplifting are likely to be even higher. In 2004-05, the BCS recorded about 10.8 million crimes. Civitas estimates, with conservative assumptions employed elsewhere by the Home Office themselves, that there is at least an additional 14.6 million crimes committed against commercial retailers and manufacturers, assuming the rate of shoplifting remained roughly similar between 2002 and 2004-05. This figure itself is at the lower end of a larger estimate of the total number of shoplifting offences each year made by Professor David Farrington.⁷ The same Civitas authors also calculated the number of crimes committed against under 16s – not covered by the BCS – at just under half a million offences⁸

Civitas's calculations – checked and confirmed privately by the Home Office – led them to conclude that as many as 21.9 million offences take place that don't show up in the BCS, but which the Government acknowledges elsewhere in other publications. They conclude that a more realistic grand total for all crime last year, including those reported by the BCS is 32.7 million.⁹ If this figure were true, the fall in crime measured by the BCS would only be the outline of a trend which in itself was somewhat insignificant next to the huge scale of the crime problem in the country as a whole.

International comparisons

The International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) is regarded as the most reliable measure of victimisation on a cross-country basis, and gives a good indication of Britain's place in a crime league of nations.¹⁰ The latest International Crime Victim Survey (2000)¹¹, which covered 17 countries, shows that only Australia has a higher rate of victimisation than England and Wales. 26 per cent of people in England and Wales reported being a victim of crime, compared, for example, to 21 per cent in the USA and France. Despite a low murder rate, England and Wales were 16th out of 17 for "contact crime", including robbery, assaults with force and sexual assaults.¹²

The ICVS found that:

⁶ Shury, J., Speed, M., Vivian, D., Kuechel, A. and S. Nicholas, "Crime against retail and manufacturing premises: findings from the 2002 Commercial Victimisation Survey", *Home Office Online report 37/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

⁷ Green, D. and B. Cackett, *Do the official figures tell the full story?*, Civitas, 2005.

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ For a more detailed discussion, see: Green, D. and B. Cackett, *Do the official figures tell the full story?*, Civitas, 2005

¹⁰ Barclay, G., and C. Tavares "International comparisons of criminal justice statistics", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 12/03*, Home Office, October 2003

¹¹ The next edition of the ICVS is due for publication in Spring 2006, with the full international results available in 2007.

¹² Barclay, G., Tavares, C., and A. Siddique, "International comparisons of criminal justice statistics 1999", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 6/01*, Home Office, May 2001.

- There was more crime per head in England and Wales – 54.5 crimes per 100 inhabitants compared with an average of 35.2 per 100 – than any other country in the survey.
- People in England and Wales face the second highest risk of being a victim of crime. Australia was the worst with 30 per cent of its people victims of crime in 2000, followed by England and Wales with 26.4 per cent.
- England and Wales had the worst record for “very serious” offences, scoring 18 for every hundred inhabitants, followed by Australia with 16.
- At 3.6 per cent of those surveyed, “contact crime”, defined as robbery, sexual assault, and assault with force, was second highest in England and Wales (behind Australia on 4.1 per cent). The figure for the USA was 1.9 per cent and for Japan, 0.4 per cent.

Based on the ICVS, in a benchmarking exercise in 2003 of the UK’s performance against other countries, the Downing Street Strategy Unit described England & Wales’ performance on violent crime as a “weakness”.¹³

¹³ “Weaknesses remain including high crime despite recent falls”, *Strategic Audit – discussion document*, Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit, November 2003.

2. Measuring crime

The publication of information is a key means to improve the performance of public services. For services such as health and education, it allows users to exercise choice between providers, often supported by advisers such as GPs. There has been a dramatic increase in consumer information for health and education in recent years, both by public sector and independent sources.

For services such as policing, where choice does not apply, it allows local communities to compare the performance of different police units and to demand better performance.

Crime statistics for England and Wales

The debate on the reduction of crime in England and Wales has been hindered by unsatisfactory statistics. Each of the major statistics are incomplete in some way and none conveys in an easily intelligible way the level of crime in their area.

In December 2005, in a highly unusual step, the Statistics Commission recognised the inadequacy of current statistics. In an important report, the Commission said that “there are questions over the adequacy of the available data” for measuring crime, and that changes in methodology (especially in police recorded crime) have served to fuel public mistrust in the accuracy of Home Office statistics on crime. It concluded: “We think there is a need to explore alternative ways to convey trends in crime concisely and unambiguously – whilst being mindful of the need to avoid adding to public confusion”.¹⁴

Police recorded crime

Police recorded crime is a measure of all crime reported to the police (by victims, witnesses or third parties) and subsequently recorded by them as an offence. As a result, police recorded crime is inadequate as a measure of total crime in a given locality because so much crime goes unreported. The British Crime Survey suggests that only a quarter of violent crimes end up in the police figures.¹⁵

All police forces are required to record a crime in relation to a standardised Home Office category, at the time or soon after the offence comes to their attention, with later revisions only possible following a formal redefinition procedure (e.g. if an offence is later deemed to be racially motivated, or judged not to have been a crime). However, the methods of recording crime

¹⁴ *Crime Statistics: User Perspectives*, Interim Report, Statistics Commission, December 2005.

¹⁵ Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, “Crime in England and Wales 2004-05”, *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

have changed so substantially over recent years that it makes comparisons of the crime rate over time difficult, if not impossible by this measure alone. Since 1998, the police have recorded any crime reported by a victim unless it can be shown to be a bogus claim and the new recording methodology now requires each victim to count as a proxy for each crime (a row of four bicycles vandalised by one offender in one incident counts as four offences of vandalism, rather than one).

In 2002, the methodology was altered for a second time when the National Crime Reporting Standard (NCRS) was introduced to make figures from different police forces more reliable and the recording more consistent. Both the more “victim-focused” approach and the attempt to lay down general principles to aid consistency were expressed in a Home Office note:

“The [NCRS] ... accords with three basic principles:

- ‘All reports of incidents, whether from victims, witnesses or third parties and whether crime related or not, will result in the registration of an incident report by the police.’
- ‘Following the initial registration, an incident will be recorded as a crime (notifiable offence) if, on the balance of probability: (a) the circumstances as reported amount to a crime defined by law (the police will determine this, based on their knowledge of the law and counting rules), and (b) there is no credible evidence to the contrary.’
- ‘Once recorded, a crime would remain recorded unless there was additional verifiable information to disprove that a crime had occurred.’
- ‘It is important that the Standard supports a victim focused approach to crime recording where the public’s call for service is met, as opposed to a proactive one where the police are required to trawl for potential crimes.’”¹⁶

These changes have in many cases substantially increased the numbers of crimes recorded by the police (especially in the violence category), making it look like more crimes were committed, when that might or might not be the case. For example, the Home Office estimated that the total figure for all crime in 2002-03 was 10 per cent higher than it would have been under pre-NCRS recording, reflecting a change in recording practice. However, not all crime types were equally affected.¹⁷

Home Office definitions for offences recorded by the police have also not remained static in the last decade. A major reorganisation of offence categories took place in 1998 when many new offences were added to the overall list (particularly in the categories of less serious violent crimes, frauds

¹⁶ *Home Office Counting Rules For Recorded Crime*, Home Office, April 2006, Annex A.

¹⁷ For more information see Chapter 3 of Simmons, J. and T. Dodd (Eds.) “Crime in England and Wales 2002-03”, *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/03*, July 2003.

and drug offences), and again in 2004 as a result of new sexual offence definitions outlined in the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Using police recorded crime for the purposes of this report makes certain assumptions about the integrity and consistency of the data collected, but insofar as it is possible to use any existing data on offences to help illustrate disparities in crime, police recorded crime is at least a robust measure in the narrow sense of relating to actual offences committed in a locality, while also being more consistent for cross-force comparisons now, than it was ten years ago. Furthermore, in 2004, the Audit Commission published their assessment of crime recording and concluded that the quality of recording by the police has improved considerably. The new Police Standards Unit, based in the Home Office, has the specific function of ensuring data quality in the collection and presentation of crime statistics.

The role of police forces in the standardised collection of offence data is statutory, but the ongoing presentation of crime statistics by the police force themselves is less of a requirement. The Metropolitan Police and Cleveland Constabulary have both led the way in providing well-presented, easily-accessible and comprehensive crime data which can be viewed via the force websites (the Met has recently begun to record rolling crime data on a monthly basis down to the level of the council ward). But the record of other forces is mixed at best, with the worst failing to have any information on their websites about recorded offences at all (with crime data sometimes presented as separate from any verdict on the force's "performance").

The British Crime Survey

The other main method of recording crime is the British Crime Survey. This is one of the most sophisticated and extensive survey-based measures of crime in the developed world. It has maintained a consistent methodology since the first survey in 1981, and is now a rolling survey published annually. The British Crime Survey (BCS) is the Government's favoured measure of gauging the crime rate and Ministers frequently use the survey to claim that crime has fallen since 1997.

The greatest advantage of the BCS is its ability to record offences not reported to the police. The British Crime Survey suggests that only a quarter of violent crimes end up in the police figures, very often because victims themselves feel the crime is too trivial or they prefer to deal with the matter themselves. However, the BCS is by no means a perfect measure of the level of crime. It is based on interviews with about 40,000 adults living in private households in England and Wales. While it records many crimes not reported to the police, such as domestic violence and failed burglaries, it does not record a huge number of other crimes, in particular those against children and shoplifting. The independent think tank Civitas estimates that the total number of crimes may be four times as high as the BCS figure (see below).

Furthermore, because it is a survey of householders, there are those who claim that it cannot accurately represent the experience of crime amongst the people most likely to be victims. Professor Marian Fitzgerald, a former Home Office adviser, has said: “One of the reasons the Government has been so misled and so complacent is that they rely so much on the BCS. The BCS simply doesn’t reach the people who are most likely to be victims of crime – young people and people who live in high crime inner-city areas.”¹⁸ For the purposes of this report, the BCS had one other crucial handicap. Although it measures crimes whether or not they come to the police’s attention, and despite its large sample size (which is usually a marker for accuracy), it cannot produce results below police force area level.

Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships

The Home Office has started to publish recorded crime figures for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships per 1,000 population. Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) were created by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to tackle crime within local authority boundaries. They are partnerships between police forces and local authorities, together with police authorities, health authorities, probation committees and other partners in some areas.

Recorded crime data for the 376 CDRPs in England and Wales showed that there were different levels of geographic concentration for different crime types and that in 2004-05 a third of recorded crime BCS comparator offences took place in 40 CDRPs.¹⁹

This is very helpful data but not completely so. Few members of the public will know in which Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership they live. More importantly, the Home Office does not use the data to rank between areas of high and low levels. The furthest that it goes is to identify the 40 CDRPs with the highest level of per capita crime, designated “High Crime Areas”. These are listed in Table 25 in the Appendix and provide an interesting comparison with the results of this survey.

Council wards

In April 2006, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) unveiled the Neighbourhood Statistics resource, which was based on a project to collect recorded crime data for council wards which the public could access via a postcode search on the ONS website.²⁰

However, even this new facility, while adding to the information publicly available in a more localised form than before, is relatively incomplete (only 13 police force areas have taken part) and most of the data refers to the

¹⁸ *The Sunday Times*, 23 June 2002.

¹⁹ Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, “Crime in England and Wales 2004-05”, *Home Office Statistical Bulletin* 11/05, Home Office, July 2005.

²⁰ <http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/>

financial year 2003-04 – and so is already dated. Moreover, it is difficult to interpret out of context (is X no. of violent offences in a given postcode area “high”?). As a source of crime figures that provides the public with greater understanding, it also repeats the flaws of most existing measurements: it is not based on commonly recognised geography, unlike the data presented in this report.

Other measures

There are a range of other measures of crime, and most are survey-based using direct questioning of a resident population who are asked to account for their experiences of crime. These measures are usually framed in the context of assessing “risk” rather than absolute number of offences. Various industry groups (particularly motoring organisations) conduct ad hoc surveys of sections of the population relating to certain types of crime, but these are usually very limited in scope and not generally applicable.

One typical sort of industry survey is by insurers who use price-signals in the marketplace to provide another more narrow (but no less insightful) means of gauging “risk”. For several years, insurance companies have provided data on their household and contents premiums for different parts of the country, based on the number and frequency of claims.

In April 2006, one such survey by the insurance company Endsleigh, reported research that showed that compared with the national average, Nottingham residents were more than twice as likely to claim for household theft. The survey examined the frequency of theft claims, comparing the rate with the national average reported to Endsleigh. The survey found that people in Nottingham were 109 per cent more likely to make a claim for household theft, while those in Hull were 88 per cent more likely and Leeds 65 per cent.²¹ As another method of gauging crime, this has a value, although it clearly only relates to one narrow offence category (burglary) and has its own weaknesses (omitting claims not made and failure to account for uninsured householders).

Police performance assessments

Since 2003, the Government has had its own means of gauging the performance of police forces, known as the “Police Performance Assessment Framework” (PPAF), with the reduction of crime, a key component of how force’s are to judged. In February 2003 the first set of PPAF monitors was published by HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), providing for the first time a high level summary of relative force performance across different police areas and between groups of most similar forces. A second set of monitors was published in October 2003.

²¹ *The Daily Telegraph*, 18 April 2006

For each force, 32 “performance indicators” (such as the burglary detection rate) plus 26 “baseline areas” (such as forensic management) have been assessed. Assessments of these 58 components are then aggregated to form an assessment of seven key performance areas: “Reducing Crime”; “Investigating Crime”, “Promoting Safety”, “Providing Assistance”, “Citizen Focus”, “Resource Use” and “Local Policing”.

3. Methodology

A better way to present statistics on crime may be to measure crime by city and population. Cities and towns are understandable geographical units in a way that local authority areas or police force areas are not. They also contain the highest levels of crime. *Reform's* work for this report was inspired by the work of Kathleen O'Leary Morgan and Scott Morgan for the US publishing house Morgan Quitno Press.

Currently in its 14th Edition, the American version has shown that presenting crime data by city can have a powerful incentive effect on local agencies. The Prosecutor of Camden County, New Jersey, the city with highest crime in the last two years, has commented that the publication of the rankings "helped to coalesce the Camden Police Department, an array of law enforcement agencies at the county, state and federal levels, the Camden community and its neighbors to focus on the crime problem with new vigor and to find solutions." This is clear evidence of the potential value of such an exercise.

In earlier editions, the American version sought to weight the value of different crimes, utilising a formula which was later criticised as unnecessarily complicated while also not adequately accounting for "outliers" in the data.²² *Reform* has not followed this approach. Instead, the methodology for *Urban crime rankings* has been simplified, basing the results for all the categories of crime and for the final overall ranking, on figures for offences per 1,000 population only. Following the lead of CDRP figures per 1,000 population, this report therefore provides data in a format to take account of population size and on a recognizable geographic basis – city or town area.

The number of offences in each category were used to compile individual rankings for each type of crime. The total number of crimes for all the categories surveyed was then summed for each city and the outcome converted into a rate per 1,000 population for the final "score".²³ The data has not been modified in any other way to take account of context (societal factors, economy, deprivation, demography etc.), or any recording or reporting variations.

Offences surveyed

The following table outlines the seven generic categories of offences that this report has surveyed, including their specific definition and Home Office code.

²² The Morgan Quitno formula is further explained here -

http://www.camconnect.org/documents/summary_most_dangerous_12-1.pdf

²³ In the ranking of cities for each offence category, where two cities have equal per capita offence ratings for a given crime, they are ranked equally. For some cities, the number of offences was equal (for instance, the number of murders in some London boroughs in 2005). In the case of London, those boroughs that recorded no murders (Bromley, Hillingdon, Sutton), are ranked according to the size of their population, with the largest deemed the "safest".

A complete list of all HM Inspectorate of Constabulary category offences for England and Wales is contained in the Appendix.²⁴

Table 3: Offences Surveyed			
Offence	Code	Definition	Excluding
1. Murder	1	Murder	Attempted murder; threat / conspiracy to murder; manslaughter; infanticide; child destruction; causing death by dangerous / careless driving / when under influence of drink / drugs; cause allow death of a child or vulnerable
2. Rape – All categories	19A 19B 19C 19D 19E 19F 19G 19H	Rape of a female Rape of a male Rape of a female aged 16 and over Rape of a female child under 16 Rape of a female child under 13 Rape of a male aged 16 and over Rape of a male child under 16 Rape of a male child under 13	Indecent assault; other sexual offences
3. Assault – Common assault – Grievous Bodily Harm / Wounding – Actual Bodily Harm	105A 5 8A	Common assault; Wounding or other act endangering life; Other wounding;	Assault on a constable; racially / religiously motivated assault.
4. Burglary – Dwelling and non-dwelling	28 28.02 29 30 31	Burglary in a dwelling; Distraction burglary; Aggravated burglary in a dwelling; Burglary in a building other than a dwelling; Aggravated burglary in a building other than a dwelling;	Attempted burglary in a dwelling/non-dwelling;
5. Robbery – Business and personal	34A 34B	Robbery of business property; Robbery of personal property	
6. Car crime – Theft from AND of a vehicle	45 48	Theft from a motor vehicle; Theft or unauthorised taking of a motor vehicle;	Criminal damage to; interfering with a vehicle; racially or religiously motivate criminal damage to a vehicle; aggravated vehicle taking
7. Gun crime	81	Firearms Acts offences; “Offences under the Firerarms Act 1968 and other Firearms Acts connected with licensing and certification of firearms”.	
<i>Source: HM Inspectorate of Constabulary</i>			

²⁴ The sample of offences chosen for this report gives an illustration of the crime problem in different parts of the country, although there are clearly offences not surveyed in this report which generate a great deal of public concern (such as vandalism, theft from shops and drug offences).

Freedom of Information requests

The compilation of evidence in this report, required in most cases a full-scale data request under the powers provided for in the Freedom Of Information Act (FOIA, 2000) – if only to receive information for the calendar year, and a detailed breakdown of offence categories that are otherwise not necessarily informative in themselves (“Rape” is more revealing than the general measure of “Sexual Offences”). The information was forthcoming in all but a few cases in the requisite time (20 working days since the receipt of the FOI request).

Population

The decision to include only those towns with a population of 100,000 or more was taken on practical grounds. A lower population threshold would have yielded hundreds more towns – doubling the statistical workload – and the current threshold of 100,000, while not providing data for a town in each Parliamentary constituency, at least allows for comparisons based on at least three towns and cities per English region, and in most cases, one or two in any given county. The 100,000 threshold also lent itself to an easier comparison of police recorded crime statistics, which are usually compiled on the basis of police force area, and then broken down further into regions within that particular force’s jurisdiction. In most cases, this aligns with the largest town in that area, so statistical “overspill” is less of a problem. A description provided by each police force of the unit used for the geographic location in question is provided in the Appendix.

To discern those cities and towns larger than 100,000 population, the Office for National Statistics’s 2001 Census data was used. Although this is now somewhat dated (after four years at the current level of immigration, some towns – especially London – are almost certain to have increased in population), the ONS conducts annual mid-year estimates of demographic change. However, this is not broken down to the level of urban conurbation, only Unitary Authority or Metropolitan Borough Area. In the case London, population data to the nearest 1,000 from the ONS mid-year 2004 estimates (released in December 2005) was used to give the most accurate measure of population – but for all other locations, the data from the 2001 Census was used. The list of towns and cities was compiled using the 2001 Census publication *Key Statistics for urban areas in England and Wales Table KS01* (released 17 June 2004). Population statistics for Milton Keynes, Telford and Cambridge refer to the “Urban Area” ONS definition.

City boundaries

In a number of cases, crime statistics collected by police forces did not correspond with city boundaries. In these cases, the most coterminous area was used as the basis for collecting crime figures on the advice of the police

force concerned. At times, these were figures for the Metropolitan Borough Council area which best corresponded to the geographic area of the city or alternatively, the Basic Command Unit (BCU) for the police force which, for example, in the case of Liverpool (Liverpool North and Liverpool South), together corresponded to the local authority area of Liverpool. In some cases, the CDRP zone was the area most coterminous with the city in question. Table 24 in the Appendix gives details of which areas were surveyed for each city.

Number of crimes covered

The 57 towns and cities surveyed for this report have a total population of 19,284,399, representing over a third (36 per cent) of the entire population of England and Wales. Based on the proportion of all recorded crime in 2004-05 the crimes selected for this survey represent a significant proportion of all crimes reported to the police in any typical year. The categories included here of Murder, Rape, Robbery and Assault (comprising "Wounding", "Less Serious Wounding" and "Common Assault"), total 821,276 for the 57 towns and cities being assessed. This represents over two thirds (69 per cent) of the total number of violent crimes recorded in 2004-05 (1,184,702 offences) and 34 per cent of all property crimes (the remaining majority of these will be offences of criminal damage and fraud).²⁵ In total, for all offences surveyed, there were 1,184,474 crimes in the 57 towns and cities in 2005, representing 21 per cent of all recorded crime (5,562,691 offences) in the corresponding (2004-05) financial year.

Missing data

The vast majority of police forces provided all the data on offences as requested. The exceptions were total firearms offences in Ashford (Kent Police) and Telford (West Mercia), and vehicle crime in Swindon (Wiltshire Constabulary). These towns have been excluded from the offence rankings where data was missing, and not incorporated in the overall crime ranking to ensure statistical integrity.

Not all large towns in England and Wales were included because some did not meet the 100,000 population threshold. Towns that are commonly regarded as larger than this – such as Guildford in Surrey (a town which is also commonly included in crime comparisons as an example of a "safe" southern town) – in fact have less than 100,000 residents in the town itself, and so were not included. According to the 2001 census, Guildford's population was 129,717; but only approximately 70,000 people lived in the town itself. Population totals for towns were considered on the grounds of whether the urban areas surveyed by the Office for National Statistics are commonly recognised geographically as towns.

²⁵ Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, "Crime in England and Wales 2004-05", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

The only towns over 100,000 population not to have data are Preston and Blackburn in Lancashire, and Huddersfield in West Yorkshire. The Lancashire Constabulary provided data for Blackpool but was unable to meet the publication deadline for the other two requests. (It is hoped that these may be forthcoming and may be included in an updated version of the report available at www.reform.co.uk). Huddersfield was the only town not to have data available in a form which related closely (or even exactly) to the area in question. Instead, West Yorkshire Police provided data for the larger area of the Kirklees division of the force, which would not have been suitably coterminous for population analysis. A decision was therefore taken to exclude Huddersfield from the analysis for reasons of statistical integrity. If more accurate data is forthcoming, it may be included in a future edition.

Scotland and Northern Ireland

Scotland's distinct legal system impacts on any criminal justice comparison between the two countries in the Union. For the sake of statistical integrity and because police recorded crime in Scotland is not included in the Home Office's figures (which cover only England and Wales and also exclude Northern Ireland), towns and cities of over 100,000 population in both Scotland and Northern Ireland (a total of five) have not been compared with cities in English and Wales. Variations in recording and police practice will have impacted greatly on the comparability of more common offences such as assault, distorting the place of Celtic towns and cities in the overall results for the UK.

London

Because of the large size of London's population (7,435,000 in 2004), it was felt that a further subdivision would be helpful for readers to gauge levels of crime in London's 31 boroughs – most of which have a population larger than half of the other cities included in the rankings and form localised urban communities in their own right. Furthermore, the Metropolitan Police provide crime figures broken down by London borough (and from April 2006, for local council wards²⁶), the subdivision on this level seemed justified. This intra-population breakdown has not been followed for any other cities in the survey.

With the exception of the City of London Police, the historical cities of London and Westminster no longer exist in any meaningful sense for most everyday purposes, but they make up the 33 geographic regions of London (alongside 31 boroughs), with the City of Westminster recorded by the ONS separately in its population figures. The total for London takes account of this. For reference, the population shown for London is that of Greater London plus the City of Westminster, as published in *Key Statistics for local authorities in England and Wales Table KS01* (released on 13 February 2003).

²⁶ See: <http://www.met.police.uk/crimefigures/>

Crime figures for the City of London were submitted by the City of London Police. The intra-London results exclude the City of London (although the results for the City are shown elsewhere). London's place in the final ranking is based on an overall London figure, which includes the City of London (both population and recorded offences).

Validity of comparison

Some critics of the American analysis by Morgan Quitno have argued that the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports which were used as a record of offences in the US, were not an accurate way to make inter-city comparisons because of inconsistencies in data collection, in particular, the strong influence of variation in how police record crime. The total number of assaults for instance, being both a product of the number of offences and the variation of the local police in recording these crimes.

Similar complaints have been raised by police forces in this country who have on occasion defended rises in recorded crime on the grounds of increased police activity. This factor was highlighted in the most recent Home Office report on crime figures: "Local policing activity and priorities also affect the levels of recorded violent crime. Where the police are proactive in addressing low-level violence, anti-social behaviour and other types of crime, this can lead to more of these crimes being brought to their attention and therefore included in the recorded crime number". While it is clearly possible for police forces to deploy in a "blitz" on street crime in a city over a three month period and therefore inflate the robbery statistics by apprehending more offenders, it is still largely speculation exactly to what extent this leads to wide variations across the country. The effect of police activity is therefore undetermined and may only be a factor in data for broad Home Office categories such as "Violence Against the Person" (where applying a Fixed Penalty Notice for Drunk and Disorderly counts as a recordable offence in this category). It is less likely that variations in police activity have significantly affected the total count for the specific sub-categories of serious crime included in this report.

Furthermore, *Reform's* analysis on the basis of recorded crime is made more accurate than the American figures by the Home Office's introduction of the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) in 2002, which established a common procedure for the recording of offences and made consistent the approach across police force areas in England and Wales. The NCRS has been the legally required method for recording offences in England and Wales since 2002, but has taken several years to bed down in practice.

4. Key findings

The results of this survey produced the following key findings:

Large variations in levels of crime

- Dramatic variation between the best and worst performers. At 115.5 crimes per 1,000 population, Nottingham had almost four times the level of crime as the safest towns in the rankings: Southend, which recorded 30.9 crimes per 1,000 population, and Poole, with 32.7 crime per 1,000 populations.
- Dramatic variation between towns of similar size. Nottingham's crime rate of 111.5 crimes per 1,000 population can be contrasted with the much better performance of towns of around 250,000 people such as Wolverhampton (49.1/1,000) or Reading (43.4/1,000).

Most dangerous city

No formal attempt has been made to "weight" crimes recorded in the cities under assessment. The overall ranking is therefore a rate per 1,000 for the sum of the seven offences in this report. On these grounds, Nottingham, with 115.5 serious offences per 1,000 population in 2005 was the most dangerous city surveyed. The next most dangerous city was Leeds, with 107.2 serious offences per 1,000 population.

There were a total of 13 murders, 144 rapes, 7265 assaults, 9567 burglaries, 1,600 robberies, 10,058 thefts of or from vehicles, and 190 firearms offences in the city of Nottingham last year. Not only did Nottingham have the highest overall rate for the seven serious offences but it also frequently came at, or near, the top of the rankings for each of the offences surveyed:

Table 4: Most dangerous city			
Nottingham - population 249,584			
Offence	Number of crimes	Rate	Offence ranking
Murder (per 100,000)	13	5.21	1
Rape (per 10,000)	144	5.77	5
Assault (per 1,000)	7,265	29.11	5
Burglary (per 1,000)	1,600	6.41	3
Robbery (per 1,000)	9,567	38.33	2
Vehicle crime (per 1,000)	10,058	40.3	1
Gun crime (per 10,000)	190	7.61	4
Total (overall rate/1,000)	28,837	115.54	1

Safest towns

With a rate of 30.9 crimes per 1,000 population, Southend in Essex recorded the lowest rate of serious crimes per 1,000 population, followed closely by Poole in Dorset. Southend came above average in the rankings for most offences, as shown by the table below, although it was in sixth place for murder, with an unusually high number of murders in 2005 for a town of its size, and eighth place for firearms offences. Poole, a town of a similar size, was in the bottom 10 for each offence ranking (with the exception of rape) and recorded the lowest number of robberies in 2005. The two safest towns in the report are summarised below:

Table 5: Safest Towns						
	Southend (160,527)			Poole (144,800)		
Offence	Number	Rate	Ranking	Number	Rate	Ranking
Murder (per 100,000)	5	3.12	6	1	0.69	54
Rape (per 10,000)	47	2.93	48	53	3.66	35
Assault (per 1,000)	657	4.10	57	1,692	11.69	53
Burglary (per 1,000)	1,892	11.81	49	1,221	8.43	56
Robbery (per 1,000)	293	1.83	30	44	0.30	57
Vehicle crime (per 1,000)	1,955	12.20	50	1,719	11.87	52
Gun crime (per 10,000)	104	6.49	8	7	0.48	52
Total (overall rate /1,000)	4,953	30.91	55	4,737	32.71	54

Police force performance

The cities and towns surveyed for this report cover the majority of police forces in England and Wales. In total 39 police forces had towns of over 100,000 population in their jurisdiction out of a total of 43 police forces. The forces not included were: Cheshire, Cumbria, Durham, Dyfed Powys, Lincolnshire, North Wales, Surrey and Warwickshire.

The results of this report are an indication of which police forces contain the most high crime urban centres. A total of four towns in the top ten highest crime cities are in the Greater Manchester Police force area (Oldham, Stockport, Manchester and Bolton), followed by two (Leeds and Bradford) in the West Yorkshire Police force area and two (Rotherham and Sheffield) in the South Yorkshire Constabulary area.

These results may be compared with the Government's own performance assessment for the police. The PPAF assessments for police forces for "Reducing Crime" give Nottinghamshire Police and Greater Manchester Police poor results and Essex Police an excellent result.

For example:

- The performance of Greater Manchester Police (GMP) on the key target of “Reducing Crime” was below average for similar forces and described as “Fair” in the latest PPAF report (October 2005).
- In the sub-category assessment of “Investigating Volume Crime”, the Greater Manchester force performance was deemed to be “Poor”.
- For the total number of recorded crimes per 1,000 population, the GMP force’s position was described as “deficient” nationally, with it placed 39th out of 43 forces.
- The force was ranked 42nd nationally for its burglary rate per 1,000 households.

This assessment in particular, mirrors the burglary rankings for the cities in the Greater Manchester area surveyed for this report, with the force containing four of the worst performing cities and towns in the top 10 for burglary (Stockport, Oldham, Bolton and Manchester). The force’s performance on detecting burglary is also poor according to the PPAF assessment. Just 9.4 per cent of domestic burglaries were detected in 2004-05, compared to a mean of 14.5 per cent for the MSF group of forces (those most similar to GMP). A similar parallel assessment for overall performance is also evident in the category of vehicle crime.²⁷

In contrast, Essex police,²⁸ which includes the towns of Southend (ranked 55 overall) and Colchester (ranked 53), is a much better performing, according to the latest PPAF assessment:

- On the important category of “Reducing Crime”, the Essex force is judged to be an “excellent” performer with Essex placed first in the MSF group for its fall in total recorded crime.
- Total recorded crime per 1,000 population reduced from 88.68 in 2003-04 to 82.71 in 2004-05, which the HMIC report notes is well below the national average of 105.37.
- There were 8.54 burglaries per 1,000 households in 2004-05 in Essex, a reduction from 10.26 the previous year. This achievement places the force second in its group and 12th out of 43 forces. This result is mirrored by the excellent performance of Colchester and Southend in the burglary rankings (46 and 49 respectively out of 57).

Similar high performance is noted for the Dorset force, particularly in the areas of vehicle crime and domestic burglary. Again, this mirrors the ranking of Dorset towns for those offences in this report: Poole in Dorset is 56 out of 57 for burglary and 52 out of 56 for vehicle crime and Bournemouth in Dorset is 44 out of 57 for burglary and 39 out of 56 for vehicle crime.

²⁷ *Greater Manchester Police - Baseline Assessment*, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, October 2005.

²⁸ *Essex Police - Baseline Assessment*, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, October 2005.

5. Crime in London

The results for recorded crime offences for 2005 show a varied picture of crime in the Capital with wide disparities between the number of serious offences in boroughs of a similar size (for instance, burglaries in Islington compared to Sutton). The 10 worst performing boroughs for overall number of serious offences (Westminster, Islington, Hackney, Southwark, Newham, Camden, Tower Hamlets, Haringey, Lambeth and Hammersmith & Fulham) are concentrated in the centre and east of the city, with the lowest crime rates associated with outlying boroughs such as Sutton, Kingston upon Thames and Richmond.

London boroughs
Ranked by population size



Source: Office for National Statistics, mid-year 2004 population estimates, 2005;
Map – Metropolitan Police Service, 2006

The data on recorded crime by London borough found that:

- The worst performing borough overall was Westminster, which recorded a total of 16,690 offences of murder, rape, assault, robbery, burglary, car crime and gun crime. This equates to a rate of 92.2 serious offences per 1,000 population in 2005. The London average for all boroughs was 57.6.
- Westminster topped the rankings for assault, with a rate of 27 assaults per 1,000 population in 2005 compared to the lowest, Richmond, which recorded only 9 per 1,000 population. The London average was 18.5.
- Westminster was followed closely in the overall rankings for London by Islington, with more than 86 serious offences per 1,000 population. Islington was also the worst borough for rates of vehicle crime and burglary.
- The borough of Hackney came third in the overall London rankings and topped the rankings for rape with more than 7 rapes per 10,000 population. In contrast there were only 13 rapes in the whole borough of Richmond in 2005, a rate of 0.71 per 10,000 population.
- The safest borough in London was Kingston upon Thames, with a total of 5,350 serious offences last year at a rate of 36.4 per 1,000 population. When subsumed into the overall results for the other cities and towns in England and Wales, Kingston ranks 83 out of 87.

The position of London is a metaphor for the whole of the country in regard to variations in crime. London contains some of the safest communities in the country, notably Richmond and Kingston upon Thames and Sutton. These good results help improve London's average ranking in our survey of cities – placing it a respectable 29th out of 55 for the overall rate of serious offences. However, this result masks the wide disparity in crime rates in the capital because London also is home to some of the most dangerous communities in the country, which when compared individually with the other towns and cities surveyed, come very high up the list. Of the top twenty worst performing cities on the seven measures of serious crimes, eight are London boroughs. Westminster, when compared individually with other towns, has a serious offence rate per 1,000 population that places it at number seven in the overall rankings.

6. Recommendations

The purpose of *Urban crime rankings* is to draw public attention to the disparity in crime rates between cities throughout England and Wales. This has not been an exercise in criminological analysis, designed to advance an argument about the causes of crime, the influences (demographics, cultural, economic) on crime rates, or the factors that affect whether crime is rising or falling. These are important albeit supplementary debates concerned with trends and causation, rather than a statement of evidence based on the information provided by the authorities.

In addition, this information is not a complete representation of crime in a given locality and many crimes will go undetected, and it therefore suffers from all the well-documented flaws associated with police recorded crime. It is however as close to a standardised measure as it is possible to get for the purposes of comparison, even accepting variations in police performance with regard to detection of offences and factors affecting the willingness of the public in different areas of the country to report crime.

The police remain resistant to comparative measures of performance based on recorded crime, and the Home Office has been reluctant to rank crime data for cities as one way of judging the performance of a local force. The data supplied by the FOI Unit of the West Midlands Police was accompanied by a statement of the police force's views on the usefulness of such data, strongly urging against any comparison with data collected for other forces, and illustrating the reluctance to use data to hold police forces to account:

"Please note that these data should be interpreted with caution. These areas differ in terms of size and they may have different ethnic, cultural or economic compositions. Therefore comparing numbers of crimes can be misleading and does not necessarily indicate the likelihood of someone being a victim of crime. In addition, the number of crimes recorded in an area over a period of time can be influenced by a number of factors. Consequently statistics on crimes for one period may not necessarily be a good indicator of future incidents in that area.

Furthermore, police forces in the United Kingdom are routinely required to provide crime statistics to government bodies and the recording criteria is set nationally. However, the systems used for recording these figures are not generic, nor are the procedures used locally in capturing the crime data. It should be noted that for these reasons this forces response to your questions should not be used for comparison purposes with any other response you may receive."²⁹

Despite this view, the existing police data, drawn up according to national guidelines, mean that it is legitimate to draw comparisons. This report does not intend to gloss over the myriad reasons that exist to explain variations in crime rates locally. Nor does it seek to prevent a conclusive or definitive

²⁹ Email from Assistant Manager of the FOI Unit in the Corporate Services Department, West Midlands Police, 11 May 2006.

picture of levels of crime. It simply seeks to present existing police data in a clear and accessible form. As a contribution to the debate, this report adds to the information available on crime in England and Wales today, which can only aid understanding, and over time, increase the accountability of police forces to local communities. In response, *Reform* actively seeks to encourage further debate on the causes of this disparity, how it can be explained and the potential solutions available to rectify this inequity of protection, but the first step is always information.

One important consideration is that this report's findings, which highlight very great disparities in crime rates, are all too frequently masked by the annual Home Office crime figures which give an overall national picture only. The importance of local variation cannot be overstated. As this report has shown, not only do crime rates vary between urban centres, but the Audit Commission's recent analysis of crime at a local level even suggested that crime rates could vary dramatically within council wards in the same city and even between adjacent streets in the same ward.³⁰ Overall, the findings of this report suggest that certain cities and towns need to learn the lessons of other, more successful cities in other areas and that new forms of policing are needed most urgently in cities with the highest levels of crime. This is likely to include learning from the best practice of forces such as the Essex Police.

Some may argue that these findings present a case for greater resources for policing in high crime areas. Such an argument is unlikely to be successful, however, in the light of the very tight public spending environment in coming years. In the 2006 Budget, the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that spending on the Home Office will be frozen in real terms from 2008-09.³¹ Regardless of the public spending environment, the police and other law and order agencies should not be immune from the need for value for money shared by other public services. Given that the Home Office's spending allocation will rise by 75 per cent in real terms between 1997-98 and 2007-08, the focus should be on improvements in productivity.

The Home Office's Public Service Agreement does include a target which differentiates between crime in high crime areas and other areas: "Reduce crime by 15 per cent, and further in high crime areas, by 2007-08." This target will be achieved if crime in the 40 highest crime CDRPs falls more quickly than in the other CDRPs: "Success Criteria: This target will have been achieved if, between the baseline year and 2007-08, both of the following are met: "(a) nationally, the reduction in overall BCS crime is more than or equal to 15 per cent; and (b) the average reduction in the 40 high crime areas is more than the average reduction in the remaining CDRP areas, as measured by the

³⁰ *Neighbourhood Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour*, Audit Commission, May 2006.

³¹ "Between 1997-98 and 2007-08, spending by the Home Office on crime, justice, security and communities will have risen by 75 per cent in real terms. To lock in this increased funding, Budget 2006 announces as part of the CSR an early spending settlement for the Home Office which maintains the Home Office's 2007-08 Departmental Expenditure Limit in real terms over the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11", *Budget 2006 – A strong and strengthening economy: Investing in Britain's future*, HM Treasury, 2006.

recorded crime BCS comparator.” The very wide variations in crime identified by this report suggest that the target is insufficiently challenging.

Considerable evidence has shown that police performance can improve radically in response to a change in culture which prioritises so-called “broken windows” crime prevention, including beat-based patrols and community policing, alongside swift intervention by the police in apparently minor crimes such as graffiti, touting and prostitution. Evidence has also shown that effective frameworks of direct accountability help to achieve such a change in culture. The Cabinet Office Strategy Unit, for example, has shown that levels of violent crime in America began to fall in the early 1990s following reforms to the criminal justice system, including “broken windows” style policing, rather than increases in police resources.

These efforts would be greatly accelerated if the police were made accountable for their performance. *Reform* has previously argued that local police authorities do not make forces accountable to their communities, with the result that there is little incentive to improve performance.³² Greater accountability requires more and better information, publicly available, and this will also be fostered by better crime statistics. As such the current review of crime statistics being undertaken for the Home Office is of great importance. The results presented here suggest that the review should focus considerable attention on variations in crime at the local level and particularly in and between urban centres, as well as on how crime data is measured and presented to the public. More and better information about crime along with new forms of accountability should drive the change in police performance that many British cities need.

³² *A Better Way: Commission on the Reform of Public Services*, Reform, 2003

Appendix

List of tables

Table 6: Murder per 100,000

Table 7: Rape per 10,000

Table 8: Assault per 1,000

Table 9: Burglary per 1,000

Table 10: Robbery per 1,000

Table 11: Vehicle crime per 1,000

Table 12: Gun crime per 10,000

Table 13: Urban crime rankings 2006 – all offences

Table 14: City totals – all selected offences

Table 15: London total – all selected offences

Table 16: Urban crime rankings 2006 + London boroughs

Table 17: London – Murder per 100,000

Table 18: London – Rape per 10,000

Table 19: London – Assault per 1,000

Table 20: London – Burglary per 1,000

Table 21: London – Robbery per 1,000

Table 22: London – Vehicle crime per 1,000

Table 23: London – Gun crime per 10,000

Table 24: Definition of geographic areas

Table 25: HMIC Offence Category Codes

Table 26: The 40 CDRP “High Crime Areas”

Murder

- Nottingham has the highest murder rate in England and Wales with 13 murders in a city with a population of a quarter of a million. At 5.2 murders per 100,000 inhabitants, it is more than two and a half times higher than the average for all the other cities (2.0 murders per 100,000 population) and significantly higher than a town of a similar size like Stoke which had just 2 murders last year, or Brighton and Hove, which recorded none.
- There were 396 murders in the 57 towns and cities surveyed for this report, which as a proportion represents 46 per cent of the latest Home Office total for all murders for the last financial year (April 2004-March 2005).
- The number of murders in each of the ten worst cities were: Nottingham (13), St. Helens (5), Leeds (19), Rotherham (4), Newcastle (6), Southend (5), Manchester (12), Ashford (3), Walsall (5) and Bolton (4).
- There were no murders in Cambridge or Brighton and Hove in 2005.

Table 6: Murder

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Murder offence rate per 100,000
1	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	13	5.21
2	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	5	4.87
3	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	19	4.29
4	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	4	3.25
5	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	6	3.16
6	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	5	3.12
7	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	12	3.04
8	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	3	2.92
9	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	5	2.92
10	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	4	2.87
11	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	3	2.82
12	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	4	2.81
13	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	8	2.72
14	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	11	2.50
15	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	7	2.32
16	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	7	2.31
17	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	3	2.20
18	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	3	2.16
19	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	4	2.16
20	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	10	2.13
21	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	158	2.12
	City crime average				2.01
22	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	2	1.99
23	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	19	1.96
24	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	2	1.93

25	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	2	1.92
26	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	4	1.74
27	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	3	1.72
28	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	5	1.71
29	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	3	1.69
30	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	3	1.63
31	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	3	1.60
32	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	4	1.59
33	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	3	1.54
34	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	2	1.52
35	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	2	1.47
36	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	2	1.46
37	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Constabulary	420,556	6	1.43
38	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	2	1.40
39	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	2	1.29
40	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	3	1.29
41	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	3	1.28
42	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	2	1.19
43	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	2	1.06
44	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	1	0.95
45	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	1	0.94
46	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	3	0.91
47	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	1	0.85
48	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	2	0.82
49	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	1	0.79
50	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	2	0.77
51	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	1	0.73
52	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	1	0.72
53	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	1	0.70
54	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	1	0.69
55	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	1	0.59
56	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	0	0.00
57	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	0	0.00

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Rape

- Portsmouth has the highest number of rapes per 10,000 people of all the cities surveyed. There were 123 rapes in the city in 2005, which amounts to a rape rate of 6.58. This is almost double the average for all the cities of 3.91 per 10,000 population.
- A town the similar size to Portsmouth – Milton Keynes – had only 45 rapes in 2005, a third of the Portsmouth rate. The lowest number of rapes in 2005 occurred in Exeter with just 15 rapes (1.4 per 10,000 population).
- The overall London result for rape (2,685 in 2005 – a rate of 3.61 per 10,000 population) places the city at number 37, but masks wide variations between boroughs in the capital (see Chapter 5). If the boroughs were included separately in the rankings for rape, Hackney with 7.44 rapes per 10,000 population would top the results, followed closely by the south London borough of Lambeth with 192 rapes in 2005 (a rate of 7.16).
- There were a total of 7,638 rapes in the 57 towns and cities surveyed. This figure represents 54.5 per cent as a proportion of the total number of rapes for the whole country in 2004-05 (14,002 rapes), even though the total population of the cities concerned only amounts to 36 per cent of the total population for England and Wales.

Table 7: Rape

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Rape offence rate per 10,00
1	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	123	6.58
2	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	85	6.24
3	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	263	5.93
4	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	108	5.82
5	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	144	5.77
6	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	82	5.75
7	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	117	5.66
8	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	96	5.61
9	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	161	5.48
10	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	128	5.46
11	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	211	5.35
12	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	97	5.11
13	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	53	5.08
14	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	62	5.03
15	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	52	5.02
16	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	48	4.68
17	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	107	4.66
18	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	152	4.60
19	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	114	4.40
20	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	106	4.35
21	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	131	4.35

22	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	61	4.29
23	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	66	4.25
24	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Police	420,556	177	4.21
25	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	43	4.04
26	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	42	3.98
	City crime average				3.91
27	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	64	3.82
28	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	39	3.80
29	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	50	3.80
30	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	44	3.79
31	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	114	3.76
32	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	47	3.72
33	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	53	3.71
34	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	64	3.68
35	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	53	3.66
36	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	91	3.62
37	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	2685	3.61
38	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	350	3.60
39	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	48	3.53
40	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	165	3.52
41	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	62	3.49
42	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	35	3.48
43	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	66	3.48
44	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	47	3.37
45	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	42	3.03
46	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	41	2.99
47	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	41	2.98
48	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	47	2.93
49	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	128	2.91
50	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	56	2.87
51	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	33	2.81
52	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	45	2.44
53	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	53	2.28
54	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	65	2.22
55	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	30	2.17
56	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	33	1.94
57	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	15	1.40

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Assault

- The assault category comprised wounding (more and less serious) and common assault. For this composite figure, the results show that with 10,218 assaults in the city in 2005, Leicester has the highest assault rate (30.91 per 1,000 population).
- The rate for Leicester is more than a third higher than the average rate (18.62) – equivalent to cities like Newcastle and London – and more than four times the rate of Southend, the city which at 4.10 per 1,000 population had the fewest assaults in 2005.
- Again, Nottingham, with over 7,200 assaults in the city (a rate of 29.11) was near the top of the rankings for this category at number 5, fractionally behind St. Helens (30.3), Rotherham (30.52) and Bradford (30.87).
- There were a total of 365,238 assaults in the 57 towns and cities surveyed. This represents 51 per cent of the total number of such offences recorded in the whole of England and Wales for the financial year 2004-05, despite these locations amounting to only 36 per cent of the population of England and Wales.

Table 8: Assault

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Assault rate per 1,000
1	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	10,218	30.91
2	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	9,068	30.87
3	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	3,760	30.52
4	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	3,110	30.30
5	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	7,265	29.11
6	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	3,931	27.63
7	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	12,165	27.45
8	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	2,685	22.90
9	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	4,183	22.36
10	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	3,082	22.11
11	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	5,052	22.02
12	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	3,668	21.45
13	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	4,428	21.43
14	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	6,449	21.40
15	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	5,448	21.01
16	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	5,101	20.92
17	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	8,162	20.70
18	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	4,837	20.65
19	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	3,649	20.53
20	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	9,572	20.41
21	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Constabulary	420,556	8,576	20.39
22	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	2,686	19.71

23	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	3,214	19.18
24	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	3,580	18.86
City crime average					18.62
25	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	2,563	18.54
26	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	137,765	18.55
27	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	1,821	17.59
28	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	3,220	17.35
29	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	1,851	17.34
30	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	2,172	17.20
31	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	7,486	17.02
32	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	3,315	17.01
33	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	3,198	16.88
34	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	2,283	16.78
35	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	1,776	16.67
36	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	2,355	16.50
37	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	4,996	16.46
38	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	2,933	15.90
39	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	2,697	15.88
40	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	1,652	15.65
41	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	3,836	15.25
42	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	2,116	15.25
43	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	2,494	14.33
44	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	1,987	13.89
45	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	13,432	13.83
46	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	1,387	13.79
47	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	1,755	13.35
48	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	1,756	12.82
49	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	3,737	12.79
50	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	1,245	12.13
51	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	1,862	11.98
52	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	1,382	11.90
53	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	1,692	11.69
54	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	2,533	10.89
55	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	653	6.26
56	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	703	5.11
57	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	657	4.10

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Burglary

- Stockport in Greater Manchester recorded the highest burglary rate at just over 41 burglaries per 1,000 population, followed closely by Leeds which suffered 17,954 burglaries in 2005 (a rate of 40.51 per 1,000) and Nottingham with 9,567 (a rate of 38.33 per 1,000).
- The average number of burglaries for the places surveyed was 16.77 per 1,000 population with Norwich in Norfolk recording the lowest rate of 6.71 (representing 1,167 burglaries in a population almost a third larger than Stockport).
- With a population of only 136,000, the burglary crime capital – Stockport – can be contrasted with Poole in Dorset – one of the safest towns of a similar size surveyed. There were 5,608 burglaries in Stockport in 2005 compared to just 1,221 in Poole.
- With a population slightly larger (152,000), the London borough of Kingston upon Thames recorded just 1,078 burglaries – 1/6th the rate of Stockport.
- There were a total of 328,900 burglaries in the 57 towns and cities surveyed. This represents 49 per cent of the total number of such offences recorded in the whole of England and Wales for the financial year 2004-05, despite amounting to only 36 per cent of the population of England and Wales.

Table 9: Burglary

Rankings	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Recorded burglary rate per 1,000
1	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	5,608	41.21
2	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	17,954	40.51
3	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	9,567	38.33
4	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	3,635	35.11
5	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	9,693	33.00
6	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	4,456	31.96
7	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	3,622	29.40
8	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	11,324	28.72
9	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	7,551	25.05
10	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	3,439	24.10
11	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	4,347	22.90
12	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	4,299	22.69
13	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	2,285	22.26
14	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Police	420,556	9,194	21.86
15	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	2,839	20.83
16	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	8,972	20.40
17	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	2,742	19.94
18	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	3,347	19.57

19	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	3,164	18.62
20	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	1,942	18.40
21	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	2,381	18.11
22	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	3,108	17.49
	City crime average				16.77
23	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	7,857	16.75
24	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	3,766	16.42
25	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	2,188	15.83
26	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	3,073	15.77
27	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	1,848	15.76
28	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	2,149	15.69
29	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	4,571	15.65
30	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	3,902	15.52
31	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	1,927	15.26
32	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	2,818	15.19
33	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	3,105	15.03
34	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	2,133	14.99
35	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	3,880	14.97
36	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	104,721	14.10
37	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	3,252	13.98
38	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	4,531	13.71
39	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	1,951	13.64
40	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	2,502	13.56
41	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	3,115	13.30
42	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	1,543	13.29
43	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	3,810	12.55
44	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	2,063	12.31
45	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	1,307	12.24
46	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	1,276	12.22
47	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	1,253	12.21
48	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	2,266	12.11
49	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	1,892	11.81
50	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	1,623	11.70
51	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	1,736	11.17
52	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	2,640	10.83
53	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	9,023	9.29
54	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	984	9.23
55	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	919	9.14
56	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	1,221	8.43
57	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	1,167	6.71
<p><i>Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004; Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006</i></p>					

Robbery

- Manchester has the highest level of robberies per 1,000 population in England and Wales, recording 3,462 robberies in the city for the year 2005. This represents over 8 robberies per 1,000 population, closely followed by Nottingham with more than 6.
- The closest city in population to Manchester was Bristol which came tenth, and although slightly larger (with 420,000 inhabitants), recorded less than half the number of robberies (1,542 or 3.7 per 1,000 population).
- The average number of robberies for the cities surveyed was 3.8 per 1,000 with the fewest robberies per 1,000 population recorded in Poole (just 44).
- There were a total of 74,354 robberies in the 57 towns and cities surveyed. This represents 84 *per cent* of the total number of such offences recorded in the whole of England and Wales for the financial year 2004-05; this despite the fact that these 57 towns and cities amount to only 36 per cent of the population of England and Wales.

Table 10: Robbery

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Robbery rate per 1,000
1	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	3,462	8.78
2	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	1,600	6.41
3	London	Metropolitan Police	7,435,000	43,343	5.84
4	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	652	4.79
5	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	829	4.47
6	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	457	4.33
7	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	995	3.96
8	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	3,796	3.91
City crime average					3.84
9	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	1,755	3.74
10	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Police	420,556	1,542	3.67
11	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	372	3.59
12	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	1,486	3.35
13	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	611	3.22
14	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	1,001	3.03
15	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	386	2.82
16	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	533	2.73
17	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	457	2.67
18	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	378	2.65
19	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	732	2.41
20	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	297	2.35
21	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	319	2.29
22	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	524	2.28
23	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	677	2.25
24	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	286	2.18
25	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	626	2.13

26	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	277	2.03
27	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	416	2.01
28	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	287	2.01
29	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	229	1.95
30	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	293	1.83
31	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	339	1.79
32	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	782	1.78
33	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	278	1.51
34	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	264	1.49
35	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	158	1.36
36	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	319	1.36
37	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	135	1.34
38	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	248	1.33
39	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	346	1.33
40	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	132	1.29
41	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	181	1.27
42	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	196	1.26
43	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	277	1.19
44	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	118	1.13
45	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	315	1.08
46	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	145	1.05
47	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	109	1.02
48	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	165	0.98
49	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	112	0.91
50	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	125	0.91
51	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	196	0.80
52	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	103	0.75
53	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	69	0.65
54	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	111	0.65
55	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	113	0.65
56	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	61	0.59
57	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	44	0.30

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Vehicle crime

- Nottingham leads the rankings for vehicle crime as well as murder, with 10,058 thefts of or from a vehicle in the city (a rate of 40.3 per 1,000).
- Nottingham's rate was twice the average (20.6) for the cities surveyed and more than four times the rate of Ashford in Kent (8.6 car crimes per 1,000 population – just 882 offences for the year).
- At number 43, a city of a similar size, Wolverhampton in the West Midlands, recorded a vehicle crime rate of 13.9 – roughly a third of the Nottingham rate. Birmingham in the West Midlands recorded only 11,962 thefts of and from vehicles for the year in question, with a rate of 12.3 per 1,000 population.
- There were a total of 400,089 thefts of and from vehicles in the 57 towns and cities surveyed. This represents 54 per cent of the total number of such offences recorded in the whole of England and Wales for the financial year 2004-05; this despite the fact that these 57 towns and cities amount to only 36 per cent of the population of England and Wales.

Table 11: Vehicle crime

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Recorded vehicle crime rate per 1,000
1	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	10,058	40.30
2	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	15,634	39.65
3	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	17,207	39.12
4	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	3,844	37.12
5	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	5,042	37.05
6	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	10,417	35.66
7	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	15,085	34.03
8	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	4,705	33.75
9	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	9,565	32.57
10	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	4,079	28.59
11	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	6,907	28.33
12	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	3,488	28.31
13	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Constabulary	420,556	11,821	28.11
14	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	4,761	28.03
15	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	3,812	27.97
16	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	3,190	27.20
17	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	2,792	26.15
18	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	3,246	24.69
19	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	7,217	23.94
20	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	2,442	23.79
21	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	2,376	22.51
22	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	3,811	22.29
23	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	4,174	22.03
24	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	2,988	21.73

25	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	9,985	21.29
26	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	3,868	20.85
	City crime average				20.61
27	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	3,570	20.51
28	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	3,566	18.78
29	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	136,208	18.34
30	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	3,550	18.21
31	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	3,276	17.51
32	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	2,349	17.15
33	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	3,162	17.14
34	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	3,923	16.86
35	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	3,830	16.35
36	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	3,744	16.32
37	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	2,775	15.61
38	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	2,118	15.32
39	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	2,502	14.93
40	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	1,869	14.80
41	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	3,768	14.53
42	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	4,292	14.14
43	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	3,502	13.93
44	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	4,423	13.38
45	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	2,723	13.18
46	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	1,374	13.16
47	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	1,874	13.10
48	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	1,847	12.98
49	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	11,962	12.32
50	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	1,955	12.20
51	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	1,379	11.87
52	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	1,719	11.87
53	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	1,177	11.71
54	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	1,597	11.51
55	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	945	8.87
56	Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	102,661	882	8.59

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Gun Crime

- Huge variations are evident in the number of firearms offences recorded by the police in 2005. There were 552 in Leeds but only 101 in Bristol, a city almost the same size.
- Bradford in West Yorkshire was the city with the highest rate of firearms offences of all the locations surveyed. There were 368 firearms offences, representing more than 12.5 per 10,000 population, closely followed by Leeds with a rate of 12.5.
- Bradford's rate was three times the average (3.9) for the cities surveyed and contrasts with Cardiff, a city of similar size, which recorded only 36 firearms offences. According to data from the Merseyside police, there were only 2 firearms offences in St. Helens in 2005.

Table 12: Gun crime

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Offences	Firearms offence rate per 10,000
1	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	368	12.53
2	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	552	12.45
3	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	194	10.24
4	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	190	7.61
5	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	179	6.90
6	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	202	6.70
7	Southend	Essex Police	160,257	104	6.49
8	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	144	6.28
9	Colchester	Essex Police	104,390	63	6.04
10	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	3903	5.25
11	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	71	4.99
12	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	73	3.93
City crime average					3.86
13	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	35	3.28
14	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	42	3.19
15	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	115	2.92
16	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	51	2.76
17	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	34	2.69
18	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	36	2.64
19	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	50	2.63
20	Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	29	2.50
21	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Constabulary	420,556	101	2.40
22	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	30	2.20
23	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	22	2.08
24	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	68	2.06
25	Reading	Thames Valley Police	232,662	45	1.93
26	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	46	1.89
27	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	33	1.86
28	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	79	1.68
29	Oxford	Thames Valley Police	143,016	23	1.61

30	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	36	1.54
31	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	15	1.45
32	Bournemouth	Dorset Police	167,527	23	1.37
33	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	36	1.23
34	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	15	1.22
35	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	14	1.19
36	Swindon	Wiltshire Police	155,432	18	1.16
37	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	48	1.09
38	Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	15	1.08
39	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	17	1.00
40	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	20	0.97
41	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	12	0.86
42	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	16	0.86
43	Birmingham	West Midlands Police	970,892	81	0.83
44	Coventry	West Midlands Police	303,475	24	0.79
45	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	19	0.76
46	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	11	0.64
47	Crawley	Sussex Police	100,547	6	0.60
48	Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	10	0.57
49	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	7	0.51
50	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	7	0.49
51	Poole	Dorset Police	144,800	7	0.48
52	Eastbourne	Sussex Police	106,562	5	0.47
53	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	5	0.37
54	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	5	0.26
55	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	2	0.19

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Table 13: Urban crime rankings 2006 - all selected crimes

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Total selected crimes	Number of survey crimes per 1,000
1	Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	28,837	115.54
2	Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	47,524	107.22
3	Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	13,666	100.42
4	Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	29,489	100.40
5	Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	38,920	98.71
6	Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	9,741	94.08
7	Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	12,625	90.56
8	Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	11,063	89.79
9	Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	34,634	78.74
10	St. Helens	Merseyside Police	102,629	8,024	78.18
11	Bristol	Avon & Somerset Police	420,556	31,417	74.70
12	Hull	Humberside Police	301,416	22,234	73.77
13	Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	10,341	72.47
14	Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	136,292	9,737	71.44
15	Newport	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	8,000	68.22
16	Walsall	West Midlands Police	170,994	11,395	66.64
17	Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	12,544	66.20
18	Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	19,146	65.53
19	Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	10,784	63.48
20	Newcastle	Northumbria Police	189,863	11,985	63.12
21	Liverpool	Merseyside Police	469,017	29,423	62.73
22	Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	20,396	61.70
23	Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	14,998	61.52
24	Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	105,542	6,492	61.51
City average / number of survey crimes per 1,000 population					61.42
25	Slough	Thames Valley Police	131,465	7,762	59.04
26	Luton	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	10,920	58.85
27	Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	13,341	58.15
28	Blackpool	Lancashire Police	142,283	8,228	57.83
29	London	Metropolitan Police Force	7,428,000	428,783	57.73
30	Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	6,070	56.85
31	Sunderland	Northumbria Police	177,739	9,894	55.67
32	Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	10,115	54.07
33	Dudley	West Midlands Police	194,919	10,535	54.05
34	Stoke	Staffordshire Police	259,252	13,737	52.99
35	Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	12,268	52.38
36	Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	206,628	10,809	52.31
37	Telford	West Mercia Police	138,241	7,135	51.61
38	Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	6,347	50.26
39	Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	251,462	12,349	49.11
40	West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	136,940	6,688	48.84
41	Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	184,506	8,974	48.64
42	York	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	6,607	48.05

43	<i>Bournemouth</i>	Dorset Police	167,527	8,033	47.95
44	<i>Coventry</i>	West Midlands Police	303,475	13,975	46.05
45	<i>Reading</i>	Thames Valley Police	232,662	10,086	43.35
46	<i>Oxford</i>	Thames Valley Police	143,016	6,177	43.19
47	<i>Norwich</i>	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	7,421	42.64
48	<i>Ipswich</i>	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	5,541	39.94
49	<i>Birmingham</i>	West Midlands Police	970,892	38,663	39.82
50	<i>Cambridge</i>	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	116,143	4,535	39.05
51	<i>Crawley</i>	Sussex Police	100,547	3,661	36.41
52	<i>Eastbourne</i>	Sussex Police	106,562	3,865	36.27
53	<i>Colchester</i>	Essex Police	104,390	3,539	33.90
54	<i>Poole</i>	Dorset Police	144,800	4,737	32.71
55	<i>Southend</i>	Essex Police	160,257	4,953	30.91

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census, 2004;
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006*

Table 14: Total Recorded Offences January-December 2005 for Seven Crime Categories by Size of City/Town

	City	Police Force Area	Murder	Rape	Assault	Burglary	Robbery	Vehicle crime	Gun crime
1a	<i>London boroughs</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	156	2,679	137,419	104,358	43,311	135,969	3902
1b	<i>City of London</i>	City of London Police	2	6	346	363	32	239	1
1	<i>LONDON</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	158	2,685	137,765	104,721	43,343	136,208	3903
2	<i>Birmingham</i>	West Midlands Police	19	350	13,432	9,023	3,796	11,962	81
3	<i>Liverpool</i>	Merseyside Police	10	165	9,572	7,857	1,755	9,985	79
4	<i>Leeds</i>	West Yorkshire Police	19	263	12,165	17,954	1,486	15,085	552
5	<i>Sheffield</i>	South Yorkshire Police	11	128	7,486	8,972	782	17,207	48
6	<i>Bristol</i>	Avon & Somerset Police	6	177	8,576	9,194	1,542	11,821	101
7	<i>Manchester</i>	Greater Manchester Police	12	211	8,162	11,324	3,462	15,634	115
8	<i>Leicester</i>	Leicestershire Constabulary	3	152	10,218	4,531	1,001	4,423	68
9	<i>Coventry</i>	West Midlands Police	7	114	4,996	3,810	732	4,292	24
10	<i>Hull</i>	Humberside Police	7	131	6,449	7,551	677	7,217	202
11	<i>Bradford</i>	West Yorkshire Police	8	161	9,068	9,693	626	9,565	368
12	<i>Cardiff</i>	South Wales Constabulary	5	65	3,737	4,571	315	10,417	36
13	<i>Stoke</i>	Staffordshire Police	2	114	5,448	3,880	346	3,768	179
14	<i>Wolverhampton</i>	West Midlands Police	4	91	3,836	3,902	995	3,502	19
15	<i>Nottingham</i>	Nottinghamshire Police	13	144	7,265	9,567	1,600	10,058	190
16	<i>Plymouth</i>	Devon & Cornwall Police	2	106	5,101	2,640	196	6,907	46
17	<i>Southampton</i>	Hampshire Constabulary	3	128	4,837	3,115	319	3,830	36
18	<i>Reading</i>	Thames Valley Police	3	53	2,533	3,252	277	3,923	45
19	<i>Derby</i>	Derbyshire Constabulary	4	107	5,052	3,766	524	3,744	144
20	<i>Brighton & Hove</i>	Sussex Police	0	117	4,428	3,105	416	2,723	20
21	<i>Dudley</i>	West Midlands Police	3	56	3,315	3,073	533	3,550	5
22	<i>Newcastle</i>	Northumbria Police	6	97	3,580	4,347	339	3,566	50
23	<i>Northampton</i>	Northamptonshire Police	2	66	3,198	4,299	611	4,174	194
24	<i>Portsmouth</i>	Hampshire Constabulary	3	123	4,183	2,266	248	3,276	16
25	<i>Luton</i>	Bedfordshire Police	4	108	3,220	2,818	829	3,868	73
26	<i>Milton Keynes</i>	Thames Valley Police	3	45	2,933	2,502	278	3,162	51
27	<i>Sunderland</i>	Northumbria Police	3	62	3,649	3,108	264	2,775	33
28	<i>Norwich</i>	Norfolk Constabulary	3	64	2,494	1,167	113	3,570	10
29	<i>Walsall</i>	West Midlands Police	5	96	3,668	3,347	457	3,811	11
30	<i>Swansea</i>	South Wales Constabulary	1	33	2,697	3,164	111	4,761	17
31	<i>Bournemouth</i>	Dorset Police	2	64	3,214	2,063	165	2,502	23
32	<i>Southend</i>	Essex Police	5	47	6,57	1,892	293	1,955	104
33	<i>Swindon</i>	Wiltshire Police	2	66	1,862	1,736	196		18
34	<i>Poole</i>	Dorset Police	1	53	1,692	1221	44	1,719	7
35	<i>Oxford</i>	Thames Valley Police	2	53	1,987	1951	287	1,874	23
36	<i>Middlesbrough</i>	Cleveland Constabulary	1	82	2,355	3439	378	4,079	7

Source: Freedom of Information Act requests to selected police forces, March-May 2006

Table 15: Total Crimes in London

	Borough	Murder	Rape	Assault	Robbery	Burglary	Vehicle crime	Gun crime	Total	Rate
1	Westminster	6	112	6,213	1,513	4,407	4,377	62	16,690	92.21
2	Islington	4	83	4,410	1,406	3,608	5,621	126	15,258	86.69
3	Hackney	3	154	5,297	1,816	3,788	5,469	244	16,771	82.62
4	Southwark	10	151	6,516	2,832	4,290	5,746	276	19,821	80.90
5	Newham	9	148	5,745	2,418	4,031	6,522	170	19,043	78.05
6	Camden	8	76	4,983	1,255	4,042	4,732	80	15,176	76.65
7	Tower Hamlets	1	107	4,822	1,611	3,409	4,930	138	15,018	76.62
8	Haringey	7	105	4,706	2,007	3,978	5,069	213	16,085	74.12
9	Lambeth	7	192	6,591	3,069	3,960	4,935	294	19,048	71.61
10	Hammersmith & Fulham	2	57	3,097	1,282	3,172	3,874	65	11,549	69.99
11	Waltham Forest	7	83	4,610	2,240	3,266	4,801	200	15,207	69.76
12	Greenwich	4	121	5,557	1,244	3,209	4,076	141	14,352	67.07
13	Lewisham	8	103	5,986	2,044	3,610	4,186	198	16,135	64.80
14	Brent	12	99	5,489	2,256	4,022	4,666	209	16,753	63.70
15	Ealing	7	101	5,588	1,822	4,983	6,224	166	18,891	62.76
16	Barking & Dagenham	6	72	3,953	785	1,935	3,214	94	10,059	61.34
17	Hounslow	4	78	4,225	849	2,965	4,168	82	12,371	58.35
	London average									57.67
18	Kensington & Chelsea	5	43	2,367	827	2,431	3,211	47	8,931	56.17
19	Barnet	8	93	4,305	1,241	4,347	6,382	101	16,477	52.31
20	Wandsworth	4	58	4,349	1,641	3,223	4,171	100	13,546	52.10
21	Hillingdon	0	54	4,057	713	3,244	4,427	70	12,565	51.71
22	Redbridge	8	48	3,043	1,300	3,207	4,480	102	12,188	51.00
23	Enfield	7	69	3,946	1,283	3,842	4,376	136	13,659	49.85
24	Croydon	6	122	5,844	1,672	3,540	4,553	152	15,889	48.00
25	Bromley	0	52	4,046	807	4,143	4,564	75	13,687	46.24
26	Havering	1	49	3,033	487	2,356	3,933	76	9,935	44.35
27	Merton	2	41	2,684	569	1,826	2,315	79	7,516	39.98
28	Bexley	2	52	3,067	457	2,314	2,765	42	8,699	39.90
29	Harrow	3	42	2,179	777	2,391	2,705	47	8,144	39.34
30	Richmond upon Thames	3	13	1,752	443	2,290	1,829	37	6,367	37.02
31	Sutton	0	48	2,393	334	1,451	2,351	37	6,614	36.74
32	Kingston upon Thames	2	53	2,566	311	1,078	1,297	43	5,350	36.39
	City of London	2	6	346	363	32	239	1	989	141.29
LONDON TOTAL		158	2,685	137,765	43,674	104,390	136,208	289	428,783	57.67

Source: Metropolitan Police Service

Table 16: Urban crime rankings 2006 – including London Boroughs

Ranking	City	Police Force Area	Population	Total crimes	Number of survey crimes per 1,000
1	<i>Nottingham</i>	Nottinghamshire Police	249,584	28,837	115.54
2	<i>Leeds</i>	West Yorkshire Police	443,247	47,524	107.22
3	<i>Stockport</i>	Greater Manchester Police	136,082	13,666	100.42
4	<i>Bradford</i>	West Yorkshire Police	293,717	29,489	100.40
5	<i>Manchester</i>	Greater Manchester Police	394,269	38,920	98.71
6	<i>Oldham</i>	Greater Manchester Police	103,544	9,741	94.08
7	<i>Westminster*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	230,000	16,690	92.21
8	<i>Bolton</i>	Greater Manchester Police	139,403	12,625	90.56
9	<i>Rotherham</i>	South Yorkshire Police	123,205	11,063	89.79
10	<i>Islington*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	180,000	15,258	86.69
11	<i>Hackney*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	207,000	16,771	82.62
12	<i>Southwark*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	255,000	19,821	80.90
13	<i>Sheffield</i>	South Yorkshire Police	439,866	34,634	78.74
14	<i>St. Helens</i>	Merseyside Police	102,629	8,024	78.18
15	<i>Newham*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	248,000	19,043	78.05
16	<i>Camden*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	217,000	15,176	76.65
17	<i>Tower Hamlets*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	209,000	15,018	76.62
18	<i>Bristol</i>	Avon & Somerset Police	420,556	31,417	74.70
19	<i>Haringey*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	224,000	16,085	74.12
20	<i>Hull</i>	Humberside Police	301,416	22,234	73.77
21	<i>Middlesbrough</i>	Cleveland Constabulary	142,691	10,341	72.47
22	<i>Lambeth*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	268,000	19,048	71.61
23	<i>Peterborough</i>	Cambridgeshire Police	136,292	9,737	71.44
24	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	177,000	11,549	69.99
25	<i>Waltham Forest*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	222,000	15,207	69.76
26	<i>Newport</i>	Gwent Constabulary	117,262	8,000	68.22
27	<i>Greenwich*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	226,000	14,352	67.07
28	<i>Walsall</i>	West Midlands Police	170,994	11,395	66.64
29	<i>Northampton</i>	Northamptonshire Police	189,474	12,544	66.20
30	<i>Cardiff</i>	South Wales Constabulary	292,150	19,146	65.53
31	<i>Lewisham*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	247,000	16,135	64.80
32	<i>Brent*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	268,000	16,753	63.70
33	<i>Swansea</i>	South Wales Constabulary	169,880	10,784	63.48
34	<i>Newcastle</i>	Northumbria Police	189,863	11,985	63.12
35	<i>Ealing*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	303,000	18,891	62.76
36	<i>Liverpool</i>	Merseyside Police	469,017	29,423	62.73
37	<i>Leicester</i>	Leicestershire Constabulary	330,574	20,396	61.70
38	<i>Plymouth</i>	Devon & Cornwall Police	243,795	14,998	61.52
39	<i>Sutton Coldfield</i>	West Midlands Police	105,542	6,492	61.51
40	<i>Barking & Dagenham*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	165,000	10,059	61.34
City average / number of survey crimes per 1,000 population					61
41	<i>Slough</i>	Thames Valley Police	131,465	7,762	59.04
42	<i>Luton</i>	Bedfordshire Police	185,543	10,920	58.85
43	<i>Hounslow*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	212,000	12,371	58.35
44	<i>Derby</i>	Derbyshire Constabulary	229,407	13,341	58.15
45	<i>Blackpool</i>	Lancashire Police	142,283	8,228	57.83

46	<i>London</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	7,435,000	428,783	57.67
47	<i>Exeter</i>	Devon & Cornwall Police	106,772	6,070	56.85
48	<i>Kensington & Chelsea*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	184,000	8,931	56.17
49	<i>Sunderland</i>	Northumbria Police	177,739	9,894	55.67
50	<i>Portsmouth</i>	Hampshire Constabulary	187,056	10,115	54.07
51	<i>Dudley</i>	West Midlands Police	194,919	10,535	54.05
52	<i>Stoke</i>	Staffordshire Police	259,252	13,737	52.99
54	<i>Southampton</i>	Hampshire Constabulary	234,224	12,268	52.38
=55	<i>Brighton & Hove</i>	Sussex Police	206,628	10,809	52.31
=55	<i>Barnet*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	327,000	16,477	52.31
56	<i>Wandsworth*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	277,000	13,546	52.10
57	<i>Hillingdon*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	249,000	12,565	51.71
58	<i>Telford</i>	West Mercia Police	138,241	7,135	51.61
59	<i>Redbridge*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	247,000	12,188	51.00
60	<i>Gloucester</i>	Gloucestershire Constabulary	126,276	6,347	50.26
61	<i>Enfield*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	280,000	13,659	49.85
62	<i>Wolverhampton</i>	West Midlands Police	251,462	12,349	49.11
63	<i>West Bromwich</i>	West Midlands Police	136,940	6,688	48.84
64	<i>Milton Keynes</i>	Thames Valley Police	184,506	8,974	48.64
65	<i>York</i>	North Yorkshire Police	137,505	6,607	48.05
66	<i>Croydon*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	340,000	15,889	48.00
67	<i>Bournemouth</i>	Dorset Police	167,527	8,033	47.95
68	<i>Bromley*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	299,000	13,687	46.24
69	<i>Coventry</i>	West Midlands Police	303,475	13,975	46.05
70	<i>Havering*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	225,000	9,935	44.35
71	<i>Reading</i>	Thames Valley Police	232,662	10,086	43.35
72	<i>Oxford</i>	Thames Valley Police	143,016	6,177	43.19
73	<i>Norwich</i>	Norfolk Constabulary	174,047	7,421	42.64
74	<i>Merton</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	192,000	7,516	39.98
75	<i>Ipswich</i>	Suffolk Constabulary	138,718	5,541	39.94
76	<i>Bexley*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	220,000	8,699	39.90
77	<i>Birmingham</i>	West Midlands Police	970,892	38,663	39.82
78	<i>Harrow*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	211,000	8,144	39.34
79	<i>Cambridge</i>	Cambridgeshire Police	116,143	4,535	39.05
80	<i>Richmond upon Thames*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	183,000	6,367	37.02
81	<i>Sutton*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	178,000	6,614	36.74
82	<i>Crawley</i>	Sussex Police	100,547	3,661	36.41
83	<i>Kingston upon Thames*</i>	Metropolitan Police Force	152,000	5,350	36.39
84	<i>Eastbourne</i>	Sussex Police	106,562	3,865	36.27
85	<i>Colchester</i>	Essex Police	104,390	3,539	33.90
86	<i>Poole</i>	Dorset Police	144,800	4,737	32.71
87	<i>Southend</i>	Essex Police	160,257	4,953	30.91

*Source: Office for National Statistics, 2001 Census (2004);
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests March-May 2006; Metropolitan Police Service website*

Table 17: Murder – London boroughs

London Ranking	Borough	Population, to nearest 1,000	Total number of murders	Murder rate per 100,000
1	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	12	4.48
2	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	10	3.92
3	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	8*	3.69
4	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	6	3.64
5	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	9	3.63
6=	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	8	3.24
6=	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	8	3.24
7	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	7	3.15
8	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	7	3.13
9	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	5	2.72
10=	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	7	2.61
10=	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	6	2.61
11	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	7	2.5
12	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	8	2.45
13	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	7	2.31
14	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	4	2.22
	London			2.13
15	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	4	1.89
16	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	4	1.77
17	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	6	1.76
18	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	3	1.64
19	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	3	1.45
20	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	4	1.44
21	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	3	1.42
22	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	2	1.32
23	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	2	1.13
24	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	2	1.04
25	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	2	0.91
26	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	1	0.48
27	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	1	0.44
28	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	0	0
29	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	0	0
30	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	0	0
	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	2	
Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics				

* NB. The official figures for the number of murders in Camden in July included 13 victims of the Tavistock Square suicide bus bombing on the 7 July 2005. These have been omitted from the results. The victims of the other attacks on the Underground that day would have been recorded as homicides by the British Transport Police in London, not the Metropolitan Police.

Table 18: Rape – London boroughs

London ranking	Borough	Population to nearest 1,000	Total number of rapes	Rape rate per 10,000
1	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	154	7.44
2	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	192	7.16
3	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	148	5.97
4	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	151	5.92
5	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	121	5.35
6	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	107	5.12
7	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	112	4.87
8	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	105	4.69
9	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	83	4.61
10	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	72	4.36
11	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	58	4.17
12	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	83	3.74
13	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	99	3.69
14	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	78	3.68
	London			3.61
15	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	122	3.59
16	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	76	3.5
17	<i>Kingston upon Thames</i>	152,000	53	3.49
18	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	101	3.33
19	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	57	3.22
20	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	93	2.84
21	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	48	2.7
22	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	69	2.46
23	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	52	2.36
24	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	43	2.34
25	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	49	2.18
26	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	54	2.17
27	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	41	2.14
28	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	103	2.09
29	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	42	1.99
30	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	48	1.94
31	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	52	1.74
32	<i>Richmond upon Thames</i>	183,000	13	0.71
	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	6	
Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics				

Table 19: Assault – London boroughs

London Ranking	Boroughs	Population to nearest 1,000	Total number of assaults	Assault rate per 1,000
1	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	6,213	27.01
2	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	5,297	25.59
3	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	6,516	25.55
4=	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	6,591	24.59
4=	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	5,557	24.59
5	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	4,410	24.5
6	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	5,986	24.23
7	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	3,953	23.96
8	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	5,745	23.17
9	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	4,822	23.07
10	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	4,983	22.96
11	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	4,706	21.01
12	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	4,610	20.77
13	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	5,489	20.48
14	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	4,225	19.93
	London			18.5
15	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	5,588	18.44
16	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	3,097	17.5
17	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	5,844	17.19
18	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	2,566	16.88
19	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	4,057	16.29
20	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	4,349	15.7
21	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	3,946	14.09
22	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	2,684	13.98
23	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	3,067	13.94
24	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	4,046	13.53
25	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	3,033	13.48
26	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	2,393	13.44
27	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	4,305	13.17
28	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	2,367	12.86
29	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	3,043	12.32
30	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	2,179	10.33
31	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	1,752	9.57
	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	346	

Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics

Table 20: Burglary – London boroughs

London Ranking	Boroughs	Population to nearest 1,000	Total number of burglaries	Burglary rate per 1,000 population
1	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	3,608	20.04
2	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	4,407	19.16
3	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	4,042	18.63
4	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	3,788	18.3
5	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	3,172	17.92
6	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	3,978	17.76
7	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	4,290	16.82
8	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	4,983	16.45
9	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	3,409	16.31
10	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	4,031	16.25
11	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	4,022	15.01
12	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	3,960	14.78
13	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	3,266	14.71
14	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	3,610	14.62
15	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	3,209	14.19
	London			14.04
16	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	2,965	13.99
17	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	4,143	13.86
18	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	3,842	13.72
19	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	4,347	13.29
20	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	2,431	13.21
21	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	3,244	13.03
22	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	3,207	12.98
23	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	2,290	12.51
24	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	1,935	11.73
25	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	3,223	11.64
26	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	2,391	11.33
27	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	2,314	10.52
28	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	2,356	10.47
29	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	3,540	10.41
30	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	1,826	9.51
31	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	1,451	8.15
32	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	1,078	7.09
33	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	32	
Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics				

Table 21: Robbery – London boroughs

London Ranking	Boroughs	Population to nearest 1,000	Total number of robberies	Robbery rate per 1,000
1	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	3069	11.45
2	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	2832	11.11
3	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	2240	10.09
4	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	2418	9.75
5	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	2007	8.96
6	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	1816	8.77
7	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	2256	8.42
8	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	2044	8.28
9	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	1406	7.81
10	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	1611	7.71
11	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	1282	7.24
12	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	1513	6.58
13	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	1822	6.01
14	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	1641	5.92
	London			5.83
15	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	1255	5.78
16	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	1244	5.5
17	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	1300	5.26
18	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	1672	4.92
19	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	785	4.76
20	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	1283	4.58
21	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	827	4.49
22	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	849	4
23	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	1241	3.8
24	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	777	3.68
25	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	569	2.96
26	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	713	2.86
27	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	807	2.7
28	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	443	2.42
29	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	487	2.16
30	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	457	2.08
31	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	311	2.05
32	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	334	1.88
	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	363	
Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics				

Table 22: Vehicle crime – London boroughs

London Ranking	Boroughs	Population to nearest 1,000	Car crimes	Car crime rate per 1,000
1	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	5,621	31.23
2	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	5,469	26.42
3	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	6,522	26.3
4	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	4,930	23.59
5	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	5,069	22.63
6	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	5,746	22.53
7	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	3,874	21.89
8	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	4,732	21.81
9	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	4,801	21.63
10	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	6,224	20.54
11	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	4,168	19.66
12	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	6,382	19.52
13	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	3,214	19.48
14	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	4,377	19.03
15	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	4,935	18.41
	<i>London</i>			18.3
16	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	4,480	18.14
17	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	4,076	18.04
18	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	4,427	17.78
19	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	3,933	17.48
20	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	3,211	17.45
21	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	4,666	17.41
22	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	4,186	16.95
23	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	4,376	15.63
24	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	4,564	15.26
25	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	4,171	15.06
26	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	4,553	13.39
27	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	2,351	13.21
28	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	2,705	12.82
29	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	2,765	12.57
30	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	2,315	12.06
31	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	1,829	9.99
32	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	1,297	8.53
33	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	239	
<i>Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics</i>				

Table 23: Gun crime – London boroughs

London Ranking	Boroughs	Population to nearest 1,000	Gun crimes	Gun crime rate per 10,000
1	<i>Hackney</i>	207,000	244	11.79
2	<i>Lambeth</i>	268,000	294	10.97
3	<i>Southwark</i>	255,000	276	10.82
4	<i>Haringey</i>	224,000	213	9.51
5	<i>Waltham Forest</i>	222,000	200	9.01
6	<i>Lewisham</i>	247,000	198	8.02
7	<i>Brent</i>	268,000	209	7.8
8	<i>Islington</i>	180,000	126	7
9	<i>Newham</i>	248,000	170	6.85
10	<i>Tower Hamlets</i>	209,000	138	6.6
11	<i>Greenwich</i>	226,000	141	6.24
12	<i>Barking & Dagenham</i>	165,000	94	5.7
13	<i>Ealing</i>	303,000	166	5.48
	London			5.25
14	<i>Enfield</i>	280,000	136	4.86
15	<i>Croydon</i>	340,000	152	4.47
16	<i>Redbridge</i>	247,000	102	4.13
17	<i>Merton</i>	192,000	79	4.11
18	<i>Hounslow</i>	212,000	82	3.87
19	<i>Camden</i>	217,000	80	3.69
20	<i>Hammersmith & Fulham</i>	177,000	65	3.67
21	<i>Wandsworth</i>	277,000	100	3.61
22	<i>Havering</i>	225,000	76	3.38
23	<i>Barnet</i>	327,000	101	3.09
24	<i>Kingston</i>	152,000	43	2.83
25	<i>Hillingdon</i>	249,000	70	2.81
26	<i>Westminster</i>	230,000	62	2.7
27	<i>Kensington & Chelsea</i>	184,000	47	2.55
28	<i>Bromley</i>	299,000	75	2.51
29	<i>Harrow</i>	211,000	47	2.23
30	<i>Sutton</i>	178,000	37	2.08
31	<i>Richmond</i>	183,000	37	2.02
32	<i>Bexley</i>	220,000	42	1.91
33	<i>City of London</i>	7,000	1	0

Source: Metropolitan Police, Office for National Statistics

Table 24: HM Inspectorate of Constabulary – Offences by Code

Offence	Sub Category	Offence ID	Offence Description
VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON	More Serious Crime	1	Murder
		2	Attempted Murder
		3	Threat Or Conspiracy To Murder
		4.01	Manslaughter
		4.02	Infanticide
		4.03	Child Destruction
		4.04	Causing Death By Dangerous Driving
		4.06	Causing Death By Careless Driving While Under Influence Of Drink / Drugs
		4.07	Cause/Allow Death Of a Child or Vulnerable Person
		5	Wounding Or Other Act Endangering Life
		6	Endangering A Railway Passenger
		37.01	Causing Death By Aggravated Vehicle Taking
	Less Serious Crime	7	Endangering Life At Sea
		11	Cruelty To And Neglect Of Children
		12	Abandoning Child Under Two Years
		13	Child Abduction
		14	Procuring An Illegal Abortion
		15	Concealment Of Birth
		104	Assault On a Constable
		105A	Common Assault
		105B	Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Common Assault
		8A	Other Wounding
		8B	Possession of Weapons
		8C	Harassment
		8D	Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Other Wounding
		8E	Racially Or Religiously Aggravated Harassment
SEXUAL OFFENCES	Rape	19A	Rape Of a Female
		19B	Rape Of a Male
		19C	Rape Of a Female Aged 16 And Over
		19D	Rape Of a Female Child Under 16
		19E	Rape Of a Female Child Under 13
		19F	Rape Of a Male Aged 16 And Over
		19G	Rape Of a Male Child Under 16
		19H	Rape Of a Male Child Under 13
	Indecent assault on a female	20	Indecent Assault On a Female
		20A	Sexual Assault On a Female Aged 13 And Over
		20B	Sexual Assault On a Female Child Under 13
	Other sexual offences	16	Buggery
		17	Indecent Assault On a Male
		17A	Sexual Assault On a Male Aged 13 And Over
		17B	Sexual Assault On a Male Child Under 13
		18	Gross Indecency Between Males
		21	Sexual Activity Involving a Child Under 13
		22	Unlawful Sexual Intercourse With Girl Under 16
		22B	Sexual Activity Involving A Child Under 16
		23	Familial Sexual Offences
		24	Exploitation Of Prostitution
		25	Abduction
		26	Bigamy

		27	Soliciting Of Women By Men
		70	Sexual Activity etc With A Person With A Mental Disorder
		71	Abuse Of Children Through Prostitution & Pornography
		72	Trafficking For Sexual Exploitation
		73	Abuse Of Trust
		74	Gross Indecency With A Child
		88A	Sexual Grooming
		88B	Other Miscellaneous Sexual Offences
ROBBERY	Robbery of business property	34A	Robbery Of Business Property
	Robbery of personal property	34B	Robbery Of Personal Property
BURGLARY	Burglary in a dwelling	28	Burglary In A Dwelling
		28.01	Attempted Burglary In A Dwelling
		28.02	Distraction Burglary
		29	Aggravated Burglary In A Dwelling
	Burglary in other dwelling	30	Burglary In A Building Other Than A Dwelling
		30.01	Attempted Burglary In A Building Other Than A Dwelling
		31	Aggravated Burglary In A Building Other Than A Dwelling
THEFT & HANDLING	Theft from the person	39	Theft From The Person
	Theft of a pedal cycle	44	Theft Or Unauthorised Taking Of A Pedal Cycle
	Theft from shop	46	Theft From A Shop
	Theft from a vehicle	45	Theft From A Vehicle
	Theft of a vehicle	37.02	Aggravated Vehicle Taking
		48	Theft Or Unauthorised Taking Of a Motor Vehicle
		48.01	Attempted Theft Of a Motor Vehicle
	Vehicle interference and tampering	126	
	Other theft	38	Proceeds Of Crime
		40	Theft In A Dwelling Other Than From An Automatic Machine Or Meter
		41	Theft By An Employee
		42	Theft Or Unlawful Taking Of Mail
		43	Abstracting Electricity
		47	Theft From An Automatic Machine Or Meter
		49	Other Theft
	Handling stolen goods	54	Handling Stolen Goods
FRAUD & FORGERY	Fraud and forgery	51	Frauds By Company Directors Etc.
		52	False Accounting
		55	Bankruptcy And Insolvency Offences
		60	Forgery Etc. Of Drug Prescription
		61	Other Forgery Etc.
		53A	Cheque and Credit Card Fraud
		53B	Other Frauds
		814	Fraud, Forgery Etc. Associated With Vehicle Or Driver Records
CRIMINAL DAMAGE	Arson	56	Arson
	Other criminal damage	58A	Criminal Damage to a Dwelling
		58B	Criminal Damage to a Building Other Than a Dwelling
		58C	Criminal Damage to a Vehicle
		58D	Other Criminal Damage
		58E	Racially of Religiously Aggravated Criminal Damage to a Dwelling
		58F	Racially of Religiously Aggravated Criminal Damage To a Building Other Than a Dwelling
		58G	Racially of Religiously Aggravated Criminal Damage To a Vehicle
		58H	Racially of Religiously Aggravated Other Criminal Damage

		59	Threat Or Possession With Intent to Commit Criminal Damage
DRUG OFFENCES	Trafficking in controlled drugs	92A	Trafficking in controlled drugs
	Possession of controlled drugs	92D	Possession Of Controlled Drugs (Excluding Cannabis)
		92E	Possession Of Controlled Drugs (Cannabis)
	Other drug offences	92C	Other drug offences
OTHER OFFENCES		33	Going Equipped For Stealing Etc.
		35	Blackmail
		36	Kidnapping
		62	High Treason And Other Offences Against Treason Acts
		63	Treason Felony
		64	Rioting
		65	Violent Disorder
		66	Other Offences (Against The State and Public Order)
		67	Perjury And False Statements
		68	Libel
		75	Betting, Gaming And Lotteries
		76	Aiding And Abetting Suicide
		78	Immigration Acts
		79	Attempting To Pervert The Course Of Public Justice
		80	Absconding From Lawful Custody
		81	Other Firearms Offences
		82	Offences Against Laws Relating To Customs, Excise And Inland Revenue
		83	Bail Offences
		84	Trade Descriptions Offences
		85	Health And Safety At Work Offences
		86	Obscene Publications, Etc. And Protected Sexual Material
		87	Protection From Eviction
		89	Adulteration Of Food
		90	Other Knives Offences
		91	Public Health
		94	Town And Country Planning Act 1990
		95	Disclosure, Obstruction, False Or Misleading Statements Etc
		99	Other Indictable Or Triable Either Way Offences
		139	Indecent Exposure
		802	Dangerous Driving
		802	Dangerous Driving
		802	Dangerous Driving

Source: HM Inspectorate of Constabulary

Table 25: Geographic areas defined

City	Police Force Area	Definition
London	Metropolitan Police Force	31 London boroughs, City of London, City of Westminster
Birmingham	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Units "E1", "E2", "E3", "F1", "F2", "F3", "D1", "D3"
Liverpool	Merseyside Police	Basic Command Unit "E" Liverpool North and "F" Liverpool South
Leeds	West Yorkshire Police	Divisions: Pudsey/Weetwood, Chapeltown, Killingbeck, City & Holbeck Division
Sheffield	South Yorkshire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone (Central, North and South)
Bristol	Avon & Somerset Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Manchester	Greater Manchester Police	Division "A" - North, Division B - Metropolitan, Division C - South
Leicester	Leicestershire Constabulary	Leicester City Division
Coventry	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit "M1", "M2", "M3"
Hull	Humberside Police	Division "D"
Bradford	West Yorkshire Police	Bradford North and South Division
Cardiff	South Wales Constabulary	Cardiff Basic Command Unit
Stoke	Staffordshire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Wolverhampton	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit "G1", "G2"
Nottingham	Nottinghamshire Police	Nottingham City Basic Command Unit
Plymouth	Devon & Cornwall Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Southampton	Hampshire Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Reading	Thames Valley Police	Reading Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Derby	Derbyshire Constabulary	Division "D" (including Swadlincote and the city suburbs of Peartree and Merrill)
Brighton & Hove	Sussex Police	Divisions - Brighton East, Central and West
Dudley	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit "J1", "J2"
Newcastle	Northumbria Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Northampton	Northamptonshire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Portsmouth	Hampshire Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Luton	Bedfordshire Police	Division "C" - Luton area
Preston	Lancashire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Milton Keynes	Thames Valley Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Sunderland	Northumbria Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Norwich	Norfolk Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Walsall	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit "H1", "H2"
Swansea	South Wales Constabulary	Swansea Basic Command Unit
Bournemouth	Dorset Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Southend	Essex Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Swindon	Wiltshire Police	Unitary Authority of Thamesdown - "D" (Swindon) Division
Poole	Dorset Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Oxford	Thames Valley Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Middlesbrough	Cleveland Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Blackpool	Lancashire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Bolton	Greater Manchester Police	Division "K"
Ipswich	Suffolk Constabulary	Ipswich Division

Telford	West Mercia Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
York	North Yorkshire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
West Bromwich	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit - "K1"
Peterborough	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Northern Division
Stockport	Greater Manchester Police	Division "J"
Slough	Thames Valley Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Gloucester	Gloucestershire Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Watford	Hertfordshire Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Rotherham	South Yorkshire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Newport	Gwent Constabulary	Division "A"
Cambridge	Cambridgeshire Constabulary	"Cambridge City" as a bespoke sub-division of Cambridgeshire Police Southern Division
Exeter	Devon & Cornwall Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Eastbourne	Sussex Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Sutton Coldfield	West Midlands Police	Operational Command Unit - "D2"
Blackburn	Lancashire Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Colchester	Essex Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone
Oldham	Greater Manchester Police	Division "Q"
Ashford	Kent County Constabulary	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
St. Helens	Merseyside Police	Division "D" (St. Helens Local Authority)
Crawley	Sussex Police	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership zone

Source: Definitions as provided by police force FOI departments

Table 25: Crime rate per 1,000 population for selected categories of offence by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP), 2004-05

Rank	Force	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership	Violence against the person offences per 1,000 population	Sexual offences per 1,000 population	Robbery offences per 1,000 population	Burglary dwelling offences per 1,000 population	Theft of a motor vehicle offences per 1,000 population	Theft from a vehicle offences per 1,000 population	Recorded crime BCS comparator offences per 1,000 population
1	Nottinghamshire	Nottingham	33	2	6	23	10	26	156
2	Humberside	North East Lincolnshire	37	2	2	12	11	19	132
3	Humberside	Kingston upon Hull	41	3	3	13	10	18	130
4	Greater Manchester	Manchester	32	2	8	17	11	21	128
5	Metropolitan Police	City of Westminster	47	3	7	8	5	16	127
6	Metropolitan Police	Islington	42	2	7	14	7	20	121
7	Cleveland	Middlesbrough	26	3	3	12	12	23	121
8	Avon & Somerset	City of Bristol UA	33	2	4	13	10	23	112
9	Cambridgeshire	Peterborough UA	33	2	2	7	8	18	111
10	Merseyside	Liverpool	37	1	3	12	10	15	110
11	Metropolitan Police	Hackney	35	2	9	13	9	17	108
12	Northamptonshire	Corby	30	1	2	8	7	11	106
13	Metropolitan Police	Camden	36	3	6	11	6	18	104
14	Northamptonshire	Northampton	24	1	2	11	8	17	103
15	Metropolitan Police	Southwark	37	2	9	11	9	14	102
16	Thames Valley	Reading UA	32	2	2	11	8	21	102
17	Lancashire	Blackpool	41	2	2	6	5	9	100
18	Leicestershire	Leicester	40	2	4	10	5	13	100
19	Metropolitan Police	Lambeth	37	2	11	12	6	12	100
20	Norfolk	Norwich	33	2	1	6	4	12	99

21	Metropolitan Police	Tower Hamlets	38	2	7	8	9	17	99
22	Lincolnshire	Lincoln	33	2	1	7	3	11	98
23	Metropolitan Police	Hammersmith & Fulham	27	1	8	13	5	21	97
24	Lancashire	Preston	32	2	2	7	4	12	97
25	Greater Manchester	Salford	20	1	3	12	10	13	97
26	Thames Valley	Slough UA	28	1	3	12	7	23	94
27	Hampshire	Southampton	33	2	1	4	5	12	94
28	Metropolitan Police	Haringey	28	2	6	14	9	13	93
29	Staffordshire	Stoke on Trent	33	2	1	7	5	11	92
30	Nottinghamshire	Mansfield	26	1	1	10	7	17	90
31	West Yorkshire	Leeds	21	1	2	13	8	14	90
32	Gloucestershire	Gloucester	26	1	2	8	6	14	89
33	Hampshire	Portsmouth	35	2	1	6	5	10	89
34	South Wales	Cardiff	18	1	1	8	6	22	89
35	Northumbria	Newcastle upon Tyne	21	2	1	10	5	12	88
36	Gwent	Newport	29	1	2	8	7	14	88
37	Metropolitan Police	Newham	32	2	8	8	9	15	87
38	Kent	Gravesham	17	1	2	5	6	17	86
39	Lancashire	Burnley	28	2	1	6	4	12	85
40	Metropolitan Police	Greenwich	35	2	5	8	8	10	85

Source: *Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships - Recorded Crime for Key Offences 2003/04 to 2004/05*, Home Office Data Tables available at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/crimeew0405.html>

References

A Better Way: Commission on the Reform of Public Services, Reform, 2003.

Bangs, M. and M. Kaya, "Crime in England and Wales: Quarterly Update to December 2005", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 06/06*, Home Office, 27 April 2006.

Barclay, G., Tavares, C., and A. Siddique, "International comparisons of criminal justice statistics 1999", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 6/01*, Home Office, May 2001.

Barclay, G., and C. Tavares, "International comparisons of criminal justice statistics", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 12/03*, Home Office, October 2003.

Budget 2006 – A strong and strengthening economy: Investing in Britain's future, HM Treasury, 2006.

Crime Recording – Improving the Quality of Crime Records in Police Authorities and Forces in England and Wales, Audit Commission, December 2004.

Crime Statistics: User Perspectives, Interim Report, Statistics Commission, December 2005.

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics, 2003 (see: www.europeansourcebook.org).

Essex Police - Baseline Assessment, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, October 2005.

Glaeser, E. L. and B. Sacerdote, "Why is there more crime in cities?", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107 (6), December 1999.

Greater Manchester Police - Baseline Assessment, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, October 2005.

Green, D. and B. Cackett, *Do the official figures tell the full story?*, Civitas, 2005.

Green, D., Grove, E. and N. Martin, *Crime and Civil Society – can we become a more law-abiding people?*, Civitas, 2005.

Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime, Home Office, April 2006.

Home Office Five Year Plan 2004-2008, July 2004.

Key Statistics for local authorities in England and Wales Table KS01, Office for National Statistics, February 2003.

Key Statistics for urban areas in England and Wales Table KS01, Office for National Statistics, June 2004.

Manifesto for Reform, Reform, February 2005.

Morgan, K. O'Leary and S. Morgan (Eds.), *Urban crime rankings, 12th Edition*, Morgan Quitno Press, 2005.

Neighbourhood Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour, Audit Commission, May 2006.

Nicholas, S., Povey, D., Walker, A. and C. Kershaw, "Crime in England and Wales 2004-05", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 11/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

De Silva, N., Cowell, P. and T. Chow, "Updated and revised prison population projections 2005-2011 England and Wales", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

Strategic Audit – discussion document, ["Weaknesses remain including high crime despite recent falls"], Prime Ministers Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office, November 2003.

Shury, J., Speed, M., Vivian, D., Kuechel, A. and S. Nicholas, "Crime against retail and manufacturing premises: findings from the 2002 Commercial Victimisation Survey", *Home Office Online report 37/05*, Home Office, July 2005.

Simmons, J. and T. Dodd (Eds.), "Crime in England and Wales 2002-03", *Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/03*, July 2003.