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1.1 Purpose and Scope

- This slide pack provides an epidemiological analysis of Serious Youth Violence (SYV) in London using multi-agency data to help inform a public health approach to prevent and reduce serious violence affecting young people in London.

- This analysis
  - sets the demographic context of London’s young population
  - describes the nature and scale of violence affecting people under the age of 25 in London
  - identifies links between violence and public health factors at a Borough level
  - makes recommendations on how further in-depth analysis and intelligence could improve our understanding
1.2 Definitions and Clarification

- The analysis shown here covers violence within London reported by the Metropolitan Police Service, London Ambulance Service, Hospital A&E attendances and admissions, British Transport Police, & Transport for London. Public health data have been drawn from a variety of published sources.
- Trend data are presented for all sources back to 2012, and longer-term trends are shown where available.
- The analysis of the characteristics of violence is based on data for 2017.
- Police data for Serious Youth Violence refers collectively to violence against the person offences and instances of Violence, Robbery and Sexual Offences involving a knife or a gun, where the victim(s) were aged 1-24*. Trend and ward data is for those aged 1-19.
- Ambulance data includes all assault call-outs in which the patient was aged 1-24 years.
- Hospital data is based on Finished Hospital Episodes (Admissions) in London trusts in which the patient is aged 1-24 years. These data are provisional and may be revised.
- * Further definitions used in this report can be found at the end of this slide pack.
2.8 million or 31 per cent of Londoners are aged under 25. 26 per cent live in areas in the top quintile of deprivation (Index of Multiple Deprivation, IMD) with a further 32 per cent in the next most deprived quintile. 75 per cent of young Londoners live in an area classified as being in the worst 40 per cent for crime according to the IMD.

Levels and rates of SYV are increasing across London as reported by a number of frontline services:

- SYV incidents reported to the police increased by 46 per cent from 2013 to 2017.
- The proportion of hospital admissions involving a sharp instrument or knife injury for those aged under 25 has increased from 25 per cent in 2013 to 38 per cent in 2017.
- Ambulance data for young people showed an increase in knife-related call-outs for assaults of 32% since 2013.
- While the proportion of ambulance assault call-outs for young people involving knife incidents has increased, the number of gun assaults peaked in 2009 and the proportion has remained steady (around 0.65 per cent).

Serious Wounding Offences comprise 55 per cent of SYV offences, followed by Personal Robberies (30 per cent). Murders account for less than 1 per cent of the total.

Domestic violence and abuse featured in 12 per cent of SYV offences.
1.4 Summary of key findings (2)

- The temporal pattern of violent incidents among young people varies by age. SYV incidents involving school-age children are more likely to occur after the school day, whereas for older youth incidents are more likely later in the evening and at weekends.

- 76 per cent of SYV victims are male. 1/10 of all SYV victims are repeat victims in the previous 12 months. Of the 24 per cent of female SYV victims, 1/3 are caused by domestic violence and abuse. These victims are more likely to be repeat victims in the previous 12 months (25 per cent) and also to be classed as vulnerable (13 per cent).

- 87 per cent of SYV offenders are male. 50 per cent are aged between 14 and 21.

- Forty one per cent of victims are from a white ethnic background, and 27 per cent are black. Black young people make up 17 per cent of the population, and so are over-represented as SYV victims. This over-representation was stronger for offenders, where 46 per cent were black young people (2.7 times their representation in the population).

- Boroughs with the highest rates of SYV offences are Westminster, Lambeth, Southwark, Camden, Haringey, Islington, Hackney and Newham.

- Looking at number of offences, the top 5 wards in 2017 were Stratford and New Town (Newham), Fairfield (Croydon), West End (Westminster), Romford Town (Havering) and Bromley Town (Bromley).
1.5 Summary of key findings (3)

- Analysis of a large range of borough level public health protective and risk factors shows a significant statistical association with borough rates of SYV offending for the following factors (in order of strength of correlation):
  - The proportion of children aged under 20 living in poverty
  - Positive Life Satisfaction amongst 15-year olds
  - The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)
  - The estimated prevalence of emotional disorders amongst 5-16 year olds
  - Social integration, as measured by voter registration rates
  - Proportion of 10-17 year olds who were given a custodial sentence
  - The estimated prevalence of conduct disorders amongst 5-16 year olds
  - The rate of Looked-After Children (LAC)
  - The proportion of the resident population aged 18-24
  - First time entrants into the criminal justice system (10-17)
  - Social, Emotional, Mental, Health Needs (SEMH)
  - Persistent absentees from school
  - Hospital admissions for self-harm (10-24 years)
2.1 London’s young population

- 2.8 million or 31 per cent of Londoners are aged under 25. This proportion is in line with other metropolitan cities in England such as Greater Manchester and Liverpool, as well as New York.
- 26 per cent of young Londoners live in areas in the top quintile of deprivation (Index of Multiple Deprivation, IMD) with a further 32 per cent in the next most deprived quintile.
- 75 per cent of young Londoners live in an area classified as being in the worst 40 per cent for crime according to the IMD.
- Ethnic diversity among under 25s in London is higher than for the older population.
- There is wide variation in ethnic diversity among boroughs – 79 per cent of under 25s have a BAME ethnicity in Newham while in Richmond the proportion is 21 per cent.
- The White ethnic groups comprised 46 per cent of the population, and the Black ethnic groups, a total of 17 per cent. These two groups are presented here to correspond to available ethnicity data from frontline services.
3.1 Trends in Serious Youth Violence

- Since 2012 (the year from which data is available from all sources), indexed data show an increase in SYV and related-incidents.
- This increase has not been consistent over time, with police, ambulance and hospital assault data all showing a fall in levels of violence before an increase.
- For the ambulance and hospital admission data, the most pronounced increases were for the assaults in which the injury was sustained by a knife or sharp instrument.
### 3.2 Trends in Serious Youth Violence – Police data

- Police offence data available for the last 9 years for those aged 1-19 showed a steady level of SYV (around 6,600-6,800 incidents) before a 27% fall in 2012/13.
- This was followed by a year-on-year increase, and in 2017/18 the number of incidents had risen to 8,068 – a 67% increase on 2012/13.
- A potential reason for the drop in 2012/13, could be the increased police presence and activity after the August 2011 riots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYVC Victims (1-19 years)</td>
<td>6776</td>
<td>6655</td>
<td>6664</td>
<td>4836</td>
<td>5763</td>
<td>5897</td>
<td>6079</td>
<td>7076</td>
<td>8068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The Number of SYV Victims in London, 2009/10 - 2017/18]
3.3 Trends in Serious Youth Violence – Ambulance assault call-outs

- Ambulance data for those aged 1-24 showed an upward trend in assault call-outs from 2002 until 2010, followed by a fall to a low point in 2015 (9126 call-outs), but have since increased by 5% from 2015 to 2017.

- The number of total Assault call outs that were Knife Assaults has increased in the last four years, increasing from 658 call-outs in 2013 to 866 call-outs in 2017; representing a 32 per cent increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LAS Assaults Callouts: Ages 1-24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>9655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Trends in Serious Youth Violence - hospital data

- Data available since 2012 show an increase in the number of admissions for assault by a sharp object, while the number of overall admissions and those for assaults which exclude a sharp object, has fallen.

- Assaults with a sharp object accounted for 38% of admissions in 2017, compared with 27% in 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Assaults</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp Object</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of violent offending recorded by BTP on the train network in London has increased year-on-year since 2012 equating to a 56% increase between 2012 and 2017 (all ages)

Prior to this violent offending increased sharply from 2002 to 2005, before steadily reducing for the next eight years up until 2012

The 1161 incidents in 2017 were below the peak of 1396 in 2005

The 2004 peak could be explained through the introduction of the British Transport Police Authority and the first phase of recruitment for BTP Police Community Support Officers to support the standard police officers’ duties.

Note: BTP violent crime offences are for all ages and includes those with no victim(s)
3.6 Trends in the level of SYV in London - TfL Driver Incident Record Assault Data

- There has been a long-term downward trend in the number of Assault-related TfL Driver Incident Records since 2007. Although, there was a slight increase shown in incidents between 2013 and 2015, there was a definite and pronounced decrease in the last two years.
- However, the data is not specifically for young people, and refers to individuals of all ages.
3.7 Trends in Violence – Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)

- Nationally, the best measure of trends in violent crime is the Crime Survey for England and Wales. This showed a statistically significant decrease of 41% between the year ending March 2007 and the year ending March 2017, indicating a gradual, long-term downward trend. The level of CSEW violence has remained fairly flat since the year ending March 2014, with no statistically significant change.

- However there are a number of reasons why the CSEW is not able to provide the best trend for SYV in London
  - The sample size is not sufficient to estimate a robust trend for crimes of this nature at a regional level. The CSEW tends to provide the better measure of more common but less harmful crimes such as minor assault
  - The survey interviews people aged 16 and over and excludes many young victims

- Data from emergency frontline services are better-placed to provide estimates for London of more harmful, less frequently-occurring offences/assaults when the trends for several services can be triangulated.
4.1 Characteristics of Serious Youth Violence in London – Offence/Assault type

- The majority of SYV Offences in 2017 were Serious Wounding offences (55 per cent), followed then by Personal Robberies (30 per cent); with Murders accounting for less than 1 per cent of the total.
- Injuries were sustained in 60 per cent of offences, within which 16 per cent were a Serious or Fatal Injury (less than one per cent were Fatal).
- Domestic Violence and Abuse featured in 12 per cent of the SYC offences (1932 victims).
- The proportion of ambulance call-outs to youth assaults involving the use of weapons increased from 10 per cent in 2002 to 14 per cent in 2017.
- In 2017, sharp object-related assault hospital admissions accounted for 46 per cent of all assault admissions for males aged 1-19, and 38 per cent for males aged 20-24; whereas for females aged 1-24 it was 12 per cent.
4.2 Characteristics of Serious Youth Violence in London - Knife and Gun Assaults (ambulance data)

- Ambulance call out data show evidence of a modal shift to the use of knives but not towards guns.
- The proportion of call-outs to SYV incidents has increased from 6 per cent in 2002 to 9 per cent in 2017 (9655 incidents).
- The total number of call-outs to gun assaults involving young people peaked in 2009 (144) and has since declined to (50).
- The proportion of call-outs to SYV incidents involving guns has been fairly steady between 2002 and 2017, averaging around 0.65%.
4.3 When does SYV take place?  
(Ambulance and Hospital A&E data)

- The temporal pattern of violent incidents among young people varies by age.
- Violent incidents for children aged 10-16, were most likely to take place between 3pm and 10pm, Monday-Friday, and between 6pm and 11pm on Saturday and Sunday. The peak day was Friday, with the weekend being the quietest days.
- For those aged 18-24 years, incident patterns more closely reflect the night-time economy and associated activities.
- Violent incidents for those over 18 are most likely to be between 6pm and midnight across the full week. Saturday and Sunday were the clear peak days, with increased call-out activity continuing until 3am the next day.
5.1 Characteristics of Serious Youth Violence victims

- **Injury:** injury was sustained in 60 per cent of offences recorded by the police, within which 16 per cent were a Serious Injury and less than one per cent were fatal
- **Repeat victims:** 10 per cent of victims were repeat victims within the previous 12 months
- **Vulnerability:** 4 per cent of the victims were classified as being vulnerable on the crime report
- **Locality:** 73 per cent were victimised in their home borough
- **Gender:** 76 per cent male (police) increasing to 86 per cent of hospital admissions. One third of female victims were victims of domestic violence
- **Age:** 83 per cent of victims of SYV were aged 15-24 years
- **Deprivation:** Hospital admission data suggest a strong link to deprivation, with 36 per cent of sharp object/stabbing-related youth assault admissions accounted for by individuals residing in the Most Deprived IMD quintile of London LSOAs, a further 26 per cent in the Second Most Deprived quintile, and only 6 per cent in the Least Deprived quintile
- **Ethnicity:** Forty one per cent of young victims are from a white ethnic background, and 27 per cent were Black. Black young people were over-represented as SYV victims, making up 17 per cent of the young London population*. 
  
  * see slide on quality of frontline service ethnicity data
5.2 Characteristics of Serious Youth Violence offenders

- **Locality:** 68 per cent committed an offence in their home borough
- **Gender:** 87 per cent male, 13 per cent female
- **Age:** half of the offenders were aged 14-21 years (range 10-77 years)
- **Ethnicity:** Over-representation was stronger for young black offenders, than for victims. 46 per cent of offenders were black young people (2.7 times their representation in the population)
- Both the level of repeat offending, the prevalence of group offending, whether alcohol or drugs were deemed relevant to the offending, nor the proportion of offenders who have also been victimised could not be determined from the data available for this analysis
5.3 Characteristics of Serious Youth Violence - Domestic Violence and Abuse

- **Repeat victims:** 25 per cent repeat victims in the previous 12 months
- **Vulnerability:** Victims of SYV Domestic Violence and Abuse (SYV DVA) were more likely to be recorded as vulnerable (13 per cent)
- **Injury:** 80 per cent of the SYV DVA offences were Serious Wounding offences, with the other 20 per cent being a combination of offences such as Assault with Injury, Harassment, and Common Assault
- **Gender:** 68 per cent female, 32 per cent male (1/3 of the total female victims of SYV were DVA victims)
- **Age:** Around 80 per cent of the victims were aged 18-24 years
- **Ethnicity:** Black victims were over-represented – approximately 30 per cent had a black ethnic background, compared with 17% of the population
- **Injury:** Although, the majority of victims sustained injuries, in a fifth of the offences no physical violence was involved.
6.1 Geographic patterns of Serious Youth Violence

- The table overleaf shows the relative position of boroughs when compared by both their overall SYV levels and rates relative to their 1-24 population size.
- The Boroughs with the highest rates of SYV are Westminster, Lambeth, Southwark, Camden, Haringey, Islington, Hackney and Newham.
- Westminster, Lambeth, Southwark, Newham, and Haringey are in the top quarter of boroughs for both rates and levels of SYV.
- While Croydon, Tower Hamlets and Brent are in the top quarter of Boroughs for overall levels of violence, once controlled for population size, they are in the group below.
- Camden, Islington, Hammersmith & Fulham, and Kensington & Chelsea have a higher rate of SYV relative to population size. This is because SYV in these boroughs less localised (a higher than average proportion of victims are from outside the borough). This tends to be related to the strength of their respective night time economies.
- Enfield, Ealing, and Waltham Forest appear in the top half of boroughs for levels of violence but once population size is accounted for, are in the bottom half in terms of SYV rates. These boroughs have a high rate of localised violence.
### 6.2 Variation in Serious Youth Violence rates and levels by borough, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough Name</th>
<th>SYV Rate (offences per 1000, 1-24 years)</th>
<th>Borough Name</th>
<th>SYV Offence Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Maps of variation in SYV rates and levels by borough, 2017

Boroughs by rates of SYV

Boroughs by levels of SYV
There is a high level of correlation between the boroughs with the highest rates of offending and those with the highest rates of youth assault ambulance call-outs, with only Islington and Newham being replaced by Croydon and Lewisham in the ambulance data.

An even closer match was found between the boroughs with the highest levels of SYV offending and the boroughs with the highest levels of youth assault ambulance call-outs, with only Haringey being replaced with Lewisham in the ambulance data.
Boroughs with the highest level of residents admitted to hospital for youth assault admissions were Croydon (108), Ealing (87), Newham (84), Lambeth (80), Tower Hamlets (78), Brent (77), Enfield (75), and Hillingdon (70).

There are limited similarities between the hospital admissions data and the boroughs with the highest offending rates and/or ambulance youth assault call-outs, with only Newham and Lambeth, and Croydon and Lambeth, respectively featuring in both lists.

This disparity can be accounted for by the fact that this data refers to the home address location not the offence location, victims being victimised away from their home borough, victims attending a hospital outside of London, or differences in injury severity.
6.6 Wards with highest SYV, 2017/18

- In London as a whole, for victims aged less than 20, the top ten wards for SYV levels were Stratford and New Town, Fairfield, West End, Romford Town, Bromley Town, Broad Green, Grove, Woolwich Riverside, Coldharbour, Camden Town with Primrose Hill. These wards contributed to 7 per cent of SYV in 2017/18.

- There was a link between high ward levels of crime and vulnerability: 38% of the top quintile of SYVC wards are also in the top quintile of wards in the Vulnerable Localities Index (see definitions slide). This Index highlights those wards that require prioritised attention for community safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Owning Borough</th>
<th>SYVC Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and New Town</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford Town</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Town</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Green</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Riverside</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Town with Primrose Hill</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 Patterns of offending within boroughs - Ward analysis, 2017/18

- The composition of the ward offending levels within boroughs varies across the highest offending boroughs, depending on their geographic and demographic characteristics. 5 different patterns are described below

- **Newham** – Stratford and New Town ward had the highest number of offences in 2017 (101) for all wards in London. In addition, most of the 20 wards had levels of SYV which were above average for 2017/18.

- **Lambeth** – the majority of wards had above average levels of SYV, with high offending spread across a number of different wards, but unlike Newham was not isolated to one key ward.

- **Southwark** – had a number of wards with very low offending, but has a number of wards well-above the average.

- **Croydon** – 1/3 of the 24 wards in this borough were below average for SYV, but the two top wards contributed 30% of the borough offence total.

- **Westminster** – over half of the wards were below average, although two wards had very high offence levels, accounting collectively for 37% of the borough offence total.
6.8 Localisation of violence - victims

Overall, 73 per cent of the victims were targeted in their own borough, although this varied by borough from 37 per cent to 79 per cent.

The 5.3% of victims who resided outside of London were most frequently victimised in the boroughs of Westminster, Camden and Lambeth.

The boroughs with the lowest localisation tended to be boroughs that had thriving night-time (and to some extent, day-time) economies; attracting large numbers of visitors to the area.

### Boroughs with the highest % of localised victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Borough</th>
<th>Percentage of Victims Local to the Offence Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Boroughs with the lowest % of localised victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Borough</th>
<th>Percentage of Victims Local to the Offence Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, 68 per cent of the offenders committed an offence in their own residential borough.

There was a wide disparity between the boroughs with the highest and lowest localised violence, ranging from 83% down to 40%.

4.5 per cent of the offenders resided outside of London; tending to offend in the boroughs of Westminster, Camden and Bromley.

Note: the above data is sourced from police records for those accused, and does not feature suspects that have not had any proceedings progressed against them.

### Boroughs with the highest proportions of localised offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Borough</th>
<th>Percentage of Offenders Local to the Offence Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Boroughs with the lowest proportions of localised offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Borough</th>
<th>Percentage of Offenders Local to the Offence Borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1 Protective and Risk Factors for Serious Youth Violence

- Analysis of a large range of borough level public health protective and risk factors shows a significant statistical association with borough rates of SYV offending for the following factors, in order of strength of correlation (ambulance data shows similar patterns):
  - The proportion of children aged under 20 living in poverty
  - Positive Life Satisfaction amongst 15-year olds
  - The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)
  - The estimated prevalence of emotional disorders amongst 5-16 year olds
  - Social integration, as measured by voter registration rates
  - Proportion of 10-17 year olds who were given a custodial sentence
  - The estimated prevalence of conduct disorders amongst 5-16 year olds
  - The rate of Looked-After Children (LAC)
  - The proportion of the resident population aged 18-24
  - First time entrants into the criminal justice system (10-17)
  - Social, Emotional, Mental, Health Needs (SEMH)
  - Persistent absentees from school
  - Hospital admissions for self-harm (10-24 years)
7.2 Dependent children aged under-20 living in poverty

- London has a slightly higher percentage of dependent children aged under 20 living in poverty (19 per cent), than England as a whole (17 per cent).
- Within London this ranges from 8 per cent (Richmond) to 31 per cent (Tower Hamlets).
- All of the boroughs with the highest SYV offending rates had a proportion of dependents under 20 living in poverty higher than the London average.

Note: red dots represent the top 8 boroughs for SYV rates, blue dots represent the other 24
7.3 Positive Life Satisfaction among 15 year olds

- Other than Hackney, the boroughs with the highest rates of SYV had lower than the London-average levels of Positive Life Satisfaction among 15-year olds (60 per cent).
- Westminster had the lowest level of Positive Life Satisfaction, with only half of the respondents agreeing that they had Positive Life Satisfaction, followed by Lambeth (55 per cent) and Croydon (57 per cent).
- Boroughs that expressed high Positive Life Satisfaction had lower rates of SYV offending.

Note: red dots represent the top 8 boroughs for SYV rates, blue dots represent the other 24.

Relationship between SYV Rate of Offending and Positive Life Satisfaction amongst 15-year olds

- $R^2 = 0.556$
7.4 Indices of Multiple Deprivation

- 75% of the top SYV offending boroughs have an average IMD borough score in the top ten for London.
- The eight highest SYV-rate boroughs were all more deprived than the London-mean IMD score.
- 75% of the lowest ranking IMD boroughs (least deprived) were in the group of boroughs with the lowest SYV offending rates.

Note: red dots represent the top 8 boroughs for SYV rates, blue dots represent the other 24.
7.5 Emotional Disorders

- An estimated 3.6 per cent of the London population aged 5-16 years have an emotional disorder.
- Across London boroughs this ranges from 2.8 per cent (Richmond upon Thames) to 4.2 per cent (Tower Hamlets).
- Apart from Westminster and Camden, all of boroughs highlighted for high SYV rates, exceeded the London average.
- An emotional disorder is considered as an anxiety disorder or depression.

Note: red dots represent the top 8 boroughs for SYV rates, blue dots represent the other 24.
Three measures of social integration were tested for correlation with SYV. Of these, borough voter registration rates showed a significant association but measures of neighbourhood trust and the extent to which people from different backgrounds got on did not.

On average, 86% of eligible voters were registered in London.

All 8 of the boroughs with the highest SYV offending rates had voter registration rates that were below the average, ranging from Westminster (68 per cent) to Lambeth (84 per cent).
7.7 Conduct Disorders

- An estimated 5.6% of the London population aged 5-16 years have a conduct disorder.
- All of the boroughs with the highest rates of SYV, except Camden, had higher than the London-mean estimated prevalence of conduct disorders.
- A conduct disorder is defined as defiance, aggression and anti-social behaviour.

Note: red dots represent the top 8 boroughs for SYV rates, blue dots represent the other 24.
On average, five per cent of children under 18 are under the care of their borough. The boroughs with the highest rate of Looked after Children within London were Croydon and Greenwich (8 per cent).

Five of the 8 boroughs with the highest SYV offending rates had a proportion of Looked After Children that was higher than the London average – Lambeth, Southwark, Haringey, Islington and Hackney.

Of the ten boroughs with the lowest rate of Looked After Children, six featured in the lowest grouping for SYV offence rates.
7.9 Population aged 18-24 years

- Within London the proportion of the resident population aged 18-24 ranged from 6 per cent in Richmond to 13 per cent in Islington.
- Of the top SYV boroughs, Newham, Camden, Southwark, Westminster and Islington all had an above average proportion of young people in this age group.
- In terms of actual population size for this age group, Newham had a 18-24 population three times as large as the boroughs with the fewest 18-24s.
8.1 Conclusion

- Bringing together a range of multi-agency frontline data suggests that Serious Youth Violence and assaults have increased in recent years.
- SYV is more likely to involve weapons (knives and sharp objects) than before, although there has been no increase in gun assaults.
- SYV is concentrated in particular boroughs and has defined peak days and times of increased activity.
- Victims and offenders of SYV are predominantly male. 1/3 females are victims of domestic violence and abuse. Young Black Londoners are over-represented as both victims (especially for offences requiring hospital admissions) and as offenders.
- Initial analysis suggests there is a significant relationship at borough level between rates of SYV offences and a range of public health factors, including poverty, deprivation, social integration, conduct and emotional disorders, and the proportion of the resident population aged 18-24 years.
Appendix 1 - Recommendations for further analysis

- More detailed analysis of geographic patterns below borough level linked to public health data to better highlight problem areas
- Create a more sophisticated area classification accounting for different volumes/severity/characteristics of SYV/demographic and public health population data
- Modelling of public health data available at lower geographic levels to quantify the relative importance of the different public health factors
- The creation of linked police/health and ambulance datasets
- More targeted spatial analysis: around specific points of interest, including educational establishments, transport hubs, and town centre networks
- Additional victim/offender dynamics – e.g. the extent to which offenders and victims are the same individuals, repeat offending, disproportionality, repeat victimisation, group offending, and combined victim/offender demographics.
### Appendix 2- Further definitions

- **Serious Youth Violence offences included in the police data**
  - Attempted Murder,
  - Murder,
  - Intentional destruction of viable unborn child,
  - Causing death by dangerous driving,
  - Causing death by careless driving when under the influence of drink or drugs,
  - Causing death by careless or inconsiderate driving,
  - Assault with intent to cause serious harm,
  - Endangering Life,
  - Assault with Injury (more serious GBH offences),
  - Racially or religiously aggravated Assault with Injury (more serious GBH offences),
  - Causing death by aggravated vehicle taking.

- **British Transport Police data are based on violent assaults for all ages.**

- **Transport for London trend data – Driver Incident Records (DIRs) for assaults.** These DIRs do not necessarily have a crime report attributed to them, and are a record produced by the driver of an event/incident that they have witnessed or been informed of.

- **The TfL offence analysis is based on slightly different definitions,** including all Violence with Injury offences on the bus network and London Underground, in which the victims were aged 12-25 years.

- **Vulnerable Localities Index:** a ward index constructed to indicate wards where community safety is a priority.

- **Positive life satisfaction refers to the percentage of respondents scoring 7-10 on the question, “Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays” on the What About YOuth survey.**
Appendix 3 - Assessment of frontline service ethnicity data quality

- There are serious issues with the quality of frontline service data on ethnicity. The ethnicity of victims, perpetrators and witnesses is important contextual information for a range of purposes including equalities duties, and prevention. The Census ethnicity categories are used by most public services to record ethnicity.

- However, the ethnicity categories recorded by the police in the offence data used here are based on the observation recorded by an officer rather than supplied by the victim or the offender. Self-defined ethnicity is collected by the police where possible but is missing for 70 per cent of cases.

- There are also issues with ethnicity data from the other services analysed in this report – it was not available for the ambulance data, BTP data, or TfL data, and was missing for a high proportion of cases in the hospital admission data.

- The reality of delivering an emergency frontline service makes accurate recording of ethnicity more challenging than for other services. These quality issues should be considered when interpreting the over-representation of groups in relation to SYV.