

Sanction and offender analysis: Gloucester City Safe

Summary of findings

Purpose of research

The research that underpins this summary document is an analysis of incident data recorded through Disc by the crime reduction scheme '[Gloucester City Safe](#)' between September 2014 and August 2018.

The purpose of the analysis is to provide insight into offending activity in the locations where the scheme is active, examine the use and effectiveness of the offender sanction system used by the scheme, and inform crime reduction activity in the scheme's location.

The sanctions

The scheme employs a two-tier warning and exclusion sanction system. A first offence results in a warning and a second offence results in a 12-month ban from all scheme member premises.

The offenders and offences

The incident data analysed consists of 4,935 offences committed by 2,080 individual offenders at 115 business locations. During the four-year period, 1,303 individuals received warnings and 329 received exclusions. Of the offences that were punished with sanction, 75 were alcohol offences, 116 were violent offences, 219 were abuse offences, and 1251 were theft offences.

Of the offenders that received sanctions from the scheme, 781 (60%) were male and 519 (40%) female. The average age of an excluded offender was 30. There were 1362 sanctions issued for offences committed during the day time economy trading hours (6am – 6pm) and 290 sanctions issued for offences committed during the night time economy trading hours (6pm – 6am).

The large majority of offenders (1553/2080, 75%) only committed one offence during the four-year period, but the highest number of offences committed by a single person was 70. A group of 34 individuals (2% of all offenders), each committing 20 or more offences, were responsible for 1254 (25%) of the total offences recorded by the scheme.

Warning sanctions and offending behaviour

Successes:

- High levels of desistance (i.e. a person committing no further offences) occurred following the issue of the warning sanction. After receiving a warning, 76% (996/1,303) of offenders committed no further offences.
- The highest rate of desistance following a warning was observed among those who received their sanction for a violent offence.

Other findings:

- Following receipt of a warning, 24% (307/1,303) of offenders did commit further offences.
- 11% more males committed further offences following a warning than females.
- The highest rate of continued offending following a warning was observed among those who received their sanction for an abuse offence or theft offence.

Exclusion sanctions and offender behaviour

Successes:

- Moderate levels of desistance (i.e. a person committing no further offences) occurred following the issue of the exclusion sanction. After receiving an exclusion, 37% (123/329) of offenders committed no further offences.
- The highest rates of desistance following an exclusion were observed among those who received their sanction for a violent offence or an alcohol offence.

Other findings:

- Following receipt of an exclusion sanction, 63% (206/329) of offenders did commit further offences.
- 14% more daytime economy offenders committed further offences following an exclusion than night time economy offenders.
- 8% more males committed further offences following an exclusion than female offenders.
- The highest rates of continued offending following an exclusion were observed among those who received their sanction for an abuse offence or theft offence.

Offender behaviour: Displacement

- High rates of premise-level displacement of offending occurred when sanctions were issued.
 - Most of those who continued to offend following a warning or exclusion did so only at business premises away from where they committed their sanction offence.
 - This was the case for 70% (215/307) of those who continued to offend post-warning and 66% (136/206) of those who continued to offend post-exclusion.
- The highest rates of offending displacement were observed among those who received their sanction for a theft offence.
 - Of those who continued to offend after receiving a warning for a theft offence, 74% did so only at business locations away from where they committed their sanction offence.
 - Of those who continued to offend after receiving an exclusion for a theft offence, 74% did so only at business locations away from where they committed their sanction offence.

Further information and contact details

- This research was conducted by [Dr Andrew Stafford, Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Gloucestershire](#),
- The author can be contacted via email: astafford1@glos.ac.uk
- Full details on the methodology and approach employed here can be found in the forthcoming publication *Examining offending behaviour following receipt of a Business Crime Reduction Partnership's place-based exclusion sanction*, available upon request from the author.