Road testing with Crown Court judges and magistrates: Domestic, Non-domestic and Aggravated burglary

Introduction

The current burglary guidelines were published by the Council in January 2012. At this time, the resource assessment did not predict any impact on prison and probation services. However, when reviewed in 2016, the initial assessment indicated that since the guidelines had come into force, sentencing severity had increased for domestic (s.9), non-domestic (s.9) and aggravated burglary (s.10). Further research indicated that the increase in sentence severity for non-domestic burglary in the magistrates' court and Crown Court, could be attributable to the guideline, though for domestic burglary this appeared to be part of a longer-term trend rather than resulting from the guideline. Due to low volumes of cases of aggravated burglary, it was not possible to conclude if this increase was caused by the implementation of the guideline.

Alongside amendments to some factors, as outlined below, the draft guidelines update the existing guidelines to reflect the stepped approach used in more recent guidelines produced by the Council and introduces new medium levels of culpability/harm. Therefore, research was needed to understand how amendments to the structure of the guideline, and changes to factors could impact sentencing practice; and to ensure the draft guidelines are clear and usable. As they were new elements to the guidelines, particular attention was paid to the following elements of the draft guidelines to understand:

<u>Domestic burglary</u>: How sentencers interpreted guidance on the application of flexibility regarding cases of particular gravity and whether guidance wording in relation to imposing community orders with drug or alcohol treatment requirements is clear.

<u>Non-domestic burglary</u>: What, if any, are the issues being seen by magistrates when sentencing cases of non-domestic burglary, that could contribute to the increase in sentence severity in this court.

<u>Aggravated burglary</u>: How sentencers applied new guidance on carrying a weapon on entry of the premises as an aggravating factor as compared with a factor used in assessing culpability.

Methodology

Twenty-one interviews were conducted, consisting of nine magistrates and twelve Crown Court judges. Participants were selected by random sample from the Council's research pool. Qualitative interviews were conducted via MS Teams with sentencers from across England and Wales. Judges considered three scenarios (summarised below) and magistrates, two, relating to the Non-domestic burglary guideline only. Participants received the draft guidelines a week prior to the interview and sentenced each scenario twice, using the draft and existing guidelines.

Scenario	Summary of scenario
A – Domestic	K, with another defendant, broke into a home of an elderly couple at night by smashing glass in the back door. The resident confronted K who threatened him with a screwdriver. Keys, a wallet, jewellery and a brand new Motability car valued at £23,000 were stolen. The couple felt violated and felt they had to install extra security measures to make them feel safe.
	CCTV captured the defendant approaching the property, alongside the number plate of the vehicle, with his hood up partially obscuring his face, using a torch and holding a screwdriver. CCTV from the day before captured K loitering outside the house, peering through the window.
	The court heard that K had been on a burglary expedition that evening, with two other attempted burglaries taking place nearby (subject to separate charges), both of which were foiled by passers-by. K was convicted after trial. He has over 100 previous convictions for theft, burglary and robbery and was out on licence at the time of the offence.
B – Domestic	A, 21, entered a home through an open ground floor window during the afternoon. He had been drinking for most of the day and needed money to buy alcohol, which led to the offence. He was disturbed by the victim, who found him in the living room, going through her handbag but left emptyhanded. He pleaded guilty at the first opportunity and has one previous conviction for domestic burglary. The pre-sentence report detailed that he has had a troubled background and suffered a trauma which led to him having problems with alcohol addiction. He is now willing to accept he has an alcohol problem and wants to tackle it. The victim was very upset and scared by the incident, leaving her anxious about security and being at home on her own.
C – Aggravated	R, 21, forced his way into a convenience store, along with two others, just as it was closing for the night and the shutters were being rolled down. R was carrying a machete which he used to force the shutters back up. Two staff members had seen this on CCTV and retreated to a locked back room and called the police. R and the others emptied the tills and contents of the cigarette store into bags they had brought with them for that purpose. Police came in time to apprehend them. Damage was done to the shutters, costing around £500 to repair. R pleaded guilty at the first opportunity. He has two previous unrelated convictions. The victim impact statements said they were terrified in the incident.
D - Non-domestic	W, 50, stole a handbag from behind a reception desk at a local hospital whilst there for an appointment. The receptionist was in the back room. The handbag (an expensive one) contained a purse with £70 cash, bank cards and the victim's driving licence and the only copy of an assignment for the receptionist's college course. The bag was found in a nearby alleyway, minus the cash, cards and licence. The handbag and assignment were ruined by heavy rain. W pleaded guilty at the first opportunity. He had many previous convictions for dishonesty. The victim was upset by what had happened and had the inconvenience of having to cancel all her cards, wait for new ones, and apply for a new licence. She was also upset by the loss of the handbag (a 21 st Birthday gift).
E – Non-domestic	P, aged 29, and a friend who had been drinking most of the day, broke into an office on a new housing development. They vandalised some of the walls, damaged some furnishings, and broke a window. P said he committed the offence on impulse whilst walking past on the way home. He has one unrelated previous conviction and pleaded guilty at the first possible opportunity.

<u>Key Points</u>

- The guidelines road tested well, and judges and magistrates found the draft guidelines clear and usable. The update to the stepped approach was highly favoured across each of the draft guidelines, especially three levels of culpability and harm.
- Under the s.9 Domestic and Non-domestic draft guidelines, a theme of concern arose surrounding assessment of two harm factors: 'much greater emotional impact on the victim than would normally be expected' and 'greater emotional impact on the victim than would normally be expected'. Multiple sentencers thought this to be highly subjective and thought the harm categories lacked a position for a normal level of emotional impact.
- One scenario (A Domestic burglary) was sentenced consistently across the draft and existing guidelines and between judges. Sentences for scenarios B-E remained largely consistent between the draft and existing guidelines however, varied depending on sentencer. For the most part, the differences are small.¹
- Domestic burglary: Additional wording relating to cases of particular gravity was found to be clear and usable. Additional wording on Alcohol Treatment Requirements (ATR) as an alternative to short or moderate custodial sentences was not opposed although some judges stated they would have to be persuaded to apply this in the case of domestic burglary or they would need evidence that addiction was the root cause of the offending behaviour.
- Aggravated burglary: On the whole, there was not opposition to the movement of the 'weapon carried when entering premises' from a factor of culpability to an aggravating factor. Five of the nine judges that considered the Aggravated burglary scenario (C), applied this factor under aggravation, hence double counting the factor, and two judges applied it at step one. One did so on the basis that it may need to be taken into account when considering taking the sentence outside of the guideline and the other was initially undecided on harm categories, but focused on the weapon element of the harm factor: 'Violence used or threatened against the victim, particularly involving a weapon', and thought the carrying of the machete to be applicable to the factor. When reading the aggravating factor of 'weapon carried when entering premises', they said 'that effectively confirms it's category one [harm]'.
- Magistrates reported they had not perceived changes to the types of non-domestic burglary cases seen in court and there were no particular difficulties in sentencing non-domestic burglaries.

¹ A breakdown of the sentences can be seen at the end of this document.

s.9 Domestic burglary

Scenario A (s.9 Domestic burglary)

Sentencing as expected by policy:

In Scenario A, the offender was expected to be placed in Category 1A, with a 3 year starting point. The sentence could go above the top of the range, because it was a case of particular gravity, leading to a sentence of above 6 years.

- Eight of the nine judges assessed <u>Scenario A</u>, relating to Domestic burglary to be category A1 as expected. Due to uncertainty surrounding if the screwdriver would constitute a weapon, one judge assessed this as B1. Five of the nine judges applied the wording 'for cases of particular gravity, sentences above the top of the range may be appropriate' and their final sentences ranged from 7-9 years. The four remaining sentences ranged between three and a half and six years.
 - It was agreed the wording was clear and workable.
 - To emphasise the additional wording, it was suggested this wording be highlighted or put in larger type.
- A point to note in relevance to the Domestic and Non-domestic draft guidelines is the assessment of 'much greater' or 'greater emotional harm than is normally expected'. Multiple judges and magistrates expressed concern about this element and felt this was highly subjective. One judge commented there was no categorisation of emotional impact on the victim that was not more than would normally be expected. They therefore felt the guideline would exclude a case of what would be thought to be a 'normal' level of emotional impact as this would automatically be assigned to a category three, which was thought to be too low to reflect the impact on victims. However, this did not appear to produce inconsistencies in the assessment of harm.

Scenario B (s.9 Domestic burglary)

Sentencing as expected by policy:

In Scenario B, the offender was expected to be placed in Category B1, with a starting point of 2 years and then a reduction for guilty plea. A community order with an alcohol treatment requirement may be a proper alternative to a short of moderate custodial sentence.

Two of the nine judges categorised <u>Scenario B</u>, relating to Domestic burglary, as B1 as expected. Three assessed it to be C1, three C2 and one B2. Five judges imposed suspended sentence orders (SSO) ranging between six months and one year and two months. Eight imposed custodial sentences ranging from one year to two years and six months. One judge did not state their sentence pre and post-guilty plea and imposed a suspended sentence of 6 months with an ATR and unpaid work.

• Those who assessed culpability to be category B (as expected) agreed that the offence was committed on impulse, but that there was more than 'limited intrusion'.

Those who assessed it as category C said there was limited intrusion, and some pointed out that there was no targeting in the case.

- Those categorising the offender under high harm (as expected) agreed this was due to the occupier being present. Those who assessed harm as category two agreed on the factor of the victim being present, but balanced this with the fact nothing was stolen.
- The wording in relation to imposing community orders with drug or alcohol treatment requirements was generally accepted, with judges saying they would be applied if alcohol was the root cause of the offending behaviour. However, two judges said they would need 'some persuasion' that it would be an appropriate sentence for Domestic burglary. Another judge said they would be hesitant to impose non-custodial penalties due to this area being 'under sentenced': "The impact on some of this sort of thing is just enormous, and to the extent that deterrence works for those who are inclined to commit offences, which is, I think very much in doubt, but to the extent it does work, they need to know that if you break into someone's house, you're going in."
- Participants were positive about the guideline and liked the flexibility of the stepped approach. Concerns were raised on the assessment of the 'normally expected' emotional impact on victims included within the harm categorisation. Additional wording relating to cases of particular gravity was found to be clear and usable.
- Judges were happy with the culpability under the Domestic burglary guideline and favoured the addition of the third category of culpability, which was thought to give more flexibility and scope to analyse the case in a more critical and detailed way. *'The guidelines really identify the factors that touch upon culpability and harm.'*
- Aggravating and mitigating factors were widely accepted. One comment was made, suggesting the factors relating to the offence itself should be grouped together, followed by the remaining factors.

s.10 Aggravated burglary

Scenario C (s.10 Aggravated burglary)

Sentencing as expected by policy:

In Scenario C, the offender was expected to be placed in category B2 with a starting point of 6 years, with an increase within the range for aggravating factors.

- Four judges placed the offender in culpability A and five judges in culpability B. Those placing the offender in the higher category did so on the basis of a significant degree of planning and targeting of a vulnerable victim. Those placing the offender in category B did so on the basis of some degree of planning or organisation.
- Six judges assessed harm to be category one and three as category two. Those
 placing the offender in category one did so on the basis of the presence of the
 victim, trauma to the victim and a significant degree of loss. Those placing the
 offender in category two did so on the basis of some degree of loss and
 psychological impact to the victim.
- Five of nine judges applied the factor 'weapon carried when entering premises' under Step 2, double counting, and two applied the factor under Step 1. Of the two,

one did so on the basis that the factor should remain in culpability as, 'it might be the fact that you feel it should be taken into account when taking it outside of the guideline.' The other judge was initially undecided between harm categories one and two but focused on the weapon element of the harm factor: '*Violence used or threatened against the victim, particularly involving a weapon*', and thought the carrying of the machete to be applicable to the factor. When reading the aggravating factor of 'weapon carried when entering premises', they said '*that effectively confirms it's category one* [harm]'.

- Judges imposed custodial sentences ranging from six to ten years.
- The guideline was well received and sentencers were in favour of the stepped approach. On the whole, there was not opposition to the movement of the factor *'weapon carried when entering premises'* from a factor of culpability to an aggravating factor. However, some clarification was called for on the wording and whether the weapon need be visible or concealed.
- Under Scenario C, no judges made an increase in their imposed sentence using the draft guideline in comparison to that using the existing guidelines. Five judges imposed sentences that were less than that under the existing guideline, the decreases range between one (three judges) and three years (one judge). One judge made a decrease of a year and a half.
- It was noted that the addition of the middle category was helpful to have in terms of starting points: 'It's a very useful area and there's a nice degree of overlap as well between the ranges with different categories, which is always good to see because it enables you to finesse things more than if the guideline categories were hard edged between the different brackets'.
- There were no points to note on aggravating or mitigating factors. One judge commended the Council on the addition of the factor 'Offence committed in a dwelling' 'I think that's a very useful addition to reflect in the new guideline that isn't present in the old [existing] one.'

s.9 Non-domestic burglary

Scenario D (s.9 Non-domestic burglary)

Sentencing as expected by policy:

In Scenario D, the offender was expected to be placed in category C1 with a starting point of 6 months, aggravated by previous convictions to around 1 year. Reduced to around 6 months following guilty plea.

- Nine judges and nine magistrates were asked to sentence scenario D. Thirteen judges and magistrates assessed <u>Scenario D</u> (Non-domestic burglary) to be category C2, three C1 (as expected), one B2 and one C1 or 2. Those categorising harm to be level two, did so on the basis of the factors of 'some degree of loss', 'greater emotional impact than expected', 'soiling of property' and 'victim on premises'.
- Sentences imposed by judges ranged from a Community Order to 8 months custody. Pre-GP sentences by magistrates ranged from Medium-Level Community Order to six months custody. Five judges' sentences remained consistent across the existing and draft guidelines and two of the magistrates sentences remained consistent.

• Two judges made increases of two months to their sentences using the draft guideline. Three magistrates made increases using the draft guideline. Two increased their sentence by one and a half months and one increased from a high-level community order to six months custody. One judge and three magistrates made a decrease using the draft guideline, all of which reduced a custodial sentence to community orders.

Scenario E (s.9 Non-domestic burglary)

Sentencing as expected by policy:

In Scenario E, the offender was expected to be placed in category C2 with a starting point of a medium-level community order. This could be aggravated to a high-level community order however, credit for a guilty plea could reduce the sentence back to a medium-level community order.

- Four of nine magistrates assessed <u>Scenario E</u> (Non-domestic burglary) to be category C2 as expected, four as B2, and one as C3. Those categorising under category C based the decision on the factor of the offence being committed on impulse with limited intrusion. Three of four of those under category B based this on the offence committed on impulse but with more than limited intrusion.
- Most (8 of 9) magistrates assessed harm to be category 2 based on 'some degree of loss' and 'ransacking or vandalism'. One magistrate categorised the scenario as category 3 and alongside 'some degree of loss', applied the factor of 'nothing stolen'.
- Sentences included Band B fine (2), medium-level community order (4) and 6 months custody (4). Four magistrates imposed a higher sentence using the draft guideline. Increases range from one and a half months to four months. One magistrate increased their sentence from a low-level community order to six months custody. Four magistrates sentences remained consistent and one made a decrease from four and a half months custody to a MLCO.

Comments on the s.9 Non-domestic burglary guideline:

- It was generally thought the guideline worked well and was relatively easy to follow. A point to note in relevance to the Domestic and Non-domestic draft guidelines is the assessment 'much greater' or 'greater emotional harm than is normally expected'. It was felt this was highly subjective. One judge commented there was no categorisation of emotional impact on the victim that was not more than would normally be expected. They therefore felt the guideline would exclude a case of what would be thought to be a 'normal' level of emotional impact as this would automatically be assigned to a category three, which was thought to be too low to reflect the impact on victims.
- Other than the above note on emotional impact, most judges and magistrates were happy with the three levels of harm and culpability and felt that there was a greater range of factors 'which fit better with the nuanced nature of the offence'.
- One magistrate thought the draft guideline to be pitched at a better starting point than the existing Non-domestic burglary guideline.
- There were no objections to aggravating or mitigating factors.

• Magistrates reported they had not perceived changes to the types of non-domestic burglary cases seen in court and there were no particular difficulties in sentencing non-domestic burglaries.

	Existing guidelir	•	Dra	ft guideline						
	SP (years)	Final senten ce (years)	Culpability	Factors	Harm	Factors	SP (years)	Aggravating factors	Mitigating factors	Final sentence (years)
Expected			A	 Targeting of vulnerable victims Significant degree of planning Other weapon carried Equipped for burglary 	1	 Occupier at home Violence used or threatened against the victim Substantial degree of loss 	3	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Vulnerable victim(s) Offence committed as part of a group Offence committed on licence 	None	Above 6 years
1	3.5 years	3.5 years	A	 Targeting of vulnerable victim Threat of violence** 	1	 Occupier at home Economic loss to victim 	3.5 years*	 Previous convictions Offence committed as part of a group Offence committed on licence 	None	3.5 years
2	4.5 years	6 years	A	 Targeting of vulnerable victim Significant degree of planning 	1	 Occupier at home Violence or threatened against victim 	6 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Offence committed as part of a group Steps taken to prevent the victim reporting Offence committed on licence 	None	7 years
3	3 years	6 years	В	 Culpability falls between A and C Other weapon carried? 	1	 Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim 	3 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Offence was committed as part of a group Steps taken to prevent the victim reporting Offence committed on licence Other offending 	None	6 years
4	3 years	7 years	A	 Significant degree of planning Other weapon carried 	1	 emotional impact Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim Substantial degree of loss 	3 years	 Offence committed at night Offence committed as part of a group Offence committed on licence Serious consequences for the victims 	None	7 years
5	6 years	6-8 years	A	 Significant degree of planning Equipped for burglary 	1	 Substantial degree of loss Age of victims Significant impact on the victims Violation 	6 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Offence committed on licence Homeowner present Value of property stolen 	None	6-8 years

								• Evidence of bad character		
6	6 years	9 years	A	 Degree of planning Other weapon carried 	1	 Much greater emotional impact than expected Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim Substantial degree of loss 	6 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Vulnerable victim Offence committed as part of a group Offence committed on licence 	None	9 years
7	3 years	4.5 years	A	 Planning Other weapon carried 	1	 Greater emotional impact than expected Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim Substantial degree of loss 	3 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Offence committed on licence 	None	4.5-5 years
8	5-6 years	5-6 years	A	 Targeting of vulnerable victims Other weapon carried Some degree of planning Equipped for burglary 	1	 Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim Substantial degree of loss 	3 years	 Previous convictions Offence committed at night Vulnerable victim Offence committed as part of a group Threatening 	None	5-6 years
9	3 years	8 years	A	 Significant degree of planning 	1	 Emotional impact Occupier at home Violence threatened against victim Significant substantial loss 	3 years	 Offence committed at night Vulnerable victim Offence committed as part of a group Offence committed on licence 	None	8 years

* raised from 3 years to reflect previous convictions.

** a harm factor but applied in culpability

			Sce	nario B – Domestic I	ourgl	ary					
	Existing	guideline	Dra	ft guideline							
	SP (years and months)	Pre-GP sentence (years and months)	Culpability	Factors	Harm	Factors	SP (years and months)	Aggravating	Mitigating	Pre – GP sentence	Final sentence, Post-GP (years)
Expected			B • Some degree of planning 1 • Occupier at home B • Committed on 1 • Occupier at home		2 years	 Previous conviction Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol 	 Determination to address addiction Age 	2 years	Around 1 or CO with an ATR		
1	1 year	1 year	В	 Committed on impulse 	1	Occupier at homeNothing stolen	1 year, 9 months	Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol	 Determination to address addiction Age and/or lack of maturity 	1 year 9 months	1 year 2 months susp. 2 years
2	1 year	1 year	С	No targetingnot equipped	1	Occupier at home	6 months	-	-	-	6 months susp. 1 year (ATR/UPW)
3	1 year	10-13 months	С	-	2	Occupier at home	1 year	 Previous conviction Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol 	 Determination to address addiction Age and/or lack of maturity 	1 year 3 months	10 months
4	1 year	1 year	С	 Committed on impulse No targeting 	2	 Occupier at home Property of low value stolen 	1 year	-	 Determination to address addiction origins of problem guilty plea 	1 year	8 months susp. 2 years (RAR/ UPW/curfew)
5	1 year	8 months susp. 2 years (ATR)	С	 Committed on impulse with limited intrusion. 	1	 Occupier at home Greater degree of emotional impact 	-	Previous conviction	 Remorse Determination of steps taken to address offending behaviour Age and/or lack of maturity 	1 year 6 months	1 year susp. 2 years
6	1 year 6 months	1 year 6 months	С	-	2	 Nothing stolen or only property of 	1 year	Previous conviction	 Remorse Some indication to address 	1 year	9 months

						low value to the victimLimited damage to property		Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol	addiction/offending behaviour • Age		
7	1 year	1 year 9 months	В	• Committed on impulse <i>but not</i> <i>limited</i> <i>intrusion</i>	1	 Greater emotional impact than expected Nothing stolen 	2 year	 Previous convictions Commission of offence whilst under the influence of alcohol 	 Willingness to address addiction Traumatic background 	2 year 6 months	1year 8 months
8	9 months	1 year	В	• Committed on impulse but not limited intrusion	2	 Occupier at home Nothing stolen or only property of low value to the victim 	1 year	 Previous convictions 	 Remorse Willingness to address addiction 	1 year 3 months	1 year
9	1 year	1 year 3 months	С	 Committed on impulse 	1	 Occupier at home Much greater impact than expected 	1 year, 6 months	 Previous convictions 	 Acceptance of alcohol problem 	1 year 9 months	1 year 2 months susp. 2 years

	Existin guideli	-	Dra	aft guideline							
	SP (year s)	Final Sentenc e Pre- GP (years and months)	Culpability	Factors	Harm	Factors	SP (years)	Aggravating	Mitigating	Pre-GP (years)	Final sentence Post-GP (years)
Expected			В	• Some degree of planning	2	 Some psychological harm Some degree of loss to the victim 	6 years	 Use of face covering Offence committed at night Offence committed as part of a group 	 No relevant previous convictions Age 	7 years	4 years, 8 months
1	10 years	9 years	A	 Targeting of vulnerable victim Degree of planning 	1	 Victim on the premises Violence against property Substantial degree of loss Psychological impact to the victim Ransacking or vandalism Weapon carried 	10 years	 Weapon carried when entering premises Offence committed as part of a group 	 No relevant convictions Age and lack of maturity 	7 years, 6 months	5 years
2	11 years	10 years	A	 Some impact or loss Victim on premises 	1	 Victim on the premises Some degree of loss 	10 years	 Weapon carried when entering premises Use of face covering Offence committed at night Offence was committed as part of a group 	 No relevant convictions Remorse Age and lack of maturity 	10 years	6 years, 6 months
3	10 years	10 years	A	 Significant degree of planning 	1	 Victim on the premises 	10 years	-	-	10 years	6 years, 8 months
4	10 years	8 years	A	 Significant planning and targeting and <i>slight</i> vulnerability Weapon 	1 or 2	 Victim on the premises Violence threatened Attempt to steal what would be a substantial loss 	10 years	 Weapon carried when entering premises Use of face covering 	 Nothing stolen No previous convictions 	8 years	5 years, 4 months

5	10 years	9 years	В	-	1	 Equipped for burglary Some psychological impact Weapon produced Significant psychological trauma to the victim Victim on the premises Some degree of violence threatened, involving a weapon 	8 years	 Offence committed in a dwelling Offence committed as part of a group Use of face covering Vulnerable victim Offence committed as part of a group 	 Age and lack of maturity No relevant previous conviction Age and lack of maturity 	8 years	5 years, 4 months
6	10 years	9 years	В	• Some planning or organisation	2	 weapon Victim on the premises Significant degree of loss Vulnerable victim 	9 years	 Unrelated previous convictions Weapon carried when entering premises Use of face covering Vulnerable victim (taken into account at step 1) Committed at night 	• Age	8 years	5 years, 4 months
7	10 years	9 years	В	 Some degree of planning Part of a group Committed at night 	1	 Violence used or threatened against the victim Some psychological injury to the victim Some degree of loss Victim on the premises 	9 years	 Unrelated previous convictions* Weapon carried when entering premises (taken into account at step 1) Use of face covering Committed at night 	 No relevant previous convictions Age and lack of maturity 	9 years	6 years
8	9 years	9 years	В	 Some degree of planning 	1	-	8 years	-	-	8 years	5 years, 4 months
9	10 years	9 years	В	 Targeting of vulnerable victim Some degree of planning or organisation 	2	 Victims on the premises Some degree of loss Some psychological injury or impact on the victim 	6 years	 Weapon carried when entering premises Use of face covering Offence committed at night Offence committed as part of a group 	 No relevant previous convictions Age 	6 years	4 years

* a mitigating factor but applied under aggravation

Scenario D – Non-domestic burglary (judges)

	Existing g	uideline	Di	raft guideline						
	SP (mths)	Final Sentence (months)	Culnability	Factors	Harm	Factors	SP (mths)	Aggravating	Mitigating	Final sentence (years and mths)
Expected			С	 Committed on impulse with limited intrusion 	1	 Victim on premises Substantial degree of loss 	6 months	Previous convictions	None	1 year
1	4.5 months	6 months	С	Committed on impulse	1	 Victim on premises Substantial degree of loss Limited damage or disturbance to property 	6 months	 Previous convictions 	None	8 months
2	4.5 months	6 months	С	Committed on impulse	2	 Some degree of loss 	HLCO	Previous convictions	None	6 months
3	MLCO	HLCO	С	Committed on impulse	2	Some degree of loss	MLCO	Previous convictions	None	HLCO
4	СО	HLCO/S SO	С	Committed on impulse	2	Some degree of loss	MLCO	None	None	CO
5	HLCO	-	С	 Committed on impulse with limited intrusion into property 	2	LossImpact on victim	MLCO	Previous convictions	None	HLCO (UW/RAR)
6	4.5 months/ LLCO	6 months	С	Committed on impulse (opportunistic)	2	Some degree of loss	MLCO	Previous convictions	None	6 months
7	4.5 months	6 months possibly susp.	С	 Committed on impulse with limited intrusion into property 	2	 Greater emotional impact 	со	Previous convictions	None	MLCO (curfew)
8	9 months	6 months (assumi ng GP)	С	Committed on impulse	1/ 2	 Substantial degree of loss Emotional impact (greater or much greater) 	6 months/ MLCO	-	None	6 months

9	4.5	6	C • Committed on impulse	1	Substantial degree of loss	6	Previous convictions	None	8 months
	months/	months				months/			
	MLCO					MLCO			

Scenario D – Non-domestic burglary (Magistrates) **Existing guideline Draft guideline** SP Final Factors Factors SP Aggravating Mitigating Sentence Final Culpability Sentence (mths) (Pre-GP) sentence Pre-GP (Post-GP) Harm С Committed on impulse, 1 Victim on 6 Previous None 1 year 6mth • • • Expected with limited intrusion months convictions premises **Substantial** • degree of loss 1 4.5 MLCO С 2 Committed on impulse, • Some degree of MLCO Previous None MLCO MLCO ٠ ٠ months with limited intrusion loss convictions 2 4.5 4.5 С HLCO HLCO 2 Some degree of MLCO None Committed on impulse, Previous ٠ • ٠ (180hr months months with limited intrusion loss (200hr UW) convictions UW) 3 **HLCO** HLCO С Committed on impulse, 2 MLCO HLCO HLCO Greater Previous None • ٠ ٠ (UPW?) emotional impact (discount with limited intrusion convictions Damage of hrs) ٠ property causing some degree of loss MLCO/ 4 4.5 3 С Committed on impulse, 2 Greater MLCO Previous None MLCO/Ba ٠ • ٠ nd B fine Band B fine months months with limited intrusion emotional impact convictions (66% WI (100hr UW) Some degree of Victim on premises ٠ • and 66hr loss UW) 5 4.5 2 С Defendant was not an 2 MLCO Custody* HLCO Greater Previous GP at earliest • • • ٠ months months emotional impact intruder as was at the convictions opportunity 1week hospital when the Abuse of a Multiple items • • offence was committed stolen position of trust 6 MLCO HLCO В Committed on impulse, 2 Some degree of 6 Previous None 6 months 4 months ٠ • ٠ months possibly with limited intrusion loss convictions

susp

7	MLCO	4.5	С	• Limited	lintrusion	2	•	Victim on	MLCO	•	Previous	None		HLCO	HLCO
'	WILCO	months	C	- Linned		2	•	premises	IVILCO	•	convictions	None		(victim	(lower
		montins					•	Soiling of			convictions			comp)	hours)
							•	-						comp)	noursy
								property Some degree of							
							•	loss							
							•	Theft/damage to							
8	4 5	4.5	С	- Commi		1		property	6		Draviava	Nene		6 months	6 months
ð	4.5 months	4.5 months	C		tted on impulse,	T	•	Victim on	o months	•	Previous	None		6 months	6 months
	monuns	monuns			nited intrusion			premises	monuns		convictions				(credit for GP is not
				Little pl	anning		•	Some degree of							
								loss							sending to CC)
9	4.5	4.5	С	e Commi	ttad an impulse	2		Como dograo of	6		Drovious		Committed on	6 months	4 months
9	4.5 months	4.5 months	C		tted on impulse, nited intrusion	2	٠	Some degree of	o months	•	Previous convictions	•	Committed on	omontins	
	monuis	monuis		WILLI III				loss Fractional impact	monuis	-			impulse with limited		sups. 1
							•	Emotional impact		•	Emotional				year
								on victim			impact on		intrusion		
										_	the victim	•	Low value		
										•	A place of		property but		
											work Dublic alway		high		
										•	Public place		sentimental		
										•	Damage to		value		
											property				

* unspecified length.

	Existing g	uideline	Dra	aft guide	line										
	SP (years)	Final Sentence Pre-GP (months)	Culpability	Factors	S	Harm	Factor	'S	SP (mths)	Aggrav	vating	Mitiga	ting	Pre-GP (months)	Final sentence Post-GP (months)
Expected			С	•	Offence committed on impulse, with limited intrusion	2	•	Some degree of loss Ransacking or vandalism	MLCO	•	Part of a group Under the influence of alcohol	None		HLCO	MLCO
1	4.5 months	MLCO	С	•	Committed on impulse	2	•	Ransacking or vandalism	MLCO	•	Part of a group Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions <i>Guilty plea</i>	MLCO	LLCO (ATR; RAR)
2	MLCO	MLCO	С	•	Committed on impulse	2	•	Some degree of loss Ransacking or vandalism	MLCO	••	Part of a group Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions <i>Guilty plea</i>	MLCO (100 hrs UPW)	MLCO (50 hrs UPW)
3	LLCO	LLCO	В	•	More than limited intrusion	2	•	Some degree of loss	6 months	•	Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions <i>Guilty plea</i>	6 months	HLCO
4	MLCO	MLCO (120hr UPW) and Band B fine	С	•	Committed on impulse	2	•	Some degree of loss <i>Some degree</i> of damage to property	MLCO	•	Part of a group Under influence of alcohol	-		MLCO (120hr UPW) Band B fine (70% weekly income)	MLCO (80 hrs UPW) Band B fine (100% weekly income)
5	4.5 months	2 months	В	•	Not limited intrusion	2	•	Some degree of loss Ransacking or vandalism	6 months	-		•	No relevant previous convictions <i>Guilty plea</i>	6 months	4 months

6	4.5 months	4.5 months	В	•	Committed on impulse Intrusion on property	2	•	Some degree of loss Some damage to property	6 months	•	previous convictions Under influence of alcohol	-		6 months	4 months SSO
7	4.5 months	4.5 months	С	•	Offence committed on impulse	2	•	Some degree of loss Ransacking or vandalism	MLCO	•	Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions	MLCO	MLCO
8	LLCO (40hr UPW)	LLCO	С	•	Offence committed on impulse, with limited intrusion	3	•	Some degree of loss Nothing stolen	Band B fine	•	Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions <i>Reasonably</i> good character <i>Guilty plea</i>	Band B fine	Band B fine (1/3 reductio n)
9	4.5 months	4.5 months	В	•	Offence committed on impulse, with limited intrusion	2	•	Some degree of loss Ransacking or vandalism Intrusion	6 months	•	Under influence of alcohol	•	No relevant previous convictions	6 months	M-HLCO