

## **GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE AND CRIME PANEL**

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2019

Subject: Standing Together Outcomes Framework – progress report

Report of: Bev Hughes – Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice services and Fire

---

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The Standing Together plan was launched in March 2018 when it was agreed that an outcomes framework be developed in order to provide information enabling strategic oversight. A variety of data sources have been used to inform the outcomes.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Panel is requested to note the progress made.

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

**Clare Monaghan**

Director – Police, Crime and Fire team

[Clare.monaghan@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.monaghan@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk)

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Following the publication of the Standing Together Police and Crime Plan, an outcomes framework has been developed to provide an understanding of the impact that the Plan is making. This outcomes framework has been developed in close collaboration with Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and the 10 districts of Greater Manchester to ensure that it is meaningful at both a GM and locality level.
- 1.2 Progress towards achieving the outcomes of the Standing Together Plan is monitored using information from a range of sources, including GMP, the Office of National Statistics, Ministry of Justice and an ongoing GM Community Safety survey. The outcomes framework is updated on a quarterly basis (where the data are available). Each quarterly wave of the survey is based on interviews of 3,250 Greater Manchester residents selected to be representative of the population by age, gender and ethnicity at both a district and GM level. The survey has four key themes:
- Feelings of safety
  - Confidence in access to services
  - Satisfaction with accessed services
  - Thoughts about the local area.
- 1.3 The report is intended to provide a summary of progress against the outcomes framework and to support a broader discussion at police and crime panel.

## **2.0 FEELINGS OF SAFETY**

- 2.1 Of the respondents interviewed between June and September 2019, more than half (56%) had not had a community safety related experience in the preceding 12 months. Approximately one third (31%) of respondents had contact a community safety organisation on one or more occasions and a fifth of respondents (22%) had at least one contact with GMP.
- 2.2 For GM, the majority of respondents (86%) felt 'quite safe' or 'very safe' in their local area (defined as 5 minute walk from their home). These feelings of safety were higher for some groups of respondents most notable:
- Respondents who were aged over 61 years (91%) and
  - Respondents who rated themselves as economically most comfortable (93%).
- 2.3 Feelings of safety were notable lower for respondents:
- Who rated themselves as economically least comfortable (70%)
  - Who had contact with a community safety organisation in the preceding 12 months (78%)
  - Who were BAME (79%)

- Aged between 30 and 44 years (82%)

There are likely to be some overlaps in these groups of respondents.

2.4 For those that said they felt safe in their local area, the most common reasons were:

- They live in a 'quiet area / nice area' (20%)
- They have no personal experience of problems (17%)
- The community is friendly and everyone knows everyone (16%)
- They have lived there a long time and know the area well (11%)

2.5 For those that said they felt unsafe in their local area, the most common reasons were:

- They are aware of antisocial behaviour in the area (39%)
- They are aware of crime in the area (28%)
- A lack of police presence (13%)

### 3.0 CRIME AND VICTIMISATION

3.1 Over the past five or so years, police forces in England and Wales have been refining their crime recording practices in line with recommendations made by HMICFRS. This has led to marked increases in the number of crimes that are recorded. However, these extent and timing of these refinements have been different in each of the 43 English and Welsh police forces; as a consequence, caution must be used when comparing changes and differences in crime levels. Notwithstanding this caveat, since 2014/15, the incidence of crime in GM has risen by 62% to 119 crimes per 1,000 residents compared to 89.5 for E&W as a whole. Over the same period, the crime severity score<sup>1</sup> has risen by 72% to 20.5 compared to 14 for E&W. This means that GM has a relatively high level of crime and proportionately more of those crimes are serious.

3.2 The incidence of household crimes in the 12 months ending March 2019 in GM, was 33.3; a year-on-year reduction of 6.7%. However, this remains higher than the 24.5 incidence for E&W as a whole. In the same period, the incidence of personal crimes in GM was 52.5 which is higher than the 38.8 incidence for E&W as a whole; the GM figure has not changed compared to the previous 12 months.

3.3 In the 12 month period ending in June 2019, 13% of victims were repeatedly victimised (i.e. experienced two or more crimes within the 12 month period) and they experienced an average of 2.64 crimes; this is slightly higher than 12 months earlier (12%). A very small cohort of people (1%) were victim of five or more crimes in the 12 month period, however this accounted for 5% of all the crimes recorded by GMP. The level of repeat victimisation is notable higher for victims of domestic abuse with 22% of victims experienced more than one crime. There is a similar concentration of offending, with 5.5% of suspected offenders being responsible for 25% of recorded crimes.

---

<sup>1</sup> A standardised measure of the seriousness of crime which has been developed by the Office of National Statistics which weights crime using average sentence lengths for different categories of crimes – meaning the longer average sentence length the more serious the crime is considered to be.

3.4 Statistical models using demographic and other data forecast an estimate of how many crimes of certain types are likely to occur in different places. These forecasts may be compared to the number of crimes that were recorded. In the 12 months to June 2019 across GM, 18% of the 343 local areas<sup>2</sup> had fewer reported crimes than were forecast, and 10% of the 343 areas had more crimes than forecasted. For domestic abuse many areas of GM (45% of areas) had significantly more crimes than had been forecast. This is particularly associated with areas of lower affluence and a small number of repeatedly attended individual addresses and consistent with the high levels of repeat victimisation.

#### **4.0 GMP INVESTIGATIVE OUTCOMES**

4.1 In the 12 months ending June 2019, for just over half of all crimes reported to GMP (57%), no suspect was identified from the investigation; and 8% of crimes resulted in a charge or caution. The proportion for which the victim did not support the investigation / prosecution has increased over the past three years (17% in 2017, 21% in 2018 and 24% in 2019).

4.2 The pattern for investigative outcomes varies markedly for different crime types. For example, in the year ending June 2019, no suspect was identified in 83% of household crimes, but for 1% of domestic abuse related crimes. For two thirds (69%) domestic abuse crimes of the victim did not support the investigation / prosecution.

#### **5. CONFIDENCE**

5.1 Of the respondents to the GM Community Safety Survey, 59% were confident that, in an emergency, they would be able to get help from GMP and 39% were confident that they would be able to get help from GMP if they needed it in a non-emergency situation. Similar to questions asked in an HMICFRS survey indicated that 52% of E&W respondents were confident that the police would be effective dealing with an emergency and 46% were confident that the police would be effective dealing with a non-emergency.

5.2 Women tend to feel more confident in both emergencies (62% felt confident compared to 56% of men) and non-emergencies (41% compared to 37% of men). Younger respondents had more confidence than older respondents (45+) (emergencies: 66% compared to 55% in respondents aged 45+; non-emergencies: 48% compared to 35%). BAMER residents said that they would be less likely to contact the police in an emergency, but felt more confident that they would get a response from the police in a non-emergency (45% compared to 38% for white respondents). Feelings of confidence decline with increased perceptions of financial hardship, particularly in an emergency.

5.3 For those that said they were confident that they could get help from the police in an emergency, the most common reason was:

- They have had positive first-hand experience (11%)

---

<sup>2</sup> As defined using the Office of National Statistics Middle Super Output Area (MSOA)

- 5.4 For those that said they were not confident that they could get help from the police in an emergency, the most common reasons were:
- The police lack resources / funding (30%)
  - There is no local police presence / police station (21%)
  - First-hand experience of the police not attending / ignoring reports / only being given a crime reference number (18%)
  - Experience of slow response times (12%)
  - General negative first-hand experience (11%)
- 5.5 For those that said they were confident that they could get help from the police in a non-emergency, the most common reasons was:
- They have had positive first-hand experience (14%)
- 5.6 For those that said they were not confident that they could get help from the police in a non-emergency, the most common reasons were:
- The police lack resources / funding (28%)
  - First-hand experience of the police not attending / ignoring reports / only being given a crime reference number (20%)
  - They feel emergencies are prioritised (15%)
  - Experience of slow response times (12%)
  - There is no local police presence / police station (11%)
- 5.7 40% of respondents to the survey 'agree' or 'strongly agree' that the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is dealing with community safety issues in their local area. 36% of respondents either did not know if the CSP was dealing with community safety issues in the local area or what the CSP is.
- 5.8 Women tended to agree with this statement more than men (42% compared to 39%). Those aged 45-60 were least likely to agree (35%), and those aged 16-29 most likely (48%). BAMER residents were more likely to agree than white respondents (46% compared to 39%). Those who rated themselves as the most financially challenged were least likely to agree (33%).
- 5.9 For those that said they agreed that the CSP were dealing with community safety issues, the most common reason was:
- A general sense of being safe in the local area (20%)
- 5.10 For those that said they did not agree that the CSP were dealing with community safety issues, the most common reasons were:
- There is no evidence to show safety issues are being dealt with (23%)
  - They didn't know who they [the CSP] were or what they did (20%)
  - There is no local police presence / police station (11%)

## 6.0 SATISFACTION

6.1 Of the respondents to the survey, who received a service from GMP, 53% were satisfied with the service that they had received and 47% were satisfied with the community safety service they had received from the local authority. Contact and satisfaction with other organisations is asked in the survey however the numbers are too small to comment on in this wave; this sample size will be built over the coming waves.

## **7.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD QUESTIONS**

7.1 The survey asked the respondents about their strength of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements about the local area in which they lived. For each of these statements, a markedly lower proportion of those who rated themselves as the most economically challenged respondents agreed with the statements. Of the respondents to the survey:

- 73% agreed that, in their local area, people of different backgrounds get on well together – (55% of those who rated themselves as the most economically challenged).
- 71% agreed that, in their local area, people look out for each other (51% of those who rated themselves as the most economically challenged).
- 71% feel a strong sense of belonging to their local area (49% of those who rated themselves as the most economically challenged).
- 36% agreed that they have a say about what happens in their local area (26% of those who rated themselves as the most economically challenged).

## **8.0 ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

8.1 Community safety is going to feature in a number of one off surveys, these include:

- A survey of GM businesses jointly commissioned by GMCA, the Manchester Growth Company and Manchester City Council; this survey is due to go out for tender shortly with data due in early 2020.
- A survey commissioned by TfGM which aims to gain a better understanding of people's use of transport (both public and private) at night time (currently live and due to close on 13th October 19).
- A separate survey by TfGM which aims to understand accessibility to public transport.

## **9.00 REPORTING PROGRESS AGAINST THE OUTCOMES FRAMEWORK**

9.1 At a Greater Manchester level, a quarterly progress report will be provided for the Deputy Mayor for consideration against each of the Standing Together priorities. The design of the report is ongoing and will provide a narrative of the general direction of travel, supported by the work that is taking place.

9.2 The report will be presented to the Police and Crime Panel, following consideration by the Police and Crime Steering Group. Information will be drawn from district community safety partnerships, GM Boards and organisations as appropriate.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

10.1 Appear on the front page of this report.