

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

Date: 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020

Subject: Police and Community Safety Survey – results for the period July 2019 – March 2020

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

---

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The Policing and Community Safety Survey results for July 2019 – March 2020 are summarised in this report and accompany a more detailed presentation.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel members are asked to note the information contained in this report.

### **CONTACT OFFICERS:**

**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 In March 2018, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) launched 'Standing Together', the Police and Crime Plan for Greater Manchester, which has three overarching priorities: keeping people safe, reducing harm and offending, and strengthening communities and places.
- 1.2 The success of the Police and Crime Plan will be judged using an outcomes framework that contains a number of specific indicators. To support the outcomes framework, the GMCA commissioned DJS Research to conduct research to understand public perceptions of personal and community safety.
- 1.3 This report contains the results from the first three waves of research with a representative sample of 9,750 Greater Manchester residents aged 16 years and older. This section of the report outlines the key top-level findings from this research, based on the combined results from the first three waves (July – September 2019, October – December 2019 and January – March 2020<sup>1</sup>).
- 1.4 All district and GM level information is also available to community safety partnerships through the online portal.

## **2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

### **2.1 Feelings of Safety**

- 2.1.1 The majority of respondents (87%) felt safe in their local area. The main reasons cited for feeling safe were quiet/pleasant neighbourhoods (21% of those feeling safe), lack of personal experiences of problems (21%) and a sense of community in the local area (17%).
- 2.1.2 The main reasons for respondents not feeling safe in their local area were an awareness of ASB (40% of those who felt unsafe) and an awareness of crime (31%).

### **2.1.3 Place of study**

- 2.1.4 Nine in ten respondents felt safe at their place of study (93%). The main reason for feeling safe was that their place of study felt secure/there were security guards or other security measures (28% of those who felt safe).

### **2.1.5 Place of work**

- 2.1.6 Nine in ten respondents who work in Greater Manchester felt safe at their place of work (91%). The main reasons for feeling safe whilst at work were due to workplace security

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that, regarding Wave 3 data, the majority of interviews were conducted before the national lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which began on March 23rd, 2020.

measures including generally secure buildings/carparks (22% of those who felt safe) and specific measures such as security guards (18%).

### **2.1.7 When socialising**

2.1.8 Four in five respondents (81%) felt safe when socialising in their local authority area. The main reason respondents felt safe when socialising was because they had not personally experienced any problems (21% of those who felt safe).

2.1.9 The main reason for not feeling safe when socialising in their local area was due to an awareness of ASB (40% of those who felt unsafe).

### **2.1.10 Behavioural changes in the last 12 months**

2.1.11 Seven in ten respondents (72%) had not changed their behaviour or taken any action in the last 12 months as a result of feeling unsafe in Greater Manchester.

2.1.12 For the respondents who had taken action or changed their behaviour, avoidance tactics were the actions most commonly cited, including being more cautious/careful (5%) and going out less in the evening (5%).

## **2.2 Confidence in Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and the Community Safety Partnership (CSP)**

### **2.2.1 Confidence in GMP in an emergency**

2.2.2 Three in five respondents (62%) were confident that they could get help from GMP in an emergency, while three in ten respondents (30%) were not confident.

2.2.3 The main reason respondents felt confident was that they were sure that the police would respond in an emergency situation (29% of those who felt confident), followed by positive first-hand experiences (9%).

2.2.4 The main reasons for not feeling confident were the perception that the police lack resources (27% of those who lack confidence), followed by lack of police presence (24%) and a general lack of confidence in the police (20%).

### **2.2.5 Confidence in GMP in a non-emergency**

2.2.6 Two in five respondents (39%) felt confident that they could get help from GMP in a non-emergency situation. The main reasons respondents felt confident was that they were sure that the police will respond (25%) and due to positive first-hand experiences (12%).

2.2.7 Almost half of respondents (47%) were not confident that they could get help in a non-emergency. The main reasons for a lack of confidence were the perceived lack of police funding/resources (27% of those who were not confident), lack of police presence (18%) and experience of crimes not being attended/being ignored/only given a reference number (17%).

### **2.2.8 Agreement that the CSP is dealing with community safety issues in the local area**

2.2.9 Two fifths of respondents (41%) agreed that the CSP is dealing with community safety issues in their local area. Over a third (37%) either did not know what the CSP was or did not know how they would rate the CSP's activities.

2.2.10 Of those who agreed, many could not give a specific reason why they agreed (23% of those who agree) or they agreed due to a very general sense of being safe (18%).

2.2.11 The main reasons for disagreement were the lack of evidence that issues were being dealt with (21% of those who disagree), lack of police presence (18%) and being unsure about the CSP's role (15%).

## **2.3 Contact and satisfaction**

### **2.3.1 Experienced one or more community safety issues**

2.3.2 Two fifths of respondents (40%) had experienced a community safety issue in the previous 12 months.

2.3.3 The most common community safety issues experienced were being witness to a crime/ASB or disturbance (17%), being concerned for someone's safety or about something suspicious (16%), and being a victim of a crime/ASB or disturbance (15%).

### **2.3.4 Contact relating to community safety**

2.3.5 Just under three in ten respondents (27%) had had contact with any community safety organisation in the previous 12 months. One fifth of respondents had had contact with GMP (20%).

### **2.3.6 Reasons for not making contact**

2.3.7 Some respondents who had had a community safety experience had not made contact with any community safety organisation, including GMP. The main reasons for this were because someone else had already made contact regarding the issue (16%), a lack of confidence in the organisations (15%), or because respondents did not feel their issue was serious enough to warrant intervention by GMP/other CSP organisations (14%).

### **2.3.8 Satisfaction with most recent contact – GMP**

2.3.9 Of those whose most recent contact was with GMP in the previous 12 months, just over half (53%) were satisfied with the service they received, while three in ten respondents (31%) were dissatisfied with the service.

2.3.10 The main reasons for dissatisfaction with the service received from GMP were experience of crimes not being attended/being ignored/only given a reference number (32%), poor/lack of resolution (21%), poor communication (18%).

### **2.3.11 Satisfaction with most recent contact – local council regarding a community safety issue**

2.3.12 Of those whose most recent contact was with their local council in the previous 12 months, half (49%) were satisfied with the service they received, while over a third (37%) were dissatisfied.

**2.3.13 Satisfaction with most recent contact – housing provider regarding a community safety issue**

2.3.14 Of those whose most recent contact was with a housing provider in the previous 12 months, two in five respondents (42%) were satisfied with the service they received from a housing provider regarding a community safety issue, and a similar proportion (39%) were dissatisfied.

**2.3.15 Satisfaction with most recent contact – community/voluntary organisation regarding a community safety issue**

2.3.16 Of those whose most recent contact was with a community/voluntary organisation in the previous 12 months, two in three respondents (67%) were satisfied with the service they received from community/voluntary organisation regarding a community safety issue. A small minority of respondents were dissatisfied (9%).

**2.4 About the local area**

2.4.1 Over seven in ten respondents agreed that their local area was a place where people from different backgrounds get on well (72%) and agreed they were proud of their local area (71%); they felt a strong sense of belonging (71%) and that their local area was a place where people looked out for each other (71%).

2.4.2 Just under two thirds of respondents also believed that their local area was well maintained (64%).

2.4.3 Just over a third of respondents believed that they had a say about what happens in their local area (36%).

**3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 Recommendations are on the front page of the report