*Positioning Paper*

# Linkages between housing, policing and other interventions for crime and harassment reduction on Public Housing estates

authored by

**Bruce Judd, Robert Samuels and Bette O'Brien**

AHUR**i**

Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute

**AHURI POSITIONING PAPER SERIES**

AHURI Positioning Papers is a refereed series presenting the preliminary findings of original research to a diverse readership of policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| ABS | Australian Bureau of Statistics |
| ACRO | Australian Community Safety and Research Organisation |
| AG | Attorney Generals Dept, NSW |
| BSC | Building Safer Communities, Queensland Government |
| CD | ABS Census Collector District |
| CAS | Community Access Schools, Queensland Government |
| CAPs | Community Action Plans, Queensland Police Dept |
| CCCs | Community Consultation Committees, Queensland Government |
| CJC | Criminal Justice Commission, Queensland |
| CPD | Crime Prevention Division, NSW Attorney Generals Dept |
| CPQ | Crime Prevention Queensland, Dept of Premier and Cabinet |
| CPTED | Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design |
| CPRM | Crime Prevention Resources Manual, NSW Government |
| CPU | Crime Prevention Unit, SA Government |
| CPPs | Crime Prevention Partnerships, Queensland Government |
| CR | Community Renewal |
| CRISP | Operational data base, Queensland Police |
| CRP | Community Renewal Program, Queensland and NSW |
| CRS | Community Renewal Strategy, NSW Dept of Housing |
| CSHA | Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement |
| DCLO | District Community Liaison Officer, Queensland Police Dept |
| DCP | Development Control Plan, NSW |
| DHS | Department of Human Services, South Australia |
| DP&C | Department of Premier and Cabinet, Queensland |
| DUAP | Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, NSW (formerly) |
| EPA | Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, NSW |
| FACS | Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services |
| GIS | Geographic Information Systems |
| HCAP | Housing Communities Assistance Program, NSW |
| ITM | Intensive Tenancy Management, NSW Department of Housing |
| LCPCP | Local Crime Prevention Committee Program, SA Government |
| LCPP | Local Crime Prevention Program, SA Government |
| LGA | Local Government Area |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NIP | Neighbourhood Improvement Program |
| NSWDH | NSW Department of Housing |

| | |
|---|---|
| POP | Problem Oriented Policing |
| QLDDH | Queensland Department of Housing |
| QPS | Queensland Police Service |
| SAHT | South Australian Housing Trust |
| SAPOL | South Australian Police |
| SCDF | Safer Communities Development Fund, NSW Attorney Generals Dept |
| SHA | State Housing Authority |
| TAFE | Technical and Further Education, NSW |
| TCIP | Tenant and Communities Initiatives Program, NSW |
| UR | Urban Renewal |
| URP | Urban Renewal Program, Queensland  Department of Housing |

# TERMINOLOGY

**Community partnerships:**  Formal or semi-formal agreements between government or other agencies and a local community to involve community members in planning and/or implementation of policies or strategies.

**Community Policing:** "a policing philosophy that promotes community-based problem-solving strategies to address the underlying causes of crime and disorder and the fear of crime…to enhance the quality of life of local communities." (Mc Laughlan, 2001)

**Community Renewal:** a combination of physical and social strategies aimed at improving the quality of life in disadvantaged areas.

**Criminogenic:** situational potential – facilitating emergence of crime and/or harassment.

**Environmental Criminology:** "…the study of crime, criminality and victimisation as they relate…to particular *places*, and…the way that individuals and organisations shape their activities *spatially,* and in so doing are in turn influenced by *place-based* or *spatial* factors." (Wiles, 1997)

**Epidemiology:** frequency/incidence/occurrence (of 'events') x distribution/location in space; socio-spatial indicators; frequently mapped.

**Harassment:**  victimisation experience of persistent annoyance or disturbance  (not necessarily 'criminal' or 'illegal') – thus, largely unreported but adversely affecting life quality, and capable of inducing future 'avoidance behaviour'.

**Intensive Tenancy Management:**  A NSW Department of Housing initiative involving the concentration of management resources to highly disadvantaged housing estates by locating a small management team on the estate to work closely with the community.

**Interagency:**  joint program or project between two or more (often government) agencies

**Mixed-use development***:* integrated, inter-activity zone; co-existent residential and non-residential land-uses typical of 'old city' socio-spatial configurations.

**Neighbourhood cohesion:** "a synthesis of the concepts of psychological sense of community, attraction to neighbourhood, and social interaction within a neighbourhood…" (Buckner, 1988)

**Neighbourhood House(s):**  A South Australian term referring to a community facility (sometimes literally a former dwelling) provided within a disadvantaged residential area for community use and assistance programs.

**Physical determinism:** the assumption of a causal relationship between the built environment and human behaviour (forgetting the intervening, human variables).

**Place Management:** a whole-of-government management strategy directed toward a particular geographic area.

**Problem Oriented Policing (POP):** a pro-active rather than re-active approach to policing involving targeted action, based on research and aimed at essential issue(s).

**Program integration:** collaboration between programs of different (usually government) agencies via a formal (eg: contractual) or semi-formal (eg: memorandum of understanding) agreement in order to improve the quality or effectiveness of service provision.

**Quotidian:** everyday, or recurring daily.

**Radburn housing layouts:** 1930's American design for housing precincts derived from a housing project in Radburn, New Jersey characterised by back-to-front houses facing open space (rather than the street), with backyards to cul-de-sac streets.

**Situational contingency:** emergent circumstance, co-incident; the inevitable, in retrospect; consequence of socio-economic, ideological, cultural and natural forces ('situations') played out in particular built environments.

**Social mix:** mingling public with private tenure in order to alter the social configurations, and reduce stigma.

**Socio-spatial:** human behaviour seen in relation to its spatial context (from an ecological viewpoint); all human interaction occurs in physical space; the social without the spatial is meaningless, and vice-versa; built environment ('configuration') reflects these relationships.

**Superlots:** large tracts of public housing under a single title (not Torrens) with properties not readily sold off individually.

**Victimisation:** an individual's experience of suffering as a result of crime or other anti-social behaviour.

**Victimisation survey and mapping:** research technique/process to elicit situational experience from victims of crime and harassment whereby respondents indicate time, location and victimisation experience (if any) that can be recorded on maps enabling spatial analysis.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Background

This research comes in the context of recent public housing estate renewal activity in all Australian states attempting to address problems of concentrated disadvantage through a range of physical and social interventions. Problems with crime and harassment feature prominently amongst the factors triggering the need for such programs. While there is some anecdotal evidence to suggest that these programs appear, in some cases, to have reduced or displaced crime, a systematic study of changing patterns of crime in relation to estate renewal activity has yet to be undertaken.

Mapped operational police data provides a useful tool for analysing spatial patterns of crime (including displacement) at the neighbourhood level. However, these data do not reveal unreported crime and harassment and fear of crime which are best understood from victimisation surveys. Previous work by the authors has studied spatial patterns of crime using mapped police operational data and victim surveys at the micro-level both on public housing estates and university campuses, but not over time during the process of estate renewal.

## Aims of the Research

This project aims to investigate:

1. the range of crime reduction strategies employed by housing, police and other agencies in public housing areas in three States (NSW, Qld and SA),

2. details of the crime reduction strategies on nine selected public housing estates - six (2 each in NSW, Qld and SA) which have been subject to estate improvement interventions and three (1 in each state) 'control' estates not subject to a renewal program,

3. the degree and nature of program integration between housing and other agencies,

4. the extent and nature of community partnerships within these programs, and

5. changes in the frequency and distribution of crime and harassment in the selected public housing estates during early, mid and later periods after interventions – compared with a control estate in each state (in which no or minimal interventions have occurred),

6. best practice models for crime prevention on public housing estates to inform policy development.

The focus is on a five year period, 1997-2001 and will use spatially mapped operational police data, victimisation mapping surveys, neighbourhood cohesion measurement and context crime data to understand the effectiveness of two different approaches to estate

renewal (physical/asset and social/community development focussed) in relation to a range of crime prevention initiatives – and in comparison with a non-renewal 'control' estate.

## Policy Context

*Public Housing Estates*

Public housing estates developed across Australia during the 1950's to mid 1980's have increasingly become sites of economic and social disadvantage, physical deterioration and crime due to a number of factors, including reduced funding for public housing, increased demand, targeted allocations, geographic isolation, inadequate investment in local infrastructure and services, and poorly maintained housing stock (Arthurson 1998; Bowey, 1997; Monro, 1997-98; NSWDH, undated; O'Brien 1997, 1999 and 2001; Randolph and Judd 2000a and 2000b; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). In response, renewal strategies have been introduced on housing estates in all states – including those under study in this research (NSW, SA and QLD) – and includes a broad range of approaches to addressing the range of factors. Renewal areas are selected according to indicators of disadvantage including: unemployment rates; proportion of households on low incomes; percentages of sole-parent households; public housing concentration; social problems related to alcohol and drugs; inadequate infrastructure and support services; poor health and educational outcomes; lack of recreational facilities; shortage of employment and training initiatives; incidence of crime; and high vacancy and turnover rates (QLDH, 2001a and 2001b; Randolph et al, 2000; SAHT, 1998).

*Public Housing Estate Renewal*

Although there are earlier examples of physical improvement programs on the older public housing estates in the three states under study, the current set of community renewal policies are really a product of the 1990s commencing earliest in South Australia (1991) (NCPA, 1993), followed by NSW (1994/5) (NSWSH, undated; Randolph et al, 2001) and most recently by Queensland (1998) (QLDDH, 2001; QLD Government, 2000). Similarities in the programs (particularly in NSW and SA) include an early bias toward physical regeneration followed later by a growing recognition of the importance of social and community development initiatives, community consultation and the need for a whole-of-government approach involving partnerships with other service agencies (including the police).

Differences between the three states include a strong emphasis on overall stock reduction, de-concentration and redevelopment in partnership with local government and the private sector in South Australia; higher levels of stock retention and emphasis on reconfiguration of 'Radburn' planned estates and Intensive Tenancy Management (ITM) in NSW; and auspicing of renewal activities through local government and other public agencies in Queensland. Funding arrangements are also different for the three states with NSW funding renewal from within CSHA funds, Queensland from state funds via a broad across-government Crime

Prevention Strategy, and South Australia using a self-funding approach from within each renewal project.

*Crime Prevention*

Crime prevention policies in Australia are broadly in line with recent developments overseas in moving toward a strong local focus, a multiple agency approach, and a more active role for local government.  There is also a growing awareness at state and local government level of the need for a wide range of stakeholders to act cooperatively with local communities. A large number of government and non-government agencies can be identified as stakeholders in crime prevention, but Premier's, Attorney General's/Justice, and Police departments generally take a leading role with important collaborations with other agencies and local government.

In two of the states under study, Premiers' departments take a leading role in crime prevention policy (the Premier's Council of Crime Prevention in NSW, and the Crime Prevention Strategy – Building Safer Communities in QLD).  All three states have central crime prevention agencies, in NSW (the Crime Prevention Division) and South Australia (Crime Prevention Unit) based in Attorney General's Departments, and in Queensland (Crime Prevention Queensland) in the Department of Premier and Cabinet.  All agencies have a strong emphasis on local community-based crime prevention initiatives funded from central agencies and recognise the critical role of local government and the importance of a multi-agency approach.  Policing policy in all three states has also shifted towards a 'problem oriented policing' (POP) approach with the appointment of crime prevention officers to work with local communities.

## Literature

*Crime Prevention*

Crime prevention is defined in legal terms as "[a}ny action or technique employed by individuals or public agencies aimed at the reduction of damage caused by acts defined as criminal by the state." (Hughes 2001:63) but includes a wide range of activities and initiatives including those other than those purely legally defined.  Approaches to crime prevention reflect different perspectives on the causes of crime (structural, psychological and circumstantial) (Pease 1997).  A distinction can be made between *social* and *situational* strategies, the latter being concerned with opportunity reduction  (Clarke 1992/97; Hughes 2001) and therefore of more central interest to this study given the spatial focus of community renewal projects (in many cases with an explicit *situational crime prevention* agenda) and its focus on short term outcomes.

*Situational Crime Prevention*

The notion of situational crime prevention originated in the British Home Office Research Unit in the early 1970's but draws heavily on Newman's (1972) ideas about 'defensible space',

Jeffrey's (1971) concept of 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' (CPTED) in the USA and Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) notion of 'opportunity and delinquency'. It is a preventative approach primarily concerned with reducing opportunities for crime through measures targeted to specific forms of crime, involving interventions in the physical environment to increase perceived effort and risk and reduce the rewards of crime as perceived by offenders (Clarke 1992). Over the last decade situational crime prevention strategies have been used increasingly by police and planning agencies to reduce risk.

### Environmental Criminology

Environmental Criminology is an approach initiated by Brantingham and Faust (1976) and developed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1981, 1991) drawing on medical epidemiological terminology referring to 'primary' (opportunity reduction), 'secondary' (modifying behaviour of potential criminals) and 'tertiary' (treatment of offenders) crime prevention. The Brantinghams identify four dimensions of *environmental criminology*: legal, offender, target or victim, and place or spatial dimension. Bottoms and Wiles (1997:305) define it as "…the study of crime, criminality and victimisation as they relate, *first*, to particular places, and *secondly*, to the way the individuals and organizations shape their activities *spatially*, and in so doing are in turn influenced by *place-based* or *spatial* factors." It is informed by two powerful contemporary criminogenic paradigms that help explain and locate criminal events – *rational choice theory* (Clark and Cornish, 1985) and *routine activity theory* (Cohen and Felson, 1979). These both embody the notion of opportunistic decision-making and conscious intent, with settings and their behaviour patterns interpreted as situational contingencies and acting as catalysts of (though not determining) criminal behaviour.

### Epidemiological Mapping

Epidemiological mapping is a development of the urban mapping work of the Chicago School social ecologists, advanced under the influence of cognitive/spatial imagery, spatial and human geography, environmental psychology, environmental criminology, victimisation surveys, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and crime mapping. GIS and crime mapping are descriptive techniques aiding criminological research and situational policing capable of mapping a wide range of social and other data at various geographic levels.

### Crime and Public Housing

Social housing is not necessarily an indicator of disadvantage but links between concentrated social housing, areas of degraded privately rented/owned housing, and the incidence of disadvantage is strong. Elements that act to produce deprivation/social exclusion include poor geographic accessibility to job opportunities, reduced provision of public facilities and services and stigmatisation of areas and their residents. Crime rates have long been known to be higher in areas and among individuals affected by economic disadvantage, and crime is a major concern of residents living in high concentrations of public housing. There is

evidence that disadvantaged people are more likely to be both perpetrators and victims of crime, and that concentrations of economically disadvantaged young males are a major factor in crime, but also that only a very small percentage of resident offenders commit the majority of crime in a residential area (NSWPS, 2001a; NSWDH, undated; Stubbs and Hardy, 2000).

While criminologists recognise that public housing areas are not necessarily criminogenic, it is known that certain design features (eg building size and height) have been associated with elevated levels of crime (Newman 1972). However Matka (1997) found no statistical relationship between public housing (type, design or concentration) and crime in the Sydney metropolitan area (based on postcode level data), arguing rather that the link is with disadvantage and socio-economic factors.

*Public Housing Estate Renewal and Crime Reduction*

Recent Australian evidence suggests that where physical interventions (reconfiguration of 'Radburn' planned estates) has been undertaken in an outer suburban public housing estate, there is a perception by residents and other stakeholders that crime has reduced (Randolph, Judd and Carmichael 2001). Stubbs and Hardy (2000) in comparing three different approaches to estate renewal in south western Sydney, found that there was a positive impact on crime and nuisance in each estate either real (demonstrated by a reduction in the rate of convictions) or perceived by tenants - including those estates with intensive tenancy management and changes to allocation policy as opposed to those with significant physical interventions. In one estate in the UK, Osborn and Shaftoe (1995) found that physical intervention (removal of overhead walkways) was not helpful in reducing burglaries. Determining a relationship between physical or other renewal interventions and changes in patterns of crime is therefore problematic. A close scrutiny of all factors contributing to a 'crime environment' is necessary as environmental factors fit within a larger crime context.

It is well appreciated now that a comprehensive mix of measures (physical, governance/management, family, social, community and educational) are necessary to raise the quality of life on public housing estates in a sustainable way. Tackling multiple problems needs to include resourcing and empowering local residents, strengthening local community organizations and NGOs and ensuring long term cooperation, partnerships and consultation (Taylor, 1998). However it is recognised that such an holistic approach is also not easily sustained, particularly where a key element is abandoned, and that social rather than physical measures are the most difficult to implement and sustain.

## Methodology

The methodological framework for the research includes four main elements:

1. Literature review - local and international, on interagency approaches to crime prevention/reduction, with particular reference to public housing areas. This provides an understanding of the theoretical frameworks of crime prevention, epidemiological

mapping and crime and public housing as a context for the research.

2. Policy review – based on documentation from key agencies in three selected states. This provides an understanding of community renewal and crime reduction policy and programs in Australia with particular reference to the states under study (NSW, SA and QLD) consistent with research aim no 1, and will assist in identifying examples of best practice (research aim no. 6).

3. Field research – within three housing estates in each state, including:

    a. Documentation of physical and demographic data for selected estates

    b. Walk-through CPTED evaluation

    c. Stakeholder Interviews

    d. Victimisation mapping survey of 50-100 residents on each estate

This will provide detailed information on crime strategies on the selected estates (research aim no. 2), the degree and nature of program integration (research aim no. 3) and community partnerships (research aim no. 4) and (in conjunction with an analysis of crime statistics and victimisation survey) will identify examples of best practice (research aim 6).

4. Spatial Analysis of Crime Data – from the following sources and for the following geographical levels and time frames:

    a. Operational police data, mapped for the first, third and fifth years over a five year period (three in SA[1]) for each selected estate/housing area

    b. Operational police data for the same years, aggregated for the band of Collectors Districts immediately surrounding the estate area

    c. Recorded crime statistics (from Crime Statistics offices and ABS) for the same years at postcode, LGA and metropolitan geographic levels.

This will provide an understanding of changes in the frequency and distribution of crime in the nine study areas (research aim 5) and in relation to 3 above assist in identifying examples of best practice (Research aim 6)

*Selection of Cases*

Three states have been selected for study (NSW, SA and QLD), all of which have significant estate renewal programs, accessible police operational data, central crime prevention agencies and community based policing policy, but with some differences in governmental structures and administrative and funding arrangements for crime prevention.

---

[1] Three consecutive years in the same five year period only available from South Australia

Three public housing estates have been selected from the metropolitan area of each state in consultation with SHAs to include:

1. An estate with a renewal program involving significant physical intervention

2. An estate with a renewal program involving primarily social/community development

3. A 'control' estate with neither of the above

This selection of cases will enable an analysis of the relative effectiveness of crime prevention strategies associated with two kinds of community renewal programs (those with a strong emphasis on physical interventions and those primarily using community development strategies) in relation to estates without any formal renewal program.

An attempt has also been made to match these estates as much as possible according to urban location, age and size of the estate, and the commencement date of the renewal program.

*Field Research*

Documentation of the estates is well under way, stakeholder interviews have been conducted and a preliminary CPTED walk-through analysis is completed. Planning for victimisation survey is currently under way.

*User Group*

A user group has been set up to advise on the project and assist with access to housing and crime data, including representation from both housing and police authorities as follows:

- Michelle Brown, Acting General Manager, Community Renewal, QLD Dept of Housing

- Chris Dayman, Project Manager, Urban Regeneration, SA Dept of Human Services

- Kosette Lambert, Senior Project Officer, SA Police

- Chief Inspector Phil McCamley, NSW Police Department

- Ross Woodward, Regional Director, South Western Sydney, NSW Dept of Housing

*Analysis of Crime Data*

Access to police operational data is secured in two states (SA and QLD) and in principle in NSW (awaiting agreement to final conditions). Identification of context crime data is in progress.

*Interpretation and Comparability*

There is a wide range of external variables that are likely to have a bearing on crime rates. Given the complexity of the background and temporal variables, establishing linear causality

between local interventions and crime rates/patterns, and comparability between estates, is problematic.  For this reason a case study approach will be taken where at the primary level of analysis each estate will be treated as a unique case in its own right to explore relationships between interventions and changes in patterns of crime over time.  A secondary level of analysis will, however, involve a comparison between findings for estates either within or between jurisdictions to enable generalisations about these relationships.

The evidence used will include both quantitative and qualitative data and will be analysed using comparative matrices.  Hypothetically, strategies are expected to produce varying consequences, some more successful than others in reducing crime and harassment.

## Conclusion

The policy and literature reviews undertaken confirm that public housing estate renewal and community-based crime prevention initiatives are now well established in Australia and reflect international shifts in policy and practice concerning social housing and crime.  Also confirmed is that crime is a matter of central concern in areas of high public housing concentrations, and that inter-agency approaches are now recognised as crucial.  However it is also evident that despite the intentions about addressing crime in such areas, very little has been done to actually measure changes in the incidence and distribution of crime associated with these interventions.  The analysis of crime statistics that has been undertaken using postcode level data is too generalised to account for changes in patterns of crime at the neighbourhood level.  The combined use of mapped operational police data, victimisation surveys and stakeholder interviews proposed in this study for nine housing areas will provide a basis for understanding more about the intersection between housing, policing and communities in addressing problems of crime and harassment in areas of high public housing concentration and socio-economic disadvantage.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Public housing estates feature amongst the most disadvantaged urban areas in Australia (Vinson 1999; Randolph, *et al*, 2001) and socio-economic disadvantage has been shown to be associated with higher levels of crime (Devery,1992).   Crime, fear of crime and harassment are major issues of concern on many public housing estates and impact both on the quality of life of residents and on housing and other community service systems.  The crime reduction strategies of State police and justice departments also target areas of high crime, which often include public housing estates.  Increasingly, it is becoming recognised by housing and police agencies alike that effective approaches to crime reduction in these areas require inter-agency and community partnerships and a whole-of-government approach. (Osborn and Shaftoe, 1995; Bell Planning Associates and Gaston, 1995).

In recent years State government housing authorities in Australia have devoted an increasing proportion of their budgets to address the problems associated with high concentrations of multiple disadvantage on public housing estates through a range of housing interventions that come under the general umbrella of 'estate improvement' or 'community renewal' programs. Crime and harassment feature prominently among the problems identified in these estates and in the objectives and strategies of these programs. The key strategies employed include:

- physical improvements (housing and urban) including re-configuration of estates

- de-concentration through asset sales and redevelopment (involving the private sector) to change tenure and social mix,

- localised housing management initiatives (including stock transfers to community housing)

- social/community development initiatives

- improved service integration/coordination (including 'whole of government initiatives)

and various combinations of these (Randolph and Judd, 2000; Randolph et al, 2001).

Most estate improvement programs in Australia have focused strongly on physical and management interventions, often in combination with asset sales and, increasingly, with service integration and social/community development initiatives in some cases as part of a whole of government or place management approach.   Physical interventions often incorporate CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles (Stollard 1991) advocated for some time by housing authorities (Sarkissian 1984) and more recently by police (McCamley 1992, and undated).  Collaboration and service agreements between housing authorities and police and human services agencies are also often involved.

While there is anecdotal evidence (see for example Randolph and Judd 2001) suggesting that community renewal initiatives, particularly those involving major physical interventions, are associated with perceived reductions in crime, at least in the short term, empirical evidence is very limited indeed, and in some cases appears to provide contradictory findings for neighbouring estates (eg Stubbs and Hardy, 2000). There is even more uncertainty as to the relative influence of physical, managerial and social initiatives, and little international evidence to suggest that physically biased crime prevention strategies are sustained over time unless part of a more holistic social and economic approach (Osborn and Shaftoe 1995). The CPTED movement, which initially emphasised the importance of the design of the physical environment, also now accepts the need for a more integrated approach involving social and community based initiatives along with physical interventions (Saville and Cleveland, 1998; Korthals Altes and van Soomeren, 1998).

An important source of evidence of changes in crime patterns are crime statistics based either on police operational data or court convictions which are collected by State Government police services and crime statistics agencies using a common national set of offence categories. The former are, indeed, often used by police to assist community renewal programs in identifying crime hot spots and even in informal monitoring of changes in patterns of crime. However, they have not been systematically used to study crime changes over time in community renewal areas. One significant advantage of these data is that they are often spatially mapped, or geo-coded so that they can be, which enables a spatial analysis of reported crime at varying geographic levels right down to the scale of the neighbourhood. However, the accuracy of reporting for these operational data can be a problem. These are often used informally by police to assist community renewal programs in identifying crime hotspots and monitoring changes in patterns of crime. Crime statistics based on court data, while much more accurate, are limited to recording convictions, and are generally only disaggregated down to postcode level – which is inadequate for spatial analysis of crime at the scale of the neighbourhood.

Neither of these sources, however, reflect unreported crime, harassment and fear of crime (which impacts on life quality), all of which can only be inferred from victim surveys. Although the ABS does undertake Crime and Safety Surveys (ABS 1999), victimisation data from these is only aggregated at State level. The Australian Institute of Criminology also publishes police data and a Crime Atlas (Carcach et al, 2000), but only at regional scales.

Given the emphasis in estate improvement programs on physical interventions, the spatial dimension is important in revealing patterns of crime and perceptions of vulnerability (also expressed as avoidance behaviour) in relation to particular built environment and public realm features and to allow investigations of how these change with time and in relation to design interventions. Mapped police operational data and victimisation surveys are clearly the most

useful in this regard. However, ABS Census Collector District (CD) level and regional crime data can also provide useful context data for indicating local displacement or beneficial 'halo' transformations in overall crime trends.

In earlier and current work on public housing estates and university campuses (Samuels 1995a, 1995b), spatial mapping methods were developed which combined mapped police operational data and victimisation sample surveys to investigate the spatial distribution of reported and unreported crime and harassment.  However, none of these studies have compared these patterns before and during estate improvement interventions - as proposed in this project.

## 1.2    Aims and Scope of the Research

This project aims to investigate:

1. the range of crime reduction strategies employed by housing, police and other agencies in public housing areas in three States (NSW, Qld and SA),

2. details of the crime reduction strategies on nine selected public housing estates  - six (2 each in NSW, Qld and SA) which have been subject to estate improvement interventions and three (1 in each state)  'control' estates not subject to a renewal program,

3. the degree and nature of program integration between housing and other agencies,

4. the extent and nature of community partnerships within these programs, and

5. changes in the frequency and distribution of crime and harassment in the selected public housing estates during early, mid and later periods after interventions – compared with a control estate in each state (in which no or minimal interventions have occurred).

6. best practice models for crime prevention on public housing estates to inform policy development.

The study will focus on the five year period 1997-2001 of estate improvement/community renewal programs of the three State governments (NSW, SA and Qld) – each of which has attempted to address crime through housing interventions and varying degrees of integrated crime reduction partnerships involving police, other agencies and the community.

The study will use spatially mapped operational police data relating to the time and location of specific offences within estate boundaries (in NSW and SA only), supplemented by rates at CD level in surrounding areas, within the context of regional crime patterns. A victimisation survey indicative of residents' experiences (in all three States and on all nine estates evaluated) will complement this study.

The findings will provide evidence about the relationship between different kinds of

community renewal interventions; interagency partnerships for crime reduction; and changes in patterns of crime and to generalise principles and best practice models for crime and harassment reduction outcomes on public housing estates.

## 2.    POLICY CONTEXT

## 2.1    Renewal of Public Housing Estates

*The international policy context*

Large public housing estates in most developed nations have declined (economically, socially and physically) over the last 20-25 years (NCPA, 1993; NSWDH, undated; Bowie, 1997; Spiller, Gibbins, Swan, 2000; Stegman, 1998; Maclennan, 1998; Monro, 1997-98).   In the United States the problems of racially segregated, crime prone high-rise blocks were addressed in the 1980s as part of a nationally funded public housing modernisation program. Renewal strategies comprised the relocation of residents from the high-rise units, and selective demolition of the blocks and construction of replacement housing.   Relocation of tenants primarily involved two programs: a housing allowance scheme, which assisted tenants to rent private housing in other neighbourhoods; and a 'scattered sites' strategy of small-scale housing projects on a variety of sites in mixed income localities.

In the United Kingdom (UK) and Europe the most significant problem is the mass housing built between the mid 1950s and late 1970s.   Housing stock primarily consists of large flat developments and high-rise units, constructed in large estates and often poorly located in relation to transport and services.   Renewal has involved three stages.   The first stage comprised physical improvements.   The second stage consisted of changes in local tenancy management (i.e. locating local offices on the estates), efforts to involve residents in managing problems on the estates, and developing and maintaining connections to social services and law enforcement agencies.   The third stage focuses on social exclusion, and aims to address the underlying causes of poverty, disadvantage and marginalisation, with strategies linked to welfare reform policies.   These policies are prominent in the UK.   The UK's Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy aims to improve the poorest neighbourhoods by placing an emphasis on local strategic partnerships and cooperative solutions involving government and non-government agencies and the private sector, and by providing opportunities for residents, community and voluntary groups to take leadership roles in their community. (NSWDH, undated)

*Public Housing Estates in Australia*

Public housing estates, developed across Australia during the 1950s to mid 1980s, are areas where there is a high concentration of public housing dwellings, and increasingly over the last fifteen years have become sites of economic and social disadvantage, physical deterioration and crime.  The declining nature of estates is the outcome of many factors, including reduced funding for public housing accompanied by an increase in the overall demand for this tenure, targeted allocations, geographic isolation, inadequate investment in local infrastructure and services, and poorly maintained housing stock (Arthurson, 1996 and 1998; Bowey, 1997;

Caulfield, 2000; Monro, 19997-98; NSWDH, undated; O'Brien, 1997; 1999 and 2001; Randolph & Judd, 2000a and 2000b; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000).

A large decline in capital funding for public housing stock has occurred over recent years, together with a growth in the provision of rental assistance to enable low-income people to rent in the private sector. This has been accompanied by a greatly increased demand for public (and other forms of social) housing, due to a decline in low-cost private rental housing and a growing lack of affordability in the private rental market. Policy changes that have generated further demand include the widening of eligibility to include youth and the introduction of de-institutionalisation in the 1980s.

Due to lengthening waiting lists, public housing has been increasingly targeted at persons/households in greatest need, and a large growth in "priority" allocations has occurred. Eligibility for a priority allocation can include homelessness, escaping domestic violence, suffering disabilities or mental illness, or a family where children are at risk of being taken into care unless a home is found. Applicants for priority housing are usually housed on large estates due to their higher vacancy rates and shorter waiting times. Consequently, the tenant profile on these estates has altered significantly over the past fifteen years, and now includes a substantial increase in the proportion of tenants on statutory incomes and people with greater and more complex needs and support requirements.

Housing estates are often remote from employment opportunities, facilities and services; public transport provision remains inadequate; and local infrastructure is deficient. A mismatch exists between, household size and dwelling size, and the needs of a broader range of tenants, including an increasing proportion of lone-parent and lone-person households. The design and layout of estates and design of dwellings fails to provide the required amenity; and housing stock is of poor quality, having aged and deteriorated over the years, and now requires high levels of maintenance. In addition, a gradual withdrawal of government facilities/services and local business from many estates has occurred. Furthermore, estates have been subject to rising levels of crime and personal security issues.

In response, renewal strategies have been introduced on housing estates in New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. Renewal is a broad approach to addressing the range of factors that contribute to high levels of disadvantage. Renewal areas are selected according to indicators of disadvantage, including: unemployment rates; proportion of households on low incomes; percentage of sole-parent households; public housing concentration; social problems related to alcohol and drugs; inadequate infrastructure and support services; poor health and educational outcomes; lack of recreational facilities; shortage of employment and training initiatives; incidence of crime; and high vacancy and turnover rates (QLDDH, 2001a and 2001b; Randolph et al, 2000; SAHT, 1998).

*Renewal Initiatives in New South Wales (NSW)*

The NSW Department of Housing (NSWDH) commenced renewal on its housing estates in 1995, initially through the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) (NSWDH, undated; Randolph et al, 2001; SCLJ, 2000). Renewal objectives include: ensuring greater physical integration of the estates; with the surrounding neighbourhood; helping to reduce crime and the stigma associated with estates; and contributing to increased tenant satisfaction (with outcomes including reduced vandalism, tenant turnover, vacancy rates, rejections of offers and rent arrears) (NSWDH, undated).

NIP strategies included physical upgrades to dwellings and estate infrastructure; innovations in housing management; involvement of tenants in decision-making about the work being undertaken; involving other social housing providers in managing properties on estates; and improving the provision of services from other agencies (NSWDH, undated and 1997). The Department sought partnerships with: government and non-government agencies to improve service provision to residents; the Commonwealth to ensure tenants had access to employment opportunities; and the police, local government, business and other key stakeholders to prevent and reduce crime and anti-social behaviour on estates. In June 1999 the Community Renewal Program (CRP) superseded the NIP (Randolph et al, 2000).

NIP and Community Renewal (CR) work has now been completed, or is underway, on a total of 28 estates (NSWDH, undated). On some of the larger estates (e.g. Bidwill – also a fieldwork location) the work is extensive, and includes: reversing the orientation of dwellings on Radburn designed estates; closure of walkways; construction of new road links; establishment and rejuvenation of parks; selective demolition of small numbers of properties (in some cases this provides redevelopment sites for private housing); upgrading of dwellings (both internally and externally; new external fencing; improvements to external lighting and security; and additional community facilities (i.e. neighbourhood houses).

Other aspects of the NSWDH's policies and practices are intended to assist in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour on the estates. In particular an increased presence of client services staff; the Good Neighbour Policy, which reinforces tenants' rights and responsibilities in relation to anti-social behaviour; early intervention of client service staff in dealing with anti-social behaviour on the estates; and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Police Service (NSWDH, undated; Randolph et al, 2000). The MOU sets out the roles and responsibilities of both agencies in relation to NSWDH properties and the exchange of information (NSWDH, undated). Regular senior level meetings take place between the NSWDH and the Police Service to improve the Department's response to problem tenancies where drug taking is involved (NSWDH, undated).

The Department also states its intention to: work in partnership with other government agencies, tenants, business and community groups to prevent crime and increase safety; and

draw up local Crime Prevention Action Plans (with responsibility for specific actions agreed to by the agencies involved) (NSWDH, undated). Partnerships are also to be expanded with the Commonwealth Government, Job Network Agencies, Group Training Companies, and Local and Regional Organisations to improve the access of residents to employment opportunities (NSWDH, undated). The Department will also increase employment opportunities for residents through the Tenant Employment Clause (in service, building and construction contracts), Community Contracts (i.e. contracts to perform works for the Department selectively tendered to Job Network Agencies), and training linked to employment.

The Department also aims to improve life on 'problem estates' for tenants through initiatives such as Intensive Tenancy Management (ITM), the key elements of which are: an on-site housing management team; a flexible local allocations policy; a smaller number of tenancies per housing than in other areas; use of a local handyperson for minor maintenance; and support for local community development work (NSWDH, undated). ITM was established as a demonstration project in Bidwill and Minto Hill in late 1998, and provides an opportunity to examine the extent to which non-asset interventions can achieve significant community renewal outcomes. In late 2000 ITM was extended to six other locations (Booragul/Bolton Point, Bonnyrigg, Redfern, South Moree, Toongabbie, and West Dubbo).

Other initiatives to improve the quality of life of tenants comprise the Client Services Outreach officers located on Cranebrook, Airds/Bradbury, Kempsey and Inverell estates for easy access by tenants; additional Client Service staff (and in some cases local offices) located on or near estates for improved accessibility; and Specialist Client Services Officers (generally located on the estates) to provide intensive housing assistance and appropriate links to support services for tenants with complex needs (NSWDH, undated). In addition, the management of 135 properties in Claymore has been transferred to Argyle Community Housing and allows for much higher ratios of staff to tenants; and similarly, the management of a section of Cranebrook has been transferred to Wentworth Community Housing (NSWDH, undated; SCLJ, 2000). Also, to reduce the concentration of residents with 'severe disadvantage' and diversify the social mix of tenants on major estates the NSWDH employs flexible local allocations policies and sales to tenants; and is investigating the possibility of divesting a proportion of estate properties to private developers for redevelopment and sale in the affordable housing market (or engaging in "joint venture" developments) (NSWDH, undated).

Initiatives to increase tenant involvement and participation include 'street by street and precinct by precinct' consultation; Neighbourhood Advisory Boards (NABs) (comprising tenants, NSWDH client service staff, and representatives from local agencies); funding local community organisations (through the Housing Communities Assistance Program - HCAP) to employ a HCAP worker on nine estates (including Bidwill – a fieldwork location) to provide

support to tenants to enable them to participate in NABs and other structures (NSWDH, undated). Also, the Department provides financial support (through the Tenant and Community Initiatives Program - TCIP) to independent tenants organisations (that provide support and advocacy for tenants in their negotiations with the Department and other housing providers) for a range of local projects and training to support their participation in NABs. The TCIP also provides training for tenants in a range of skills, including advocacy. On some estates with significant numbers of Aboriginal tenants or tenants from non-English speaking backgrounds (such as Waterloo, Moree and Dubbo), additional training and support has been provided.

A Joint Guarantee of Service between the NSWDH and Health Department, which aims to achieve coordinated provision of services to people with an enduring mental illness (NSWDH, undated). Also, services from a range of agencies (including community health, Centrelink, legal aid, breakfast programs, play centres and TAFE outreach programs) have been co-located on estates such as Claymore, Miller, Bellambi and South Kempsey to improve access for tenants. In addition, the NSWDH provides community facilities on some estates, which provide a base for local community development workers (including those funded through HCAP), and a venue for community meetings and activities.

The Department intends to seek the support of key agencies to establish Integrated Community Renewal Action Plans where priority estates are located (NSWDH, undated). The Plans will identify priorities and outcomes to be achieved; include tenant and community involvement in their development; be comprehensive in their approach to social and economic problems; and indicate particular strategies. Further MOUs and Joint Guarantees of Service will be developed with key agencies to ensure tenants are provided with the required range of services; further "one-stop-shops" established on major estates; and the support of the Human Services agencies/Ministers to establish a small number of "Service Integration" demonstration projects (whereby services would be delivered in a more streamlined, coherent and flexible way).

*Renewal initiatives in South Australia (SA)*

South Australia has historically had a significantly higher proportion (11.2% in 1991) of public rental housing than other states due to the use of public housing to support industrial development and more generous eligibility criteria than other states (Arthurson 1996). Much of the public housing was, therefore, located on large estates close to major industries – such as near the Chrysler factory in Adelaide's southern suburbs and General Motors Holden and the defence and aviation industries in the outer northern suburbs and the satellite city of Elizabeth (Peel 1995). The decline of the manufacturing sector has hit the South Australian economy hard and contributed to high levels of unemployment which, compounded by the changing demographics of public tenants and their increasing eligibility for rent rebates led,

inevitably, by the 1980's to a burgeoning public debt and the marginalisation of public housing as a tenure of last resort. Much of the public housing stock was ageing, poorly maintained and poorly matched to the needs of the new clientele. A report of the South Australian Public Accounts Committee on public housing assets in 1986 recommended a much more strategic approach to asset management which led to the adoption of a life cycle planning model by the SAHT resulting in improved maintenance procedures and putting the issue of disposal and redevelopment of obsolete stock on the agenda. (Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000).

The first housing estate renewal in South Australia, therefore, dates from as early as 1986, with the demolition of 60 outmoded 'double units' (semi detached houses) in Mitchell Park in Adelaide's southern suburbs, and their replacement with 117 dwellings at higher density – all for public rental (Arthurson 1996; Carson et al, 1998; NCPA, 1993). However, this was a purely physical approach to renewal and urban consolidation without any serious attempt to address social problems of the area - in fact the increased concentration was perceived to have compounded the problems.

In 1991 a study of area disadvantage in Adelaide for the Planning Review, revealed high levels of multiple disadvantage on public housing estates in Adelaide warranting government intervention to improve quality of life (Forster, 1991). The Planning Review also advocated a more strategic approach to urban consolidation policy with a focus on "underutilised land" and "redeveloping degraded sites" in the middle suburbs and a continuation of consolidation initiatives on the urban fringe to provide housing diversity and affordability (SADEP 1991).

A significant shift in the SAHTs approach to estate renewal also occurred in 1990 with the adoption of a policy to reduce overall public housing stock and introduce social and tenure mix into the large estates via a program of asset disposal and re-development in partnership with the private development industry. In this 'revenue neutral' model, income from sales and redevelopment (where possible at higher densities) was intended to offset the cost of upgrading or replacing existing stock and any improvements to the public domain or community facilities (Findlay and Bach, 1993).

Two of the early renewal projects adopting this approach were the second stage of Mitchell Park (commenced 1990) and the Rosewood redevelopment project in Elizabeth North (commenced 1991) both involving partnerships with the development industry and local government aiming at significant reductions in public housing stock (from 80% to 25% in Mitchell Park, and from 50% to the metropolitan average of 11% in Rosewood), an upgrading of the public domain, infrastructure and community facilities. (Arthurson 1996; NCPA 1993; Spiller Gibbins Swan, 2000). Although still focussing strongly on physical interventions, there was also a new emphasis on the social objectives of creating more balanced communities with greater civic pride and identity and recognition of the need for community consultation and participation to ensure support for the redevelopment process. However

along with de-concentration of the estates came a new set of social concerns about the equity and impact of permanent relocation of increasing numbers of tenants (Peel, 1995).

In 1994 the SAHT adopted a formal Redevelopment Strategy which outlined the extent and staging of estate redevelopment for the next 10 years including social, economic and environmental criteria against which the program could be assessed.  A Draft Redevelopment Policy was also prepared which set broad financial, social and environmental objectives for projects while allowing flexibility for individual projects to respond to local needs (Arthurson 1996).  It also established principles for community consultation including information displays and dissemination, surveys of residents about relocation preferences, and community meetings and reference groups (Arthurson, 1996). This set the stage for a succession of estate renewal projects during the mid to late 1990's (Rosewood Stage 2, Hillcrest and Oakden, The Parks and Salisbury North) all of which have adopted a similar public/private partnership, de-concentration/redevelopment model with more formalised community consultation and an increasing emphasis on non-asset strategies such as employment and training programs and partnerships with other government and non-government agencies (including police) to improve integration of services.

In 1997, the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) was incorporated within the new Department of Human Services (DHS) clearly with the intention of providing opportunities for better integration between housing and other human services.   Public housing estate renewal continues to be implemented under the 'urban renewal' program of the SAHT with a strong focus on sales and redevelopment but increasingly incorporating a range of social and community development issues.   Meanwhile the DHS has its own Urban Regeneration Program focussing more on rejuvenating disadvantaged areas through community development, and whole of government approaches than through de-concentration and redevelopment.  A SAHT study of northern metropolitan areas was undertaken between 1997 and 1999 aimed at developing strategies to address the problems of social disadvantage and obsolete stock also advocated the encouragement of community development through partnerships with other agencies.  The obligation to consult SAHT clients about changes to their tenancies and pursue partnerships with other agencies via a whole of government approach was formally embodied within the new SAHT Charter in 1998.  Neighbourhood Development Officers have been appointed to estates undergoing renewal from 1999 to work with communities to improve communication about renewal programs and to implement community development strategies and by 2000 Community Reference Groups were established on renewal estates to provide advice from both public and private residents on renewal activities and act in liaison between the venture partners and the community.  Estate renewal is therefore now seen as integrating asset and non-asset strategies in consultation with communities and in collaboration with other government and non-government agencies.

(Wood, Forthcoming)

*Renewal initiatives in Queensland (QLD)*

The QLD Community Renewal Program (CRP) was established in September 1998, aims to strengthen disadvantaged communities through intensive community action, and involves the development of action plans in the target communities to ensure interventions best meet local needs (QLDDH, 2001; QLD Government, 2000). The CRP works with local communities, councils and other State Government agencies to fund projects of lasting benefit for people living in renewal areas, and has been implemented in 15 sites across QLD (QLD Government, 2000; DP&C, 1999; QLDDH, 2001). The Department of Housing administers the program and has responsibility for planning, developing, implementing, coordinating and evaluating Community Renewal (CR) initiatives. Funding is provided by the QLD Government, and is separate from the Department of Housing's funding through the CSHA (QLDDH, 2001).

Seated alongside the CRP is 'the Department of Housing's Urban Renewal Program [URP], which funds public housing upgrades and redevelopment in areas with a high concentration of older public housing' (QLDDH, 2001). In contrast, CR addresses the social and economic well being of particular communities and their physical environment beyond the boundaries of their housing block. Given that nearly all CR areas contain a large amount of public housing stock, there also is Urban Renewal (UR) expenditure in most of these areas. One of the CR areas has a high concentration of relatively poor quality private housing; another is an Indigenous community with housing primarily owned by the local council (QLDDH, 2000).

Urban Renewal objectives focus on improving the visual appearance and physical environment of the suburb; creating an aesthetically pleasant and desirable residential environment; applying the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design; reducing the amount of public housing in the area through offering opportunities for affordable home ownership; enhancing the physical quality of housing; realigning housing stock to meet changing community needs; and creating employment opportunities for residents through involvement on the capital works program (QLDDH, undated:a).

The objectives of the CRP relate to improved safety and security; social and economic integration of residents; their accessibility to community services and facilities; opportunities for young people; improved neighbourhood amenity; ensuring projects are funded that will have lasting and positive impacts; and making communities central to achieving program objectives (QLDDH, 2001). Community Action Plans (that prioritise local issues in consultation with the communities and government) have been developed or are in the process of being developed for all renewal areas (QLDDH, 2001). Community Reference Groups comprising a cross section of the community meet regularly in each renewal area to discuss the progress of renewal and initiatives developed through Community Action Plans.

Regional Managers Forums have been established throughout QLD, comprising senior managers of QLD Government departments and councils, who meet to discuss issues of importance in their regions (QLDDH, 2001). CR draws on these forums to gather senior level support for the program, gain assistance in implementing coordination in renewal areas, and avoid any duplication of effort. CRP projects are monitored by Project Coordination Groups made up of CR and UR staff (where relevant), councils, and relevant departments. Joint working arrangements have also been established with other departments with interests in the renewal areas, and include sub-committees and working groups overseeing projects that work in partnerships with councils. Some renewal areas also have Program Coordinators, who are responsible for developing links between projects and coordinating the delivery of initiatives. They are also responsible for employment opportunities and business ventures in renewal areas together with the Department of Employment, Training and Industrial Relations and Department of State Development. In addition, CR has set up regular working group meetings with senior managers of other key government agencies to gain support at the central office level.

The CRP is part of the QLD Government's Crime Prevention Strategy – Building Safer Communities (BSC) and seeks to address the causes of crime and disadvantage in specified localities (QLDDH, 2001). The Program is one of the eleven funded crime prevention initiatives in QLD (DP&C, 1998), with crime prevention measures including job creation activities, improved public facilities and recreational facilities, and organised graffiti and public arts projects. As such, the primary goal of the CRP is to fund and implement strategies to reduce crime, and raise the confidence and image of identified communities (QLDDH, 2001a).

Sites for CR are selected on the basis of 'indicators of disadvantage such as unemployment rates, proportion of households on low incomes, percentage of sole parent households, housing provision and incidence of juvenile and general crime' (QLDDH, 2001). Associated with this disadvantage are various issues of concern to people living and working in the renewal communities 'like declining community trust, increasing crime and negative images of these areas' (QLDDH, 2001). The CRP therefore funds joint programs that address crime, unemployment, local business development, education and training, family support and facilities.

*Summary*

Although there are earlier examples of physical improvement programs on the older public housing estates in the three states under study, the current set of community renewal policies are really a product of the 1990s commencing earliest in South Australia (1991) (NCPA, 1993), followed by NSW (1994/5) (NSWSH, undated; Randolph et al, 2001) and most recently by Queensland (1998) (QLDDH, 2001; QLD Government, 2000). Similarities in the

programs (particularly in NSW and SA) include an early bias toward physical regeneration followed later by a growing recognition of the importance of social and community development initiatives, community consultation and the need for a whole-of-government approach involving partnerships with other service agencies (including the police).

Differences between the three states include a strong emphasis on overall stock reduction, de-concentration and redevelopment in partnership with local government and the private sector in South Australia; higher levels of stock retention and emphasis on reconfiguration of 'Radburn' planned estates and Intensive Tenancy Management (ITM) in NSW; and auspicing of renewal activities through local government and other public agencies in Queensland. Funding arrangements are also different for the three states with NSW funding renewal from within CSHA funds, Queensland from state funds via a broad across-government Crime Prevention Strategy, and South Australia using a self-funding approach from within each renewal project.

## 2.2   Crime Prevention

*The international policy context*

Crime prevention initiatives introduced in Australia are broadly in line with recent developments in crime prevention overseas; and a growing consensus among practitioners and researchers that crime prevention requires a strong local focus, a multiple agency approach, and a more active role from local government (CJC, 1999).

The European Forum for Urban Security, established in 1987 to provide a Europe-wide crime prevention body, has articulated three principles for optimal crime prevention: the use of a central coalition to manage and resource crime prevention partnerships; the need for a technical coordinator to administer the coalition's problem-solving approach; and community input, with actions targeted at local priorities and needs (CJC, 1999).  This new approach has resulted in a profusion of initiatives, both nationally and internationally, including the British, Canadian and Australian approaches discussed below.

In Britain, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 has placed statutory requirements on local authorities (councils and police services) to establish crime and disorder partnerships, and to include any probation committee or health authority in the local area (CJC, 1999).  The Act also gives the Secretary of State the power to name other agencies for mandatory inclusion. Partnerships are required to prepare and implement a detailed three-year strategy for crime reduction, based on an analysis of crime and disorder in the local area plus the views of community members; and to report to the Secretary of State on the progress of implementation.

In Canada, the Department of Justice has developed a four-phase model to assist in implementing the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime prevention (CJC, 1999). This model is detailed in the document: Building a Safer Canada: A Community-based Crime

Prevention Manual (1998), and emphasises collaboration with individuals and organisations who are interested in crime prevention. The four-phases comprise: identifying and describing problems; developing an action plan; carrying out the action plan; and monitoring and evaluation the program. A second document: Step by Step: Evaluating Your Community Crime Prevention Efforts (1998) provides a detailed guide for the design and conduct of the evaluation.

*State and local level crime prevention initiatives in Australia*

A growing awareness exists among state and local governments in Australia that the implementation of crime prevention measures requires a range of stakeholders to act co-operatively with local communities. For example, Report 1 of the Inquiry into Crime Prevention through Social Support conducted by the Law and Justice Standing Committee of the NSW Parliament designates the following state agencies as key players in crime prevention. (SCLJ, 1999; refer also NSWPS, 2001):

> The Cabinet Office
>
> The Premiers Council on Crime Prevention
>
> Attorney Generals Department
>
> Premiers Department
>
> The Police Service
>
> The Department of Community Services
>
> The Ageing and Disability Department
>
> NSW Health
>
> The Department of Education and Training
>
> The Department of Sport and Recreation
>
> The Department of Juvenile Justice
>
> The Department of Corrective Services
>
> The Officer of Commissioner for Children and Young People
>
> The Department of Housing
>
> The Department of Urban Affairs and Planning [now NSW Planning]
>
> The Department of Aboriginal Affairs

These agencies either have a direct role in developing and implementing strategies to reduce offending behaviour or a vital role in developing programs and delivering services that can support vulnerable families, children and communities and thus lessen the likelihood of

criminal activity (SCLJ, 1999).

In discussing the programs administered by these agencies, the Crime Prevention through Social Support Report gives prominence to crime prevention at a local government level. At the local level, stakeholders in crime include the police service, health and community services, employment services, housing and accommodation services, schools, neighbourhood centres, youth services, local government, community groups and local business (NSWAG's, 1998:9). Also, many services and programs may not have crime prevention as a stated aim but this may occur as a by-product. For example community health or baby health centres may offer parenting skills courses or home visits to new mothers at risk, and local councils may employ a youth officer or a recreation officer or include crime prevention in a specific plan such as their Management Plan (NSWAG's, 1998).

State police services have also placed their focus on local communities and have recently adopted problem-oriented-policing (POP) and partnership policing (reflecting an international shift towards this form of policing) (QLDPS, undated). This approach involves looking beyond individual crimes to patterns of recurrent incidents and the community problems associated with these incidents. Police officers use 'intelligence' data to identify these trends and underlying causes, and collaborate with SHAs and the community (where appropriate) to identify likely offenders who are then specifically targeted.

The following policy account focuses on policy initiatives introduced in the three states of Australia where research for this project is being conducted: New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. An approach to crime prevention similar to these initiatives (and those in Britain and Canada) has also been introduced in Victoria.[2]

*Crime prevention initiatives in New South Wales (NSW)*

The NSW Premier's Council on Crime Prevention, which met for the first time in October 1995, is at the centre of the NSW Government's goal to achieve crime prevention partnerships among all sectors, and reduce the incidence of crime through the development, promotion and implementation of relevant strategies. The Council is chaired by the Premier and comprises 11 ministers and 8 non-ministerial members drawn from academia and private/community sectors. A Crime Prevention Resource Manual (CPRM) specifically for local councils has been prepared under the auspices of the Council, and was launched on 20 October 1998. Financial and in-kind support for the development of the CPRM was provided by: the Department of Local Government, the NSW Police Service, NSW Planning, the NSW Attorney Generals Department, the Local Government and Shires Association, and Waverley Council (NSWDLG, 98/87 and NSWAG's, 1998). In addition, a Premier's Working Party was formed in 1998 to deal with youth and crime issues in the Bankstown and Canterbury local

---

[2] The Victorian Government has developed strategic crime prevention partnerships, and identified local councils as the lead agencies in convening partnerships and compiling community safety plans (CJC, 1999:51).

government areas (LGAs) with representation from the local councils; and similarly, South Sydney Council participates in the Redfern-Waterloo Partnership Project with the Premiers Department, which targets crime and other issues of concern in the Redfern-Waterloo area (South Sydney City Council, 2002).

A Crime Prevention Division (CPD) was established in Attorney Generals Department (AGs) in May 1996, and is the NSW Government's key agency for strategic policy advice on the prevention of crime. The CPD acts as the secretariat to the Premier's Council; has established an integrated approach to crime prevention between government, community and private sector agencies; and developed a Crime Prevention Strategic Plan for endorsement by the Council. The Plan provides a whole of government approach to address and prevent a range of specific crimes and those factors that contribute to particular crimes (NSWAG's, 1998).

The main work of the CPD is to assist local communities, particularly through local government, to develop crime prevention in their areas. The CPD provides this assistance through the development of crime prevention resources that local communities can use, the provision of training information and advice about crime prevention planning and implementation, and the administration of the Safer Communities Development Fund (SCDF). This fund provides financial support to councils and communities for: the development of innovative crime prevention initiatives; development and implementation of local crime prevention plans; endorsement of their plans as 'Safer Community Compacts' (refer below); implementation of Compact initiatives; and/or to undertake specific crime prevention projects nominated by the NSW Attorney General's Department (NSWAG's, 1998; SCLJ, 1999 and CPD, 1999).

The Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997 provides a statutory basis for the endorsement of local council crime prevention plans as 'Safer Community Compacts' by the Attorney General (following consultation with the Community Services and Police Ministers). The Act states a number of issues, which the Attorney must consider before endorsing a local crime prevention plan. Guidelines have been issued by the CPD to assist councils that wish to apply for a Safer Community Compact. The Act also provides for the establishment of the SCDF.

Strategic Projects Division of the Premier's Department has pursued several "whole of government" experiments in crime prevention, primarily through place management projects in Cabramatta, Kings Cross and Moree. These areas have a high level of social problems, including high crime rates. Place management is a way of governing differently at all levels in NSW. Projects to date have had a high level of involvement from local councils. Place management calls for policy makers to appoint a "place manager" who is accountable for outcomes in a specific geographical area. In crime prevention terms the outcome would be

"community safety", with the place manager using any of the resources available (police, local council, other government agencies, and community organisations) to achieve this outcome. The Cabramatta Project, which is a joint Premier's Department/Fairfield Council initiative, includes 15 projects targeting crime through police operations, employment and urban planning (NSWAG's, 1998; SCLJ, 2000; CPD, 2000).

The NSW Police Service (NSWPS) has established a Community Safety Action Plan. In November 1997 a full time community safety officer (also known as a crime prevention officer or "Beat Constable") was appointed to each of the 80 patrols across NSW in support of this plan. These officers are responsible for working with the community to determine the delivery of policing strategies that can be employed to prevent crime and promote community safety, and provide advice and assistance in relation to the delivery of police services in support of local crime prevention activities. These initiatives can involve other state government agencies, non-government organisations and local councils. For example, Waverley Council participates in the Crime Prevention consultation committees set up by the Police of various Patrols in the Waverley LGA, rather than duplicating this work through a separate council initiative (NSWAG's, 1998; NSWPS, 1998 and 2001a, b and c; CPD, undated).

The NSWPS also has a Volunteers in Policing (VIP) program, whereby volunteers assist police and administrative officers in servicing their local community, plus Police Liaison Officers (PLOs) (comprising police officers, administrative officers and volunteers) who form a link between the police and particular client groups (NSWPS, 1998 and undated). Another initiative of the NSWPS is Safer by Design training, based upon CPTED principles (NSWPS, 2001bandd; DUAP, 2001). Safer by Design training assists councils to identify, assess and minimise crime risk, and is provided to town planners, crime prevention officers, designers and key personnel from other agencies.

 Local government is one of the areas of crime prevention of most growth in NSW. In 1999, the Local Government and Shires Association surveyed its 177 members and found that 48 percent had a Community Safety or Crime Prevention Advisory Committee and 20 percent had a formal crime prevention plan (Submission to SCLJ, 1999 cit. SCLJ, 1999; NSWAG's, 1998). To a limited extent, local Councils in NSW have introduced other crime reduction initiatives. These initiatives vary across councils, and include Community and Safety Officers, a Good Parenting Program (NSWAG's, 1998), a manual on how local councils can develop youth crime prevention policies, the development of a regional approach to juvenile crime prevention, a youth crime prevention officer, a Youth Crime Prevention Action Plan, youth projects, and vandalism and graffiti strategies.

Further initiatives include a 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' Development Control Plan (DCP), a 'Community Crime Prevention' DCP (NSWAG's, 1998), and DCPs that include a section on crime prevention. In addition, depending on the nature of the

development applications being assessed, representatives from other organisations such as the NSW Police Service may be invited to attend local council meetings to comment on issues relating to crime prevention (NSWAG's, 1998). Councils also assess development applications using the crime prevention legislative guidelines prepared by the former Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP, 2001; NSWPS, 2001d).[3] These guidelines outline the dimensions of crime risk assessment and the principles for minimising crime risk, including CPTED principles.

*Crime prevention initiatives in South Australia (SA)*

In 1989 the former SA State Government launched a five-year Crime Prevention Strategy, with the aim of moving away from a sole reliance on criminal justice measures in dealing with crime and harnessing broader community involvement and effort in crime prevention (CPU, 1998; NSWAG's, 1998). A Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) was established in the SA Attorney-General's Department (AGs) with a mandate to prevent or reduce crime by involving a range of other partners in crime prevention work (CPU, 1999a).

The CPU developed a Local Crime Prevention Committee Program (LCPCP), which drew upon the experiences of the British Safer Cities Program and the French 'Bonnemaison' approach (CPU, 1998).[4] The LCPCP promoted a broader organisational interest in crime prevention at a local level, supported various programs, and disbursed funds to other organisations to implement programs. A total of 22 local crime prevention committees were established in 30 local government areas (LGAs), with support and funding provided by AGs.

The SA Government announced a new policy direction for the LCPCP in 1995, a shift away from broad based programming and funding towards problem solving approaches to crime prevention (i.e. 'strategies appropriate to the type of crime and/or context of specific locations') (CPU, 1998). Funding was provided to 15 LGAs with sponsorship provided by councils in 13 of these areas (including Port Adelaide Enfield, and Salisbury – fieldwork locations for this research project) (CPU, 1998). Crime prevention committees were established as either formal or informal council advisory committees, and membership typically includes representation from the local council, police and other state government agencies, non-government agencies, community groups, Neighbourhood Watch and residents. However, no state-level protocol exists to identify which agencies should be involved and the nature of their commitment (CPU, 1998).

The overall activities and initiatives undertaken by the committees are identified and assessed in their annual reports, and entered (usually during their implementation stage) in a

---

[3] Amendments to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act enable crime prevention impact to be taken into consideration in assessing planning and development applications (CPD, 2000b).

[4] The British Program involves multi-agency management with an emphasis on the role of local authorities in crime prevention, while the French practice entails regional crime prevention councils entering into a contract with the government around an agreed crime prevention plan.

crime prevention projects database maintained by the CPU.  The database enables the CPU to monitor project work on a program wide basis and all stakeholders to access information about the projects being undertaken.  Upon completion of each project the committees (usually the project officer) provides an evaluation report to the CPU, and the CPU examines the outcome claims of each report in accordance with 'the robustness of the evaluation design, differing operational definitions of crime prevention, displacement effects and other criteria of success.'  This process has informed the terms of reference for future funding cycles of the LCPCP (CPU, 1998), now known as the Local Crime Prevention Program (LCPP) (CPU, 2001; CPU, 1999b).

A total of 14 LGAs received funding for the period 1998-2001 under the LCPP, including Port Adelaide Enfield and Salisbury, plus Onkaparinga (also a fieldwork location).  By 2001 the LCPP had been established in 18 LGAs.  During the triennium the SA Police Service (SAPOL) underwent a major restructure and reorganisation, which has had an external influence on the role of the LCPP.  Fourteen Local Service Areas (LSAs) have been created and a problem-solving model adopted by SAPOL that involves other agencies in crime reduction activities (CPU, 2001; SAPOL, 2001a,b and 1999).  In some areas this is complementary to the LCPP, while in other areas a duplication of efforts is occurring.  An integral part of SAPOL's community-oriented policing is community consultation and working in partnership with local communities to address concerns and underlying causes of crime.  A Community Programs Unit within each LSA provides for decision making at the local level.

*Crime prevention initiatives in Queensland (QLD)*
Crime Prevention Partnerships (CPPs) were established in QLD at the end of 1997 as a State Government 1-year pilot program, based on a model developed by the Australian Community Safety and Research Organisation (ACRO).[5]  This model is largely based on other partnership models in operation overseas (CJC, 1999).  ACRO also prepared the Charter, Strategic Plan, and Policy and Procedures Manual for the CPPs (CJC, 1999).  CPPs are committees consisting of members of the community, chaired by the mayor of the local council.  They comprise representatives from police, local government, youth and ethnic and Aboriginal and Torres Islander groups, local business and the media.  'Their aim is to bring together the various elements of a community in a concerted bid to prevent or reduce crime in a specific local area' (CJC, 1999).

 A State Government grant was provided for each CPP to defray the administrative costs and to fund a full-time coordinator who would guide and support the work of the partnership (CJC, 1999).  In addition, a CPP Central Board chaired by the Police Minister, with representatives from the police, media, local government and academic community, was established to deal

---

[5] 'ACRO is a non-government organisation that aims to work towards crime reduction and the creation of a safer community' (CJC, 1991:2; ACRO, undated).

with matters that could not be resolved locally. In October 1997 the Minister appointed a Social Development Coordinator, who attended meetings of all partnerships, acted as a non-voting member of the Board and had responsibility for the management of the program (CJC, 1999). The Coordinator position was located within the QLD Police Service (QPS) and administered through the Office of the Minister for Police.

CPPs were formed in the LGAs of Mackay, Thuringowa, Sunshine Coast, Gold Coast, Logan (a fieldwork location), Maryborough-Hervey Bay and Toowoomba. Two of the seven partnerships, Gold Coast and Logan, were discontinued before the pilot ended and an eighth site, Woorabinda Aboriginal Community became part of the pilot in May 1998 (CJC, 1999). The Gold Coast coordinator was employed as a crime prevention officer on the local council, and Logan made a decision to revitalise the Community Consultation Committees (CCCs) in the area, two of which had lapsed (CJC, 1999). The existing CCC in Logan had publicly criticised the CPP because it was seen as operating in competition.

In preparation for an expansion of the CPP, the Coalition Government provided further funding to the Program in its 1997-98 State Budget, and established a Crime Prevention Office in May 1998 (CJC, 1999). However, following its election in June 1998, the Beattie Labor Government established a Crime Prevention Task Force under the direction of the Premier to address the causes of crime and implement crime prevention strategies across all areas of government. The Task Force has representatives from members of the community, community agencies, business, youth, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, victims associations, crime prevention specialists and government agencies (QLD Government, 1999). In addition, primary responsibility for crime prevention policy was moved from the Police Minister's portfolio to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (CJC, 1999; CPQ, 2001).

The Central Board of the CPP was disbanded; administration of the program moved from the Office of the Police Minister to the QLD Police Service; funding of the Coordinator position ceased in September 1998 (at the conclusion of the pilot period); and an evaluation of the program was undertaken by the Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to assist in determining whether funding for existing CPPs should continue, and whether the program should be maintained and extended over the longer term. In November 1998, a preliminary evaluation was provided to the Taskforce for consideration, and to address issues relating to the structure and management of the program over the longer term (CJC, 1999). To allow sufficient time for this process to be completed, funding of the program continued for an interim six months.

In December 1999, the Premier launched the QLD Crime Prevention Strategy – Building Safer Communities (BSC) as part of the Government's overall approach to crime (this strategy incorporates the CRP discussed above). BSC aims to create safer and more

supportive communities through Government and Community action, and has a particular focus on intervening early, addressing factors that place young people at risk of crime, and building factors that protect them from engaging in criminal activities (QLD Government, 2000). Key features of BSC are: the establishment of mechanisms to provided strategic direction, and coordination of, government crime prevention initiatives; planning processes designed to facilitate and align delivery of a range of programs across departments; the establishment of a Crime Prevention Fund to support communities working in partnership with government, business and industry; and the establishment of an evaluation program (DP&C, 2000; DP&C, 1999). The Department of Families, Youth and Community Care has also established a Youth Crime Prevention Grants Program to support community crime prevention initiatives for young people (DP&C, 1999).

Six principles are defined in BSC as follows: community involvement and ownership; working better and working together (i.e. integrated and coordinated service delivery at the local level with all stakeholders including families cooperating and working together); a comprehensive approach; a focus on people and places (i.e. 'at risk' targeting); value for money; and a focus on outcomes and on what works (DP&C, 1999). The principle of a comprehensive approach is described as a mix of approaches that include developmental (or early intervention) approaches such as positive parenting programs; community approaches such as targeted employment strategies; situational approaches such as improved street lighting; and criminal justice approaches that emphasise deterrence, incapacitation, and the targeted presence of police.

BSC has established five goals for priority action based on the major concerns raised in public consultations, and issues identified by Australian and international research on crime prevention (DP&C, 1999). Goal 1 is strengthening communities, which comprises the government and community working together in partnerships and combining resources to make communities stronger and more resilient to crime. Government actions to assist in achieving this goal are employment and training programs which assist the long-term unemployed; targeting the causes of social disadvantage; working closely with local community members; and consulting with community members in planning processes. The other goals are supporting families, children and young people; reducing violence; enhancing public safety; and dealing with offending.

Crime Prevention QLD (CPQ) in the Policy Coordination Division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is responsible for guiding the implementation of BSC. CPQ's key functions include providing policy advice to the Premier, facilitating community based crime prevention, coordinating and developing departmental crime prevention policy and programs, and coordinating an evaluation of the strategy (QLDDPC, 2001). A total of 44 crime prevention initiatives have been implemented across 13 QLD Government Departments

(CPQ, 2000). Many local councils also engage in crime prevention activities. The 1999 Local Government and Crime Prevention Survey indicated that over 90 percent of councils with QLD were involved in crime prevention (CPQ, 2000).

The 5 CPP projects in the LGAs shown above have continued, and 4 new and diverse CPP projects have commenced at Tairo, Coolangatta, Darra/Sumner and Fortitude Valley in 2000, managed by local government, with crime prevention plans unique to each community (CPQ, 2000). These additional sites were chosen on the basis of weighted socio-economic and crime data. A place management approach has been adopted, and along with safety and security issues the projects address image and marketing, community infrastructure and services, physical infrastructure, transport and traffic, sport and recreation, open space and parkland, and economic, social and cultural development. Two new resource manuals to assist local government and community groups in planning and organising effective local crime prevention initiatives were distributed State-wide in 2001 (CPQ, 2000).

Eleven Community Access Schools (CASs) have been created in QLD as part of a pilot initiative funded by BSC (through the Community Renewal program, Department of Housing) and managed by Education QLD (CPQ, 2000). Five of these schools are located in the Logan-Beaudesert Education District (including Logan Lea and Woodridge State High Schools – QLDDH, undated). CAS aim to build community capacity through the interchange of school and community resources and partnerships (various models that involve the community in the school have been on trial across QLD); eliminate educational and vocational disadvantage (as an early intervention component of crime prevention); and increase the number of people completing their junior and senior high school education. A wide range of courses are offered outside the normal classroom environment to give local people the basic skills they need to enter the workforce and further their education.

The Qld Police Service has also adopted local level strategies. The Service is engaged in '[p]roblem-oriented policing which focuses on identifying crime spots and 'at risk' premises'; and an '[e]xpansion of Police Shopfronts and Police Beats to increase the visibility of police, particularly in areas of highest disadvantage, supported under the Community Renewal Program' (DP&C, 1999; QLDPS, 2001a&b and undated:b). In some cases, Beat Area Officers (BAOs) are provided with accommodation 'on site' that becomes their base of operations. A position of Police Liaison Officer (PLO), otherwise known as District Community Liaison Officer (DCLO), has also been introduced in each of the 27 Police Districts across the State to promote trust and understanding, and assist the community and police to work together in reducing and preventing crime (Goldsworthy, 1998; QLDPS, 2001c and undated:a). In addition, Volunteers in Policing, based in their local police station, 'work with police to address customer service, community safety and crime prevention needs in the community' (QLDPS, 2001d).

*Summary*

Recent developments in Australian crime prevention policy toward a local, multiple agency approach are consistent with recent trends overseas.  In two of the states under study, Premiers' departments take a leading role in crime prevention policy (the Premier's Council of Crime Prevention in NSW, and the Crime Prevention Strategy – Building Safer Communities in QLD).  All three states have central crime prevention agencies, in NSW (the Crime Prevention Division) and South Australia (Crime Prevention Unit) based in Attorney General's Departments, and in Queensland (Crime Prevention Queensland) in the Department of Premier and Cabinet.  All these agencies have a strong emphasis on local community-based crime prevention initiatives funded from central agencies and recognise the critical role of local government and the importance of a multi-agency approach.  Policing policy in all three states has also shifted towards a 'problem oriented policing' (POP) approach and the appointment of crime prevention officers to work with local communities.

# 3.  LITERATURE REVIEW

## 3.1  Crime Prevention

*Definition and Approaches to Crime Prevention/Reduction*

Crime prevention is defined by Hughes (2001:63) as:

> Any action or technique employed by private individuals or public agencies aimed at the reduction of damage caused by acts defined as criminal by the state. Given that crimes are events proscribed or illicit by legal statute, it is not surprising that there is a great plethora of activities and initiatives other-than-legally-defined, also associated with the term 'crime prevention'.

A diverse range of predisposing factors underlie delinquent, criminal and anti-social behaviour. These include marginalisation via poverty cycles and economic hardship/stress (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960) or consequent poor parenting (Weatherburn and Lind, 2001); Durkheim's anomie, and strain theory (Merton, 1938); inner-city social and housing disorganisation detected by the Chicago social ecologists (Park, Burgess and colleagues – see below);  somato-typing - ie mesomorphic physique and delinquency (Glueck and Glueck, 1958); and social-injustice and -exclusion (Harvey, 1988; Castells, 1997; White and Sutton, 1995, inter alia). These endemic socio-economic and cultural factors are influenced by environmental design, but this does not address their causes. Influencing situational opportunity and social inclusion via partnerships and spatial configuration is the scope of the environmental criminological approach discussed below. Its focus is on the community, the 'criminal' and the environment in which crime occurs, including, thus, social intervention and situational opportunity reduction.

Pease (1997) relates approaches to crime prevention to three different perspectives on the causes of crime – structural (via social and economic change), psychological (via control or reform of potential offenders) and circumstantial (via intervention in the social and physical settings of crime). Other approaches distinguish between social and situational strategies, the latter being concerned largely with opportunity reduction; or focus more specifically on crime prevention through environmental design, or CPTED.

*Defensible Space and CPTED – Environmental Design and Crime*

Foundational work on crime prevention and environmental design surfaced in the 60s and 70s. Angel (1968) tested Jane Jacobs (1961) notion of 'eyes on the street'…and 'active street life hindering opportunities for crime', proposing a 'critical intensity zone' where sufficient people are on the streets to provide 'rewarding opportunities' for potential offenders, but not enough to provide adequate natural surveillability. Newman (1972), an architect, developed the notion of *defensible space* and crime prevention through urban design, based on both design and theories of human territoriality. His central thesis was that crime on public housing estates could be reduced by application of a set of design strategies which gave residents

more control over their environment, eg defining private and public space to reduce ambiguity, but also cultivating 'community of interest': in sum: 'a social fabric that defends itself' (Newman, 1976b, 1980). While some have criticised Newman's notion of *defensible space* as being physically deterministic, he was aware of the relevance of concentrations of socially disadvantaged families and many teenage children on housing estates. It was his use of statistics, rather than physical determinism that justified criticism of him by his peers. Jeffrey's (1971/77) concept of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) recognised the relevance of including the physical environment and also behaviour modification ('psychobiology') in the generation of a crime prevention model. He proposed environmental design as a spatial analysis methodology to complement the prevalent and virtually exclusively sociological approach to criminology. Merry (1981b) showed that without community mobilisation defensible space can be left undefended. The field was further developed, notably by Crowe (1991/94; 1994), whose 'designation, design and definition' strategy is of practical use to architects and planners aiming for "the management, design and manipulation of the immediate environment in a systematic way" (Clarke, 1992: 4).

Though the notions of defensible space and first generation CPTED have been criticised by some as apparently espousing architectural determinism, they have persisted as an important foundation for situational crime prevention and community-security approaches, since the physical context is critical to comprehend situations holistically. For some two decades practitioners have employed an inclusive, transactional approach (see below), in recognition of the salience of psycho-social factors, and interdisciplinary and interagency collaboration in reducing crime and victimisation (see, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1995; and Taylor, 1998 for example). Even the United Nations has proclaimed the merits of intersectoral crime prevention (Item 98, 40th Section, General Assembly). Over the last decade in Australia, CPTED strategies have also been increasingly used by police to reduce risk, in NSW for instance (McCamley, 1994), and are appreciated by planning, transport and housing agencies (Perlgut, 1983; Sarkissian, 1984; Geason and Wilson, 1989; Bell, 1991, 1995; Samuels, 1995a; McCamley, 1999).

*Situational Crime Prevention*

The notion of 'situational crime prevention' originated in the Home Office Research Unit of the British Government in the early 1970's (Clarke and Cornish 1983) but also drew heavily on the corresponding work of Newman and Jeffery in the USA; and on Cloward and Ohlin's 1960 notion linking 'opportunity' and delinquency (see also Schmid, 1960) ie the concept of differential access to opportunity. According to Clarke (1992:9) "…it refers to a preventative approach that relies, not upon improving society or its institutions, but upon reducing opportunities for crime…" and can be defined as follows:

> "Situational prevention comprises opportunity-reducing measures that
> are (1) directed at highly specific forms of crime (2) that involve the

> management, design or manipulation of the immediate environment in
> as systematic and permanent a way as possible, (3) so as to increase
> the effort and risks of crime and reduce the rewards as perceived
> by…offenders."

It is therefore a concept that, along with environmental design measures, includes other types of environmental strategies such as various forms of target hardening and removal, CCTV surveillance in zones of negative attractors (bars, games-arcades, discos), security technology, human surveillance by employees, and presence of capable guardians, or even limiting opportunities to make 'excuses' for crime, via signage concerning 'rules of conduct' (Hoefnagels, 1997; Clarke, 1992/97; Hughes, 2001).

*Environmental Criminology*

Environmental Criminology is an approach initiated by Brantingham and Faust (1976) and developed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1981/91), drawing on medical epidemiological terminology, and referring to 'primary', 'secondary' and 'tertiary' crime prevention. In this construct, primary prevention is concerned with opportunity reduction, secondary prevention with modifying the behaviour of potential criminals, and tertiary prevention with the treatment of offenders and the justice system (Pease 1997). The Brantinghams' identify four dimensions of environmental criminology: legal, offender, target or victim, and place or spatial dimension; and Bottoms and Wiles (1997:305) defined it later  as:

> "…the study of crime, criminality and victimisation as they relate, first, to
> particular places, and secondly, to the way that individuals and
> organizations shape their activities spatially, and in so doing are in turn
> influenced by place-based  or spatial factors."

The term *environmental criminology* is employed in the current research generically i.e. to represent a meta-discipline that is inclusive of both CPTED and situational prevention approaches. Clarke (2001) now merges the twin approaches, while Herbert and colleagues also use the term broadly in their 1992 book: 'Crime Policing and Places: Essays in Environmental Criminology'.  In addition, White (1998: 15-16) argues that "…crime prevention through environmental design…[and]…situational prevention…are not mutually exclusive. The ideal crime prevention strategy is one which incorporates elements from each strand".

Two powerful contemporary criminogenic paradigms that help explain and locate criminal events can be understood in this meta-context: rational choice theory (Clarke and Cornish, 1985; Cornish and Clarke, 1986) and routine activity theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Felson, 1987; Sampson and Wooldredge, 1987). Both embody the notion of 'choice': opportunistic/circumstantial decision-making and conscious intent and interpretation.  They also both presuppose the juxtaposition of ability and motivation/attitude of an offender, a target/victim, and the principle of 'least effort', or environmental contingency resulting, for example, from absence of 'natural guardians' (inappropriate design) and/or 'capable guardians' (gatekeepers and security personnel).  Settings and quotidian (day to day) lifestyle patterns are thus interpreted as situational contingencies and act as catalysts (but do not

'determine' behaviour). Within this equation, immoderate consumption of alcohol can blur reality and distort such interpretations and behaviour, perhaps better described in such cases as 'semi-rational'. Elevated assault rates (hot spots) in the vicinity of licensed premises contest to this (Roncek et al, 1989, 1991; Homel and Tomsen, 1992). Earlier work (West and Farrington, 1977) was able to predict delinquency proneness from the amount of time spent on the streets – a lifestyle component. Further, lifestyle behaviour patterns (for example, occupancy times – when someone is at home) are also interpreted by the criminally-intent and acted on accordingly. In a sense, 'social capital' as described by Bourdieu (1986) – those routine practices and cohesive relations of everyday life that facilitate social advantage – are played out in physical settings such as neighbourhoods or urban places. This differential exposure of people and places also becomes a component of the opportunity structure for crime and harassment.

A further evolution in the literature considers temporal as well as spatial factors.  People naturally feel more afraid 'afterdark', some more than others, and whether such apprehension is accurate or exaggerated, reasonable people modify their lifestyles and practice avoidance behaviour to accommodate their fears (Samuels 1995b, 2001). Often people avoid going out at night at all. A sense of community appropriation is lost when a sufficient number of people recoil from using the built environment. Although official statistics suggest that fear far outweighs actual levels of crimes, given the exclusion from these rates of unreported crime and harassment, this represents only a partial understanding. Victim surveys, which take such factors into account, indicate that fear is indeed warranted (Painter, et al 1989; inter alia). A recent British Crime Survey estimated that less than 25% of all crime is reported (Mirrlees-Black et al, 1998); and the ABS reported in 2000 that in Australia about 83% of assaults, 68% of attempted burglaries, 67% of sexual assaults, and 50% of robberies went unreported. The fear of crime for many estate residents, in reality, is a fear of violence (Osborn and Shaftoe, 1995). There is an important gender issue too; fewer women than men feel secure (Warr, 1984; Reiss and Tonry, 1986; Pain, 1991; Painter, 1992;) particularly at night - Borooah and Carcach (1997) report a six-fold increase. Even on university campuses women feel more vulnerable (Lott et al, 1982; Klodawsky, 1994), in particular after dark (Samuels, 1995b). Fear of rape is a central concern (Warr, 1985; Roiphe, 1993). However, once rape is controlled for in the analysis, Ferraro (1995) found women's fear of other crimes is no higher than is men's.

Environmental criminology approaches to crime reduction are not infallible and have also been critiqued as being incapable of explaining away displacement of crime - i.e. a restriction in one location causing redistribution to another place, or time, or offence (Clarke and Cornish, 1983). Simultaneously, however, a positive benefit may result: a halo effect spreading to adjacent areas (Clarke, 1992/97), where weaker opportunities trigger action by those with only the most powerful compulsion to crime (Brantingham and Brantingham,

1991). Both benign and malign deflections are possible (Barr and Pease, 1990). A recent Dutch review of 55 studies found no displacement in 22 cases, and some in 33, but all had a positive net benefit (cited by Clarke, 2001).

Environmental design underlies both CPTED and situational approaches. A triad of inter-dependent criminogenic design factors have evolved over the past half century, largely in the theory and practice of CPTED, namely surveillability, accessibility and territoriality - or seeing and being seen, control of access, and sense of place. Each factor has multiple ramifications. Territoriality, for instance, includes space management, (for example, repairing 'broken windows' and routinely cleaning up graffiti), as well as symbolic cues built into buildings and urban places suggestive of proprietary attitudes (personalisation, for instance). Albeit less directly, the situational opportunity approach also utilises the environmental design triad to help achieve it's ends: moderating access to targets/victims (perceived effort); enhancing surveillance; natural and electronic (perceived risk); employing physical territorial cues such as rapid repair/maintenance of infrastructure; and symbolic cues such as the display of rules (anticipated reward). Opportunity potential remains the situational rationale for the triadic approach which involves reducing the possibility for anti-social-spatial behaviour and victim/target vulnerability, and the potential for anonymity/escape, while simultaneously fostering community spirit and cohesion. In addition to empowerment and management strategies, this necessitates the building-in of places for the congenial congregation of like-minded citizens in the public realm.

*Summary*

Notions of social/territorial/communal involvement, long emphasized as core strategies, have recently been re-emphasised in the literature. These focus on attachment, cohesion, tenure-mix, social capital, civility, networking and neighbouring - influencing sense of place and identity, social control, perceptions of fear, safety and trust, and avoidance behaviour. An ecological sense of responsibility through empowering communities, engendering proprietary attitudes, police living in neighbourhoods, etc., has also surfaced. Other strategies emphasise coherent mixed-land-use combined with animation after dark (influencing risk-reward evaluations via natural policing), threshold-avoidance (countering incivility), and problem-oriented policing (target-focusing and crime mapping) - all within the context of a social democratic, co-operative, inter-agency partnership approach.

## 3.2   Epidemiological Mapping

*Theoretical Origins and Development*

From the early 19th century, along with the rapid industrialisation and urbanisation of Western societies, the mapping of crime had been carried out and used as a basis for law enforcement as well as social commentary and reform. The spatial analysis of crime was given great impetus both theoretically and methodologically, in the early decades of the 20th

Century, by the Chicago School of social ecologists (Park, Burgess, McKenzie, 1925).  Shaw and McKay's (1929) work on juvenile delinquency and Faris and Dunham's (1939) on mental illness, for instance, consistent with the 'human ecology' approach, employed a spatial mapping technique to help understand the distribution of vulnerable communities in Chicago and other American cities. The epidemiological mapping research described here and employed in the current research project is part of the evolutionary development from the seminal urban mapping work of those social ecologists. The approach has also been advanced by way of cognitive and spatial imagery (Lynch, 1960; Appleyard and Lynch, 1964; Downs and Stea, 1973; Appleyard 1976; Carter and Hill, 1979  [criminal's image]), spatial and human geography (McHarg, 1969/92; Robson, 1969; Berry and Horton, 1970; Smith, 1973; Baldwin, 1975; Herbert 1976, 1979, 1982, 1997; Herbert and Johnson, 1976; Samuels, 1978; Herbert and Smith, 1979),  environmental psychology (Barker, 1968 [behaviour settings]; Lee, 1968 [sociospatial schema]; Proshansky, Ittleson and Rivlin, 1970 [behavioural mapping]), environmental criminology (Baldwin and Bottoms, 1976; Brantingham and Brantingham, 1981/9; Taylor, Gottfredson, and Brower, 1981; Merry 1981; Taylor, 1988),  victimization surveys (Braithwaite and Biles, 1980; Painter, 1989, 1992; Samuels, 1995a and b), Geographic Information Systems and crime mapping (Harries, 1976, 1999; Devery, 1992; Brantingham and Brantingham, 1994; O'Kane et al, 1994; Weisburd et al, 1994; Samuels, 1995a; Rich, 1995, 1999; Hyatt and Holzman, 1999;  Ratcliffe, 2000; Saywell and Bawden, 2000; Crime Mapping Lab/Police Foundation, 2000 a and b; Boba, 2001; Murray et al, 2001).

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and crime mapping are descriptive techniques aiding criminological research and situational policing; enhanced by rapid advances in computer software (Mapinfo®, in particular). This enables the spatial analysis of social data or indicators at various geographical levels in an epidemiological context. Maps are setting-specific, temporally sensitive, visual-diagnostic tools allowing situational experience to be interpreted in the light of the theory and practice of environmental design and community-empowerment criminology, or other paradigms. For instance, socio-economic, cultural, health, accident or offence data ('indicators') can be geocoded (spatially referenced via geographic coordinates) and analysed by areal parameters such as density, incivility, tenure, tenant-involvement, number of police patrols, sightlines,  or the extent and type of night animation facilities.  Each factor is recorded as a spatial layer. Over a given time-period changes, trends, patterns of distribution and intensity of crime and harassment events can be measured within given areas.

A critical element of mapping is the scale at which it occurs, which is dependant on the data sources. ABS indicators are available at collector district (CD) level (about 225 households), but crime data is often at suburb (postcode) scale or greater. The research of Murray, et al, (2001) in Brisbane, for example, is constrained by reliance on crime rates per 1000 population. The work of the social ecologists and spatial geographers is generally at large

scales too, covering entire districts of several kilometres, or a CBD. "Macro-level data rarely produce findings with preventative application" (Clarke, 1997: 10), since it is at the micro-environmental level that intervention needs to occur. The uniqueness and salience of the current research is its access to data at the micro scale providing information on discrete events, in particular places, and at specific times.

*Recent Research of the Investigators*

Recent research on crime and harassment in a high-rise public estate (Judd, Samuels et al, op.cit.) produced the victimisation and fear maps shown below. Spatial identifiers have been removed from the maps, in order to ensure no stigma flows to any area, by association. From the maps it can be seen that many areas which are perceived as threatening (the darker areas on Figure 1, right hand map) are also avoided at night: i.e. crime does not happen there because people do not go there. Neither the large park/oval (top right) nor the railway station (top left) feature as victimisation locations after dark. These are far and away the most feared places. The correlation between fear and avoidance is self-evident; a rational choice, this time from the potential victim's point of view.



**Victimisation Experiences, night and day**  **Fear and Victimisation, at night**

**Fig. 1.   Victimisation and Fear  Maps, High-rise Inner-City Public Housing Estate**

## 3.4   Crime and Public Housing

*Social housing and disadvantage*

Social (including public) housing is not necessarily an indicator of disadvantage.  However, the link between concentrated social housing, areas of degraded privately rented/owned housing, and the incidence of disadvantage is strong (OECD, 1996 and 1997 cit. Bowey, 1997; Hall, 1997; Arthurson, 1998; JRF, 1998; Randolph and Judd, 2000; Bottoms and Wiles, 1986 cit. Weatherburn, 1999; Rock, 1988 cit. Hope and Foster, 1992).  Broad similarities exist among distressed housing areas: they are younger than the urban average; have higher concentrations of lone-parents, higher levels of unemployment, and lower levels of education

attainment; and are more likely to be in areas of social housing (OECD, 1996 and 1997 cit. Bowey, 1997). The emergence of distressed housing areas/disadvantaged groups is primarily due to socio-economic change, labour market changes, the globalisation of economic processes and fiscal constraint. Elements that interact to produce deprivation/social exclusion include poor geographic accessibility to job opportunities, reduced provision of public facilities and services, and the stigmatisation of areas and residents through the (media's) use of labels such as "ghetto" and "underclass" (OECD, 1996 and 1997).

*Disadvantage and crime*

"Crime rates have long been known to be higher in areas and among individuals affected by economic disadvantage" (Belknap, 1989; Box, 1987; Chiricos, 1987: Devery, 1991 cit. Weatherburn, et al, 1999). A major concern of residents in areas with large concentrations of public housing is the high incidence of crime within their suburb and, whether perceived or actual. A recent study of neighbourhood renewal strategies on three estates in South West Sydney: Airds, Claymore and Minto, found that overwhelmingly the main types of offences related to domestic violence and inter-personal disputes (Stubbs and Hardy, 2000). This study cites literature indicating that a major factor in crime is the concentration of economically disadvantaged young males, and further, that a very small proportion of resident offenders commit the majority of crime in a given residential area.

A paper by the former NSW Police Commissioner, Peter Ryan states that "[t]he decline of traditional support mechanisms[6] contributes to an environment with greater potential for criminal and anti-social behaviour" (NSWPS, 2001a:17). Furthermore, he argues that "[r]esearch has shown that people from more marginalised and disadvantaged groups are more likely to be the perpetuators of crime", and that "…a disproportionate share of crime occurs where community cohesion and effective social support services[7] are lacking" (p.17). Similarly, the NSW Department of Housing refers to research showing the link between social disadvantage and high levels of crime, and the strong link between social disadvantage and the likelihood of being a victim of crime (NSWDH, undated). Weatherburn, et al, (1999:256) connect this argument back to public housing in their statement that "[p]ublic housing estates in Britain, the United States and Australia are frequently plagued by crime problems."

However, criminologists recognise that public housing estates are not necessarily criminogenic, despite the fact that social disadvantage and exclusion concentrate there. Such conclusions would be reductionist and deterministic - some areas have high rates, others do not; some individuals are crime-prone, others are not. Osborne and Shaftoe (1995) found

---

[6] Family structures and family role models are specifically mentioned.
[7] By implication, particularly services for families and young people.

that a small number of residents on a London estate were responsible for the majority of the crime. Consequently, injunctions against specific individuals and repossession orders against persistent offenders saw crime rates drop sharply. Bottoms, et al, (1987) showed how two estates with almost identical social class composition had very different offence and offender rates. Self-evidently, the local environment cannot be discarded from the equation since it contains the cues to which individuals respond (Herbert, 1976, inter alia).

*Estate design and crime*

Newman's (1972) work assessing the statistics of the New York City Housing Authority, responsible for 19% of USA public housing at the time, enabled a comparison with design features. Higher crime rates were associated with larger projects and higher buildings, and it was in the interior public spaces of the largest buildings that a high proportion of the crimes took place. The emergence of a sense of community was suggested to be linked to allowing residents the opportunity to identify with smaller, clearly defined spaces, and thus raise the likelihood of them taking responsibility for them. However the relationship between the built form and crime cannot be considered in isolation. As Osborne and Shaftoe (1995) and Stubbs and Storer (1996) conclude, physical design or redesign strategies alone have little impact on actual crime rates.

## 3.5 Public Housing Estate Renewal and Crime Reduction

*Effect of renewal on crime reduction*

The Stubbs and Hardy (2000) evaluation of estate renewal in South West Sydney indicates that over the period in which renewal was undertaken there was a positive impact on crime and nuisance in each estate, either real (demonstrated by reduction in the rate of convictions) or perceived (with tenants reporting increased feelings of safety).

Airds (which historically had a far higher crime rate than Claymore and Minto) experienced a large reduction in both recorded criminal convictions and convicted offenders resident in the area. Tenants attributed the positive impact on crime to the physical changes to their area, such as increased visibility of neighbours, closure of walkways and enclosure of backyards. Similarly, an evaluation of five other public housing estates in NSW found that physical interventions such as 'Radburn reversals' on Bellambi, Bidwill and Macquarie Fields estates were perceived by residents (plus Dept of Housing personnel, community workers, police and other agencies) to be associated with reductions or changes in spatial patterns of crime (Randolph, Judd and Carmichael, 2001).

However, physical interventions may not always have a positive impact on crime. The study by Osborn and Shaftoe noted above found that the removal of overhead walkways in a London estate was not helpful in reducing burglaries. Stubbs and Hardy (2000) also found contradictory evidence from two adjacent public housing estates in South West Sydney (Airds and Macquarie Fields) that had undergone similar Radburn reversals. They compared

conviction rates of resident offenders on each estate with each other and with average rates for the Campbelltown area. In Airds there was a 23% drop in crime rate per 1,000 residents between 1996 and 1999 (it was previously 3 times higher than the overall average), while in Macquarie Fields, crime rates had risen significantly (70%), but still remained just above the average.  Also, while there was a decrease in the number of resident offenders in each of the study areas of Airds, Claymore and Minto, crime decreased significantly in Airds, but did not decrease in Claymore and Minto.

Determining a relationship between physical interventions (or other crime reduction strategies) and a reduction in crime is therefore problematic (Stubbs and Hardy, 2000; Weatherburn et al, 1999).  For example, in the case of Airds, the association between reduced crime rates and the decline in residents who are convicted offenders requires additional investigation.  Similarly, in areas where there are no substantial physical interventions (e.g. the study areas of Claymore and Minto), further analysis of the relationship between increased feelings of safety and the decline in residents who are convicted offenders is required.  Also, the relationship between perceived and real impacts on crime requires testing.  Several urban renewal studies in Britain found that resident perceptions of a decrease in crime were not borne out by a real decrease in crime, but had more to do with residents feeling they had been included and consulted in the process, and that something was happening to actively change their area (Hope and Foster, 1992).

In Claymore and Minto (neither of which had crime rates above the regional average during the sample periods for the Stubbs and Hardy study), the renewal emphasis was on non-asset management strategies (including the location of tenancy managers on site and a more flexible approach to policies and procedures) - not physical interventions - with much of the positive impact on crime related to a 'settling down' of the areas, and residents perceptions of increased safety rather than reduced rates of conviction.  Stubbs and Hardy (2000) relate perceptions of increased safety at Proctor Way in the Claymore estate and in the Minto Intensive Management Area to resident involvement and participation in the renewal process, and the approach adopted by Argyle Community Housing (the tenancy managers).  Argyle assumed management of Proctor Way after the exodus of many of the original 'problem' residents thought to be responsible for criminal/drug related activity in the area, and was proactive in relation to initial allocations and prompt in dealing with convicted resident drug dealers and other high impact issues.  In addition, there was an increased police presence in the area and night time patrols by men from the resident Samoan community (while welcomed by residents and services, they also had concerns about the ways in which power might be exercised).

Weatherburn, et al (1999) challenge the view that public housing design influences crime (the design hypothesis) to argue that public housing estates experience crime problem largely, if

not entirely, because disadvantaged crime-prone individuals are more likely to be allocated public housing (the allocation hypothesis). They cite research by Pyle (1976), Wikstrom (1989) and Matka (1997) as supporting this hypothesis. However, the two hypotheses (design and allocation) are not necessarily mutually exclusive, as the literature reviewed in this section reveals. Also, greater selectivity of residents comes with its own set of issues. For example, as Stubbs and Hardy note, selectivity of residents in one area may unduly disadvantage other areas. Also, prompt action related to 'problem tenants' can involve judgements and actions potentially beyond the reasonable boundaries of power and control possessed by housing managers and/or other residents. A delicate balance exists between the interests of a majority of residents and the individual rights of each member of the community, particularly when dealing with disadvantaged people, who are already in dis-empowered situations.

*'Crime environments'*

Research indicates that a close scrutiny of all the factors contributing to a 'crime environment' is required. Merry (1981) interviewed young men who lived on a multi-racial housing estate in Boston and committed robberies there about their choice of victims and crime opportunities. In cognitive maps they indicated places good for robberies, which agreed closely with the distribution of actual crime incidents i.e. where visibility is poor, witnesses few and escape routes many – clearly, environmental design and place management issues. Environmental factors also fit within a larger crime context, for as Voordt and Wegen (1993:355 cited in Stubbs and Hardy, 2000:161) conclude: "…knowledge of the environmental characteristics of a housing estate will seldom be sufficient to explain the spatial distribution of crime on that housing estate … let alone to predict such patterns."

Samuels (1995a: see Fig 2 below), using an early version of Mapinfo, in a housing district of mixed tenure, illustrates how proportionately the highest offence rates for numerous offence types, over a 3-year period, were concentrated in a privately-owned, medium density domain (3-storey walk-ups). Presumably, more opportunity for property crime exists here (break and enter and car theft featuring prominently) - evidence of situational contingency. But assault, robbery and malicious damage to property are clustered here too – suggestive of territorial and design factors. Proximity to areas where public housing is concentrated suggests, further, that issues relating location of offence to residence of offender are likely to be implicated. Interestingly, at the station (Figure 2, right, centre), in the adjacent pedestrian tunnel that traverses the highway and in the adjoining residential area, many criminal and harassment events took place and were noted in the victimisation mapping, none of which appear to have been reported or recorded on the operational data-base. Taken together, crime and victim mapping can deepen comprehension.

VICTIMISATION & POLICE DATA COMPOSITE

**Fig. 2 Compilation of operational offences and reports of victimisation experiences**

A recent study of the NSW metropolitan area by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics (Matka, 1997) contends that housing type (detached, semi-detached, walk-ups and high-rise) and even concentration of public housing are not the issues behind crime rates; rather, the link being with disadvantage/socio-economic factors. It is well recognised that the latter are always dominant, but the design of the built environment is also always a part of the behaviour-environment equation. There are several critiques which must be levelled at this work. The study reflects on recorded crime rates data at postcode (entire suburb) level, per 100,000 population. Consequently, relationships 'on the ground,' either in terms of public housing specifically or at street level generally, will remain elusive in reality. Indeed, Matka appreciates that the time-old concept of the 'ecological fallacy' (see Barr and Pease, 1992, *inter alia*) seems relevant here (ie that statistics aggregated at meso-levels mask any significance analytic differences) by stating that "…we should be careful about ascribing the characteristics of the postcode's population as a whole to any particular group of individuals within that postcode" (Matka 1997: 22). With the exception of 2 postcode areas, which have about 40% public housing dwellings, and a handful of others with relatively high proportions,

the very great majority of other postcodes have less than 10% or between 10 and 20%. The study also appears to assume that the generic nature of all suburbs in Sydney is the same, and that all public housing estates are the same. Finally, housing type is assumed to be the issue of relevance, while the design of the public realm and relationships of dwellings to non-residential functions, streets and open-spaces, and the neighbourhood and urban context is ignored. Indeed, Weatherburn, in the Preface, states that: "the study does *not dis*prove the hypothesis that public housing estate design influences crime" (cit. Matka, 1997:3).

Clearly, the physical issue is not one of the aesthetics of design (or of size per se) but, rather, a much more sophisticated notion affected by the percentage of public housing in the area, a lack of a sense of ownership over space, ambiguous public territory, low surveillability of the public realm, control over accessibility (both actual and symbolic), and a sense of fear associated in people's minds with areas or streets (or individuals). All of these affect social interaction and feelings of community cohesion and social attachment and provide fertile situations for offence-intent individuals or groups. Brown and Perkins (2001) statistically linked neighbourhood blocks of low social cohesion and high physical 'incivility' (litter, graffiti etc) with subsequent crime. Conversely, an association between 'attraction to neighbourhood' and 'safety variables' is evident in Vinson's study of an inner Sydney public housing estate (Vinson 1995).

*Responding to disadvantage and crime*

It is well appreciated internationally, both in the literature and government policies, that a comprehensive mix of measures - including urban configurations, housing quality and design and physical security measures, as well as governance/management and family, social, community and educational measures – is necessary to raise the quality of life on public housing estates in a sustainable way. Tackling the multiple problems associated with these areas relies on resourcing local residents to enhance their confidence and skills, developing a neighbourhood focus for mainstream services, targeting economic development on disadvantaged areas, strengthening local community organisations and NGOs; and ensuring long-term co-operation, partnerships and consultation (Taylor, 1998). It is also recognised that a holistic approach is not easily sustained. Problems begin to emerge again after a time where a key element is abandoned and it is the social not the physical measures that are most difficult to both implement and sustain (Osborn and Shaftoe, 1995).

Evaluative literature on crime reduction within Australia and overseas has revealed that a range of strategies is likely to have an impact on the reduction of crime and harassment on public housing estates (Stubbs and Hardy, 2000). Strategies seen as particularly effective in reducing crime and creating social stability are those that increase resident participation or satisfaction, resulting in a slow down in tenancy-turn-over rates and a demographic maturation of the area; and a more proactive approach by housing managers to both initial

allocations and dealing with 'problem tenants'. The study being undertaken by the authors of this paper will contribute to the literature by revealing the extent to which, and the ways in which, physical interventions, community development initiatives, and whole of government/partnership approaches contribute to, or fail to contribute to crime reduction on public housing estates.

# 4.    STUDY METHODOLOGY

## 4.1    Epidemiology of Crime and Harassment

The major problem in attempting to understand the effectiveness of estate improvement programs on patterns of crime, whatever their nature, is methodological: how to measure the extent of decrease in crime, and/or harassment, or fear of crime in reality. Even GIS mapping of police operational data, which can provide rich spatial information at various geographical levels (eg at street and Collectors District level) suffers from problems in consistency of reporting (and under-reporting). Nor are policy development, implementation and impacts always straightforward. Politics and policy personnel change, records and comprehension of developmental sequences are not necessarily self-evident, and the consequences emergent from intervention strategies do not become apparent immediately, or even systematically. Many other situational factors intervene, too. But in conducting fieldwork, unknown complexities can only be taken as background context, cannot be controlled for, and are assumed to be common to all specific domains under scrutiny, while attention is placed on the consequences of factors that are known to have been changed, within a specific, geographically bounded environment. Changes in criminal intensity, thus, can be associated with those changes, without having to prove causality. As far as possible estates can be 'matched' by factors over which there is some measure of 'control': age, size, location, housing type and the nature of intervention(s).

## 4.2    Methodological Framework

The broad methodological framework of the research includes four main elements:

1. Literature review - local and international, on interagency approaches to crime prevention/reduction, with particular reference to public housing areas.  This will provide information on theoretical frameworks, international and local policy and practice concerning crime prevention and public housing estate renewal as a general background to the study.

2. Policy review – based on documentation from key agencies in three selected states. This will provide a summary of key policy initiatives and strategies for crime prevention/reduction and public housing estate renewal in the three states in relation to Research Aim No 1 in section 1.2 of this paper.

3. Field research – within three housing estates in each state, including:

   a. Documentation of physical and demographic data for selected estates

   b. Walk-through CPTED evaluation

   c. Stakeholder Interviews

    d.  Victimisation mapping survey

Components (a), (b) will provide important data describing the physical and social context for the field research in each estate.  Component (c) will provide information on crime prevention initiatives of various agencies that impact on the particular estates, and the extent to which these are integrated.  Component (d) will provide mapped victimisation data (including on unreported crime and harassment incidents) to complement mapped police operational data on reported crime; information on perceptions of change in crime and harassment on the estate, and a measure of neighbourhood cohesion.

4.  Spatial Analysis of Crime Data – from the following sources and for the following geographical levels and time frames:

    a.  Operational police data, mapped for the first, third and fifth years of a five year period 1997-2001 (three years in SA - 1998-2000[8]) for each selected estate/housing area

    b.  Operational police data, for the same years, aggregated for the band of Collectors Districts immediately surrounding the estate area

    c.  Recorded crime statistics (from Crime Statistics offices and ABS) for the same years  at postcode, LGA and metropolitan geographic levels.

Data from (a) will be presented in the form of neighbourhood maps enabling spatial analysis of incidence and distribution of crime within the estate area; (b) will enable inferences concerning crime displacement and halo effects immediately around the estate; and (c) will provide context data on overall local and metropolitan crime trends for the same period as a benchmark for any changes in the incidence of crime.

## 4.3  Selection of Cases

*Selection of States*

The research investigates the effectiveness of crime reduction programs on public housing estates in three States (NSW, QLD and SA).  These jurisdictions were selected for the following reasons:

- All three States have had significant estate improvement/community renewal programs during the last five years involving changes to physical design, de-concentration through asset sales and community development.

- The three States have different governmental structures providing different opportunities and support for program integration and whole-of-government approaches (see below).  NSW and QLD have more traditional stand-alone

---

[8] In SA, data is not geocoded prior to 1998; so three consecutive years will be analysed.

Departments of Housing whereas in SA the Housing Trust is part of an integrated Human Services Department.

- Each of the three states have somewhat different administrative arrangements for managing crime prevention. Premiers' departments have a instrumental role in setting policy in NSW and QLD but not in SA. In QLD the central administrative agency is also within the Dept of Premier and Cabinet, with the more independent Criminal Justice Commission also having an interest in crime prevention. In NSW, while the principal administrative role is undertaken by a unit the Attorney General's department, the Premier's Department also has its own place management programs targeted to areas with high crime rates. In SA the key administrative role is undertaken by the Attorney General's Department.

- In all three states Police agencies also have crime prevention strategies, a key strategy of which is a move toward more community-based, problem-oriented policing.

- All states have agreed (one in principle only at this stage) to provide access to operational police data, and have data either in mapped, geocoded form, or in a form which can be mapped and geocoded.

The policy and literature review components are now largely completed and is reported on in chapters 3 and 5 of this report. Progress in other methodological tasks is reported on below.

*Selection and Documentation of Housing Estates*

Three public housing estates were to be selected from each of the three states included in the study (NSW, Qld and SA). Selection was to include one estate per jurisdiction in each of the following categories:

1. An estate that had undergone (or is undergoing) renewal involving significant physical interventions (eg major design, housing/urban upgrading or partial re-development).

2. An estate that had undergone (or is undergoing) neighbourhood renewal primarily through non-asset, community development approaches and without any significant physical interventions.

3. A 'control' estate that has had neither significant physical or community development initiatives as part of a renewal program.

This selection would enable some analysis of the role of physical vs social initiatives – where either are the dominant approach. However, except for some early examples, these approaches are rarely mutually exclusive – and so it would be unreasonable to find examples without some mixture of approaches. Similarly, even estates without any formal renewal project cannot be assumed to have had no physical or social initiatives.

It was also important that the two renewal estates in each State jurisdiction were sufficiently

advanced to allow time for any impacts on patterns of crime. It was decided therefore to select estates with renewal programs that had been operative for at least 3 years from the commencement of the study (early 2002) – in other words having commenced no later than early 1999. A reasonable matching of estates according to the size of the estate (ie total no of properties), type of urban location (eg. inner, mid and outer metropolitan) and demographic profile was also to be attempted. This would also provide some control for overall economic circumstances and trends in crime.

These estate selection criteria were sent to senior SHA staff involved in management of community renewal programs together with an estate information sheet asking for up to four estates to be nominated in each of the three categories (see Appendix 1) with information on:

- Urban location (inner, middle or outer suburbs)

- Age of the estate

- Commencement date of renewal program

- Completion date of renewal program (if applicable)

- Total number of public housing dwellings on the estate (before renewal and at Dec 2001)

From the responses, three estates were chosen from the metropolitan area of each jurisdiction with the characteristics outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Selected estates and their characteristics

| State | Metropolitan Location (s) | Age of estate | Renewal Commenced | Renewal Completed | Dwelling no. before | Dwelling no. 2001 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NSW | Outer western | 23yrs | 1997 | On-going | 1141 | 1090 |
| | Outer south western | 22 yrs | Early 1999 | On-going | 1081 | 1081 |
| | Outer western | 42 yrs | N/A | N/A | N/A | 420 |
| Qld | Outer southern | 27 yrs | Late 1988 | On-going | 1152 | 1093 |
| | Outer southern | 18 yrs | Late 1998 | On-going | 467 | 456 |
| | Outer middle northern | 45 yrs | N/A | N/A | N/A | 658 |
| SA | Outer northern | 35-50 yrs | 1998 | On-going | 1390 | 965 |
| | Outer southern | 25-40 yrs | 1995 (some earlier) | On-going | 749 | 749 |
| | Outer north west | 35-50 yrs | N/A | N/A | N/A | 750 |

It can be seen from the table that some difficulty was experienced in closely matching age of estate and estate size, but within the estates nominated this was the best match available to achieve good representation of the three types of estates – given that there is a limited number of community renewal estates to choose from in two of the jurisdictions (Qld and SA).

It has become clear that the estates to be evaluated consist of low-rise, low-density sprawling suburban type housing (with isolated instances of medium-density walk-ups - which, interestingly, stakeholders often said, concentrate much of the criminal and disruptive events in several estate domains), with considerable proportions of these areas housing owner-occupiers with private tenure. This complicates the analysis. The NSW estates are of the more 'traditional' type: concentrated clusters of public housing, often on 'superlots' but still within a wider suburban area of mixed tenure. The data that will be obtained from operational police records will cover the general area, or suburb, within which public housing is located. Indeed, the issue is not of residence of offender, but location of the offence event; thus this could occur with equal facility in private as in public areas. The terminology to be used will thus be: housing estate areas or domains. In like fashion, potential respondents for the interview will be drawn from the area in general and not only from SHA tenants. A covering letter will be circulated to members of community networks and SHA tenants. It has also become advisable to adjust the 'control group' terminology, and talk instead of 'quasi-controls', since in all estates evaluated there has been some intervention, even if no formal community renewal program.

## 4.4   Field Research

*Documentation of Selected Estates*

Documentation of physical characteristics of the nine estates is well under way.  Maps have been obtained from SHAs and scanned into digital form to be used as base maps for mapping both the operational police data and the victimisation survey data.  At this stage there is some variation in quality and currency – particularly for the 'control' estates which have not been subject to formal renewal programs. Collection of housing and demographic data for the estates is in the early stages sourced from SHAs, LGAs and the ABS.

*CPTED Walk-Through Analysis*

A preliminary CPTED walk-though analysis has been conducted (at the time of the stakeholder interviews), and another will be conducted near the end of the project, during the day and after dark, once places of criminal and/or harassment activity have been mapped/identified. A checklist of major features from the CPTED surveillability-accessibility-territoriality triad of parameters will be generated and utilised as a generic guide; and, ultimately, corroboration sought for these interpretations from Chief Inspector Phil McCamley of the NSW Police, who has developed a sophisticated classification system (aspects of which will be referred to as well). The joint chief investigator has previously undertaken such analyses in prior research on a housing estate domain, university campuses, Sydney Railway Stations and before construction of the residential village at the Olympics site at Homebush Bay (the latter two, confidential).

*Stakeholder Interviews*

A total of 20 stakeholder interviews, of between 1 and 2 hours in length, were undertaken by the Joint Principal Investigator between 18th and 25th of February 2002 in the three states. A minimum of 2 people were interviewed for each estate – one local housing manager and one local police officer with direct involvement in crime prevention and community renewal (in the case of estates with renewal programs) or local housing management (in the case of non-renewal estates). Others with involvement in community renewal or housing management were interviewed as recommended by local housing and police agencies.

Open-ended questions on the following themes/items were included.

1.  Strategies put in place over the past 5 years or so. These could be generic, i.e. as a consequence of whole-of-State policies that relate to public housing in particular. (Copies of policy documents if available)

2.  Strategies specific to the particular estates under scrutiny, agencies involved, and extent of integration with community groups. (copies of policy documents if available)

3.  Details of physical upgrades (both housing and urban) including any sales and /or redevelopment strategies

4.  Perceptions/impressions of changes in crime and/or community satisfaction over the past several years.

5.  Details community network contacts (and local secondary schools contacts), to assist in setting up of eventual resident interview survey; establishment of place in which to conduct interview.

6.  Copies of maps of the area under evaluation (if available)

Insights gleaned from the stakeholder interviews will be merged with other evaluations, at a later date. Where considered necessary, additional stakeholder interviews may be undertaken during the field work.

*Victimisation Mapping Survey*

A survey of a sample of residents (50-100 on each estate) will be undertaken to understand their experiences of crime and harassment and perceptions of fear and change due to housing and other interventions, over the past five years and to map these spatially (see Appendix 2 for survey form). This period of recall is considered unproblematic. Similar research was undertaken previously (Samuels, 1995a and b) and it is intrinsically evident that people do not forget victimisation experiences.

Previous situational experience mapping exercises undertaken by the researchers suffered from inaccuracies, for several reasons: a team of door-to-door interviewers (with individual interpretative styles), first; and from the eventual manual transfer from individual survey forms

to a master map. An advance in research methodology now permits one researcher to interview all respondents, armed with a laptop computer into which an estate's street map is scanned. Via the researcher, respondents 'drop a dot' on a map, if they have had a victimization experience, indicating what, where and when (the temporal element is as critical as the socio-spatial). Victimisation events are identified according to 11 nationally accepted offence categories used in crime statistics including 4 offences against the person, 6 against property and drug offences (see Appendix 3). Dots are symbolically coded (colour/number/shape), representing day or night occurrence, offence type, and reported/unreported, respectively. Respondents can also indicate feared places or areas, which are encircled by the researcher (in red); and places where they feel safe (in green). Each response is thus digitally recorded, and is available for precise compilations (via overlays), later. Originally Photoshop was to be used; now AutoCad 2000 is the preferred program because of its ability to fix locations more precisely and securely.

Neighbourhood cohesion ratings and perceptions of change in crime on each estate domain will also be recorded – via a self-report questionnaire (see Appendix 2) – a combined version of Buckner's (1988) 18-item 5-point scale relating to neighbourliness, with four additional 'safety variables' items included by Vinson (1999). A community worker recruited from a local community organization in each target area will also be employed to assist the research associate with recruitment, organising venue(s) and refreshments, and the general administration of the survey for that area – and for reasons of safety.

Recruitment for the survey will use a 'snowballing' technique via community networks which were identified during the initial stakeholder interviews and walk-through CPTED analysis and are now being followed up. Secondary schools in the catchment area will also be approached. Covering letters explaining the research and the potential benefits to respective respondents will be circulated. A $100 shopping voucher will be offered to one respondent in each estate area, drawn at random, as an incentive. A community centre in which to conduct the interviews has been identified in each estate/housing area.

## 4.5   Analysis of Spatial Crime Data

*Police Operational Data*

NSW and SA use geocoded Mapinfo data, as a form of pattern language intelligence analysis, where events can be spatially tracked, and resources rationalized in response. NSW records 'events': these might also be harassment (not necessarily crime). Queensland uses another system, not geocoded (called 'CRISP'), but otherwise similar (address and suburb by offence and time). Using the latter data will involve some alternative analysis, executed manually. Maps with street numbers have been provided by the QDoH.

Permission to access operational police data is now secured for SA and QLD and approval in principle has been agreed NSW, with detailed conditions still being negotiated. Gaining

access to this sensitive data has been a long process, begun well before the final submission of the research proposal, and not yet fully resolved. Varying conditions have been imposed by the various police services. Where we have been asked to submit results for authentication before documentation in a Final Report, this is considered reasonable. Anonymity will be assured, as always, for respondents and areas (spatial identifiers will be removed from any document that might become disseminated in the public realm). Original reports with full data sets will be made to AHURI and copies or abbreviated versions distributed to the collaborating SHAs and Police Services.

Analysis will include the collection of crime statistics for 11 types of offences (see Appendix 3) over a 5-year period for the 9 selected housing districts (in 3 States). The primary data set will focus at the street level (via Police Mapinfo data); a secondary set will be pitched at Collector District level, ie rates per $\pm 225$ households in the ring of CDs immediately surrounding the estate.

*Context Data*

Finally frequencies at regional and postcode level will be examined, as context data (derived largely from ABS and Crime Bureau statistics: see Table 1, Appendix 4). The ABS publishes on a wide range of issues related to crime, including crime victim surveys, and safety fears (for example, the 1996 National Women's Safety Survey) as well as indirect indicators such as unemployment and income level, etc. The influence of national trends or even international events (Sept 11th) may be experienced or reflected at local level. For instance, the recent publication: 'Measuring Australia's Performance' (ABS, 2002) shows that between 1995 and 2000, the assault rate rose, nationally, by an average of 5% a year. Possibly, intervention policies aimed at community renewal in disadvantaged areas might ameliorate this trend; or, indeed, such areas might be implicated in this rise.

A mapping survey of samples of residents (hopefully 50-100 in each estate area), aimed at understanding their experiences of crime and harassment and perceptions of fear, over the past three to five years, will complement the crime mapping derived from reported operational data, which is inevitably partial.

## 4.6   Interpretation and Comparability Issues

Determinism still exerts a powerful influence on designers of the built environment. But, architectural determination of spatial behaviour is a misnomer. Human factors determine behaviour and it's precursor, attitude, hindered or aided by potential built-into the architectural and urban environment. From a criminological viewpoint, deterministically designing out crime is not possible, at least not until the socio-economic and sub-cultural precipitating factors are resolved.

Yet, from past experience the likelihood of certain future events occurring in similar contexts can be predicted to some degree. Where 'guidelines' are, however, prescriptive, they fall into

the determinist category; performance, rather, is the aim (or end - the means are variable). In any event, without considering the available knowledge, both theoretical and empirical, to help design safer places (encouraging the emergence of certain situations while discouraging others), the odds are stacked against achieving a higher quality living environment.

Complexity is at the root of phenomenological reality. Nothing is unrelated. At an urban scale, the complexity and interactive relationship of the parts is infinite. Each 'situation' is unique - albeit part of an integral, comprehensive system and none is ever known, even in part. Logically, a human science of the built environment reflects this complexity. Inevitably therefore,  establishing linear causality is problematic and even comparability between settings can be difficult. Relationships can often only be inferred from associations between phenomena.

There are a wide range of external variables that are likely to have a bearing on crime rates, not the least of which are general economic conditions and their impacts on regional labour markets, and hence poverty and social disadvantage. Similarly, differences in policing and housing management practice between jurisdictions may impact on crime.   Even within different approaches to community renewal (eg physical improvement versus community development) it is rare that these are mutually exclusive and the extent of overlap can vary significantly between jurisdictions and projects.  Associations between interventions and crime outcomes may however become evident either within or between jurisdictions.  If consistent across estates or jurisdictions, and interpreted with an awareness of some of the important context variables, this may also enable generalisations about relationships, albeit without statistical validity.

Given the complexity of the background contextual and temporal variables, a case study approach will be taken in the research where at the primary level of analysis each estate will be treated as a unique case in its own right.  Direction and magnitude of change in patterns of crime will be observed and evaluated in the light of interventions occurring within that domain (its situational contingency) and its socio-spatial configuration.  A secondary level of analysis will, however, involve comparisons between:

a. Estates within one state jurisdiction, to enable regional generalisations about differences in outcomes based on the three intervention approaches (primarily physical, primarily community development, and those with little formal intervention)

b. Estates of similar intervention types between state jurisdictions, to enable any national generalisations to be made based on consistencies between intervention approaches and outcomes.

The evidence used in these analyses will include both quantitative and qualitative data based on stakeholder interviews (qualitative), recorded crime data (quantitative), victimisation survey data (quantitative and qualitative), and certain context data (quantitative) – enabling

some triangulation, but not attempting to control for many external variables, which will be treated as 'situational contingencies'. The more convergence between findings from these different sources, the more confidence can be assumed for any generalisations. This analysis will be undertaken using comparative matrices. Hypothetically, strategies are expected to produce varying consequences, some more successful than others in reducing crime and harassment.

The spatial mapping of social phenomena is a robust technique to detect and reflect relationships. Within the context of the demographic profile of any particular place, individual experiences cluster and aggregate - like an emergent artificial life-form - and translate into measured epidemiological (or social-spatial) indicators. What happens, where, when and how often – sets the scene. Over the five-year period of the research focus, longitudinal effects have time to begin to emerge (as consequences). Interpreting these, however, is hindered by 'lag', the time taken for an intervention to have an effect, which is difficult to predict.

The field research tactics employed in this research are themselves both long-standing and constantly evolving. Although certain core strategies (operational data mapped at micro-scale and digital user mapping) appear robust *a priori*, they too will be evaluated in the course of the research to inform future research on the spatial analysis of crime and harassment.

# 5.  CONCLUSION

Community involvement and regeneration partnerships to tackle social exclusion and reduce or prevent crime in disadvantaged areas took root in countries such as the UK in the early 1980s, and in Australia in the 1990s, and are now widespread. Practically, this is a challenge of major proportions. Wide-ranging research (see, for example The Joseph Rowntree Foundation's sixty  Area Regeneration research projects such as Achieving Regeneration through Employment Training and Physical Improvement (1997); Regenerating Neighbourhoods: creating integrated and sustainable improvements (1998); Urban Regeneration through Partnership (2000)) is now suggesting that neighbourhood management strategies which allow for dialogue between local communities, service providers and policy-makers, and follow an incremental approach - building on existing practice and relationships at local level - are likely to bring about more sustainable change.

Governance structures and co-ordination at neighbourhood level - forums and committees, eg - are believed to be vital. Some models are service-led, or top-down,  where agencies such as housing, police, health, employment and welfare are 'joined up' with local groups. Other neighbourhood management approaches are community-led, or bottom-up, where local leadership is vital in helping develop consensus, promote local democracy and neighbourhood initiatives. Service-led and community-led approaches need not be mutually exclusive.

Simultaneously, the general nature of the built environment is self-evidently also associated with quality of life, and geographic concentrations of deprivation exist, and persist. Environmental-criminology-design has dealt not only with the configuration of the spatial environment, but has specifically related situational 'opportunity potential' and appropriation or sense of place to community strengthening or disempowerment over the past several decades, with crime, nuisance, victimisation and fear being consequences that are measurable – spatially, temporally and by intensity.

The research being undertaken here treats these complex social and spatial philosophies and practices as mutually interdependent (one without the other is meaningless); and methodological strategies devised to unearth relationships are correspondingly multi-dimensional. The research seeks to understand and associate spatial concentrations of crime and harassment with specific policies implemented in order to inform and contribute to the knowledge base of agencies with responsibility for raising the quality of life of disadvantaged housing communities.

The next phase of the research includes undertaking the victimisation survey on the remaining 6 estates in NSW and Queensland, receipt and analysis of the police crime data

and context data, analysis of mapped victimisation survey data including cohesion variables, and the analysis of relationships between interventions and changes in crime patterns for each estate, and comparisons between estates intervention types.   The final phase of the work will include the writing of the final report and research and policy bulletin.

# REFERENCES

ACRO (The Australian Community Safety and Research Organisation Incorporated) (undated) www.acro.com.au

Australian Bureau of Statistics (1999a) *Crime and Safety, Australia*, April 1999 Cat. No 4509.0, ABS, Canberra.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (1999b) *Crime and Safety, New South Wales*, April 1999, Cat. No 4509.1, ABS, Canberra.

Angel, S. (1968) *Discouraging Crime Through City Planning*, Working Paper 75, University of California, Berkeley

Appleyard. D. and Lynch, K. et al (1964) *The View from the Road*, MIT Press

Appleyard, D. (1976) *Planning a Pluralist City: conflicting realities in Cuidad, Guayana*, MIT Press

Arthurson, C. (1996) *Redevelopment of Public Housing:  The Australian Experience*, Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Policy and Administration, Flinders University, Adelaide

Arthurson, C. (1998) 'Redevelopment of Public Housing:  The Australian Experience', *Urban Policy and Research*, 16, 1: 35-46

Baldwin, J. (1975) British Areal Studies of Crime - An Assessment, *British Journal of Criminology, Delinquency, and Deviant Social Behavior,* 15, 3: 211-227

Baldwin, J. and Bottoms, A.E. (1976) *The Urban Criminal*, Tavistock, London

Barker, R. (1968*) Ecological Psychology*, Stanford, California.

Barr, R. and Pease, K. (1990) 'Crime Placement, Displacement and Deflection', in N. Morris and M. Tonry (eds.) *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 12, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Bell, W. (1991) 'The Role of Urban Design in Crime Prevention: Adelaide City – a case study', *Australian Planner*, December: 206-210

Bell Planning Associates and Gaston, G (1995) *Crime, Safety and Urban Form*, Commonwealth Department of Housing and Regional Development, Urban Futures Research Program.  AGPS, Canberra

Berry, B. and Horton, F. (eds.) (1970) *Geographical Perspectives on Urban Systems*, Prentice Hall, NJ

Boba, R. (2001) *Introductory Guide to Crime Analysis and Mapping*, http://www.usdoj.gov/cops/pdf/cp_resources/crime_mapping_news/Introductory%20Guide%20to%20Crime%20Analysis%20and%20M

Borooah, V. and Carcach, C. (1997) 'Crime and Fear: Evidence from Australia', *British Journal of Criminology*, 37: 635-657

Bottoms, A.E. and Wiles, P. (1988) 'Crime and Public Housing: A Framework for Crime Prevention Analysis', in Hope and Shaw, (eds.) *Communities and Crime Reduction*

Bottoms, A.E. and Wiles, P. (1997) 'Environmental Criminology', in M. Maguire, R. Morgan andand R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology,* 2nd ed.  Clarendon Press, Oxford

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'Forms of Capital', in J.G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook on Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*: 241-258, Greenwood Press, NY

Bowey, R. (1997) *Literature Review on Urban Renewal* (prepared for the South Australian Department of Human Services).

Braithwaite, J. and Biles, D. (1980) 'Overview of Findings from the First Australian National Crime Victims Survey', *ANZ Journal of Criminology*, March: 13

Brantingham, P.J. and Faust, F.L. (1976) 'A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention', in *Crime and Delinquency*, 22:130-46.

Brantingham, P.L. and Brantingham P.J. (1981) 'Notes on the Geometry of Crime', in Brantinghams (eds.) (1991) *Environmental Criminology,* 2nd ed.

Brantingham, P.L. and Brantingham P.J. (1981/91) *Environmental Criminology*, Sage, Beverley Hills

Brantingham P.J and Brantingham, P.L. (1994) 'The Relative Spatial Concentration of Criminality and its Analysis: Towards a revival of environmental criminology', *Criminologie*, 27,1: 81-97

Brown, B.B. and Perkins, D.P. (2001) *Neighbourhood Revitalization and Disorder: An intervention evaluation*, Final Report, NIJ, Washington DC

Buckner, (1988) 'The Development of an Instrument to Measure Neighbourhood Cohesion', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16, 6: 771-791.

Burgess, E.W. (1916) 'Juvenile Delinquency in a Small City', *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 6: 724-728.

Carcach, C. and Muscat, G. (2000) 'An Analysis of Regional Variations in Crime Using Crime Concentration Indexes', *Proceedings of* '*Crime Mapping: Adding Value To Crime Prevention and Control',* Joint AIC and CSAGIS Conference, September, Adelaide

Carter, R.L. and Hill, K.Q. (1979) *The Criminal's Image of the City*, Pergamon, NY

Carson, E., King, S., Walker, D. and Tesoriero, F. (1998a) *Community Perceptions of Social Outcomes of Community Renewal in Mitchell Park*, Social Policy Research Group, University of South Australia, Adelaide

Carson, E., King, S., Walker, D. and Tesoriero, F. (1998b) *Community Perceptions of Social Outcomes of Community Renewal in Rosewood*, Social Policy Research Group, University of South Australia, Adelaide

Castells, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity*, Blackwell, Oxford

Caulfield, J. (2000) 'Public Housing and Intergovernmental Reform', Australian Journal of Political Science, Vol 35, No 1, pp 99-110)

Chilvers, M. (2000) Validation of NSW Police Crime Statistics, Crime and Justice Statistics Bureau Brief, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

Clarke, R.V.G. (1983) 'Situational Crime Prevention: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Scope', in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, 4, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Clarke, R.V. (1992/97) (ed.) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow and Heston, NY.

Clarke, R. (2001) A Situational Crime Prevention Theory: A foundation for future CPTED practice?, *6th International CPTED Conference*, Brisbane.

Clarke R.V. and Cornish, D.B. (1983) *Crime Control in Britain: A Review of Policy Research*, State University of New York Press, Albany NY.

Clarke, R.V. and Cornish, D.B. (1985) 'Modeling Offenders' Decisions: A framework for policy and research', in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, 6, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960) *Delinquency and Opportunity. A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*, The Free Press, Chicago.

Cohen, L.E. and Felson, M. (1979) 'Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A routine activity approach', *American Sociological Review*, 44: 588-608.

Coleman, Alice (1985) *Utopia On Trial: Vision and reality in planned housing*, Hilary Shipman, London.

Cooper Marcus, C. and Sarkissian, W. (1986) *Housing As If People Mattered: Site design guidelines for medium density family housing*, University of California Press, Berkeley

Cornish, D.B. and Clarke, R.V. (1986) *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending,* Springer-Verlag, NY

Crime Mapping Laboratory Police Foundation (2000a*) Integrating Community Policing and Computer Mapping: Assessing Issues and Needs Among COPS Office Grantees*, http://www.usdoj.gov/cops/pdf/toolbox/computer_mapping/e032k0046.pdf

Crime Mapping Laboratory Police Foundation (2000b) *Geocoding in Law Enforcement, Final Report*, http://www.usdoj.gov/cops/pdf/cp_resources/e10990023.pdf

Crime Prevention Division (CPD) (1999) *What is the Safer Communities Development Fund?*', NSW Attorney-General's Department, www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/cpd.nsf/pages/cpdgrants2

Crime Prevention Division (CPD) (2000a) *2.38 Woolloomooloo Crime Prevention And Safety Initiative (part of The Kings Cross Place Management Project)*, NSW Attorney-General's Department: www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/cpd.nsf/pages/directnsw2_38

Crime Prevention Division (CPD) (2000b) 3.5 Crime Prevention through Urban Design, NSW Attorney-General's Department: www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/cpd.nsf/pages/directnsw3_5

Crime Prevention Division (CPD) (undated) *2.13 Community Safety Officers, Youth Liaison Officers and Gay and Lesbian Liaison Officers*, NSW Attorney-General's Department: www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au./cpd.nsf/pages/directnsw2_13

Crime Prevention Queensland (CPQ) (1999) *Queensland Crime Prevention Strategy: Building Safer Communities*, Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Crime Prevention Queensland (CPQ) (2001) *Task Force on Crime Prevention, Department of the Premier and Cabinet,* www.premiers.qld.gov.au/about/crimeprevention/index.htm).

Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) (1998) *The Local Crime Prevention Committee Program*, July 1995-December 1997: Evaluation Report, Attorney-Generals Department, SA

Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) (1999a) *About The Crime Prevention Unit*, Attorney-General's Department, SA www.cpu.sa.gov.au/home.htm

Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) (1999b) *The Local Crime Prevention Program*, Attorney-General's Department, SA, www.cpu.sa.gov.au/sa_lcpcp.htm

Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) (2001) *Evaluation of the Local Crime Prevention Committee Program, 1998-2000*, Attorney-Generals Department, SA

Criminal Justice Commission (1999) *Crime Prevention Partnerships in Queensland: An evaluation of a pilot program*, Research and Prevention Division, Criminal Justice Commission

Crowe, T. (1991/94) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Applications of Architectural Design and Space Management Concepts,* Butterworth-Heinemann, London

Crowe, T. and Zahm, D. (1994) 'Crime Prevention through Environmental Design', *Land Development*, Fall: 22-27

Devery, C. (1992) *Mapping Crime in Local Government Areas*, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. Sydney.

Downs, R and Stea, D. (1973) *Image and Environment: Cognitive Mapping and Spatial Behaviour*, Aldine, Chicago

Faris, R. and Dunham, H. (1939) *Mental Disorders in Urban Areas: An ecological study of schizophrenia and other psychoses,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Felson, M. (1987) *Routine Activities and Crime Prevention in the Developing Metropolis*, Criminology, 25: 911-931

Ferraro, K.F. (1995) *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*, Suny Press, NY

Forster, C. (1991) *Areas of Multiple Disadvantage in Adelaide,* Final Report to the Planning Review

Findlay, M. and Bach, D. (1993) 'South Australian Case Study: Rosewood Village Demonstration Project' in National Capital Planning Authority (1993) *Restructuring Public Housing Precincts,* Occasional Paper Series 1, Paper 4. (Report prepared for the Better Cities Program, Commonwealth Department of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Services)  Canberra, ACT

Geason, S. and Wilson, P. (1989) *Designing out Crime: Crime prevention through environmental design,* AIC, Canberra

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. (1958) *Physique and Delinquency*, Harper, NY

Goldstein, H. (1979) 'Improving Policing: A problem-oriented approach', *Crime and delinquency*, 25.

Goldstein, H. (1990) *Problem Oriented Policing*, McGraw Hill, USA

Goldsworthy, John (1998) 'Partnerships with Local Government – A Practical Approach to CPTED by the Queensland Police Service', Paper presented at the conference *Safer Communities: Strategic Directions in Urban Planning*, held in Melbourne, 10-11 September

Hall, Peter (1997) 'Regeneration Policies for Peripheral Housing Estates: Inward and Outward-looking Approaches', *Urban Studies*, 34, 5-6: 873-90

Harloe, M. (1995) *The People's Home*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Harsley, S. (1993) 'How Tenants Have Succeeded in Reducing Crime on the Estate', *Housing Review*, 42, 3, May-June.

Harries, K. (1976) *Cities and Crime: A Geographic Model*, Criminology,14:369-86

Harries, K., (1999) *Mapping Crime: Principle and Practice Research Report,* http://www.ncjrs.org/html/nij/mapping/pdf.html

Harvey, D. (1988) *Social Justice and The City*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford

Heal, K and Laycock, G. (1986) Situational Crime Prevention: From Theory into Practice, HMSO, London

Herbert, D.T. (1976) 'Social Deviance in the City: A spatial perspective', in Herbert and Johnson (1996) *Social Areas in Cities*

Herbert, D.T. (1979) 'Urban Crime: A geographical perspective', in Herbert and Smith, *Social Problems and the City: Geographical Perspectives*

Herbert, D.T. (1982) *The Geography of Urban Crime*, Longmans, London

Herbert, D.T. (1997) *Crime and the City: Environmental Approaches to Crime Prevention: What works in community safety*, UK Home Office, London

Herbert, D.T. and Johnston, R.J. (1976) *Social Areas in Cities*, Vol 1: Spatial Processes and Form; Vol 2: Spatial Perspectives and Problems, Wiley, Chichester

Herbert, D.T. and Smith, D.M. (1979) *Social Problems and the City: Geographical Perspectives*, Oxford University Press

Hirschfield, A. and Bowers, K.J. (1997) 'The Effect of Social Cohesion on Levels of Recorded Crime in Disadvantaged Areas', *Urban Studies*, 34, 8: 1275-1295.

Hoefnagels, P. (1997) *The Prevention Pioneers: History of the Hein Roethof prize 1987-1996*, Ministry of Justice, The Netherlands

Homel, R. and Tomsen, S. (1992), 'Hot Spots for Violence: The environment of pubs and clubs', in H. Strang and S.A. Gerull (eds.) *Homicide: Patterns, Prevention and Control*, Australian Institute of Criminology: 53-66.

Hope, T. and Foster, J. (1992) 'Conflicting Forces; changing the dynamics of crime and community on a 'problem estate',' in *British Journal of Criminology*, Autumn: 488-504

Hope, T. and Shaw, M. (eds.) (1988) *Communities and Crime Reduction*, Home Office Research and Planning Unit, HMSO, London.

Hope, T. and Shaw, M. (1988) 'Community Approaches to Reducing Crime', in Hope and Shaw (eds.) (1988) *Communities and Crime Reduction*

Hughes, G. (2001) 'Crime Prevention', in E. McLauchlan and J. Muncie (eds.) *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology,* Sage Publications, London.

Hyatt, R.A. and Holzman, H.R. (1999) *Guidebook for Measuring Crime in Public Housing with Geographic Information Systems.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Random House, NY

Jeffery, C.R. (1971/77) *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*, Sage Publications, Beverley Hills, California

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1995) 'Successes and Failures in Neighbourhood Crime Prevention: Findings', *Housing Research* 149, June, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

Judd, B., Samuels, R., Baldry A. and Zehner, R. (forthcoming) *Neighbourhood Improvement and Community Cohesion in the Waterloo Public Housing Estate*, UNSW

Klodawsky, F. and Lundy, C. (1994) 'Women's Safety in the University Environment', *Journal Architectural and Planning Research*, 11, 2

Knowles, C. (1995), *Housing Policy Green Paper*, NSW Government

Korrthals Altes, H.J. and van Soomeren, P. (1998) 'CPTED and Community Building: The Next Phase', Paper presented to the *1998 International CPTED Association Conference*, Washington DC, December

Lee, T. (1968) Urban Neighbourhood as a Socio-Spatial Schema, *Human Relations*, 21: 241-267.

Lott, B., Reilly, M.E. and Howard, D.R. (1982) 'Sexual Assault and Harassment: A campus community case study', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8, 2: 296

Lynch, K. (1960) *The Image of the City*, MIT Press

Mant, J. (1992) *Inquiry into the NSW Department of Housing*, Report of Commissioner John Mant, Sydney

Matka, E. (1990) 'Uses and Abuses of Crime Statistics', *Crime and Justice Bulletin*, 11, November, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

Matka, E. (1997) *Public Housing and Crime in Sydney*, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney

Mayhew, G.T., Clarke, R.V.G., Sturman, A. and Hough, J.M. (1976) *Crime as Opportunity*, Home Office Research Study 34, HMSO, London

McCamley, P. (1994) *Safer by Design: A Practical Guide to Creating Safer Communities*, NSW Police Service, Sydney Through Social Development – A Discussion Paper. NSW Police Service

McCamley, P. (1999) *Crime, Design and Urban Planning, A Report to the Dept of Urban Affairs and Planning,* Sydney, NSW

McHarg, I.L. (1969/1992) *Design With Nature*, Garden City, NY

McLaughlan, E. (2001) 'Geographies of Crime', in E. McLauchlan and J. Muncie (eds.) *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*, Sage Publications, London

Maclennan, Duncan (1998) 'Urban Regeneration in Britain: New Times, New Challenges' in B. Badcock and K. Harris (eds.) *Proceedings of the 1998 National Urban Renewal Seminar*, AHURI: Melbourne

Merry, S.E. (1981a*) Urban Danger: Life in a neighbourhood of strangers*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia

Merry, S. E. (1981b) 'Defensible Space Undefended', *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 16, 397-422.

Merton, R. K. (1938) 'Social Structure and Anomie' in *American Sociological Review*, 3:672-682

Mirrlees-Black, C., Budd, T., Partridge, S. and Mayhew, P. (1998) *The 1998 British Crime Survey,* HMSO, London

Monro, D (1997-8) *Public Rental Housing Policy: Learning the Lessons from Overseas*, Research Paper 6, Social Policy Group, Parliament of Australia

Murray, A.T., McGuffog, I., Western, J. and Mullins, P. (2001) 'Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis Techniques for Examining Urban Crime', *British Journal of Criminology*, 41: 309-329

National Capital Planning Authority (1993) *Restructuring Public Housing Precincts*, Occasional Paper Series 1, Paper 4, (Report prepared for the Better Cities Program, Commonwealth Department of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Services), Canberra, ACT

Newman, O. (1972) *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention through Urban Design*, Macmillan, New York

Newman, O. (1976a) *Design Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space*, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Government Printing Office, Washington DC

Newman, O. (1976b) *Community of Interest – Design for Community Control in Architecture, Planning and Urban Crime,* Report of NACRO Conference, London 1974

Newman, O. and Franck, K. (1980) *Factors Influencing Crime and Instability in Urban Housing Development,* US Dept of Justice, Government Printing Office, Washington DC

NSW Attorney-General's Department (NSWAG's) (1998) *Crime Prevention Resource Manual,* NSWAG's

NSW Department of Housing (NSWDH) (1995) *A Guide to Urban Safety and Security for the NSW Department of Housing*, Technical Policy, Housing Production Division, NSWDH, Liverpool

NSW Department of Housing (NSWDH) (1999) *Directions for Housing Assistance Beyond 2000*, Background Paper, September, NSWDH

NSW Department of Housing (NSWDH) (undated) *Neighbourhood Improvement Framework* (internal document)

NSW Department of Housing (NSWDH) (undated) *Community Renewal: Transforming Estates into Communities – Partnership and Participation*, NSWDH

NSW Department of Local Government (NSWDLG) (1998) *Crime Prevention Resource Manual for Local Councils*. Circular to Councils from Garry Payne, Director General.

NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP) (2001) *Crime prevention and the assessment of development applications: Guidelines under section 79c of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*, DUAP

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (1998) *Annual Report*, www.police.nsw.gov.au/annual_report/ar-97-98

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (2001a) *NSW Police: Future Directions 2001-2005*, www.police.nsw.gov.au/main/detail.cfm?ObjectID=33

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (2001b) *Crime Prevention: Focus on Community Safety*, www.police.nsw.gov.au/prevention

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (2001c) *Local Area Commands: How is a Local Area Command (LAC) structured?,* www.police.nsw.gov.au/lac

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (2001d) *Safer by Design*, www.police.nsw.gov.au/sbd

NSW Police Service (NSWPS) (undated) NSW Police Liaison Officers: www.police.nsw.gov.au/services/liaison.cfm

O'Brien, B. (1997) *Public Housing: a great investment marred by portfolio decisions,* Paper presented at Urban Research Program Seminar, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

O'Brien, B. (1999) *Australian Housing Policy: resulting tenure impacts*, Paper presented in International Housing Practices Course, FBE, UNSW.

O'Brien, B. (2001) *Planning in the new millennium: housing needs among older NESB women*, unpublished PhD thesis (Chapter 3, Public Housing Supply), Australian National University.

Osborn, S. and Shaftoe, H (1995) *Safer Neighbourhoods? Successes and Failures in Crime Prevention*, Safer Neighbourhood Unit, London.

Painter, K., Lea, J, Woodhouse, T. and Young, J. (1989) *The Hammersmith and Fulham Crime and Policing Survey*, Centre for Criminology, Middlesex Polytechnic, London

Painter, K. (1992) 'Different Worlds: The spatial, temporal and social dimension of female victimisation', in D.J. Evans, N.R. Fyfe and D.T. Herbert (eds.) *Crime, Policing and Place: Essays in Environmental Criminology*, Routledge, London

Park, R., Burgess, E. and McKenzie, R. (1925) *The City*, University of Chicago Press

Peak, K. and Glensor, R. (1996) *Community Policing and Problem Solving: Strategies and Practice*s, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River

Pease, K. (1997), 'Crime Prevention', in M.Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 2nd ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford

Peel, M. (1995) *Good Times, Hard Times: The Past and the Future of Elizabeth*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria

Perlgut, D. (1983) *Manageable Space: Selected case studies of crime prevention and the design and management of public developments in Australia,* Social Impacts Publication, Australia

Poyner, B and Webb, B. (1991) *Crime Free Housing*, Butterworth-Arch, Oxford.

Proshansky, H.M., Ittleson, W.H. and Rivlin, L.G. (1970) *Environmental Psychology: Man and his Physical Setting,* Holt, Rinehart, Winston, NY.

QLD Department of Housing (QLDDH) (2000) *The Challenge to Lead and the Opportunity to Learn through Community Renewal*, Housing Policy and Research, Occasional Paper 6

QLD Department of Housing (QLDDH) (2001a) *Community Renewal Information Paper*, QLDDH

QLD Department of Housing (2001b) *Community Renewal Info: Program Overview*, www.communityrenewal.qld.gov.au

QLD Department of Housing (QLDDH) (undated:a) *Urban Renewal*, www.housing.qld.gov.au/indiv/public_content/renewal.htm

QLD Department of Housing (QLDDH) (undated:b) *Project Details*, www.communityrenewal.qld.gov.au/projects

QLD Department of Premier and Cabinet (QLDDPC) (2001) *Crime Prevention Queensland*, www.premiers.qld.gov.au/about/community/crimeprevention.htm

QLD Government (2000) *Smart State: Putting Families First*, QLD Government

QLD Police Service (QLDPS) (2001a) *Neighbourhood Police Beat*, www.police.qld.gov.au/pr/program/p_beat

QLD Police Service (QLDPS) (2001b*) Police Beat Shopfronts*, www.police.qld.gov.au/pr/program/polshop

QLD Police Service (QLDPS) (2001c) *Police Liaison Officers*, www.police.qld.gov.au/pr/join/plo.htm

QLD Police Service (QLDPS) (2001d) *Volunteers in Policing*, www.police.qld.gov.au/pr/join/vlteer.htm

Queensland Police Service (undated), *A Guide to Problem-Oriented Partnership Policing,* Queensland Police Service

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000a) 'Community renewal and public housing estates', *Urban Policy and Research*, 8, 1:91-104

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000b) *Community Renewal and Large Public Housing Estates*, Research Paper No. 2, Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown

Randolph, B and Judd, B (2000c) *Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project, Monitoring and Evaluation Project, Final Report prepared for City of Salisbury and South Australian Housing Trust*, Urban Frontiers Program, UWS/Faculty of the Built Environment, UNSW

Randolph, B., Judd, B., Carmichael, C. and Holloway, D. (2001) *Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Improvement Program for the NSW Department of Housing*, Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown.

Ratcliffe, J. H. (2000) 'Visualising Crime Hotspots and Making Sense of High Volume Crime', in Proceedings of '*Crime Mapping: Adding Value To Crime Prevention and Control'*, Joint AIC and CSAGIS Conference, Sept, Adelaide.

Reiss, A.J. and Tonry, M. (1986) *Communities and Crime*, Vol 8 of Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Univ Chicago Press, Chicago

Rich, T.F. (1995) *The Use of Computerized Mapping in Crime Control and Prevention Programs,* National Institute of Justice, NY

Rich, T.F. (1999) *Mapping the Path to Problem Solving,* National Institute of Justice, NY

Robson, B.T. (1969) *Urban Analysis: a study of city structure*, Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge

Roiphe, K. (1993) *The Morning After: Sex, Fear and Feminism*, Hamish Hamilton, London

Roncek, D. and  Pravatiner, M. (1989) 'Additional Evidence that Taverns Enhance Nearby Crime', *Sociology and Social Research,* 73, 4: 185-188

Roncek, D.W. and Maier, P. A. (1991) 'Bars, Blocks and Crimes Revisited: Linking the theory of Routine Activities to the empiricism of 'hot spots',' *Criminology*, 29: 725-753.

Saarinen, T. (1976) *Environmental Planning: Perception and Behaviour*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Safe Women - Liverpool Project (1994) *Ask Any Woman*, Report prepared by L. Reedy, M. Hickie, R. Leonard and E. Simeoni, Liverpool City Council/South Western Sydney Area Health Authority.

Sampson, R. and Wooldredge, J. (1987) 'Linking the Micro- and Macro-Level Dimensions of Lifestyle, Routine Activity and Opportunity Models of Predatory Victimization', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* 3: 371-393

Samuels, R. (1994a) *An Environmental Design and Management Approach to Security*, Proceedings of the ASHAC Conference

Samuels, (1994b) *Safe Places*, part of a development course for the NSW Police Service

Samuels, R. (1995a) *Design and Planning for Urban Safety and Security*, Final Report, NSW Department of Housing.

Samuels, R. (1995b) *Defensible Design and Security - University Campuses*, Department of Employment, Education and Training: Evaluations and Investigations Program, AGPS, Canberra.

Samuels, R. (2001) 'The Afterdark Paradigm; and temporal-Spatial Mapping', *6th International CPTED Conf*, Brisbane

Samuels, R. (forthcoming) 'Afterdark Design, Night Animation, and Community Appropriation: a community-security approach', Special CPTED Edition, *JAPR*.

SA Department of Environment and Planning (1991) *2020 Vision: Ideas for Metropolitan Adelaide*, Adelaide, SA.

SA Police Service (SAPOL) (1999) *Annual Report*, SAPOL

SA Police Service (SAPOL) (2001) *Annual Report*, SAPOL

Sarkissian, W. (1984) *Safe as Houses: Designing Medium Density Public Housing to Reduce Crime and Vandalism Problems*, Prepared for the Criminology Research Council, Canberra and the NSW Department of Housing, NSW Department of Housing, Sydney.

Saville, G. and Cleveland, G. (1998) '2nd Generation CPTED: An Antidote to the Social Y2K Virus of Urban Design', Paper presented to the *1998 International CPTED Association Conference*, Washington DC, December

Saville, G. and Wright, D. (1998) 'Putting Neighbours Back Into The Neighbourhood: Strategies for Safety, Urban Design and CoHousing', *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting*, Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology, Vancouver, Canada

Saywell, J. and Bawden, P. (2000) 'Crime Mapping from an Intelligence Perspective', in *Proceedings of 'Crime Mapping: Adding Value To Crime Prevention and Control'*, Joint AIC and CSAGIS Conference, September, Adelaide.

Schmid, C.F. (1960) 'Urban Crime Areas', in *American Sociological Review* 25, 527-54 and 655-78

Shaw and McKay (1929) *Delinquency Areas*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Shaw, C.R. and McKay, H.D. (1942) *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Silverman, E.B. and Della-Giustina, J-A. (2001) 'Urban Policing and the Fear of Crime', *Urban Studies*, 38, 5-6:941-957

Smith, D.M. (1973) *The Geography of Social Well-Being in the USA*, McGraw Hill, NY

Smith, D.M. (1975) *Patterns in Human Geography*, Penguin.

South Sydney City Council (SSCC) (2002) Redfern-Waterloo Partnership Project, www.sscc.nsw.gov.au

Spiller Gibbins Swan Pty Ltd (2000) *Public Housing Estate Renewal in Australia*, Project No 212, Australian Housing Research Fund, Melbourne.

Standing Committee on Law and Justice (SCLJ), (1999) *Crime Prevention through Social Support, First Report*, NSW Parliament Legislative Council, Parliamentary Paper No 159, Legislative Council, NSW Parliament

Standing Committee on Law and Justice (SCLJ), (2000) *Crime Prevention through Social Support, Second Report*, NSW Parliament Legislative Council, Parliamentary Paper No 437, Legislative Council, NSW Parliament

Stegman, M. (1998) 'The Challenge of Revitalising Social Housing in the United States' in B. Badcock and K. Harris (eds.) *Proceedings of the 1998 National Urban Renewal Seminar*, AHURI: Melbourne

Stollard, P. (ed.) (1991) *Crime Prevention Through Housing Design*, Spon, London

Stubbs, J. and Hardy, M. (2000) *Evaluation of Three Neighbourhood Renewal strategies*, Prepared for the South West Region, NSW Department of Housing.

Stubbs, J. and Storer, L. (1996) Social *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Department of Housing's Neighbourhood Improvement Program, Case Study, Airds* (prepared for the NSW Department of Housing, Western Sydney Region).

Sutton, A. (1994) 'Community Crime Prevention: A National Perspective'*, in D. Chappell and P. Wilson (eds.) *Australian criminal Justice: The Mid-1990s*, Butterworths, Sydney

Taylor, M. (1998) *Top-Down Meets Bottom-Up: Neighbourhood Management*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, UK.

Taylor, R.B. (1988) *Human Territorial Functioning: an empirical, evolutionary perspective on individual and small group territorial functioning, behaviours and consequences*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Taylor, R.B. (1999) *Crime, Grime, Fear and Decline: A Longitudinal Look*, Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, NY

Taylor, R.B., Gottfredson, S.D. and Brower, S. (1981) 'Territorial Cognitions and Social Climate in Urban Neighbourhoods', *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 2: 289-303.

Trench, S., Tanner, O. and Tiesdell, S. (1992) 'Safer Cities for Women: Perceived risks and planning measures', *Town Planning Review*, 63, 3:279-295

Vinson, T. (1995) *Waterloo Estate Study: Preliminary Findings*, School of Social Work, UNSW.

Vinson, T (1999) *Unequal in Life: The Distribution of Social Disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales*, Jesuit Social Services Inc., Richmond, VIC.

Walker, J. (1991) *Crime in Australia: as measured by the Australia component of the International Crime Victims Survey 1989*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Warr, M. (1984) 'Fear of Victimisation: Why are women and the elderly more afraid?' in *Social Science Quarterly*, 65: 681-702

Warr, M. (1985) 'Fear of Rape Among Urban Women', *Social Problems*, 32: 238-250

Weatherburn, D. and Lind, B. (2001) *Delinquent-Prone Communities*, Cambridge University Press

Weatherburn, D., Lind, B. and Simon Ku (1999)' "Hotbeds of Crime?" Crime and Public Housing in Urban Sydney' in *Crime and Delinquency*, 45, 2: 256-271

Weisburd, D., Green, L. and Ross, D. (1994) 'Spatial Analysis of Crimes Committed in Street-Level Drug Markets'*, Criminologie*, 27, 1: 49-67

West, D.J. and Farrington, D.P. (1977) *The Delinquent Way of Life*, Third Report of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, Heinemann, London

White, R. (1998) 'Public Spaces and Community Crime Prevention', *Proceedings of the 'Safer Communities: Strategic Directions in Urban Planning' Conference*, Melbourne

White, R. and Sutton, A. (1995) 'Crime Prevention, Urban Space and Social Exclusion', *ANZ Journal of Sociology*, 31, 1: 82-99

Wilson, S (1978) 'Vandalism and Defensible Space on London Housing Estates', in Clarke (ed.) *Tackling Vandalism*, Home Office Research Report, 47, HMSO, London.

Wilson, P. (1987) 'Research Brief: Graffiti and Vandalism on Public Transport, Trends and Issues' in *Crime and Criminal Justice*, 6, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Wilson, J and Kelling, G (1982) 'Broken Windows: The police and neighbourhood safety', *The Atlantic Monthly*, March.

Wood, M. (Forthcoming) *Resident Participation in Community and Urban Renewal in Australia: A Study of Six Neighbourhoods*, AHURI Final Report, UNSW-UWS Research Centre, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, University of Western Sydney, Campbelltown, NSW.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1:    Estate Selection

**Letter to State Housing Authorities**

**UNSW-UWS Research Centre,**

**Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI)**

**AHURI Research Project:  Linkages Between Housing, Policing and Other Interventions for Crime and Harassment Reduction on Public Housing Estates**

**Estate Selection Process**

Now that AHURI has funded this project we need to revisit the estate selection, which we discussed with you earlier.

The research design requires that we select three public housing estates from NSW, SA and Queensland – one in each of the following categories:

1. An estate that has undergone (or is undergoing) neighbourhood renewal that involved (involves) significant changes to the physical environment (eg. major design or re-development interventions).

2. An estate that has undergone (or is undergoing) neighbourhood renewal primarily though non-asset, community development approaches and without significant interventions to the physical environment.

3. A 'control' estate that has had neither of the above – i.e. no significant physical or community development initiatives as part of a neighbourhood renewal program.

We need to identify estates in the first two categories that meet the following criteria:

1. Minimum three years (and preferably more) of neighbourhood renewal activity – i.e. commenced no later than early 1999

2. Reasonably matched in terms of:

    a.  size (no of dwellings)
    b.  type of location (eg inner, mid or outer suburban)
    c.  demographic profile.

Your assistance in completing the attached estate information sheet (by Friday 7 December) will help us greatly in this process.

Please fill in the information on the form and return as an e-mail attachment.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

**Bruce Judd and Robert Samuels**
**Chief Investigators**

## ESTATE INFORMATION SHEET
## (please list up to four estates in each category – in order of preference)

| Estate Name | Urban location (inner, middle or outer suburbs) | Approximate age of estate (years) | Date renewal commenced (month/year) | Date renewal completed* (month/year) | Total number of public housing dwellings on estate | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | before renewal | Dec 2001 |
| (A) Estates with substantial physical renewal interventions (asset or urban improvements or redevelopment) | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| (B) Estates with community development initiatives but no substantial physical interventions | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| (C) Estates with no substantial physical interventions or community development interventions | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |

**\*  If applicable**

## APPENDIX 2:    Victimisation Mapping Survey

| State Code | Area Code | Survey No. |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

**THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES**

**AHURi**
Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute

# Neighbourhood Crime and Safety Survey

The purpose of this survey is to find out your views about crime and safety issues in *(suburb name)*, and map any experiences you might have had as a victim of crime or harassment.

**Part A – First some questions about you.**

1    Gender    ☐ Male    ☐ Female

2    Age group    ☐ 14-19 years    ☐ 20-29 years    ☐ 30-39 years    ☐ 40-49 years

☐ 50-59 years    ☐ 60-69 years    ☐ 70 years & over

3    How long have you lived here in (suburb name)    [    ] years    [    ] months

**Part B –  Now some questions about changes you have noticed in *(suburb name)* over the last few years.**

4    What are the main changes (for better or worse) that you have noticed in *(suburb name)* over the past 3 to 5 years?

Changes for the better                    Changes for the worse

_____        _____

_____        _____

_____        _____

_____        _____

5    How do you think crime and harassment in (suburb name) has changed over the last 3 to 5 years?

☐    Much better            ☐    A little better            ☐    About the same

☐    A little worse          ☐    A lot worse                ☐    Uncertain

6    Now could you please look at the list of statements on the following two pages and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of them?
*(Place a tick in one of the boxes for each statement)*

| Statements | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 2.  I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 3.  I visit my neighbours in their homes. | | | | | |
| 4.  The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me. | | | | | |
| 5.  Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 6.  If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something, I'd think of it as something 'we' were doing rather than something 'they' were doing. | | | | | |
| 7.  If I needed advice about something, I could go to someone in my neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 8.  I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life. | | | | | |
| 9.  I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency. | | | | | |
| 10. I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 11. I borrow things from my neighbours. | | | | | |
| 12. I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 13. I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years. | | | | | |
| 14. I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 15. I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit. | | | | | |
| 16. A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood. | | | | | |
| 17. I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood. | | | | | |

| Statements | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree or Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community. | | | | | |
| 19. When I'm alone in my home during the day I feel safe. | | | | | |
| 20. I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the day. | | | | | |
| 21. When I'm alone at home during the night I feel safe. | | | | | |
| 22. I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the night. | | | | | |

**Part C – Finally, we would like you to help us mark on the map (computer screen) where you feel SAFE and UNSAFE in *(suburb name)* and where you have been the victim of crime or harassment during the last five years.**

*(point out key features on the map if necessary)*

a. First, could you show me on the map on the computer screen the places in *(suburb name)* where you feel SAFE:

    i. during the DAY?

    ii. at NIGHT?

b. Now could you show me on the map where in *(suburb name)* you feel UNSAFE:

    i. during the DAY?

    ii. at NIGHT?

c. Finally, in the last 5 years, have you had any bad experiences in *(suburb name)* – like someone harassing you, or been the victim of a crime?

    IF YES, for each incident could you: *(interviewer to prompt for each incident)*

- Show me on the map where it happened?

- Tell me when it happened? (day or night)

- Tell me what happened? *(coded by researcher – see over)*

- And if you reported the incident to the police?

## THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS SURVEY

## APPENDIX 3: Victimisation Survey Event Categories

| VICTIMISATION CHECKLIST (for use by researcher) | |
|---|---|
| **Property** | **Personal** |
| 1. stolen vehicle/motorbike | 5. robbed (steal from person) |
| 2. break into vehicle | 6. assaulted |
| 3. break into home, steal | 7. physically intimidated or threatened |
| 4. malicious damage to property | 8. verbally insulted or abused |
| | 9. sexual harassment, stalked/followed |
| | 10. sexual assault |
| 11. Drug Offences | |

## APPENDIX 4: Preliminary List of Regional and Demographic Context Data Sources

| DATE | AUTHOR / SOURCE | TITLE |
|---|---|---|
| 2000 | AIC | Australian crime • Facts and figures 2000 |
| 2001 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE Catalogue No. 2001.0 |
| Dec, 2001 | ABS | AusStats 4509_1 Crime and Safety, New South Wales |
| May, 2001 | ABS | AusStats 4510_0 Recorded Crime, Australia |
| Aug, 1999 | ABS | AusStats 4509_0 Crime and Safety, Australia |
| Jun, 1905 | ABS | AusStats 1370_0 Measuring Australia's Progress |
| 2000 | ABS | AusStats Special Article - Crime and Safety (Year Bk Aust 2000) |
| 2001 | ABS | AusStats Special Article - Crime and Safety (Year Bk Aust 2001) |
| | ABS | AusStats Types of dwellings |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Campbelltown (C) (NSW) |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Penrith (C) |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Zillmere |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILESLA - Loganlea |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Woodridge |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Blacktown |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA- Noarlunga (C) |
| 1996 | ABS | BASIC COMMUNITY PROFILE SLA - Salisbury |
| 1995 - 2000 | ABS | Recorded Criminal Incidents: Cambelltown LGA |
| 1995 - 2000 | ABS | Recorded Criminal Incidents: Blacktown LGA |
| 1997- 2001 | Lawlink NSW | Blacktown LGA Trends in Recorded Crime Statistics |
| May, 1996 | Marilyn Chilvers | Lawlink NSW B44 - Public Perception of Neighb Crime in NSW.htm |
| May, 1996 | Weatherburn, Matka et al | Lawlink NSW B28 - Public Percept Risk of Crim Victim in Austr.htm |
| 1997- 2001 | Lawlink NSW | Campbelltown LGA Trends in Recorded Crime Statistics |
| April, 2002 | Jacqui Allen | NSW Recorded crime stats 2001: Regioal analy/crime trends |
| | Office of Crime Stats, SA | The Dispersion of Motor Vehicle Theft in South Australia 1998 |
| Feb, 1997 | Office of Crime Stats, SA | Reported Crime Trends in South Australia |
| | Office of Crime Stats, SA | Arson on the Increase: Motor Vehicle Theft and Arson in South Australia |
| | Office of Crime Stats, SA | Motor Vehicle Theft in South Australia 2000/2001 |
| 1990/91- 2000/01 | Qld Pol, Stat Review, www.police.qld.gov.au | Offences reported by police region and type of offence, Queensland |
| 1896 | Commissioner of Police, Annual Report 1896. | Persons reported by police by type of offence by sex, Queensland |
| Apr, 1995 | ABS, Crime and Safety, Qld,1995, Cat.no.4509.3. | Proportion persons victims of selected crimes (a) by age and sex, Qld |
| May, 2001 | Office of Crime Stats, SA | Motor Vehicle Theft Hotspots |
| Jun, 1905 | Office of Crime Stats SA | Crime/Justice/SA, Offences Reported to Police, Victims/Perpetrators |

Level 7 20 Queen Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000

Phone +61 3 9613 5400 Fax +61 3 9629 8536

Email information@ahuri.edu.au  Web www.ahuri.edu.au

**AHURI Research Centres**

Sydney Research Centre

UNSW-UWS Research Centre

RMIT-NATSEM Research Centre

Swinburne-Monash Research Centre

Queensland Research Centre

Western Australia Research Centre

Southern Research Centre

**Affiliates**

Northern Territory University

National Community Housing Forum