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Mr T. Lake, International Chair, International CPTED Association.
The CHAIR — Good afternoon, Tony. Thank you very much for making your time available to the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee, a joint parliamentary committee here in Victoria.

Mr LAKE — It is my pleasure.

The CHAIR — I understand Sandy has had some discussion with you regarding you speaking to us today in relation to it being seen as a public hearing.

Mr LAKE — Yes.

The CHAIR — You are comfortable with that?

Mr LAKE — It is not a problem.

The CHAIR — On that basis, Tony, I will have to read to you, as required in a public hearing, the rights and responsibilities of someone speaking to this committee on that basis.

Mr LAKE — That is fine.

The CHAIR — If you could bear with me, I will read it to you. Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I expect you have received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees or understand it?

Mr LAKE — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I understand Sandy said the format of this afternoon would be that you would give us a brief presentation of around 15 minutes. You have, I understand, some questions that Sandy provided to you.

Mr LAKE — That is right.

The CHAIR — That may or may not encompass your presentation, but we would like the committee to have the opportunity to question you either in relation to your presentation or the terms of reference, which I understand you also have in your position.

Mr LAKE — Yes, I do. That is all fine.

The CHAIR — Excellent. Are there any questions before we start? Perhaps I could invite you, Tony, to address the committee. Again, thank you very much for making yourself available this afternoon.

Mr LAKE — It is my pleasure. Thank you, Simon. I thought the easiest way would probably be to comment on each of the questions that Sandy has sent to me, if that is okay with you.

The CHAIR — That is fine. Can I just say, Tony, at the outset you are our first witness to this public hearing. Obviously we were only given the terms of reference some weeks ago, so we are at the very start of this inquiry and feeling our way, and some of the questions we ask you will reflect that.

Mr LAKE — That is not a problem; I understand that completely. Firstly, I think you are probably aware I come to you from, I guess, three different angles. Currently I am the international chair of the International CPTED Association, which is an honour as far as I am concerned. I am
also the director of the International Security Management and Crime Prevention Institute, which is the training arm of where I work — that is Amtac Professional Services.

My background is in policing. Until five years ago I was a member of the Queensland Police Service. I retired as an inspector. The last job I did before I retired from the office of the commissioner was putting together the Queensland CPTED guidelines. I have been involved with CPTED since 1991. The comments I am making are mainly from my experience with CPTED in Queensland mostly but Australia and New Zealand as well and in other places like Canada and the USA to a lesser degree.

The question that you asked me firstly was: how effective has CPTED as a conceptual strategy been in addressing crime and safety issues? It is very effective, but we have found that it is most effective when it is part of an overall crime prevention strategy. One of the comments we make, particularly in our doing our training and in dealing with local government, is that CPTED will not work as well if it is implemented on its own. It must be part of an overall strategy.

CPTED itself is, I guess, part of what we call situational crime prevention, which includes the organised approach, which is using police and obviously security and anyone else who has authority. It includes the mechanical approach, which is all the stuff we use — in other words, locks, gates, bolts, CCTV and everything else. CPTED is what we call the natural approach. There are those three approaches, but not only that, we like to think that if we are going to implement CPTED properly it will be including all those things plus any other crime prevention strategy that might be around, including drug strategies, youth programs and seniors programs, regardless. I guess what I am saying is that to be most effective CPTED needs to be part of an overall crime prevention strategy. I will mention that again when I get to the recommendations.

Guidelines like those Victoria has — your Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria — need to be promoted and marketed as well as being supported, endorsed, updated and evaluated too. I will probably mention that again later on. However, to answer the question, yes, it is effective in not only reducing crime but also reducing the fear of crime, because what it does is make areas safer, which actually makes people feel safer as well. If it is done properly, then we will get those results.

I will admit to you right up-front, though, that most of the information we have on those results is anecdotal. The trouble we have, which your committee may be able to assist in, particularly in Victoria, is getting people to put things on paper — in other words, evaluate things and write them up. If we can get that done, we will have a lot more information that we can give people when they ask that question: ‘How do we know it works?’ — if you know what I mean. That is pretty well all I was going to say on that question. If you like I will just go through the lot, and then you can ask questions —

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, Tony; just before you go on, you just said something quite important. You said on the one hand it is anecdotal, but you said at the outset it was very effective. Unless you are going to come back to it later, how did you draw that conclusion, then?

Mr LAKE — It is from the evidence we do have and from anecdotal evidence as well. Quite a few things have been written up over the years, and we have some fantastic papers on these things. I would just like to see a lot more of it; that is all. That was where that comment came from. I will mention some of them as we go through.

The second question is: to what extent are architects, developers and planners familiar with CPTED principles. That is an interesting one. Architects usually know; in other words, they are not that familiar. You would hope that architects would be the main ones, but they are not necessarily. I have been doing training in this stuff for years now, and I could count on one hand the number of architects who have sat in on training — out of several hundred people.

Developers — we have found it is only when they are forced, because there is another imperative as far as developers go, and that is making money and getting the best they can. That is not all developers, by the way; there are some excellent developers out there. Delfin Lend Lease is an
example that comes to mind. They are a very community-orientated company, and they will ensure that CPTED principles — they even have people working for them who are CPTED experts.

We find planners are normally familiar, particularly in a lot of councils. In the councils that have taken CPTED on you will find that planners are involved, which is very good, as well as urban designers and landscape architects, for example. All of those are normally pretty good. As a matter of fact out of all of them I think the only ones we have issues with are architects. Except that it is amazing but occasionally you will come across one who is an exception. A name that springs to mind is a chap called Frank Stoks, who is an architect from Wellington in New Zealand. He is the expert on designing public places with CPTED principles in New Zealand, and there are some excellent examples of the work he has done. So people like him are around, but I am afraid to say they are few and far between.

The next one is: what criticisms could be made of CPTED as a strategy in preventing or reducing crime, particularly at a local level? The first one we normally cop is cost. Speaking with councils I will always say that CPTED will work; it will give you results, but it comes at a cost, because, for example, we have to have maintenance plans. We have to ensure that things are maintained. We have to ensure that plans are looked at properly and ensure that people are trained to ensure that they can look at plans properly before they are approved. All these things are a bit of a cost; however, when you see the results the cost is quite minimal.

Another criticism I have had a few times is: the implementation of those principles may have worked in that space, but surely other things contributed as well. In other words: what were the police doing, what other strategies are in place et cetera? I will always say: I hope those things did contribute as well, because we like to see all these things working in together. I have already mentioned the lack of evaluation. That is one of the criticisms, because people say: how do you prove it? If I have to go to my boss and give him some examples, are there any? I will always find some, but there are not that many around.

Training is becoming a bit of an issue — training people in CPTED itself. I am going to speak about training a bit later on, because each state, territory and jurisdiction — like New Zealand — does it in different ways. The main point of the criticism there is that it is not as effective if it is a stand-alone strategy, and that is a point I have already made. There are not too many other criticisms we get of it, though. It is mainly about the fact that it does cost, and how are we going to get our people trained?

What obstacles, challenges or impediments may prevent state and local government and other bodies from successfully implementing CPTED? I think the first one is continuity. What I have found is that a set of guidelines will work in practice but not every time, because councils, police or whoever will then do what they want. Some do not bother to follow the guidelines and some do. All the marketing and promotion is only good enough up to the change of staff. We find that in local government a fair amount and in policing we have very keen people who get out there, do things, get trained, and then they get promoted and go somewhere else. Then all of a sudden no-one else is there to be able to do it. We need to be able to manage that continuity, and we need a champion to push that change. I guess that is one of the main issues there.

If government is serious and develops a strategic plan — like the Victorian guidelines — it needs to be funded and monitored. Whereas it was first put out in Victoria I think about 15 years ago now — with the latest guidelines of course from 2007 — but they have not really been maintained or extended. I think that is part of the problem, but trust me that is the same everywhere else, and we need to be very careful of that. Guidelines only and not legislation, that is one of the things that is quite often said to me is: ‘Why are we just having guidelines? Why don’t we put in some legislation and make them do it?’. I am going to talk about that shortly too, because one of our jurisdictions in Australia — that is, New South Wales — actually has legislation, and it is not as effective as we would like to think. I will talk about that.

Another obstacle particularly in councils that are more traditional is the attitude: ‘That is not the way we have always done it, so why should we change?’. That is a very interesting one to try to get around as well, but only training, marketing and promotion will do that. Another obstacle, or an
impediment more than anything else, is not having police involved. The terms ‘crime’ and ‘crime prevention’ are both contained within the title: crime prevention through environmental design. You cannot have that and not have the police involved.

Bureaucratic roadblocks can be another issue as far as being an obstacle. Narrowly defined responsibilities is an interesting one, particularly in councils. Large councils tend to be built in silos, and I am sure you know what I mean. As a result some parts of council do not talk to other parts of council, and you do not get the right results. It is only when councils work together that you get the best results. I have found another obstacle is that the community usually does not get involved until it is too late. There is a lot of strength, knowledge and insight out there in the community — for example, it is quite often untapped until it is too late in the project’s development.

The next question is: can you point to any local government areas that are particularly good at incorporating CPTED or safe design principles? You have got one down there, and I am talking about the City of Melbourne. I did training for the City of Melbourne a couple of years ago and I was fascinated by the work that is happening there. I have got a contact there that I would think would be worth talking to.

Brisbane City Council is another one, particularly with planning in the Brisbane city plan, and there are about 60 local area plans as well. All have CPTED mentioned in them. Training happens every year. They train planners and various others in CPTED, which is excellent. I have been involved in that. Surprisingly Brisbane City Council is the only local government I am aware of anywhere in the world that has public toilet design guidelines based on CPTED principles that you can download from their website. I think that is magic; so Brisbane is definitely one.

Not so much now but before the two councils in Townsville were amalgamated, the original Townsville City Council did some magic work in Townsville, particularly on the redevelopment of The Strand. Cairns is the same on the Esplanade redevelopment. One of the best examples of CPTED implementation in the world is in New Zealand, and I use this whenever I travel around and show people photos. It is the Palmerston North Square, which obviously is situated in the city of Palmerston North on the North Island. That is another one that was designed by Frank Stoks, who I mentioned earlier. It is fantastic and has been fully evaluated before and after, and there were some fantastic results from that one.

I will just do three New Zealand ones now. Wellington is doing some excellent work as well. Their process is slightly different to others when it comes to CPTED. They have it in their policies and procedures, but they actually negotiate with developers and various other people who want things approved and come up with a suitable — well, I guess agreeable — solution in the end. It is working very well for them. But the other one I would recommend to you is Christchurch in New Zealand. There are mainly two — that is, Brisbane and Christchurch. Christchurch is in an unenviable position in one way I suppose. The things that have happened over there have been terrible, but in another way it has given them lots of opportunities to redevelop the place. There are some magic plans happening there, and CPTED is right in the middle of it. Christchurch police are involved, and Christchurch City Council is involved as well. Everything that is being redeveloped is being done with CPTED principles. I will give you some more suggestions at the end, but they are just some very good ones I can think of off the top of my head.

The next question is: should CPTED principles be mandated in legislation? I personally do not think so. If we have a look at what is happening around here — around this part of the world — in Victoria you have guidelines. They came out in 2007. Queensland guidelines came out in 2007 as well. In Northern Territory they came out in 2010, in New Zealand it was 2005 and Western Australia was 2006. On the other hand, as I said New South Wales is different. New South Wales has CPTED in legislation. Under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act there is a requirement of assessment of applications to be done prior to things being approved, and in that assessment there must be an accompanying CPTED review.

We might all be thinking, ‘Well, that is fantastic that New South Wales has gone that far’. The only trouble with New South Wales, and it is an issue — and this came out of a paper that I am
quite happy to give you; it is a PowerPoint presentation from Garner Clancey from the University of Sydney who did a fantastic review into this type of thing. The title of it is Do Crime Risk Assessment Reports Measure Crime Risks? It is a good title. It analyses 33 crime risk assessment reports just randomly picked from the period 2007 to 2010. In that they discovered — I will just give you some of these results, which will indicate to you, I am hoping—that guidelines are okay but will only work if they are properly supported. The length of the reports, for example, ranges from 2 pages to 35 pages. Some form of crime data was presented in only 16 of the reports; in other words, less than half. Eleven of the reports made reference to a site visit. In other words, in only 33 per cent of the reports had people actually gone and visited the site.

I guess what I am saying is that people are doing CPTED reviews very cheaply and easily because all the legislation says is that a review must be done. It does not say that it has to be effective; it does not say that any recommendations have to be taken notice of. Unless we are going to back it up with a little bit more than that, it is not going to be as effective as we would like. All I am saying is: let us be careful of going down the track of legislation unless it has been prepared.

Besides, I have an issue with the state telling councils what to do as far as that goes. It is fine to do it any other way, but with crime prevention it is a different issue. Crime prevention is a local matter and a local issue. The purpose behind guidelines like the Victorian safer design guidelines is to say to councils, ‘Okay, this is what we think it should be; this is how it should work. What we would like you to do is take it on board and for you to put it in your own policies and procedures’. The places I already mentioned are doing that and doing it very effectively. Honestly, in the end the people who have to make the decision on whether something has been approved or not are going to be the local council, so they are the ones that should have the responsibility.

In New South Wales because of legislation, and this is not a recent thing, New South Wales police had to form a Safer By Design unit — they call it Safer by Design in New South Wales — and that unit had to develop a training course which they took around New South Wales, and still do, training people in CPTED and how to review applications. That is a four-day course. It is based on a crime risk assessment and is quite a complicated course. What this means is that the person in the development application area who is actually approving it has to be accredited under the New South Wales system. That is another big expense in New South Wales — forming the unit, having police there and police then going around the state training people. Whereas everywhere else the training is normally conducted by police or people like myself who do that type of stuff.

There is an interesting point about the guidelines before I move onto the next question. All the guidelines I mentioned can be downloaded from the web. Queensland guidelines can be downloaded from the Queensland Police website, New Zealand from the Ministry of Justice website, Western Australia from planning, and Northern Territory from lands and planning. The Victorian guidelines used to be able to be downloaded from the department that put them out, which is the Department of Sustainability and Environment, because that was where Crime Prevention Victoria was. However, that unit no longer exists, and it is very difficult to find a copy of the Victorian guidelines on the web because that unit does not exist anymore. I tried myself and had a lot of difficulty. It is very interesting because it used to be just there and you could just download it.

Next question: how could CPTED principles be facilitated in new urban fringe developments and new high-rise developments in well-established urban areas? There is a bit of this happening in Melbourne at the moment that I am aware of, particularly in places like Footscray and what have you. Basically the principles that are there remain the same, and the idea is to modify the principles for each particular application.

In other words, there needs to be proper CPTED reviews done, and I mean reviews done by people who know what they are doing. The main principles of CPTED are natural surveillance, being able to see in and out of places, access control, controlling what people do, and the main one to my way of thinking is territoriality, or ownership if you like. Ownership is all about presenting the place in such a way that it is obvious that somebody maintains it, it is obvious that somebody looks after it and keeps it clean and neat, and there is an ownership of that space which signifies to people who might want to do the wrong thing that, ‘We are not going to tolerate that here’.
These are the ideas and principles of CPTED. Regardless of where you are developing things, the same principles apply; you just do them in different ways. To answer that question would probably take all day, but it is just to be aware that there is a lot of that happening and it is also happening in the other major cities in Australia, and overseas as well, which is new urban fringe developments and also high-rise developments in this city, and what have you. Of course that is a magic thing because it means that you have got people in CBDs 24 hours a day, and I think that is just great.

Next question: what recommendations could the committee make to facilitate the effective implementation of CPTED principles in Victoria? There is one main one and quite a few others. The main one is that there has to be support from the top. As I said, the guidelines were put out by the Department of Sustainability and Environment and currently nobody actually owns them, so they need to be supported from the top. There needs to be training where and when it is needed. Victoria Police currently run training in Victoria. They do not do as much training as they used to. As a matter of fact I am not quite sure how many courses they are down to per year now, but I know the two guys that are doing it because they sat in on a course that I conducted some years ago in Melbourne. The main thing is that the training needs to continue and somebody needs to own the guidelines. In other words, be responsible for them, be responsible for updating them, be responsible for evaluating them, and until we can do that, then we are going to have some issues.

The safer design guidelines were released to facilitate planning and design of state urban environments for all Victorian communities. They are supposed to be there to assist planners and designers to apply design principles that will improve safety. They are there for the right reason. This comment I discovered on the guidelines is:

Planning and responsible authorities must have regard to the guidelines in assessing the design and built form of new development …

Apparently that is in clause 19 of the state planning policy framework. There is something there that says we need to have a look at this, but because it is policy, I do not know how much weight that holds. However, each municipality in Victoria is covered by a planning scheme which sets out policies and provisions for the use, development and protection of land, and in those schemes is where CPTED should actually be mentioned. The urban design unit of the Department of Planning and Community Development provides leadership and direction for the design and development of the industry in Victoria, so they should definitely be involved as well.

There is plenty there and the recommendations really should be to ensure that the guidelines are relevant, they are owned and supported from the top. Another one, I have already mentioned of course is that the committee could recommend the evaluation of projects. We need that evidence. Another one too is the evaluation of the guidelines. I do not think they have been evaluated in Victoria. Nobody has actually gone out and said, ‘Are these working, are they being used?’ . Whereas in Queensland there have been two evaluations of the guidelines since they were put out, and New Zealand has also had two. We have got to do that: we have got get out there and find out if councils are using the guidelines and how they are using them et cetera.

I would also recommend at least some contact with the Victorian Safe Communities Network. The Safe Communities Foundation is a worldwide foundation under the auspices of the World Health Organisation. It goes about accrediting cities as safe cities. Actually, the city of Melbourne was one of the first cities in Australia to be designated a safe city. That was back in 2000. I think Hume is another one. It is just something to keep an eye on.

I will address the last question that you had, and then I will make some other comments. Who should be involved in implementing CPTED policies and during what part of the process? Basically it is nice to have everybody involved right up-front. I will just run through a list of who I think should be involved. Obviously architects need to be involved and community crime prevention officers or community safety officers from council, certainly elected representatives in local government. I have found in places where I have done training that if we have councillors involved in doing the training, things work so much better because somebody in council itself, one of the elected representatives, is supporting it. Engineers should be involved, and insurance advisers can be worthwhile getting involved.
One thing I have not mentioned at all — and it would take all day to explain, but I will just quickly mention it — is that CPTED is becoming more and more involved in liability and litigation cases, and if something goes wrong and somebody gets hurt and somebody sues council and it goes before a court and somebody asks the question, ‘You have these CPTED guidelines, or the state has them, and if you followed those, this would not have happened; why didn’t you do it?’ it is becoming more and more involved.

I will tell you about one case recently where a Brisbane City Council bus driver was assaulted — this was only finalised last year. When he got to the end of his run and took his cash tin and went to the little toilet that is provided at the end of the run for use by council employees he was assaulted and the money stolen obviously. There are a few issues there. One of them is the practices of council. Drivers should not actually be taking the cash in with them, although it was a requirement at the time that it be left in the bus. He got $100 000 out of council because of being assaulted. The judgement was very interesting to read because the judge was using all the terms that we have in CPTED. He was saying that the toilets were not maintained, that you could not see them, that they were overgrown, that the lights did not work — quite a few things that we would say, ‘Look it’s obvious these things should have been done but they actually weren’t’.

Another interesting aspect of that is that, as I have already told you, Brisbane City Council has public toilet design guidelines. The trouble is it was not following them in its own toilets, which is very interesting. That is becoming an issue as well: liability and litigation. People involved in that need to be involved as well. Obviously maintenance people, planners, police, security, urban designers, you name it — they should all be involved in implementing policies, and academics particularly should be involved. There is no reason why academics should not be there too. Let us face it: all of this stuff was originally created by academics, mostly in the US, the theory of crime prevention through environmental design, and there is a lot more work being done on it and a lot of fantastic ideas coming out of works put together by academics themselves.

As I have said, Melbourne City Council is doing some great work. My contact there is Nancy Pierorazio. She would be worth you having a chat to as well. On the issue of training, police do most of the training in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and Queensland. They do some in Western Australia but not a lot. Victoria Police has not been doing much lately and New South Wales is down to only two courses per year, so it has all been cut back, which is not very good. We ourselves conduct two levels of CPTED training. We do a level 1 course, a three-day course, and an advanced course. Our level 1 course is being held next month on the Gold Coast and the advanced course in Adelaide next February.

Another question that Sandy asked me was to look at where you might possibly travel to to check out what is going on, and I will just finish my presentation with these comments. I mentioned two already: Brisbane — and I can let you know the names of some people you might want to talk to there — and also Christchurch, a city in New Zealand, and I have contacts there as well. The first thing I would recommend if you are able to travel overseas is to attend the international CPTED conference that my organisation puts on every two years. It is being held in Calgary, Canada, from 3 to 5 July 2013. That way you will be able to get an international perspective on what is going on with CPTED, along with some fantastic presentations from various parts of the world, including places that you would not expect, like Chile, for example, and South Africa. You are very welcome to come along to that. I can liaise with Sandy and give you the information on that without any problems.

That is probably all I would like to say. I assume you will have some questions, and I am open to those and happy to take them from you.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for a very extensive presentation. Thank you for basically answering all the questions that we provided to you. You gave us a great starting point in relation to the reference. I will invite the committee to ask you questions. Regarding our reference, the minister has made it clear to us that he does not actually want us to spend a lot of time interpreting CPTED or to reinvent the wheel in relation to the work that has been done, but more to see how local government authorities are working with the guidelines.
You made a couple of points in response to those last two questions on which the committee will be doing some work, and they are with regard to the evaluation process and also whether the safety design guidelines are being incorporated by our local government authorities. That is the principal priority of this reference, notwithstanding many of the responses to the questions you have already addressed.

At some point you can perhaps give us an indication of how you see Victorian local government authorities responding to the guidelines. You already made some sweeping comments to that effect anyway. Perhaps I could invite our committee members to ask some questions of you, Tony. I am very aware that it is 3 o’clock, so we will ask questions until through 3.15 p.m. or thereabouts, just to give you a bit of a time frame.

Mr LAKE — Yes, I am fine, so it is okay with me.

Mr McCURDY — Tony, is it a one-size-fits-all approach in terms of regional and metro opportunities? You have spoken about the cities of Brisbane and Melbourne and those sorts of places. What about the smaller regional areas? Are these principles guiding principles right across the board?

Mr LAKE — The principles are the same regardless of where you are. It is the way in which they are interpreted and implemented that is different. We had some magic examples. Palmerston North, for example, in New Zealand, is a town of around 60,000 people. They are quite capable. Surprisingly enough I recently did some training at somewhere with the same name, Palmerston City Council in Darwin. They only have 28,000 people there and they are also implementing CPTED in a way that suits their own environment. They are more about trying to make people feel safer and opening places up. They were quite amazed, when they went around and had a look at their own city, at some of the simple little things they could easily do to try to make it safer. The principles are there and they are pretty much the same regardless of where you are, but it is the way that they are implemented. It has to be local and suitable to the local area, Tim.

Mr SCHEFFER — I jumped in a bit pre-emptively regarding the evaluation when you were going through. I am interested in knowing if the issue around evaluation is that appropriate tools have not been developed, or is it that they are just not used? What is the context of that? You indicated in the way you spoke about it as though it was a bit of a frustration.

Mr LAKE — It is a frustration. I think the main thing is this reason I have been given several times: somebody might tell me, ‘We did this here, and it has had a fantastic result’. I say, ‘How do you know?’. They say, ‘The crime stats are down’. I say, ‘Did anybody write it up?’, and they will say, ‘No, it is just part of our job; it is what we do’. That is the main reason: people think, ‘We are employed by council, we are supposed to do these things and that is just what we do’. I do not think too many people give some thought as to, ‘Should we be writing this up or shouldn’t we?’. I would think that even reporting back to their own council it would make sense to write things up, but in most cases they are just not. Generally as long as their bosses are happy with it, that is the way that they leave it. To me the main reason those evaluations are not done — and I am talking about on a project-to-project basis — is that people think it is part of their normal jobs, so they do not get around to it, if you know what I mean.

Mr SCHEFFER — Can I just follow that up? I was going to ask you this a bit later on, but I will ask it now because I think it links up. When you were talking about whether it is best to leave these processes in a local sphere or whether it should be legislated and made mandatory by the state or central government, you very clearly opted for not having it legislated, yet you have now described a situation where there is a drift going on. People are making up their own minds about things, and so it moves away from where you want it to go. How do local governments track themselves if they are not benchmarked by legislation?

Mr LAKE — I think they only really need to be benchmarked by the guidelines themselves. The whole purpose of the guidelines, including Victoria’s guidelines, is to get local government to try to use them and put them in their own policies, procedures, by-laws or whatever
you want to call them. In actual fact the guidelines do become not so much legislation but statutory in a way because they belong to that council and are relevant to that council, rather than the states saying, ‘This is the way that it should be done’. I do not know if I am explaining that properly, but to me that is the better way of doing it. You still end up with the council having the authority to say, ‘Yes, you can do that or, no, you cannot’; it is just that the council has decided to make those decisions and is not being told by the state to do it.

Mr SCHEFFER — I will not prolong it. I appreciate what you are saying in theory, and I would like to believe that. My sense is that public policy always needs the part where one group ratchets it up and the other group runs against it. It has to be a two-way street. I am not persuaded by the way you are describing it. Anyway, let us see as we go forward.

Mr LAKE — Yes. The other point that I made earlier on about that is that the guidelines themselves have to be supported from the top by government and what have you. The support must be there, and the guidelines must be promoted, marketed and looked after, somebody takes control of them et cetera. It can be done. I understand what you are saying, and I take that on board.

Mr LEANE — Under the guidelines we have a whole chapter on lighting. Have you ever heard an argument against lighting up certain public spaces like halls that will not get used at night or sporting club’s pavilions? There is the argument that people can see what they are grafittiing on the wall, which windows they can throw a rock through and where they might be able to access the building to perpetrate a theft.

Mr LAKE — That is a good question. The way we look at that is interesting. We have done lighting reviews and made recommendations not to light things up like parks and what have you. That is because you have to take a whole pile of other things into consideration. Lighting is a very difficult subject. It is not one of those things where you say, ‘We will just put some lights in the park or lights around that building or whatever’. You have to go through a lot of processes to work that out. The Australian and New Zealand standards on lighting give you that process, and they are very easy to follow.

The main thing is that sometimes we can be creating an opportunity for, if you like, vandalism, but that will depend on whether that particular area is viewable or seeable from surrounding areas where people may actually be. The idea is to put some thought in the back of these potential criminals’ minds that, ‘Somebody might be watching so it might be too risky for me to do this. Therefore I probably shouldn’t’. Whereas if you put lights on a building that cannot be seen from anywhere, quite often all you are doing is helping them do whatever they want to do in the wrong way. We use a term called ‘guardianship’, and in particular ‘capable guardianship’, in CPTED — that is, if we are going to have these places lit up of a night-time, we need to make sure that people can see what is going on. If they cannot, maybe we should not light them up. Another reason that we may not light up a park, for example, is: let us do a crime risk of the area. Who lives there and what is the area like? Are there problems in the area? Who is likely to use the park of a night-time? If it is the wrong people, bugger them, do not give them lights. The main reason for all this is when we put lights in a public place in particular we are telling everyone that it is safe. If it is not safe, we should be thinking twice about whether we put lights in it. I do not know that answers your question, but lighting is a very difficult subject. Quite often we will say, ‘No, do not put lights there because all you are doing is helping the crims’.

Mr LEANE — It does answer the question. I think it is something for us to be aware of too in that area. Were you around when a lot of the pubs and various places were putting in those sort of blue-coloured fluorescents — or it might have been a red colour — to make it hard for people to inject?

Mr LAKE — Yes, that is the blue lights, absolutely. I will tell you a funny story on that one. We had to put them in the public toilets on the ground floor of police headquarters in Brisbane. That is because a druggie could not show off to his mates and say, ‘I shot up in the police headquarters toilets’. We knew that it was actually happening and that they had to put them in there. It is a bit sad, but it has to be done periodically, and that is still a current thing being done.
I notice you are looking at drug prevention as well, and that is one of the things that is being done, particularly in public places.

Mr SCHEFFER — I have another question, Tony. You mentioned that architects were the profession that were not good at this, and you said that Frank Stoks was the exception. I wonder if you could just talk to us for a few minutes about why it is that architects as a group are not so good. Is it something about their training or the history of their discipline or the way they work? And what makes Frank Stoks an exception?

Mr LAKE — I do not know what makes Frank an exception, but I know that he is involved and he is very much behind it. He is very expensive too, I have been told. He is involved in the redevelopment of Christchurch and he is also doing training in Christchurch. The question I always asked myself was: why are we not getting architects in these courses? I asked a friend of mine who is an architect and he said, ‘Yes, we do study CPTED when we do our degree’. He said it is only for a day or so, but they do. They know what it is. But he said, ‘The thing you have to remember is that when you get your degree and you get a job your focus changes to the client, so you actually go and do what the client wants’. There are not too many architects who will say the client, ‘I wouldn’t do that because it is really not safe’. They will normally just do what the client wants. I think that is where the issue is.

There are people who have suggested over the years, ‘Why are we not getting into the universities? Why isn’t CPTED being put in the courses on urban design and architecture and everything else?’ Good luck with that if you want to try that one. But telling a dean what to do, I do not think that is going to work. That is why it is interesting that they lose that particular focus on crime prevention. It normally does not come about until the designer goes to the council and council says, ‘No, you cannot do it like that because it is not safe. Go back to your architect, who should know better, and get him to fix it’. Again that is the client say to the architect, ‘Can you fix this?’. Anyway, from my experience the main reason is that the focus is not that. The focus is on what the client wants.

Mr SCHEFFER — I just have one further question. You mentioned the cities of Melbourne, Brisbane, Townsville, Cairns and then Palmerston North as being very good examples of the strategy and principles being well applied. What I want to ask you — and perhaps we know the answer, but I want to hear you say it anyway — is whether they all have similar processes that you pointed to as being part of good practice. You have also talked about them varying in the way that they do it. Were they very different examples, or were they common and would they all have recognised each other?

Mr LAKE — They were actually quite similar. Some of them, however, do have CPTED mentioned in their district plans, which is what they call them in New Zealand, or their 10-year plans and policies and procedures, and some did not. Palmerston North, for example, just decided they were going to do it. The square was really unsafe. I do not know if you know if you know Palmerston North in New Zealand that well, but it has a massive 17-acre town square right in the middle of town, and everything is built around it. It was becoming quite unsafe because the last build back in the 80s happened when we liked things different to the way we like them now; we liked mounds, trees and secluded spots so we could go and read our books and all that sort of stuff. This eventually became very unsafe and you did not go into that square in the day, let alone at night. A lot of lobbying from police and various others said to council, ‘This has got to be fixed’, and the council decided to do it properly. To their credit they did, and they got old Frank up and he sorted it all out.

I do not think they actually had CPTED in their own council guidelines and principles. It is interesting that some do and some do not. Brisbane does, and Townsville has some. Cairns on the other hand, where I mentioned the esplanade, was the first council in Queensland to have CPTED in its policies and procedures. That was back in about 1993. It was unbelievable — they just went and did it. They have been practising it ever since. Some did and some did not, but they just decided they wanted to make these places safer and do it properly.

The CHAIR — Thanks, Tony. I know the committee would love to question you a bit longer, but at this stage we will wrap it up and thank you again for your time. Perhaps there will be
another opportunity, after the committee has done some work, to come back to you and have another look at some of the issues you have raised.

Mr LAKE — You are very welcome to do that.

The CHAIR — All right, Tony, we will let you go. Thank you very much again. We really appreciate it. I know you have been on the phone for nearly an hour and have been asked some fairly exhausting questions as well as responding to our own. We really appreciate your time.

Mr LAKE — That is not a problem, Simon. Thank you very much, and I sincerely wish you all the best with this one, because I think it is a magic thing to do.

The CHAIR — Thank you. In fact some of the areas you have identified are part of our discussion in relation to where we might go to look at some areas. I am happy to report to you that the areas you identified in New Zealand are part of that discussion this afternoon. That was also valuable for us to start homing in on where we can best spend our time in relation to learning more about what other countries are doing.

Mr LAKE — That is not a problem. In most of those places I mentioned I have contacts, so if you need anything like that, just let me know.

The CHAIR — I am sure Sandy will be in touch. Thanks, Tony.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — David and Mark, welcome to the joint parliamentary committee of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. Thank you very much for your submission and also for attending this hearing this afternoon. If you will bear with me, I might actually ask the committee to introduce themselves so we know who we are, starting with Johan.

Mr SCHEFFER — I am Johan Scheffer. I am the Deputy Chair of the committee.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr LEANE — Hi. Shaun Leane, upper house member for eastern metro.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — Pete Johnson, senior research, and Danielle at the back, admin. That is all of us. Before you start, David, I have just got to read you your rights, so to speak, in relation to this hearing. Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by the parliamentary privileges provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to the Parliamentary Committees?

Mr DREADON — I have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. We are recording the evidence, as I suggested earlier, and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Now, David, I understand you want to present to the committee, and then we will ask a range of questions, both from your submission and that presentation. Thank you.

Mr DREADON — Okay. Thank you. Firstly, I thank you very much for the opportunity to present. The Australian Institute of Landscape Architects is very much interested in this topic. It is an integral part of our professional work and role and belief in terms of the planning, design and management of public open spaces. We believe that this is a good opportunity to strengthen what we see as being an integral part of our profession so that we can get that embedded into a greater or wider perception amongst the community but also amongst other design professional groups. I think as part of our submission we indicate that there are a lot of design professionals involved in the built environment. There are planners, architects, engineers and landscape architects. It is an integral part of our work, and we would like it to become an integral part of everybody else’s.

I am the secretary of the Victorian branch of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, and Mark is —

Mr FRISBY — Past president.

Mr DREADON — Mark is past president and currently chairs the urban design and advocacy committee of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, Victorian branch. What I will do is go through this presentation. Mark and I will play a bit of a tag team, if that is okay, in terms of the presentation.

Overheads shown.

Mr FRISBY — I will just give a bit of an introduction about landscape architecture. Oftentimes people will hear landscape architecture and think it is all about domestic gardens and those types of things, but that is really not what we do. I mean, there are a few landscape architects who work in those sorts of environments, but most of the time landscape architects are working in large public realm spaces, and we increasingly talk about public realms – so all the spaces between buildings, so that includes streets and forecourts and all of those spaces. So obviously crime prevention through design is, as David said, at the front of our mind, but it is also often about empowering communities and activating communities through our work, because you very rarely get a wholesale change or redesign of an area. So some of the examples of projects we have got
there sort of highlight that. Geelong really was a great way of activating part of the foreshore; it was part of the broad work that had been done in that area, but also targeting responses to youth in that instance. Raglan Street Park is actually just part of a road reserve, but it was a way of activating a small quite degraded part of an existing part of the neighbourhood, and places like the city square have been just one of many examples in Melbourne which are terrific examples of good design.

Landscape architects are quite different from architects in that we work both in private consulting, but there is a large proportion who work in government as well. So a huge number of landscape architects work directly in local government, state government as well and government agencies like VicRoads and Melbourne Water. I suppose our membership has quite a different perspective on design in that we are at the planning stage as well as the design stage around getting things on the ground but then also the management. There is a recurring relationship with a lot of our work. We find that is where our members are very interested in the whole-of-life issues with this, rather than sometimes, I suppose, an architect might be involved in the big upfront capital bit but then has no legacy relationship sometimes with the site. We work with various agencies, and the Landscape Principles was a project a couple of years ago around sustainable design, which was developed in partnership with the CSIRO. That was a national project that has been implemented across Australia. As an industry body we look to try and be at the forefront of contemporary issues, and those principles have since been applied to international landscape architecture practice, and it is currently being looked at as an international policy. Australia has always punched above its weight quite a bit in terms of policy development in these areas and is often seen at the forefront of a lot of landscape design. I think I have covered the next point there, so maybe over to you, David.

**Mr DREADON** — Our submission was based around some of the questions that were asked in terms of the original brief there, so what we will do is just address these. To what extent have safer design principles and in particular the state government’s safer design guidelines been implemented by local government and the development industry in Victoria? The safer design principles are embedded into the legislation, the Victorian planning provisions and in the state planning policy framework, so it is a reference document for any of our projects that have to go through the planning process, and we think that that is a good scheme. It also has been embedded into a lot of local government work and by design guidelines. So when there is new development or if there is open space, the safe design principles are embedded in those guidelines so that they are talking about trying to activate places and spaces so that people are using them, and as a profession we would say the more people who use a space the better it will be in terms of its safety and also its attractiveness. It is a circulating process. I also have worked across a range of sectors, and I have prepared design guidelines for private development. As has been indicated, the safe design principles are embedded in the preparation of those guidelines. That is dealing with urban design or landscape architecture. The principles are embedded there, particularly amongst our profession because, as we said before, we are about creating attractive, vibrant, safe spaces.

However, we feel it falls down a bit when there is the assessment of those safe design principles because there is no real checklist, if you will, in the appraisal process. Often if there is no need for a planning permit — in other words, if the application is an as-of-right; so if you are getting a residential house on an existing lot, there is no need for it to go through a planning permit appraisal process, so therefore the safe design principles cannot be assessed by a local government planner, for example. Also there are some of the public realm projects that are undertaken by either state government agencies or local government agencies. They go through the planning of the design, but there is no check, if you will, of the safe design principles, so we think that that is where those principles fall down because they may be considered but they are not checked off, if we would want that word to be used. So we recommend that the safe design guidelines and the principles be promoted across a wide range of the community groups but also the government agencies and also professional design institutes. I would also add to that that we have got the development industry, but I think that people like project home builders, who are responsible for designing and building a lot of our – whether it is infill housing or new housing – incorporating safe design principles into those designs is what we feel is a bit of a letdown, between the interface, between the built form and the external spaces where we work and the ideas of safe design. You know, the passive surveillance is being lost in a lot of instances by that built form interface, so we would encourage
the safe design guidelines across a broad range of organisations and places.

Mr FRISBY — I guess the next question was: how effective has CPTED been in addressing crime and safety issues in Victoria? Because of the breadth of issues and practice, whether it is inner suburban or regional settings that you are working, I guess each area sometimes has its own peculiar crime issues that it is perhaps trying to target. We would argue that open space-wise there has been quite a big shift since the guidelines came out in terms of the way design responses are prepared to places. As we were preparing this submission we have had a little working group within AILA, to come together and just to talk about some of these issues. Some of the things — you know, toilet block design has changed dramatically, and that is through consultation with police as well. Little internal hallways and stuff in there have been taken out. It is a relatively minor thing, but through discussions with police and council workers who have identified those as being real problem sites, there have been good design solutions that have come back. Removal of shrubs and hiding spots in landscapes — there has been a big change in the way that open spaces have been designed and implemented, even through management, matching some of those management responsibilities.

A real problem we often do find though is that interface with — you can see a couple of examples here. The bottom right one is a fairly common example, and I suppose that is what David was talking about, even with more volume-type buildings or even sometimes renewal projects, ‘as of right’. People want the double garage, and the implications of that in terms of people’s perception of safety and how desirable it would be to walk down that street really diminishes as a response to some building design outcomes. Similarly, the example on the left; whilst the second storey is fine, and if you are 12 metres tall, you might be able to feel safe because you are feeling someone is looking at you at a street level, that can be quite an uncomfortable and undesirable space to be. I suppose we often find that is where we are trying to retrofit or address. You can see some of the small landscape slithers that are trying to soften some of that building mass. It is a relatively minor solution to a bigger problem.

Mr DREADON — Can I add to that — the example on the right was an award-winning design from an architectural institute, whereas we would be arguing that in terms of community safety, the presentation to the street, it is lacking in that response to the streetscape. Also the safer design guidelines talk about locking people in, but I would also argue that it is about locking people out. If somebody feels threatened there, how do they find that help in the streetscape if it is like that? I think if you look at part of the study that I was involved in, that was looking at housing topologies. If you think of Californian bungalows or the Victorian, they always had a front porch on them and people use to sit on the porch and talk to people, and they used to know their neighbours. In those ones people use a remote control. They go in, and there is no interaction. So that loss of community sense of belonging and therefore the community safety has been diminished by that sort of result. The one on the left there — there were issues in terms of people illegally accessing the building because they can pretend to be knocking on the door, but then when a car goes in they can just duck around the corner and they have gained access to the building. So the safety of the people in that has diminished because of that design.

The incorporation of CPTED, crime prevention through environmental design, into planning strategies, as we have indicated, the principles are well entrenched in planning strategies. As landscape architects we think that the strategies are good. They are there, and they can be used by those people who do have awareness of them and understand the consequences of community safety. The Growth Areas Authority documents — they are guidelines that refer to eyes on the street. Local government has a lot of guidelines. But, once again, we see that there is a gap between the strategies and the development assessment. It is falling down when they are going to be built on the ground. I think some of the examples there — on the bottom left-hand corner there is an urban layout for a greenfield site, but you can see that the park is surrounded by streets so that there will be cars driving around there, there will be people walking around there and there are no cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs — a lot of people do like them, but in terms of community safety there can be issues with them; whereas if you have got a connected and legible urban structure, the layout is that
people are walking in the streets, and that is what we as a profession would encourage to access the school and the neighbourhood park and the community centres.

Again though, you look at all the guidelines, and the local government and the state government are saying that the parks should be surrounded by a street. The example in the middle there is a direct frontage onto an open space, a creek corridor. It has got a footpath there, their front door is there, so you have got the activation, but in an assessment normally that would be rejected because it has not got a street between the house and the park. So that is what I mean by – sometimes there is no consistency in terms of the assessment of the strategies and the outcomes, and it is a real battle, but I also think in situations like this you have to look at the rear access, and what happens is sometimes that the laneways look like – I call them ‘gun barrels’ because they are pretty narrow; they have got a row of garage doors and a paling fence down the other side, thus areas of entrapment. They are areas of seclusion so people can go in there and do graffiti and damage all the buildings like that. Some of the guidelines that we have worked on are looking at putting in studios over the garages or something. I have seen some great examples in the United States, for example, where you have got studios or teenage retreats over the garage or something so that can people are looking down and are using the laneway as a playground almost so it becomes a safer place to use.

Then the other one in the bottom right-hand corner is pedestrian connectivity. We talk about making sure that places are connected by pedestrians, but that one ticks the box. I would suggest it is not a safe, attractive place. That is what I mean – sometimes the outcome does not quite match the —

Mr SCHEFFER — Why not?

Mr DREADON — It is got paling fences, so if you are walking through there and with the distance between the blocks, you can get trapped in there. So if somebody wants to assault you in a place like that, it is more likely to happen where there is no overlooking, for example. So what I am suggesting is that the one in the centre normally would not pass, but I would say it is the safe one because people are overlooking; whereas the one on the right would pass an assessment, but there is nobody overlooking, there is no —

Mr FRISBY — It is even just perception. Imagine at night walking down there and if anything did happen, having the frontages of the buildings you feel as though there is an escape.

Mr DREADON — I think some of the other examples are in urban infill. When you are trying to get an increase in density, there are car parking requirements, so what are they are doing? They are building car parks at the lower levels, and the interface between the car parking at the lower street levels and the street are often just blank walls and you have got the apartments above it, so they are issues. As landscape architects we are concerned about the public realm and the safety of the people in the public realm, but the interface between the architectural and that public realm we feel needs more attention so that we can increase the surveillance and therefore the safety.

Mr FRISBY — The criticisms – I think there was another question about how effective CPTED is as a strategy in preventing and reducing crime, particularly at a local level. I am sure there have been other submissions by people which can give you the statistics of it. I suppose from a landscape architect’s perspective there is perhaps a couple of ways of looking at this. Certainly from an awareness perspective, CPTED is extremely well known within our industry. Perhaps one of the criticisms is that it can potentially stifle outcomes. I guess it is always the challenge with a statewide policy to try and create parameters by which certain outcomes can be really encouraged, but it is at its extreme that it can actually be quite reducing in terms of opportunities. I guess an example of that is the Melbourne laneways. If you looked at how iconic that part of Melbourne that is, some of the best known laneways of Melbourne, you would not want to go near them if you were really analysing them quite critically, and yet there are such a vibrant part of the city. Even the way that has been supported has been really positive. So from a criticism point of view, I suppose it is trying to create policy that allows flexibility but is not necessarily applied so rigorously that it prevents alternative outcomes. You know, you always would like to believe that
is the case – that there is discretionary change. I guess it is trying to set up a framework where that works well. Related to that is, I guess, the notion of overregulation. As much as we say about the triggers in planning, it is the key of trying to get that balance right, just finding good methodologies. That is perhaps where we would encourage more promotion, particularly in other design professions, like architects and drafts people, who are often doing a lot of design work.

The other part to it perhaps as well – and again it goes back to that blanket broad cover of the strategy – is in terms of how effective it is regarding specific crimes. I think landscape architects have proven to be very capable of coming up with ways to address crime. For example, in an existing neighbourhood you may find really good solutions around how to prevent speeding vehicles or ways to actually address an existing area which was seen as being problematic. I guess, as much as the strategies are trying to minimise those events recurring, it is also looking at the way that design can actually provide solutions to recognise or acknowledge crimes in a particular area, which perhaps brings up to our next examples.

Mr DREADON — Which are some best practice examples. We have provided just two good ones here that we think – Melbourne city, with its streetscapes, its laneways and even Birrarung Marr and how it has activated the riverfront but also the link between Flinders Street, Birrarung Marr to the sports precinct there, so people are walking that area. So there is a lot more activity, there is a lot more vibrancy about it, so therefore we contend that it is a safer place, but from a landscape architectural point of view, we think it is adding value to Melbourne. Also Mark did speak about the laneways, but even if you look at these little, I call them, ‘opportunistic moments’ – it is just a retaining wall, but people can sit there. I think that is what we have got to try and install in some of the regional shopping areas or regional centres, even in some of the outer suburban areas, those places where people can just sit. I remember I did a project in Cobram that was trying to animate the town centre, revitalise it, and it always struck me – I took this photograph of a gentleman just sitting on a seat, watching the day go by, but there was somebody there, and it was about having somebody creating those spaces for people to come and sit in and look at other people because we would contend that that diminishes the crime or the opportunities for crime. I think when you do look at research on that; a lot of it is about opportunistic crime. What we as landscape architects are trying to do is to make places animated so people use them and reduce the opportunity for crime.

I think the other example is Geelong waterfront. Once again, there is also the CBD, Little Malop Street. This is a lot more complex in terms of a project because it was about revitalising Geelong but it was using urban design as the catalyst to do that and creating some more vibrancy and activity about it, particularly the waterfront but also the CBD, and making it a safer place. There were other things that I mentioned before. Wyndham City – I have seen some residential guidelines about the laneways that I mentioned before. I have also worked on a review of the Northern Territory community safety design guidelines. That was looking at issues in the Northern Territory, which are obviously different to Victoria, but the principles are still the same; also the Darwin laneways policy, which is why as a professional I am against laneways because I see them as being areas of entrapment, vandalism and antisocial behaviour. So it is about urban structure, and I think that that understanding needs to be filtered out across the community as a whole so people understand how a city is laid out, the streets and the laneways, and the consequences that can have. So, while it may tick boxes, you have got to look at the nuances of spaces, and I think landscape architecture tries to look at those nuances to say how they can be created interesting so people come and use them. I think Little Malop Street was an attempt to do that, and James Street, just off there. The idea of changing activities through the day so that, you know, during the day it might be business but in the evening you might take over the car spaces and put café tables out there so you are getting activity at night. Therefore, you have got activity at night so you are reducing the opportunities for crime and those sorts of things.

Mr SCHEFFER — What do you mean by a laneway? Is Little Malop Street a laneway, is Celestial Avenue a laneway? What is the ordinary —

Mr DREADON — In our terminology, I guess the laneways would be the typical one in Melbourne, but also what we have seen in some of our projects has been laneways between
residential houses. If you have two cul-de-sacs, for example, and they are connected by a pedestrian laneway, so it is really just about —

Mr FRISBY — Just out here; I suppose between some buildings – is it public, is it private, what fronts onto it?

Mr DREADON — The laneways and residential area are often bounded by paling fences, 1.8-metre paling fences, as people try to – and this is one of the other things; it is a bit counterintuitive, but people try to seclude themselves. They barricade themselves within the properties, so they feel safer like that, often with high-front walls, and the laneways are a typical one because they think if you go down the laneway they will just access their properties, so they barricade themselves, loosely. We would be arguing as a profession that the more open it is – and I think there are statistics; I have read reports about statistics showing where it is more open the crime rates are lower. It is counterintuitive to try and get people to open up their built form environment so that people can see and use spaces, and therefore they will feel safer in that sense.

Mr FRISBY — Yes, surveillance is a very effective means of crime prevention.

The CHAIR — I will just flag the issue of the Geelong waterfront, as I understand it – Malop Street on one side is fine, but you have got the mall now and you have got the bus interchange, and it is a nightmare; you have got all these young kids behaving very antisocially, and Ballarat is the same. The two cities really do not know what to do with their malls. I would be interested to know – where Bendigo, where we actually were last week, seems to have a sort of a blend of a bit of cosmopolitan activity and not getting that sort of grouping of adolescents who just want to run amok and actually scare everyone else away. They have this big, huge windy spot in Geelong, which no-one goes to, except for the kids, and Ballarat is the same; it just has the steps in the central square there, and they all gather and just really impede people toing-and-froing. It is a real nightmare for both councils.

Mr FRISBY — Yes, it is an interesting one. Both David and I have worked in those sorts of settings, and even just the – I guess there is often the sense that you build it and then everything is fixed. We did some work actually with Fed Square, and you would think that is perfect; it is the example of how you fix everything, but they had a similar sort of problem from Monday to Thursday lunchtime; there are tumble weeds rolling through the middle there because there is just not the same activation, and they are looking at ways around how you program the space. Design is one part of it, but then the operation of these spaces is important too. I think you can argue a good case, and Bendigo is perhaps interesting in how it has promoted more shared rather than 100 per cent pedestrianised spaces, so you are still getting some vehicle movement through some of these areas as well. There is not one solution for everything, and Bendigo, I know, has had trouble with its mall in that there is too much pavement and not enough shade to retrofit shade structures. But then again the vegetation is really young so it has not grown up. It is always a hard one. In the same way Melbourne City Council with its pedestrianisation – it was not just about getting rid of cars; it has been a slow accumulation of lots of little things, whether it is increasing residential housing, design responses, going back and fixing some things, super stops, fixing footpaths and crossings, skating room – there is a fantastic skate facility on the QV side. Everyone was up in arms once it was being developed, and then there has been an alternative site being developed.

They are complex problems, I guess. The sites here we are using as examples, I think, do highlight often part of the problem, but also sometimes it is how you then respond to that in terms of what you do next, whether it is rebuilding the whole thing or whether it is relying on a little bit of – like Melbourne City Council with activating its laneways has created incentives for certain operators to come in. So if there is a certain type of use that you really want to attract, then how do you assist that? How do you make it come to town? That is a hard thing to do. Docklands is a good example. Offices are down there, and it is like this warped thing where all the upper storeys are full but all the ground storeys are empty, and there does not seem to be any incentive for developers to subsidise rent on the ground floor or something to make it a more attractive place, because all the streetscape – they have done all the design right; it is just there is no social component to it. But at least the buildings are generally heading in the right direction. We were saying when we were
coming up today it is the same with this building. It is all louvres all the way around; it does not take much to retrofit it to reactivate it, but you cannot have cafes everywhere either. They are complex issues, and I guess you still want to draw attention and activity to places, but I think you have got to also allow time for things to evolve in response to that. Malop Street is an interesting one. I was down there a couple of weeks ago talking to the Geelong group down there. They were saying that it actually functions really quite well at night but then during the day it does not. Is that a reflection of the owners who run some of those establishments and are not realising the potential of their lease? They are effectively paying the same rent, but they choose not to open during the day. Can someone explain that to them? Is the council even saying, ‘Look, for no extra cost – your cost of a coffee machine and some staff – we are really supportive of you trading here more often’? Sometimes they are the barriers, I guess.

Mr BATTIN — Just about that, Simon —

The CHAIR — Yes.

Mr BATTIN — You were talking about the kids’ hanging area. You were talking about the seats before. There is reluctance by some councils to actually put in areas where you can sit, no. 1. – and I have spoken to a couple of councils down our area – for the fear of creating an area, which Simon said, where kids hang out. Most of the kids who actually hang out are not troublemakers and are not problems; they might have a skateboard, and they have got their helmet on, and they jump up and down on the seat; they do not actually cause any problems. In my view, actually, a lot of times they are probably good for crime prevention to have those kids around, but the reality is there is a perception that if you see 20 kids hanging around, that it is dangerous and is an area that you do not want to walk through, even if the kids are not swearing. How do you work with councils to say, ‘Well, hold on, you do need to create the areas because you want people to sit around like this’? You do not want the bad element in there, but how do you work it out with them to try and prevent that bad element coming in, but saying to people in the area it is all right to have the kids there?

Mr DREADON — That was the example I used before, in the Northern Territory and the Darwin (#indistinct) places. The kids were creating a problem because they had nothing else to do, so they – I do not want to say go on a rampage, but they would go wandering around all the laneways. So what the council did, it would organise basketball games in the car park of shopping centres. During those times when they had organised them there was no crime and no antisocial behaviour, so it was a question of activities for the children. I think your example of the Geelong bus stop is: why are they there? Maybe there needs to be some more study about why they are gathering in that place or what activities they are missing. The one on the waterfront, the youth area, with the skate park has got multiple functions; it can operate – concerts, I think I have seen it has and all sorts of things. It is about creating places that have multiple uses. I think it is just time; you have got to allow time to happen, that patina of time to come and maybe influence the activities that do occur there.

Mr FRISBY — There is a bad joke in terms of the provision of youth facilities – you do not need the youth centre, you just need McDonalds. That is an unfortunate belief that that is the solution to providing a place for young people to gather. Some people do perceive that you build a civic space and no-one will come. I guess what David is saying about the basketball stuff; it is about how you then use it when you do make that investment. Last week I was actually in Cape Town for a conference. To present today relative to their crime issues, it is just extraordinary. The worry is that if pulling all the furniture out is the solution to fix this, then we are spiralling seriously downward, because the next step after that is what they have got on every second corner – there is a security guard there, armed security. If that is the only way to fix the problem, then we are not really fixing the problem, we are just taking away the driver behind it. There have to be better ways to address these things. Then there are whole human settlements. We are talking garages and a lack of front doors. They have got 2-metre high chainmesh fences with razor wire on them as their solution to their attractive streets, so everyone has to drive everywhere. There have serious problems compared to us. In fact, what they use as strategies over there – they talk about the importance of, even in their shanty towns, their first places for investment are things like parks,
because they talk about this uplift in terms of the community feeling like it has got ownership and someone actually investing in the community.

It is the importance of making these places – in the same way that kids are drawn to these centres of town; the community needs to see this investment in the community. They are great places for getting broad community buy-in or benefit from seeing the changes. Even though people might be critical of aspects of Geelong, I think most people would say Geelong has evolved in the last 20 years to be a much more active and vibrant place than what it was when Pyramid was, you know, going belly up and things were really looking bad, even with talk of Ford and some of the other industries down there, the Ring Road seems to have reunited the town, and there are some really good opportunities. The town is getting its own identity. It might not be perfect, but some of the issues that you have talked about have been identified in some of those regional centres, and it is great actually that people are talking about that stuff because it perhaps starting to identify where to prioritise next.

Mr BATTIN — We have had some good years at the football club too!

The CHAIR — I was going to say that might involve (#indistinct) 8 o’clock Saturday night.

Mr DREADON — We would also argue that it is about private place, and it takes time but it also takes effort if you do develop a public open space and it does get damaged, it is like the classic graffiti response – as soon as it goes up you take it that you would paint over it. It shows that the community as a whole has pride in that place. The next one there is that some of the obstacles to implementing CPTED principles are that the councils we find as a profession, sometimes local government does have policies that are driven by maintenance; its capacity for maintenance. If you look at Wyndham, for example, it is just growing so rapidly and it is getting so much open space handed over to it, that it just does not have the capacity to deal with it. They are anxious about that. The park on the right – the requirement was for the developer to maintain it in a pristine condition for two years. The community moves in there and it sees this well-maintained park, there is a sense of community pride, and then it gets handed over to council, and it has a different maintenance regime so the weeds come up and grow back, and the community gets a little bit disenchanted with that so it leads to frustration. That is an issue that we see about implementing some of these – you know, one of the principles of CPTED is maintenance, making sure it is maintained well. We were having a discussion about that before – some of the requirements by local government for its open space. I would say that it is fantastic to have lots of little open spaces in the streets. Streets are not just for driving through; they can be for walking, as I said before, but also just seating spaces, but they are not credited as part of the open space contribution to the developer so the developers will not provide them. It takes away an opportunity for even a seat or a place in the street for people to just sit, and when you have those people sitting they are watching what is happening. In essence, I think we are saying that it is the maintenance side of some of these open spaces that is an obstacle to putting them in place.

Mr FRISBY — The other thing too – this relates to the obstacles or impediments to CPTED and safety design principles – my other point I wanted to make there I guess was that sometimes crime is used in an alarmist way. The perception is completely disproportionate to the issue. I suppose, in terms of how successful it is, there may sometimes be an absence of reporting back or even the nature of the crime that is trying to be addressed through the process, there is perhaps a bit of a disconnection there. That is possibly part of the role – like we talk there about how the project is initiated. The sooner these things are either addressed or identified as part of the scoping of a project, because it may equally change priorities sometimes, if, say, the youth, that may not be a specific crime, but it is a perception issue, then that may prioritise a project, versus if it is addressed at a checklist point at the end, at its worst, it is hard to measure whether it has been successful or otherwise.

Mr DREADON — So unless we think that, as I said before, there are community perceptions of safety and what is required to address antisocial behaviour, often we think it is counterintuitive; people adopt a fortress mentality, but there is the maintenance side of it, and we think that to address those obstacles it is about consultation and communication across a broad
range of stakeholders right from the very beginning of a project, right through to the ongoing maintenance of it once it has been implemented over time.

Mr FRISBY — We should note there too – certainly from the experiences I have had, and David is probably the same – when you are engaging the police in these issues they are fantastic. They are very practical, excellent in being able to cut through some of the issues or even identifying potential problems. They actually see engagement through these processes as a really positive example of the police being involved with public participation. It has kind of worked both ways, I guess, from either often a complex consultants team, which might be involved to work on a project, or, equally from the police side of things, they seem to be both valuable but also find value in the process of engagement through these processes.

Mr DREADON — And we would think that they would have an important part to play in the ongoing education. We alluded to the fact that community safety principles need to be embedded into the education of a whole range of different professionals, not just landscape architecture but architectural planners, designers —

Mr FRISBY — Engineers.

Mr DREADON — And the people who have got experience in that would play a very valuable role in that education and advocacy. I think, just to summarise, the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects thanks the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee for undertaking this. We appreciate the opportunity. We believe that good design is safe design and that great spaces are rich, diverse and they offer a variety of experiences, and therefore those experiences through the day, through the year will add to the vibrancy and sense of belonging and community safety. We do encourage general awareness of crime prevention through environmental design and safe design principles in the education of all design professionals. As Mark alluded to before, we do not think it is necessary to stifle the innovation and the creativity that is embedded in the design professions with a whole raft of new legislation. It is more about advocacy and education and awareness to encourage people to consider what the implications of their design decisions or management decisions are. We think that Melbourne is a great example – the laneways, the vibrancy of those are just fantastic outcomes that have been driven by community participation rather than overly complex regulation of planning permits and things like that. Thank you, once again.

The CHAIR — Thanks, David. I am sure the committee will have some questions for you. Can I just before Tim kicks off – can you just tell me fairly simply, particularly in relation to the suburbs, you know how now there is the tendency to have the garage, so consequently in old, where you used to quite a high-rise fence where you would have some protective barrier around, which you see as your holing. Now it is very open plan suburbs like Hoppers Crossing. I was at Melton the other day, and they are just very open, and there is no real privacy at all, bar inside your house. Does that tend to reduce opportunities for crime, going back to the old where you had a physical fence barrier. Does that allow us in the principles – because I guess our role is to see in relation to the safer design principles if they are being upheld by government and if there is a need for change in some way. There is no doubt that the newer suburbs now seem to be very open because everyone wants the roller door garage and the house with no fence; it is all open.

Mr DREADON — It is an interesting question. I would say that the traditional fence – and I am assuming it is just a 1.2-metre high fence —

The CHAIR — Below the garage, yes.

Mr FRISBY — A picket fence.

Mr DREADON — A picket fence or something like that. Because I think they are still visually transparent, so you can see through them. One of the principles of safer design is the definition of ‘territoriality’ between public and private so that we recognise that as being a necessity. Yes, if you look at, as I mentioned before, some of the house designs from those older times did encourage – there were bedrooms, the front door was obvious so that people were in the house looking out; it did not matter if there was a fence there, a picket fence or a wire mesh fence.
Mr FRISBY — You can probably argue both ways, because if you can get inside the fence, then no-one can see you breaking into the house.

Mr DREADON — No; I have heard of that one, but there are two fences. There are solid walls that are 1.8, and that is where I have heard if you get inside there – and one of the policemen in Darwin mentioned to me a lot of the doorways in these modern houses are recessed now, so they get behind the fence and into the doorway and they are there, no problems. Whereas if the fences are lower and transparent, there is a lot visual connection between the house and the streetscape so there is that passive surveillance, which is one of the other principles. But then the newer houses, even though they have got no fence, they still do have a visual barrier to them now, which I would contest is less visually transparent than the older style.

Mr FRISBY — The reason why it is that way too in a lot of the newer areas is there is often design guidelines which do not permit low front fences; they basically say it is not allowed to keep it open. You could have guidelines that could mandate having fences at a certain height as well. So it has evolved a bit, and there is a little bit of subjectivity to it. Interestingly, overseas in America they do not even have side fences, particularly areas with snow because fences obviously just get knocked over when you are trying to get rid of your snow. There are cultural traditions everywhere.

Mr DREADON — I did a study in Newcastle. Part of that was the urban design of the whole town, the whole city. I would contest that some of the older suburbs that did have the front fences but the houses had porches and that, they felt a lot more open than the newer suburbs that had no front fences but solid houses. To me, they were more closed visually and emotionally. So I think it is not the fence that is the issue really – and I use the word ‘fence’ as opposed to ‘wall’ – it is the built form; the interface between the built form and the outdoor spaces that is the issue.

The CHAIR — All right, David. Tim, you had a question.

Mr McCURDY — You spoke about more open – lower crime rates. Is there evidence of that anywhere? Has there been any research done that proves that that is the case? I mean, I am sure it probably is, but I am trying to work out is there – can you point me in the direction of somewhere where I can put my finger on —

Mr FRISBY — We can see if we can track some down. There is a website around crime prevention, which you have probably come across. It is like an international website. It may have some statistics on it.

Mr DREADON — I have read reports – I think it was carried out in Moreland, and they did look at a park (#indistinct) park. They looked at the crime, you know, the break-in burglary rates, and where there was that high front wall the statistics showed that there was a higher percentage of break-ins of properties like that than those that were lower. I have seen that presented at a conference once as well. We can chase that up for you.

Mr McCURDY — Yes, I would just be interested if this is the way we need to be headed, we need something to evidence that, I suppose.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes. That is really interesting, your presentation. Thanks very much for that. I was interested – there was some discussion about the front of the house looking out on the street, you described as older areas. I suppose my take on that is that in the past the backyard was really the utility; it was where the chickens were, it was where the vegetables were and where the toilet was, so the front of the house, as the hierarchy goes up to the main living room, the formal front door, then the veranda was part of your interface with the street. Now we have reversed all that. The backyard is the barbecue and the pool, so it is outward looking and the street becomes the utility where you just garage and treat it without personal relationship and that sort of thing; there is that observation. I want to go back beyond the California bungalow to look at suburbs that are really sought after and, I think, admired now, like Fitzroy where the houses come right up to the footpath. Do you think that is something that is worth entertaining in terms of safer community relationship, and, picking up on Tim’s point, do we have any evidence about whether
those sorts of communities, with the alleyways, I would call them, as well as laneways as well as small streets and buildings built right up to the footpath itself, where literally the front door opens onto the footpath – whether that is even safer than the suburbia of the Californian bungalow?

Mr DREADON — I cannot really answer that because I do not have the statistics at my fingertips, but I think the community vibrancy or attachment to those sorts of suburbs and that is greater. I have always participated in some community forums, and I have felt quite lonely and a bit lost in some of those newer suburban streets where they are dominated by the car because of the setbacks of the house; you do not feel as though there is anybody here. Whereas in the old ones, even if they have got a window open, you can hear a radio playing, you know there is something around, so that sense that there are other people around is reassuring to you from a psychological point of view.

Mr SCHEFFER — You have got here about the fence, the front wall being rather alienating. I find the experience of the walls is better because you get a better sight line, and you do not have all that shrubbery where you do not really know what is going on.

Mr FRISBY — I mean I think David’s point about the sense of nobody there – the type of housing you are talking about too is often reflected with the high density of settlement too. So there actually is not anyone there, and the alternative is it is lower density. Activation is obviously proportionate to density, but then also activation is relative to proximity of destinations. Would you walk to school because you can or is the density so low that you cannot? It just does not make sense to walk.

Mr DREADON — Because I think the other thing is the reliance, particularly in the newer suburbs, on the car. Some of the houses we showed you there with the doors – there is no interaction. I go back to the words ‘opportunistic interaction’. When the houses are closer I think there is more likelihood to be interaction between members of the community who are in the street and the houses; whereas in the newer suburbs, where you have got the setbacks, there are false setbacks, but you are also not hearing anybody. They are orally more closed, quieter. But I was also thinking there of the type of antisocial behaviour. So if you have got the streets that are focused on vehicles you can get a lot more hoon behaviour because there are less people watching them so there is speeding. I think, Mark, you did speak about traffic-calming measures before. One of the first examples is that we can create spaces in some of those older streets by closing off them and just creating a small pocket park where people can gather; whereas in the newer suburbs, even though I might be going back, I said before, in terms of the layout now, there are less opportunities for those, or they are not designed in, those small pocket parks in the streets. My personal view is that it is better to have open-faced houses with the streets to get that interaction between the community members, and from that you reduce your opportunities for antisocial and criminal behaviour.

Mr BATTIN — One of the things you mentioned before was in relation to cul-de-sacs – the design up there basically took out cul-de-sacs. It just got me thinking. Is the focus on that – and you were saying it is connecting, whereas my view of cul-de-sacs, and we will just use them as an example – I live in a cul-de-sac. I like it actually, and I am more than happy for my kids to ride around in the street, ride their bikes in the street, but if I were in a street where people were driving through, I would actually be less likely to do that. To me, that was actually – crime prevention by environmental design is very important, but isn’t as important or almost more important creating that community feel that is there? You talk about opportunistic interaction; how do we go back, I suppose, to just interaction, not opportunistic but just to actually get to know your neighbour? If we do too many designs that prevent the availability to go out in the street, isn’t that taking it away? Like, we have a street barbecue, but you cannot do that in a street where you drive through; well, you can, but it is very difficult to move the barbecue every 5 seconds. Street cricket – getting your neighbours out for street cricket – all of those sorts of things; how do we design those in there?

Mr DREADON — Cul-de-sacs are a great one.

Mr FRISBY — It is an exact fifty-fifty split. For everyone who loves them someone hates them, almost.
Mr BATTIN — That is right.

Mr FRISBY — All the good points you talk about are exactly possible, and in the same way people would say you get less through traffic so there is less surveillance, and if there is a bad neighbour or something, you are stuck with them, type of thing.

Mr BATTIN — Yes.

Mr DREADON — The length of the cul-de-sac and going back to the walkways – in Darwin if they were longer than 100 metres or something and have got a walkway at the end of them, connecting them with another one, statistically the ones in the middle are burgled; it is quite high. Whereas if it just a short cul-de-sac with no pedestrian throughway, they are fantastic. I was going to add also one of the drivers of the cul-de-sacs is occupational health and safety, the garbage collection. They have to go on a continuous forward movement, so the land take is quite high, so developers do not like giving up that amount of land because it is just for a road.

Mr FRISBY — That is right. The rubbish trucks and fire engines —

Mr DREADON — So, as you say, you have got that factor coming into the design as well. It is a contentious issue, for sure. I have heard so many people say that cul-de-sacs are great for community development, but then you get this other – what I talked about before – the maintenance requirements of local government and the authorities coming in and putting another layer on there in terms of whether they can be incorporated or not.

Mr BATTIN — Just the other thing – sorry, if you do not mind, Simon – when you have got any of those cul-de-sacs, you were saying pocket parks, which you said there are less of and less opportunity to create those in the newer estates. The area I cover – I cover Berwick through Pakenham. Johann is obviously in the upper house for down there as well. We have got one of the fastest growth areas. One of the biggest issues is there are community groups out there, people in the community trying to create those little pocket parks at the end of their court or if there is an area that they can do it that is available. Every time they do anything in those areas it is stopped by council. How, from your view, do we go back to councils and say this is actually something that should be designed in and given the opportunity for the ownership back to the people. They put a basketball ring up – and this is an actual fact – one of them put a basketball ring up and the council took it within about 24 hours and gave them a $200 fine for putting it up. Whereas, actually I thought it was best thing that had ever happened in that little area, to put it up there. It was just a water view, held up by water. The communication on that – when we are doing the designs with the developers and the council for an environmental design – and say that is actually what we wanted. We wanted the ownership back to the community, not the council.

Mr FRISBY — It is a tricky one, particularly in growth areas where you have councils, as David was saying with Wyndham. You can equally respect that they are grappling with just this huge upswing of financial responsibility, so all these little things – it just takes the same time to drive to 1-hectare park as it does to drive to this little one. When you are there it is much faster to do the work. Then it is what happens if you do hand responsibility over to the community to maintain it, and then they put in a whole lot of weeds that then spread everywhere and they end up having to spend a fortune to get rid of the weeds.

Mr DREADON — There are other things. There is the litigation. If there is a —

Mr FRISBY — A basketball ring – someone falls over and it hits them on the head or something; who is responsible?

Mr DREADON — That happens, because I worked in local government, and often we received telephone calls, and the community used that. It is a double-edged sword in many ways. What we would suggest is that it is part of the advocacy and education. Those sorts of activities are beneficial to the overall community development and reducing —

Mr FRISBY — In the same way probably, the bigger thing, which is quite surprising, is in growth areas – how homogenous the outcomes are. I have done renewal projects in the city of
Moreland, where they look at their streets as play opportunity, and they will build a basketball court in there. They will slow down the traffic and create share zones. There are examples of this that are done. Ohea Street in Pascoe Vale is fantastic, where they have created off-road bicycle lanes. This is through a retrofitting process of 100-year-old road reserves, and yet nearly all of our new streets in subdivisions in growth areas – and I work on those areas as well – it is highly regulated; ‘This is the standard cross-section, just reproduce it’ versus them trying to create these hubs. Look, they are problematic too, because if your neighbour decides they want a basketball ring and puts it out the front of their house, you might be next to it and go, ‘I hate basketball and listening to a ball bounce’, because when we are designing basketball rings in parks, you end up putting them right in the middle so the noise is not affecting everyone at 6 a.m. because someone is out there playing basketball, or 6 o’clock at night even. There is no easy solution, but you would like to think there are more opportunities for different outcomes versus just more of them same perhaps.

Mr BATTIN — Yes, the growth areas down there where you —

The CHAIR — Shaun? Do you have a question?

Mr LEANE — Just a brief one. You say that one of your recommendations is to create an awareness of CPTED. Is there much of an awareness in your profession around the Victorian safer design guidelines? Is it something that gets discussed?

Mr DREADON — The guidelines themselves, I am not sure, but the principles, definitely. I would say the principles are well understood by landscape architects.

Mr LEANE — To me, reading the guidelines is sort of like commonsense. I suppose that is something that you apply as a matter of rule anyway.

Mr DREADON — I think that what we are after is creating those vibrant, attractive places. It is the people playing the basketball in the street — they are increasing their sense of belonging, their pride and place, and those places are generally safer; it is the neglected areas that have the greater issues. When you look at those principles of passive surveillance, activation, maintenance, and territoriality — they are just integral to, as you say, commonsense, almost.

The CHAIR — Could you give us an example of a suburb where you believe the safer design principles have not been upheld by local government?

Mr DREADON — Have not been upheld?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Mr FRISBY — It is probably thinking of sites rather than a suburb. When you talk about problem areas, I think generally the growth areas are actually pretty good. I think probably a lot of the issues around — and this was the same with healthy living and design — some of the worst areas of perhaps some of those areas that were designed in about 80s maybe, sort of like your Rowvilles and even parts of maybe Sunshine and some of those middle-ring suburbs, are the ones that perhaps have the biggest problems. It is probably combined with the social — the building stock is getting to an age where it probably needs to be replaced so it is becoming cheaper housing and perhaps that changes the dynamic as well. They are probably what I would see as some of the bigger challenges in some of those areas. But that does not mean all those suburbs — places like Higgeth and stuff are out getting renewal with the new communities coming through, so they are being uplifted just through that population change as well. That would be my, if I had to pick suburbs —

Mr DREADON — I cannot think of any suburbs just off hand. I can think of examples that just occur everywhere really. So what you are alluding to then is that it is good to try and get a broad mix in the community. I think sometimes there is a tendency to try and — well, there is just a natural tendency, I guess — just to have homogenous groupings, whether that is done by economics or the housing stock that is provided. And one of the criticisms that I do have with some of the newer suburbs is that they generally are aimed at one family type; whereas communities — look at
the trend for demographic; I think it is going to be 30 per cent will be just single household occupants in the next 15-odd years, 15 to 20 years. Are the households like that going to live out on the periphery when there are no houses for them there? No, they are not, but they still add to the vibrancy of the community, and they will probably come into those suburbs like Fitzroy or Highett, those new ones that are developing.

The CHAIR — Any other questions?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I do. In the first question you picked up in your submission about the extent to which the principles in the safer design guidelines have been implemented. You say that things are reasonably fine where there is a formal application process, but what drops out, from what you were saying, would be the smaller developments that do not need permits. And, on the other side of that, you were talking about developments in public projects that are not subject to the same kind of processes, but then you end up saying that we require better promotion of that. We have had a bit of discussion about whether promotion or tighter regulation is better. Could you, one, talk about what you mean by ‘better promotion’ and then also just give some comments about whether you think that the regulations should be expanded to take in, for example, larger projects? How might that work?

Mr DREADON — I think in terms of the permit and I guess — following on from Mark was just alluding to – in some of these middle-ring suburbs that going through housing renewal, if they somebody wanted to replace a single house on a block there, they would not have to go through a permit application; they would just get a building permit, that is it, so there is no need for them to have any assessment. So what I would query though is: is the one designing the house or is the applicant aware of the safer design principles? Probably not. Maybe they are, I do not know, but that is what we think about the advocacy of it.

Mr SCHEFFER — So are you saying that there should be a trigger in there that gets them to consciously consider it in —

Mr DREADON — What that trigger is, I do not know – whether it is local governments or even community groups promoting safer design and highlighting the impacts that some design choices are having on safety.

Mr FRISBY — I think you could equally argue though some people might consider, ‘I’ve got an old house’ – it might be a Californian bungalow in Camberwell – ‘and my garage is way down the back of a driveway. I’m going to knock over this house and put a double garage in the front. That’s actually safer for me because I can just drive straight in, and there is no longer an area someone can access down the side of my house’. So it is a perception of safer for whom, I guess, and the implications for your neighbourhood versus your personal safety.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but what you are saying is that at the moment there is not a tool that gets that private builder to think about what the community safety consequences are for that building. You said you do not know, so I accept that. I just inviting you to —

Mr DREADON — But we would be saying that we do not think there is a need to have additional regulation there. It is more about advocating or advertising these principles and making sure they are embedded across a wider range of the community, rather than just specific design professions like landscape architecture or in council – I think some of the community services staff there are well versed in what is there. The principles as a whole I do not think are well understood, or the implications of certain design proposals are not well understood.

Mr SCHEFFER — So, I mean, I am not clear on it. Are you saying that people would do this if they were aware of it just out of goodness, because the example that you gave, somebody would say, ‘Well, that’s fine, but actually I care about me driving onto my property and going straight into my house, someone putting the garage up the front. What happens in the street, well, that is just tough; that is not my problem’.
Mr DREADON — There could be that, but then, I guess, as Mark alluded to before, when we go to the example in Cape Town it becomes an unsafe — these are the consequences and ask the community —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but no one individual is going to take responsibility for what in 10 to 20 years might become a consequence. I suppose my view is that it is the role of the state or the local government or somebody to kind of do something that consciously makes people take responsibility for the public consequences of their private actions. That is where I would come from, but you do not share that, so I accept that.

Mr DREADON — I am not saying that. I think that it is extremely difficult to do that, because we have had this debate, and what do we call it — the nanny state; there are so many regulations there. I guess I do believe in the general good faith of community.

Mr FRISBY — I think if you can show people the way to do it better, because often the solution to this is shuffling things a couple of metres, and it makes a massive difference.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr FRISBY — So by explaining that to people — I think most people get it. I guess it is also who you are advocating to, because oftentimes it is thought, ‘Well, we’ve got to talk to the planners about this’, but they are often responding to the problem or they can also be the first port of call for someone if they are looking to do a renovation or whatever. So it is useful to have that information available. Or it is thought to be the architect, but architects design such a small percentage of homes. It is really the drafts people — are they being promoted to or are they even aware of the responsibility that they have through their work?

Mr DREADON — So even the Masters Builders Association or those sorts of organisations that deal with the volume construction, they are the ones that I think should be targeted.

Mr BATTIN — Is it fair to say then — you were saying to target it there and also looking at something similar. You talk about getting the information out there and saying for the goodwill of the person, whether that is via every time someone puts an application in because you will still have to apply for a permit; you cannot just build a house — when you get it out, a brochure that explains —

Mr DREADON — Building surveyors.

Mr FRISBY — Building surveyors — every building has to go through building surveyors.

Mr DREADON — They are what I would call the target audience, yes.

Mr FRISBY — It is not to say we are anti-regulation. I guess it is matching regulation relative to the risk or the issue. I guess that is where criminologists would probably be able to say, ‘Here are some statistics of emerging trends’, and if it needs to be presented. One I heard recently is the suburb with the highest proportion of solar panels is Tarneit. It is more because of the opportunity; there are a whole lot of new houses being built there, and people are very proud, and they see the long-term value in putting investment into solar panels. If you were to ask people to guess which suburb was the greenest in Melbourne from solar panels, I do not think many people would pick Tarneit.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, just to finish that — you would say the same about your second paragraph, where you say:

There is presently not form of instrument or tool (such as a permit trigger) for the assessment and appraisal of public projects that are not subject for a formal application process, and as we understand it, a number of public realm projects fall within this category.
So you would say the same in that it is better that we use a promotional tool that raises awareness of it, rather than having a type of regulation?

Mr DREADON — Generally those public realm projects are undertaken by government, so it is about the state government organisations, whether it is VicRoads or Melbourne Water or the local government authorities. My experience in local government is sometimes they are driven by – and it depends whether it is regional areas; it could be the engineering department and whether the engineers are fully aware of community safety principles or open space planners. So it is about working with that broader range of professionals who are involved in it. I guess it is not going to be a one-size-fits-all; it has to be flexible enough to deal with a lot of different situations.

The CHAIR — All right. We might leave it there, unless committee members have another burning question. Can I thank you both, David and Mike, for your time. It has been a great opportunity to hear something which is of interest to all of us, I think, environmental design, particularly in relation to housing. We appreciate your time this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr DREADON — Thank you very much. I just have one question – if we wanted to give you some information, would it go through you?

The CHAIR — Sandy is the conduit.

Mr DREADON — Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

Mr FRISBY — Thank you.

The CHAIR — Thank you for putting in the submission too. We appreciate it.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — Thank you very much for having us here this afternoon. I appreciate your time, all of you. We are a joint parliamentary committee of the parliament, Drugs and Crime Prevention. I understand we have Anne, Nancy, Todd, Michael, David and Martin. Also, we have Leading Senior Constable Glenn McFarlane. For Hansard, who will be making the presentations? Who is providing evidence to the committee?

Ms MALLOCH — Basically, everybody around the table has a role to play in evidence. We received the questions from Pete that comprise pretty much the realm of information that you are seeking responses to, and so the people gathered around the table each have a role to play in aspects—for example, in planning and service provision, as well as then the more social planning side of CPTED.

The CHAIR — So you will each make a short presentation and then perhaps deal with some of the questions that have been posed and the committee will have an opportunity to respond to you after your presentation. Is that how you wish to proceed?

Ms MALLOCH — Yes, I think so. What we had done in preparation was take the 20 questions and divide them into the two areas of work in the City of Melbourne and then with Glenn McFarlane. We thought if we just work through the questions with you, and at the beginning of it if each person restated their role in the City of Melbourne and how it is that they have a role in CPTED, if that would suit you.

The CHAIR — Excellent. Thank you, that is fine. Just before we start, can I also acknowledge an apology from Johan Scheffer, who is also one of our committee persons. I will have to read you an address to the witnesses so it is being recorded on Hansard, and there are some legal obligations around that. Before I do that, can I also say: obviously you have the reference that was given to us by parliament in relation to the inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design. Prior to that we have done a reference in relation to community safety and community safety programs and some of that covered off, obviously, some of the issues that we are dealing with in this new reference, but not to the same degree of intensity. Given the past few weeks, there is renewed interest, obviously, in urban design in relation to crime prevention—the CCTV issue.

Ms MALLOCH — There is indeed, yes.

The CHAIR — On that basis, we are particularly interested to see how the City of Melbourne are responding to those events. Also, we are heading to New Zealand in two weeks to look at the rebuilding of Christchurch and how that city is dealing with the crime prevention aspects to environmental design. So what turned out to be not so much a mundane reference but certainly one that had ebbs and flows in relation to interest, now has caught on as a significant interest, particularly for new and emerging suburbs and how people are proposing to feel safe in those suburbs. We do have some important work ahead of us in relation to making recommendations to the parliament at the end of this inquiry and we look forward to any additional information you might like to present to the committee, either through submission or through a verbal hearing.

Ms MALLOCH — Yes. We have already talked with Pete about that, too. For example, if there is any information that is referred to today but we do not have a copy with us, then we will certainly make sure that everything comes through to you.

The CHAIR — Good. Thank you. I will just read you this so everyone is covered. Welcome to the public hearings of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand you understand the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof
version of the *Hansard* transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I now look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

**Ms MALLOCH**—Thank you. I think, Chair, if we started off with addressing the Safer Design Guidelines that the state government has in its repertoire. To that end, Mike Norton, Martin Williams and David Pryor have particular involvement in referring to those guidelines. Mike, would you like to start off.

**Mr NORTON**—Michael Norton from Engineering Services Branch, City of Melbourne. I have been at City of Melbourne for 33 years, doing many things, but my current role is looking after the public infrastructure for the City of Melbourne, or civil infrastructure, as we call it. My responsibilities include design of all of that infrastructure and also reviewing applications from developers and regarding development which has third party public realm infrastructure that is built as part of developments under subdivisions and planning permits.

What I thought I might do is just talk about four projects—a couple of them are current and a couple are from a year or two ago—in terms of the work that we do and how we would use CPTED principles in some of the work that we have, in particular these four particular projects.

There is a set of photos there. This is a public toilet that we installed last year. It is just outside 225 Bourke Street. The public want public toilets, but it is very difficult to find a location for them to be sited. This toilet is really aligned with our Safe City taxi rank program of trying to install toilets where we do have night-time taxi ranks. Bourke Street does have a night-time taxi rank in there, which supports all the other Safe City taxi ranks that we have in the CBD. We originally thought we would install this toilet outside Hungry Jack's on the corner of Russell Street and Bourke Street, but when we did some work with Glenn—I think Glenn was involved—and we did a community safety audit and looked at that site and then looked at other sites, eventually it was recommended that we install this toilet outside 225 Bourke Street, which is about halfway down Bourke Street between Russell and Swanston streets, and after we went through some other sign-offs and approvals with property owners, we were able to get agreement and we installed the toilet in there. We have a new toilet, only just recently opened, which supports our night-time taxi ranks, as well as serves as a 24-hour toilet for anyone to use as well.

As you can see from the location of it, it is taking into account high visibility. There are no hiding points and things like that and the street lighting is at good lighting levels, so we think we have got a solution for the public in terms of public conveniences with 24-hour access, as well as in supporting our taxi ranks and therefore then supporting the taxi drivers and supporting the security of the city.

That is just one example. Another one is a recent one, too. This is a pathway in Royal Park and it is a pathway that connects Royal Park station with The Avenue in Parkville. Residents who live in The Avenue commute or walk backwards and forwards along the pathway to catch the train. Of a night-time, this pathway was unlit and we had complaints from the residents in The Avenue. They were saying, ‘Why are you spending money on building a road or rebuilding The Avenue when we have a pathway that's unsafe?' So we went through, again, a reviewing process. Again we had Glenn do a community safety audit review and it came back identifying that it was unsafe. We then went through the Friends of Royal Park, got all the approvals, installed the lights and those lights have just been turned on in the last month.

Another one is a piece of public art. This is in Collins Landing in Docklands. This is a piece of public art that was built by Lend Lease under their one per cent contribution for public art towards Docklands development. The artwork itself is a number of sculptured pieces of moulded concrete and brick paving, forming structures in the public space. They are quite high and there are quite a number of them and again we used CPTED principles to have Lend Lease redesign the sculpture so that it was much safer for the public to use and enjoy. We also had additional lighting installed by Lend Lease. That artwork is now on the council's register of public art and we now maintain, as a council, that piece of artwork. So that was quite
interesting. Lend Lease already had a planning permit approval for this but had not taken into account design principles around community safety and so we negotiated a better outcome.

A current project in place is to do with the Regional Rail Link Authority. This is a new railway bridge that is being built over Railway Place and right next to Festival Hall and, although it is in the early stages, the original design of this space had lots of corners in it and this is basically going to be a bridge over a narrow road, right next to the Festival Hall. Again we have been able to work with the Regional Rail Link Authority, the contractor and their urban designers to come back with a better design solution that takes into account community safety requirements.

So we work with, as best we can, building in and endeavouring to get the best outcome in terms of design solutions for the public around infrastructure that do take into account community safety requirements.

Ms MALLOCH — What has emerged for us is a really great program which Nancy will talk to later, which is the opportunity that we have been able to bring into the City of Melbourne to train staff across the organisation in CPTED, especially with the development of—as well as Designing Out Crime—Designing In People, which Mike's examples cover very nicely. CPTED is a program that we have been committed to for a great many years and it has been very much, at an increasing level, incorporated into planning in a formal sense, through strategic planning across the organisation—so in the development of lighting strategies and traffic planning and so forth—through to the delivery, through operations, of how engineering services, for example, might actually incorporate. Mike had been a part of the training program that we had held.

Ms PIERORAZIO — Shall I give a little bit of an additional introduction?

Ms MALLOCH — Okay.

Ms PIERORAZIO — This is to perhaps set a seed in relation to how the City of Melbourne embraces CPTED and in particular the principles which CPTED uses. The City of Melbourne is accredited by the World Health Organisation as a safe community and, with that status and accreditation, we go through a rather extensive process of ensuring that we have structures, frameworks, planning and programming that help us meet that accreditation. We have what is called the Policy for the 24 Hour City, which sets the scene in relation to how we plan for services, programs and activities over the course of the 24-hour period—that is not to say that we are expecting the city to be active 24 hours but it is understanding that there are cycles—and we have also got the Strategy for a Safer City, which obviously highlights the way in which we are addressing crime, safety, injury, drug and alcohol issues and (syringe 1.19.35) management issues within the City of Melbourne. They are a couple of our key policies or strategies in relation to safety specifically, but we have a whole range of policies and strategies that actually embed CPTED principles in them.

I will give you an example. We have got the Urban Design Strategy, the mixed use planning, the Graffiti Management Plan, the Public Toilet Plan, the Kerbside Cafe, the signage policy, the Melbourne Planning Scheme, and in particular, more so, the local policy and planning that forms part of that scheme. We have got what is called the Streetscapes Framework, we have got the Lighting Strategy, and again these are all policies and strategies that pretty much encapsulate CPTED principles in the way in which the City of Melbourne perceives safety as being a paramount or an important issue to address.

In addition to the policy we also have the practice: how do we go about ensuring crime prevention through environmental design? Principles are taken into consideration. For example, we have existing programs such as, as mentioned earlier, providing CPTED training to staff across the organisation, and we try to provide that training on a regular basis. It is not annually at the moment but, where we can, we ensure that our staff are skilled-up in CPTED principles, and they are staff members that are across the organisation, those who deal with social planning but also those who deal with statutory planning and urban planning and design, through to engineering services. We have had really good attendance from staff across
the organisation. They are interested in the concepts and how they can apply them in their everyday work.

We have also got programs such as our Safe City Cameras Program and our Safe City taxi ranks which Michael mentioned earlier. We have got our Safe City car parks and our Car Park Accreditation Scheme, all of which embed CPTED principles. It is all about active frontages, about ensuring that the locations in which cameras and other activities are placed incorporate territoriality, natural surveillance, and even digital surveillance, I guess.

We have, for example, projects or sites that we particularly manage in relation to the redevelopment or the development. An example would be the Elizabeth Street redevelopment. There is also the Swanston Street redevelopment which, although there might be some additional works, is nearing completion.

I am not sure if you are aware of the detail in relation to CPTED and tell me if you already know this, but I have tried to highlight things that relate to CPTED Generation 1. I am not sure if you are familiar with the generations. There is Generation 1 CPTED, Generation 2 CPTED, and now we are aware that there is Generation 3 CPTED, so I can talk a little bit about those, if you like. As I said, I am not sure how much detail you are wanting.

Essentially, CPTED Generation 1 is all about designing out crime, and that is through the way in which we and our planners and landscape artists design the physical layout of a space. Generation 2 is about designing in people, about adding those elements, about how to engage people into these sites and places that we have developed and designed. CPTED 3, which is a new concept and one that we have just been learning more about, is around utilising digital means and green technologies to enhance both Generation 1 and Generation 2 concepts—that is, designing in people, designing out crime.

Through our policies and through our planning and designs we look at addressing Generation 1 CPTED. Generation 2 CPTED is those programs that I mentioned earlier. We have also got a whole range of projects that relate to activation of space. A really good example is the way in which we activate our laneways. As you know, Melbourne is renowned for its laneways. Many years ago many of those laneways were not being used other than as service areas, whether for picking up rubbish or dropping off service goods. Now we have activated many of those spaces to ensure that they are safe, that they are more accessible and readable for those who are wanting to access those spaces, and that they look vibrant and exciting. As you can see, we have got lots of activity in laneways that relate to art, incorporating arts in laneways, but also activating them from a business point of view, so including outdoor alfresco dining areas. That again promotes the natural surveillance. Having more people out there using those spaces in a positive way makes people feel a lot safer. When we go on our site visit, we will go to Degraves Street, which is a really good example of how we have activated that space from an outdoor alfresco dining point of view.

The CHAIR — Is that as opposed to King Street?

Ms PIERORAZIO — In King Street there were lots of design structures that were implemented to enhance the safety of that location. For example, the lighting was considerably improved across King Street and security cameras were installed, which are monitored on a 24-hour basis. Taxi ranks have also been installed. There have been lots of design elements put into addressing that space. It is interesting that you raise King Street, because we conduct a Perceptions of Safety survey every two to three years and King Street still comes up as an issue for people, for community, but when we look at the statistics, King Street is not as high, in relation to the number of assaults that have been taking place, as other areas—Queen Street, Flinders Street—that seem to really show, through our police data or the data that we have—

Ms MALLOCH — It is like it is burnt into people's memories as a place of ill repute and bad behaviour, which certainly does happen down there at times, but it does not have the behaviour patterns that there used to be, say, 10 to 15 years ago. The lighting that Nancy mentioned was developed by City of Melbourne by Ian Dryden, our industrial designer.
that focused on was that instead of lighting the road, which is not really so vital, the sodium lighting was maintained over the road but then a second arm of lighting was added out over the pavement. That is natural daylight quality lighting so you can tell skin colour and clothing. It is not just for identifying who might have approached you and caused a problem; it is just that natural thing, that daylight rendition of colouring, and that has been replicated in many places, and interstate as well, which is really great. Another thing that happens is that, because we have the staffing and the expertise here, some of the work that we do is picked up elsewhere by, say, local governments that do not have that facility available to them.

Ms PIERORAZIO — The other key issue within King Street is the strong partnerships that were formed with the businesses in that location. Many of them actually made a financial contribution to enhancing that area. It definitely goes to show that, when certain locations have been flagged as problematic, businesses and residents are genuinely keen to enhance the safety and will make contributions, whether through their participation in activities and events or through their financial contribution. What did they contribute to? Was it the development of the Melbourne Licensees Forum?

Ms MALLOCH — There was the Licensees Forum but they also contributed significantly to the start-up of the Safe City taxi rank program by providing funding towards the security personnel. They also provided—back then it was quite a lot of money—about $100,000 to the development of a mobile police facility.

Ms PIERORAZIO — I will give examples of some of the other programs that we have in place that look at designing in people. We have those on-street vendors, as you would see—those that sell flowers, those that sell fruit. We have also got many little pop-up eateries—for example, the Creperie that is on the corner of Swanston Street and Little Collins Street—all of which provide informal surveillance. They all contribute to the health and wellbeing of the city and to people's perceptions of safety.

We have City Ambassadors. You may have seen those who are dressed in red, offering support to, particularly, visitors, those who are new to the city, giving direction, or even going up to them and saying, 'You look a little confused. Can I help you?' They are very active in providing that street presence in a positive way as opposed to in an enforcement way. They provide a bit of surveillance, a bit of positive activity in the street, leading to perceptions of safety. We have the recently established Youth Street Teams that are pretty active late at night and, obviously, service those who come into the city late at night, who might be intoxicated, who may have lost their friends and are trying to find their way home, and public transport is closed after one. They provide a real, positive presence in the city and are more of a social support mechanism.

One of the locations where we know CPTED has been really effective is Federation Square, which is obviously a place for people and is very well utilised. I am not saying the City of Melbourne owns Federation Square but it is a really good example of a place within the city which is very well utilised by people and obviously people feel very safe in that location. There are some problems in relation to the grading and the types of materials used on the floor, but aside from that I think it is a very successful place for people. ArtPlay is a space that City of Melbourne manages, and Signal. ArtPlay is ultimately a place for young people and children. Lots of young people and children utilise that space and there is a playground that is part of ArtPlay too.

I thought I would provide that as a bit of a summary, just to give you a flavour of the depth that of our involvement in CPTED principles. Martin and David, and even Michael, can add to this in relation to the way in which the Safer By Design Guidelines and/or CPTED principles are being utilised by the City of Melbourne.

The CHAIR — Can I put on notice—and I invite other committee members to raise any issues as we go along—the skateboard complex you have got.

Ms PIERORAZIO — Skate Park?
The CHAIR — Skate Park, yes. In Ballarat and Warrnambool, which are my electorate areas, you have groups of young people congregating right outside the Target doors or at somewhere else where the public thoroughfare is, and people are feeling quite intimidated by these crowds of kids that are just smoking and carrying on. I was wondering how successful it is trying to attract and motivate youth to those sorts of areas like skateboard parks rather than the pinball machines down Swanston Street. In future environmental designs is that public space for activity useful to get them away from the trouble areas?

Ms PIERORAZIO — Sure. I can talk a little bit about that.

The CHAIR — I guess the question I am really asking is: does that create a problem in itself?

Ms PIERORAZIO — Skate Park itself?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Ms PIERORAZIO — There is a lot of work that the City of Melbourne is doing, and unfortunately there is no-one from Youth Services here that would be able to add a bit of history, but Dean might be able to. One of the things that I know was very successful in relation to engaging particularly young people that might be exhibiting some of those behaviours around the CBD is that we have what are called the skate ambassadors, who are all about promoting the skate park, going to these young people where they are skating in inappropriate areas and saying, 'Look, we've got a skate park just in this location. Why don't you strut your stuff in this location?' They were a positive presence to engage young people and get them to utilise the skate park.

Ms MALLOCH — The skate park is managed by the YMCA, so there is a management group in place there, and it has a little kiosk and so forth. One of the issues that we had faced was that late at night young people—the goths and the emos—were gathering at the Flinders Street station steps, and I do not know if you know City Hatters, but also at the little steps down into City Hatters. They were gathering there and at Skate Park, so there was sort of like a route from Flinders Street station down to Skate Park. One of the things that we trialled through our recreation and parks services was to light the skate park later at night, to have some activity later into the evening, and to work with service providers and so forth, those who provide services to young people who are marginalised or whatever, and youth outreach workers, to then engage with those particular groups.

It combines to be no one simple response to the issue, but looking at Skate Park itself and encouraging people to use Skate Park when they are skaters, and then, for other young people who were using the area not to skate but to gather because they like the spot, looking at lighting, working with the YMCA managing the space, and then working with Victoria Police, Salvation Army, Frontyard and so forth, to then engage with young people to see what the issues are.

It is really interesting: one of the ways that we can measure the response to CPTED—but it could be any initiative; how long is a piece of string in terms of what is actually responsible for a particular positive outcome?—is to monitor our service calls, complaints from the public, concerns raised by residents and so forth. Calls about skating used to be incredibly regular. They come through to our area and we would always be composing a response and making phone calls to someone who was concerned about their safety in relation to skating. Now that has really dropped away and a lot of that has been due to the skate ambassadors that Nancy mentioned.

Docklands was a key area for skaters and it is often said that once the skaters arrive you know you have a successful public space; people are then voting with their wheels as well as their feet that they will be there. So that is one aspect, that concerns and complaints have dropped away. Also, I am not up to date with what is happening with the young people, but certainly
you hardly see anyone inline-skating now. It is just not the thing to do. Skateboarding certainly is, but not inline-skating.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Can I just say something from a police point of view about skate parks. I have been in the police force 25 years and I have worked in the city as well as in the country, up in the Macedon Ranges. For the last three years I have been in town as the crime prevention officer for North West Metro Division 1, which is the city of Melbourne and the city of Yarra. From my point of view, I take the example of the Macedon Ranges. We have got two skate parks there. One is in Romsey, which is on the main street near the primary school there, adjacent to there. It is right next to the road and there is a lot of natural surveillance and accountability. Also, I am not sure if it is still there, but Gisborne had one tucked in behind the old police station out the back of the football ground and all the rest. Funnily enough, they had issues with drugs and assaults and all those other types of issues because it was out of sight, so there was not that natural surveillance with it. So siting has got a lot to do with it.

Just in regard to the skate park down here, a recent trend that is developing—and I have not spoken to anyone here about it—is that we are having issues to and from the skate park; so, as Anne was saying, from Flinders Street station to the skate park. Going to and from the park environment or that secluded area, we are now starting to see issues, offences, occur. It has happened before and the skate park management actually instigated something, which became known amongst the skaters, for when they were going down there not knowing if anyone was there and putting themselves at harm by venturing down there to see if anyone was there. What they would arrange was that they left the lights on if they were there, but if they were not there they turned them off, so they did not have to go down there to see. They would know, before they even got there, whether anyone was there.

The other thing, as Anne was saying, is the utilisation of the other services, like ourselves, the Salvation Army, the 614 bus and things like that, to actually help and get to the kids where they are, rather than trying to get the kids to come to us, which does not really happen. That is just my input in regard to that.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Mr PRYOR — Turning to this document, the Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria, the significant thing for us, I think, is that it is referred to in the planning scheme. That does not necessarily mean that a lot of detailed attention gets given to it on a day-to-day basis, but it makes it a more useful tool for us. It is a crutch we can lean on to support good decision making, if you like. In terms of that question of whether it should be mandatory, the wording in clause 15 of our planning scheme—I do not remember exactly what it is—is that planning must consider as relevant this document. I am speaking as an urban designer, not as a planner, but that would seem to me an appropriate level of obligation.

With things like this, it is extremely useful for people to think about the issues that are in the document. To become more specifically prescriptive would be a challenge, I would think. When you go through the document and look at specific design suggestions, for example, a lot of them are either too broad to have a lot of applicable meaning or they could potentially conflict with other issues. You might have a conflict between wanting more glazing and wanting to preserve a heritage building, for example.

As for the extent to which we refer to this in our day-to-day work, I think a fair generalisation would be to say that that document very rarely gets referred to but that the principles that are in it are quite well embedded in our work. I am in the City Design Division and, from our director down, I think it is fair to say that the sorts of principles that are in that document are just normal practice. When I briefly mentioned to our director that this hearing was coming, he mentioned for example the Postcode 3000 program, which was back in the nineties. That was certainly building-in people and we are consistently optimising activation of frontages; avoiding shops having shutters closing them off, sort of opening them up; the whole focus on
lighting, which is to a large extent encapsulated in the Lighting Strategy, and you will hear more about that from our industrial designer later on.

In terms of applying some rigour to this and making sure that certain issues get addressed, I do not think there is a great deal of that, but probably an example that would give you a reasonable sense of it is in this document. With a lot of planning applications, the planners will refer them to the urban design team for comment and we have a template that we use as a checklist, effectively, in formulating those responses. One of the line items on that template is pedestrian safety. That is item 8 on that document. It is just a prompt to make sure we think about it.

Just as an example, there is a fairly typical planning application here. This is the ground floor as it was initially proposed at a pre-application meeting. We suggested that they do something about the quite deep space that they have got outside the entrance there and by the time it came in as an application they had reduced the depth and the ratio of depth to width of that space. There is probably scope for further improvement, but they have listened to the issue that was raised and done something about it. Similarly, this project had quite limited activation at upper floor levels in terms of human presence and eyes on the street. The left-hand side of that drawing highlighted in orange is the extent that they initially had and, when they came back with the actual application, they had increased that.

The CHAIR — Thanks, David. We are leaving it up to you, for everyone to have a say, and then obviously the committee would like to—

Ms MALLOCH — Ask questions.

The CHAIR — Bearing in mind I think we have got about 15 minutes left to quiz the presenters, if that is all right.

Ms MALLOCH — Yes, sure. Martin, if we could hand over to you now.

Mr WILLIAMS — I am the executive officer planning. My planning officers process all the applications for planning permits that we are responsible for and we also provide advice to the minister when the minister is the responsible authority for large developments, usually over 25,000 square metres, or—until I think Thursday of this week—the Docklands as well. We also process hundreds of referrals from the Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation on licensed premises and we collaborate with the police in dealing with our responses to them. We approach the CPTED question not just from the planning scheme but from liquor regulation as well and we are well aware of the hot spots around the city and the correlation there is between them and the level of safety and perceived safety in the city.

For David, where there is a project that the council itself is doing, then they generally do not need a planning permit for it and we do not see it, but we know that all of this practice is well embedded in city design anyway, and when we have an application for a new building—there are about 150 a year, which is significant—generally we refer them to whichever internal branches are relevant. Often it is Michael, often David, and we get back specific advice on CPTED questions. When you look through the planning scheme, as David mentions, the Safer Design Guidelines are embedded in the state section of the scheme, and my staff have had the CPTED training internally as well, and we are well aware and we are made aware by public comment on applications that we advertise when there is a potential problem with a new application.

Like all of us around here I think, we get a stream of complaints from the public about things that are not working. Sometimes we are in a position to do something positive about it, but sometimes we have to refer that to perhaps Michael for lighting or, if it is a public space, perhaps City Projects, and when we look at whether or not it is necessary to mandate the Safer Design Guidelines, I went through all of our appeal statistics and where we have received advice, say, from City Projects that something like David has mentioned should be changed on a plan and we have compelled the applicant to do that through a condition on a planning
permit, we have not had a single appeal against that from any of the applicants for a planning permit for significant developments.

When you look through the specific questions you ask here—how well embedded is all of this information in the architects, designers and so on?—if it is a major project, the answer is: pretty well. They generally know what we are looking for even before they apply for a permit and if we impose extra conditions they, by and large, accept them. They realise that mostly our and their pieces of bread are buttered on the same side. They do not want dangerous conditions after they have finished a building any more than we do and we get very little resistance from them.

When you look through the planning scheme for detailed bits and pieces, we have got a licensed premises policy which we use, we have got urban design policies that we use, we have got laneway policies which we use, so when we are looking at a major development, say the Upper West Side which is under construction now, which used to be the old council power station, there are laneways in there and we rejigged the laneways with CPTED concepts in mind before we agreed to sell or rearrange laneways, and the same thing is now being discussed on the Age site on the other side of Lonsdale street, so as we go through and redesign the city, CPTED is one group of considerations that we have in looking at the design.

Ms MALLOCH — That brings us to the end of the various aspects of information that we have, with Nancy's general introduction but with some detailed examples, and then from engineering and statutory planning and urban design, with some information from Glenn as well. Just to introduce you: this is my manager, Dean Griggs, manager of community safety and wellbeing. We partner very closely with Victoria Police in responding to safety audit requests that come in but also with our Community Safety Audit Program. Glenn, did you want to just—

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — I see Victoria Police's role as that go-between, with statistics, obviously, for crime and that, which we do not provide through our corporate communications but just our own knowledge, and also the recent trends and things, the way they are doing it, how they are doing it, what they are looking for and things like that. There is the public toilets, for example. They are being used for drug dealing and assaults and things like that, and the initial location was seen as a hot spot for us in regard to those issues, so we conducted that audit and obviously found a better and safer location for them.

The other thing is, obviously it is easier if you can get it at the first stage rather than redesigning, from my point of view as well as, I would say, the City of Melbourne's point of view. The way the Docklands was developed probably meant there was some redesigning that had to be done once it was handed over to the City of Melbourne, and I do not know what dealings were had in that development stage, but it just seems that the cost factor obviously goes up as soon as you look at redeveloping or redesigning those sorts of things after they have already been done.

The other thing I was just going to mention quickly was compliance with policy, procedures and training. Since I have been doing this job, they are I believe the main ways of getting it all right on that level, mainly for staff and that as well—in other words, good management or some formal management processes. A lot of businesses that I have been dealing with in Yarra and Melbourne are small businesses and they have not really got any ideas, even from setting up shops, and even corporate businesses and things like that, on how to handle situations that they come across; therefore, I suppose in policing terminology we have like a debrief after each incident. I now cite occ health and safety as the thing, rather than crime prevention, so to speak, because they do not see it as an occupational health and safety issue and in actual fact it is, because of the safety of their staff and the people that are coming into and out of areas and into the stores and things like that.

Also, obviously CCTV footage has been spoken about. Are you aware that we have got a facial recognition software now called iFace? You can have CCTV footage, but then you have to have the right quality, the right zoom, you have to have it positioned right, and all those
other things to actually make it work. I have seen footage where you can see the tops of their heads, which does not help you identify them. When I do site visits and things like that, I am looking at those sorts of things and advising them, but I suppose it could come down to part of the management again.

Ms PIERORAZIO — And, Glenn, that is particularly in relation to your work with local businesses in the municipalities.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Yes.

Ms PIERORAZIO — So Glenn will liaise regularly or be invited by those businesses to do a security audit of the premises and that is being gratefully engaged in.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — The problem with that is that usually, unfortunately, it costs money; therefore, the businesses back away or the community backs away because of the cost factor. That could be like registers put in the wrong position in a shop. With all the electronic devices that you have got there and all the wiring and everything, you are up for $5,000 to $10,000 maybe just to resite that area. Again, I suppose if it was done properly in the first place or in consultation it would have been better, but it is not always done that way.

As mentioned, this training with the City of Melbourne, with their staff, which I have been part of, and just that practical experience and human observation of them interacting with spaces and businesses and things like that, is a component. As part of our audits, we do generally a daytime/night-time inspection or audit so that we get the various aspects of it, rather than just daylight, because it changes dramatically, especially the city of Melbourne, from daytime to night-time to weekends and things like that. City of Melbourne has been very proactive in this regard with CPTED. There are other councils that have not and sometimes they put it down to the culture of the area and things like that, where it is probably not the safest culture to have but they believe that it is part of their area and they are not willing to change.

Mr McCURDY — David, you were talking about the guidelines being embedded into designing, and more of an obligation to refer to those, but then we listened to Glenn talking about developers. Is there a gap between what the City of Melbourne would be doing in their design features and what developers would look into?

Mr PRYOR — Not necessarily, but generally what we are designing is in the public realm and there are particular issues that are foregrounded there. A private development is generally focused on lettable space and any of the sort of external spaces, which are generally what we are talking about in CPTED—that is where the crimes are that you are trying to prevent—are secondary. So I would say 'yes'. It would be a generalised answer, but there is less focus in private development. I think that is where a constructive dialogue through the planning application process is very valuable.

Mr McCURDY — Glenn said not all councils are doing what the City of Melbourne is doing. Is there a major cost impediment that other LGAs would see?

Mr PRYOR — I cannot speak on behalf of other local government areas, but certainly anything that gets addressed on the plan is costing virtually nothing compared to something that has to be addressed after it is built.

Mr WILLIAMS — Our experience has been that if we require a developer to change the plan, as the examples that David has given you show, the cost to them is so trifling by comparison with the cost of the overall development they want approval for that it pales into insignificance by comparison with the cost of delays—

Mr McCURDY — Or retrofitting.

Mr WILLIAMS — and the cost of taking us on at the tribunal and probably losing.
Mr PRYOR — It is also worth saying that we always keep an eye out for multiple benefits in the one action, so if we can see an opportunity to improve passive surveillance and give the developer more lettable space, we will put that to them.

Mr LEANE — In this project are there many paths that you are lighting up with solar lighting?

Mr NORTON — This is our first pathway in the city of Melbourne with solar LED lights.

Mr LEANE — Obviously that looks good and it will be safe. You can see where you are going and you can see other people, if you felt concerned. This is like a pilot?

Mr NORTON — Correct.

Mr LEANE — Are you happy with it?

Mr NORTON — It has only been in for about three or four weeks. First impressions: very happy.

Mr LEANE — There is a lot of conversation when you talk about CPTED and lighting. I would imagine that the more lighting you have the bigger the bill you have to maintain that.

Mr NORTON — These lights are quite interesting in the sense that they have motion sensors in them so they actually dim down. Obviously, they are solar powered and rely on solar energy to recharge the battery, but these batteries would have about a three-day life if they were not recharged. Obviously, they do draw current while they are on. They have a low level of light when they come on at night-time, through the sensor, and as someone walks along the path they light up to full illumination, and then they dim down again to, again, just conserve the batteries. In that path we put 20 lights along a pathway that had been unlit since the park was first built—a long time ago.

Mr LEANE — Was it more expensive to do it that way than to just put in a few standard, traditional lights?

Mr NORTON — No, because surprisingly we got a pretty good deal. It was about $3,000 a light to install, pole and light, with no underground power, no disruption to the park. The dimming feature is a part park people like because it was consistent with the master plan for the park, where they were wanting to have lighting but at lighting levels that actually also would support all the different sorts of flora and fauna in the park.

Mr LEANE — And there would be less light pollution.

Mr NORTON — Yes, and, again, sustainability. It is greenhouse-gas-safe.

Mr LEANE — Thanks. That is really interesting. We will look at it.

Mr NORTON — Yes. LED lighting—and these are LED lights—is fantastic emerging lighting technology. It is only relatively new, like three or four years old. Even so, this design, this light, is two, three, four, five or six months old and there is probably already—

Mr LEANE — Yes, something better.

Mr NORTON — With a better design now. Public lighting and street lighting is at a very emerging level of technology now.

Mr McCURDY — Is the sensor on a bank of lights?
Mr NORTON — No. Each one has got its own sensor, but essentially they all come on at about the same time. We were up there two weeks ago and 15 of them came on within a minute of each other, and the other five came on about a minute or two after that, and that was at about 6.40 p.m.

Mr McCURDY — Are you trying to get that effect of still being able to see in the distance?

Mr NORTON — Yes.

Mr McCURDY — The light you are under is coming on but you would still want the light—

Mr NORTON — The lights are on. They dim down to a level where they are on and there is still reasonable light, but as you approach them, about 10 metres away from the light they dim up to full illumination and then they dim down after you walk past.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — And for crime prevention it is good, because if you are walking along and you see the lights on, that tells you that someone or something is there; there is movement there. It alerts you to that movement.

Ms MALLOCH — Another aspect is that I think one of the things in the safety audit was, ‘Do you light more of the park?’ and so forth, but if you are keeping it along a particular path then it is encouraging people to use that path, so you have more people using the one route rather than perhaps people spread out over a large area, which is again a safety factor.

Mr McCURDY — Also, the path is part of the Capital City bike path, so quite a few people use it. The foot traffic is probably limited to the train schedules, like the morning and the night-time rush. Then after they cease, you have got the bike people going through, across Parkville, across the top of Carlton, then up into Sydney Road and up into those areas.

Mr BATTIN — You mentioned King Street before, Simon. We were talking about King Street and you said it is a perception, because the figures there have dropped over the last three years. However, perception is reality. How does the city council get around that to try and encourage more people to go there, as point 2 of your evolution of the club venture design to get more people down to the King Street area and create the environment that does feel safe? How do you get the message out there that it is safe, first of all?

Ms PIERORAZIO — King Street has been an evolving space/area/street because the nature of the businesses also changed. For a while there it was a bit mixed. There were a number of different licensed premises. Now that seems to be centralised. I think that there was a rationale for why it would be best to group them in a certain location, and I think they are being better managed, better targeted and better policed if they are in a certain location. I think there has been lots of work done, and please contribute if you know a little bit more from the planning and approval side of things in relation to licensed premises, but I know that there has been some strategic work done to enhance the area for what it is and for the types of business that it is currently attracting. We have the Safe City cameras, the Safe City taxi ranks, and the lighting has improved considerably. The nature of the business in that location requires a certain level of supervision and safety and I think that there is probably always going to be that perceived level of unsafety because of, currently, the nature of the businesses that it attracts.

Mr GRIGGS — I think also having the late-night taxi rank or the mega rank in Queen Street that we have set up in the last 12 months decants the King Street crowd. Rather than them waiting in King Street for taxis, it gives them a place to walk up to. It is a bit of a
release valve, in a way, in that it gets people moving. There is no late-night transport, so from one o’clock in the morning until 5 a.m. taxis are it, basically, to get out of the city. So it does give pedestrian flows a little bit of movement further up to Queen Street to get a cab in a safe, well-managed environment. King Street will possibly always have some level of concern about it. All we can do as a city is manage it well, light it well, work with Victoria Police well and have those partnerships in place. We have, I suppose, done the best we can, and I think the late-night taxi rank probably adds to that new suite of things that can take the pressure off that area.

Ms MALLOCH — It is an evolving street as well. Vue de Monde moved from its previous location to the Rialto and there is quite a discussion at the moment between the person who owns many of the buildings on that block and the owners of the Rialto, wanting to turn that into a different type of precinct, for fine dining and so forth. Some of those things then, of course, are outside our control and state government’s control and anyone’s control other than the businesspeople concerned. I guess if the price is right, at some stage there will be a repurchasing of property along there, which then takes that west end precinct into its organic phase of moving and reshaping and re-forming itself into perhaps something else.

We also have a really strong relationship with our arts and culture branch in council and so there have been different projects. We have art in the laneways and that is at times focused on the west end of the city to encourage people to use the area in a slightly different way. There was also the idea that King Street would become almost the central axis of the CBD with the development of Docklands as that grew and in a sense that has not really happened, but it is still part of the evolution of that area and how the cityscape just continues to develop.

Ms PIERORAZIO — I think in addition there were some other streets in the CBD that have the types of activities also dispersed in other streets. Queen Street is now quite renowned for its late-night activity. What are some of the other streets? It is Queen Street predominantly, isn’t it?

Ms MALLOCH — And the Spring Street end.

Ms PIERORAZIO — And the Spring Street end, yes.

Ms MALLOCH — Your end of town is quite popular—increasingly so.

Mr BATTIN — The other question, Glenn: CCTV cameras are obviously a part of planning, and more so now, coming into the future with crime prevention. I have worked at City East, where they used to have the monitors in the watch house, and we have also visited WA and had a look at the system with the monitoring of the cameras over there. Is it still the same here, where you have a private company monitoring it and the screens are not on in City East, only when they flick them on? In Western Australia a dedicated police officer was with the staff permanently to watch it for instant reaction, which looked like a better and quicker response time.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Believe it or not, the City of Melbourne is probably better at answering it because they provide it.

Ms PIERORAZIO — Yes. We run the Safe City Cameras Program, which we service Victoria Police in monitoring and accessing. That arrangement that you talked about that Western Australia have is a very good model and I think the City of Melbourne have explored with Victoria Police a better engagement and a better collaboration. There were some discussions and I think what Victoria Police suggested was that it was best that they access the service rather than be part of the service.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — At Melbourne East—that is where I am from—we have just had plasma or LCD TVs put up in the muster rooms, in the watch house and in the sergeants office, with that footage going there, but it is controlled through the City of Melbourne.
Ms PIERORAZIO — And there is a reason for it.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Yes. There are issues of security et cetera behind that.

Ms PIERORAZIO — Particularly, I think, for Victoria Police. At the council it is seen that we have strict protocols and operating procedures. By having those, by being governed by those, Victoria Police and the City of Melbourne are covered in relation to who accesses it, how it is accessed, and ensuring that it is being used in an appropriate manner so that if there were any issues of concern by individuals who may have been targeted by the cameras, there is an opportunity to say, 'Well, it's not Victoria Police just accessing the program for the sake of it. There are approvals that are required in order for Victoria Police to access it,' although the relationship is very strong and there is that flow, that ease of access, and when there are crises there is an automatic access right to Victoria Police to manage a location or a space or an area. There has been lots of work been done together with Victoria Police in ensuring that that is a service that benefits both organisations.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Obviously they have got evidentiary requirements in regard to the footage, the security of it and tampering and things like that, as well, and there is an independent audit committee which oversees it. As we were saying, it covers both parties to that effect.

Mr BATTIN — And it would be good as crime prevention or is it more as evidence after? That is a question that has been no research on, so it is all anecdotal.

Ms MALLOCH — The Law Reform Commission conducted an inquiry into CCTV 18 months, two years ago. The City of Melbourne program is very strongly detailed in that, if I can refer you also to perhaps follow up with that report. Certainly the value of CCTV as either preventative or after-the-act has occupied us and many other people, especially in England.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — As you say, for an investigative tool, which is what it is. But for actual policing, anecdotally I have heard a number of stories where someone has been assaulted, say in King Street, and they have been caught in Russell Street because the staff who were there working the system have got the description or whatever and they are going through the cameras looking for the person and they have come across them at the other end of town.

Ms MALLOCH — But it did not stop the assault happening in the first place.

Ms PIERORAZIO — Evaluations that we have done have highlighted and suggested that the strength of the program is around being able to use it as evidence, particularly for Victoria Police, and the response time in relation to putting together a brief that explains the incident and who the victim and/or the perpetrator was in that case, so there have been lots of benefits in relation to the time and resources that are needed to develop a brief et cetera. The difficulty is how do you measure prevention and that is often the challenge. That is not to say that it is not a really good preventative tool; it is about how you are able to review and evaluate that and that is always a challenge.

The CHAIR — I am very aware—

Ms MALLOCH — Of the time, yes.

The CHAIR — I am in your hands because you obviously have got a better feel for how long it is going to take us to do the tour of duty, but for the record, I must say I have not heard a lot of negativity about the Safer City principles. Everyone seems to think they are wonderful. They are all embedded and the City of Melbourne is doing a fantastic job in adhering to the principles, and we do not wish to go into any scrutiny of CPTED because there does not appear to be too much criticism of that. Are there any areas that we can enhance from
a parliament point of view in relation to the Safer City Guidelines or in fact encourage other LGAs to use as well as you are using them here? Everything cannot be wonderful.

Ms MALLOCH — No.

The CHAIR — There must be some areas that we can improve on in relation to the adoption of the report by other LGAs or in fact the guidelines themselves.

Ms MALLOCH — For us, one of the things goes back to what Glenn was saying, and also David and Martin, and that is that so often you are having to play catch-up with businesses, developers, designers and so forth when inappropriate design has actually eventuated. When we have had our in-house training, we have used various areas of the municipality as our training ground and we have gone out to do our practical work. It is just an incredibly interesting process to go through. The group that I was working in had gone down to an area of Docklands around Channel 7 and just over that walk bridge from Southern Cross station and, even though commentary had been provided in developmental stages, some of that was never paid heed to.

Really, everybody is an urban designer in one form, shape or another because people know whether an area is safe or not and they do not need signage to say, ‘This is a safe area,’ or whatever. They themselves know and they will vote with their feet. We may come across people who cannot find their way—tourists, say, from overseas, who cannot find where to go to eat; they thought that it was going to be a lovely area down by a marina or whatever and they have got simply no guide—so we need to have really excellent way-finding and signage and a much tighter relationship between the development that is taking place and the local authority that is inheriting it. That would be a very positive thing.

You said that perception is reality. That is something we struggle with quite significantly in the municipality and I think a relationship between state government and our municipality would be fabulous to try to promote an improved perception.

The Premier announced the White Night program that is going to be taking place in winter next year. When we are talking about designing in people, there are all sorts of cultural activities that people really like to take part in that are free or low cost and that encourage people into this municipality and the other municipalities that you are each responsible for, wherever they may be, and that is where a great deal of work can be done. It is speaking very much of a paradigm shift against what you can do using conventional measures, such as CCTV, through to what it is that you can do to actually have people enjoy a space and to address the culture of alcohol. I know this is in a sense stepping from CPTED but it still comes into the environment that people are coming into: what is it that we do to attract them and to support them in those spaces and places? For example, what transport will be in place to be provided for the people who are coming in for the 24-hour White Night celebrations and activities? What is it that we can do to have get people home more effectively when they have finished partying in the city?

There was Allan Fels's inquiry into the taxi industry recently, so there is quite a lot happening at state and local government level, but if it is that very nicely coordinated process of communication between the two levels of government, it would be really fabulous.

Mr GRIGGS — Just broadly—as a local government concept rather than just City of Melbourne—I think the CPTED principles give each local government a sense that crime prevention is their business as much as Victoria Police's but in a much more proactive and positive, preventative sort of way, and that is about livability and attraction to municipalities, whether it be in rural Victoria or our suburbs; that they can play a part in making their municipalities livable, engaging and safe places to be, in partnership with the police at the enforcement and prevention end. It is a language that certainly councils understand and it is a good way to engage local governments, and they have been engaged over the last few years, but it certainly needs to continue, and strongly, I think.
Ms PIERORAZIO — Can I just add that the City of Melbourne, along with a whole range of other local governments, were involved in the development of the Safer By Design Guidelines, so you will find that many local governments are familiar with them and use them—not necessarily in that particular form, but in other forms or in forms that they are able to apply to their everyday work. I know that there was a considerable amount of effort and engagement with local government in the development of those guidelines to ensure that they were applicable to the local council.

Mr PRYOR — In answer to that question, my suggestion is to look for good planning principles in other respects that can also reinforce CPTED principles. One of those is to help settlements become less car dependent. An area that is walkable will tend to be safer. For example, we need to move towards where the risk of a child being attacked on the way to school is addressed through it being the norm that kids walk to school; they know their neighbours and that there is safety in that sort of respect; they know the area; they become street savvy, rather than being chauffeured to school, which actually generates risks and embeds car dependence.

Part of that is to design communities in a reasonably intense way in terms of getting appropriate levels of density of development and mix of development and getting them well connected. Those principles are in here, but I think to reinforce those principles is particularly important in newly developed areas. There are also things that could be done to improve public transport so that, for example, if you are going to a show on a Saturday night, public transport would be an automatic choice rather than, as is currently the case, the car. Even if you are coming into the best served bit of the state in terms of public transport, most people still choose the car because the late-night and weekend public transport is just not that great.

Ms MALLOCH — This morning a colleague of ours was saying that she had been in North Melbourne at the weekend and had experienced the new PSOs that are working at the station. She said it was fabulous, that North Melbourne railway station felt really fantastic and safe, and there were police there as well as the PSOs, and then she said she stepped out of the station and she was walking to her friend's place for dinner and that is where her sense of safety finished. There are fabulous initiatives such as that, but then what do we do as a local government, as police and so forth, to back that up? You arrive somewhere and you are in the hands of protectors and feeling safe, but then you move away from there, and I think that concern has been heightened for both males and females, but especially women, since the tragic murder of Jill Meagher.

Mr PRYOR — In that particular instance we liaised with adjacent property owners to encourage them to redevelop mixed use development of appropriate density that would be of benefit to the proximity of that station and contribute to that becoming a local centre, with eyes on the street at different times of the day, but the owner was not a developer and that did not go anywhere. Changing a whole precinct like that is often a gradual process; we cannot necessarily make happen overnight.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — In regard to time and manpower for CPTED, the consultation, the audit, the report et cetera can take quite some time, so if mandating anything, that would have to be taken into account. The police obviously have various roles and responsibilities and we would find it hard to actually be the lead agency, but we could support consultants or councils or someone else, with the information and that sort of thing that I have already detailed. Even the community safety audits we have done take considerable time, just for the development and identifying issues and all those sorts of components.

Ms MALLOCH — Resourcing it.

Ldg Snr Const. McFARLANE — Resourcing, yes.

Ms MALLOCH — I am mindful of the time and that your bus is needing to be met by budget at a particular time and so we have made one slight adjustment but, never fear, it will not impact on driving around.
The CHAIR — I know some of our parliamentary committee members have parliamentary commitments—I think post four o'clock.

Ms MALLOCH — Yes, that is right. We will make sure that you are back where you need to be.

The CHAIR — For those that are not travelling with us, can I thank you very much for your time. We appreciate it, and I suspect that as our inquiry gathers steam we will probably come back to some of you and investigate more some of the question-and-answer session we had here today. Thank you all very much. We appreciate your time.

Witnesses withdrew.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — We might formally open this hearing and thank you both for attending the joint parliamentary committee, the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee, and its inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design. We also thank the City of Casey for its submission, which we will talk through and, I suspect, you will talk through this morning. I would like to introduce our committee. If they would introduce themselves.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr SCHEFFER — Johan Scheffer, Eastern Victoria Region.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — We do have an apology from Mr Shaun Leane, who will join us at about 11.15.

The CHAIR — Before you both speak I just have to read you the conditions surrounding this hearing and welcome you to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. I advise you that all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you read and received the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees? You are fully understanding of that? We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Caroline and Liam – who is going to present first?

Mr HODGETTS — We firstly thank the committee for receiving the submission. Caroline will be presenting on the written submission that you have got a copy of, and she will be speaking to a PowerPoint presentation prepared to show some more visual and case study examples of some initiatives that are taking place at Casey.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Ms DICKSON — Thank you very much for having us today. I have just got a brief presentation I will run through.

The CHAIR — Just for the committee, Caroline, you are the senior strategic planner for the City of Casey?

Ms DICKSON — Correct.

The CHAIR — Liam is the manager strategic development, both in planning, obviously?

Ms DICKSON — Yes.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Overheads shown.

Ms DICKSON — I will just quickly go through our presentation, which focuses around three areas – what does the City of Casey think safer design is, how the current Safer Design Guidelines fit within particularly a context of planning in the way that the City of Casey utilises the guidelines and then some examples that we have included in our submission; I will include some additional information on those from the submission.

The City of Casey considers safer design to be more than just crime prevention. It is about creating an environment where the built form and infrastructure are physically safe for individuals, and, more importantly, it is about creating an environment where people feel both physically and personally safe. So it is also more about perceptions of safety. Council’s
submission and the presentation that I am presenting today will focus on safer design in response to the elements included on that slide.

Mr SCHEFFER — So some of those – sorry, just going back —

Ms DICKSON — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Some of those, like safe materials, surfaces and edges, have got to do with people looking after themselves so they do not hurt themselves, and other ones like – I am just trying to find one – places where people feel safe – for example, dead zones and designing – they are to do more with people being harmed by criminal – people doing something illegal and wrong. Do you mix them up together, or do you separate them out when you think about it.

Ms DICKSON — Yes, they can be considered separately in terms of what we see safer design as meaning. It is about both the physical safety as well as the perceived safety and that crime context as well. The reason for that is that if there are unsafe materials or surfaces or edges within an environment, a person may not feel safe in using whatever —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes. When you sit down and do the planning – I just want to get this clear – when you sit down and you are working out a new space do you say, ‘Okay, here’s the list to do with criminal activity and here’s the list to do with how people’ – and I understand there are overlaps – ‘feel safe and they don’t hurt themselves by bumping up against things’? Are you very clear about what is to do with the criminal stuff and what is to do with the other safety considerations?

Ms DICKSON — I would not say that we are particularly clear in terms of a delineation, more so that we consider both holistically in the way that we are considering design and —

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay, thanks.

Ms DICKSON — Thank you. Casey’s submission details that there is a vast range of documents that talk about safer design, the first one being the Safer Design Guidelines, which are reasonably well considered, but when looking at the State Planning Policy Framework for guidance around making decisions in a planning context about safer design, the design guidelines are only referenced in a clause within the State Planning Policy Framework around activity centres – so shopping centres and similar facilities that you would find around shopping centres. The Activity Centre Design Guidelines, which are prepared by the Department of Planning and Community Development, are also referenced by the same clause that triggers the reference to the Safer Design Guidelines, and that document itself also references the Safer Design Guidelines. The Activity Centre Design Guidelines also talk about public transport in the context of safer design as well. The Department of Planning and Community Development has also put together a template structure plan to assist councils in preparing their own objectives for activity centres, which is called the Ruby Town Structure Plan. That makes reference to the Activity Centre Design Guidelines, but the objectives that help to guide councils in preparing their own objectives for activity centres do not necessarily focus on safer design.

The public transport land use and development guidelines are prepared by the Department of Transport and focus on public transport and private transport infrastructure, including active transport options, like walking and cycling, and that includes some reference to safer design in those guidelines as well. The Growth Areas Authority Precinct Structure Planning Guidelines are also quite holistic in looking at safer design within the guidelines themselves, and the guidelines are used to assist the preparation of precinct structure plans. What is talked about in safer design of the Precinct Structure Planning Guidelines is not necessarily included in the precinct structure plans themselves. Finally, the Department of Justice design guidelines for licensed premises talks specifically about licensed premises, and they also talk about the
inside areas of licensed premises, which is something that is not covered in any of the other documents.

Mr BATTIN — Sorry, Caroline, just on the public transport, does that include the connections between public transport – train to bus, bus to taxi —

Ms DICKSON — Yes, I believe that it does. It is council’s position that there is a lot of fragmentation with these particular documents and that there would be a benefit in one planning document that is a comprehensive set of the guidelines that are considered in the broader context of a planning scheme – so more holistically. The other documents that exist – they are not necessarily safer design documents; they are more holistic than that in themselves, but it would be beneficial if those documents referenced one set of comprehensive safer design guidelines.

I would like to take you through some of the examples that we spoke about in our submission. The first one is Cranbourne Place Park. A CPTED audit – a crime prevention through environment design audit – was conducted in September 2011, and the reasons for the audit were youths loitering in the area, antisocial behaviour in and around the park, criminal damage to facilities, alcohol consumption and assaults. The recommendations included upgrading permitter fencing, providing signage to the park – this is an example of the fencing around the park – redesigning and removing vegetation and mounding that are obscuring sidelines and upgrading older facilities that are more susceptible to graffiti and damage. The top picture is of the playground within Cranbourne Place Park, which is a more recent facility, and the audit demonstrated that there was barely any damage to that area, particularly in comparison to some of the older facilities in the area. There is a gazebo within the site as well that experiences some antisocial behaviour and graffiti damage, so one of the recommendations is to redesign that space.

The next steps for council are that we are preparing a master plan to bring back —

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, what do you mean by ‘antisocial behaviour”? Is the graffiti antisocial behaviour or do you mean people being assaulted?

Ms DICKSON — Not necessarily assaults – I do not believe that there are assaults particularly around this gazebo area, but more so things like drinking at night, the congregation in concealed spaces where there may be activities such as criminal damage occurring and things of that nature.

Mr HODGETTS — This is was an interesting park because when we talk about legitimate and illegitimate use of the park area, the community had long since abandoned real use of this park day and night, spanning the evening hours. In this particular instance it was deemed that it was the antisocial behaviour which was pushing away the actual community use of that asset, so these steps were taken in the design of this park. I believe the works will commence next year to remove the rotunda to thin out the vegetation, flatten out a lot of the places where people have perception issues in terms of looking through vegetation to a point of destination, such as a barbecue stand or a park bench and to leverage off the activity corridor, which is South Gippsland Highway and make sure people can actually look into that park and its well surveyed both daytime and night-time, and, hopefully that is going to lift the presence of the park and therefore the usage, by the general use of the public.

Mr SCHEFFER — I guess where I struggle in that space is you could, from what we have heard, make different arguments about how you arrange the space. One argument could be if you have got a wide barren space people feel isolated so they do not want to use it. The other argument is if you have too many culverts and places for people to congregate, they do the sorts of things you said, which then drives out other people. You know, you can toss that, but how did you use the guidelines in getting to your solution? How did you navigate your way through the paradox that I have just alluded to?
Mr HODGETTS — It is always a design balance. You are keeping the high-canopy trees, but have good human scale visibility through —

Mr SCHEFFER — Is that so you derive – you actively go to the guidelines and look at —

Mr HODGETTS — The guidelines are used as a reference point, but most professionals in the field of urban design or landscape planning generally apply them anyway in any design context. In this particular instance you are leveraging off the movement corridor I spoke of, so there is a passive surveillance experience. You are removing any of that 2-metre-to-1½-metre-high vegetation, which obscures the user spaces, but you are retaining the shade opportunities that large-canopy trees have above that area. There is a thinning on the ground, but you are leaving the canopy trees in place.

Mr SCHEFFER — Because our focus is really the guidelines and how they are used and in what ways, so I am just sort of honing in on that – are you saying that, yes, the guidelines are there, but basically the people doing the work know all this stuff anyway so they just get on with it?

Mr HODGETTS — In public parks – within a growth area context like Casey where we have developed this design in parks for us – handing that asset that over when they get compliance certification, and the basis for those park designs are leveraged off conditions that are placed on it by using the design guidelines. It is very important that their architects, their designers, some of whom vary, depending on what developer you have, have that base level of information available.

Mr McCURDY — Is that stipulations that you have put in place?

Mr HODGETTS — Their permit conditions, correct, yes.

Mr BATTIN — From memory, I know we have had a look at a couple of parks down there fairly recently, and obviously some have been changed, particularly around Berwick. One of the philosophies – and I think it was you who actually said it – one of the ideas in a park is, even when you are alone, that you can look around and never feel alone. Is that the perception? I know you were saying that it is open spaces —

Mr HODGETTS — It is.

Mr BATTIN — But the perception is to try and say wherever you are standing within that park you feel like you can see someone?

Mr HODGETTS — Yes, you can see a point of entry and a point of exit.

Mr BATTIN — Yes.

Mr HODGETTS — So if you feel threatened in the park, you can have multiple paths of exit, and that is safety, effectively. It is a feeling of some sort passive surveillance and some sort of desire to be able to get out of a space.

The CHAIR — It is a bit of a trade-off. I have to say that just from a general practical point of view, removing a rotunda or removing somewhere where people can actually shelter from the elements and create an environment – down my way we have a number of rotundas that are used regularly by different groups to get out of the sun or get out of the rain and have a sort of an enclosed capacity, so how do you —

Mr HODGETTS — This particular rotunda is not something owned by the community as such; it is an ornamental rotunda, I suppose, but there are rotundas, as you know, across Victoria and Australia that serve a purpose, not only for event space, because their origin was a band venue, basically, where the community would gather and you could deliver a performance. But in this particular instance the assessment was made that the passive
use of this park was more about children coming to play in the playground and have a barbecue as opposed to shelter from your rotunda.

Mr BATTIN — I am assuming it is not policy for Casey to remove rotundas; it is on a needs basis to get rid of some that are —

Mr HODGETTS — Absolutely, yes. The community usually informs the design of the park as well.

Mr BATTIN — Yes, we have some fantastic parks down there.

Mr HODGETTS — I think, Caroline, was it 70?

Ms DICKSON — Yes.

The CHAIR — Yes, it is recorded.

Ms DICKSON — The removal of the rotunda is part of the first stage of delivery or infrastructure upgrades for this park following from the audit, so we are currently preparing the master plan that will look at a longer-term strategy for the park as well. As Liam mentioned previously, the first stage of the works will be undertaken in August next year, and that includes the removal of the rotunda, but the master plan for a longer-term strategy might look at something that is provided in its place to provide somewhere where the community can go in that space. The first stage of the works also include the revegetation, furniture upgrades and also lighting.

The park was originally in the 1970s. CPTED was not something that was highly considered in the 70s. It is not only important to continue with strategies to improve current park spaces to improve safer design – and this particular CPTED audit and the first stage of works have been funded by the Department of Justice, so from that perspective, the City of Casey is very appreciative of that funding – but also we would like, as Liam was saying before, some sort of opportunity, I guess, to improve the way that we consider design for future parks, particularly, as Liam said before, where they are not necessarily being designed by local government and being designed by private developers through permits and things like that.

I will move on to our second example, which is the Fountain Gate bus interchange. As part of the planning permit to extend Westfield Fountain Gate, council negotiated with the developer, Westfield, to undertake a CPTED audit of the bus interchange and to make public realm improvements as part of its expansion. The audit was conducted by a private consultant in November 2008, and it raised issues with blank wall facades, poor surveillance, poor maintenance, poor pedestrian connections and accessibility, and, in addition, the police had concerns with loitering issues in the area. This is the interchange here. Buses would come through the centre on this side, through here, and this is the actual interchange on the inside. Now the interchange and the shelters are along the outside, through here, so the buses go on this side, through here. Some of the improvements that have been made are to move that shelter to the outside to improve the accessibility and pedestrian safety as well as surveillance, improving access from the centre and from council’s facilities to the shelter and reconfiguring and changing the particular types of shelters to provide better surveillance.

Our third example is the Berwick footbridge, which is a current project that the City of Casey is working on with VicRoads and the Monash University. VicRoads and Monash University are intending to construct a bridge to provide a better outcome for pedestrian safety between the Berwick railway station and the Monash University site, which also includes a secondary school, Nossal High School, providing a connection for students coming from the train to the university site and vice versa. In discussing solutions for a pedestrian safety outcome this has raised issues, or introduced issues, for a safer design outcome, such as barriers for passive surveillance from the road created by the bride footings, the points of entry and exit on either side of the road, the level of activity in those at various times during the day and night and also lighting. Council is advocating for an outcome that achieves both pedestrian safety and safer design as a perception of safety. A recommendation for a project such as this is that the
Safer Design Guidelines could be considered more holistically and across various government departments so that the application of the guidelines are considered more holistically by other stakeholders as well.

In closing, Casey’s submission has focused on establishing a clear and holistic set of safer design guidelines where people in the community feel safe as well as actually being safe. In new places Casey’s submission has emphasised the need to improve the Safer Design Guidelines through inclusion in the planning scheme, improving the consistency across other documents and increasing the application of the documents as well. In existing spaces the City of Casey supports and requests the continuation of funding and resources to achieve safer design outcomes in our existing environment. Thank you.

The CHAIR — Thank you. You are finished?

Mr HODGETTS — Yes.

Ms DICKSON — Yes, unless you have any questions.

The CHAIR — Liam, were you – I want to deal with your presentation, if that is all right, now so it is clear in our minds. Are you happy with that?

Mr HODGETTS — That is fine.

The CHAIR — I invite the committee members to ask any questions.

Mr SCHEFFER — I just did want to come back to that issue that we talked about before. It is not just you; it is a common dilemma – you have got a group of young people, who are – I think you said before they might be drinking or ‘loitering’ was another word. You said the police have observed at the bus terminus young people doing various things that we may regard as unacceptable. Then you use the guidelines and your own expertise to redevelop it in ways that make sense so that the community can use that space. I guess what I am after is what is the intersection between how the guidelines assist around criminal/antisocial activity and then the kind of dilemma of – do you negotiate or talk to the people who are not using the space in a way that you think the community would like it used? I am not being critical; I am just trying to think how we work that through, because one of the criticisms of the CPTED process is that it really displaces people – so it moves these anonymous young people off somewhere else, turns the park over to the ‘community’ in a way that is acceptable to some people but really unpleasant for young ones who used to hang about. How do you actually sort that through?

Mr HODGETTS — I think I could take the committee to the Buchanan Park example. To answer your initial question – the design has to be holistic when you are talking about a public space because, of course, the public is so varied and diverse.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr HODGETTS — I mentioned before about legitimate and illegitimate uses. If I take you to the growth corridors, some of the recreation planning goes down to the minutia of whether a bocce court is in a public space or not. Now a bocce court infers a certain type of recreation. It is an active but also passive element in socialising et cetera, so the degree of planning down to that level legitimises the use of that space. You will have an active recreational need or you will have a passive recreational need, and there are various combinations to those. Buchanan Park is an interesting one because we have both passive and active recreation. The skate park you can see towards Clyde Road here is a recent development to address a need identified by the perceived displacement of youth from public spaces in Berwick. The design intelligence that went into that was to draw that skate park close to that movement corridor, which is Berwick Cranbourne or Clyde roads, and in doing so the youth in that space were able to, yes, group, congregate, usually eat their McDonalds from just across the road and also skate, while just loaded in behind the skate park you have got a family playground. So the uses are quite complementary now. When the playground is
not being utilised, the teenagers who were skating in the park or congregating at the park are also receiving passive surveillance from Clyde Road. It is not the fact that we are not accommodating them; we are just accommodating them in design more cleverly, and, taking us back to the concept of legitimate use, we have now legitimised that use from a youth point of view by locational criteria we seek through the Safer Design Guidelines basically or the application of those principles.

The CHAIR — Okay. Do you get advice from the Victoria Police when you look at CPTED guidelines in relation to, say, relocating youth to a skate park in a certain area? How close do you work with the police?

Mr HODGETTS — We usually work with – do you want to answer that?

Ms DICKSON — Yes. All of the audits that the City of Casey undertakes are either undertaken by officers who are trained by Victoria Police in using the CPTED audit.

The CHAIR — Your safety officers or accountants?

Ms DICKSON — Yes. Or they are conducted by Victoria Police themselves, so in that regard we have a very good relationship with Victoria Police in identifying where outcomes can be achieved. In situations like this, again, we do confer with Victoria Police on what sorts of opportunities need to be provided and how they can be provided and designed.

Mr HODGETTS — In the case of Cranbourne Place Park and the Fountain Gate–Narre Warren bus interchange, we had received proactively from the police approaches to council about what we can do about this. We had some antisocial problem behaviour. I think in the case of Cranbourne Place Park, that was the primary motivator to get something done there – from the police; they approached us first, I think, and initiated some outcomes there. With Fountain Gate we had already actually issued the planning permit when those issues were coming to rise. The changes to that transit interchange have meant a marked improvement to the public safety outcomes there, and the perception is also that that interchange had —

Mr SCHEFFER — The other thing we talked about as well just on that, about improved safety outcomes – it is not your problem; it is everyone’s problem – the difficulty in assessing how we know that. What do you draw on to make that assessment that it is safer now than it was before? Do you do surveys or do look at incidents? How do you measure it?

Ms DICKSON — A combination of things, particularly incidents, advice from Victoria Police and, I believe, that we undertake surveys periodically, not just for particular areas but across the whole of Casey and also using statistics provided by other sources as well. There are particular indicators through private organisations and state and local as well around perceptions of safety in spaces.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

The CHAIR — I hope other committee members have put their – I can’t see; Tim, is it?

Mr McCURDY — Do you see any room for further legislation to make sure this happens in our community or are the regulations in place now adequate? Do you see a role for government to step this up even further than what it is currently doing?

Ms DICKSON — The short-term best outcome that the City of Casey sees is to improve the application of the existing Safer Design Guidelines within a planning context, so referencing them in a broader way within the State Planning Policy Framework. Generally the principles are very good. There are areas that could be improved, particularly around design of open space internal areas. So an example, within Fountain Gate, it is a public area. There are public amenities and things like that, so detailing information about safer design considerations in internal spaces is important in that regard – so not only implementing them
in the scheme but also reviewing to improve their application and to bring greater consistency with the other guidelines that are around that we have discussed through our submission and in the presentation. In terms of further legislation or if the government needs to elevate the consideration of the guidelines, that would be supported, particularly where the guidelines are being considered not just in a planning framework, not just in a crime prevention framework but holistically across a vast range of different areas. One example that we have put forward here with the Berwick footbridge is consideration through road safety as well. So that is just one example of how the application could be further elevated, not necessarily through legislation but perhaps through regulation, but consistent and comprehensive regulation.

Mr SCHEFFER — Why do you not think it should be legislated?

Ms DICKSON — It is not whether it should or should not be legislated, more so that it can be elevated. So whether it is legislation or regulation – I am not sure if it matters.

Mr SCHEFFER — But you think it should mandated?

Ms DICKSON — In so much as a council such as Casey can advise or provide —

Mr HODGETTS — Rely on it for decision making.

Ms DICKSON — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

The CHAIR — I am not sure that she said it should be mandated.

Mr SCHEFFER — No, I am asking.

The CHAIR — She was talking about elevation.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I know, but I was just trying to clarify that, because one of our questions is whether it should be mandated or not, so we are interested in your view.

Mr HODGETTS — Look, mandating is — in my experience as an urban planner, a town planner – injects an inherent amount of inflexibility, and planning has to be flexible at times.

Mr SCHEFFER — But even if just the principles are mandated?

Mr HODGETTS — I think the principles in terms of safer design absolutely because if it is enshrined as a reference document in the planning scheme, for example, it would give us greater weight, or even an incorporated document to make planning decisions on behalf of government for urban design outcomes or urban development outcomes. That is quite important because when we go to a third party like the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal it also needs to consider that as equal weight as well in making its decisions. So it just elevates the concept of safer design higher into the hierarchy of planning decisions.

The CHAIR — Can I put a hypothetical to you? I understand you are doing auditing all the time, presumably over your public space. It is already established on how to improve that in relation to safer guidelines. You say a new area for residential development whereby, as I understand, many developers – councils tend to let the developers define the open space within a new suburb. What controls do you have then in relation to how that space is designed in relation to CPTED and the safer guidelines? If councils decide, well, you will do a better job at a cheaper rate to provide the open space requirements in a new development – I suppose it gets back to mandating – how are some controls put in place to make sure that whatever the developer does in that open space meets the guidelines in relation to CPTED or the safer guidelines?

Mr HODGETTS — Okay, I will answer – there are a couple of sections to that question. I think the first thing to understand is that there is greater control in a greenfield...
context because of the nature of the planning permit process. Just to take you one step back
from there, council actually has quite a bit to do with open space planning with the Growth
Areas Authority and the eventual developers of the area when it comes to seeking where
pieces of infrastructure such as open space go. We are quite able to input into that process and
inform the decisions made by the Growth Areas Authority and where that space should be and
what it should be. The mandating of Safer Design Guidelines – they are probably a lot more
relevant in existing urban situations such as activity centres and established urban areas,
effectively. They are the areas – if, for example, a shopping centre were expanding, there
would be a permit condition that does not require a use control, so shopping is allowed, for
example, and all it is, is about buildings and works. We need to have some sort of control over
what those buildings and works look like and whether they are safe or not for the public to
use. That is where it is quite important, in an activity centre context, that we have some
control and some elevation in the hierarchy of safer design for our established activity centres.

The CHAIR — Yes, but my question was: what controls do you have over a
developer creating the open space with the guidelines in place that are not mandated? You talk
about elevation and you talk about – I mean, some councils are probably not even aware of
what CPTED is or the safer guidelines are, but —

Mr HODGETTS — The controls in a greenfield context relate to the actual
certification of the subdivision plans. At that point our landscape architects and urban
designers have a look at that plan and make a decision on whether the plantings are correct
and it is a safe outcome.

The CHAIR — Do the police and your safety officers become involved in that
process at all?

Mr HODGETTS — Not at that point. My experience has been it is very much
usually in the established area context where the police would get involved. So the last
example I said, about activity centres – that is an expansion of an existing facility under an
existing planning regime. It is more difficult to control. You have only got one point of
control, and that is permit conditions in a planning permit. Then, of course, they all
contestable with third party appeal rights. When we do contest that permit condition in front of
an independent arbitrator we want to make sure that we are making some good decisions
backed up by some strong government guidelines.

The CHAIR — Any other questions?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I have just got one more. Just going back to the police, you
talked about the example with the – it was the first one —

Mr HODGETTS — Cranbourne Place?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes – about how the police informed you about what was going
on in that particular location. Do you have regular meetings with the police where you would
do a bit of sweep of the city?

Mr HODGETTS — Yes, we do.

Mr SCHEFFER — Right. So that is an ongoing way of collecting —

Mr HODGETTS — We work closely with the police through our community safety
unit.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, so they might say there is a bit of a problem down here – do
you then ask them about what they think might help? Or do you say, ‘Right, thanks for the
alert’, and then you sort it from there on?

Mr HODGETTS — Very much so. If it is our asset, absolutely. We look to put in
place changes, which is Cranbourne Place Park.
Mr SCHEFFER — Then you reference back to them, and they say, ‘What about this and what about that?’, ‘I don’t think that’ll solve this problem’, ‘It looks like a good outcome’, so there is dialogue here.

Mr HODGETTS — Very much so.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr HODGETTS — That is moving into some of our established areas as well. Berwick town centre, for example, Berwick Village – there is a relationship with the police in regards to how we manage that space. Local government and the police work very closely in managing it. The entertainment venues spill out after hours, and there is some antisocial behaviour and problems arising, and it needs a management framework put in place with the police and the community safety work to try and manage that. We do so, of course, in association with the chamber of commerce and the traders as well.

The CHAIR — Thank you. It might be a good note to finish on, given our scheduled time. The committee appreciates your time. Thank you very much, and for the work you did in your submission, we appreciate that also.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Sylvia, welcome to the joint parliamentary committee of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee.

Mrs GEORGES — Yes.

The CHAIR — Thank you for your time. I might ask our committee members to introduce themselves.

Mr SCHEFFER — I am Johan Scheffer. How are you?

Mrs GEORGES — I am good, thank you.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — We have Mr Brad Battin, who is outside. He will be joining us shortly, and Shaun Leane, who has been an apology this morning. Thank you very much for presenting yourself to this hearing. I do have to read you some conditions around your — it is not testimony, is it? What is it? It is evidence. Mr Leane has just walked in — another committee member. Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the Guide for Witnesses Giving Evidence to Parliamentary Committees?

Mrs GEORGES — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — Well done. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Again, welcome, and we look forward to hearing your verbal submission. Thank you. Just before you start — you are the urban designer for the City of —

Mrs GEORGES — Boroondara.

The CHAIR — Boroondara, thank you. We have got your submission. Thank you for your written work here for this committee too.

Mrs GEORGES — Thank you. This is basically the reason — I do not know if you have copies of it — we were invited to basically make a presentation on the brochure that I developed for the City of Boroondara. I started in the job in Boroondara a few years ago, probably four years ago, and I developed some brochures just to educate the planners more than anything, to be honest, because we have statutory planners — some of them are junior planners, and they do not probably have the knowledge or the training, especially in areas like this. They study them as part of their planning courses, but nonetheless need refresher training or material like the fact sheets. I think that you have gone to the question about whether they should be mandated or not. Yes, it was just, I guess a tool for the statutory planners and the applicants, really an educational tool more than anything else. It is not in the policy. It is not a document that is adopted by council. As I said, it is just an educational tool.

Thank you very much for inviting us, as I said. My work is an urban designer — basically I provide urban design advice on planning applications. As part of that advice — this is one of the things; CPTED is something that we studied when I did my masters in urban design. We did a lot of studies on Oscar Newman and all that research work. It is something we really apply, but, I guess, as we go through the presentation you will see that not all planners really apply that. We have our senior planners, and these are the ones who apply it more than, I guess, the junior planners. It is probably a very long presentation, so probably when I go through the sheets I will just go through them quickly, because what I have tried to do is answer the questions that you had in your letter. Some is probably to a great level of detail. As I said, when I go through the policy I will probably go through it quickly. I will try probably to
focus on more the areas which I think really are the weaknesses and the recommendations, that sort of stuff. Feel free to interrupt to ask any questions while I am presenting. I am happy to answer them.

The application of Safer Design Guidelines – the first two questions I tried to group together – ‘the extent to which Safer Design Guidelines and CPTED are currently applied by local government authorities, particularly planning departments and the development industry in Victoria’. The second question you had was: ‘to what extent has CPTED-associated principles, such as the Safer Design Guidelines and the Urban Design Charter, been incorporated into planning strategies in Victoria, particularly at the local government level?’ For us as a council CPTED principles and the Safer Design Guidelines are incorporated into the planning scheme through the State Planning Policy Framework, obviously, and the local planning policy provisions and councils’ plans and policies. Obviously – and I think that was mentioned in the presentation before me – they are both reference documents in the planning scheme. A very brief summary of them is included in the state planning policy and in the local planning policy. [Refer to slide 2 of the presentation]

Mr SCHEFFER — So you have got a piece of work in front of you, and you say they are referenced, does that mean that you say – I am being a bit glib – ‘Yes, I have had a look at those. I understand it is all cool’? Or do you have a checklist and say, ‘Yes, I have checked against that, checked against this’? Do you work through so later on you can say, no, we are absolutely rigorous in applying it when we sit on that?

Mrs GEORGES — That is a very good question. Because I am the urban designer, I provide special urban design advice on planning applications. The planners go through that checklist, and they basically tick the boxes. I had a discussion with – to be honest, before I even started preparing the presentation I sent an email to the planners saying, ‘Guys, I developed this sheet a few years ago. Does any one of you look at it when you assess planning applications?’ The only response that I got was from the principal planner that we had, Seuna. I guess the problem is that we have small-scale projects, and, as I said, junior planners are not aware of them. They (the guidelines) are not used very effectively by them, mainly because they are just guidelines, not like other rules in ResCode and the state planning policy – these are the only provisions that they look at. Because we do not have these ticking boxes – planners are used to, to be honest, ticking boxes. The provisions that you have for CPTED and for safety in ResCode – and you will see them, they are probably three or four lines; they are very, very brief, and they do not really, in my view, achieve much.

The CHAIR — They are not prescriptive, is that right?

Mrs GEORGES — Yes, they are not prescriptive but that is another question as well – i.e. whether they should be or not? When I go through that we will – because I discussed with my manager and my director whether they should be prescriptive or not. That is another issue. Probably we will get to it later. But, I guess, in terms of education, even though the planners probably study about the defensible space and Jane Jacobs work when they do their planning course, when they come to real-life experience, as you said, it is just ticking the boxes beside the provisions that they have in front of them, and they have tables and templates for ticking boxes; that is what they do. For me, to be honest, that is what I have been doing wherever I go to any council - trying to educate planners. No-one knows this area. There are many areas like sustainability, accessibility etcetera and all these areas are not well covered in the policy and not well known to planners. Because, like for me, in addition to the fact that I have studied all this stuff as part of my urban design course, which did it at the University of New South Wales and part of it also in my architectural studies. I also rely on (in my assessment) the Urban Design Charter and all the urban design principles that are used widely, not only by Victoria but really all over the world, I have to say. I think the problem is that it is an educational process as well as really ticking the boxes, but to what degree you tick the boxes, what level of detail should you provide, that is the thing that needs to be given a lot of thought.
What are the key aspects of the CPTED that have been incorporated into the planning strategies in Victoria at a local level? Probably you would be aware of that. Land-use mix, active ground floor frontages, definition of use, ownership and demarcation boundaries – how do you define the boundaries between the public, semi-public and private spaces? – passive surveillance, clear sidelines, avoiding concealment entrapment opportunities such as dark and blind spots, and good lighting in public spaces and on building exteriors. At this stage, let us be honest, the planning scheme has very little detail even about these sorts of principles. You will see the state policy that we have now does not tell me much, and I will go through that at some stage. That is one of the things that we, I guess, encounter when we go VCAT. I have a few examples. As an urban designer I really promote active frontages. This is what I get on a major road in an activity centre. This is approved by VCAT. You have offices at the ground-floor level. Just look at the separation between the ground-floor activity and the street. By providing this setback and these steps you literally separate the ground-floor level from the street. Then by doing that there is no point even having that activity because it does not mean anything; there is no actual interaction. [See slide 3]

The state planning policy – that is exactly what we have in the planning policy now. Safety as a concept is embedded in many clauses. We cannot deny that. You have health and safety as a key element. We have the Safer Design Guidelines, and then you have activity centre planning requires you to consider them. These are the two main objectives that we have in the planning scheme, the state planning policy – land use must provide communities with adequate safe physical and social environments for their residents. It is a very generic, motherhood statement, if you understand what I mean. Then talking about liveability, high-quality urban design and architecture – in my view that is why I apply them, because that is part of the larger context: high-quality urban design and architecture. One of the key aspects to providing – and it is proven through research since the 1960s until now – that activity surveillance, eyes on the street, helps achieve safety in built environments. Then you go to the actual clause 15.01, where you have urban design. That talks about, again, the high-quality architecture and urban design that contributes to the character of the area and its safety. This is the objective that we have – enhanced personal safety. Again, as I said, it is good as an objective, but there are no guidelines as to how, and you will see that even in ResCode. There is very, very little guidance, I guess. [See slides 4-7]

Design for safety – again, you have the strategies, but what do the strategies say? Ensure the design of buildings, public spaces and mix of activities contributes to the safety and the perception of safety – how? Support initiatives by safer walking and cycling and ensure suitable locations for police stations and fire brigades – I do not know how this relates to my work. I do not really even look at the third one because it is not relevant to me. That is what we have got in the VPPs, and then you have the reference documents that are used. As I said, they are used by planners, but, to be honest, mostly senior and principal planners. The junior planners, because they deal with small-scale projects, issues like these are not of priority – and their main focus is ticking the boxes, and ResCode is their Bible – I mean, this is the way. The documents that we have referenced in the planning scheme are all great documents. You have got the Urban Design Charter for Victoria, you have got the Safer Design Guidelines, and you have got activity centres guidelines, higher-density guidelines. They are very good documents, and the concept of safety and the perception of safety is all well embedded in them, and there are some guidelines that really show how you can achieve this in these documents, but, as I said, these documents are not effectively utilised – to be honest, the junior planners in our council do not even really consider them. I do not know, it is automatic to think this way. This has to do with high-scale, high-rise development or large-scale development. So we have got a few planners that look at them, but this is as part of three or four storeys or, as I said, large-scale projects. [See slides 7-9]

The CHAIR — Can I ask why doesn’t the council be more proactive in making sure that any new development that comes under the young planners actually has to go through the stringent safety guidelines under the CPTED as a matter of course? Why are you not looking at that, at that point in time?
Mrs GEORGES — That is a very good question. My role, as I said, as an urban designer – when I provide advice to the planners, these are in my advice. Like, if it is an active ground-floor plan, if it is in terms eyes on the street, these are included in my advice. I guess, with the younger planners, as I said, they do not have that training. We have been proactive, to be honest, since I have started here. We have been running some urban design training for the planners, not only in relation to safety but all good urban design principles. Let us put it this way, with a council like Boroondara the focus is on the neighbourhood character more than anything else – whether this really fits in the neighbourhood character or not. It is too high, three storeys – it is too high for this context. I think there is a focus on these things – on the zoning, the building height. These sorts of matters, that is, safety, become really secondary rather than primary – they do not get really taken seriously. You will see in some of the examples that I will show you that I argued for that at VCAT. We managed to get some sort of result, but it was not really the result that I would expect. One of the examples that was given to me by our principal planner was a good example as well. It shows the difference that these principles can make to the whole design outcome, especially at street level in terms of interaction with the street.

In terms of the Urban Design Charter, this is, again, as I said – and all were involved in that. It lists the key urban design principles that are well known all over the world, and we use them in our assessment – structure, accessibility, legibility, animation, fit and function, complementary mixed uses, sense of place, consistency and variety, and safety is one of them. Yes, so we have been – I do that as part of my assessment, and we have been trying to be proactive in developing the fact sheets – this is us being proactive, trying to provide some guidance to the planners, whether it is on safety or sustainability. All these are matters that we think are important in urban design terms, but they are not really well covered in the planning scheme.

Safer Design Guidelines – and you probably know them more than I do. If you have got surveillance and you have got access, movement, sideline activity, ownership – these are the main principles in the safer guidelines, but they are not mentioned anywhere in the planning scheme. I mean, just having them in the planning scheme I think makes an argument when I go to VCAT. It would strengthen my argument actually when I go to VCAT. The local planning policy, again, as a council Boroondara has a focus on achieving a safe environment and the health and wellbeing of the community and all that. It is in the MSS, but, again, as I said, it is really generic, motherhood statements. I think the question would be: how do I achieve that? How do I achieve the safe environment that you are talking about? [See slides 7-9]

Mr BATTIN — But wouldn’t that come back to the planner, though? As an urban design planner, or even the local planners, doesn’t a lot of that come back to them on how you achieve that safer – because what might work in your council may not work in one of the councils I represent.

Mrs GEORGES — Yes.

Mr BATTIN — So, I suppose, from your view, should it be just mandated, put in writing, legislated that you must have some safety elements taken into consideration? But what you are saying is how to do it. Is that asking the big question of how to do it?

Mrs GEORGES — I think that is the question we are just talking about. Many of the planners that we have are junior planners. They might study the concept of CPTED or safety when they are doing their planning courses, but when they graduate and come and work – and do not forget that each planner has probably 30 or 40 applications – their problem becomes ticking the boxes. That is what we said. I mean, I think, whether they should be mandated – like, in my view, they should be in the legislation. There should be really – and I will probably talk about some examples like Queensland and New South Wales, where they have a requirement in the legislation saying that you must consider these aspects. Then you can provide some detail. There needs to be some flesh to this clause. It does not say much to me, to be honest. [See slides 10 and 11]
We have started actually—and this is part of the urban design work; us being more proactive—this is the activity centre strategy that council developed, or the strategic planning department, obviously, developed, working with us. These are the things that we want the planners to cover. So now, when the planners do their assessment—this is now a clause in the planning scheme that they must consider. It has been adopted on an interim basis until 2014. The council rushed to get this in the planning scheme, mainly because it had some mandatory building height limits and setbacks. In the process we were grateful that we had some sort of real guidance. It requires that the street frontages have some interaction with the street and lighting and all these aspects. We have dead laneways—how do you really address them? Not many developments would want to open on to those laneways, and there is an example that I will show you. Generally, they are the sorts of things we want to create, but, again, I go back and say this is a policy for activity centres, and the planners will look at it when they have an application in an activity centre or an enterprise corridor. If someone is dealing with residential zoning, then they probably would not. As part of us being proactive and as part of the things that I have been doing and keep saying over and over to the planners, they really now come back to me and say, ‘Oh yes. We have already told them’, that is, already told the applicants. In a residential development, for example—'we have units and we require all those at the ground-floor level to have direct street entries because we want that interaction’. This is me educating them over a few years. Now when an applicant comes with a planning application, the planner will say that. Yes, it helps, but still, as I said, when they come and tick the boxes that might be compromised by something else, such as higher priority controls like building height and neighbourhood character.

Mr LEANE—On dot point 5 [slide 9], do you have pushback, when it is residential, from developers and owners as far as people in apartments might particularly want a private balcony and not particularly want their windows on the—so is there pushback as far as amenity and what the owners want?

Mrs GEORGE—That is a very good question, because you get that. I mean, because in many cases residential development has to provide very generous front setbacks, and obviously they are trying to make the development viable, so you end up with private open spaces within the front setback. I mean, you cannot reconcile between the privacy that is required for the private open space and the interaction that you want for the streetscape.

Mr LEANE—That is right, because for someone to actually make it attractive for someone to actually buy it or rent it—I mean, that is the juggling act you have got, isn’t it?

Mrs GEORGE—I will show you an example of it. We went to VCAT, and that was my main push. My main push was to get an active frontage along that street, and all that I got was very tokenistic, pedestrian entries—I will show the outcome that we got. It was better than the original, I have to say. Again, that is what the planners look at. That is the only guidance that they have—clause 55. That is what it says, the standard which will interest us, and, as I said, it is very basic; it does not say much. These are the boxes that they tick. [See slide 12]

The CHAIR—What more can it say though in a sort of generic sense like that? It cannot be much more prescriptive, can it, because every situation is different?

Mrs GEORGES—It is, but again, with ResCode if you cannot achieve the standard, what do we do—I am achieving the objective? That objective might be, as I said, the minimum that could have been achieved. Because if you are talking about zoning—and we will go to that aspect—in many cases where you have residential abutting onto a commercial or an activity centre, the residential would want to turn their backs because they do not want that activity. That is the sort of stuff that needs to be guided, I think. There is also a level of flexibility. The example I will give is just on the edge of an activity centre, on the corner—a really important corner. Just because it was residential zoning, the VCAT member told me, ‘Sorry, it’s residential. We can’t actually force them to do this. We can’t force them to have an active frontage’. You will see the outcome that we got on that corner. [Reference to images on slides 16 and 25]
This is just basically us saying that we are trying to be proactive. It is our Boroondara plan. Safety is one of the objectives, and we strive to achieve high standards of community safety, health and amenity. Again, how? As part of being proactive I tried to put together something as a tool for the planners to use in their assessment, and that was basically a bit of the Safer Design Guidelines, a bit of the guidelines that were provided, I think, in Healthy Spaces and Places and also it was in the planning scheme that you need to consider these factors. We have developed it over three years now. When I sent an email around when you invited us to this presentation asking how many people have used this document, the answer was probably two or three, not many. [See slide 13]

Mr LEANE — Are you being kind?

Mrs GEORGES — Actually I received one real comment, but I was told that a couple knew about it, but anyway.

CPTED in other regimes – again, as I said, because I tried to answer the question I went through the questions from, I think, 1 to 12. I will try to go through them quickly. Investigate the use of Safer Design Guidelines and principles and the local government or equivalent planning regimes in other jurisdictions. [See slide 14]

We were just basically saying that VPPs, which includes the Safer Design Guidelines and the reference to safety, you would be aware, applies to all of Victorian, and all planners in all local governments have to consider them. It is incorporated, again, I say, at a very basic level. Then we are seeing generally, and I have to say that this is the one thing that has come across in a few articles now by planners, designers or architects that the CPTED concept is now really more embraced by the residential design than the commercial, especially when we are talking about master planning of new suburbs. It is taken into account even in the design of existing areas like Boroondara. However, it is harder especially for shopping malls and bigger commercial developments to incorporate them into their design, nonetheless they have started to look at them.

I have looked at other models, and I think the examples that New South Wales and Queensland have are great actually. I do not know whether we can develop them to that level of detail, but I think the concept is having something in the legislation that says you must consider CPTED, and then the planners or whoever really applying that assessment tool, even VCAT, must consider them. Basically, they should be given some priority in assessment rather than being left at the end. This issue – the conflict between the privacy of the occupants and the interaction with the public realm. I often say, how do you achieve the privacy of the occupants within the private open space and the active frontages that we were talking about?

Effectiveness – how effective have they been in addressing crime, and how effective has CPTED been as a conceptual strategy?

I think it has been really effective. I mean, we do not have statistics that prove that places are safer or the perception of safety by the community is better. Nonetheless it is proven in many areas. In many design examples all over the world, especially the with new urbanism concept. That safety relies on mix of uses, eyes on the street and all these aspects. These principles are proving that they are actually providing better suburbs than the ones that we had previously. I have found a recent survey that showed that most Victorians feel safer in their neighbourhoods, but they probably do not necessarily feel that in activity centres or in shopping strips. Again, we are talking about activity centres. These are actual examples of commercial development in the urban area, which is Boroondara. That is basically Swinburne University, the new research centre, the photo at the bottom (reference to images on slide 15). Look at the design – even the designers, the architects, in large-scale projects and in urban areas like these are more aware of these issues now. The developers are doing it because there is a benefit for them.

I worked at the City of Yarra for a few years. I was the principal urban designer, and we had issues with Victoria Gardens – the fact that they could not bring people inside the shopping
mall because it is designed as internalised, inward-looking centre. Their problem was that
when you have no activity/or active frontages around the street there is nothing that invites the
customers to come inside the shopping centre. So that was part of the work that we did with
them, really trying to open up the ground-floor activities to have this interaction by having
more glazed facades and more entries to basically invite people to come in. That is now done
by many developers because of the value it brings to their developments. The shopping malls
are proving to be really big monsters in many of the development areas that we have because
they are inward-looking monsters. They do not interact with the street. But now the attitude is
changing. There is a shift in mind even for the designers and the developers – they know that
that will bring some benefit to them because they will not only be relying on people driving to
the centre but also on people walking around the centre. By being really interactive I am
inviting them to come in. In addition to that, basically, the top image is an office development,
but we just worked with the applicants, and forced them to have active frontages where we
can. So when you have active frontages, even if it is an office, you end up with a small café on
the corner, which really improves that environment completely.

This is the example which I was talking about [reference to images / slide 16]. What are the
criticisms of the CPTED? In my view, as a strategy it is useful in enhancing the public realm,
and there is a lot of evidence and research that verifies that. At the local level when it is
implemented, as I said, it is an acceptable argument at VCAT. If I go and argue at VCAT, it is
acceptable, but then it gets compromised for other reasons. In this case – this is the
development that I was talking about. This is the corner of Burke and Belmore roads. It is on
the edge of a neighbourhood shopping strip. This is the corner that is within the residential
zone. Just across the corner you have the shopping centre, and my argument was – and at the
beginning what they came with – and we probably have a few photos further down just to
show you the sort of – yes, these are the photos. They came to us with all residential, even at
the ground-floor level. What do you do when you have private open space within a front
setback? You have to have high solid fencing to provide some sort of privacy for them. I went
to VCAT arguing that residential use should not be considered for this particular location,
even if the zoning says that you have to have a residential zoning. Then even residential
zoning allows you to have a café or some sort of activity, but the member said, ‘We can’t
force them. If the developer doesn’t want that, we can’t force them’. In this case, at least we
ended up with something that is slightly better than they had. They had the high solid fence
along Burke Road with no interaction whatsoever and they had these balconies, and you can
see this lower one along Belmore Road. These are the balconies that you have on the ground
floor – tell me who is going to be using these balconies? They are literally within a metre of
the footpath. There is no privacy, nothing. So I am actually waiting to see what will happen
there. Until now they all are sort of blocked with the blinds always shut because no-one can
use them. This is the site that I tried to focus on. We ended up with some direct entries into the
ground-floor units along Burke Road, but you will see what they ended up adding to those in
the following slide – all services and hydrants were added to the recessed sections of the fence
[see images on slide 25].

Are they (Safer Design Guidelines/CPTED) applied by councils? Yes, they are applied, and
the City of Melbourne has been leading in that area, not only because of the safety; it is one of
the key urban design principles that we think is really a good principle. They are embedded,
and they have used them very effectively. That is the reason why they have a really brilliant
environment, whether it is in laneways or in other areas.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but it is also the inherited stock, isn’t it? I mean, the 19th
century gives you a leg up, whereas you are dealing with a post-Second World War open plan
that makes the spaces very unattractive.

Mrs GEORGES — Yes, but still you can do that even at, let’s say, at Boroondara’s
scale. What do we do now with laneways? Do you know what we do with them now? Sell
them. That is what we do with laneways, instead of trying actually to use them, even within
the shopping centres. That is what I am trying to change now: the culture. Because they are
really considered safety hazards rather than anything else. So we sell them to residents, and
they get fenced off, whereas laneways should be encouraged to be retained because having this sort of connectivity within any urban environment – that is what makes it safe.

The CHAIR — Now, Sylvia, we are at 5 to 12.

Mrs GEORGES — Sorry.

The CHAIR — No, I am just wondering for your own sake. We want to make sure we cover the recommendations, which I think will be very useful for us. Also the committee – while you have been very thorough with your response to the questions – might well like to ask you some questions.

Mrs GEORGES — Okay. I will just mention we have been proactive as part of our urban design awards.

The CHAIR — I think we got that message from the start actually.

Mrs GEORGES — These are some examples of how we are trying to apply it, like in terms of whether it is to the public space – this is in our urban design awards – the winners and losers. [see slides 18 and 19]

The CHAIR — Unless there is something in particular you want to point to us in some of the work that you have been doing. I am just mindful we have got about 5 minutes.

Mrs GEORGES — I think I might just leave it there, Chair. As I said – and this sheet is important – the principles included are okay, but when you have these competing interests you need to basically make a decision, and VCAT will make a decision based on the zoning, on the building type, on all these aspects, rather than safety. Mind you, it has now been considered by VCAT more often. I think some members more than others consider this area. Local government – that is from my manager – often deal with individual size. That is an issue for you to look at. They do not look at master planning. How do they assess individual sites? Have you applied a concept of safety to individual sites? For me, first of all, I think architects, planners and all the professionals need to be trained and well educated in this area because this needs to be included in the very early stages of the design, rather than the last-minute stages.

Just a few examples – I will leave them because I will leave a hard copy of the presentation for you to look at some of the examples. Again, I will not go through that because I think probably you would know the background of it. Yes, and again examples of where the police have been involved [reference made to slides 21 to 23]. I think that would be a great thing even for us – to have the police involved even as a referral party, especially when we have large-scale development, large public realm projects.

Finally, this is the example that I was talking about, where ended up with some setbacks and a lower high fence, but look at the spaces that they created around the fence. These are all safety hazards. I wanted a frontage that would interact with the public realm. Look what I got, and the VCAT member said, ‘Okay. We’ll get them to have two direct entries into the ground-floor units’. That is what we ended up with, actually. This is the site I was talking about. [See slide 25]

Healthy Spaces is one of the good documents – it has got so many guidelines that could be used more effectively by planners. This is what I think. I think the adoption of a CPTED strategy similar to the New South Wales and Queensland, which involves high-level, mandatory policy in the legislation, like in the EPAA. This is mainly to help council to say we must consider this; we cannot ignore them, and that obviously adds to their strength at VCAT. Then that could be followed by a set of detailed design guidelines, as Queensland and New South Wales have [see slide 26 and 27]. Then I think it would be very useful to have some design guidelines in the BCA because most of the architects that come to us don’t apply to them. I actually advise them to have the active frontages and that sort of stuff. We sort of force them to do that, and you end up with the results we saw in the images earlier because they were added at the last minute. Whereas, if it is integrated in the design from the beginning,
that would give you a much better outcome. Also I think a greater involvement by Victoria Police would be helpful [see slides 27 and 28]. I do not think CPTED and the training that you were talking about should be limited to community planners. The community planner sits in a different department. They do not get involved with the statutory planners. They do not know what the statutory planners do. The statutory planners need to have that training, if possible. Who should be involved? As I said, the architects, the planners and all the regulatory bodies, and the safety audits and all of that should help in informing us how effective they have been. [See slide 28]

Finally, this is an example just to show you. This is Seuna’s example that she sent to me. It is a commercial development, or mixed-use development in Surrey Hills. You have three frontages. This was the first design, and you can look at the interface with the laneway (reference to plans and images on slide 30). This is the top frontage, this is the ground floor, and this is the interface with the laneway. We had undercroft car parking, and this would make, obviously, this laneway very unsafe. That was the quality of the development that we had at the start [see slides 29-31]. The interface with the laneway was one of the grounds for refusal. Luckily in this case the VCAT member was really more informed than the previous one that we dealt with. This was actually enforced in the design. This was the amended design as approved [reference to images and plans on slide 31]. Look at the transparency that you have in this scheme and the interface with the laneway – that has changed the environment and you have that really public connection through the side. You have three or four frontages that are effectively active and interactive with the public realm. That is the sort of environment that you create with this one as opposed to this one. It made a huge difference to the whole development. Thank you for being patient and listening to me.

The CHAIR — We appreciate it. It was a very intensive presentation.

Mrs GEORGES — Thank you.

Mr McCURDY — We could employ Sylvia to go to all the other councils, and they can see the passion. If everybody would be using the principles —

Mrs GEORGES — I am passionate about all urban design principles, not only safety.

The CHAIR — So are you an employee or are you contracted?

Mrs GEORGES — No, I am council’s urban designer, but my role is mainly to provide advice on planning applications, which is the reason why some of the junior planners do not work harder to learn about these things, mainly because they have someone who is in-house, advising on these matters.

The CHAIR — All right. Sylvia, I suspect you have covered a fair number of questions.

Mrs GEORGES — Thank you. I like to be able to help, I guess.

The CHAIR — Thank you, and thank you for the information sheet.

Mrs GEORGES — You are welcome. I have a few copies of the presentation, but if you want, I can send you the electronic copy as well. Sorry, I made only three copies of the presentation, but I have more copies of this that I can hand out, if anyone is interested.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much, Sylvia, we appreciate it.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome. I am Simon Ramsay, Chair of this joint parliamentary committee, the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. The committee is here, bar one, but I will let them introduce themselves.

Mr SCHEFFER — Johan Scheffer. How are you?

Mr FENDER-KATSAKIDIS — Pleasure.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr ALFANO — Thank you.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — Sandy Cook is the executive officer, and Kim has joined us, helping with admin.

The CHAIR — There you go. Shaun Leane is an apology. He is a member of the Legislative Council who also sits on this committee, but I think he will join us later on.

Mr ALFANO — Okay.

The CHAIR — Thank you. I do have to read conditions of evidence that you are providing to this committee.

Mr ALFANO — Sure.

The CHAIR — It is recorded on Hansard, so I will just quickly go through that. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees?

Mr ALFANO — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Welcome to our inquiry.

Mr ALFANO — Thank you.

The CHAIR — Thank you for coming here today and providing evidence to this hearing. Our normal way that we run the meeting is to allow you to present material or verbal evidence to the committee, and then we will ask you a range of questions. It has been known that committee members are very keen to ask questions along the presentation, so if you are not happy with that, let us know, and we can—

Mr ALFANO — No, I would rather, given the context of our – if we would have had more time, I would have liked to make a formal submission, you know, a written submission. I acknowledge that Alison came to me rather in haste and said, ‘They would really like us to make some representations at the hearing’. We were quite happy with that, and we would like to think of it as a conversation in that really honest sense about our members understanding and our understanding of this very important topic.

The CHAIR — Thank you. You are the chapter councillor of the Australian Institute of Architects, is that right?

Mr ALFANO — Correct. I am one of the chapter councillors. Maybe if I talk about the institute a little?
Mr ALFANO — The institute is the big national body for architects. It represents about 12,000 members, 2,500 of which are Victorian. I have been an elected chapter councillor for 12 years. I am the longest-serving member. I am also the joint chair of the Urban Design Committee, which is a standing committee which really makes responses to government initiatives. In terms of my background, I have worked for state government and was part of the open Design unit at its inception under Rob Maclellan when it was first part of DOI and subsequent two following governments, I guess. There are a number of things. I am also a professor. I am a Principal Fellow, an Associate Professor of Infrastructure Engineering at Melbourne’s Engineering School. I kind of cross a couple of disciplines in that sense, and in my past I have spent a lot of time on policy work and looking at practical applications of some of the performance measures that we tend to come up with associated with buildings and urban design primarily.

Mr ALFANO — Right. To clarify a couple of things – the Australian Institute of Architects as the peak body for architects when we discuss safety has been primarily focused on OHS issues, issues associated with the building regimes and the BCA. To be honest, urban design as a topic falls between a lot of different disciplines. It is a multidisciplinary, let’s say, field of endeavour. You will have the planning fraternities that will say, ‘Urban design and urban planning is our thing’. We will also have the landscape architects, to a certain degree, talk about public realm and the second dimension. We like to think of urban design or a city design as the, let us say, the logical conclusion of these efforts, as being something which looks at kind of community evolution. We have been making submissions over the past 15 years to government on the future of Melbourne and how we think the city should evolve, the implications of drastic and radical change to certain neighbourhoods and how this is done. The next thing to be considered in a certain way is what we consider to be our triple bottom line framework. At the moment we start out with urban design or good design as a design exercise about aesthetics, and we say pick places that have better aesthetic qualities and are more vibrant, I would say, visually and cleaner are better places. We can talk about those sorts of topics. Let us say that would have been our focus 10 years ago. At the moment we have been moving, as lots of people are, into what we call precinct discussions. At the university now we have a joint program looking at what we call PIM, precinct information modelling, which is putting together a range of performance indicators associated with liveability, sustainability – both economic, social and environmental – and evolution. To be really clear – while we as architects primarily focus on buildings as a profession, we are intimately concerned and involved with the public space associated with those changing places.

To move on from that, we reviewed these guidelines in the past, in 2005, I believe, when they came to fore. There was a suite of guidelines – the Urban Design Guidelines, the Urban Design Charter; they were all part of, more or less, the same remit. To put them into context, we saw them as, in a sense, fine efforts. The question has always implementation and what falls out of them. As a tool – as a policy tool – it is a wonderful thing, but where is the implementation matrix? Who is responsible for implementing this and quite simple and how will they do it? To be quite clear about it, we have always felt that to a great extent urban design is really the remit of local government. To that extent, these guidelines exist at a much higher level, and the ability of local government to take something which is very broad based in principles and attempt to be quite generic and try and have, let’s say, some force with a lot of competing influences and quite specific influences and/or pressure in certain instances is something that we have been quite interested in looking at.

In 1980 I had an experience when I was in university. I worked for the government of New York State, and we worked on the Times Square project from the perspective of the Urban League, which was one group, and the state government had no control in terms of planning in New York City. It was the Department of Cultural Affairs at the time. What was learnt in that process is if you were able to analyse a specific place and say, ‘Well, look we have extant’ – I
guess we called it physical culture establishments at that time in New York. We had extant problems. We had a broad range of contributing factors which were creating antisocial behaviour, general crime, non-competitive places and really caused a loss to business in the city itself. It was quite a significant thing on multiple levels. There was a multiple-layered approach to try and deal with that. That involved things like changing the corporations act to stop people from doing phoenix businesses that were a bit less than desired. It got as touchy-feely, for lack of a better word, as a creating the Times Square partnership, which is a coalition of businesses which basically joined up with some of the ecumenical societies to provide for activity and certain levels of amenity in the streets. It started with that, the idea about people feeling comfortable, and it is the first instance, I think, of this community safety and environmental design. There are certain design parts that we can mandate over time. A retrospective is quite difficult, but the idea is that these places are managed, and they are managed in a number of ways. They are managed in the planning processes, the long-term strategy, and the short-term strategy is really physical management and using different layers of community – that may be residential communities or business communities to do that – and to maintain certain standards. This is something that ended up being very effective because of the retrenched nature of that – Times Square has always been a very complicated place, and it goes back to probably the turn of the century, to be honest – to sort of extinguish certain types of behaviour and also in another way: to have people think of it in a different way, as a place for amenity and not be scared to go there at night and do those sorts of things. It really had to be dealt with in a multidimensional fashion. I guess what I am saying is that a lot has been learnt from those sorts of exercises. I think you will find that New York City, for example, is quite a different place today than it was even 10 years ago in terms of general public safety and people’s understanding of how they feel in the public realm.

The CHAIR — Can I ask – we were ask members of your profession whether they understood the Safer Design Guidelines or CPTED for local planning in Victoria, would they know what we are talking about? I mean, how much is it a part of the work that you do in relation to trying to conform with at least the basics of the guidelines or the principles of CPTED in your work as against local government, which —

Mr ALFANO — Given the fact that we are a national body, we would probably understand it more clearly in some of the other states. New South Wales has very specific guidance on specific requirements on larger projects. Actually safety audits are conducted as a precursor to design work. I mean, to maybe focus in on what has probably happened since the writing of that document – let’s just to talk about the effectiveness of that document. That document exists. There is an Urban Design Charter, which exists and is vastly iterative. There is another thing called Activity Centre Guidelines, which are very iterative. They are very similar. If you looked at them, they are quite similar. When VPPs were issued in 1997 the underpinning logic was that all places would – and that included, along with amalgamation, right, so we amalgamated a lot of councils – the idea was to create an overarching strategic vision for each municipality. Those visions would have a municipal strategic statement that would give very clear guidance on, effectively, the urban form and the objectives of those places. Then as you filtered down through the system you would have local area policies and so on and so forth.

What happened since the beginning of that process was we got obsessed with quite specific issues, which are very small issues and quite specific issues. The fact that we did not really do any local area planning – which is actually a diagrammatic thing which establishes the hierarchy of elements in a very clear way and is a by-product of some conceptual idea of we are making a safe place; it is going to function like this, and these are the way these things work– is probably a symptom of the way the VPPs of the planning system has evolved. Anecdotal evidence – I did a straw poll last week. We do not see this document. We have not come into contact with it. Nor do we have it as anything other than a cross-reference in a series of dot points, and whether this document actually is part of something you have to consider. We take these things into account all the time. There are some things which are counterintuitive. The City of Melbourne has documents now, which say all laneways are potentially active laneways and should be dealt with in that way. We have made submissions
to the contrary and said that some of the more functional laneways and maybe people should not be taking down a laneway to a coffee shop in the middle of nowhere down the west end of town. There is an idea about reinforcing the strength of this perspective on things. I think maybe the shortcomings of it were that it was issued by the Department of Sustainability and Environment, to a certain degree; it was done as a suite of things; it was a joint project. Previous to this was the Safer Cities and Shires program, which was done through DOI in an integrated way, and it was public transportation – it was all parties sitting in a room, and it was a managed process, and when larger things would happen the police would come and everyone sit down and sort of roll their sleeves up and come up with a solution. This is a slightly different exercise.

Mr SCHEFFER — I am just a little bit confused there. Are saying that when architects are doing their work on a particular project they reckon they know what is in there and they do it anyway because it is generic and it is broad brush? Or are you saying that is not a document that they are particularly cognisant of and it is just on a shelf somewhere, and they just drop it into a intro or —

Mr ALFANO — We would not be cognisant of it. This particular document does not get referred to us as such. The other urban design documents – and if you look at the cross-referencing Activity Centre Guidelines —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but is it because you do not know about it or because you dismiss it?

Mr ALFANO — It is neither of those things —

Mr SCHEFFER — I am not talking of the generic —

Mr ALFANO — No, it is not really brought up as a core requirement. Neighbourhood character and things like this are the things you need to deal with.

Mr SCHEFFER — If it were mandated – because you mentioned New South Wales and we have Queensland mentioned to us as well – then you would use it?

Mr ALFANO — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — But you would use it because it was mandated not because of its inherent quality? Is that fair?

Mr ALFANO — I liken this topic to the discussion about site analysis a long time ago in the planning. We said we have to do site analysis. One of the problems with site analysis for us was that there was no database ordinance that said this is where buildings are and this how big they are. There was no official record of this. What happened was we spent several years running around, invading people’s privacies, trying to survey the house next door because there was a legal requirement that we have actually responded to something that we did not know about, and it was quite difficult. I would think to a certain degree that the policy intentions of that document are quite clear. I think the idea of it as a very specific guideline, a very specific and useful tool with techniques, is probably not quite what we would expect. Queensland has very specific detail. New Zealand – actually to be honest, have a better job governmentally in terms of trying to say that this is quite a complicated exercise; it needs to have multiple stakeholders. It is everyone’s responsibility, but it is almost the first order of discussion when discussing a master plan. The first thing you do is go and talk about doing a safety audit and community safety and how are these places going to work.

Mr SCHEFFER — Is this because in New Zealand it is legislated and then it is in regulations so therefore you cannot avoid it?

Mr ALFANO — Yes, correct, but it is also – I mean, legislat – I think that to a certain degree you do not necessarily need legislate or force people to do this. I think it is a question of how you express these things, how they are expressed. If we talked about social
contracts or something like this and said, ‘Look, our duty is to provide safe environments and how do we go about this?’ as sort of dot point 1, if you look at the Urban Design Charter, there is a rather rambling diatribe somewhere down about dot point 10, and it is mixed in with activity centres, and making safe non-trip zones and other sorts of things. It is mixed into other things. I think the perspective about being overt about the objectives, saying our objective is to create safe environments which meet the social standards and the physical standards, and there is an interrelationship between those, as a core objective, and then these other things trickle down.

Mr SCHEFFER — To understand you properly, you are saying as a document, as far it goes, it is fine. It needs further work to be a bit more directive, perhaps if that is the right word, or a bit more detailed.

Mr ALFANO — Sure.

Mr SCHEFFER — Then it needs to be located in legislation or regulatory framework so that people know that it is serious and they have to do it.

Mr ALFANO — Yes, more or less.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr ALFANO — You have to remember – well, not remember; I will make a statement. The State Planning Policy Framework is basically the larger structure within which the local planning schemes sit within. The State Planning Policy Framework is usually not used that much. Anecdotally, when we go to make an application for a very large master plan, even something as big as E-Gate, they will say, ‘Well, does it meet the objectives of the State Planning Policy Framework?’. Of course it provides diversity of housing, it sits in an inner-city location, the big dot points are fine, and it is connected to public transportation – done. Then what? Then we drop down to very low level controls, which say, okay, you have got four different types of land use that you may be able to get away with, how do you go about doing this in the absence of quite good strategic planning? What I mean by that is when you have an area of change – for example, Southbank was restructured, right. That is a structure planning exercise – the roads were moved; they were realigned and a hierarchy of roads was determined. We still today suffer from the fact that City Road is kind of devoid of significant activity – today. That was never intended. That was intended to be a local boulevard, something like St Kilda Road – trams and trees and all that sort of stuff. But to the extent that this is actually filtered through and actually been applied – and there were a number of reasons for that; we all acknowledge the public safety things, we all acknowledge permeability, we acknowledge the connections about the transport and legibility, the broader network that you could connect two things. It was clear. These are all part and parcel of this idea of creating clear safe defining boundaries – what is public and private and the like.

I think that, in essence, to a certain degree local government has not had the ability to do the strategic planning very well, and their municipal strategic statements tend to be a little teeny map with a couple of dot points saying ‘opportunities’, maybe ‘no opportunities’, and it is a very broad-brush thing. What should be happening in specific areas is literally a master plan, saying this is where the commercial activity is going to happen, there is where the residential activity is going to happen, these existing networks and other bits and pieces are eventually going to be changed or closed or protected, and how are these things going to work. Does that answer your question?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr ALFANO — What we have been saying for a long time at the institute is that we had forgotten how to do master planning. We have competitions all the time. Even our friends at Places Victoria or VicUrban – we go two different architects, two different master plans. Master plans are not like that. A master plan is the genetic code with which you create a place, and you would assume that the genetic code, right, would be determined and that we would be
talking about buildings. In Europe you will find architectural competitions such as a train station. There is an envelope, there is a use, and it sits within there. It is not maybe this building is here, maybe this building is there and different sorts of ‘innovative responses’.

Mr SCHEFFER — Is this a conceptual difference or a consequence of bad policy?

Mr ALFANO — No, I think it is a hangover actually from something that never got completed initially. I think what happened – the remit of strategic planning has always been the state government’s responsibility. In 1997, or whenever it was when the new format schemes came in, it effectively became the local government’s responsibility, and, to a greater or lesser degree, we have strategic planning units that float around the state government, which are primarily obsessed with roads, to be quite honest, and it is where money gets spent. VicRoads probably suck up something like half of the capital around the place, and this is just always the way it has been. Public transportation is at a little bit of short shrift in terms of funding, and the system is very old. We are dealing with something that is very old and is very inflexible in terms of its adaptation to change.

Those are quite simple things. I think that we used to say measure twice, cut once – this is a building proverb. Your outcome is only as a good as your strategy, and if you think of a master plan as being a key point of your strategy or a local area plan or something quite specific – you know, about 10 years ago I was seconded to DOOP, Sydney’s agency. They do master plans for every little place when they acknowledge that there is going to be change there. Coburg would have a master plan done. We made attempts at that, and all the junctions – Kew junction, Camberwell junction, all the places that were complicated – and said, ‘Well, this has always been the back of four or five different places. No-one is really looking at it, and how do we do these things?’ You know, how does someone do a concerted effort? It needs to be done in such a way where that is brought into force with some hierarchy and clarity about where it should apply and how it should apply.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay, so that is clear. If we go to the next step, which is, you said at the beginning that most of your focus has been occupational health and safety, and you have talked about community safety in these environments. We are the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee.

Mr ALFANO — Correct.

Mr SCHEFFER — So we are interested in that aspect of that continuance of people doing bad things to each other, so can you talk about that space a bit – how you people relate to that particular set of problems?

Mr ALFANO — I guess I have to say that us as architects in terms of drugs and crime prevention —

Mr SCHEFFER — No, we will deal with the drugs.

Mr ALFANO — Well, the drug part is a little bit hard for us. We spend a lot of time looking at exemplars and designing buildings, and we know that there are certain situations which are undesirable. Recently I got sent – about six months ago – to the Kidsafe discussion, which was about the children who were being, primarily, run over in strange circumstances. You sat there – we were there with a lot of people, not dissimilar to this environment, and the coroner as well – and we were having a discussion about how this functions, and you say, ‘It is patently obvious that places without footpaths have this problem in great abundance’, and everyone goes, ‘Are we sure about this?’, and you say, ‘Well, I think it is quite simple’. I think there are multiple contexts in which I think this needs to be looked at. This one primarily focuses on urban places and the Activity Centre Guidelines in other places. There is the other side of suburbia, which needs to be dealt with as well. I think the idea of orientation of blocks and lots probably falls a bit short of something as simple as street design. We know that some of the economic imperatives in terms of gated communities and things like that create some
very odd urban environments from the outside and pose issues about just even flight – how far can someone run? Can I run 400 or 500 metres if someone, even a rogue car, is pursuing me?

I guess to be specific about it we try to incorporate what we consider to be best practice in all instances into our work. More often than not we are called upon to – somewhere between the public realm design and strategic planning – actually do master planning, and we would consider that —

Mr SCHEFFER — Architects would be engaged to do a plan on a building or a set of buildings in a particular envelope, and given what you said before – I will call them – failures of general master planning in area – are you saying it is difficult then for an architect to engage in those larger issues, the ones that we are concerned with, because of the lack of confidence around the master plan? Is that a fair way of understanding what you are saying?

Mr ALFANO — I think it is a question of who is doing these master plans necessarily. We get engaged to do them, and —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but you were saying they are all over the place.

Mr ALFANO — Yes, well they are. I think what we would like to have is some quite specific guidance in terms of hierarchy and special organisation in most of these places in our work.

Mr SCHEFFER — Would that then help architects to think in the kind of envelope that we are talking about – about people hurting each other?

Mr ALFANO — Yes, sure.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

The CHAIR — What about base of the educational facilities where you are doing your courses to get your appropriate degree for architecture? Would the CPTED guidelines or the Safer Design Guidelines incorporated in part of that curriculum be of some use to get your head around, like Johan was talking about – actually starting to think as you draw and plan, structure and engineer structures?

Mr ALFANO — It is interesting. I sit on the national visiting accreditation panels for the universities, and we have just accredited a new one, which is Monash. This is a new architecture program. To be honest, we have been trying to focus the architecture schools on urban design as well, on what we consider to be that field – urban design and master planning – or refocus them on that. I think it would be a very valuable thing for this topic to actually be taught.

The CHAIR — We talk a lot about urban design, but do you go into the environmental design as well? I mean, how far out of your relevant responsibility —

Mr ALFANO — No, look, we go into environmental design in the sense that we look at ecosystem and we look at energy consumption.

The CHAIR — But do you look at it in the way that our inquiry is looking at it, providing the sort of principles of CPTED or safer designs?

Mr ALFANO — Look, not so much. I think though one of the hardest things for us to deal with at the moment – and I think the planning fraternity will probably corroborate this – is the social component, the social impact of development, for example, how we go about looking at that side of community development, that component of the triple bottom line exercise. It is very difficult. We do not consider it our particular professional forte, as such, and we are not really sure who does it, per se. I could send you 20 reports on social impact associated with development and they would be coming from totally different perspectives. They would touch on community safety and the like, and they would touch on impacts and
other issues associated with creating disadvantage or dichotomies of disadvantage and creating 
social tension and the necessary amenity impacts, but, by and large, what happens with local 
government is they come and say, ‘Look, we are doing a social impact statement to try and 
assess the community contribution, the contribution fees that should be paid associated with 
the development’. That is pretty much it. You will need a new kindergarten down the road 
because there are too many people moving in. That sort of thing. That is by and large —

Mr SCHEFFER — When you were talking about – you were comparing the way that 
we do or do not do our master planning compared to Europe you used as an insight. There is a 
master plan, and then the architect who has got a particular brief knows what is adjacent and 
the environment. Certainly my experience of European cities is they feel more coherent. It is 
just a general sense that the cities add up. Whereas in Melbourne there is always a sense of 
incoherence – you know, viscerally I feel that. If you are a European architect, how might – I 
mean, if you could answer this – you get brief, how would your work be different to what it 
would be in Melbourne, knowing that there is a master plan. Like, do you go to local 
authorities and get a very clear idea of how you might design a building or its surrounding 
grounds that is safer and is more capable of preventing crime incidents occurring? I mean, I do 
not know if that is too big a question.

Mr ALFANO — Look, I guess I could say that as a percentage of our work the focus 
would be detailed design, right, as opposed to trying to deal with these macro issues of – is it 
really like this or is like this? We spend a lot of our time, to be honest, solving what I consider 
to be planning problems, which are associated with lack of guidance, by and large. How can 
you have a generic guideline? We have a guideline for higher-density apartment buildings. 
There is a guideline which was produced. It is a hybrid document – it has some things from 
the UK, it has some things from New Zealand, it has a lot of florid language, but it is not 
unusable actually as a document, and where would you use it, in what sense? Given the 
history of Melbourne – Melbourne has grown in a very eclectic way and over spurts in time. 
This is something which is innate and inherent to its character, and it is a good thing. It also 
has robustness – and a strength to it, which allows for other things to happen. I think to be really 
clear, it would be very helpful to focus on detail and be able to go and say, ‘Look, I can take 
certain things for granted. I know it is going to be about this big and about that’ – and that is 
where it is going to. We spend a lot of our time fighting about height, which is not the only 
issue, which it is the only issue. We spend a lot of time, and we spend of time fighting about 
all sorts of little things, which, to be honest, it is part of the joy of being here in a certain way, 
but it is —

Mr SCHEFFER — You do not have to say that.

Mr ALFANO — No, but you could spend your time in the wrong area, I guess. It 
would be like going to directions hearings – being a lawyer and going to directions hearings 
for half of the legal case. You just say, ‘Okay, we’ve gotten the rules sorted out. So what are 
the rules we are playing by?’ The issue about providing certainty for the community on a lot 
of different levels and about spending effort in the right places – not only from adverse 
impacts associated with greedy development next to you but about what your environment is 
going be – is actually spelling it out really clearly. The policy machine is quite good at making 
a lot of policy on top of policy on top of policy. These guidelines are effectively policy, to my 
mind. Guidelines should be quite specific. For guidelines to work they need to be specific to a 
place. We talk about this being different to that. We know St Kilda is different to Footscray, 
right? So they should be different. I see no reason why you couldn’t prescribe those things. I 
think it would be enlightened to actually say, ‘Well, this is what it is going to be’. There has 
been no less than three urban design frameworks done for Footscray, revisioning exercises, 
and none of them can describe anything other than land use really or maybe high-rise or 
maybe there is a 100-storey building someplace. How does that help anyone on the ground 
really? I think, to be honest, for us to be helpful we would encourage you to, one, elevate the 
status of this – elevate the status of the topic of crime prevention as something about really 
underpinning the evolution or maintaining the quality of our public environment. You say 
these are the things we share. Everything outside of your house boundary, your little fence is
stuff that we share. That is order no. 1. As an urban designer that is box no. 1 because this is the social environment.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — You use the word ‘elevate’. What does that really mean?

**Mr ALFANO** — I mean elevate it throughout all of these very simple documents – the VPPs, the planning documents, for the first instance, I will elevate them through there. I would actually put it front and centre.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — That is not just a drafting issue. You are saying it should be mandated. It should be in legislation. It should be —

**Mr ALFANO** — These things are performance based; mandating is a different thing. To be quite clear, the VPP practice notes – even if you went to them – say, ‘Look, you should not cross-reference documents with one dot point that require extensive and may contradict other documents’. The other thing is that you should try and take what is in there and actually put it front and centre. If that is a core objective, then it should be a core objective. If between the changes of the Department of Sustainability and Environment and the department of community development and these other – between the changes and focuses, I think it would be entirely appropriate to look at placing that upfront and centre and be really clear about it and say, ‘Look, we want to ensure that our shared environment, which we all share, is not aesthetic exercise or urban design exercise; it is actually the thing that we all live in, and it needs to be safe, it needs to ensure that antisocial and these things are not promoted and supported and it needs to be of a certain quality’. I think that would go a long way to doing it. Then I think if you were going to mandate something, you would say, ‘Look, a community safety audit would be the first’. For anything bigger than a bread basket you would say this is the first thing that you would do, and you would get the professionals to come and you would get council engaged with it. I mean, unfortunately, to a certain degree, I think, councils should be saying, ‘Look, we have done our homework; this place is a problem, and you working in this place now – we are giving you that information. We want you to contribute to the outcome’. I think that would be the appropriate way to go about it.

**The CHAIR** — I am sorry. I am just wary of the time.

**Mr ALFANO** — No, that is all right.

**The CHAIR** — I just want to invite the other committee members, if they want to engage or raise a question.

**Mr McCURDY** — I am fine, thanks.

**Mr BATTIN** — A very good discussion, Jose.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — We could probably have a conversation.

**The CHAIR** — I could see you could banter for an hour or two more.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — No, but it is very interesting, Jose.

**Mr ALFANO** — What I would like to say from the perspective of the institute – we will initiate in the next week or so a more broad-reaching policy discussion and fact-finding mission from some of our colleagues internationally. We are a member of the UIA, and we can lean on our friends in the UK and in the States and stuff like that. We will endeavour – how would I say – we would like to be party to any ongoing discussions. We would like to say that to solve this problem you probably need a ‘whole-of-government’ response in a certain sense. I would have thought if this were brought within planning rubric, you brought it a little bit more to the fore so people could budget for it and acknowledge it and then you went through, rather than leaving it to people like DHS or other people to deal with their components in isolated ways – that you were able to bring it together – then you would guarantee yourselves an outcome. It would also be seen – it is important to be seen to be doing
something about this in a focused way. Those documents ended up being quite diffuse and end up being sort of under the counter, I think.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for your time. We appreciate it.

Mr ALFANO — Yes, thank you, Mr Chair.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome, Simon, and thank you very much for your time. My name is Simon Ramsay. I chair the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. I will ask our committee persons to introduce themselves.

Mr SCHEFFER — Hi, Simon. Johan Scheffer.

Mr BATTIN — Hi, Simon. Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — We have an apology from Shaun Leane, who is also on our committee but is unavailable at this time.

The CHAIR — The gentleman from Hansard, who is recording as we speak. On that basis, Simon, I might just read the conditions around your evidence at this hearing so you are clear about roles and responsibilities here. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by the parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you read and received the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees?

Mr McPHERSON — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. They are the rules. It is really up to you in relation to you making a presentation – whether you prefer us to ask questions of you straightaway or whether you want to make a short presentation. You have got a PowerPoint I see, so would you like to present that first and then just to let our committee members raise some issues out of that?

Mr McPHERSON — Yes, that is probably best. In my discussions with Peter Johnson he suggested that I could run through some material for 20 minutes or so and then we could have discussion after that, so I think that is probably the best way, but if there are particular points that come up during the process, I am happy to be interrupted.

The CHAIR — Good. Thank you. Now, we have allotted to 2.30 for this session. You have been well backgrounded in relation to the inquiry itself, so we do not need to go into much detail about that.

Mr McPHERSON — No.

The CHAIR — It is crime prevention through environmental design.

Mr McPHERSON — Yes.

The CHAIR — You are from SJB Urban?

Mr McPHERSON — Yes.

The CHAIR — Thank you, Simon. We will leave it to you.

Overheads shown.

Mr McPHERSON — Great. I put together a slide show that, I guess, has been informed by my discussions with Pete Johnson. It looks at urban design considerations for the implementation of CPTED, so it is actually focusing on how the principles actually happen on the ground and at different scales and so on. It will all be revealed as I go through. Just to begin, I guess, the established principles of CPTED are these – natural surveillance, natural access control, natural territorial reinforcement, maintenance and activity support. These come
in different interpretations and different wording and so on, but, essentially, they are the principles. So I thought I would structure my presentation around those.

Natural surveillance takes various forms. The first one I want to look at is actually on the street. This is about people actually being in the public realm, so it is not natural surveillance from buildings or elsewhere but it is actually activating the public environment. That means encouraging walking and facilitating walking through destinations, accessibility, quality, interest, amenity and safety and also how land uses are mixed and how urban structure and key routes are configured as well. I will begin with a quote from Jane Jacobs from the seminal 1960s book The Death and Life of Great American Cities. This is really where the CPTED principles originated from, largely or at least partly. The city street that is equipped to make a safety asset from the presence of strangers, as successful streets always do, must have three main qualities. The first one is the sidewalk must have users on it fairly continuously. This is about people being on the street. I am just starting off with this sort of case study. This is in Greenvale in Melbourne’s north. That is just a house that I nominated randomly and there is an activity centre at the bottom of the screen here. Just to illustrate some of the problems that are happening. If you were to walk from your house to that centre, you would need to take a fairly circuitous route, and, even then, you would need to walk through this rather barren open space to take the most direct route – so you would sort of take a loop over that way, back down and in – and the edges of that space are largely back fences of houses, so there is no passive surveillance, there are no edge conditions, there is no overlooking and there is no proprietorship or ownership of that space. So that is a point in itself. If you want to avoid that condition, then you take that route. So you can see that the urban structure is significantly discouraging walking and cycling and so on, for that matter, in suburban locations. There are examples like this all over town.

In inner suburbs where there is a more grid-based structure the routes are more parallel, more structured, more legible, and so getting to destinations is a much easier, more direct, more accessible and therefore more heavily trafficked from a pedestrian point of view outcome. Those open spaces that have back fences look like this – not attractive places for walking. I have got quite a lot of images and case studies coming up, but Pete suggested I talk about this project that we call ‘Shall we Dense?’, which is an independent research project that our office is undertaking, and it is an ongoing process. It is not a paid commission or a client project; it is just independent research. But it is really about understanding how to encourage walking and how to facilitate walking in the suburbs or generally in the city. It starts off looking at policies. Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne @ 5 million both suggest that we should be aiming for a density of 15 dwellings per hectare in new growth areas because that is sufficient population size within service catchments to support and sustain new infrastructure services and jobs. At least that is what is purported in these documents. Interestingly, in Sydney —

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry —

Mr McPHERSON — Sorry?

Mr SCHEFFER — No, you are doing it now.

Mr McPHERSON — Yes. In Sydney the aims are much higher – 25 to 60 dwellings per hectare everywhere, except for around larger centres, where it is even more, and low density less than 25 only in constrained and heritage areas. In the UK back in 2003 they recommend 60 dwellings per hectare as well, where everyone can walk, usage of local facilities increases and bus services are more regular. There are links between density and what happens in the urban environment, and that is what this study is about. But I want to focus particularly today on walking. These diagrams from the Melbourne 2030 document – the one on the left is what not to do, and the one on the right is the aim, which supports the strategy objectives, Melbourne 2030 being the strategy. What that illustrates is walkable catchments where every circle of a 400-metre radius approximately – 400 metres is 5 minutes walk – so that every circle has a centre: shops, kindergarten et cetera, deli, café, child care and so on in the centre, in the little blue squares. Every dwelling is within one of the circles, or virtually every dwelling is within a circle, so it is within 5 minutes walk of a small centre.
Then the small centres are clustered around – they are all touching each other and overlapping a little bit to support the bigger centre, where the trains and trams are and so on. It is a very strong principle. Also in Melbourne 2030 and in the same section, policy 5.5 – the yellow rectangle over that text on the right is my own, because this is designed to foster interaction and build in safety. There are certainly connections between safety and density in development patterns and walkability. If you can facilitate and encourage walking, then people are more likely to be walking, and therefore the streets are more activated and then they are safer.

Of course, the Victorian state government is currently updating or preparing a new metropolitan strategy, and the strategic principles are available online, and this is them. But particularly I want to draw attention to the last one: ‘Living and working locally – a 20-minute city’. This is, again, linking accessibility to safety, convenience and attractive local areas and areas which are healthy, liveable and more inclusive. There are certainly strong parallels between safety and crime prevention outcomes and other aspirations for sustainable cities. For ‘Shall we Dense?’ we looked at the threshold. Sorry, it is a little bit chopped off with the little graphic on the top of the TV there, but the square with the house in it represents 1000 dwellings, so we looked at the thresholds of how many dwellings are required to economically support different levels of activity centre, from a corner store on its own, which needs between 800 and 1000 dwellings to support itself, right up to a train station or secondary school, which need around 10 000 dwellings to support themselves, and then there is a hierarchy in between. Then we looked at – if you fitted all those dwellings within walking distance, what would the densities be? So we configure those densities across a mix of different housing types – detached, semi-detached, terraces and apartments – and allocated quite generous, certainly very conservative, estimates of land area per unit to work out the calculations and then worked out the densities that result from different proportional mixes of those four different housing types you can see here. If you develop exclusively in detached houses, the density will be around 14 dwellings per hectare, and if you develop exclusively in apartments – and only up to three storeys, it is important to note; three storeys only – the density would be well above 80 dwellings per hectare, and then there are various proportions as such. Our hierarchy in ‘Shall we Dense?’ of the five activity centre types spans a full range of densities, from 15 through to about 75.

This is all the numbers that support it, which I will not go through, but just to say at the lowest centre, which is category E, your corner store, the model meets the threshold – 850-odd dwellings to meet that viability threshold – whereas category X is the Melbourne 2030 aim of 15 dwellings per hectare, you can see here, and that delivers 550 dwellings within 5 minutes walk of the smallest centre, which is just over half of what you actually need to support that centre. So, effectively, it just does not work. This is just a sketch image of what the five centres would like. It is still quite a conventional urban development outcome, not a substantial change physically but certainly a significant change in performance. There is a lot evidence around to support the principles. This editorial from the Age back in July says that our outer suburbs are a disaster in the making, and I will just draw your attention to the last line there:

Too many recent developments lack —

the infrastructure —

leaving too many young people jobless, bored, alienated and angry, too many mothers in single-car families hopelessly isolated.

This sense of isolation and the lack of destinations, the lack of things to be in the public realm to get to by walking, really contribute to poor urban outcomes and certainly poor safety outcomes. Essentially, 15 dwellings per hectare will not deliver this objective. 15 dwellings per hectare will more likely deliver something like this, which is what the strategy is not to do. There is a disconnect in terms of the objective and the suggestion. Our model shows that to deliver this type of clustered, walkable, active, vibrant urban outcome of clustered neighbourhoods the density will be between 16 and 80, with an average of 25 to 30 dwellings per hectare across the area.
So there are structural precinct-scale principles to support walking and therefore people being on the street, and that is what generates an active, vibrant public realm. Like this – this is in Europe, of course, Bordeaux on a rainy day, but the proportions, the scale and the interfaces between the street and the built form are very close and very much connected. Similarly here – this is in Sunbury, so much closer but still an immediate relationship between the public realm and the built form and conditions that support walking, because it is interesting – there are destinations, there is amenity, and there is shelter and so on. New streetscape concepts originating in Europe and the UK, such as home zones are like this, or shared zones, where walking and playing are enshrined in legislation as equally valid uses of street space as driving. I think this is really part of the future of city streets and facilitating a shared, slow-speed, cautious use of streetscape environments. Similarly, here – this one is in Oxford, and you can see here buses, pedestrians, cyclists all using this space freely and cautiously. This is a retrofitted example, of course. Whereas when the streetscape looks like this – this is in Sydenham in Melbourne’s north-west. It is extremely discouraging for walking or being in the public realm, to say the least, or using public transport in that case.

The second component is natural surveillance adjoining the street, so they have building frontages and also land use mix. The second principle of the three from Jane Jacobs is there must be eyes upon the street. This refers to the natural proprietors or a sense of ownership of the public realm from the buildings or the people in the buildings. The buildings cannot turn their backs or blank sides on it and leave it blind. This is really a common mistake, and it particularly affects suburban locations and really has a huge impact on the quality of the public realm and safety considerations. This article from the Wall Street Journal this year also refers to Jane Jacobs’s work, so it continues to have relevance. It mentions crude density, which is just districts packed with tall buildings without generating innovation or economic development or Jacobs density, which creates street level interaction and maximises informal contact. In the absence of a pedestrian scale, density can be big trouble, so it is not really just about density being maximised, it is really a number of considerations, and scale is a really important one. What matters for a city is not density itself but how much people mix with each other.

Human scale or pedestrian-type scale, where there are direct relationships between the people on the street and the people in buildings – there is immediacy and an intimacy there. That is in London. This is also in London. Supermarkets with housing on top – why not? It is certainly starting to happen in Victoria and other Australian states. Again, an immediate relationship – it is not just a shed. Also in Bordeaux – that mixed shared space-type environment and direct relationships between the windows, which is where this picture is taken from, of course, and the public realm. Whereas when you get to bigger scale that relationship certainly breaks down between the upper levels of a tower like this one. The lower levels here certainly work quite well. The upper levels you really lose that connection with the public realm, and I am sure we have all experienced that. It can be retrofitted as well, and this one, I think, is a great example of a blank frontage. This is in London also. A typical kind of supermarket or chemist in this case, which has a glass frontage, which looks active on plan but in fact is just covered with posters and painted and so on, is not. But this is an infill café that has just filled a gap in the street. It is very narrow, but certainly activated that part of the street. So there is opportunity for these small interventions in the city. On the less successful side of things, this is also in Sunbury, where buildings do turn their backs or their sides to the street, and it really creates a good opportunity for crime or lack of safety because there is just no relationship between the building and the street. The positioning or siting of built form is also important. As you can see here, what looks like active frontages on a building but are set well back behind a car park, away from the footpath, which is in the foreground, really is a poor public realm outcome. You can see it is similar here – a person walking, a pedestrian, in amongst the traffic, and the buildings are sort of way over the back there.

Natural access control is the next one. This is about demarcation between public and private space. This is the third principle of the three. Public and private spaces should not ooz into each other as they do typically in urban settings, as we have just seen in those images. A strong definition – this is the street, this is the edge of the street and then there is other stuff
Activity support is the next one, which is about focusing on the public realm and also temporary uses. There was another article found, which was quite good, about a study – this was also in the Age in July – that showed that in the inner city there is a much stronger social connection between families with young children than in the outer suburbs, not surprisingly, and also that fathers are much more involved with their children in the inner suburbs relative to the outer suburbs – that is one that is important to my heart. Also the inner-urban families have a stronger reliance on incidental meetings in the public realm, such as in the street or in the local park, and they rely on public outdoor spaces as a place for social interaction much more than in the outer suburbs. There is a lot to be said more about that, but, due to time, we will press on. Temporary uses such as market stalls, that sort of thing, can really contribute to that activity support. Streets which support activities like this are really important, and I think we miss these opportunities too often. Even a blank wall can be conspicuous. The place can be really livened up by a tiny coffee cart, like this one, where people are walking from the station to their work or on route somewhere and can stop. Even if you do not stop and buy something, it is a little piece of life in the city. A bit more life, in this case in London also, where public art and signage and so on can really make a place feel active and vibrant and utilised, activated. Also I put this in – this is in Geelong, the youth recreation skate park facility on the waterfront in Geelong. It is a very well-regarded project, and I think it reflects the investment in quality that young people have, by all accounts, responded to by looking after the place. It is a great facility which encourages usage and activation and therefore not isolation. In contrast, streets like this do the opposite. The prioritisation for people rather than cars – this is in a town centre in New Zealand, which is the opposite message to what should be given, whereas pedestrians have to give way to traffic, so you cannot cross the road easily; you have to watch out for cars and so on. It is really the wrong way to go. Streets and roads which obviously prioritise vehicular movement and the suburban locations really affected by this really do not support other activities.

I am going to finish this with a quick case study that was also suggested. I have done or my company has done a lot of work in the Footscray station precinct, and I will wrap up just in a couple of minutes. This is what it looks like currently or at least a couple of years ago. We started off with an urban design framework. I am not sure if you know Footscray station precinct, but there is a row of shops here that face out to the street – or there was anyway – between the city, the shops and the station here and also quite significant social problems, antisocial behaviour, crime, drugs and so on in this reserve, the railway reserve, which is a historic reserve but certainly not very well maintained these days. We looked at the precinct in terms of the wider network and how people use it and move through it, which is a really important aspect of CPTED – I think, understanding how people move in the city. Then looking more closely – there are those existing shops and the existing old footbridge and there is that reserve and a former bowls site down there. There is significant heritage, as shown in this plan here. But this is what the framework looks like. It is really about inserting urban development parcels in the blue areas here, and I want to draw your attention to this one, no. 7, sub-precinct 7 in here, because that is now under construction, and also a new footbridge, which is built through this area here and new forecourts. So we really looked closely at picking up on those movement routes through the station and down towards the river in this direction into the shops there, down to the Victoria University here and so on. This is not just getting to the station, it is about crossing town. So understanding desire lines, flow lines, in the yellow here, help people move from the shopping area into a new footbridge, which is this element here, and shaping a forecourt and active frontages in the red dotted line to respond to those flows and really make smooth, easy movement routes across a shared
space intersection treatment in the light brown here. Similarly, in the middle forecourt – about getting direct flows along McNab Avenue into the station and also into the bridge to cross through, so really facilitating and encouraging that movement. The footbridge is now built, as I am sure you would be familiar with. That is what it looks like. The forecourt is built as well in this area here, and the shops have been demolished in this area here as well. That is what the footbridge looks like. We did not design the footbridge. We certainly set up the principles for it, and those principles of transparency, natural light and visibility, I think, have certainly been achieved, despite this bridge having its critics.

Later to that, we have also worked with Grocon in preparing the design for the first development parcel, which is now under construction – sorry, this bottom end, with an office building here for state government services and residential through here. This is the master plan, so it is activating McNab Avenue, which runs through here towards the station, as I showed you in the plans, and really providing a new active edge to this railway reserve, which will also be upgraded. This is an earlier image. The precinct will not look exactly like this; the design has evolved since then and is still evolving, but the office building down the end here is now under construction. You can see here the activation of the park, with active frontages. You can see here retail down the front, cafes and so on, onto McNab Avenue and onto the reserve. A number of those points are provided here, and these few slides were provided by Grocon last week. This is the ground floor of the office building. State Trustees are going here, the Department of Justice in the back and upstairs, so you can see there is activation along McNab Avenue with the café and the foyer. That is just a preliminary image of what it will look like.

Just to conclude, CPTED applies at all scales of planning and design, from the precinct structure planning scale right down to individual buildings and the details of those buildings. In my view, it is difficult to mandate or regulate because it is so complex and multifaceted. It covers density, land use, design, scale, traffic and many other facets. It does require a strategic and precinct-scale approach. It should be embedded in structure plans and frameworks. I think building proposals should be rigorously tested for CPTED, and perhaps that is a more effective process in terms of review and assessment rather than mandatory controls or guidelines. That concludes my presentation. I hope I have not run too much over time.

The CHAIR — No, you have been fine. Thank you. It was interesting. I was sort of wondering where the Aussie backyard fits into all of that and the need or necessity for many just to drive straight to the front shop and park the car and get the groceries and drive away back to the 800 square metres of land and backyard.

Mr McPHerson — Yes. I did not have time today to dwell on the model and the ‘Shall we Dense?’ research in-depth, but I am happy to provide – there is a written report that sets it all out, and there are other slideshows and so on, which I am happy to provide to the committee, if that is of use. But the model certainly accommodates everything. It certainly does not say that all houses need to be smaller or that everyone needs to live in townhouses and apartments; the city has room for 800-square-metre lots, and it has room for apartments. The model recommends a mix of all types in all locations. That mix varies in its relative proportions of the different types. So if people still want to live in a large house, there are plenty of those in the city already, and there are plenty more forthcoming as well, but, I think, we need to adjust the mix to get those ingredients working to get the urban structure right.

The CHAIR — I might invite the committee to ask some questions.

Mr McCURDY — I think you nearly answered my question on the last slide when you said it is difficult to mandate or regulate heavier. I was just interested in the London aspects. I assume that coffee shop —

Mr McPHerson — Yes.
Mr McCURDY — Is there a greater role for education from a government perspective in terms of retrofitting? I mean, both of those examples were nearly retrofits after buildings that have been a long time.

Mr McPHerson — Yes.

Mr McCURDY — If mandating or legislating is not the path we need to go down, is there an education process we should drive?

Mr McPHerson — Education of council officers and so on?

Mr McCURDY — Yes, of those who are in that space and still – not necessarily all new buildings and news spaces but some of the older stuff as well.

Mr McPHerson — Yes, I think there certainly is, and as I worked through these images and the more I thought about it, the more variables and different options came to mind and came to the fore. I think education and sharing of ideas and knowledge and potentials would, in my view, certainly have a strong impact and a good role to play. Yes, and when you look at a plan of building it might have, for example, a supermarket with a glazed frontage, as I showed in that case, which looks on plan to be an active frontage because it is glass, but active frontage is such an overly used and easily misconstrued term, and, I think, what I have tried to illustrate with these images is that what actually happens on the ground and what that means for the city and for the public realm is highly variable. We need to be monitoring and be conscious of retrofitting potentials or perhaps even planning enforcement procedures which lock in certain outcomes from the plan into delivery in that the supermarket cannot cover their windows with posters or the backs of shelves, for example, as happens so often.

Mr McCURDY — Yes, fair enough.

Mr BATTIN — You said before with the PSPs, the precinct structure plans – I cover through Berwick and Officer and, obviously, a few PSPs are going through there at the moment.

Mr McPHerson — Yes.

Mr BATTIN — At the moment – and correct me if I am wrong – there is no real thought or input into the crime prevention element during the PSP stage; that comes more in master plans with the select small areas as it goes through later on. What is you view? What are the difficulties with that? Does it end up ad hoc because you have different developers looking at it differently? Or is that something that council should take on board to put it across the board from the start?

Mr McPHerson — I should say to answer that question I would not look to correct you because I am not highly experienced in PSPs. Our office generally is not involved in that type of work, but I do know a lot about growth area planning from various parts of my career, and, I think, in general, growth area planning at the precinct scale or even regional scale, yes, it does not pay enough attention to making sure that the ingredients are in place to have the desired outcomes in the public realm. I think we still see major roads that are edged by back fences all the way along on both sides. We still see circuitous, elongated curvy roads and streets that form indirect routes. We do not see many local activity centres in the growth areas kind of surviving. We still see a strong reliance on car movement and so on. I think that is certainly an area that needs much stronger attention. Have I answered the question fully?

Mr BATTIN — Yes. I suppose, how would you get that into that PSP level? I am looking at the PSPs through Officer, and they are in place now, but they do not have anything, from what I have looked at, for crime prevention. Each development will obviously go through council, and you end up with a disengaged – because there are so many developments going on through there, including council land they are developing and putting in their facilities. I suppose, what is your view on that to try and get the councils to start thinking about that at that higher level to enforce it more already in preparation for the developers?
Mr McPHerson — I am just going to skip back to that diagram, that one. What is important here is the local activity centre, which is each of these blue ones. In the growth areas you just do not see this structure. You see that, where larger centres are much more dispersed. So, I think, we need to understand, in my view, how to make this work, and that is what ‘Shall we Dense?’ is all about – getting enough people living close enough together to support these centres so that they do exist. When they exist people have a destination and they have a local focus, a local community identity. You can meet down there for coffee or you can meet down there at the child-care centre or at the little plaza or you can get your bread and milk and so on. In many respects, the local centre is the most important one because it is the glue that holds the urban structure together. They are those infill ones. The larger centres are important, of course – they are scattered around – but it is the small ones that provide that local focus, which, I think, will be increasingly important as petrol prices rise and as there is a cultural shift towards a more local focus. Then, secondary to that, I think, in PSPs we can start identify – you cannot have every street with shops all along it and cafes and everything, of course; it is impossible, but you can start to say this is a key route, this yellow line, and this yellow one across is a key route, and then all other routes feed into that one. When you live on this dot here, you then walk down here and then you are on a key route, and then you start to focus attention so the people understand where the key walking and cycling routes are and make them really amenable, really safe, comfortable and direct, easy to navigate to get to destinations. Then people will go from their local street in a grid-based structure, which is very permeable, very navigable and legible, to get into a key route which might be a green way or something like that, so people understand – ‘I want to get to that street, and then that will get me to my destination, and then I am the destination’, and then you start to encourage the concentration of pedestrians walking. People can walk because it is within a reasonable distance and there is something to get to – to buy the milk or go to the movies or whatever, have a beer et cetera – and so there is a destination, it is within walking distance and the routes are of good quality.

Mr BATTIN — Can I just add one part to it? I do not know what your definition of a ‘small neighbourhood centre’ is and a large one, but through the growth corridor many of the developers are all putting in what in my view is quite large – they have got the big Coles, the big Safeway. I am not sure – long term I can see issues because we are going to have lots of large neighbourhood centres, and eventually half of them will go broke. In my view, we are eventually going to get to that stage and we end up with half closed.

Mr McPHerson — Yes.

Mr BATTIN — How do we get that message, again, back to councils and say, ‘Hold on. You have to start looking at this and say no, you can have your big one in Lakeside, Pakenham, but you won’t in Officer; it’s too big. You need to put in smaller’?

Mr McPHerson — I am not a retail economist, but I would agree with that concern. I think – sorry to jump back – that is like that model: a bigger centre with a Coles in it. But supermarket operators know about all this stuff. They place themselves where their catchments are and not too close and so on.

Mr SCHEFFER — With big car parks.

Mr McPHerson — Big car parks, yes – very crude buildings. They do not care about frontages. They do not care about streets.

Mr BATTIN — Concrete on concrete.

Mr McPHerson — Yes. When you get an intensity of population – and, again, there is still room for detached houses and so on, as the illustration I showed quite quickly; I cannot remember where that is, but it does not matter – as that illustration showed, there is still a mix of housing so it is not Port Melbourne or Docklands, for example; it is still suburban. But when you get that concentration then it starts to trigger viability for the small centres, and you can see it. Our office is in Southbank, just off St Kilda Road. You can see small cafes and
small convenience stores popping up as the apartments are built. People start to live there. People see opportunities and stuff happens. Getting back to the small, the independent operators, local food stores, that sort of thing – I think people really want those things. People still want a nice coffee if they live in Berwick or Officer, definitely, and they do not just want the generic. I think we do need to be careful about concentrating all the stuff in centres that everyone has to drive to, because, even if you live across the road, it is still hard to get to by foot, as we saw in some of the images.

Mr SCHEFFER — When you were doing the Footscray precinct did you use this?

Mr McPHERSON — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Could you tell us quickly how you used it?

Mr McPHERSON — That document and the other two that form part of the suite are always part of our reference information. In terms of the Footscray package, that guidance – in terms of the Grocon projects, that guidance was referred to as part of the planning scheme applications, but many of the principles of CPTED or crime prevention or safer design are essential – I guess, they are embedded in good urban design practice, as is sustainability and walking and so on.

Mr LEANE — It is starting to become like a second nature now?

Mr McPHERSON — Yes, I think so. As I illustrated here also, the principles that support safety and crime prevention also support streets that people enjoy and streets that support good economic performance and streets that are vibrant and so feel active and interesting and so on. There are cross-overs. It is not, in my view, a kind of separate discipline necessarily. However, we do refer to those documents as a way to demonstrate how a particular building proposal meets the requirements, but I think certainly the devil is in the detail and these things need to be constantly tested and assessed.

Mr SCHEFFER — Do you think it could do with more detail? It has been put to us that it is too generic.

Mr McPHERSON — Yes. I understand that point. I do not have a firm position on that. The reason is that I previously worked for the state government of Victoria in DPCD’s urban design unit – or DSE, as it was at the time – and I was involved in the preparation of the higher density design guidelines and also a little bit with the Activity Centre Design Guidelines, and this document was being produced within the team at the same time. I do have some familiarity with the preparation of guidelines. It is very difficult to provide specificity in guidance that applies everywhere across a state or even a city because the context is so different. As much rigour as possible is a good thing, but whether that can be achieved in a guidelines document I am not sure.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thank you.

The CHAIR — Can I just follow on from that. Part of our briefing is to gauge the response from local government planners in relation to CPTED and the safer design principles. Do you, from an external business, I suppose, see that they are receptive to the guidelines? Are many councils actually incorporating the guidelines as part of their strategic thinking in environmental design?

Mr McPHERSON — This is guideline —

The CHAIR — Yes, and the CPTED principles – I mean, is it ingrained in local government planners now as such?

Mr McPHERSON — I think it is. To a large extent, I think, the basic principles of buildings which address the street effectively and which minimise any negative impacts on the public realm, from loading docks and vehicles entries and blank walls and so on – that has
come a long way in the past 5 to 10 years. I think the principles of general good design are quite well established.

The CHAIR — Thanks very much, Simon.

Mr McPHERSON — My pleasure.

The CHAIR — We have reached the end of our time allotted for this session. We really appreciate your input, thank you very much.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome to you both. I chair the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. Actually we have a full committee, and I might ask them to introduce themselves.

Mr SCHEFFER — Johan Scheffer, as you can see.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr LEANE — Shaun Leane. I am an upper house MP.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley.

The CHAIR — I will just let you get set up for a minute, Jill, and then we might start. While you are starting maybe I can just go through the conditions around the public hearing and you providing evidence to this committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. As you received and read the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees?

Ms GARNER — Yes.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Thank you and welcome.

Ms GARNER — Thank you very much for having us.

The CHAIR — Pleasure.

Ms GARNER — I am hoping this is a bit informal.

The CHAIR — Just before you start, Jill, we have scheduled this session to end at 3.30, and we are fairly tight on time because we have got a number of submissions.

Ms GARNER — Okay.

The CHAIR — Thank you, and also the committee does have some questions to ask of you.

Ms GARNER — Yes, I thought so, and I thought that I could, hopefully, just run through some Overheads that I have put together. I am going to get Kim from our office to just give a quick case study overview of some of the work that she has been engaged with for the office and then just open it to questions because I actually think probably some of the specific questions might be better just answered direct.

The CHAIR — I understand Peter or Sandy has talked to you about the inquiry and the terms of reference, so I do not need to do the backgrounding.

Ms GARNER — No.

The CHAIR — Fine, thank you.

Ms GARNER — From our point of view — we are the Office for the Victorian Government Architects — obviously is a design-focused office. We are concerned with architecture, we are concerned with environmental design, and we are concerned with urban design and landscape as well. We cover the gamut of design. Really I put this together to give you a bit of an indication of our understanding in industry and in practice of the CPTED principles and the way that we are starting to use them as background for what we do, and then, we will probably answer some questions from you about how they are perceived, how it is integrating into the wider use in industry and in practice.
Basically, I guess, the agenda, from our understanding of CPTED, is the issue of actually making safer places and with this holistic idea that it covers both crime – so safer places as far as the offender perspective, which is the crime perspective, and also from the community perspective, which is the fear of crime. So it has to cover both of those gamuts. These are what we understand as the key four principles for CPTED. One of the things that we think is interesting about these four principles is that the language that is used in them is not design language. While CPTED refers to design, environmental design and urban design, the words that are within the principles really could be interpreted by a policeman, could be interpreted by the community, and could be interpreted by an urban designer or an architect quite differently because we all have different mindsets. So I think one of the things that we see in these four key elements of CPTED is lack of design language within them, despite the fact they are talking about design.

These were some of the questions that you asked, which I will go back to later one after I have run through a few slides with you. You asked us about whether have we got any comment to make about the implementation of these principles; the sort of influence they are having out there; the acceptance of the advocated principles that we see through the DCPD principles that it has put out, including the Urban Design Charter; some criticisms we might have of it; any impediments we see to it; industry awareness; and case studies. Basically the way we look at CPTED stuff is that we think it is very important that we design out, first of all. That is the first issue, so that we remove opportunities that might influence the occurrence of crime that might be inadvertently provided by the built environment. There needs to be an understanding of what is, actually, inadvertently not promoting but allowing crime to happen. That is the issue of designing out. The second aim is the aim to reduce the fear of crime – this is community side of things – through highly considered and attractive design that adheres to principles that acknowledge safety. That is what we call designing in. Any approach to the built environment needs to take into account those two views.

This is the Safer Design Guidelines, which I am sure you are all aware of, there, which are Victorian ones. We think the language in these is really good. You can see there what they have added is the word ‘activity’ to the CPTED principles. The other key four points are actually exactly the same as the CPTED principles, but they have actually changed the language slightly. The slight difference within that language – what it actually does is – ‘access movement and sight lines’ actually refers to architectural design or urban design. There is a slightly different emphasis on those principles that actually talk to the design fraternity and allow them to understand where those CPTED principles might be addressed in terms of design. I put this one in as well, which many of you are probably also aware of. This comes out of the UK. None of these are legislated. Even the ones in the UK are not legislated; they are advice guides. They are strongly promoted by the design fraternity and the fraternity that leads on these kinds of issues. Here, once again, we see the CPTED principles. There are a couple of extras added in there again. Over and above those four key principles we have the word ‘structure’, which to us means the designed structure of the neighbourhood. The other that is added is physical protection and that same word ‘activity’, which we saw in the DPCD principles as well. This physical protection one is one that does not speak to design, really. I guess, what you would call ‘physical protection’ is something that we may not even advocate in the sense that it needs to be invisible physical protection. Part of the issue of really good environmental safe design is that it is invisible. Once again, the language in this we feel perhaps could do with some work.

These are the 12 principles that are in the Urban Design Charter of Victoria. I have highlighted in orange there the ones that speak directly to CPTED principles. So you can see out of those 12 principles which make up the Urban Design Charter the language, once again, is quite different. The language speaks to design, and the next layer as you head into Urban Design Charter is carefully constructed so that these principles could be put in front of a place designer and they would actually really be able to understand that there are any number of ways of addressing these things, but it is a design issue. I thought I would just touch on some of the language that is used in that. This issue of the structure of a place being organised so there is a very highly considered relationship between parts of the place, accessibility, the idea
that there is ease, safety and choice of access for everybody, legibility so there is a clarity of the way a place works and a clarity of movement, patterns. This is a really key one, the issue of animation that stimulates activity and a sense of vitality in public places because that is an absolute key requisite of safety. Then there is the issue of designing spaces that minimise risks of personal harm and support safe behaviour.

I thought I would put up just some imagery to give you an idea of what we are talking about when we talk about designing out and designing in. Here is a really obvious one – two lanes, one of which has no address, no activity, it is a back door, everything is guarded, it probably has those barriers, it has impediments, all of those sorts of things, but it is a non-occupied space; and then on the right is something we see in a lot of Melbourne’s inner-city laneways, that is for sure, where it is an occupied space, and the difference in actually having activity there. These images are actually really just talking about knowledge of materials or product that is out there that designers have. These two fences do exactly the same thing. The one on the left – if the top was not there, if the razor wire was not across the top, you could climb it. The one on the right is actually specifically designed to not allow climbing, not allow toe holes and is quite a different look; you do not need the razor wire. If you can imagine an environment that has the need for safety or has the need for separation of a place, the difference in use of each of these products is what speaks to those who are using the place, and one of them shouts that there might be something unsafe about the place. One of them is invisible, properly designed. I put this in because I think it is quite an interesting case in point – about how an approach to the built environment might make a significant difference. Over there on the left-hand side of the new Hamer Hall Southbank development is the new set of stairs that come down from Swanston Street down to Southbank, and they also cut under the Swanston Street Bridge and go through to the boat sheds. I do not know if anyone remembers what that place was like before that set of stairs went in, but it was frightening, no-one there, difficult, badly lit and not a safe place at all. Putting that set of stairs that runs down the side has had the most remarkable impact on that particular environment. It is a key urban design move that has actually opened out and made an incredible difference to safety in that particular area.

In Western Australia there is a set of guidelines that have been put into one of the local government documents they have. They have used this kind of strategy of little sketches, saying this is good, tick, this is bad, cross. There is one, the idea of actually – that is what we were talking about: clear visible pathways so there are no corners, there is nowhere to hide, those sorts of approaches to those kinds of laneways. Here is a very simple graphic to show the difference between not being able to see through a fence onto a street and being able to see the different fences, different types of vegetation, one has eyes on the street, one does not – very clear design statements. The ATM machine on the left-hand side – if you put the ATM machine into an enclosure, you are asking for trouble. If your ATM is out on a flat surface and it is well lit, it is a safer place to be. Then clear diagrams like this that show the window looking the wrong direction, so no-one would use the playground. The playground there, the second one on the right-hand side, which is clearly overlooked and therefore there is a sense of being watched – that passive surveillance issue, once again, the sort of eyes on the street, eyes on the public place.

Just talking about safety, I put this in as well because adding to – while this is not about crime, really, it is about safety and public safety and that perception of safety and just sort of this comparison between places on the right that actually highly consider who uses what part of the street, and over there on the left-hand side the Melbourne model, which we are trying to address. Down the bottom there is Copenhagen, which is the absolute haven for bike riders, that one. Once again, this is a really graphic example. That is the underpass at St Kilda junction over on the left-hand side, and on the right-hand side is the new Nunawading station underpass, where just by opening it up to the sky, dropping light in, dropping skylights in, the balustrades of glass so there is a lightness and an airiness and people can actually see in from the top and can see people coming and going. So you have this completely different sense of personal security and safety as you are using each of those underpasses. Consequently, I would never use that one on the left because there are also some sorts of dog legs in it as well.
Here are some of the questions you asked us. The issue of implementation – as far as we can ascertain, we bring these CPTED principles to everything we do. We run design critique, and we sit around the table on a lot of public projects in Melbourne, and one of the things we bring to it is CPTED principles but not those four key principles; we bring those sorts of broader principles that you see in the Urban Design Charter into it because they are a little more complex and a little more design focused. Nothing, as I said, is legislated. We try very hard to get those principles embedded in briefs right at the beginning of a project because if that knowledge about how to design safely is embedded into a project from day one, as I say, it is quite invisible. You do not notice the difference, and it does not cost any different; it is just making sure a lane does that rather than that. They are basic principles. Because it is not legislated the influence and effect of the principles depend on who is interested in them, who is reading them and who is writing the briefs and whether you have got somebody who cares around the table to bring them up. The acceptance of the DPCD-advocated principles – so the Urban Design Charter and the other safer design charter – I think you could say within the design professions they are really highly regarded. The Victorian ones – we really do feel the language in the Victorian ones is excellent in comparison to what we have seen around Australia, because what we find is that the Perth ones, for instance, and some of those in New South Wales – I should be very careful to say this – an engineering base is quite different to a carefully orchestrated maybe architectural design base.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yet we have had other witnesses that we have told us that we should go and have a good look at New South Wales and Queensland because they are really good, better than this.

Ms GARNER — That is interesting.

Mr SCHEFFER — You disagree?

Ms GARNER — Yes. Okay.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay. That is good.

Ms GARNER — I feel the language in them is a little less design focused and a little more focused on the outcome, which can be done in any number of ways. That said, we do feel that the Urban Design Charter needs some revisiting with CPTED in mind and some more work on it. While we feel that those 12 principles do represent some good thoughts, we do feel that CPTED principles need to be brought in over the top of it, because they are actually embedded in more than just 4 or 5 of those key 12 points. The criticisms of the principles – the criticisms of the base principles is what I have really just already voiced: that we feel that they need to be embedded in the design-in, design-out mode because we feel that that is a really good way of representing what might be CPTED invisibly so that people really understand what not to do and what to do.

Impediments to it might be general awareness, community awareness – you know, ‘Why can’t I have a fence that protects my property?’ Somewhere along the way one needs to embed community awareness and industry awareness of the contribution that everybody needs to make to public safety, and they need to understand the principles of why their fence should be see-through or why they need to make a contribution to general public safety. Industry awareness – right through the design industry, I think, there probably does need to be an education campaign in the same way that the Disability Discrimination Act came in a very long time ago, and we all started talking about it, we all had to start doing it, and now it is embedded as a universal access code rather than as a disability discrimination code. I think really our feeling about things like CPTED is that they need to be embedded in good design rather than a set of principles that you need to follow in the same way as DDA started to infiltrate into everyday good practice. Somehow everyday good practice has to embrace these principles, which at the moment it is not.

The CHAIR — Is that including these sort of local government plans, because we have heard a different view at a previous hearing?
Ms GARNER — Yes, where they feel they are very aware of them?

The CHAIR — They seemed to suggest that best practice was, particularly in the Safer Design Guidelines, being adhered to, in the main, by local government planners. That is not your view?

Ms GARNER — No, I think it probably is. Sorry, I did not mean to give that impression. It is more a matter of how the principles actually emerge, because you can tick the boxes, and ticking the boxes is quite a different process to what I would advocate as that invisibility. You know, you can do it in two ways, one of which – both of them you tick the boxes – one of them needs a value judgment as to whether it is a better design response than that one. Do you see what I mean? Because I think –

Ms IRONS — I think it goes back to Jill’s earlier point about designing out and designing in. That can be the difference that is significant that we can see – that there is a way of designing so that crime stays out, but there is always a way of designing safe behaviour in and positive community places.

Ms GARNER — Yes. I thought I would put this one up because this Western Australian one, I think, is very interesting, because one of the things I like about it is it actually graphically represents the process, and it is a process that needs collective commitment. Those boxes that are shaded are seen as public and private sector commitment, and the white boxes are seen in this particular diagram as public sector commitment. I think what this highlights quite well is no. 4 there. The Western Australian guidelines have actually put together what they call a ‘tool box’ of design principles. They have some that are generic, which could be a tick-the-box issue. Then they have some that are site specific. What they make the key process here is that every case is slightly different, and because every case is slightly different, then you somewhere along the way need a design strategy for that particular place. You need a design assessment for that particular place, and the design assessment is effectively a design review. That is somebody – a peer review of whether that process has been done in a good manner or in an effective manner. This process that you see here, which has been mapped out, actually ends up at the bottom with a monitoring process, because, in a way, we do need to prove this – that it actually does make a difference. That is something that is a little thin on the ground, really – is the data to say whether it really works. I mean designers inherently feel that some of this stuff is about good practice and does work, but in a way there is a lack. There are some case studies out there and some data, but it is not huge.

Where we have got to – these are the things that we feel need to be done. We feel there does need to be principles embedded, and the starting point in Victoria is already there. I think they need to be embedded in both government and in industry, meaning also in practitioners there as well, in design practitioners. We feel there does need to be a built environment policy in Victoria, which at the moment there is not. It is something that the government architects office has been working for some time. We are hoping that it will get some support, and this is something that we think probably needs to be very clearly embedded within our policy for good design and good built environment. There is the education level and the skill of the designers and the community awareness of what safer places might be as well. There is the issue of exemplars and case studies, and, Interestingly, in the Western Australian one, where the sketches were done, they also had some case studies, and the case studies were, in a way, less convincing than the sketches because they almost gave you this – here is an answer; the sketch leaves it up to your imagination; you could interpret it in any number of design ways. Then there is the issue of design critique and advice, because somebody who knows what the three-dimensionality of what is being proposed needs to have the role of peer review to say – is this doing it; is it actually doing what you are talking about it doing? And they also need to be the champion for the key design moves that are contributing to the safer place, because budgets change all the time and sometimes stuff gets pulled out. If a fence that you cannot climb gets pulled out and the chain wire goes in instead, it completely changes the nature of the place. That is one of the dangers of this – that along the way this value management system downgrades potentially the design proposition. Somewhere along the way there needs to be some champions for the principles of safer places.
Then the bottom of that also is that issue of evaluating the success – that somehow we need to be able to understand the successes or the failures of certain ways of approach. There needs to be some documentation of that as well. I thought I would Kim, who is one of our senior policy architects and basically works with us for the Department of Transport. She represents the voice of design around the table of the Department of Transport projects. We have just put a couple of images in here of some of the new station projects, and I thought they were really good examples where Kim has really had a significant voice in changing the way that the designs represent safety, because obviously the Department of Transport is one of the key players that has embraced these issues. I will press the button, and you can talk!

Ms IRONS — Thank you. Obviously, because they are public civic spaces they do have that significant role in the public sector that the community is involved with, and there is quite a lot of activity. One of the key things we have found is having the right design team there. The two projects we have here are designers who are fully aware of making safe spaces and safe places in train stations. Then part of my role is to actually assist them in the pursuit of those principles, particularly if there are budgetary issues coming in, we can be the person advocating why that material is of worth and what the value is et cetera. Then some of the key gestures that we do in our review process is to sort of maintain that passive surveillance upheld at all times, be it from ticketing officers, public space to public space. Some of the cues, for instance, here in this one is it is a stair straight down, so we have a direct sight line into a cutting — a direct sight line from the public concourse down to the platforms. The balustrades are glazed instead of being solid. The walls to the sides, the retaining walls, have actually been treated with a material in order to reduce graffiti, which also can then mitigate other behaviours occurring. Then just the value of things like lining that ceiling with timber and providing natural light coming through, which also is that designing in, so it is about valuing the public and saying this is a good positive space in which we encourage good positive behaviour.

The next one —

The CHAIR — How did you manage to talk the department into providing all that timber?

Ms IRONS — Well then we could have another inquiry about procurements.

The CHAIR — Good old Canadian redwood, was it?

Ms IRONS — When you place materials like this, though, in a high space, because of the form – actually this was cheaper than using another material that was proposed – the reality is too is that it is up at an elevated height so you are giving public value but it is also at such a level that it cannot be vandalised or damaged, and being in a reasonably sheltered position it will withstand the weather really well.

The CHAIR — No, it is effective.

Ms IRONS — It is very effective. It is really positive, and, yes, it does create some debates.

Ms GARNER — But, yes, I think it gives value to —

Ms IRONS — It gives value to the 99 per cent as well, and I think the other thing is that it is about saying to the public, ‘We value you as a positive member of our society’, and that is that designing in aspect that I think is really critical. You can come at everything with an engineering perspective, as we have said – which tends to be the way I see it – where you design everything out, or you can also say that we are going to design in this value. I think that is really important.

This is Thomastown station. There was suite of train stations delivered in the one project. While it is quite utilitarian in its approach and its shelter, the louvers are all about getting a sense of transparency and light. Obviously there is that bit of value having some orange paint
to designate, and it seems to be the way of finding legibility. Then the glass screens again that allow you to have – as you cross over the railway line you can see down into the platforms and the stations in this location. Then this is Nunawading. Again, we have a timber ceiling, and you have seen an earlier slide about this too, but you will notice that there are issues here, for instance, about that value of having glazed balustrades so that there is as much transparency and light as possible, that the waiting area beyond those stairs there is the bus waiting area but is also the waiting area for the trains. Again, it is glazed, it sits directly adjacent to the ticket office, and the ticket office has a window straight into that space, so one has a sense of being next to somebody else who can be there for contact. There are also issues here around the durability of materials et cetera. The blue there is a very hard surfaced enamel product that costs a bit more money but is very robust and very durable, and the colour gives some sense of joy and activity again, and obviously the ceilings have contributed to that as well.

The CHAIR — Can I ask you how you go with toilets because they always seem to be the big issue?

Ms IRONS — Toilets are a big – and some of this actually goes to that industry awareness and community awareness. One of the issues we have in train stations is actually bringing the staff on board, I think. This one, for instance, has a corridor that goes to the two toilets, and there is a window that looks directly from the ticket office into the toilet – into the corridor, not into the toilet but into the corridor. The issue we have is the blinds get drawn because the staff become concerned that people are looking in on them. So it becomes a bit of working with the people in the places and the spaces. I have had a few dialogues with MTM, who are currently the operators and said, ‘Do we need to change our design approach or does it need a cultural change?’, and his comment to me was, ‘We just need to bring the culture on board. You keep pursuing that. They are right design approaches. We just need to bring the staff on board’.

Ms GARNER — They will get there.

Ms IRONS — I think it is also about sets of values —

Mr SCHEFFER — Is that not very common? That people want to – one of the good things about cities is the sense of anonymity which you have in the city.

Ms IRONS — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — It is all very well to have people around but you want them to be constantly engaging with you. Do you have that tension where some people say, ‘I’m being looked at’ rather than —

Ms IRONS — Look, I have not had the direct conversations with the staff. That is my understanding – that they get concerned that they are being looked at.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, there is probably a balance there. Some people feel looked at as opposed to ‘There is somebody there’, which is —

Ms IRONS — Some of them suggest that it is when they are counting money. Many of us have been in public spaces have had to count money in front of the public. I think there is another question about why they are feeling vulnerable. Are they vulnerable? It is something I do not know directly with those staff, for instance, but I think there is a lot of dialogue that has to actually occur.

This is Thomastown again, just demonstrating the big gestures here are that this is looking from one forecourt on one side of the train lines to the other forecourt on the other, so you can see that, again, trying to get that sense of transparency – the entrance way is very open, the fences are very transparent, they have been glazed in these locations, and it is a generally open positive space. The landscape, although difficult to read from these, has been very much about maintaining shrubs that are 600 high and then canopies that no lower than 1.8, so you always have that clear zone of transparency —
Ms GARNER — These are the things I was talking about that are invisible. I mean, we are the ones who say, ‘Make sure your trees start at 1.8’. That stuff can be written into a code, definitely, so that knowledge – but the knowledge of overlooking it, ticking the box, yes, they have done the done-right thing, and it is also very easy to lose if you have not got someone keeping their eye on it.

Ms IRONS — Interestingly, I have just been through the train station codes again to check through things, and that is not actually written anywhere – there is no section on landscape, but the good landscape teams in this environment know those rules; they know those principles. But the interesting thing about this, now that I look at it again – of course, what is not invisible is the number of CCTV cameras and lights and things that are starting to pop up in all of those poles. Sometimes the message can be, if those things are integrated, it starts to marry up that issue of designing and designing out. The more CCTV cameras you see, the more you may be a little guarded and wondering why you should be nervous. The less you can see them – yes, you might want that sense of knowing; for some people that is important, but for many people, ‘Why should I be concerned? Why do I need a CCTV camera? Why is there a barbed wire fence there?’ This again is another example about working with glazing as much as possible and transparency. This is again another waiting area, and the waiting area to the right is visible from the ticket office, to the left are the toilets, so the ticket office can see straight through to these toilets here. The toilets are never locked. Then the passenger can be waiting in here in a sheltered environment but can see if their bus is coming and can also see if the train is coming. Again, it is about those cues of connection and visibility. That is the last one.

Ms GARNER — I think that is it, yes.

The CHAIR — Well done. Any questions, committee?

Ms IRONS — We have not left you much time.

The CHAIR — No, we have 5 minutes or so.

Mr LEANE — It is probably a bit outside what you discussed, but most or all of the submissions we have had from architects in the private sector are pretty adamant that the guidelines should not be mandated. That is probably one of the first things they say. They say, ‘We love them. They are great’, and, as you said yourself —

Ms GARNER — There are some good principles.

Mr LEANE — ‘Good principles, and it is easy for us to read’, so that is always a good sign that they are common sense and easy to understand, but with submissions like those from yourselves I am starting to wonder why they would not be mandated, that they have to be taken into account.

Ms GARNER — I suspect that – it does remind me, as I said, about when the DDA came in – that architects were nervous about it.

The CHAIR — Sorry, what do you mean by that?

Ms GARNER — The Disability Discrimination Act. Architects were quite anxious about being required to do this stuff. It has been probably heading on for 20 years. It is 15 years now, and it has almost become embedded in what we do, but we have moved beyond it being, ‘Okay, I have to provide a ramp that this wide’, and we have started to do Federation Square – okay, it is a platform; it is all at 1:20. It is a better approach. Our knowledge of it has got richer and we have got cleverer at it in trying to —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, trying to running a wheelchair over those stones on Federation Square.

Ms GARNER — I know.
Mr SCHEFFER — No, I am serious.

Ms GARNER — No, you are right.

Mr SCHEFFER — Anyway, let us not go there.

Ms GARNER — No, I should not, Fed Square is probably a very poor example.

Mr SCHEFFER — It is.

Ms GARNER — You have to follow – there is only a route that is at 1:20 so you have to know where you are going to do that.

Mr SCHEFFER — With a lift, they had a door that opened out for a while.

Ms GARNER — Right. Why they do not want it legislated or mandated, I think they probably just feel it is another set of rules that they have to adhere to, and a lot of designers like to say, ‘I like to be inventive. I like to have the capacity to invent new ways of doing things’, and maybe that is what their response is, and they are nervous about being told how to do it. I think that is probably one of the keys. I think the principles can be – I do not know if ‘mandated’ is the right word – expected, but I think designers should be given the capacity. It is a little like the way the Building Code goes these days – there are performance criteria. You have to prove via performance criteria that you reach an hour fire rating on boundaries. You do not have to do it in a particular way. You can do it in 20 ways, 100 ways, so there is no mandate to say ‘You must tick this box and build it in this certain way’, so I think the issue of it being expected or being mandated – it is probably the language, about encouraging the outcome rather than how to do it.

Mr LEANE — Pretty much those guidelines are along that line.

Ms GARNER — Yes.

Mr LEANE — They are not prescriptive to say use this material. It is, basically, these are the principles that you should follow.

Ms GARNER — Yes, which, as you say – the difficulty is in the critique of it or in the assessment of it or the design review of it. Someone would tick the box of a razor wire fence and say, ‘Great, that is doing that’, whereas we would say, ‘You have got to be able to find some other method of keeping people out – something vertical that has no toe holes is just as good, in fact better’.

The CHAIR — Or keeping people in.

Ms GARNER — Or keeping people in, yes, one way or the other. It is the principles of it and allowing people to come up with methods of meeting those principles, but then you still need someone to assess whether they have met them in the best possible way, which is where case studies or exemplars come in, because you can say, ‘Go and have a look at Nunawading station. Have a look at what they have done there and the way that the barriers have been broken down between A and B’, and it allows a designer to say, ‘Gee, that is not quite the same circumstance, but I think the principles of it can be used’.

Mr LEANE — Thanks for that.

The CHAIR — Given the time it is probably opportune to close this session. Thank you both very much, Jill and Kim, for coming here today.

Ms IRONS — You are welcome.

The CHAIR — We love what you are doing with the stations. It will look fantastic.

Ms IRONS — We wish we could do it across more things.
Ms GARNER — I tell you it is a bit of a battle for Kim because she is a lone voice amongst the train bodies.

The CHAIR — Right.

Ms IRONS — Sometimes we have to remind them they are people who get on the trains.

Mr SCHEFFER — What do they want?

Ms IRONS — The trains, and they do not really care.

Ms GARNER — Look, some are very good, and that goes to that issue of designing out and designing in, and some will design out because they know they have to because it is vandalism and it will cost them – there is graffiti, and there is the designing in, which are those positive aspects about encouraging positive behaviour. That is one of the barriers for us.

The CHAIR — Can I just ask – do you have an issue with the glazing, the glass, the kids running along and scratching?

Ms GARNER — There is that issue, but they have put a film on it now to allow for that to occur so that then the film can be replaced, and sometimes it is about strategic locations. It is, again, about not having a one-solution-fits-all, so sometimes it is about where do you put that glass where it is of the best value and the least likely to get that sort of damage, and when you are in a highly active – going back to that issue of activity – station precinct it is very hard for that behaviour to occur because there are a number of people around watching it. There are other strategies in place as well. Again, it is that not one-solution-fits-all; it is how you integrate all of it into the design thinking.

Mr BATTIN — Sorry, on a non-crime prevention section, you know how your roofs now are inverted – you get a lot wetter?

Ms IRONS — Yes, I know.

Mr BATTIN — I have got a lovely new station down in Pakenham, down at Lakeside. You get very wet wherever you stand on the platform.

Ms IRONS — I know. It is to do with the clearance from the drain.

Ms GARNER — This is how sad my life has become.

Ms IRONS — It is to do with the way that they clear the train lines. It is about bringing all of the water down to one location. I am sure you do not have to record this.

Mr BATTIN — Every word.

Ms IRONS — Heights of the PID screens – it is all quite complicated. I know it is fraught.

Mr BATTIN — I am using an umbrella undercover now, and you are not allowed to open an umbrella – it is seven years bad luck.

Ms IRONS — Now we have ramps at all of the stations, and people are saying to us, ‘Well, now we need roofs on all the ramps’, and I get this, ‘Why are you architects spending all this money?’, and I go, ‘It’s not me. You put the ramps in’.

The CHAIR — We had better close it there. Thank you very much.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome, Professor. Thank you very much for making your time available to this committee. I might ask our committee members to introduce themselves.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, member for Gembrook.

Mr SCHEFFER — Johan Scheffer.

The CHAIR — Simon Ramsay, Chair.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, member for Murray Valley, and don’t think I am rude if I leave at 4:00; I have another meeting I have to go to. I apologise.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Thank you.

The CHAIR — Shaun Leane and other committee members will be joining us shortly. I will have to read you the conditions around the evidence you providing at this hearing this afternoon. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I ask you if you have read and received the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees. You are nodding assent.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Yes, I am, thank you.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I understand Sandy has backgrounded you in relation to this inquiry?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Yes.

The CHAIR — Good. In relation to how we run this out, you have a small presentation to give to the committee, and then the committee will ask you questions. Is that all right with you?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — That is fine. Yes, it will be about 15 minutes. Is that okay?

The CHAIR — Now, we have allotted to 4.15.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Okay.

The CHAIR — As has been said by Tim McCurdy, he will have to leave at about 4, so he will just up and leave, and I apologise for that, but some of us have commitments during the afternoon. Thank you.

Overheads shown.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Thanks so much for the invitation to present to you. I am actually presenting also on behalf of my colleague Sarah Foster, who has contributed a lot of the data that I will be presenting. What I was asked to do was to talk about the impact of the built environment on health, so to take it from a health perspective. You may have already got that from other presenters, but that is the position I am going to be picking up. The issues I am going to raise with you are how the fear of crime appears to be directly and indirectly related to health and wellbeing, and I will talk you through that. I am going to show you the evidence that we have collected, showing that CPTED features reduce disorder, even in suburban environments – so not just in inner-city, but also if we can put CPTED into suburban environments, it will make a difference. Some evidence around how the presence of graffiti in parks decreases recreational activity, and I am going to talk briefly about implications for policy and practice.
How does fear of crime affect health? There are a number of pathways. It can be a direct pathway, but we think it is the – it constrains behaviour. People who are fearful are more likely to constrain their behaviour, particularly more vulnerable. We see this with older adults, and we see this also with children, so parents who are fearful constrain their children’s behaviour, so that can have an indirect effect on people’s physical and mental health. But fear of crime also constrains social behaviour. Social interaction protects people’s mental health. So people who have got more social networks have better mental health. So we are concerned that fear of crime constrains social activities. It causes psychological strain, which has a more direct impact – anxiety and unease. The other thing – because the built environment can – I will not go there. Sorry I will stop that sentence because I have got two slides with similar sorts of findings, but I am not going to go there because we do not have enough time.

What are the correlates of fear? The physically and economically vulnerable are more likely to be fearful, so older adults and children are more likely to be more vulnerable. Where we find in the social environment – there is collective efficacy – collective efficacy is when, for example, a parent is more likely to let their child walk if they think people in the neighbourhood will intervene. If they thought that if the child was bullied or there was a problem going on, other people would intervene, they are more likely then to allow their child to walk. But where there is collective efficacy there tends to be less crime and fear of crime, and that is because people think that someone is going to intervene. There are territorial guardians, as we say – that someone is actually taking notice. Collective efficacy is really important. Activities that can build collective efficacy – Neighbourhood Watch programs, those sorts of things, are important for these points of view.

The physical environment also affects fear of crime. Physical incivilities include litter, graffiti and vandalism. Obviously you know this; that is why you are having your inquiry. Then suburban incivilities – even the minor things that we may not take any notice of. House and garden maintenance actually has an impact on people’s fear of crime. This is important for the Department of Housing, for example, about how the maintenance of public housing and how that is looked after, because this can have an impact on how people perceive that environment. There is the ‘one in nine strategy’ of putting social housing in amongst other housing. If those houses are not well maintained, it actually creates an environment where people perceive it to be more fearful. In terms of land use, land use and fear of crime – that is an interesting one which we have been looking at. People who live closer to grocery stores have a higher fear of crime. If there are a lot of destinations nearby people feel less safe, so their safety is diminished. If there is a commercial centre nearby, there is not such an association, and that might be because a commercial centre could well be offices and things like that, so people are not so fearful there. What we now recognise is, obviously, where you have got land use and shops and services in a neighbourhood that promotes the presence and circulation of strangers, so more people circulating in a neighbourhood, people perceive a greater fear of crime. That is an important consideration.

The other thing we have looked at now is access to mixed use that promotes walking. If we have more communities where there is more mixed use, more shops and services, what we find is that people are more likely to walk. There is this tension between – if you have lots of shops and services, people feel a greater fear of crime because there are more people circulating in the neighbourhood, but mixed use is very important from a health perspective, particularly with chronic diseases. Chronic diseases include cardiovascular disease, some cancers, diabetes. It is incredibly important that we keep people moving, and having shops and services nearby is something that is actually really important from that perspective. Even though access to more services makes people feel a little bit more fearful, if we did not have those, then that would decrease their levels of walking, which would have a detrimental effect and health impact. What is interesting, actually, in terms of some of what our research is looking at – people may perceive more crime when there are more people circulating, but actually they can also report feeling reasonably safe. That is because there are more people circulating – they know that crime is likely in that neighbourhood, but because there are people circulating and there is good surveillance, they can actually still feel safe. There is sort of slight inconsistency in the evidence.
There is a lot of evidence about physical activity and the importance of the built environment in terms of walking and levels of obesity. Does the built environment – this is a Transportation Research Board report – does the built environment influence physical activity? Indeed it does. So the idea that we move to a point of not having shops and services near people’s homes would be detrimental from a health perspective. What we need to have is shops and services with all the crime prevention through environmental design built into it because we need to have people circulating, we need to have people physically active. Where we look at the evidence on the built environment and walking, for example, we know that in compact, high-density neighbourhoods, as opposed to urban sprawl – sorry, the other way around, so where have neighbourhoods with more urban sprawl as opposed to higher-density neighbourhoods we have lower levels of walking, we have fewer people using active modes of transport – that is, walking, cycling, public transport use – people drive more, more sedentary behaviour and increased levels of obesity. This is very detrimental health, so the idea that we could have mixed-use development with shops and services with good crime prevention through environmental design features that actually make feel safe would actually produce the optimal health impact, if we were able to achieve that. What the evidence tells us in terms of walking – we need much more of this type of design where there is mixed-use development, shops and services nearby, green leafy access to cycling, infrastructure and public transport. That is going to produce a much stronger health impact than the suburban development, which people might say they feel safer in because there are less people circulating, but actually from a health perspective that is actually producing quite a lot of harm. I guess, from safety perspective, the little image on the top there with the big walls that go along the main street, obviously that is not a very safe environment from anyone’s point of view, and it decreases walking. When there are no people circulating in those neighbourhoods it is bad for people’s health. From a health perspective, what I am saying is that what we need to be seeing is more mixed-use development which is convivial, good crime prevention through environmental design features that make it safe, but that is going to produce a much healthier impact than going for the suburban development, which people report that they feel safer in.

I am just going to talk through now the social side of how the fear of crime affects anxiety and unease and has a detrimental impact on people’s mental health. One of the things we have been doing some research on, or doing a literature review on, is the impact of density on health. I think this is a really important issue for yourselves, considering the growth of Melbourne and where crime prevention is going to fit into this. What we have found is that what we really need to have is at least 35 houses per hectare and 35 jobs per hectare to maximise opportunities for public transport and again to encourage people to walk and cycle. So we do need more density. The question is: how are we going to build that density to optimise health outcomes? On the right is an example of density being built in New Zealand, on the left in Perth – all sorts of different styles of density are being built, which can have a positive or negative impact on the health and wellbeing on the people who live there. I want to summarise for you the factors that are important from a crime perspective. We have looked at all the range of factors that need to be aligned to maximise the health impact. First of all, the building factors which are important, and from a crime prevention through environmental design perspective, getting this right is really critical as we build density in the cities. For example, incorporating crime prevention features such as territoriality, natural surveillance, transitional zones from the public to the semi-private to the private is really very important, so actually thinking about the way we are building buildings as we densify is going to become incredibly important if we want to maximise the health impact and reduce antisocial behaviour.

One thing that is often forgotten when we are building higher-density developments – and I am not sure what the legislation is like in Victoria, but across the country, this is a national report; I am not sure that it is consistent – is the requirements for governance and maintenance. That clearly is very important from your point of view for this particular inquiry because once you start to get degradation and any disorder in the building those who can move out do move out, and once they start to move out you get this cycle of degradation. Considering as we densify the city, looking at making sure that we have got appropriate governance and maintenance in place is really going to help maintain those buildings to
optimise the health outcomes for people who live there. Again, this idea that if you have got an environment where people start to constrain their behaviour because they are fearful, that is going to have a detrimental effect on their mental health and their physical activity patterns. This is, from a health perspective, why governance and maintenance are so important.

The other thing in terms of what we have concluded with this report we have written for the Heart Foundation is that we should be achieving higher density through lower rise, putting limits on the height of buildings, particularly for lower socioeconomic groups, mainly because they have less options to recreate, to enjoy —

Mr McCURDY — Can you still achieve around 35 dwelling per hectare on the lower

Prof. GILES-CORI — Yes. You can achieve high density without having to go high-rise. For example, if you think about all the social housing that we have got around Melbourne, there are huge setbacks, and it is because of the setbacks that you can use that land to achieve higher densities without having to go higher. Three to five storeys high could actually achieve the same sort of density, rather than the towers. Now, I am not talking about necessarily when we are building in the inner-city and you have got people living in the inner-city who can afford to have a lifestyle that can be outside of their home, but for those who have to spend a lot of time at home that can be detrimental to their health and wellbeing.

I think the other thing to consider as we are building cities – and this is related directly to your inquiry – is the opportunities to have age-appropriate recreational opportunities. What is being found in Sydney, for example, is that the inner-city housing is being occupied by families, even though the developers have probably built it for students and investors, but families are moving in, and there are no opportunities; there is nothing for the kids to do. Where you have got adolescents with nothing to do, you can imagine what they do – they get themselves into trouble. As we build and we densify the community we need to be thinking about making sure that there are age-appropriate recreational facilities, from children through to adolescents, so that when people live in the city there is something for them to do. The other side of, in terms of the factors that are important, is getting the building factors right, getting the social environment right, thinking about who is going live there, the management of crime, vandalism and disorder and carefully considering – which is not so relevant to you – the neighbourhood environment. Though what is relevant to you in this inquiry is – again coming back to adolescents, having something to do – locating higher-density housing near recreational facilities so that kids have something to do rather than having to just wander without opportunities for recreation. I think this is an important thing to consider as we densify the city.

I also wanted to talk to you about public open space, and that is part of the recreational opportunities, not just for higher-density housing but also in suburban environments, and the quality of that public open space can make an important difference, first of all, in how much the public open space is used and what impact it will have on the health and wellbeing of the residents. That is directly related to crime and disorder. For example, these are the sorts of parks that we see in higher socioeconomic areas, but these are the sorts of parks that we see in lower socioeconomic areas, both in terms of the amenity that is available but also in terms of their upkeep and care and the amount of graffiti that is present. In terms of a mental health perspective and why it is important to manage this, people who have access to higher-quality public open space have lower psychological distress so lower levels of depression. Even if they do not use that public open space, if they live in neighbourhoods which have got higher-quality public open space, our evidence suggests – this is in suburban environments – that they have enhanced mental health, even adjusting for the socioeconomic status of the area.

So the sort of work you are doing in terms of thinking about the sort of surveillance that is required to manage crime and disorder in public open spaces is important. This is work by my colleague Sarah Foster. This is looking at park disorder. Where there is no park disorder – this is the base, compared to if there is at least three different types of park disorder, so graffiti, broken glass, that type of thing – and where there is more disorder, where there is all the types
of disorder, the likelihood of doing any recreational physical activity decreases by about 60 per cent, as opposed to parks where there is good amenity, people who live in areas where there is good amenity are more than two and a half times more likely to recreate, and, again, with the absence or presence of lighting. Where there is more lighting people are one and a half times more likely to do recreational walking. Again, this is a public health perspective on how important it is to do recreational walking. Sarah actually did some work looking at suburban environments and created a CPTED index auditing the streets and looking at – did the houses have good visibility, did they have a veranda, a porch or a balcony, did they have low walls, a fence, hedges or borders to create some sort of territoriality, whether they had unkempt gardens or lawns and whether there were vacant lots. This is very important in new suburban developments. What she found was that, looking at the index, where people had the absence of these things – so they had no disorder, they had well-kept gardens, they had a fence at the front, they had surveillance, the likelihood of graffiti was down by almost of 80 per cent and the likelihood of disorder – that is, broken glass and skids marks on the road was down by about 90 per cent. Again, I guess, in terms of social housing, from a government perspective, where there is only social housing being built, it is so important to include these crime prevention through environmental design features within this suburban housing to prevent disorder.

I guess, in summary, what I have tried to present to you is that the fear of crime has both a direct and indirect effect on the physical and mental health of residents. Being fearful – people constrain their behaviour, both their physical activity behaviour but also their social activities, and that has negative impacts on the mental and physical health of residents. It can also have an impact on the physiological and psychological outcomes. All together, fear of crime has a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of residents. CPTED features – we have shown evidence, and I am sure you have been shown a lot through this inquiry – can reduce disorder and graffiti, and as we build and we densify that is going to become very important, and when are building higher-density development, the buildings – how much natural surveillance there is present, how much the transitional zones are built into the development so that we go from the public to the private and so people start to know who are those people are in the private space and should they be there. This whole issue of territoriality – where people have territoriality they have territorial guardians who can actually start to look out for that space. The CPTED features could be built into streets. They can also, as I have argued, be built into suburban environments, into neighbourhoods. It is important, even in suburbia, to have CPTED features built in. I think particular considerations need to be given to inner-city development as we move into a denser environment. I think getting this right now will actually save a lot of problems into the future – and, as I said, also suburban environments. There is a tension. I guess you can see that even in myself because I am sort of arguing on the one hand for building the health and wellbeing of the population but also recognising that where there is more retail, where there are shops and services, even though there are going to more strangers in that area which actually make people feel a little bit more fearful because it is not perceived as quite as safe, it is very important because it encourages walking and recreation and also social interactions. I think that is where we need to manage that tension, and that is where the crime prevention through environmental design becomes important to build that in, rather than constrain the retail. I think putting the big box shopping centres is not the solution for making safe neighbourhoods. What is much safer is actually when we have got the main streets, the sorts of suburban development which we have in inner-Melbourne, are really the sorts of environments which are optimal from a health perspective.

Residents’ perceptions of crime can be managed and improved, and the sorts of interventions that our evidence is showing are the aesthetics, the lighting, managing disorder, having traffic – although having some traffic is good because there is some surveillance – and also working on social cohesion, so the sorts of things about how you build neighbourhoods – Neighbourhood Watch programs, those sorts of things will help build social cohesion. I think that is another contributing factor that could help improve residents’ perceptions of crime. That is my presentation. I look forward to discussing any questions that you might have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. Any other questions, committee?
Mr LEANE — It is actually a really good graph, the one you showed about four slides ago. That one, yes.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — It is very powerful, isn’t it?

Mr LEANE — Yes, and it is sort of – there has been a bit of a lack of solid evidence-based material as far as implementing CPTED principles, so it is good to have that. It is good.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — It took Sarah a while to develop that, so I am sure she will be pleased to hear that. The other one, I suppose, which I think is also very useful is that – it is the sort of thing that councils could say, ‘Why would I bother managing park disorder?’, but it actually shows, in terms of recreational walking, that it is quite important. We have not looked at it in terms of mental health – actually I tell a fib because we have. Jacinta has looked at mental health in terms of – this is looking at park quality; we have not looked quite at the sort of level of detail in terms of graffiti, but where you have got parks with higher quality it is actually protective of people’s mental health. The idea that local government or Parks Victoria invests in public open space and maintaining and doing all of the disorder management is incredibly important.

Mr LEANE — It proves you get a return.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Exactly, yes. People would feel safer, obviously, and that is why they do recreational walking because recreational walking is a volitional behaviour; you do not have to do it. You know, like, if you do transport walking, you do not have a choice; you have to go and walk to the bus or you have to go and walk to the shop because you do not have a car, but recreational walking is something that people do by choice, and it is so protective of people’s mental health and their physical health, so it is, from a health perspective, incredibly important. Of course, where you have got more people using public open space it makes it safer. You have got more natural surveillance.

Mr SCHEFFER — We have been told by other witnesses, as Shaun was just saying, there is a dearth of research in this particular space. Did you design this all up yourself, or is it replicating research that has been done in other places?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — There has been more research, I think, done in inner-city rather than in urban environments.

Mr SCHEFFER — In Australia or generally?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — There is a little bit of work. Cozens – I cannot think of his first name.

Mr SCHEFFER — It doesn’t matter. It might be interesting —

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Paul Cozens – I have remembered his name. Yes, Paul Cozens does work in Australia, and there are a number of criminologists who are doing work. We have focused, I suppose, particularly from a health perspective, and I do not know that there is a lot of work done in suburban environments, so our work is quite unique in that sense. The evidence that I am presenting actually is based on a longitudinal study we have done, evaluating state government policy in Western Australia, called the liveable neighbourhood guidelines. Its whole purpose is to create a liveable environment which encourages walking, cycling and public transport use. So we have set up a study —

Mr SCHEFFER — That is all WA stuff, is it?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Yes, it is all WA, and it is all outer-suburban, which is not dissimilar – I mean, in terms of the environment, it would be similar to the north-west as you are growing the north-west of Melbourne. The work on density, the inner-city density, the work on the Heart Foundation reports that I presented, there are spots of evidence around there. We have pulled together a whole evidence base. There is quite a lot but in different
areas, but I would not say there is a lot of Australian evidence. We do not have Australian evidence – there is work from the US and the UK.

Mr SCHEFFER — But that is consistent with what you are finding?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — The lower-density stuff is relatively unique. We have not done work in Australia on inner-city development, but I think for this inquiry that is really important to get our heads around, because the evidence – actually I should put on the record that, as someone interested in promoting good health, I am very keen to increase density. I think we need to increase density, but I think what we need to do in Australian cities is really think about how we do that to maximise the health benefit and minimise the harm, and in fact that is indeed the name of the report that we have written for the Heart Foundation, ‘Increasing density in Australia: how do we maximise the health benefit and minimise the harm’. From a crime perspective – where we have got it terribly wrong – I mean, there are lots of examples in the US and the UK where buildings were imploded because of the level of crime and disorder that took place in buildings because they were not designed well, and particularly when we are going to put a lot of lower-income families in there, who do not have options to recreate or to make choices that people who are wealthy do. The home environment becomes incredibly important, and so designing that well with the issues of territoriality, transitional zones, opportunities for kids to recreate – I think we ignore that at our peril if we going down the route of density, although I am arguing that is clearly where we need to go. I think that is a really important thing for us as a state and as a nation to think about, but we need to do it well, and the point of that report that I have written is to try and align the building, the social environment and who is going to live there, managing crime and the geographic location.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thanks.

The CHAIR — Given your role on the design review panel as well, can you give some insight to the committee? What suggestions would you like to make to see greater use of the CPTED and safer guidelines – the principles and the guidelines in new development or redesigning, if you had that choice, public space?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — I guess, what Sarah talks about – she has done a lot of this research. I was her supervisor for her PhD, and she is probably more an expert on this than I am – what they talk about is there are target hardening activities, where you put the CCTVs up and you put all the things, the bars on the window but, that actually make people feel more fearful, and they constrain their behaviour even more. The alternative is actually to design it so that there is natural surveillance and there is circulation, there are the transitional zones – you know where you are allowed to be, and if someone is present who is a stranger that should not be, it is obvious that they should not be there. I would like to see it both in terms of the suburban environments – and that is why I mentioned it in terms of what government can do. I suppose there are a number of things government can do in terms of guidelines, but often, unless they are regulated, developers will choose whether or not they actually embed them. But where you can influence them, where —

The CHAIR — Do you want to make a comment on that as well?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — I would like to see that. I guess what we are seeing in our evidence – you saw the result yourself – where we have got six of those features present, the likelihood of disorder and crime decreases dramatically, so building CPTED into new developments so that there is territoriality, there is that surveillance, the houses overlook, rather than big walls out the front, we have shown in suburban environments – and these are new suburbs, they are not old suburbs – that it actually makes a difference.

Mr SCHEFFER — But where do you sit on the continuum of, on the one side, having it mandated and, on the other, leaving it up to a more nebulous good practice?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — I am a public health person. I am a social engineer, in that sense. In our evaluation of policy in Western Australia – we have been evaluating this state
government policy. The policy is actually very good. It was not mandated when we evaluated it; it was a voluntary code, and what we have found is that we have about 47 to 49 per cent implementation. Unless you have got mandating, then it does not get delivered. I would encourage you seriously as we densify to really build into the mandating of CPTED into those environments because I do not believe that will happen by itself. I think design is great, and that is what we hear from architects—it is all about design. It is about design, but let us get the design right, and that is about really trying to get that into higher-density housing, because when we have got concentrated numbers of people in suburban environments we have shown that it makes a difference. But where you have got a concentrated environment where we are likely to get more crime, I think building that in and putting in the mandating is important. I guess that would be my position. I would like to see it also—I mean there are simple things that you can do. The way you design a park—so rather than having all the houses backing onto the park; having all the houses looking onto the park, so you can see them from the street with the houses surveilling the park. Those little things can make a difference, so I would be suggesting that a degree of mandating is important to be able to bring the development industry along with you.

The CHAIR — Any other questions? My comment was about—I know we have seen a number of visuals today about the high walls against houses that back onto busy roads, and I suspect it is not all about privacy but also about trying to reduce the noise and vibration and impact of having a busy road. It is difficult to remove a solid barrier and still be able to provide at least offset of the impact of having heavy vehicles running up and down past your window every day. So there is a balancing act between trying to provide some security around your environment from the impact of roads, cars, vehicles as well as provide some security of being able to have a greater transparency, I guess.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — I understand exactly what you are saying, and I can see why that occurs. If you consider the way we used to build our suburbs, where we had the main streets, where on the busy roads you had the shops and services rather than the big box, then actually that might produce a better outcome.

The CHAIR — Rather than what?

Prof. GILES-CORTI — The big box shopping centres. The big box shopping centres take all the trade and put it there. It has become a very car-dependent sort of development where you have got what used to happen in Fitzroy and places like that—Brunswick

The CHAIR — The corner shop.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — You had the corner shop, but you had all the surveillance on streets. You had the shops on the busy roads and not all the houses; you had some housing above. In a way we have started to design, especially on the fringe, the sorts of development that makes it necessary to do the sorts of walls that you have just described. But if you consider, for example, Royal Parade. It is a busy road, but you see the design of those streets where you have got the little side streets and you have got streets broken up. St Kilda Road is a similar thing, which makes it possible to live on those roads even though it carries an enormous amount of traffic every day. There are different designs; it is just that we have gone down a certain route, which is probably not producing the best outcomes for the residents who live in those areas. Do you see my point? In some ways we have moved to a different sort of design, even though in inner-Melbourne there are plenty of examples where there are streets that carry large amounts of traffic but do not use that design.

The CHAIR — That is true. I suppose with technology, double glazing, things like that are removing those sorts of solid barriers.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — In terms of the report on the density that I wrote—in terms of getting the building right, I did not present that to you because it is not such an issue for this inquiry—you do get mental health problems if you do not manage the noise, and that is
managed through construction and design as well. But I think what is really critical is that we have moved to designing roads in a way that encourages traffic to travel very fast, and if we had local jobs, redesign the way we did our cities, where, the activity centres where there are more local jobs so people did not have to travel so much further, it could actually produce a better health outcome and would be more walkable, and you would have more natural surveillance. In a way it is about rethinking about the way we are building our roads. The engineers have got a bit to answer for.

The CHAIR — If it is any consolation, I am with you. I walk to work every day, but I am more worried about the cyclists that try to run me over as I cross the road.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Yes, actually separating the cyclists from the pedestrians and the cars is actually another important issue, isn’t it?

The CHAIR — It is.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — Beyond your scope?

The CHAIR — Well, no, actually. In another committee I am involved in – I am not sure if anyone else is, but we have been looking at that very problem, or car dooring, the sharing of the road between cyclists and motorists.

Prof. GILES-CORTI — If you take the Copenhagen approach, which is the separation – that you actually have real separation. I know, you have done a reasonably good job in Victoria, compared to other cities in the country, but still I think with the cyclists on-road is really quite dangerous. As someone who has cycled a lot in Perth, I have not got my bike out here. The cars travel too fast. But having the cyclists and the pedestrians on the street is clearly important from a crime prevention perspective because it provides all that natural surveillance. It is more convivial, more attractive environment where you have got the traffic count and the trees to slow the traffic.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much. We appreciate your presentation.

Committee adjourned.
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Mr SCHEFFER — Carolyn, thanks very much for coming along. Sorry we are a bit late and have kept you waiting for a few minutes. We have had a few things to organise. Our chair will be along in a moment, so I will just step in while he is away. Thank you for your submission. I think we have received it, so that is great.

Welcome to the public hearings of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken here is protected under parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. You have received and read the guidelines. We are recording the evidence, as you know, with Hansard. We leave it open to you, we are all ears and we are going to take what you say very seriously.

Dr WHITZMAN — Thank you very much. I am going to be very old-school and read my deputation, if that is all right.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Dr WHITZMAN — I am going to start off with some recommendations, the first of which may seem outside the scope of this particular inquiry, although perhaps not the previous inquiry where I did not have an opportunity to speak. The first recommendation, which I will justify in a moment I hope, is that the Planning and Environment Act, which began but was not completed during the previous government, includes the reduction of social and health disparities as a goal of planning, along with environmental resilience, economic viability and democratic and inclusive decision making. These four objectives should underpin every planning decision made at both the state and local government levels through establishment of state-wide, long-term and short-term baseline indicators and targets for improvement, the full integration of local government council plans, municipal health and wellbeing plans and municipal land use plans, such as municipal strategic statements and precinct structure plans—which has been called for at least since Environments for Health—and alignment of these local government plans and indicators with state transport, affordable housing and social health infrastructure planning.

The second recommendation will be a little bit more concrete: that a mandatory and easy-to-use health and safety impact assessment system be integrated into development assessment which combines design for safety with design for active transport and social inclusion, and which is administered by statutory planners who have received training in its use. Third, that specific pilot projects and designing for safety are more inclusive; that spaces in high-crime hotspots be evaluated in terms of increased use of public spaces and services, including such spaces and services as parks and open spaces, streets and public buildings such as recreation centres; that there be an increase in active transport via walking, cycling and public transport in problem neighbourhoods; also that there be an evaluation in terms of increased comfort use in these public spaces, particularly for certain population groups such as children, young people, older people, women, people with disabilities and new migrants.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. Over the next 15 to 20 minutes I am going to respond to several of the questions provided by the inquiry. I will begin by outlining my involvement in Victorian local crime prevention initiatives for 20 years, since 1991, and the reasons I focus on violence prevention rather than crime prevention. I will then address two main themes: first, how can public sphere and private sphere crime and violence be more effectively addressed in an integrated fashion at the local level by the planning system in Victoria; second, how can success be measured?

To give you a bit of background on myself, from 1989 to 1999 I worked as a senior policy planner at the City of Toronto where one of my main responsibilities was coordinating the Toronto Safe City Committee. The City of Toronto is a city of 2.5 million people that combines the responsibility of local governments with several responsibilities covered by state government in Victoria including transport, education and policing. This Safe City work,
which was recognised by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime as best practice, led to a number of tools being disseminated and adopted internationally. I spent several weeks in Australia in 1991, when I first fell in love with Melbourne, where I was a keynote speaker at a national conference on local governments creating safer communities. I returned for a longer stint, almost six months, in 1995 when I consulted with Crime Prevention Victoria as well as the national Safer Australia initiative.

Tools which originated in Toronto and have been adopted for use internationally, including in Victoria, include women's safety audits widely used by local governments, police and community organisations as community safety audits from 1991 to 2005, and design guidelines which strongly influenced Victoria's Safer Design Guidelines. From 2003 onward I have been a researcher based at the University of Melbourne and have undertaken extensive Australian and international research on safer communities. From 2006 to 2009 I was a lead investigator of an Australian Research Council linkage grant on Gender, Local Governance and Violence Prevention in Victoria, which had an advisory committee of health, planning and policing experts.

My work has also been the basis of several multimillion-dollar international initiatives led by UN-Habitat and UN Women on safer cities in the developing world context. I teach two subjects, Healthy Communities and Inclusive Cities, at my university, as well as an undergraduate subject and a couple of other postgraduate subjects. I provide guidance on how safer design principles can be included in one of the core urban design subjects of the professional planning course. I am giving you this information partly to excuse citing myself a great deal in this short submission. It seems a bit egotistical but I have been thinking, teaching and writing about safe communities for most of my adult life.

In this 25-year body of work I have focused on the local level of governance. As an extensive meta-evaluation of crime prevention has said, the most effective strategies focus on policies, practices and programs located in seven interdependent institutional settings: communities, families, schools, labour markets, specific hotspots, local policing and criminal justice. It makes more sense to tackle these issues in a coordinated local fashion. In Bogota, Colombia, an integrated design and social development approach to crime and violence resulted in a decrease in the order of 70 per cent in both violent and property crimes, including murder, from 1993 to 2005, from a much higher than national average to a much lower than national average. The city's credit rating has also increased and the city was able to collect three times the property revenues in 2002 than it did in 1990. As the Sherman report also makes clear, it makes no sense to separate incidents in the public sphere from incidents in homes and workplaces because they are so closely related in cause and impact.

I have also focused on the prevention of violence rather than crime, since violence is widely recognised to have huge social and economic impacts at both the individual family scale and at the community scale. Violence is one of the leading causes of death for people aged 15 to 44 years and in Victoria 'male intimate partner' violence is a leading cause of death, disability and illness for women aged 15 to 44. Safety and security is the single most important factor in the Economist Intelligence Unit's livable city rankings, in which Melbourne comes first, and the impact of a single violent crime, such as the murder of Jill Meagher earlier this year, has huge spillover effects on communities in terms of inclusive use and enjoyment of public space.

I have also argued that it is impossible to ignore gender when talking about safety and security in either the public or private sphere. According to the Australian 2005 Personal Safety Survey, both women and men most often experience violence committed by male perpetrators but women are more likely to be at risk in their homes from men that they know. Men are more likely to be at risk in public spaces, particularly near licensed premises. Women are far more likely, however, to restrict their activities in public space because of fear of violence. This phenomenon is related to everyday experiences of harassment and assault, most of which are never included in police statistics.
A recent survey done by the National Union of Students in 2011 found that 86 per cent of female students had experienced harassment in the form of verbal abuse, mostly from strangers, and 67 per cent of female students had had an unwanted sexual experience. Only three per cent of the women who had experienced assault or harassment had reported it to university authorities and only two per cent had reported the experience to the police.

Mr McCURDY — Did you say 57 per cent were unwanted—

Dr WHITZMAN — Sixty-seven, or two-thirds. I give this background as context for my first point. In my fairly extensive experience, both in Victoria and internationally, Victoria has gone from being in the forefront of crime and violence prevention to being on the back foot. Victoria was the first state in Australia, as you probably know, to establish a locally based crime prevention initiative in 1988. This initiative weathered changes of state government to provide support to council based initiatives through both VicSafe, which turned into Crime Prevention Victoria, and the Victorian Community Council Against Violence in the 1990s and early 2000s.

The Safer Streets and Homes policy in 2002 tackled violence in both public and private spheres in an integrated, locally based fashion. This framework, however, was dismantled in 2005, the same year that the Safer Design Guidelines were published. It is thus not surprising that the Safer Design Guidelines have, in my opinion certainly, been largely ineffective in implementation. Part of the reason why the Labor government abandoned almost 20 years of work in creating safer communities is that the focus in locally based planning for health and wellbeing shifted from injury prevention to health promotion. In other words, Victorian health promotion or Victorian local health plans moved from preventing injuries to preventing chronic diseases such as depression and heart disease.

It also moved from preventing particular one-off incidents, whether that be traffic accidents or assault, to a 'harm reduction across a life course' approach. This trend, which is reflected internationally, is not necessarily a bad thing for crime prevention. The Sherman report, UN-Habitat Safer Cities initiative and the International Centre for Crime Prevention all agree that the most important aspects of crime prevention are not necessarily labelled as crime prevention and that situational crime prevention is only one small part of a larger puzzle, which is why I am taking the big picture today.

Providing affordable and appropriate housing, access to social and health services and employment opportunities for young men aged 15 to 30, who are out of school and out of work, who are a particularly at-risk demographic group for crime and violence, are all effective violence prevention strategies according to the World Health Organisation. But there is also a strong role for planning and design in relation to a place management approach to crime and violence prevention and that unfortunately is what has been lost in recent Victorian policy.

The Heart Foundation's Healthy by Design guidelines, published in 2004, provide an excellent model of how safety and health considerations can be included in development assessment. Like the Safer Design Guidelines and my co-authored book Safe Cities, the considerations cover three sets of elements: seeing and being seen through measures such as improving sightlines, being able to see ahead and around you using a path, but also designing buildings to overlook streets and designing entrances so that they are clearly visible to passers-by. By the way, getting here was a good example in poor sightlines or at least less legible design. Secondly there is lighting, with a particular emphasis on places that are intended to be used in the evenings, such as areas around transport stops and main pedestrian and cyclist routes, and avoiding concealment and entrapment spots, particularly along main pedestrian and cyclist corridors.

The second set of elements are around knowing your way around, legible design to naturally orient yourself along a path or open space and easily find destinations such as public toilets and assistance; and signage to signal main paths and destinations and where to get help, particularly for first-time visitors. The third set of elements is around designing attractive and
convivial spaces: so encouraging land use mix to get more eyes on the street during day and night—getting apartments above active street frontages like convenience stores and cafes, getting housing near public transport; encouraging mutually reinforcing activity generators like cafes near playgrounds and laundromats and community gardens near or within parks and senior centres; shelter from rain and sun; seating, which is particularly important in places like bus stops and also important for older people; and maintenance and management practices that encourage a range of people to enjoy public spaces.

Most of these elements also support active transport—walking, cycling and using public transport—universal access for people with disabilities, and social inclusion and cohesion. Unfortunately, as I pointed out in previous deputations to the state government, for instance the inquiry into environmental design and public health last year, land use planners still lack clear direction from the Planning and Environment Act to prioritise health and social equity along with environmental sustainability and economic resilience. They find it difficult to include these concerns in their strategic planning and development approval processes. A simple, two-page, health impact assessment checklist, such as one used by the Design for Health project in Minnesota, US, could easily provide guidance on both health and safety concerns and development approval, but they will only be used by statutory planners if there is a clear legislative imperative for its implementation.

I chaired the Planning for Health and Wellbeing project at the Planning Institute for two years, between 2004 and 2006, and did an evaluation of that initiative. It improved training and research dissemination and vastly increased planners’ understanding of issues but not their ability to include health and safety considerations in their day-to-day practices. In 2002 it was 24 per cent who included it in their day-to-day practices. In 2005, it was 24 per cent. When asked about the reasons for this disconnect, the answer was virtually unanimous. 'It's not in the legislation,' respondent after respondent of 200 respondents said.

The inquiry asked about the role of Victoria Police in the implementation of CPTED. Information and guidance from the police is vital in decisions such as accumulative impact of licensed premises. Police, land use planners and social health planners all need to work together with local service providers, schools and other key stakeholders in a coordinated approach. But I would argue that the primary responsibility for safer design implementation should, in fact must, rest with land use planners and designers. This is because the overriding objective in planning for safe communities has to be a socially inclusive and cohesive community, not only a reduction in reported crime in public space.

Let me illustrate this in an anecdote from my time at the City of Toronto. There were many complaints about a small, public space adjacent to Toronto City Hall. This space was felt to be unsafe because it was occupied by people engaged in unacceptable behaviours such as panhandling, sleeping on benches and washing their clothes in the fountain. I asked planning students to do a headcount at several points during the day and the evening in this public space and another public space across the street, which generated few complaints. At 12.30 p.m., the peak use time, there were five people exhibiting such behaviours at the problem public space and 12 people exhibiting such behaviours at the safe public space. The difference was that there were no other people at the problem public space and about 100 other people sitting, eating lunch, chatting, playing and ignoring or perhaps not even noticing the problematic behaviours in the safe public space. The challenge, therefore, is not to clear out the people engaged in problem behaviours by removing the benches or fountains, as had been suggested by the police in this instance, but in finding other activities that can attract a range of other users who can leaven the mix.

The challenge of planning for safer communities also, as I have suggested, goes beyond safer design of public spaces to encompass affordable and diverse housing, social use and land use mix, employment and educational opportunities for marginalised populations at risk of violence and the provision of adequate social and health services that can act as safe spaces for people facing violence in their lives. This is a responsibility of strategic planners, although informed by police and other key stakeholders in safer communities. The increase specifically
speaks of the importance of CPTED principles in new, urban fringe developments and new high-rise developments and I totally agree with that, but I would argue that safe community principles must also be integrated in the transformation of middle suburbs into more diverse, environmentally resilient and more connected environments.

I have written about how an indicators led policy was partly to blame for the collapse of Victorian crime prevention initiatives after 2005. Simply put, the Victorian government simultaneously declared a goal of reducing violent crime as reported by the Victoria Police while successfully working with the Victoria Police to increase reporting of intimate partner violence. Unsurprisingly, assault rates reported to the police rose slightly in the period from 2000 to 2005. The state government found it difficult to spin this in a positive manner and the emphasis shifted to other, more malleable crime statistics, such as property crime.

Along with that shift, interest appeared to wane in comprehensive violence prevention initiatives. I have cited research indicating that both violence and subcriminal incivility such as harassment are greatly under-reported to the police, particularly by women. Using victimisation surveys, which the VCCAV did in the 1990s and early 2000s, to measure both incidence of violence and property crimes and a sense of safety makes more sense. However, I should caution that even after the murder rate declined by 70 per cent over 12 years, Bogota's 'fear of crime' rates did not drastically decline. But what did increase exponentially in the case of Bogota was use of and comfort in public space, which is a slightly different measure to 'fear of crime'.

Participation in the weekly Ciclovia events is in the order of two million people, which also supports 1,500 kiosks with 2,000 employees. As a result of Sunday and holiday Ciclovias, which is a time when car traffic is shut off and pedestrians and cyclists take over several hundred kilometres of streets, increase in pedestrian and cycling routes 24/7, the TransMilenio rapid bus transport system and car-free days, air pollution related to car emissions decreased by 40 per cent and traffic deaths decreased even more dramatically than murders from 1,300 in 1995 to 700 in 2002. Bogota's local government has been able to successfully combine social and health equity with economic development and environmental infrastructure improvements for a true triple-bottom-line approach that should inspire Melbourne's metropolitan strategy.

In Australia, the sense of being able to autonomously explore public space has been in decline for several years, with the most extreme declines occurring amongst children aged eight to 12. This is as much a result of concerns about traffic safety as it is about personal safety. Indeed, and as illustrated in the Bogota example, it makes sense to address these health promotion issues in an integrated way. The more a greater range of people feel comfortable walking, cycling, using public transport and lingering in public space, the more eyes on the street and intensity of use is generated in the public space. This can have a core traffic calming effect but also can have a huge impact on social cohesion and connectedness, on small business and on positive economic and environmental gains.

I have argued strongly in favour of the place based approach to particular communities and public spaces. In the case of specific place based interventions, I would recommend before and after and/or control and intervention observations of the number and diversity of users of public space, combined with locally based surveys on use and enjoyment of local spaces and services.

To summarise and conclude, safer design guidelines can and must be integrated with other health and wellbeing goals. Health and wellbeing goals should be a guiding principle of land use planning and design. Victoria can easily regain the position it once had as a leader in the prevention of crime and violence but to do so takes across-party political leadership and action. Frankly, the state government track record over the past two governments, whether it is the rather sad fate of the Safer Design Guidelines or inaction coming out of the inquiry into environmental design and public health last year, suggests that renewed vision and courage are in order from political leadership to successfully address public concerns. That is it from my written statement and I am very happy to take questions at this point.
Mr SCHEFFER — Maybe I will start off by picking up on the last point that you made and which you addressed a couple of times through your presentation. That is, you started off by saying in 1988 a lot of good things started but by the time we get to 2005 the Crime Prevention Unit is packed up and you get a disintegration of an integrated approach.

Dr WHITZMAN — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Then you ended up by saying that over the last two governments there had not been such good performance. I was intrigued to know why that was, what your take on it was, and you touched on the easier way of presenting stats. Could you just—

Dr WHITZMAN — Elaborate on it?

Mr SCHEFFER — The reason that is important I think is because if we end up getting sufficient evidence that it was better done before rather than now, and there was a bit of a hiatus that has now produced a situation where things are not all that good, we might want to have a good look at what was done in the past and use that as a bit of a model. If you could talk to us about what went wrong and why, then we could not do that again.

Dr WHITZMAN — Let me provide a sort of nuanced approach, because I have done a lot of work with UN-Habitat Safer Cities in developing countries over the past 10 years. There is a much more sophisticated understanding of integrated approaches, not only to crime prevention but to overall health and wellbeing. That has happened over the last 10 to 15 years. I would not want a simplistic return to the past. I would want to see—and really, Victoria has been in the forefront of thinking in this regard—an integrated approach towards planning for better health and wellbeing outcomes that would encompass safety. We cannot turn back the clock to an injury prevention approach. We can move forward using some tools that have been developed recently. The Heart Foundation guidelines in 2004 were really helpful. The national healthy design guidelines developed by the Heart Foundation, the Planning Institute and the Australian Local Government Association are terrific. The Design for Health guidelines from Minnesota have been fantastic.

We need to integrate both health and safety in municipal health and wellbeing plans. Municipal health and wellbeing plans generally are talking much better to council plans than they did before Environments for Health. Environments for Health, by and large, is a pretty successful example of an initiative that has weathered changing from a Labor government to a Liberal government. That approach could be strengthened to integrate crime prevention, which at the moment is seen as very much out of favour. I spoke to a couple of local health officers recently in the current round of health and wellbeing plans which are being developed this year. It is almost considered a bad look to include safety in an integrated way. I think it is because the safety work is seen as something that belongs to the past. Safety can be brought front and centre into a health and wellbeing approach and it needs to be done in that way, rather than by a 'back to the future' approach. Does that make sense?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

The CHAIR — Carolyn, can I just take this opportunity to introduce myself, and my apologies for being late.

Dr WHITZMAN — I understand that you had a funeral to attend.

The CHAIR — I do thank Deputy Chair Johan Scheffer for filling in. Tim or Shaun, do you have any questions?

Mr LEANE — I do, just on the bottom of your submission on page 5, and you have mentioned it in your response to Johan's question as well around the Design for Health project in Minnesota. We had previous witnesses recently, some experts from CPTED, who were saying they were a little bit against checklists. They said that with CPTED sometimes a little bit of knowledge can be a dangerous thing and they were very bullish about people needing to
be trained and the expertise needing to be there for it to be effective. Would that be a fair argument?

**Dr WHITZMAN** — Legislative imperatives/mandatory guidelines alone are not enough and training alone certainly is not enough. The two have to be seen together. Again from my experience in the Planning for Health and Wellbeing project, we had a really strong uptake from people who were attending workshops. Indeed, there was a much greater understanding but with the pressures on stat planners to turn around applications quickly et cetera, if it is not mandatory it is not going to happen. I think you are right that there is not a one-size-fits-all approach, which is why the situational crime prevention has to be combined with the wider approach towards social development, supportive community and health infrastructure et cetera. You cannot have training and expect it to be utilised without a strong legislative imperative to include these guidelines and you cannot have an informed use of these guidelines without good training.

To speak to Johan's question earlier, then the challenge is to come up with, for instance, pilot project interventions that can be evaluated in a strong way to show improvement and then take these pilot projects out wider. Even with mandatory development assessment, including health and safety requirements, it would be unrealistic to expect that you would see a turnaround in either reported crime statistics or use of public space over a short period of time. I think a certain amount of patience is necessary. I know that is sometimes difficult for politicians to accept because they are only in a term of office for a certain period of time and they want a clear improvement to be shown. Unfortunately, that is the only approach that works and in Bogota what you had was three successive mayors—well, one mayor came back—and they hated one another's guts, by the way, but they kept on with the approach and you started seeing some really dramatic results in about 12 years.

1988 was the end of the Cain government, the beginning of the Kirner government. Through the Kennett government into the early days of the Bracks government there was more continuity than change in terms of crime prevention, so I think you can have an approach that is relatively resilient to the changing government, but it does take a certain amount of leadership and courage to not throw out the baby with the bathwater.

**Mr LEANE** — Since the 2005 Victorian guidelines were developed, I do not think we have had anyone be really critical of anything in the make-up or the way the guidelines present themselves. How do you see them?

**Dr WHITZMAN** — In the meetings that I was a part of from about 2003 to 2005 there was a sense, to be perfectly frank—and I guess I can be because I am in an academic job—that the Department of Planning was going in a slightly different direction and saw the Safer Design Guidelines as a little bit of a distraction from the direction that they were going in. It was a difficult intradisciplinary/interdepartmental relationship, as I remember it. But the most important thing that happened in 2005 was the Safer Streets and Homes mandate, and it was 2002 to 2005. It was a three-year plan and nothing really replaced it. Crime Prevention Victoria, which could have provided some training, was disbanded and the Victorian Community Council Against Violence, which could have carried out those surveys, ended.

It was really frustrating, because I got my ARC Linkage grant on the basis that Safer Streets and Homes would be continuing and I would be able to work with local governments to come up with integrated violence prevention plans, and that did not happen. It was a very frustrating time.

**Mr McCURDY** — Are CPTED principles embedded in legislation in Ontario?

**Dr WHITZMAN** — In Ontario local governments are bigger and have more authority. They do not have a constitutional basis which is the same in Australia and Canada. Keep in mind that the City of Toronto covers 2½ million people and also the administration of the police force takes place at the local government level. It is more important to say that in a couple of successive strategic plans CPTED principles were incorporated. Also the Ontario
Planning Act has changed since I moved here 10 years ago, so I cannot speak about the provincial government plans.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sandy might need to correct me on this if I get the information wrong, but my understanding is that in the UK the police are the drivers of CPTED, the crime prevention continuum. Here it is planning. A couple of weeks ago we went to Palmerston North in New Zealand and we were talking to them about some of the things they are doing. They have a police officer, who is physically located in the local government office, who works with the planners and developers. In your view, who should drive it and how should it be structured so that it has maximum benefit?

Dr WHITZMAN — I hope that my deputation has made it pretty clear that I think that planners should be the drivers of it. There have been some issues in the UK, with tensions between police review of plans and implementation of new urbanist or mixed plan use and diversity of housing, and that is unfortunate. I can argue against it for both practical and theoretical reasons. From practical reasons, we went through a two-year trial period, where we sent it to police officers. We provided some training to police officers and then we sent out some key plans to police officers and the turnaround time was miserable. They were mostly local police crime prevention officers, and it simply fell to the bottom of their baskets, so it did not work very well in terms of timely return. That is a practical problem with it.

I think it is really important to have police referral, particularly in the case of something like licensed premises, but the theoretical reason why I prefer that it be in the hands of both statutory and strategic planners is that I think that they can take a nuanced, multipronged approach, which I think is really important. Shaun was asking about the two-page health impact assessment. It only goes so far. It is a pretty simple checklist. In general in Victoria there is a little bit too much of a distance between statutory planners and strategic planners—I would be the first to argue that—but I think that both statutory planners and strategic planners are used to juggling a lot of different balls and are able to come up with a more balanced approach than a police officer looking at a particular set of criteria would do.

Mr SCHEFFER — So that is an either/or. They clearly need to speak to each other.

Dr WHITZMAN — Yes, and it depends on the type of land use and the scale of land use. It is possible in a larger project that you would want to include the police, and certainly in the case of licensed premises it is important to consult with the police about, for instance, reported incidents of assault near other licensed premises and that sort of thing. But in terms of your day-to-day, garden-variety development assessment, which is incredibly important, and also the load of it—the number of development assessments in particular local governments is quite high—you would not want to abrogate the responsibility for looking at safer design principles to the police. I do not think they would be able to keep up with it and I do not think they would do as good a job.

The CHAIR — Carolyn, we are nearly at the time allowed. Can I thank you for your submission. I note in an article you did in the Age you talked about some cynicism in relation to yet again another submission to yet again another inquiry, so I do congratulate you for your perseverance. I think you will have some comfort in the knowledge that the submissions presented to this committee will in fact be acted upon in its report.

Dr WHITZMAN — Good.

The CHAIR — We look forward to the government responding to our recommendations, whatever they might be. So thank you for your work in putting another submission in, which we certainly look forward to embodying in our report. And, excuse me, I did come in late and it might well have been covered—and please say so, because we have talked about being frank and I look forward to frankness in response to this question—but we will be asking local governments whether in fact they implement the Safer Design principles in their planning regime, but perhaps importantly to us we want to know what are the obstacles or impediments to local governments in relation to their planners, if they do or they
do not. Can you give us some frank thoughts about why local government might not incorporate the Safer Design principles.

Dr WHITZMAN — Yes. It is not in the legislation, it is not in the legislation and it is not in the legislation!

The CHAIR — So the mandating is a powerful component of actually encouraging, through legislation, local governments to incorporate it?

Dr WHITZMAN — Yes. I think that the difference between ‘may consider’ and ‘must consider’ is terribly important to overworked statutory planners. So I think it needs to be mandated in the legislation if it is going to happen and I think that there is a critical lack of training. All of the issues in planning in Victoria really over the 10 years that I have lived here full time have been issues of implementation failure more than policy failure, although in this case certainly a mandatory legislative approach would help.

I have seen some really good practice examples. I think one of the questions was about good practice. The City of Maribyrnong, for instance, has had a really excellent integrated crime prevention approach and they have looked at some community centres in Braybrook, both the design and the programming in the community centres. Again, I do not think you can look at design solely without looking at programming of a space. I do not think you can look at design solely without looking at involving local communities and identifying unsafe places and how they can be improved. Having mandatory consideration of health and safety concerns is a must, but I also think that a holistic approach and one that looks at community participation and programming and management of spaces as much as it does straightforward CPTED, straightforward design, is the only approach that is going to work.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much.

Dr WHITZMAN — Thank you very much.

The CHAIR — Again we appreciate the time you have given us this afternoon.

Dr WHITZMAN — Yes, I would heed the next presentation as well! A very wise group.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome to the joint parliamentary committee on drugs and crime prevention, and thank you for your time this afternoon. Brett, I have you and Liz but I do not have Jo and Carmel. Is everyone speaking?

Mr DAVIS — I will generally speak to the submission but for any particular questions both Carmel and Jo can speak to those as well.

The CHAIR — Welcome to the public hearings of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you all received the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees? I am sure you have, from the nods. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. We now look forward to hearing your submission. Thank you.

Mr DAVIS — Thank you. Just to begin, I will introduce the team we have here. Liz Johnstone is the executive officer at the Planning Institute of Australia. We have Jo Cannington, who is an associate with Beca, and Carmel Boyce, who is a director of Equity Justice Access. My name is Brett Davis. I am a partner with SED Advisory but I am also here in my capacity as vice-president of the Planning Institute of Australia, the Victorian division.

I understand you received the submission this morning. What I intend to do is take you through some of the components but then we will make this more of an intuitive process which we can work through. So, just a bit about the Planning Institute of Australia in general, and I will refer to them as PIA for the remainder of this submission. PIA is the national peak body for planning professionals, with nearly 5,000 members working across Australia and abroad, and over 800 members in Victoria. We aim to serve the public interests of urban and regional communities through activities such as promotion of the professional interests of members, establishment and administration of a standard of professional competency, provision of training to increase members' knowledge—and that training occurs right round the state where practicable—facilitation of forums to exchange views and contemporary planning issues, and the advancement of issues to committees like yourselves, government, the community, private sector and academia.

Approximately 30 per cent of the members are employed in strategic planning development, assessment or other planning roles within local government, including social planning, community development and urban design. The remaining members are primarily involved in private consulting, state government, academia or are student members. Recognising that diversity, the members are able to join one or more of seven chapters which have been set up. The chapters are outlined below. We have representatives from all those chapters that sit on our working committee. Members are classified to their level of expertise. In addition, experienced members are able to complete further assessment to obtain what is known as certified practising planner status, which is ongoing training in amongst professional experience.

That is a bit about the Planning Institute of Australia itself. I will take you to our executive summary and then we will walk through the rest of the submission. The submission outlines our understanding of the CPTED principles. It explores the broader processes in which the principles are currently applied and responds to the questions you have posed. Our understanding of CPTED is that it is based on the three key principles of natural surveillance, natural access control and natural territorial reinforcement which is underpinned by maintenance, which we expand on in section 2. More traditional CPTED approaches can be punitive and alienating. We found that rather than harnessing community activity and surveillance by those, they are likely to assist so that perceptions of safety are improved and development is supported. Occasionally the application of CPTED principles can work against other policy objectives and can be poorly integrated into policy and decision-making.
frameworks and processes to properly balance the range of urban design and healthy design objectives that have been sought.

The role of planning is pretty complex in this regard and the relative influence of planners varies across the different built environments and contexts. As such, a formulaic tick-the-box approach adding referral requirement at the permanent assessment stage will be unlikely to reduce crime in a cost-effective way. By incorporating inclusive approaches using the diverse skills of the built environment professionals represented by PIA, targeted and tailored contextual responses will lead to more success. So the key messages are context: tailor and link the CPTED approach to the issue, community and place, being alert to unintended outcomes. Integration: a multi-agency and multidisciplinary approach is essential, utilising existing processes and guidelines which are supported by ongoing Safer by Design training for planners and related professionals.

Even in the lead-up to this session, we did have a fairly strong discussion in and around Safer by Design or training and planning. Jo, you offered some observations about perhaps where training could be of more benefit in this approach through the universities.

**Ms CANNINGTON** — Yes, in terms of understanding within the context of actually training our planners. Our understanding is that it is within a broader safety planning context and it is a week of a syllabus rather than a particular subject that focuses on it. The opportunity is there of training our planners so that when they get out and are qualified they are bringing that knowledge and the latest information to the workforce, as well as obviously broader training of established planners and the community at large about what is a safe place and what makes a safe place.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Can I just jump in? Shaun raised this with our last witness. We have been told by witnesses that really the planning around this is almost like a new discipline that brings in different skills and approaches from other areas. A small unit like you are describing is—I think your term was, 'A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.' Could you just reflect on that?

**Ms CANNINGTON** — It needs to be influenced through the whole of the university experience in terms of a principle. One of the challenges at the moment is people hear of it and think they can adapt it but do not know how to, and it is not required, so it is, 'What do we do?' In terms of its best fit, I think it is being used. I do not think it is a particularly new concept in the planning world. I have been using it in social planning for over 15 years in different ways. A lot of my colleagues are from New Zealand and they are using it all the time. It is about sowing the seed at that university stage but becoming part of best practice planning rather than it being this add-on.

**Mr DAVIS** — There is certainly a tie-back there to the end of our previous speaker as well, in terms of what reference, weight or status it is given in the planning framework. Correct me if I am wrong but it is probably more a bells and whistles view from somewhere as it is actually an essential part of planning for spaces. It is something that can often be challenged easily by a developer or a proponent if there is no statutory weight behind it as in, 'Why do I have to do this?'

**Ms JOHNSTONE** — If you look at some of the examples we have given under each of the three CPTED principles—we are on page 5 of 17—if you just run down those, it is quite clear which ones are best incorporated at the design stage by a proponent. It is not the role of a statutory planner to redesign a proposal. They can make suggestions and try to improve it but essentially they are tasked with assessing what has been put before them. When you get over the page you will see some of the other techniques that are really important around how public spaces are used; the programming and civic activities that can happen in those spaces, and the maintenance. They are clearly not directly within the realm of planning.

The education requirements are as much for the assessors as they are for the design professionals themselves and the community so that they have a fuller understanding of what
they should expect from their public realm and how they should be able to enjoy it. We have really tried to be clear that simply making it a requirement for some statutory planner to assess it on its own might improve the rigour and consistency of the assessment but it will not necessarily be a holistic solution.

Ms BOYCE — The other thing we should say, Liz, is that places are assembled over time and so are a product of multiple applications over a long period of time. If you take spaces like Sydney Road, for instance, you have the road put in in 1850, you have new bars opening in 2012, and you have a whole range of things that have happened in the intervening period, including trams going in, lights going in, verandahs coming on and off, new and old buildings going up and down, car parking being put in where housing has been in the past, housing being put in where old industrial estates have been. There is a point at which that assembly of things is not what it used to be and needs to be rethought. Some of that is an urban design issue and some of it is also about evaluating what is actually happening on the ground and thinking about, 'What is that, and how safe is that, and what could be improved in terms of amenity and the perception of safety?'

All spaces, except for greenfields spaces, when they are initially built have that issue over time, so all spaces should be part of the same rigorous kind of review and thinking. 'Is this what it used to be? Has this changed? Are the changed uses supported?' It is not about individual buildings. It is about a composition of place and rethinking what that might be in another year or five years down the track. Planners are part of that mix but not the drivers of that. Usually that is urban design or council officers who have issues with behaviour in public places, or it might be youth hanging out and at risk. It could be that it is difficult to get up the kerb because there are now old people who need pram ramps.

Ms CANNINGTON — It is about that cumulative effect of design in terms of changing one aspect in one environment does have a flow-on effect and can make a safer place or a less safe place because of that one thing. That flow-on effect in that context is really important.

Mr DAVIS — Did you want me to take you through our understanding of the CPTED principles or are these things that have come up in other submissions? I am happy to take you through in more detail or we can move through to I suppose what we just got into, which is the role of planning and planners.

The CHAIR — We do not intend to go into detail about CPTED and its principles because they are pretty well confirmed. Our brief is about the Safer Design Principles and why they are not being utilised by councils. We have heard a lot about training and education, planners for local government. If you would like to make some commentary more so about that than CPTED, I think it would be more useful for us and also an opportunity to ask questions. As the hearings roll on we are gathering more evidence and we are becoming more aware of certain things. I find these hearings are better for us to ask you about things that have come before us that are in your field of expertise.

Mr DAVIS — Yes.

The CHAIR — I am more than happy if others want to contribute and then perhaps open it up to the committee to pull out some of the detail we are looking for, if that is all right.

Mr DAVIS — That is fine. With that, I will take you to page 8 of 17, which is our section 3 on the role of planning and planners. As Carmel spoke about just then, it most definitely goes beyond just planners. About halfway down the page there, currently the planning system, in our view, is generally characterised by its complexity and process. It claims to be outcome driven but it is quite a complex system to get to those outcomes. As such, there are high transaction costs and delay. These are caused by culture and practice, rather than structural factors.
The system in Victoria does enjoy a number of strengths such as the ongoing commitment to strategic planning and policy development. You have heard of, and we will discuss in this submission, some of those policies that exist out there. There is significantly improved growth area planning, so planning these places from scratch has come a long way. Integrated land data and mapping are underpinning the planning system and being used to help inform an evidence base when making decisions. There is the state-wide system of Victorian planning provisions, the extensive use of SPEAR, which is the streamlined planning through electronic applications and referral for subdivisions and the like.

The policy and administrative challenges faced by the planning industry include things like affordable living; tensions between local, broad and state policy objectives, so local and state conflict; integrated effective and efficient infrastructure and land use planning and, more importantly, the delivery of that. It is well and good to plan for it. Ultimately it needs to be delivered. There are also the whole-of-government approaches to policy development and implementation and bipartisan agreement of longer term planning objectives.

The key roles of planners in Victoria include both strategic and statutory. Certainly there are a number of disciplines but focusing on the strategic and statutory side, planners try and influence the future by imagining a future, then adopting the actions to achieve that. Strategic planning is the longer term arm and vision focus that includes the preparation, maintenance and amendment of municipal planning schemes, policies, activity centre structure planning and the like. Statutory planning primarily consists of the preparation of planning permits for their assessment, as well as enforcing compliance with those planning schemes. Probably a little bit more as an aside to that, the enforcement of planning schemes across the board is probably something that is sorely under-resourced. It is something that could also help in that contributing of auditing of places as they change over time, again from the example that Carmel gave of Sydney Road.

Other more specialist activities relating to planning include urban design, heritage transport, landscape architecture, social, economic and environmental planning. Between them these disciplines provide expertise in understanding people in place, environments that reinforce and celebrate cultural values, support healthy living and design opportunities to support, importantly, activation in the public realm.

Other submissions have probably spoken of Jane Jacobs’ ‘Eyes on the street’. Informal surveillance is just as critical as formal surveillance in these places. The role of planning is primary and critical for greenfield situations and larger urban renewal sites but is complementary to health and other community development activities for dispersed development. The role of strategic planning in crime prevention is most important for planning in general and for mixed use and commercial areas. It creates land use diversity, hopefully safer and more inclusive places.

I will skip through the rest of that and take us to the key messages on page 11. The key messages include: context, tailoring and linking the CPTED approach to the issue, community and place—it is not a one-size-fits-all approach—being alert to those unintended outcomes and having the multi-agency and multidisciplinary approach and utilising existing processes and guidelines where applicable, supported by ongoing Safer by Design training for planners and planning related professionals.

In tailoring the approach to the issue, we cannot stress enough that it is important to consider every situation in context. Planning often falls victim to cut-and-paste template type design solutions, and certainly in a CPTED type environment that is not an outcome that is desirable or practical.

For new greenfield or brownfield areas the importance of strategic planning is critical to the functioning of those areas. In established areas, and as greenfield areas develop, social planners and community development workers play key roles in developing those communities and establishing how public spaces can be used by all members of the community. Certainly a number of developers seem to have heeded that message now in
greenfield situations, and there are community planners or community planning consultants on board from day one working with the community as it grows or the councils themselves are allocating particular community planners to work on board, and Selandra Rise is one that comes to mind in the Casey growth corridor.

Gender, age and race are also important and manifest spatially. Family violence remains a serious concern, particularly in the fringe suburbs, and is not often apparent in straightforward crime statistics. Crimes against young men and other racial or ethnic groups can also be localised, requiring a tailored response. A tailored approach relies on understanding the issues and the opportunity for influence. Critically, evaluation of planning outcomes over time is necessary at a neighbourhood scale. Comparative indicators established by Community Indicators Victoria provide that data at an LGA scale. These provide an opportunity for comparative analysis, but detailed local data is necessary to understand the local neighbourhood conditions.

Being alert to the unintended outcomes: traditional CPTED approaches have been more likely to criminalise or alienate behaviours—that is, skateboarders, graffiti artists, taggers, public drug users, sex workers, youth loitering in train stations and so on—by excluding those groups and moving the behaviour on. An interesting analogy that one of the people working on the Geelong waterfront development gave was that a group of eight- or nine-year-olds together in a space are considered to be playing; if they are 14 or 15, they are considered to be loitering. It is just a community perception type of approach. Certainly the Geelong waterfront is an example in and around that. It is partially a skate based park but it is also an open and collaborative space that attracts all demographics and all age groups, successfully.

The Healthy by Design principles prepared by the Heart Foundation encourage planners to consider a wide range of guidelines impacting on health, safety and access, using the Matrix of Like Design Considerations which allow for the synergies between different guidelines that affect and influence the built environment. The increasing use of cumulative impact assessment recognises the need for broader impacts external to the site to be considered. This is another important point. A lot of statutory planning applications are concerned with 'the site', not necessarily the other sites in and around it, unless it is something like a liquor licensing application or a nightclub. So the cumulative impact assessment is a critical tool.

The pursuit of a single objective can at times have unintended consequences. Some CPTED approaches focus on safety around traffic and graffiti prevention, which can then create barriers to use and enjoyment of a public space. We do not want just sanitary public spaces either. You can go too far one way in trying to make a safe space; it ends up being a space that no-one is attracted to.

Safety audits required for development stop at the title boundary. However, impacts are often external to the site.

Then we have the multidisciplinary approach which we have touched on, dealing with other agencies such as the Heart Foundation, VicHealth, VicPolice and the community sector. We answer one of the questions later in the submission around perhaps a role there for the Victorian Design Review Panel as well, which has had a collaboration of a number of design professionals to assist in targeted intervention.

Using the processes we have, on page 13: working with the Healthy by Design and Safer Design guidelines to integrate safety objectives into methodologies, cautioning that another layer of assessment and additional guidance would unnecessarily add to the time and cost of decision making and work against a comprehensive and effective response.

VicPolice expertise has a significant value on this crime prevention—I am interested in your questions at the end of the last submission—and their input to the larger scale strategic planning processes is very useful. It is also critical for an application of a type or scale, such as licensed premises and gaming, which result in detriment or in a location where crime may already be a problem.
That is where we will stop and we will open it up for questions or clarifications with yourselves. We have also provided some answers to the terms of reference for your own review, but we welcome some questions.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you, Shaun.

**Mr LEANE** — On page 13 you say it is undesirable to have another layer of assessment, and I appreciate that. With the Victorian Safer Design Guidelines—and I do not know what your view is—it seems that most people are happy with the actual guidelines and the structure and there is no problem with that. Where would be the problem in that actually being called up somewhere in the planning act? It has actually been called up, so it has to be taken into account when—

**Ms BOYCE** — If you think about your public health department, they use the social model of health and they say health is a social construct. One of the components of health is safety, both community safety and safety in the home. If you include in the Planning and Environment Act that planners have to consider a healthy built environment, safety is a component of that. So it would not necessarily be a trigger for it, but at the moment they say people 'may consider social impacts' and they do not even mention health, so safety is not even on the agenda. Although they sit on the DPCD website and are interesting for new buildings, there is no requirement to move beyond that to consider safety in any other built form consideration at all. Sometimes safety is taken into account and some people place enormous importance on the consideration, but it is voluntary and it depends on the attitude of the developer or the project proponent.

People like MPV, for instance, in delivering re-gen projects will spend an enormous amount of time thinking about social considerations and how they play out in the built environment. Jo works with Devine Property Developers and they do too. We have heard that Selandra Rise do as well. I am sure the growth areas consider safety as part of their planning but if you spent time auditing developers, you would not get a consistent approach. Even at local government, you would not get a consistent approach. Some local governments will be quite good at it and others will not have thought about it. But there is no compulsion, at the moment, that requires anyone to think about it.

**Mr LEANE** — Yes, I understand. I suppose that is the question I am asking: what would be the issue as far as for PR if it was actually called up in state planning?

**Ms JOHNSTONE** — Currently section 60 of the act says 'where the circumstances appear to so require, may consider social effects'. A lot of people have argued that 'may' should be 'must'. The argument would then turn to, 'What circumstances appear to require it?' and it would simply shift the debate to another point. I think the Productivity Commission found over 1,000 equally valid objectives in the VPP that planners had to consider. So considering it and giving effect to the outcomes that are intended are often different things. What we are saying is, the requirement—without the education, the training, the awareness-raising of the community, the industry and the professionals—on its own is token.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Just going back to that section, could you read it out again?

**Ms JOHNSTONE** — Section 60 says 'where the circumstances appear to so require, may consider'.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — What if that preamble to the sentence was knocked off?

**Ms JOHNSTONE** — And said 'in all circumstances must require social effects'?

**Mr SCHEFFER** — For argument's sake, because would there be a circumstance where you are entering into the planning of a development where you would not consider it?

**Ms JOHNSTONE** — There should not be.
Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, so couldn't that cover it: 'Everyone needs to'?

Ms CANNINGTON — I guess then the argument is, how much do they need to consider it? At what scale? I think the challenge at the moment is, you have stat planners who are incredibly overworked, under pressure, they have all these different pressures on them and in many cases it is the community that helps them prioritise what they consider with all these 'mays' throughout the planning process. So if there is a particular area and a lot of objections on a particular issue and safety might be one of them, then in that instance that might be on the agenda and it might be considered in great depth. In another area, it might be about traffic, so then safety gets pushed down the priorities.

I think all of these policies are sitting at the same sort of level and it is then up to the statutory process, the stat planner, to then decide what priority takes precedence for this particular site. I think the opportunity this inquiry gives us is a position to say, 'It is about putting it back on the agenda and making it just part of best practice,' and the language might need to be overtly around that for a little while to get everyone back on it, get that back on the agenda.

Ms BOYCE — But the other thing that section 60 raises is, if you say 'social', then you start saying, 'What are the social considerations?' Are they about people and place? Are they about safety, about health? You almost need to define what those are, the subcomponents of social, because some people will just count people walking through a place and say, 'Oh yeah, that's highly activated. Great.' It might be dirty, uncomfortable, ridiculously hard to use, but people can and they do and so, 'There you go.' So just mandating 'social' does not give you a very complex or nuanced approach. We have been talking in this about place based solutions that have nuanced approaches saying, 'Each has its own particular'—I do not know if it is vibe or the way it works—that needs to be thought about. It is a unique composition of numbers of allotments joined together.

Mr SCHEFFER — Why is health and safety just one of a number of factors? Would you consider there is a hierarchy in these? I understand what you are saying about the traffic and the situation specific dynamic, but health and safety is much different, isn't it?

Ms BOYCE — If you look at a social model of health, there are a whole range of factors—maybe, I think, nine—and one of them is having sufficient income. Another is having a decent home and whatever. If you think about it, lots of social issues occur in the built environment in places that are effectively ghettos, because we have a whole range of people with incredibly low incomes, low social skills, low educational outcomes and high health issues amassed in the same place.

One of the issues about developing safer places—and if you look in the earlier stages of this, one of the key issues for planners in general—is about delivering affordable housing. But it is not just affordable housing, it is affordable housing that is integrated into the rest of the environment so that you do not get that coalition or massing of issues together. If you address the affordable housing issues and the integration of affordable housing, you might well get crime reduction anyway, without even having to think about crime. That is why we are saying nuanced, because there are a whole range of ways to skin a cat and in crime prevention one of them is dealing with the underlying issue rather than the presenting issue. If we could do that, or if we could think about that approach, then we could probably get better results.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just on that, because it comes from what Shaun was touching on, everybody tells us the Safer Design principles are terrific. They get a tick. They are great. In New Zealand, we had people coming to Victoria because they thought we were such big leaders—maybe not world leaders, but pretty good—on this CPTED. Then we thought, 'Oh golly,' because we have a reference that tells us that people are not using these guidelines to the extent that the powers that be think they should. You are reflecting some of that back. So if you look at your membership, your planners, many of whom are located in local government—I think one of you touched on a hypothetical audit before—and you now had to think how many of them would use the guidelines in the most constructive way, given all the qualifications you have said, what would your response be?
Ms BOYCE — We would say maybe of the composition of planners, the only people that would necessarily use them are stat planners in an organisation that supports their use.

Mr SCHEFFER — And do they?

Ms BOYCE — And social planners, I would say.

Mr DAVIS — I would probably qualify that: in general, it would be a low rate of usage. The good developers would have a social planner as a part of theirs. The councils that have a policy focus that relates back to the guidelines would also use them. But as an assessment tool, there is not a high rate of take-up.

Ms JOHNSTONE — I think you need to also remember the points of influence across a council, because they are not just limited to the planning process. There are the owner and manager of a lot of assets. They provide public spaces and maintain them and program their use, so my perception has also been that those guidelines are talked about and thought through when they are developing some of their open space strategies, when they are looking at how they scope and design improvements to streetscapes. Whilst you might not see them at the tail end, the wrong end of the pipe, at the permit assessment end in local government I think they are much more of a corporate planning tool. Whether there is sufficient training to broaden their understanding and how they are applied in councils I think remains a challenge.

Mr SCHEFFER — From the point of us gathering evidence, what I am having trouble with is that I think I understand the complexities that you are describing—I think we all do—but given all that, others have said to us, ‘Yes, it’s definitely better to mandate it.’ I am not getting that reading from you, which is why I am very interested in what you are saying.

Ms JOHNSTONE — Would you mandate it as part of the framing of the council’s Public Health and Wellbeing Act?

Mr SCHEFFER — What do you think?

Ms JOHNSTONE — My observation—and because I am new in the job I can probably get away with saying this now—is that people like to put things into planning processes because it is cheap, you do not need to go through a regulatory impact statement, and the effect of it is felt slowly over time. That is part of the strength of using planning processes but it is also a way of feeling like you have done something when you actually have not done much. I think the health and safety are outcomes and the net community benefit methodology is core to planning processes. There is a range of levers and in established areas with entrenched behaviours the strategy will need to be a different one and the role of planning low. But if you are building a new area or you have an opportunity to transform a place, the role of planning is high.

Mr SCHEFFER — Is that why you push the training, saying it is about a cultural change and you can mandate it if you want but it is not going to get you your outcomes? Is that what you are saying?

Mr DAVIS — That is right. The planning industry itself is certainly going through that reform and review and introspective look at the moment. A lot of it is based in and around trying to free up the system or streamline the system. We say in our submission here that adding another layer just for the sake of adding a layer could also then add into that cut-and-paste response, ‘Oh, I’m just going to do my community impact assessment,’ tick, tick, tick, tick. It is the nuanced model that we advocate, which is that there are particulars. It is an organisational approach; it is not just lying in the hands of a statutory planner at the end of the day.

Ms CANNINGTON — The other thing is it is about increasing the knowledge within communities as well in terms of their understanding and expectations of what it should look like. That then feeds back into council. It is about the councillors understanding what it is all about. It is about the whole network of decision makers and influencers, understanding the
opportunities. It is not left for one person to be ticking a box to make sure it happens. The people with the applications are incorporating it to start with. They can see the benefits of it.

The CHAIR — We seem to be at a stage where we have different points of view in relation to mandating but we have a consensus about training, it seems, from all the witnesses we have had so far. I am wondering, where is the intervention in providing training and at what level and by whom? Should it go back into the courses that planners go through initially or will people get a sort of brief along the way in their journey? If we had to make a recommendation to parliament in relation to, 'Well, we might consider mandating but there is a way to reduce some regulatory impact to local councils and staff et cetera when we talk about training,' what sort of a recommendation do you think we should made?

Ms BOYCE — DPCD runs a whole lot of training every year for planners.

The CHAIR — In relation to the Safe City guidelines?

Ms BOYCE — No, but it could.

The CHAIR — So it could just be an appendage to the training that has already been conducted through a DPCD?

Ms BOYCE — And you might give credit to it somehow. You might endorse it in some way. You might require planners, over time, to all go through it. You might say, 'Planners making these sorts of decisions need this sort of certification.' You could do that.

Ms JOHNSTONE — That is the PLANET program and it is a very good place to start. It does training in a whole range of important new government initiatives or things that are seen as important policy areas.

Ms CANNINGTON — The other thing is that the training is across the whole spectrum but it is also across your experience level so that we are keeping up to date with the latest knowledge bank. We mentioned here that even CPTED itself has changed over time and we need to keep training and keep people aware of those learnings. CCTV is a great example of how one thing can be the buzzword for the time. We know that could be one element of a safer place but it is not the answer to everything. It is about trying to keep that level of knowledge up to date.

Mr DAVIS — It certainly needs more than a week in an undergraduate course over a year. Ongoing training is something that the institute would strongly support. It is not even probably once a year. As Jo said, it is different levels and it is calling in not just the planners. It is calling in the engineers, it is calling in the architects, the designers, and having that collaborative multidisciplinary approach to place based solution.

Ms CANNINGTON — And possibly having Victoria Police as a partner.

Mr DAVIS — Definitely.

Ms CANNINGTON — VicHealth, Heart Foundation, all those people who are currently building up their knowledge banks so that we can be sharing information.

The CHAIR — We are at the end of our time, unfortunately. I would love to ask you a few more questions but we have a busy schedule this afternoon, so I thank you all very much for your time this afternoon.

Mr DAVIS — Thank you.

The CHAIR — We appreciate it and we will make the report available to you once it is tabled in parliament. If there is any further information you think could be useful for the committee, we would gladly accept it. Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I understand you have received the terms of our inquiry and have responded on that basis.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes.

The CHAIR — We have allotted time till 3.30 but we appreciate we have already encroached on some of that time.

Mr HARDYMAN — That is all right.

The CHAIR — Being chair, I can be a little liberal about that, but we will try and keep it as close as we can to that time.

Mr HARDYMAN — No problem.

The CHAIR — Would you like to make a presentation to this committee? Then we can ask you some questions.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes, if I can. What I thought I would do is try and scoot through fairly quickly and then leave as much time as possible at the end for questions.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Mr HARDYMAN — I probably do not need to go through too much of my history, but essentially I am a director of design at Urbis. Urbis is a national firm with social planners and planners, so we have quite a broad view of this sort of topic. I have been a landscape architect for 25 years. We do a lot of work in the public realm, so what I am about to say is very much at the pointy end of the spectrum. I make things. I do not write about them — I am not a report writer — and I am probably at the opposite end of the spectrum to the people that you have just heard from that are much more at the legislative end of things.

I am about to talk about physical and not so much social issues, and quite site specific. What I would like to do is talk to you specifically about two projects that our office has done in Queensland that are significant urban places that address a whole lot of these sorts of issues that you have been focused on. One is King George Square, which is right in front of the town hall in Brisbane, so Brisbane’s main civic space, and the other is Chinatown Mall, which is in the heart of the nightclub district in Fortitude Valley, which has quite a different set of social issues that it addresses.

I am going to try and touch on the key principles and then at the buck end maybe run through some of the challenges and opportunities that might come out of what we have seen. I thought I would just jump right into the issue at its simplest form from a designer’s perspective. As a purely physical form, the design of public places from a CPTED perspective is about permeability versus impermeability. It is about physical permeability, so being able to physically walk in and out, and it is about visibility. Really that it is it in its simplest form.

Overheads shown.

Mr HARDYMAN — In plan form at the top there it is probably indicative of, for example, King George Square. Previously there were a lot of hidden little nooks and crannies
where people could get up to all sorts of mischief. Open the place up and those sorts of issues start to decline. At a micro scale those bottom little diagrams again identify quite a simple issue. There are three layers of urban spaces from a planting perspective. There are trees, there is a mid-layer and there is a ground level. It is the mid-layer that is the key issue. If you take that out it resolves the majority of these issues. It is an incredibly simplistic perspective. So if you take all the shrubs out you end up with that and a huge number of your issues go away, both physical and visual. The other thing that starts to come into play when designing spaces, certainly in Queensland, has come about from this new Safety in Design legislation in the last couple of years that is placing a lot of onus on designers to create places that are safe but also the construction of those being safe. It has taken the onus off builders, for example, and is trying to place it back onto designers.

So, King George Square. As I said, it is the main civic space of Brisbane. It was built in the mid-1930s. It was untouched for 33-odd years until the end of the 1960s, when it was done up and a car park built underneath it. The design that had the majority of the social issues was the one from the late sixties. It existed for 36 years until about three years ago when the new mall was opened. In a similar way to Federation Square, it has had plenty of controversy and continues to to this day. In literally the last week there has been ongoing media about it. It has sparked a lot of discussion in the general public, and from a public not particularly focused on talking about the design of public space.

That gives you an overview of the space. On the right-hand side here is the town hall. The main shopping mall through Brisbane is right here and there is a large shade structure that has been built. Essentially this space is generated as a civic space for activities. There is a lot of movement through the space and inherently it has generated a very permeable space. You can see right along this edge there is almost nothing to stop people going through the space, and in a similar way along this edge. There are no nooks and crannies. I will get to some of the downsides of that later on. It is not all about it being totally open because there are clearly some design issues that people feel strongly about that this does not quite generate in their views.

What I have tried to do is indicate some before and after types of images and issues. On the left-hand side is the pre-renovation—limited casual surveillance. I probably do not need to go through the issues around that with you, but being able to see from outside in. There were plenty of visual obstacles. There were bits of substations and bits of that mid-level planting. There were no CCTV cameras. On the right-hand side we end up with significantly more casual surveillance. There are CCTV cameras. There is the insertion of cafes and restaurants, so you get that activation. You get people sitting there watching other people doing antisocial things. That activation becomes one of the most significant components of the design. Lighting is also critical. Lighting and CCTV you would probably term as the technical or mechanical surveillance as opposed to the passive surveillance that you get from diners and cafe users.

There is another level of active surveillance and that is clearly the monitoring of it from security and police. One of the things that has been very interesting in both these projects is the very strong collaboration between the council's Malls Management staff and security staff and the local police. In talking to both groups, they are saying the same things and they are working very closely hand in hand. Again, chances for entrapment: on the left-hand side there are nooks and crannies that used to exist where people would get up to mischief. It was a matter of removing those and turning them into thoroughfares, so making sure that people move through those spaces; so limited chances for entrapment, removing clutter on the ground plane. That comes down to simple things like a million signs that people come and insert over 30 years, thinking they are doing a good thing and looking after their mall and putting up a sign to do this and a sign to tell someone to do that. By the time everyone has done that for 30 years, you cannot see from one end of the place to the other. Chinatown was a particularly good example of that—probably the best example I have ever seen of it.

You may be aware of the term 'place making'. The term 'place making' has really gained a lot of momentum in the last couple of years. To me place making is landscape architecture
overlaid with public space management and activation. As a landscape architect I make the place and I make it capable of being activated. To me that is the critical thing. If you can activate it, get events going on in here, get cafes, get shops, get restaurants, you inherently attract people and those people stop other people doing the things that we are all trying to stop. A lot of older public spaces do not have any facilities to manage events. They do not have power points and they do not have water and they do not have the ability to house markets and events like commonly happen in King George Square.

The previous mall had no retail outlets. There is a very famous small pocket park in Manhattan called Paley Park that was designed in the late 1970s. It was a very small enclosed space that had a little cafe in the corner of it and it was very famous for being activated in a very simple way and being completely safe. It had a very narrow opening from the street and it opened out, so if there was no activity on in there, it would be a very dangerous place. I find it interesting that there were places being designed in Australia not long before that that just had no understanding of that notion at all, and there still are today. That sense of activation and the facility to allow that to happen is really key.

As I said, simple things like power points to allow you to bring in large events are really key. More activation generally stems from the management of the malls and in this particular circumstance Brisbane City Council have a very active group within council that organise events. They help organise those events right from the design phase. They do not wait until it is finished and go, 'Okay, what are we going to do now with it?' They are very actively involved right from the start. Those events then generate this sense of ownership by the community that uses them and in this case it is the whole of Brisbane. You need to have the Christmas tree being launched for a few years and people start to take their kids in and it becomes a regular thing. You get this sense that it is an important part of their urban fabric.

This visual and physical openness in this particular circumstance has come at a price. The common criticism that we get in this circumstance is that it is too hot, it is too open, 'Where are all the trees? Where's all the shade?' Our response to that is that we have a big roof that provides three or four times more shade than ever existed in the mall. It was not about putting 50 trees in here because there is no civic space that I know of in the world, in front of the main town hall, that is full of trees. The main town hall in most cities is a significant building that everyone wants to see and has heritage issues. It needs to be open from a range of perspectives, not just CPTED.

I might in 20 seconds touch on a few comments that came from the local police that run this area of the mall. To quote the officer in charge, 'It was a positive change from a crime perspective.' It was very obvious to him that it had improved significantly. They valued the restaurants and the fact that there are regular users. They had a lot of what he describes as emos or goths, youngsters that were hanging around in a particular part of the site that were a real issue for them. This has helped to address that.

However, they moved from one part of the site to a different part of the site once it was redeveloped, and then the Malls Management guys came in with their version of addressing it. There were facilities for piped music through the whole mall as part of the design, so they put on a bit of Burt Bacharach or something that they decided these kids were not going to like, and they scooted off pretty quickly. And I quite like Burt Bacharach! So the ability to incorporate some of these facilities to enable music to be put in there is really important during the design process.

I will quickly jump through Chinatown Mall. As I said, it is in the heartland of the nightclub district of Brisbane. It had some challenges that included it being a shared zone, with access into car parks that could not be changed. There were facilities for piped music through the whole mall as part of the design, so they put on a bit of Burt Bacharach or something that they decided these kids were not going to like, and they scooted off pretty quickly. And I quite like Burt Bacharach! So the ability to incorporate some of these facilities to enable music to be put in there is really important during the design process.

I will quickly jump through Chinatown Mall. As I said, it is in the heartland of the nightclub district of Brisbane. It had some challenges that included it being a shared zone, with access into car parks that could not be changed. One of the keys here was the need to reinvigorate the retail strip that was down both sides. It was formerly a street and had been turned into a mall in the late 1980s, so it was 22-odd years old and well and truly needed a facelift. So it was the activation from an economic perspective that drove a lot of these outcomes.
You can start to get a sense of the shared zone there on the top left. The plan on the bottom shows the mall. It is about 160 metres long and 25-odd metres wide, so not a massive area but had the opportunity for plenty of mischief, given that the main nightclub district is 50 metres from this strip.

Its history was that there was plenty of activity going on here late of a Friday and Saturday night that the police were pretty busy dealing with. It was very cluttered. As I said before, it had a huge amount of debris placed in it over the years, as you can start to see on the left there. There was overgrown vegetation—that whole mid tier of planting was infill—and massive visual obstacles.

The key on this project was the management of the CCTV camera network, which goes back to a central location—the ability to get sightlines from those cameras and the ability to make sure that the lighting was key to the success of the space. That involved not only code lighting, so making it bright, but there was a very strong focus on ornamental lighting. So there were a lot of aesthetics that went into this. It was not just the pure practicalities of opening the space up.

One of our focuses here was to lift all those cluttering elements up in the air—get all the signage, all the lights, all the poles and all the speakers up off the ground plane and out of that zone that is sort of 500 to 1,800 mm high, where you can see through.

You can imagine how inviting that little nook on the left would be on a rainy day if you were homeless, and they were certainly finding plenty of issues there with these little pagodas spread throughout the mall. It was a very vehicle focused area and not very friendly for the restaurateurs, and business was at an all-time low. You can imagine if you had a restaurant on the left of that left-hand image, in the dark there, it would not be very popular at all. These days it is a really thriving little part of the city.

In relation to the ability to have some central open spaces that could accommodate large crowds, as much as that left-hand image could accommodate a crowd, we fit 15,000 into this mall on its first weekend. You would have been lucky to fit 5,000 into the previous version. During weekdays it was usually filled with delivery vans, which did not really help its ambience either. So that mall management was really quite critical. Previously there was no mall management in this space, so it became dirty and it became a spot where there were homeless people and drug dealers, and after-hours mischief was happening constantly.

This mall did not get quite the amount of attention that King George Square got in terms of its activation program from council and it took them a little while to get going. Now they have a pretty good program. They obviously have strong cultural events—Chinese New Year et cetera—but this was one circumstance where they should have done that a little bit earlier. However, the Malls Management staff from council were involved during the design process, right from the start. They were in almost every design meeting and they had a lot of input.

Mr McCURDY — Is that because of legislation?

Mr HARDYMAN — No. One comment that I would make is that none of what we did on either of these two projects was pushed upon us by legislation. It was purely our ability to know what was required and to design to that and to take council along for the ride almost. They were well aware of it. They had Malls Management guys who were getting rung at three o'clock every Saturday morning to come and sort something out. There was no discussion at all about the legislation that sat behind doing any of these things. It was purely practical.

Again the openness of the space and the activity was really key. I will not go into too much of the social issues; I am sure you will have heard a fair amount about that. To me the things that were issues previously were the vehicle dominance—the delivery vans—it was not a pedestrian-friendly zone and the sightlines were key. Pedestrian focus was the change, and weather protection.
One thing that we did that was fundamentally quite different here was that we switched how people walked down the street. We did not let people walk down under the cover; we sent them down the middle of the mall and used the areas under the awnings and the trees on the sides to activate the restaurants, so all the restaurants could open out into what were previously the footpaths. That allows people to stay there longer, rather than sitting out in the middle, where you have to then provide some shade, keep them out of the heat and provide some weather protection if it starts raining. So you inherently get weather protection and the reason why you can stay there is much more enticing.

We put together this little diagram that starts to say, 'Look, there are a whole lot of things down that left side that most people would perceive as negative from a CPTED perspective.' However, a lot of things actually have a positive. You can say, 'Rightio, there's no CCTV camera'—on the other hand, a lot of users might think that is great because there is a sense of privacy—or that there are no visual obstacles. Again, people have the sense that it gives them some privacy in these little nooks and crannies. It might be a bit more visually interesting.

I will not go through all of these, but I wanted to just comment on the fact that the downside of a lot of CPTED outcomes is the public perception that we are generating bland places—blandscapes. It is very open. It inherently has to be very open. The solution that we used to try and counter that in a place like Chinatown was to focus on the more detailed design elements. So we designed all the chairs in a custom designed manner that had a lot of intricate detailing. We made the interest at a much smaller scale.

The public likes public spaces to be green—certainly in Queensland they do. Less so here. Sydney is somewhere in the middle. To generate that is very difficult while also accommodating CPTED issues. We found it was a challenge to change the public perception that it did not have to be green to be good and that these sightline issues were important—the openness of it.

I have a handful of recommendations and challenges; I did not put these in but I can certainly formalise them and send them to you afterwards. Recommendations from my perspective include working with the local police on site specific design issues. They know their place very well. They know what the issues are that they have been dealing with. Passive security is better and cheaper than active security, so sightlines are important. That is much cheaper than hiring 10 security guards and getting the police to walk through every two hours. Maintenance is important: keep it clean, repair vandalism quickly, remove graffiti, replace broken lights and make it feel like someone is looking after the place.

Malls Management involvement is key. It is also a challenge, though, from the perspective that they want to open out spaces and not encourage people. I physically remember sitting in a meeting when a Malls Management guy said to me, 'You wouldn't put seats in there, would you, because that'll just attract people.' I said, 'Aha, it's a public place. That's what we try to do, we try to activate.' His mindset was, 'Do not put anywhere to sit in this place because people will come and hang out there.' So it was a matter of changing that perception. Collaboration—police and council, those two groups working closely together—was really key, in our observation. That activation management: how to get events in there on a regular basis so that things are happening there, and to employ a place manager. A lot of councils are now starting to employ a person they are titling a place manager, whose job it is to do that. Having a shop or a cafe is absolutely paramount for passive surveillance. In a residential area the residents are doing that. In a public space in the city area you do not have those residents.

Challenges are ongoing maintenance, things like pruning. It is hard to keep control of a guy, in 30 years time, who is not pruning the thing like you intended it to be done, so they let it all grow because they do not understand the principles. Even on Chinatown, 2½ years on, we are having those issues where I am needing to ring the malls maintenance guy and say, 'Hey, you need to let that bamboo grow up there so that people can see the bloke's shopfront and his signs and go and eat at his shop, but also the CCTV cameras can see someone getting up to mischief. Don't make a hedge. It was not designed to do that.' It is hard to manage that long term. The openness opens itself to criticism, as I mentioned before.
One final comment from a legislative perspective: we experienced very few barriers. The legislation does not stop us or make us do things but, in my view, if it did become too restrictive and prescriptive, we might end up with some pretty significant blandscapes with some planner telling us to put nothing there because they want to be able to see everything. In my experience the legislation is good in most spots around the country and really quite clear. In a nutshell, that is how we approach it at the very pointy end of the spectrum.

The CHAIR — Thanks very much, Paul. I now invite the committee to ask questions.

Mr LEANE — Probably similar to the question Tim posed here: when the Brisbane council engaged you for the King George Square, was your brief to actually design and build a safer square? Was that their driving reason to create a new square?

Mr HARDYMAN — I would not see it as the driving reason. It was probably one of four or five main reasons and it probably was not at the top of the list. The top of the list was probably that it was a run-down disaster zone and that a main city square deserved better, but it was certainly on that top five list. At the end of the day, the police and the Malls Management guys are very comfortable with the fact that we have achieved that outcome, even though we get criticised for other things.

Mr LEANE — That is good. Thanks.

Mr SCHEFFER — One of the issues that we are dealing with is that the principles and the guidelines around CPTED do not appear to be used by local governments. We have had a range of views about how that could be improved through training, through mandating the principles, various structures like that. You have come along and given us a really useful hands-on approach. The bit you have not told us, and that I would be interested in getting you to talk about, is after you have sharpened your pencils on Monday morning and you have the contract. What did you refer to? You said the legislation was open-ended or mostly open, and that was good because it allowed creativity in the space, but did you use guidelines? How did you pull together the framework of what the government and the city had developed?

Mr HARDYMAN — I am just opening a file there right now. There is this sort of legislation or this sort of documentation in Queensland. Certainly we refer to these sorts of documents. However, as a fairly experienced designer, it has been in my head for 25 years that that is what you do.

Mr SCHEFFER — We will switch the clock back 25 years.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Our issue is we have people out there who do not use it well. The ones like you are fine and they are probably not the ones we need to address. We are drawing on your experience to say to the younger ones, the new emerging industry, 'How can these sorts of documents be of use?'

Mr HARDYMAN — To me it is the council. The people we deal with who are our clients are the council. Their planning staff like to have the legislation sitting behind them so that they can tick a box. However, the council design manager and the council project manager, who is engaging someone like me, are the people who should be saying to me or my junior staff, 'This is the stuff you've got to use. You've got to use this piece of paper, this document, and you've got to make sure that's implemented correctly.' I found it interesting, sitting at the back of the previous speakers. The lady who was sitting here made a comment about how they like to have that legislation behind them but they do not necessarily actually use it. I thought that was interesting.

I have brought a piece out of a document that our Sydney office had used, where our social planners and our urban designers had researched all of the crime prevention documentation that the local council and the state government had in place. They said, 'Here's all the issues that need to be incorporated. Here's a whole lot of police findings and, by the way, the last
three or four pages, here's the site that we're working on and here's what you need to do. Here's how those five pages of stuff turn into a real thing.' To me that is a useful bit of paper. That is much more useful than a piece of planning legislation in the background that no-one is using. We actually use it, but it is translating it from the legislation down into a real thing. It physically says things like recommendations for pedestrian access, how to set up your doors to your hall—make sure they face the street—physical, practical things.

I think that is the key to it but at the starting point is council saying, 'Here's one of the things in our DA approval conditions that you've got to make sure you've ticked off.' If it is clear and direct like that, people like me will get it and we have to do it. Even if you do not have a lot of experience you say, 'Okay, I've got to make sure I do that.' That would be practical.

**Mr McCURDY** — You spoke about employing a place manager. Is that more and more common?

**Mr HARDYMAN** — It is becoming more and more common: places like South Bank Corporation in Brisbane, places like Darling Harbour Authority in Sydney. I know Sunshine Coast Council do now. It is becoming more common. I know in Newcastle they do, and Malcolm Snow, who has taken over Places Victoria—he has come from South Bank Corporation—understands that process and the value of that. I would say it has only been for 12 months that people have heard of that title. They are almost events managers. You get events managers and people who make public places, like me, and the two of them go hand in hand during the design process to implement those things.

**The CHAIR** — The state government are reviewing the planning regime. Can you give us some views about how we would be able to encourage local councils to adopt the CPTED Safer Design principles as you have been doing as part of your work. If the mandatory approach is not justified—and we have heard about education and training at the planning stage—are there other areas you think we should look at to have greater participation or understanding of the principles?

**Mr HARDYMAN** — Certainly at university level some of these things are reasonably clearly understood. I disagreed slightly with the planners who were in here before who said you could spend a week on it and you still would not know about it. I think most landscape architects do. It is in their head. These sorts of principles are pretty commonplace and have been for a fairly long time, in probably a less formalised way than they are these days. I think there is a role at the starting point of the process, at an education level at university, because then the kids who come out of uni at 21 or 22 know that documents like that exist. Regardless of whether a planner tells them or whether council tells them that they have to use it, they know that they exist and they know that is their responsibility. I think designers generally are responsive. They know that they need to address these issues and these days the legislation around whose fault it is when something goes wrong is turning firmly towards designers, so they are going to be much more acutely aware that if something goes wrong in a place because they design something stupid—did not incorporate some of these principles—potentially someone might come after them; so that will encourage them.

**The CHAIR** — Can I just paint you a quick scenario. There is a brand-new greenfields suburb being built not far from where I live and in my mind it has ticked the boxes for everything wrong with design, placement and public space. It is built in a swamp, so there are a whole lot of foundation issues. They are only 400-square-metre blocks, so there are compaction issues. There is little public space and the council has decided to give it to the developers to develop the public space, so suddenly they lose ownership of the end scenario. I am wondering about control and the environmental design aspect to crime. Councils lose control to the developers, who have been given the instruction to develop the public space using their money, and, while we have all this wonderful planning stuff, I am just wondering how we can satisfy the financial imperatives as against the voluntary expectation of community design in relation to safety.
Mr HARDYMAN — At that point I think it would be directly coming out of a council development approval condition that says you have to make sure you satisfy whatever the CPTED document is that is the strongest document that can be generated. I think it is as simple as that. The reason why council conditions are so onerous is that so many developers like to do something different and you have to write lots of clear words to them, because they only get it when it is clear. If they get it and they are going to pass it on to their landscape architect, I think in that circumstance the only way to do it is to specifically refer to a document that has some good, clear issues addressed in it, like this one. The Queensland one is very good. It is very clear. If it is a DA condition, the planners then get it, they understand it, because they have to tick their boxes, but the designer understands the implications of being told to do it that way. I think that is the only way to do it. I am not one for bashing people over the head with a sledgehammer, but for a lot of developers, that is all they will understand. They will tell you to cut it out of your scope if it is not in a DA condition, so that is unfortunately how it ends up usually. If they are not forced to do it, they will not.

The CHAIR — That is the issue though, isn't it? That is why we are talking about mandating. I think you sat in on some of that discussion.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes.

The CHAIR — There was a variance of views just between two different witnesses.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes.

The CHAIR — One was worried about the regulatory impact of mandating and the other one was worrying about the compliance or lack of compliance if there was not such a thing as a mandate.

Mr HARDYMAN — I think if you mandate, the thing that is important is what you mandate. If you mandate a document, saying, 'It's got to comply with this,' you need to be really careful about what that document says. If the document is too prescriptive, you are going to get these blandscapes generated from it.

The CHAIR — We have been generally, I think, asking people about mandating the CPTED principles rather than—

Mr SCHEFFER — Which are not that restrictive.

The CHAIR — Yes.

Mr HARDYMAN — Yes. I personally think you should. They are in my head, but they are not in a developer's head. He does not care, so you need to mandate it for him, not for me. I get it. I usually drag him kicking and screaming to the table to make him do it properly. A lot of my time is spent on dragging them kicking and screaming on a whole lot of issues that someone does not mandate.

The CHAIR — Is there anyone from the committee with a question? If not, thank you. Are you from Brisbane? Do you hail from there?

Mr HARDYMAN — I am from Brisbane. I am these days. I used to live in Sydney and Melbourne.

The CHAIR — Can we thank you very much for coming down from sunny Queensland and providing evidence here today. We appreciate it.

Mr HARDYMAN — No problem at all. Thank you.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees? We are recording the evidence and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Thank you, Superintendent and Inspector. Who is leading off?

Insp. LANGDON — Mr Chairman, I will lead off, if you like. I believe you might have received some documentation in relation to some questions that were asked. That will form the foundation of the main principles of what we are talking about. By way of apology, I have not been able to give you a history of my work, but I will do that quite quickly, if you like.

The CHAIR — Sorry, Tony, I am just getting some instructions. I am just getting the committee to page 5 of the briefing notes. Thanks, Tony.

Insp. LANGDON — That is okay. I have had some 30 years experience as an operational police officer, general duties policing, nine years of investigative experience in divisional investigation, Homicide Squad and Armed Robbery Squad. I have had some 12 years experience as a tactical operator. I was one of the senior project managers for the Commonwealth Games security overlay. I have managed 24-hour busy police stations at Flemington and Broadmeadows and I have had other project management experiences.

I am currently inspector in charge of the Safer Communities Unit, and we are a strategic based unit and we deal with crime prevention matters and we also have oversight in relation to assisting the crime prevention officers and Neighbourhood Watch coordinators for Victoria Police.

I will lead in by saying that we have addressed your questions in relation to the CPTED inquiry. Victoria Police obviously place emphasis on crime prevention during environmental design. We understand that it is a science which is overarching a lot of principles around crime prevention. We currently have some 42 part-time and full-time crime prevention officers within Victoria Police and they have received training through a crime prevention environmental design course. That is a course that went for some five days—four days of theory and one day of practical exercise out in the field. That course has proved to be quite successful where external areas such as council and other industry have actually been a part of the course. There was a review within Victoria Police and that course was suspended during the review process, where the department went through a change. It has been revamped and should be running again by March next year.

The fundamentals associated with CPTED, as we see it, are that it is part of an array of strategies to help us try and impact on issues associated with crime within the community and within industry. We take the view that it is a strategy which requires leveraging from social aspects, economic aspects and community aspects, and a large portion of that we associate with our relationships with local council.

Although there is not anything formally arranged with local council as far as guidelines or legislative control, Victoria Police has been making headway in relation to our fundamental approaches with council on intelligence based concepts through our new Victoria Police intelligence doctrine and in relation to how we can add value to those community spaces that council may or may not control or have influence over. We understand that we cannot always be there for the council like we would want to, but we believe that it is a strong relationship with council which makes this work for us. That is about it at this stage.

The CHAIR — Thank you.
Mr McCURDY — Simon, can I follow up on that. We were in New Zealand last week at Palmerston North, which is a fairly well populated place, and the Palmerston North City Council had an arrangement where a senior sergeant, I think it was, was on secondment into the council for a three-month period. They would then leave and another one would come through. So there was this relationship-building going on within the council that seemed to be working very well. They were understanding each other's issues and there was actually that first port of call, knowing they have relationships built with the police and they do not have to have formal guidelines in place, and it seemed to me a pretty good idea. Do we have anything like that?

Insp. LANGDON — Generally we do not formally place people in councils. We have our police service area—our local area commander—which in general terms develops very strong relationships with their council, also through emergency management principles et cetera. What we do, generally speaking, is have our committees set up with the local area commander and through council, and that is how we learn of issues to be treated and gain footholds in relation to developing best practice with council.

Mr McCURDY — Okay.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thanks for that presentation. You said earlier that your crime prevention officers go through training—

Insp. LANGDON — Correct.

Mr SCHEFFER — and part of that is theory and part of that is practical experience, and they work with councils in that week or whatever period of time they do that, and with other bodies. Could you talk about what that actually involves.

Insp. LANGDON — In relation to?

Mr SCHEFFER — When they are doing that practical experience, what actually happens? They go along to the local council and who do they work with? Do they go out on site visits?

Insp. LANGDON — They do.

Mr SCHEFFER — Do they talk to planners? Talk to us about that.

Insp. LANGDON — I can give you an example. Out at Casey there was what we call a high-risk community location at Horton Place, so the local crime prevention officer there went out with council to do an audit/assessment of that location.

Mr SCHEFFER — So this was a person in a trainee position?

Insp. LANGDON — Correct. So that is a full-time crime prevention officer based at Casey. That person conducted an audit of that area and, in consultation and negotiation with council, treatments started to be put in place. We are talking about basic CPTED concepts in relation to the effective use of space, design, lighting, natural surveillance, thoroughfare access et cetera.

Mr SCHEFFER — This is what the officer does?

Insp. LANGDON — Correct.

Mr SCHEFFER — So they do an audit with that sort of detail?

Insp. LANGDON — Correct. There really is nothing else in Victoria that I am aware of which provides the education standard for our police officers to do that role. They have a rather comprehensive crime prevention officers course. The fundamentals associated with CPTED are taught quite strongly. It used to be an accredited course, but there was a change in the framework and Victoria Police chose not to adopt the change in the framework for most of...
our courses, with a couple of exceptions. So our officers, generally speaking, have quite good relationships with council in effecting these types of changes—intelligence based, with an evaluation process built in.

Mr SCHEFFER — Going back to the audit, how is that designed? Is that contracted out to someone? There is a lot of detail there.

Insp. LANGDON — Correct.

Mr SCHEFFER — That is quite a body of expertise that you are talking about that the officer draws on, so there would be a whole back story to that, how that is all put together and how they use it. I would like you to tell us a bit more about that.

Insp. LANGDON — A way to explain it is that our audits really are surrounded around Victoria Police's needs, so we are not so much basing our audits on industry best practice as far as holistic planning goes. Whilst we focus on the fundamentals attached to it, we are really orientating our auditing processes around what we need to treat at the time. Of course, that falls into the general array of CPTED principles. So our officers would be looking at the fundamental crimes that have been occurring at the time and the intended aspect of that environment for the future. We do not go and extend ourselves to outside industry for that auditing process, although some councils have done that.

Mr SCHEFFER — So you have your officer and you have done an audit on a particular site or a locality and then you talk to council, and council, from the planning side of the universe, has got a view and you are negotiating that through. Do you find that there is—'conflict' is too strong a word—sometimes not a coinciding of views on how treatments are best developed? For example, council might want a lot of community interaction on a really activated site and you might have a view that it is better just to diminish that down a bit. Do you just work that out, or does your view prevail because you are the law enforcement arm in the end?

Insp. LANGDON — No, I do not think so, because we do not have a right of control. I think in general terms these relationships are best managed through a negotiation principle.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Insp. LANGDON — Ultimately we might give a higher end recommendation of what probably should be done to treat the issue, but there are obviously issues in relation to whether council actually owns the space, whether there is co-existing ownership of the space, what costs are associated with the treatment, which we obviously cannot overly influence, but we can come up with a best practice principle. I do know of cases where council have come back, or industry have come back, and said, 'Well, we just can't meet that cost.' So they have negotiated a different way of treating the problem, because there is always obviously more than one way to solve the problem. My experience is that our members are quite flexible in their approach in relation to that. I think that is the only way it can work in the current environment because there is no doctrine that really states what people do and do not have to do.

Supt BRIGHAM — I had some experience with this when I worked at Box Hill in the City of Whitehorse. They got Adam Sutton from Melbourne university to do a report in relation to the shopping centre there. We worked together and formed a group that acted on the recommendations coming out of that report. To some degree we advised council about how to best go about implementing those. Some of it comes down to cost as well, so it is a matter of how much budget they have to spend. That imposes limitations on things like CCTV, such as how good a system to put in. In that case our crime prevention officer worked closely with the council. I think that was a good example.

We got some good results out of that and it was an interesting report. A lot of it was really commonsense. For example, there were some seats near the main doors of the shopping centre. The only people who ever used those were people they probably did not really want to
have in the shopping centre, so they took the seats out. Simple things like that made a
difference; the provision of lighting. Victoria Police cannot do this on its own. It has to be a
collaborative relationship with those key stakeholders and in this example the Box Hill Central
shopping centre played a key role in improving their own security and systems within the
shopping centre. It was an overall collaborative approach.

Mr LEANE — In that case Box Hill shopping centre and the station and council
triggered that themselves, as far as the input from VicPol?

Supt BRIGHAM — It started off with concerns about crime in the area, so we had
discussions with local traders, with the shopping centre. Council became involved and then it
was council who actually initiated work by Adam Sutton. That was a very good piece of work
and we adopted the recommendations coming out of that. Cost did become a bit of an issue
for some of the recommendations.

Mr LEANE — If it is a major reno, like the station, or if it is a greenfield major site,
it is going to have a lot of human traffic through it. In the Melbourne metro, MFB would have
the say in a certain design: 'We won't be able to fight a fire here, so you need to do it
differently.' On a major site like that, is there any trigger that gives VicPol a chance to have a
look and say, 'This is going to be very difficult for us to police or prevent crime in the design
you've got, so you might have to rethink?' Is there any trigger anywhere that causes VicPol to
get called in on that?

Supt BRIGHAM — Are you talking about a fresh design?

Mr LEANE — Yes, let's say a fresh design because that makes it easier. Say a
greenfields site and it is going to be a major site, as I said, with a lot of traffic, a lot of people.
MFB have the say. At some point there is a trigger where they can look at it and go, 'Look, if
there's a fire here we aren't going to be able to fight it efficiently, so therefore you need to go
away and do something and improve it.' There is nothing that triggers VicPol's chance to look
at that same plan and go, 'Well, if you build it like this it's going to be very hard for us to
police it or to prevent crime there?'

Supt BRIGHAM — There is not. Obviously in some situations it just works well
because there are good relationships already existing, or we might find out about something
and make an approach and say, 'Look, we'd like to have some input into this,' but there is no
requirement for that to happen.

Mr LEANE — I am sure someone better with words than I could come up with
something, but do you think it would be good that out of our report there is something to say
that maybe there could be a recommendation that in an instance like that there is a trigger so
that VicPol actually gets to look at what someone is going to build and have a say on the crime
prevention aspect of it?

Supt BRIGHAM — Tony and I were talking this morning about this and we came up
with liquor licensing as an example of where that collaboration takes place. That is about
preventing crime too.

The CHAIR — Just leading on from Shaun, I am thinking of an example where the
recently announced expansion of the Chadstone Shopping Centre—I think nearly a third of the
size again—increases people flow and traffic flow. It would be a great one to see how the
planners are looking at it. I do not know what the crime stats are around Chadstone or whether
the liquor outlets with packaged alcohol are creating problems in those little areas. It is quite a
big centre to expand to a third again of the size. It must raise a whole lot of complications with
human flow, traffic flow, criminal intent and desire and everything else. It would be a good
one to be in the box seat to find out how that runs out with all the different agencies that
Shaun was talking about.

Mr SCHEFFER — Can I just come back to what Shaun said, because you nodded
but I doubt that went through to the microphone. When Shaun was asking did you think that
there would be some value in us putting together a recommendation that strengthened the role of the police in being able to recommend—

Mr LEANE — Better crime prevention—

Mr SCHEFFER — The analogy being the fire brigade saying, 'Look, you're building this big green development. This makes it hard for policing.' I think were your words, but these things would be helpful if they were changed so that you actually get a formal input into that process. Now you are saying it might work very well because you have good relationships and it is about negotiation. That is probably fine in 95 per cent of cases but sometimes there could be a situation where you might need that strengthening of regulation or legislation or protocols. Would that be useful to you?

Supt BRIGHAM — It should be a 'must have' rather than a 'nice to have' when it comes down to it.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr McCURDY — Retrospectively, too, you must have community hotspots that you would identify, not just the design of new areas. Certainly retrospectively you would be targeting different spots that your members would know about, making sure that information flows back to the local council, local government to make it a partnership to solve the problem, rather than it is all your problem and you have to just stop all the action that goes on there.

Insp. LANGDON — It definitely has to be evidence based. There is no doubt about that. You do find when the negotiations or the relationships are going well, there is a bipartisan approach to that information flow to try and solve the problem. Casey's classic example was the redevelopment of an area, which tended to work out quite well. The Department of Justice's Public Safety Infrastructure grants have now changed the guidelines when it comes to CCTV. The applicant, the local council, has to apply to police for agreement that CCTV would be appropriate in the circumstances, so it is evidence based. People are leaning that way and we have a more active involvement in the guideline principle. I think, in all honesty, that would be a significant aid to us to be able to have active involvement in the initial stages.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just as a bit of a side issue, when you talk about guidelines for the CCTVs, how are they developed?

Insp. LANGDON — In relation to our internal guidelines, MOUs are developed between Victoria Police and the councils that operate them, but I am talking fundamentally about the reasoning behind using CCTV to be part of the treatment for an issue.

Mr SCHEFFER — That is what I mean.

Insp. LANGDON — In general terms it is part of the CPTED principle. CCTV has a place, there is no denying that. Is it appropriate all the time? That is undecided. Is it more effective if it is part of a treatment with everything else in relation to lighting and traffic flow and design? In general terms that is the case. The Department of Justice rightly, I believe, have indicated that it is more appropriate to liaise with police in the first step of the application because that might not be the most appropriate treatment for that location but it might be a better treatment for another location, based on evidence and intelligence.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, excellent.

Insp. LANGDON — That is the principle behind it.

The CHAIR — When we first started the hearing I was under the impression that we had received some correspondence from VicPol in relation to this inquiry. Is that your expectation? I am struggling to find any information.
Insp. LANGDON — That is my expectation, yes.

The CHAIR — We have not received any responses to the question.

Insp. LANGDON — I have copies of correspondence with me. I do not know whether the committee think that is appropriate or not, but I know that that was meant to come through from our legal department through the chief commissioner, which is probably why, when I started, you were looking at me—

The CHAIR — No, I did not want you to think—we have been scrabbling through papers, but I have to say I could not find the information here, and I have just checked with Sandy and we have received nothing from VicPol, so I guess we have come in a bit cold in relation to the positions that you might want to speak to us about in relation to the inquiry. On that basis, perhaps, if you are privy to the information, you might like to raise with us some points that you think we should be aware of.

Insp. LANGDON — If it is appropriate, I can go through the questions that were sent out. We provided a written response in relation to that, so I can talk to that if that is going to help, or I can ensure that a copy is provided.

The CHAIR — I think we would welcome a copy if possible, mainly for the research work we are doing.

Insp. LANGDON — Of course, yes.

The CHAIR — The questions we can probably cover off within the committee here today. We have got the questions here that I assume were posed to you anyway, so we can flesh out those ones that have not been covered in the presentation, but I just want you to be clear that we have not received any information and that is why we were looking—or I was anyway—and hunting around, saying, 'Well, yes, I'm sure they're here somewhere.'

Insp. LANGDON — My apologies. I will check on that once I get back and I will make sure you have got them tomorrow.

The CHAIR — Are there any questions from the committee?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I have one about local governments. Police Command works across the range of them. One of the reasons we have been given this reference is that there is uncertainty about the extent to which local governments are picking up the guidelines and the CPTED principles. Can you reflect on that? Without necessarily singling out local governments, what is your sense of what is going on? Do you think they are following the procedures that they are given, or are the guidelines and principles over to one side and they just run their own show on what they think is a good idea?

Insp. LANGDON — I think in general terms the intent and willingness would be said to be there, but I do not know if it is an imperative for all local governments to actually act upon the guidelines as you have stated. A lot has to do with capacity, knowledge, obviously resource, and cost. We find that the police divisions or the police service areas that have a good relationship with the local councils work quite effectively with each other and they have an interest in developing these strategies. There are obviously some which, through those other reasons I mentioned, probably cannot deliver the same level of output even if they wanted to do that. A lot has to do with education, training, resourcing et cetera.

Mr SCHEFFER — If the principles were mandated, do you think it would lift that engagement or do you think it is just inevitable that it is going to be the way it is because they do not have the resources?

Insp. LANGDON — I do not generally see it that way. I think that if you give a principle to be reached, then people can achieve that, as long as there is a stepping-stone process to get there and there is support along the way. I think it is probably flawed not to
have some principle of operation attached to CPTED for council and for government, mainly because, if we do not, then exactly what you said could be true: that we will just be going along and adopting the same principles that we are now.

Mr SCHEFFER — So there is some argument for mandating the principles?

Insp. LANGDON — There is argument for some legislative framework or mandating of principles. Yes, I believe there is.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay. Thank you.

The CHAIR — I am going to go a little bit outside the square in relation to our brief, to give an opportunity to think about other factors that can reduce crime. I do not know the stats, but assuming there is compliance in the adoption of the Safer Design principles, how large a part do the Safer Design principles play in reducing crime? What other factors should the government be looking at, not in relation to more policing—I did not want to get into that area—but in relation to design work that is not covered in the design principles? I suspect they are not a perfect, comprehensive list that should be adhered to by local councils or planners. Are there other areas we should look at?

Insp. LANGDON — This is but one part of an array of strategies to help with crime prevention and we presented at the last inquiry in relation to that. If you just have CPTED principles alone, without any social inclusion, without any education framework, without any active buy-in from community, council and police, then it is just a stand-alone item, which may or may not treat the problem, because obviously you have the deference of crime and you have adaptability of criminals.

Peter and I were talking about this this morning. It really is a circular motion. You are developing something to treat a problem, but adaptability of the criminal element means that there will be another issue associated with what you are doing, potentially, down the line, whether that is because of education, lack of social inclusion, socio-economic issues, cultural diversity et cetera. You have to be aware of all those aspects, not just looking to treat a certain area in a singular fashion, so I would say that it is part of an array of strategies, but overarching all that are your basic principles attached to crime prevention. Did that answer the question?

The CHAIR — It was a pretty broad question, I have to admit. When we are making recommendations from the report and the evidence gathered, what else can we add that will be of some significance in reducing crime? We can say, well, some councils are either adopting it or not, and they should be doing this and they should be doing that for better compliance, but are there other things that we should look at? It is very broad and I am sorry about that. I did not expect that sort of narrow answer to a broad question. I was just trying to make sure we cover all the bases, that was all.

Insp. LANGDON — In essence, we have not really spoken about training. We have spoken about what police do, but we have not spoken about what industry does. I think there is a gap there. Our training suits our need. It does not suit industry's need, yet industry has relied upon us to actually provide some of that training to it.

The CHAIR — Sorry, what do you mean? What industries?

Insp. LANGDON — Council, and there are some other types of industries that have participated in our course. There is argument to suggest some tertiary aspects associated with a CPTED course for the state.

Mr McCURDY — Because clearly every organisation that we hear from says, 'We need the police involvement to help us through this.' Maybe there is a gap in resources there if there are, what, 45 CPTED—
Insp. LANGDON — Forty-two, and they are not all full time; there is part time as well. You are right, there is a gap. One or two crime prevention officers may service a police division, which may entail two or three municipalities. When you look at it like that, yes, it is a big ask.

The CHAIR — Any other questions? Are there any closing statements you would like to make?

Insp. LANGDON — I will commit to getting that Q and A back to you by tomorrow.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Insp. LANGDON — My apologies for that. Thank you for the opportunity. We will be available if you would like to speak to us again.

The CHAIR — Thank you. Peter?

Supt BRIGHAM — If there was going to be a change or adding of legislation relevant to this, then there would need to be the development of appropriate guidelines to go with that. It is really important for people to understand what it means, because I think there are different interpretations about what this actually is. It is quite a confusing subject, I suppose, and people have different perceptions of what it is about. I suppose from our point of view we have our blueprint, we have our focus on particular crimes. That might not be the way that the council views it in a particular area, so there needs to be that, and I think really this builds on some of the other issues, the recommendations coming out of the other committee, recommendations 8 to 12 about the need for the framework. This would fit in with that, to build a more robust crime prevention framework.

The CHAIR — All right. Thank you both very much.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Geoff, welcome to this public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Mr GRIFFITHS — No, I cannot say that I have. I emailed Pete this morning and asked was there anything relevant I needed to know for today. I have not checked my email. I said at the same time I could not answer my emails; I have been teaching all day. But that is not a problem.

The CHAIR — We will guide you through.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Okay.

The CHAIR — Importantly, though, we are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate.

Mr GRIFFITHS — That is fine.

The CHAIR — I understand you wish to make a verbal submission to the committee.

Mr GRIFFITHS — I was actually offered to make a submission. I put a very brief written submission in maybe eight or nine months ago, and I saw it in the paper. That was it, and since then I have had some discussions with Brad and then Sandy, and then Pete made contact. I did not formally request, but it just naturally fell into that situation, I suppose.

The CHAIR — That is all right. This reference was only given to us some months ago. Do you understand what the reference is, Geoff?

Mr GRIFFITHS — I am fully familiar with the topic and the context of the inquiry, yes.

The CHAIR — It is an inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Yes, that is right.

The CHAIR — We have been asked to look at specifically the Safer Design principles and how local government is adopting those principles.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Yes, that is fine.

The CHAIR — Would you like to make a brief presentation to the committee and then we might ask you some questions, if that is all right.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Okay. My involvement in this goes back to the nineties. I worked in the ANZ Bank for 12 or 13 years and, as part of that consulting role that I had, I was seconded to various departments. In the last four or five years in the position there, I spent my time predominantly in armed robbery reduction, even though we had a very large security department. I was in retail banking, responsible for 35,000 staff through a general manager, Glen Twidale, and 1,400 branches. In those days they felt it was better to have someone within retail banking to look at this particular topic and it was basically just the reduction of armed robberies. I was seconded out for 18 weeks, did major research, identified a whole host of issues after putting a terms of reference paper to the senior executive, and as a result of that I was appointed to the position and given some substantial amount of money each year to reduce the impact of robberies.
Within that context, I visited a number of academics around Australia, and I still have contacts with them; the Australian Institute of Criminology; went to America a number of times, and Canada, and then eventually went back and presented the results of this research, which was based on a situational crime prevention model, but I did not really know that at the time until we invited Ron Clarke out here through the police department and Justice. The then chief inspector, Frank Byrne, who is now retired—and I actually saw him and his wife a couple of weeks ago; they live down at Geelong—ended up bringing out Ron Clarke. We ran workshops for the police commanders, and it went on from there, where the guidelines were developed. I moved on in my career and went into education. I ended up at the head of a department at Chisholm TAFE for another 11 or 12 years.

The reason why I was involved in CPTED was that part of the funding for the armed robbery reduction was building a bank branch with the elements of CPTED oriented around it. I built a branch in a factory in Footscray and it was the practical application of the theory to the building out of crime. You will see it if you go into an ANZ Branch now. In those days it was quite unique. We called it an ‘open-plan’ branch and I implemented all the elements of CPTED—sightlines, access control, territoriality et cetera—involved in that branch.

It was a passion that I had and maintained. When I read in the paper some eight or nine months ago about this report, I said, ‘Oh look, I’m going to give it one more shot,’ with political elections and funding cuts, the departments that I was liaising with earlier on folded. When this Inquiry came out, I said I would give it one last shot, but when the completed report arrived, that actually restimulated me and, being semi-retired now, I then started to make my contacts again with the police departments here, academics overseas, and I could bore you to tears with the number of people that I have made contact with again.

Some of them you have obviously interviewed. Chris Hale comes to mind, just recently. You have been over to New Zealand and seen Sue Ramsay. She came over some months ago and she and I met with the police regarding CPTED here and what they are implementing in New Zealand. Greg Saville is another associate professor over in the USA. We regularly make contact. He has developed a great blog that I have actually relayed on to Pete. It is in that framework that I was interested in following up on the CPTED review.

I also am on a committee here at Officer, and Officer, as you know, is going through enormous urban growth with Places Victoria involved. I know you have interviewed Places Victoria and I mentioned to one of the senior execs there, James Gallagher, about implementing CPTED into that design, both residential and commercial—multi-multi-million dollars. They were somewhat interested but did not know what I was on about, so I went in to see them and saw James, with a senior architect, and the architect did not know what I was talking about when I deliberately used the acronym CPTED—not being smart, but it gives me a heads-up on what they understand about CPTED. Anyway, they have gone a bit cold about implementing it. I said there was very minimal cost.

I have actually been in touch with some councils about their introduction of CPTED. Some of them have actually followed on from the nineties and still have officers in place. Others have not. There are 33 police out there that are also involved in CPTED as part of their duty statements. I have been in touch with a number of them. I was blocked from contacting all of them. I was going to write to them about a questionnaire in relation to their roles and what they are doing with councils. The police blocked me from doing that, but I still know enough of them to understand what is happening in the Police Department.

The Dandenong CPTED officer is in a CPTED job but has never been trained in CPTED. The last course ran at the academy two years ago. I have been in touch with the Inspector out there. It may run next year. The Frankston CPTED coordinator has been in the job seven years and is not confident in actually reviewing architectural plans. Then I was wanting to find out what was happening around the network, but that did not eventuate because the Police Department did not allow the contact.
I am so motivated about this. I am in the process of writing to council mayors. I do not know whether they have even been appointed yet, but their budgets are due by June 2013 and I am just indicating to them that maybe they should be considering some CPTED element as part of their planning process because if we do not get it on the agenda, by June it will be locked out for the next four years.

There have been community meetings here at Officer with two schools. One is the election platform to build the special school in Officer, that you would be well aware of, and the other one is the high school. I went to a community meeting. The architect did a fantastic job in the presentation of the new school architecturally. I asked him about CPTED. He knew nothing about it. The regional director of education was there and I spoke to him and he said, 'Oh, go and have a chat to the architect,' so I went up to the architect. By this stage in the community meeting they had actually said, 'Oh, everything's all right. We've put some locks on and we've got CCTV cameras and, yeah, we know everything about CPTED,' but of course when I approached this young architect, they did not really know much at all, and did not even invite me to visit them and have a chat and look at the architectural plans, which I said I would do at no charge.

They said, 'No thanks, everything's all right,' including the regional director of education. I said to him, 'Look, I'm semi-retired. I'm off on Thursdays. I don't mind jumping in the car and adding value to this multimillion-dollar development in Officer. I've got a passion also because I live at Officer.' Of course, nothing happened there, so I am still out here pushing for CPTED to be integrated into the system again. I think it fell over big time because there was no strategic plan. To give you an example, in the bank with 33,000 staff, 70 regions, I was a one-man band. We had a large security department I was working with. I appointed 70 key staff, one from each region, flew them in to Melbourne and trained them in an 8 series workshop program and managed it tightly.

The strategy, Simon and members, is the most important thing. If we do not think through the way it is to be implemented and championed to manage CPTED, it will fall over big time. If it is fairly loose in the way that it is implemented, relying on the goodwill of the council to do something, it will not happen. As an example, Phil McCamley from Sydney, New South Wales, was a police sergeant when I met him—he also went to Canada. They kept him in the job for 14 years and promoted him. He retired last year as an inspector, I think it was. He had mandatory requirements for CPTED, not only for government agencies but for commercial developments put in place.

Commercial developments here, even when the police get out and do a CPTED audit—which is after the event, not at the preliminary planning stages—it is all too late. The developer turns around and says, 'Look, thanks very much, Mr Policeman. You've just spent taxpayers' funds giving me this audit but I'm not going to spend a dollar on this place, even though you're telling me that the windows should be here, the door should be over there. We just don't have the money to put in CCTV cameras, but thanks for your time.'

All those sorts of things are out there and of course now I hear from New South Wales, with Phil retiring, that the champion has gone. If the champion is not maintained or you do not train someone with the responsibility to take it on, you will probably find in New South Wales it will be watered down again. It has been very disappointing. When I worked in the bank there was this enlightened general manager, Glen Twidale. I went to him and said, 'Look, boss, it's really not me just working in the bank. We've got to think outside the square and we've got to work with external agencies.' That included the Australian Bankers Association dealing with academics around Australia that were involved in this particular field, and also developed programs for small businesses, as a big organisation ANZ should be able to assist to some degree.

It was great to be able to do that. That is what brought me in contact with so many other people. My network, even now, is reasonably extensive in terms of what is happening around Australia. For instance, there was recently a fire in Queensland. Greg Gray is the police EPB guy up there and I am just about to email him to find out what happened with the 13-year-old
who lit that fire in the shopping complex, in terms of any sort of CPTED review that did or did not happen prior to the building of that complex. It escapes me how a 13-year-old could hide in a corner somewhere and light a fire. Look, I am getting beyond it because I do not know, but I am sure Greg will inform me of what happened, what fell down, in terms of a CPTED review in that complex.

The CHAIR — Geoff, I might have to pull you up there, if you do not mind, just to allow the committee to ask a few questions before the time elapses.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Yes, that is fine.

The CHAIR — Some of our committee members have other responsibilities shortly.

Mr GRIFFITHS — The only thing that I would say, Simon, if you do not mind, is that CPTED is one very small element in the crime reduction program, even with the banks. I spent a lot of money on training, I spent a lot of money on cash reduction mathematical modelling and experience, a regression model that looked at the prediction of robberies in our branch network. ATM locations et cetera. Even in the scheme of things what we are talking about with councils and others, CPTED is a small element of the situational crime prevention approach.

The CHAIR — I understand that. In fact, we have just had VicPol, the Victorian police, here prior to you coming on. Our reference is fairly narrow, in that we are looking at the Safer Design principles that are adopted by local government. It is a wide range.

Mr GRIFFITHS — That was Tony Langdon, wasn't it?

The CHAIR — I will just ask Tim McCurdy, one of our committee persons, to ask a question. Then I might open it up for the committee, Geoff.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Yes, fine. Thank you.

Mr McCURDY — Geoff, Tim McCurdy here. Do you see that CPTED or Safer Design principles should be mandated into legislation or do you think the way we are going about it now is adequate for the input that is going on?

Mr GRIFFITHS — No, I am fairly adamant about that. It has to be mandated. Time would indicate since the nineties very little has happened in our system. There is that example of New South Wales, where it is mandated. Unless you have a stick of some sort, the developers will just say, 'Thanks very much, I'm too busy. I'm making more money elsewhere and we won't need to worry about that. We'll leave that to the keeper, if anything happens,' because it is indeterminable too, in terms of CPTED, if anything would happen down the track. It is obvious from both local and overseas research that if it is not looked at at the early design stage, something could happen down the track. What happens if you do not manage CPTED and people are promoted, they move on, you have no champion to continue with the program. So no, I believe it has to be formalised and mandatory for an initial involvement in the architectural design, and plans audited.

Mr McCURDY — Thanks for that.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Thank you.

The CHAIR — Another question from one of our committee members?

Mr LEANE — Geoff, the question Tim asked really covered what I was going to ask you. Thanks, you have been pretty comprehensive, so that is great.

Mr GRIFFITHS — Okay.
The CHAIR — Maybe just as a closing question, Geoff, what recommendations would you see the committee making to facilitate the effective implementation of CPTED and Safer Design principles, given your passion?

Mr GRIFFITHS — I have given that some thought and also read the article by Carolyn Whitzman, who was involved with Adam Sutton. There was a real motivator at Melbourne University who passed away a number of years ago, but he and I worked on the police program in his own university course. Carolyn was involved in urban planning. In her article she has hit the nail on the head to some degree and I firmly believe that the Department of Planning and Community Development—not knowing their full responsibilities but obviously they are linked in with all the councils—could be a responsible authority to formalise the policing and mandatory control of CPTED. The other people I had spoken to was the Office of the State Architect. I had a good chat to the staff over there but I think there are only three or four in that department and they may have limited scope.

The police have done a good job and we can see, with cost constraints, they have certainly developed a great course. We brought Phil down from Sydney. I was involved in the initial courses over at the Army barracks. They even had it accredited around Australia. It had national accreditation. We were so far ahead of the other states. The police, with internal issues, have still got the only program here in Victoria, unless you use commercial people. I would not entertain that. If they can get that course going and it is redeveloped it could be accredited again—but that is all lapsed now. It would cost some dollars to get it reaccredited. They certainly have a role to play but, from experience, they have not managed it effectively. They obviously have not seen CPTED as a top priority in the Police organisation. Some academics and others thought that because they are police, they should be responsible for crime prevention. I don’t agree with that.

Here is a classic case of over 20 years where they have had the opportunity but did not take full advantage. We brought Ron Clarke over, who is still around. He is the situational crime guru and CPTED guru. They had it for a while. They have held onto it. I cannot understand why they have not continued to run the course at the academy. It has been two years. They would have had funds from councils to send participants on it. It might have been a fee-paying course. I do not care what it was. I even tried to get a TAFE course going when I was at Chisholm, but people did not see the need. Where they do not see a need, they will not attend. I even tried to run a couple of short courses in those days. Because it was new and innovative, people did not see a reason to attend.

I would see the Department of Planning and Community Development being involved. The police would certainly be involved. We would have to hang onto their CPTED course and update it. With the individual councils and because of the way it is with personalities and territorial issues, if it is not appropriately mandated and policed in some way by a department, it will be completely watered down in a number of years.

It will be interesting on the response I get when I do send this letter out to the mayors, talking about CPTED. I have asked them in the letter whether they could give me a heads-up of what is happening in their councils. I know some councils are doing it reasonably well. I know Melbourne City Council have been. There have been territorial issues there with Places Victoria and the government saying, ‘Well, look, you're not involved in the Docklands development.’ People get a bit upset with those things on their own patch. It could happen here at Officer, where Places Victoria might just step in and say, ‘Look, sorry, council, we're responsible for this 350-acre development here and we'll be putting things in place.’ That could be quite positive and some department clashes but they must involve the community.

The CHAIR — All right, Geoff. We might have to wrap it up there because in fact we are going to be doing some work with the local councils ourselves. We appreciate your time this afternoon, and I am looking at our committee; I think they feel we have covered that area well. I thank you very much for your presentation.
Mr GRIFFITHS — Okay, yes. The only point that I would mention with councils is that I have actually asked councils what they are doing about CPTED and they have virtually said, 'Oh yeah, don't you worry about that, Geoff. Everything's all right.' Then I have said, 'Well, do you have some guidelines on your webpage? I cannot see any guidelines or anything that you've actually requested of developers.' 'Oh, don't you worry about that, Geoff.' You need to see their hard-copy evidence to see what they have actually introduced on CPTED and that you can see the clear guidelines on their webpage. Thank you, gentlemen, for your time. All the best. I will be watching for the results of this review.

The CHAIR — Thank you for your interest, Geoff. We really appreciate it.

Witness withdrew.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — I open the hearing and welcome Dr Christopher Hale. Thank you very much for your time. This is the joint parliamentary committee for drugs and crime prevention. We have three of our five members here this afternoon, and one will be joining us a bit later. We have allowed time until 1.15 p.m. for your presentation and questions, Chris. I have to read you the conditions around your presentation this afternoon, so bear with me for a minute.

Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005, and where applicable the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Dr HALE — Yes I have.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I understand, Chris, you have been given our terms of reference in relation to this inquiry?

Dr HALE — Yes I have.

The CHAIR — We have been given some background about you as part of the preparation for this hearing today, so we know a bit about you and I suspect you have probably googled us and know a bit about us too. So thank you again and I look forward to hearing your presentation and we also look forward to asking a number of questions of you after that. Thank you.

Dr HALE — Okay. I will just display this presentation.

Overheads shown.

Dr HALE — What I would like to do is run through essentially an alternative vision for stations, which is stations as vibrant centres of the community. That of itself implies an opposition to some of the fears and the negatives around stations that I presume are leading to the discussion that we are having today. I will run through the items roughly in order.

I think I would like to start by summarising another location internationally which I thought brought up some interesting ideas and analysis, and I have handed around a paper from which I am drawing some of this discussion for the next couple of slides. In this particular paper they basically identify two types of negative behaviour at stations. They call them category 1 and category 2. Category 1 is serious, category 2 behaviours, which are mainly represented on the screen here, are more your antisocial behaviours, tending to be sufficiently antisocial that they probably warrant police intervention.

I would suggest, personally, that these behaviours are also problematic because they have an ability to escalate into something else. There is the question there for me, if I am a public transport user, and I am observing these behaviours and I am the only person on the station — or maybe there are some other people — what are my responsibilities and what does it feel like for me to be in that situation in the absence, maybe, of staff or other oversight? How do I feel as a passenger when these sorts of things are happening? The other thing about these behaviours is that they are probably reasonably common. We hope they are uncommon but these are certainly things that happen.

I thought the paper from the LA people was very interesting. Strangely enough the pathway that led to me delving into that particular piece of analysis — in being invited along today I thought back and I have been travelling around the world a lot in recent years, looking at mass transit environments, and I thought back on what was the most uncomfortable I had been, or what was the most scared I had ever felt on public transport over the last 5 or 6 years, and this was it. It was in Los Angeles. It is the blue line in Los Angeles, and this is the Wilmington station in East L.A. Basically, if you are foolhardy enough to take the light rail from Los Angeles airport through to the centre of town, more or less you pass through these sorts of environments and the analysis in the
paper there suggests to us that this particular station, where I felt extremely uncomfortable and intimidated for about 7 minutes, had some very interesting things going on.

Mr SCHEFFER — Can you say why? What happened?

Dr HALE — The paper goes into it, but these are the four red lights here. The context is that the surrounding neighbourhood has a very, very low socioeconomic context. So this is essentially Compton, and Compton station is one or two stations away from this particular Wilmington station, but the basic factors are very low socioeconomic performance, if you want to call it that, in the surrounding neighbourhood. It is a high crime suburb in which this station is situated. For me, that led to very scary perceptions when I was there for 7 minutes, waiting for an interchange. It is also extremely poorly designed, so you can see in the background there, that it is underneath a freeway viaduct. It is poorly maintained and there are very dark spaces as well.

However, there is something very interesting going on here because we are looking at the figures in the paper that I have handed around, and this is a high-volume station but proportionately a low-crime station. So there is something going on there. My perceptions, in a sense, were almost incorrect. The statistics showing that, proportionately speaking, this is a relatively safe station in the LA network. I tried to surmise why that might be, and I came up with the answer that it is because of the high volumes of passengers at this station. And I will talk a little more about what that means as we go along.

Mr McCURDY — Even the thugs feel scared.

Dr HALE — Yes, or they feel that they are under observation or they are less likely to get away with antisocial behaviour at the station here, compared to what they might get away with around the corner.

The CHAIR — Is there a visible presence of security?

Dr HALE — No, there was not at this particular station. You can sort of see there is a CCTV there somewhere, but the only thing I could summarise was that there were about 20 or 30 people on the platform. That was probably the thing that was leading to those particular statistics that they are showing in the paper. And that is not to say that there is no crime or no antisocial behaviour at this station; it is just proportionately lower, which is an interesting little relationship. But we might come back to those ideas as we go along.

Leaping on from that starting point, and I was thinking about the topic today, I think ultimately we are talking about your crime prevention through environmental design, but applying that specifically to stations as particular sorts of facilities and environments. So that the CPTED thinking in terms of safety — generally speaking it is all about this idea of eyes on the street. Eyes on the street is an idea that goes way back to the 1960s, and essentially precedes the CPTED concept and principles. It has been around for a long time. What we mean in the station’s environment is that we are talking about eyes at the station, I think, as the key CPTED outcome or factor that we should be looking to reinforce.

Those eyes at the station can come from staff members. They could come from uniformed patrol, but equally it can come from other passengers. It could also come — and this is not so relevant in Melbourne, but I think this is what is going to happen over the next 10 or 15 years — from other people who live or work in the surrounding area coming to that station and that facility for other reasons, and I will talk about what those other reasons might be in a moment. Basically all of these different things — the eyes at the station from these three or four different sources — should reinforce safety and passive surveillance and active surveillance to some degree.

There is then another set of CPTED principles that I think probably apply in the station design and the station environment context. Those are things like open and transparent design approaches. Then there is also this final dot point here, which is kind of a tricky one, but it has been around in the literature for quite some time. This is what some people summarise as the broken window theory. which is that a high-quality, up-market, well designed, well maintained building or location
for whatever reason psychologically reinforces civil behaviour, whereas down-market, poorly maintained ugly-looking facilities can — —

Again, it is difficult, because there is a connection there between facilities and psychology and behaviour, but people are tending to say that those lower-quality environments can psychologically trigger an expectation that this is a location where antisocial behaviour is either likely to happen or unlikely to be punished, or something like that. We will go through some of these ideas as we move ahead.

I then jump off into some observations around station facilities worldwide, and what is the sort of benchmark, and to some degree what are people doing with new stations and with new design approaches. In that sense I will spend 2 or 3 minutes speaking about stations in the international context and what they are saying to us. This is always my favourite example of a great station and a great design. There are a couple of interesting things going on here that might be relevant to us. Sometimes you can scale these ideas. This is obviously a large-scale example, but the ideas can be scaled down to different contexts as well. I think what is going on here is the movement and the activity, and the openness and the natural light of the facility. What you find is that Grand Central station in New York is a very safe location to be.

Then I started thinking about what other cities and countries and mass transit agencies are doing with station design, and maybe looking at it more broadly rather than just in relation to safety. What we have seen in the last couple of years is that station design has gone up-market. It has been taken very seriously by the agencies, by governments and by transit operators, and they are resourcing stations to become high-quality environments. I think that is reinforced with activity and also with other uses that are incorporated into the facility. This example is a very up-market department store which is combined into a major rail transit facility in Japan. That was Nagoya station.

This is Kyoto station, a similar sort of outcome — a very big investment in the station with lots of activity. It is open and there are all these other uses going on there. There is a hotel and a department store, restaurants and cafes and a whole range of other things. It is a multi-use facility with plenty of activity, and with a very high-quality design and high-quality outcome.

At a lower-volume scale, here is a recent example from Vienna. This is more of a suburban station example. It is a nice, clean, open, inviting design, but there is also this incorporation of these other activities and uses into the facility — a small-scale supermarket, I think there was a bookstore, a bakery, a cafe and a restaurant. There might have been a florist, a hairdresser and probably 10 or 11 different tenancies at this suburban location in the Vienna context.

Here is a different sort of example, one from Munich. As we know, the underground environments for mass transit can at times be quite intimidating and dark, gloomy and scary. I think what this is suggesting here is that simply the use of colour, materials, detail and lighting is turning this into quite an active and vibrant sort of a location; there is no sense of foreboding or scariness about this particular location.

More broadly, here is an example from France, in Strasbourg. Certainly there is open and transparent design there, but it is really about taking stations seriously as important civic buildings.

Here is something else that is a little bit different from what we are talking about today. There is this sense of serious design — well-resourced outcomes for mass transit, high-quality outcomes — and this as much as anything I think is the trend with stations internationally over the last five years and certainly pushing forward.

This is another underground example in Hamburg. I believe this particular underground environment is 100 or 110 years old, but they revamped it. The thing that I see here and in all of these other examples is the relationship between activity, movement and people, and the reinforcement of stations as safe environments. To reinforce the point, that can be activity coming from using station environments as multipurpose facilities. Again, there is the Hong Kong example of large-scale retail combined with a station facility.
Here is an example from Queensland. To me this is working fairly effectively as an Australian example. There is a station. Strangely enough Fortitude Valley itself has a little bit of a reputation for being an unsafe location, rightly or wrongly — probably rightly at the end of the day; however, this treatment they have given it, with the cafes and convenience retailing closely configured around the station entrance, reinforces safety and does a whole lot of other things as well.

There is activity that comes through other activities, other uses within the station environment. There is also the activity that we can proactively work through with that is coming from ridership growth, and I think that is something that is quite important in the Melbourne context moving forward. We know that ridership growth has happened, and we know there is more ridership growth coming forward. How do we work with that in terms of reinforcing stations as a safe environment?

The question ultimately becomes: so what? That is what they have been doing internationally I guess is what I am saying. The interesting question would be: what have we been doing in Melbourne? This is one of our recent, brand-new stations in Melbourne, at Roxburgh Park. This is the way we have been approaching stations in Melbourne in recent years — the design thinking, the sorts of environments that we are creating, and certainly a very defensive environment in terms of its design and its language. I know it is always difficult when we dip into the psychology, but to me this is a built environment that is reinforcing or articulating an expectation that antisocial behaviour is going to occur at this particular location.

To draw a contrast, this is that same Roxburgh Park station. I think this was about 11 o’clock — midmorning. There are probably about half a dozen people on the platform there. The contrast would be with something like this, which is a very different type of location. It is an underground station in Munich. It is also a suburban location. From memory, I took this photo midmorning, probably around 10.30 or 11 o’clock. There is the same number of people on the platform. Basically to me this station, this environment, is reinforcing civil behaviour in terms of its cues, psychologically speaking, whereas this one I think is reinforcing an expectation that antisocial behaviour could occur at this particular location. I know that is quite a tricky linkage through built environment and design and psychology and behaviour, but I think it is a point worth making.

Some interesting words came up in the Los Angeles paper. They use the expression at one point — and I thought this was very interesting wording — ‘a legitimate behaviour setting’. To me this is a legitimate behaviour setting, and I am not convinced that this is a setting for legitimate behaviour. I thought that cartoon in the Age of probably a couple of months ago now was also quite instructive.

What message are we reinforcing with the environments that we are creating, the facilities we are delivering and the outcomes we are delivering with stations in Melbourne? I think we are reinforcing a down-market image with these facilities. There are two things here. One is taking staff away from stations. I think there is a very obvious connection to safety outcomes and active surveillance, but to me there is also a sense that we are not taking these locations seriously; we are not taking these facilities seriously. People are picking up on those cues. I think somehow there is a spiral into what might be possibilities for antisocial behaviour. So with stations we should be reinforcing these locations as civil environments in the fullest sense.

**Mr McCURDY** — In terms of PSOs, they are fundamentally different to staff. Looking at your other examples where you are nearly reinforcing that antisocial behaviour, are you suggesting that PSOs might have the same effect as a staff member?

**Dr HALE** — Yes. I have to say from the outset that I am really in favour of a uniformed presence. When we broaden this discussion out to safety and security more broadly I think there is a real argument for a uniformed presence. Having spent a lot of time overseas I came back and was working a lot in Queensland and so forth in recent years, and any time that the issue of safety and security came up I was always telling people in Queensland Rail and my Department of Transport and Main Roads that I was surprised at the lack of a uniformed presence in major stations in Queensland.
A uniformed presence is a great idea. A uniformed presence, however, is clearly active surveillance. In broadening things out there are all these other elements that contribute to safety beyond a uniformed presence, and staff is one of them. I think staffing provides a mixture of both active and passive surveillance. Having staff is a good idea, and by staff I mean not necessarily staff directly related to security, just station attendants. Then I guess what I am saying is there is a whole range of other built environment and design-related factors that in combination, if you were to take those three or four different things, being a uniformed security presence, staffing, open and transparent design and reinforcing the activity and the movement of passengers and other people through a facility, are the three or four different legs that make up the reinforcement of a safer environment — certainly from a perceptions perspective.

That is how I would summarise an issue like this. This is what stations should be. They should be a focus of the local community, a focus of movement. They should be busy day and night. They should be multipurpose facilities which include convenience offerings and retail — that is a third or fourth element to that passive surveillance idea. They should be well designed, they should be up to date, they should be clean, inviting and open. They should be statements of civic pride and the priority that the community places on public transport. They should be locations that reinforce civil and legitimate behaviour, and they should be staffed. There are always arguments about why you would not staff a particular station, but to me it is almost like let us have a default position that we will staff stations and argue our way around that if it is not to be the case at a particular station.

Who is responsible? I think for the most part we know who is responsible. There is a group of second-tier actors, probably the consultants and contractors listed there. I would not say they are one of the problems at the moment, but they need work and they need engagement with this idea because in a sense they are the people who are delivering the design as much as anyone.

I think ultimately it all revolves around the issue of capability in the Australian context. What happened in Australia historically after the Second World War essentially, after the 1940s, was that public transport was de-emphasised for several generations and I think there was a falling away in terms of the skills set there. More recently we have started to pick up our work on public transport again, but after a very long and very deep break from taking it seriously. Therefore I think a lot of the core capabilities that we see exhibited in the high-performing examples from overseas are not necessarily immediately and readily available to us. I think we need to work on capability. It involves recognising that station design is a specialised skill; it involves recognising that any specialised skill requires formal learning for individuals and for the institutions that are involved. In the Australian context it also involves recognising that mass transit planning, engineering design and finance are specialised skill sets; they are not generic skill sets, so we need to be addressing that over time. They are seen as a specialisation in Europe and Asia, but not in Australia.

I think in the Australian context in planning and transport we also have problems with closed cultures or even secretive cultures, and that is an inhibiting factor any time you want to have a discussion about what we are going to do with stations or mass transit or with planning or whatever the case might be. The default position seems to be to have more of a closed discussion and then defend afterwards based on what has been decided in a closed environment.

I know it is important not to generalise, and it is not particularly about Melbourne, but in the Australian transport and planning culture as much as there is an interest in innovation there is also a resistance against any form of innovation coming from other sources. That is what I have observed in any case. Therefore when I talk about the idea of capabilities and skill sets, that is what I believe led to this particular outcome. That would be my evidence of a lack of capability and a lack of skill in public transport. My understanding is that this was not by any means a cheap exercise. I have heard the figure of $45 million for that particular station and for those outcomes. Again capability would be what I would point to.

I think then there is another set of issues around it being all about resourcing. If we see there is an issue that we want to address, it is a question of how we resource that issue from an existing resource base, therefore we get into prioritisation. Obviously the CBD stations in a sense take care
of themselves, but what we have in Melbourne is a list of second and third-tier stations that on the latest figures are very high volume stations. Large numbers of people are passing through these particular locations. You can see the numbers in the second column from the right. Therefore these are locations that I would suggest directing priority and resource towards in terms of improving the environment and maybe even in terms of things like staffing and so on.

There is another set of stations here, the growth column which is the third column from the right. This is a much more diverse set of stations which have seen outstanding percentage growth in terms of passenger movement numbers. This is another grouping of stations where I would say, ‘Pay attention to these stations; look at the resources that they have’. They may well be locations that require new and updated thinking or a little bit more investment or attention and care.

I think there is a third set of stations where high transfer volumes are encountered, and these are stations where you are classically changing from one line to another. They are very important network elements in the system, and therefore it is another set of stations. A lot of these overlap of course with the other ones but are another pathway towards prioritisation of investment and upgrades and things like staffing.

Just to summarise, these would be three or four things that I suggest need to happen to improve station outcomes and to reinforce stations as civil environments. There is plenty of research and documentation. I know people in a sense expect that from researchers, but if you look at that LA document, I think that type of exercise in Melbourne would be highly useful, which is just to identify where crime and antisocial behaviour is occurring throughout the network and then maybe stocktaking those locations where there are either high rates of antisocial or criminal behaviour occurring and/or locations which in a sense surprise us because of their low levels of antisocial behaviour. You would want to have a look at those locations as well and try to replicate or understand what is going on at those locations and reinforce that throughout the network.

Point no. 2 is that having a strategy is always a good idea I think, so I would reinforce that one. In the third point here, it helps to have design guidance. I know there is plenty of design guidance, but the types of design guidance we typically see in Australia are 300 or 400 pages worth of how to design a toilet, quite literally, in a railway station. You have to get something that is communicating more effectively so that people like it. It has to be shorter, punchier, clearer, more evidence-based and something that people understand. When I am looking at stations, when I am trying to reinforce safety and security, what are my top 10 things I need to be attending to? I think that type of guidance would be very useful at this point.

The final point is opportunities to upskill and in a sense, firstly, to communicate these issues to a relatively broad audience. But if we go back to those different players and stakeholders, I think everyone wants to be involved in this discussion about where we are going with stations, what that involves, what it means for resourcing and what the design issues are. Not necessarily everyone, but there is a certain set of audiences that you want to be able to reach with any message that is conveyed. I think that is it for me actually.

The CHAIR — Well done, Chris, you have given us a very expansive presentation. Thank you. Even better you have allowed a little bit of time for questions. I was just trying to remember a train station. Remember we had another witness — was it the City of Casey? It had a lot of glass. Remember that?

The CHAIR — They used a lot of transparent glass through their new station design — which got away from that sort of concrete grille-type effect which I think you were saying indicates there is antisocial behaviour there already — allowing for an environment where it creates that sort of activity and family and space. Nevertheless I will invite the committee to ask or raise some questions.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thanks, Chris; that was a great presentation. Just before we go on to other things that perhaps people want to pick up, you talked about the culture of closed planning around railway stations. Could you just step us through what an open planning process might involve? You drew on international examples. Perhaps you could talk about some of those.
**Dr HALE** — Yes. At the moment I am not sure what the pathway is towards particular stations getting resources and being invested in or renovated. What I think I would like to see is some sort of program for station upgrades. Obviously you have high-profile examples like Southern Cross and now there is a move with Flinders Street station. The reality is there are 160 stations or something like that in the Melbourne system. I would be interested to see a program that has some sort of time line to it and some sort of picture of what it means to engage in station redevelopment or reconfiguration and then a nominating of priority stations and some sort of sense of timing about how they are going to be worked through.

One of my little bugbears is that I like the idea of a small number of high-profile, high-impact station reconfigurations rather than a program for which resources are spread everywhere at once and you do coats of paint here and there and you do new signage and a little bit of lighting at every single station. I would rather see a benchmark set in suburban stations where, say, we have five particular stations, for argument’s sake, and these are the ones that we are prioritising at the moment and we are going to demonstrate a new benchmark for station design through that program.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — You could still do all of that in terms of prioritising and not have a consultative approach on the ground in that neighbourhood.

**Dr HALE** — Yes. Again my evidence — ‘evidence’ I guess is a loaded word — would be to point to this type of example here and I would suggest, my guess would be, that there was not a particular consultative or engaged process there.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Agreed.

**Dr HALE** — Going back to these sorts of contrasts, to me it is about the planning community and agencies and the transport community and agencies being clear and honest with everyone about the current state of practice and where that is relative to where we want to be. If you start being clear about that, I think you start to say, ‘We need to work through a process of upskilling and we need to recognise that the outcomes we have been delivering are not sufficient’. Again that to me requires an open discussion. It is a multiparty discussion. It involves local government becoming involved. Certainly to get the outcomes you are going to need local government involved.

It also involves breaking out of what I sometimes refer to as the bureaucracy-consultant nexus. Almost everything occurs as a nexus between the bureaucracy and consultants. Consultants, as we know, are paid per output arrangement and they have certain skills, and if the skills that they have are limited or if the guidance they are getting from bureaucracies is limited in some way, then there is no other angle, voice or discussion that is breaking that nexus.

The type of thing I would refer to would be something like peer review. Peer review does occur in major transport and planning projects, nominally speaking, in Melbourne, Brisbane and Sydney. There is always some kind of peer review going on. But invariably it is consultants reviewing the work of other consultants. I think you would want to broaden that out. You would want to look at who has some knowledge, who has some ideas about the way stations are going internationally and who has some ideas about design guidance and different approaches to station design. You would want to reinforce that and get them into the mix.

**Mr McCURDY** — That is fine in theory, but I suppose I look at that station that you just put up — which one was that again?

**Dr HALE** — Roxburgh Park.

**Mr McCURDY** — Roxburgh Park. You were telling us about interactivity and more people. If you look at Flinders Street, Southern Cross, obviously trains come and go. For some of the older suburban stations the community is right at the station — not like Roxburgh Park, where it seems to be still removed a bit from it. You still have a fence there because everyone had to come in via the gate to show their ticket. They do not nowadays; you do not need the fence. Then it comes down to what is safe and what is not safe for dogs getting on the train line or whatever it might be.
I suppose there is this balance with our enthusiasm to sue all the time. If you look at that design, it is a safe design in terms of people falling over and hurting themselves or falling onto the train line, but how do you get that balance right? I understand what you are saying. It is certainly not friendly when you look at it. But there is also finding the balance in terms of liability.

**Dr HALE** — My answer to that is that I think good design teams and good oversight project guidance from the transport stakeholder can do both. My view is that for the most part good design is about creativity; it is really a thought process and an outcome, and for me this is a cost-effective solution. There is nothing special about this example here. It is a concrete box, it is underground, but they have used lighting, colour, detail and clever design thinking. Again you would see a similar number of passengers at that station. So in this case it is not the activity per se that has been the reinforcing element, it is the brightness and the colourful nature of the facility.

I guess what I am trying to say is that the really good designers and thinkers should be able to deliver high-quality outcomes without necessarily adding to the cost. To me that all comes back to that question of capability.

**Mr McCURDY** — Fair enough.

**The CHAIR** — It is a bit hard to put a mural on fresh air though, Chris, and that is the comparison that you are giving us. One is an internal, subterranean structure and the other one is an open-air one.

**Dr HALE** — Yes, that is right. But it is really about the materials that are chosen and the materials that are used.

**The CHAIR** — And the floor space.

**Dr HALE** — If you are using raw concrete, for example, that is a certain design material. You can use other materials, but you could argue that it is marginally more costly to use other sorts of materials.

**The CHAIR** — Which is interesting because Roxburgh I thought, from memory having gone through there, actually has a lot of colour around it. You see a building in the background with colour around the squares and things. It does look a bit like Pentridge revisited, doesn’t it? Any other questions?

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Just a quick one, because we only have a minute, and that is: do you have much litigation with the CPTED safety design principles?

**Dr HALE** — Do you mean am I familiar with them?

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Yes. One of the issues we are dealing with is that they do not appear to be picked up and used as well they should be, which is what we have been asked to look at. Do you have any light to throw on that?

**Dr HALE** — I would suggest that stations are a sufficiently specialised type of facility environment where you have that specialised guidance. CPTED is a very broad-ranging set of ideas for all sorts of locations and environments.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — I will just narrow it down a bit. If you had a set of guidelines around stations, you might have the same problem with your guidelines but they might not be picked up by the people who need to pick them up.

**Dr HALE** — Yes. This is why I say that there is a need for active engagement in this particular topic, and you have to have that as a guided program of engagement over two years. To me there is an issue with stations in Melbourne, and equally in Sydney or Brisbane, in that we have not been applying the latest thinking to these stations and the stations have deteriorated as environments. So it is a question of how you turn that around. You turn it around through upskilling, through
evidence-based analysis, through having documented guidance and through a process of talking through the issues with a whole range of different stakeholders.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay, thanks.

The CHAIR — All right. We will have to leave it there. Thanks very much, Chris, for your time this afternoon and your obvious passion for train station development.

Dr HALE — Thank you.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Welcome to the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. Thank you for your time this afternoon. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you read and received the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Dr SALIM — Yes.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence, and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Dr Salim, I understand you have been given the terms of reference in relation to our inquiry, and you are a research fellow from the spatial information architecture laboratory.

Dr SALIM — Exactly.

The CHAIR — Welcome. Thank you very much. We have allowed until 2 o’clock for this session. We like the committee to have opportunities to ask questions, and if it is okay with you, a couple of our committee members like to do that through the presentation, and some like to wait until the end. Do you have a preference? Are you happy if we — —

Dr SALIM — I’m happy.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Dr SALIM — I am here representing RMIT but more specifically the Design Research Institute and also the spatial information architecture lab. Just to give you a bit of background, the spatial information architecture lab is a research facility within the school of architecture and design and we are very transdisciplinary. For example, my background is actually computer science. I have been embedded within the lab for the past four years, working with architects and engineers mainly, and also industrial designers and artists. I am actually reporting to Professor Mark Burry. I understand that the invitation was first sent to Dr Richard Blythe or Mark Burry. Neither of them can make it, but I am representing them because I have actually done research in this area as well.

The main question that I would like to go through in the presentation is how design can help communities deal with crime.

Overheads shown.

Dr SALIM — This was a question posed by RMIT’s DRI design challenge in 2010. DRI runs a design challenge every year, and this year the focus is ageing, but in 2010 it was crime. When we had that design challenge DRI invited key speakers and experts on this topic, and we had people from Victoria Police, the City of Melbourne, academics and experts. International experts on the topic as well gave some talks. It becomes really interesting, because I never did any research in crime until I got involved in the design challenge, and I thought this was a very interesting topic.

There are a few highlights from the presentations that I thought were quite interesting. Paul Pottage from VicPol did a presentation about different interventions mainly on infrastructure design, such as CCTV and lighting across the city, as a deterrent factor for crimes or assaults to happen.

There is another presentation that I think is quite interesting, from Paul Ekblom, if you have heard about him. He is the leader of the Design Against Crime lab in the UK. If you have not, I think they have a very good resource — their website is very good. A few things that they did was they
actually made visual briefing documents. One graphic of this was that communication design can actually help in informing the public of what usually happens around, let us say, bag theft. These visual documents were distributed in areas prone to theft, and that was proved to be quite effective, so people are becoming more aware of different techniques of bag theft. Beyond that, they did some design call as well from the public. The designers responded, and one of the products that was designed was called the Stop Thief Chair. It was based on some of the modus operandi of bag lifting from shoppers — a lot of times the bag was left behind the owner. Now they create these chairs that have the hangers or hooks for the bag in a defensive area so it is very hard for a thief to take it. This is just an example of what product design can do.

Another example is bicycle theft. There was another briefing document on what are the usual modus operandi of thieves. Then they also did a design challenge. Some examples of products resulting from that are bike stands and also a new type of bike. This bike is called the Puma Bike because it was then produced by Puma. One of the down strips of the aluminium frame was replaced with a steel cable that works as a locking mechanism. Basically, if the cable is cut, it will leave the whole bike not sound structurally, so it will actually destroy the value of the bike, and it basically defeats the point of stealing the bike. That was very successful, and they sold that bike quite successfully. They did an ad campaign as well, so the thieves know that if they steal one of these bikes, it is worth nothing for them. The other one is the Camden stand. The way the stand works is that it locks the bike to be upright, so it is very hard to release the bike from the stand.

These are some examples of how design can be used in designing infrastructure that works against certain modus operandi of thieves. These are all very important and very interesting, but what we did was a bit different. Our project was one of the finalists in the RMIT design challenge in 2010 by the Design Research Institute. It was a project called Transafe, a mobile phone app. What led us to that project was that we had a specification from Anne Malloch, who is the leader of City Safety in the City of Melbourne. She talked about the background, about people using the city, about 770 000, and that they are mainly commuting by trains into the city.

This is actually a much greater population — double — at night-time, and it is much greater than the population itself. The key challenge really is to meet the needs of those visitors. Another big challenge also is the perception of safety, which is really bad, especially around visitors and international students, the idea that Melbourne is actually perhaps not that safe. There is increased sensation in the media about Melbourne, about one event or the bashing of international students — all those things trigger those negative perceptions. But the fact is that crime stats are decreasing. The media do not report that; they report one or two major attacks.

How do we allow the public to see what is actually happening and access and understand the data? Then we will be able to work with the public to identify those real issues. What makes the public scared, for example? Those are the questions that remain unanswered — the understanding of public sentiment over the issue of safety. That was a challenge for me when we did the design challenge in 2010: how to understand public perception on safety.

How do we effectively influence behaviours? I think that is also another thing, if we actually know what are the perceptions of the public about safety in different places at different times of the day, maybe in King Street, for example. People’s perceptions of King Street is quite different from Swanston Street around Melbourne Central. There is just a different public perception of different places.

How do we tell people what we do — local government, Crime Stoppers? In our project, we collaborated with Victoria Police. The director of Crime Stoppers collaborated with us on this project as well for finding data and also Yarra Trams and basically experts in media and computer science and arts. We have a very intricate public transport network which is quite dispersed. The trains, trams and buses are all run by different operators and the data is quite dispersed. Now we have started working with Public Transport Victoria and we understand the way that they even store and manage data is it is managed by different services, and there is the start of an effort to integrate the whole data. It is quite a challenge. It is hard to know what is even happening on the public transport network.
One of the biggest problems is that commuters feel unsafe and vulnerable on public transport networks. As I said before, we need to answer the needs of those 770,000 people commuting to the city every day. If we look at the actual crime stats, which are decreasing, what makes people scared? How can information regarding public perception on crime be used to promote and facilitate feelings of safety within the city? That was the question for our project.

A few tools and methods that we used we call crowd sourcing. How do we use the crowd to actually outsource information for us? As I said, it is hard to get data from individual transport providers because they are scattered, so how about if we get the crowd to provide the data for us — not just facts but also perception, feelings? Then we have this mobile technology. Everyone is using smart devices, smart phones. There is this sense that we can pass on information that is so rich, with multimedia — like photos taken with your camera. We can even know where photos are taken from, for example, because they can be geotagged.

Mobile devices allow interactive feedback. There is a term called sentiment mining; that is something that we are interested in doing. How do we mine the public sentiment and the perception of safety? And how can we use techniques like augmented reality and visualisations to show people layers of information, of what is happening or maybe the level of perception? And how do they actually integrate or layer together?

There is some other related work that we looked at — NYPD ‘311’. This is the work where people in New York can actually send multimedia or text messages if they see something is wrong, so there is a channel to do that. We had a few discussions with Peter Sprott from Crime Stoppers, and he admitted that the current way of disseminating data from Crime Stoppers is quite limited, just public signage at train stations or news or just the internet. There is not much interaction with the public. There is no mobile app yet.

Mr SCHEFFER — Is this sort of like a higher development of the traffic reports on the radio, where people call in in the morning and say, ‘There is a hold-up at this point’, and then the radio announcer gets other calls and mediates them through so that other drivers know what is happening in the city and which areas to avoid? Is this a development of that concept?

Dr SALIM — Yes, sort of. Basically this is like an aggregate data, if you like. What these applications have done — they did something like that — is to actually allow the public to respond and provide feedback on what is happening and actually send it back. This one, FixMyStreet, is quite interesting. It is an online reporting in the UK. Let us say, they see a big hole on one of the roads, one of the major roads, and they just take pictures of it. If there are is a heap of, let us say 10 or 100, people in the area sending the same sort of picture, that means it is a major problem and it has to be responded to. Actually the local governments do respond; they do not just collect. I mean, the public will not do it if they do not see any response. Because they see this as a two-way thing, and then they become very engaged. FixMyStreet works really well in the UK because the local governments really act on what is reported by the public.

This is very interesting. All those things, they are not so visualised, but Oakland Crimespotting is a real-time visualisation of what is happening. If they spot a crime, they are able to report it on this website, and it will be visualised straightaway online so other people will be able to see — ‘Oh, there’s a bank robbery’, ‘Oh, there’s an assault’. Even a little assault or different levels of crime that are happening can be visualised. The police actually respond to the public reporting as well. This works really well because, as I say, it is a two-way thing as well. That is why we collaborated with VicPol and Crime Stoppers in this project, because they also see that it is something that we have not done in Melbourne.

This was the project, called Transafe. A few things that we outsource are, basically, the input from the crowd, perceptions about places, antisocial/illegal activity reporting, input from Victoria Police and Crime Stoppers. There is output to the crowd again, with data visualisations, crime information. Based on the crime input we actually synthesise it with mobile sensors input so the information becomes smarter. For example, if someone sends a picture, we will be able to know where the picture was taken and in which direction that person was looking at. For example, there is a crime happening in Parliament but there are so many exits — which direction, for example.
There is a compass in the mobile phone so we actually know which way the person is looking, and things like that.

We see that there are a few stakeholders of this information — Crime Stoppers, the police, city councils and the public users, and perhaps also related businesses and services will make use of this information. There is a direct user interaction. We actually gather people’s perception of safety using what we call an emometer — emotion meter. They can actually put themselves on the scale of feeling sad, happy or whatever. On a certain site we gather that data and analyse it. You can actually view it using either the two visualisations or the augmented reality app, so you can lift your phone up and look at a site and you can see a layer of colours. They are visualising the data of the perception of people.

Also, we are visualising data from Crime Stoppers. Let us say, on this site a week ago there was an assault, and maybe someone who actually lives nearby, a neighbour, realised that this was a real assault. Maybe this person had seen it sometime ago — a week ago — but might not have remembered, but when they look at this they say, ‘Oh, I think I remember this last week’. It becomes localised rather than having Crime Stopper data only on a station or on media where there is no point of reference for where that exactly happened. We can actually do that with this mobile app.

If people feel, for example, someone at night is stalking them, following them, they just feel not safe, they can actually advertise where they are to the three closest people — either mum or dad or a friend or a partner — and they can activate a tracking system, saying, ‘I’m not feeling safe’. Because sometimes even if they do not feel safe, people are afraid to take the phone out and make some phone calls. They are just too scared. In this platform we allow a one-click button where they just activate the tracking system. Once you activate your tracking system your partner, let us say, or your parents will be notified that, ‘This person is feeling not safe and this is where they are’, and they will be able to see where they are.

This is just an example of a scenario that can happen. It is a video.

**Video shown.**

**Dr SALIM** — It gives a range of services, not just collects data, so people will then use it, such as, ‘Where is the nearest train station?’. Using the emometer we actually aggregate the data on where people mostly feel unsafe or feel good. We cannot really see the video.

**The CHAIR** — Yes. There do seem to be a couple of issues there.

**Dr SALIM** — Yes. Using the emometer, the user can actually report how they feel about different places at different times of the day. If there is a suspicious person, they can choose to give that information to Crime Stoppers. For emergency services they can call 000 straightaway. It uses tracking, and I think this is really useful. When they feel they are being followed or stalked, they can turn on tracking mode and the other people can receive it.

**The CHAIR** — It just goes to the three identified people in the app, does it?

**Dr SALIM** — Yes, exactly. You can actually specify up to three people. The status of the project — we have designed the app and when we actually built it, it was developed halfway and we were actually having a funding problem. The plan was to get Victoria Police to fund the project partially so that we could get funding from ARC, which is federal funding for research, but at that time in 2010–11 there was a big change in VicPol and because of that problem with VicPol we could not actually get funding, so the project was halted. Our developer has now got another job so we are now trying to get some more people attracted to the project, then we can have this project activated.

The Department of Justice was very interested. We have people from the Department of Justice who contacted us about this. We have not had time to contact them again, but we will perhaps have to start a conversation again.
What we would like to do is finish the development, deploy the app for the public to really test it, and then study the impact of this technology on public perception of safety. I think a lot of people we have talked to about the app are very convinced of the potential, including people from the City of Melbourne, the Department of Justice and Crime Stoppers, but the problem now is funding.

I think it is very important for us to understand the perception of safety, given the rise of the social network, social media and also mobile devices. There is a way now to do it and a way to harness all this data for understanding this better.

**Mr McCURDY** — Is anybody using this technology internationally?

**Dr SALIM** — As I said in the earlier slides, there were similar projects elsewhere, so those are similar projects as well. The closest project I think is the Oakland Crimespotting, but the Transafe project itself is not yet fully developed because of lack of funding. Our partnership with VicPol was halted because of the changes in 2011 and we could not get a commitment to continue the project. Otherwise we would have been able to propose this project and get funding from ARC.

This was a linkage project that was federally funded on integrating real-time travel data from Public Transport Victoria. So it is $510 000 funding for a three-year project from ARC, the Australian Research Council. But it has not actually started because we do not have the agreement with PTV now. PTV actually committed some cash that now they cannot fulfil due to the budget cuts. So now we try to get new partners for the project. So that project potentially, Transafe, can benefit from this funding if we can actually start this project soon. We hope this project will start soon.

We will then have this data from public hospitals in Victoria on all the transport operators, and then we are going to merge the data, aggregate it with public data, and then provide better services, basically, for the public. So that was my project.

And just quickly going through the other finalists, we are one of the finalists, the Transafe project, but the other design challenge finalists are Trust, so how to actually build trust in different communities by using public arts, the art of demonstrating the trust through handshake, for example. Liquid Criminals — I think that is quite interesting. They actually use sensors to monitor different levels in different containments in the Murray-Darling Basin. For example, one thing they ask us is how big is a milk container that fits one billion litres. That milk container will have to be the size of the building at 120 Collins Street, for example. So it is that sort of visualisation and visualising the data of our water tests from the Murray-Darling.

**The CHAIR** — All those nasty irrigators!

**Dr SALIM** — Yes. And money laundering — a call to enable small and medium size businesses to comply with the anti-money laundering act. And OUTr. OUTr is basically a games-like simulation platform to simulate different scenarios or ‘What if?’ scenarios. If you are going to do some sort of big planning or let us say there is going to be a music festival or footy match in the stadium, how can we actually design better transport and reduce all those crime issues that can happen?

**The CHAIR** — Doctor, we had better leave it there, which gives us 5 minutes for questions. Have you finished?

**Dr SALIM** — Yes, I have finished.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you for that. There is some good work you have done. I guess given the circumstances around quite a lot of violence in our streets of late, not centralised, but real, I thought that app would have more potential.

**Dr SALIM** — Yes. Even last week there was this YouTube video of someone being assaulted verbally on the train, and that becomes a media sensation.

**The CHAIR** — I will invite committee members to ask questions.
Mr SCHEFFER — You talked a lot about aggregating data and harnessing data, and you talked about this tracking device that can go up to three people, presumably through a provider.

Dr SALIM — It would be direct from our server.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, but the point in all of that is that there are a lot of privacy issues in there about what happens to the data?

Dr SALIM — Exactly, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — And who gets access to it and when it is purged. There is the ethical level about people’s privacy, but on the other hand there is also the issue about if people did not have anonymity, it might put a constraint on their ability or their willingness to engage.

Dr SALIM — Exactly.

Mr SCHEFFER — Have you considered that in the project?

Dr SALIM — We do. When they sign up for the app they will be able to opt, if they want to, to remain anonymous. That is a different level of anonymity. We do not actually gather real names. They can just have app names. But we get our people a profile — so their age range. We like to have a demography of the users of the app, but they will be anonymous until they submit information, then they can opt to send their real info. For example, if they send data to Crime Stoppers, they can choose to remain anonymous or not.

Mr SCHEFFER — We have not got much time, but have you been in conversation with the privacy commissioner, for example?

Dr SALIM — No, we have not, but that is a good idea.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much for your time, Doctor. We have appreciated it this afternoon. We look forward to providing you with the report once it is tabled in the Parliament. Thank you very much.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thank you. That was very interesting.

Witness withdrew.
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Welcome to this public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Yes.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence, and we will provide you with a proof version of the transcript at the earliest opportunity, so you can correct it as appropriate. The time we have allotted for this session is until 2.45 p.m. I understand you have a PowerPoint presentation. The committee is quite keen to ask questions. You have what you think we need to know, but we would also like to tease out some of the things we want to know, so if you will allow us that opportunity at the end of your presentation.

I understand that the reference itself has been conveyed to you in relation to our inquiry. We hope to report on this inquiry to the Parliament at the end of June, and we are well into it at the moment. Thank you again for your time, and we invite you to present to the committee.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. I will take the opportunity to depart significantly from the PowerPoint, and my preference is also to have a discussion.

Overheads shown.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — There is some quite detailed material in here, but I am quite happy not to go through it in sequential order. The basic outline of what I would like to talk about today is to focus a little bit on the idea of crime prevention through environmental design, and at the end to actually think about some wider applications rather than the traditional narrow application of crime prevention through environmental design. Part of that is a discussion around CCTV, and to discuss some of the literature around CCTV and where it is thought to work well and where it is not thought to work well.

I am really guided by your interests here, but I want to take you back to a time in Melbourne around 2000, when we had a very live example of crime prevention in an urban environment, and contrast that with the challenges that we might face in preventing crime in residential environments, in particular in growth corridors, and to see what learnings we could have around the proliferation of drug crime around 2000 and the application of environmental design interventions, and contrast them back to what we have come to learn from that and to think — if we are in the business of trying to make our growth corridors safer and to enhance wellbeing, what are the lessons we can learn from that? Rather than looking forward, we will do both — looking back and looking forward, if that is okay.

The CHAIR — If we feel you are steering us in a direction that perhaps we do not want you do go, we will bring you back.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — I am certain you will.

The CHAIR — I am happy for you to take us on whatever journey you want to take us on.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Certainly. The final part of what I would like to do is to reflect a little bit on some recent data around drug crime in particular, and reflect a little bit on a range of datasets to provide some sense of what kind of challenge we might be looking at in the
not-too-distant future for the growth corridors, and how we might plan for that. No doubt these are the principles you are familiar with in terms of crime prevention through environmental design, and the idea of situational crime prevention, but regardless of how you do it, the kind of end point is to require the perpetrator to increase the effort, increase the risk, reduce the reward and remove excuses from crime.

Some of the examples that you are no doubt aware of are target hardening, reducing the rewards through marking property and increasing the risk. This is where CCTV and natural surveillance fall in. Usually they are the ones that become much more familiar in terms of how we design in ways in which we increase risk. There are two schools of thought: defensible space and eyes on the street.

In what I think is quite a wise review of the applications of CCTV networks from the Australian Institute of Criminology, they reviewed the impact of CCTV. They said:

From the impact studies, it appears that CCTV is effective at detecting violent offending but does not prevent any type of offending.

The effectiveness of CCTV as a crime-prevention tool is questionable.

From the research that they reviewed —

… it appears that CCTV is effective at detecting violent crime and/or may result in increased reporting as opposed to preventing any type of crime.

I suppose the picture is that it is quite good at some things, but not good at everything.

The CHAIR — It is good at providing evidence for investigation more than being the benchmark.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Yes. That is right. I think that is the point they are making here. In terms of preventing, it actually has limited applications.

In terms of its application in the UK, they say quite specifically:

Results of this review indicate that CCTV has a modest, but significant, desirable effect on crime, is most effective in reducing crime in car parks, is most effective when targeted at vehicle crimes … is more effective in reducing crime in the United Kingdom than in other countries. These results lend support for the continued use of CCTV to prevent crime in public space, but suggest that it be more narrowly targeted than its present use would indicate.

Mr McCURDY — Is that monitored CCTV or just filmed and looked at retrospectively?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — The review they did went across many different types, both monitored and episodically monitored. I suppose the take-home from this for me is that, again, it has some applications, but quite specific ones that are rooted in a particular location. That to me is the nub of the point that I will make for the rest of the time — that is, that some of the challenges we face, specifically in the area of drug crime, are very significant, because the trend that we have seen over time in Melbourne is that the mobility of drug crime has been a really strong theme in the last 10 to 15 years. That is one of the points I would like to make now.

During that period of high drug crime activity in 1998 to 2000 we had street-based drug crime — open street markets in four to five areas around Melbourne. One thing that the police knew, that criminologists knew, that health people knew really clearly was that you displace the crime quite readily from one place to another — by pushing it down in one area, it will pop out in another; there is nothing new about it.

What we are interested in is what particular effects doing environmental design might have in an environment where you might design in the prevention of crime just simply for it to move into another place and effectively waste your money. That poses a lot of opportunity costs and often financial costs in doing those interventions. We are trying to think of ways in which we could what they call ‘program space’ in different ways that are not necessarily ways that are the traditional CPTED kind of approaches where you create sheer walls so there is little opportunity for opportunistic crime, and those traditional ways of making the space hard for crime to occur in.
What we are looking at is ways in which we can program the space in such ways that you would create other imperatives within the space other than simply stopping the crime. That includes amenity and creating mixing, and I will come to some of those in a minute.

I will take you back to what we saw back in 1998 and 2000. This slide relates to a period of time in the CBD. It shows data about syringes collected in syringe bins and loose on the ground over the period of time from January 1999 to 2001. You can see the sorts of volumes on the vertical axis on the left-hand side of binned syringes, and on the blue line on your right-hand side of syringes collected loose on the ground. What we are interested in is what that told us both about the mobility of the drug market, and not only its responsiveness to policing but also the capacity to intervene in some of it.

We also knew about the rate of overdoses and the particular locations of overdoses. No doubt you have seen this type of data before, where you are looking at overdoses at the LGA level. In this case it was Melbourne, Yarra, Port Phillip, Greater Dandenong and Maribyrnong. I am not particularly worried about the particulars of this; it is more about the trends. You see this in Yarra, which is the squares, where there is a peak in the middle of the graph, then a vast reduction and then a peak in the city of Melbourne’s overdoses. Overdoses, if they are a proxy for drug use, reflect a mobility of the market moving from one local government authority to another.

In more detail, we were able to notice and we worked closely with Victoria Police at the time — this was the time during 1998 where we worked with police around an operation they ran called Operation Juva. Operation Juva ran around April, May, June — June I think was the main focus of the operation. There were a number of different components to it. Here is a graph that shows the number of syringes collected loose on the ground in the central business district, shown by the vertical bars, and the client contacts with the blue line of drug users going to the needle and syringe program in Smith Street.

The reason we did this was to see whether a drug operation in Smith Street affected the number of syringes on the ground in the CBD, and we were pretty confident that that is what was going on. It is a messy graph. We are not quite sure it is ecological, but all sorts of things could be happening. But we do see that this kind of trend of displacement is readily apparent. This is not rocket science; we know the drug markets move around.

This is the sort of map of space that we used; it is from the *Herald Sun*. We went down into some detail and did some more detailed maps of the footprint in the CBD to get more detailed data.

This is a map of what they call ‘accessible space’ — that is, the space that is not occupied by buildings in the CBD that we mapped back in 2000. The light areas are basically footpath areas, or areas that people can access. As you can see, this is the grid. If you go down here, this is Baptist Place. This is the Greater Union theatres, and these are the laneways. The detail is not important; it is just to show you — the next slide will drill into more detail — that we mapped using a variety of methods places where people were injecting multiple times, using on a daily basis or usually on a weekly basis. It is really a density of where people were injecting around the city grid.

We will go into a bit more detail. This slide shows a laneway network where we can see a range of amenities around water, parked cars, syringe disposal units and the places where people were injecting. This is all accessible space, and this is the building footprint. You can see that there are lots of perturbations in walls. What we were able to find is that in the distance away from what is called co-present street space — that is, a place where it is likely that other people are going to be there providing natural surveillance — there was a kind of immediate zone that drug users occupied at different points in time. Sometimes it is far away, so this is two turns away from line of sight next to some water. That is a good place to inject a drug. But on the other hand it was not a great place to inject a drug, because if they overdosed there then there was a high likelihood that they would not be found. What we found was that drug users liked instead these kinds of spaces that were kind of what we called shallow spaces. They were out of the line of sight, but not so much out of the line of sight such that if they overdosed nobody would find them.
We formed an opinion from this — that is, if drug users had the choice, they would choose these kinds of spaces in preference to these deep spaces. But that offers a particular challenge to crime prevention through design, because when drug users prefer spaces that are not so deep, it means the traditional strategy of putting a gate up to gate off these deep spaces — are not the sort of spaces that drug users like to inject in, because they like the spaces that are not so deep.

What we came up with was this point of view that some of the traditional ways of preventing crime from occurring were not as beneficial as we thought at this time because of the preferences for drug users to balance off the risks of being detected versus the risks of suffering an overdose.

When we went into a bit more detail we could actually measure the distance to assert this idea of distance from blue space, which is what they call copresented space, where it is likely over a point in time that someone else would be there to actually encounter you in a social setting, which provides a form of natural surveillance. So copresent space is a space where it is very unlikely someone is going to be engaging in drug crime — that is, using a drug. It might be different for dealing a drug, but this is for using a drug in particular.

Here we are again looking at these kinds of interstitial spaces — not really deep, somewhere in between — and we are getting a similar space. We did these audits of street space twice over different points in time in the street market. We came to various conclusions about that. Again, we were able to look at overdoses. We were able to look at syringe collection in different places where we knew people were injecting — so, in public toilets and in streets and lanes — and we could run comparisons. This is from the city of Melbourne when the Collins Street toilets were still operating and the GPO toilets were operating. You can see the various changes in syringes collected in these toilet locations, which were kind of operating as quasi --- dare I say it --- supervised injecting facilities. I will not say it — but I did, so there you go.

At that time we did some numbers on the data, where we actually related over a set period of time the rate of overdose per 1000 syringes collected. We were able to make some commentaries about that in the same way you would look at salmonella poisonings per 1000 hamburgers. That gives you some sense of what the health outcome is; it is not just raw rates of overdose. We were able to actually index the number of overdoses per 1000 syringes collected, which gave us some sense, over time, of worthy interventions we were putting in place, improving health outcomes, and in the CBD you can see that they were.

This is a photograph from the work we did at that time, which is in a laneway just near David Jones or Myer. We did an interview with — in this case it is a made-up name — Bianca. I asked her, ‘What do you like about injecting in this loading bay here?’ She said:

That is what I like about it, because that light’s on … and at night time it’s enough to see, but it’s not like a sensor light showing you that someone’s there.

You will notice that there is a CCTV camera just directly above, here. This was very common. Our estimate was that it really only took a 400-millimetre perturbation in a wall to create a break in the line of sight for people to comfortably inject without being worried about being detected. Likewise, Baptist Lane; that stairwell in the loading bay was a very comfortable place to inject.

What we found was that the influence of displacement was very significant and that it has numerous effects. One is to actually move, in this case, drug use around, but also in some cases it actually increases the likelihood of discarding syringes onto the ground. That is obviously having a negative effect on public amenity, so then we start building industries around that. We are putting out outreach teams to do syringe collection, so we get this multiplicative effect in terms of burden of cost.

That was back in 2000, and things have changed dramatically since then. The overdose rates dropped precipitously from 2000 to 2001, when the heroin glut finished and the trend to use amphetamines took on. Non-fatal overdoses in Melbourne is the trend we are looking at now. There are around 1000 non-fatal overdoses per year around at the moment.
This might seem like a lot of background, and it is, but it sets a bit of a preamble to where I think the data is pointing at the moment. If you look at it month by month around March, we can see that non-fatal overdoses in Melbourne are sort of wobbling a bit, but they are all around that rate per month. With syringe distribution across Victoria over to 2008, even though heroin overdoses dropped enormously, syringe distribution and syringe use did not. The people were still injecting drugs at quite high rates, and as you can see, the syringe distribution is higher than it has ever been.

The picture I am painting is that we still have lots of drugs being injected. We might not be having the heroin overdoses we had, but there are a number of trends which are pointing in a direction which I think poses a particular challenge for the growth corridors.

This is the first bit. There have been a number of intelligence reports and public documents submitted to police around harassment of drug users in the inner city — in this case, Footscray, and from Fitzroy Legal Service. The characteristics of these reports generally are that it is the harassment of needle and syringe program clients, syringe confiscation, multiple searches and the surveillance of needle and syringe program clients in and around needle and syringe programs.

Regardless of the merits of this, what it generally implies is that we have seen this kind of strategy used in New South Wales, around Cabramatta, that has effectively put together a kind of ‘moving on’ strategy, which is quite explicit in New South Wales. They have quite explicit new ‘moving on’ strategies to disrupt and displace the drug markets, which is fine if it is an explicit strategy. In Victoria, or in Melbourne in particular — this is early, and it is speculative — my suggestion is that we are actually seeing this policy in place to displace and disrupt drug markets in the inner city of Melbourne, which of course may well be a legitimate policy; I have not had heard it explicitly stated though, I must admit. The consequences of this kind of strategy actually is where we connect up with planning.

There is another set of data we should look at. Victoria Police statistics reveal a continuing trend to arrest low-level drug users in preference to focusing on high-level traffickers. There was a 27 per cent increase in arrests for possession or use of drugs, mostly cannabis, compared to an 11 per cent increase in arrests for trafficking offences. The purity of methamphetamine seized by Victoria Police was 39 per cent, which was higher than in the preceding year, and the style of policing focused on arresting drug users holding small quantities. The average size of seizures collected in Victoria has reduced over a 12-month period from 60 grams per seizure down to 48 grams per seizure — effectively, shooting small fish in a barrel. You get the combination of small seizures, an increase in arrests of consumers versus producers and harassment of drug users around inner city needle and syringe programs. These datasets tend to triangulate, to me, to a form of displacement of drug markets into other places.

Again, if you look at the data from Victoria and compare that to New South Wales — I will not go into that; it is too much detail — you will see the average seizure data emerges from that data there. If you look at methamphetamine use in the most recent 2011 survey, you see that the proportion of methamphetamine users is increasing, that there is an increasing level of first-time injectors using amphetamine instead of heroin, that the number of amphetamine overdoses was significantly higher in 2010–11 than 2009–10 and that there has been a pronounced increase in crystal meth-related ambulance attendances over the two-year period from 2009 to 2011. The highest ever number of crystal meth-related overdoses occurred in 2010–11. So we are seeing some very profound changes both in the nature of the market that is being policed and, I would say, in the place where it is being policed.

The CHAIR — Can I ask a stupid question?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — I doubt whether you ever have!

The CHAIR — I am just wondering about the cost for the low-user end — heroin against amphetamine. What is the cost?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Fairly stable.

The CHAIR — Is it?
Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Yes.

The CHAIR — Similar?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Similar and stable.

The CHAIR — Right.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — I must admit the tools we use to monitor costs are not particularly sensitive. It is done in the IDRS, the illicit drug reporting survey, and whilst they survey drug users about the cost I can honestly say I have not seen that many changes in the cost over time.

The CHAIR — I am just trying to work out why we are transitioning from heroin to amphetamines. Is it a different kick? If the cost is similar and the application is the same, what is driving people to move from one drug to the other?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Back in 2000 there was a really sharp decrease. There was thought to be a glut of heroin, and when that glut dried up it actually went back to what we would call a kind of steady state. What was also happening was that there was a global increase in the production of amphetamines, most notably from South-East Asia. There is a kind of argument — it is not a ‘kind of argument’, it is actually a really well-established argument from people like Don Weatherburn in the bureau of crime statistics in New South Wales — that suggests that many of the trends we see in drug crime are actually transnational. They are often the supply of amphetamines and much more powerful determinants of street-based drug law enforcement.

Many of the efforts we put in are struggling against a stronger force, and that force is the supply that comes not necessarily locally but from a range of different sources. That large shift we saw back in 2000 — a major shift away from heroin to methamphetamine — was related to that.

This is one of the most interesting bits of data I have seen for a long time. It suggests that there has been a move of methamphetamine overdoses to growth corridors around outer Melbourne. If you look at the top graph here — this is from the ambulance overdose project — this shows in colour code the number of ambulance attendances in each LGA in 2009–10. You can see the highest are in these LGAs here and here.

In 2010–11 you can see the growth in methamphetamine overdoses into this growth corridor here to this one down here. We are not seeing the same changes in other forms of overdose; this is specific to methamphetamine. My suggestion to you is — and again I say it is speculative; we have not published on this — the combination of these three or four datasets, where we look at seizures, reports of policing activity, overdose frequency and the types of arrests of consumers and producers, suggest a form of policing that is displacing the markets into growth corridors.

That may well be a strategy. For mine at a broader policy level that should be of interest to this committee and to the interests of Parliament. A policy level of shifting drug crime into growth corridors is probably not a great idea. We tend to concentrate our drug services in the inner city. We tend to concentrate them in services in parts of town that have a density of service and amenity, in terms of housing, medical, health and all these types of services that can support that kind of change. Growth corridors that have very little service infrastructure and very few GPs are not set up for this kind of thing. This is probably the worst place to which you can displace a drug market.

What we can do is — not to be negative about it — I think we can try to plan these growth corridors in ways that can actually help make them resilient to these kinds of effects, and this is where the planning comes in.

The sensitivity of these growth communities means that we know they suffer from a lack of social infrastructure. They suffer because they are dormitory suburbs. People travel a long way; they do not spend time in their local areas because they are spending time travelling. One of the features of these places is that the capacity to provide the levels of natural surveillance through social mixing...
is reduced because people are just not there much. In effect that increases the likelihood and ease for drug markets to proliferate because we do not have the kind of social surveillance we rely on. This makes growth communities particularly vulnerable.

It also means because it is a drug market that using your traditional CPTED approaches to try to design out crime by putting up gates, making defensible space so that you are actually defending your home, are kind of meaningless approaches. We need to use crime prevention strategies, but we need a wider codification of what that means.

If we think about the initial imperatives around CPTED, one of them was to actually reduce the reward. Another way of talking about that is to provide greater rewards for not participating in the drug market for those communities in these growth corridors. No doubt you would have heard a number of people talking about growth corridors providing local employment for the purposes of reducing transport to reduce greenhouse gases and all those sorts of things. In this case I would suggest local employment, local training opportunities and local mechanisms for young people to make connections and form a bond to their community and increase the social mixing. That is one of the most profound things you can do to prevent crime and make these areas resilient to the displaced drug crime markets that are being pushed into these areas.

This is not easy. This is not as easy as saying ‘Drug crime here; let’s stop it by putting in a camera or a gate or something like that’. The actual intervention is what we call distal, somewhat distant from the phenomenon that we are talking about. But in the realm of prevention, that is what we do. We have to look at the long term and we have to look at the deeper underlying structures that can actually prevent crime.

Here are some ideas. We should look at employment, transport, family support and regional training opportunities in these growth corridors, and we do it by using master planning to get us there. As you know, the planning mechanisms in Victoria through precinct structure planning processes allow for the inclusion of a whole range of amenities if those amenities are set as priorities. As I said, this is a wider codification of crime prevention through environmental design. It is looking at planning at a wider level, not just at the single land use or laneway level; it is looking a bit broader than that and asking do you have the collocation of amenity between transport, education, training and employment, because these are the things that are going to build a resilient community.

These are very simple things like: do you use the principle of defensible space or the principle of eyes on the street? In this particular environment, for this particular type of crime, I would really suggest you do not go for defensible space; you go for eyes on the street. You try to create as much mixing as you possibly can, because social surveillance is your best friend in these kinds of environment. For dormitory suburbs, where no-one is around and people can come and go without anybody watching, you really have to try to plan so that you do not have lots of houses full of hydroponic cannabis and you do not have houses where a body is left for seven days and nobody knows. These are the kinds of things that happen in growth corridors.

Lighting of parkland is one of my bugbears. You can make parks really useful at the break of day and at the end of the day by putting in lighting. I have come across this with so many local governments I have spoken to where there is this kind of belief that if you put a light in the park, it attracts crime. That is just crazy. I sat down with a residential developer in Cranbourne and I was getting feedback from a community consultation and we were talking about it, and I said, ‘Here’s this lovely parkland on this master plan. Here is a great opportunity to employ personal trainers at the break of day. They need places to do their personal training. In dormitory suburbs break of day is a perfect time for people living in growth corridors because they have to travel in and out. But if you get them out of the house at 6 o’clock, at break of day, you have to have lights in the parks if you are going to do personal training. Otherwise you’re going to send the liability insurers through the roof’.

They said, ‘That sounds great. Let’s put some lights in’. So they went to the community and said, ‘What do you think about putting lights in?’; ‘Oh, no, we can’t do that, the young people are going to do crime’. So there are ways of doing lighting that are not necessarily criminogenic. You can do
lighting in ways that improve local employment. We have a burgeoning load of personal trainers who we have just been trained through our TAFE sector. We need to get them into employment, and here is a great opportunity to do so.

The CHAIR — If you can afford $300 an hour to pump iron! Sorry, John, a distraction. Keep going.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — No, that is all right. Here are some inclusive strategies around space rather than defensive ones. Think about crime prevention as community-based crime prevention. Use the environmental design to create alternative rewards. Use and look at the functional and the amenity mix. Think about spatial programming principles that come from the work of Hillier from some time ago. Things like mixing, movement and meaning — that is, mixing the time taken in a spatial encounter.

Not far from where I live there is a laneway where we know there is commercial sex going on, but the reason for that is because there is very little mixing. It is adjacent to a playground. We really do not like it, so we are talking to local government. We said, ‘What would be the usual response?’ They said, ‘We’ll put a gate up’. They said, ‘What do you think?’ I said, ‘No way. We don’t want a gate there. We want more kids moving through there’. If you have more kids moving through there is not going to be commercial sex going on. So mixing works really well. But you need mixing so there are not a lot of turns where people can find a nook or cranny and get out of the line of sight.

Movement and meaning are really important. People moving through, and people have to have destinations. You cannot just put laneways in there and expect people to go down them unless there is a meaningful place to go. I will not go into that.

You have the argument around the alternative to defensible sites, but what Hillier says is that the formula for urban safety is determined by the pattern: what is the probability of social interfaces created by the design itself? If you can actually design in blocks of mixing, mixing of strangers with residents, that is what is going to guarantee resilient suburbs in these growth corridors — and you can do it.

An extra I thought I would just put in for you is that these growth corridors are of interest not just to crime prevention, they are of interest because they actually occupy areas identified through health in what they call the prevention community model. The prevention community model is all about getting people out of their houses and into space. There is a huge funding line that has come from COAG that is supporting this funding program right through to 2018.

The CHAIR — They have been rolling it out for the last year.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Here is a great opportunity to actually value-add to that spend. The point of those funding programs is to get kids and their parents out of their houses and playing, running around in public spaces. If they are afraid to — if they are actually living in dormitory suburbs with mobile drug markets entering into them — they are not going to go into public space because they just will not feel safe. If you can make access to these interventions which are coming through the prevention community model in health, such as walkable communities; walking groups; Healthy Dads, Healthy Kids; community gardens — these are things that take place in spaces for which you have the opportunity to put in guidelines to increase the social mixing, to actually make them meaningful spaces, places where people feel face — you will create a value-add on the expenditure that is currently occurring in those growth corridors into which we know drug markets are on the move.

Hopefully it has not been too negative a picture, but I am actually quite hopeful, because I see that there is a conjunction of interests here that want to make these spaces really healthy, productive, safe and good for the wellbeing of new and young communities.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much, John. That is very interesting. I have tonnes of questions to ask you, but sadly I have no wriggle room in this agenda today. I will perhaps invite members of the committee to ask questions.
Mr SCHEFFER — Thanks for that. What you have just told us is extremely interesting. I will jump in with one on one of the central things we are dealing with. The issue that we are being asked to deal with is related to the safer design principles that are out there and that witnesses tell us are good, but there appears to be a lack of take-up of those. So part of what we are thinking about is: why is there a lack of take-up; is it something about the set of materials that local governments and others are given; where is the impediment? Are you across that, and can you throw some light on that for us?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Certainly. I have been acting in a kind of advisory capacity to one of our major residential developers, Stockland, over the past three years. Part of those discussions have been around: what is it around the guidelines that makes it easy or makes it hard? For the larger developers I think the guidelines form one part of a larger mix which does not pose much problem for them. If a guideline said, ‘You really should start doing this’, then it would not pose that much of a problem for them. For the smaller developers, I think it does. I think this is where you get very much a patchwork quilt response to the guidelines.

My sense is that if the larger developers saw it as part of their value proposition to actually make a place safer, and if it was made explicit to them that it was part of it, then I think they would do it. I think at the moment, because they are focused on guidelines rather than crime prevention as such, there is an element of safety becoming diluted into a range of other issues. This idea of actually building resilience in communities through design, that is like from Mars.

Mr SCHEFFER — What would we need to say to government to try to shift some of that?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — I think the audience is not just government.

Mr SCHEFFER — In this particular instance we are recommending to government, but we can recommend to others.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — I think it is both providing greater clarity about what sorts of things would constitute good design and widening the script at the moment. From the planners I have encountered, good design is about whether you put a camera in place around the street network; it is very, very tightly constrained in terms of the ideas that the planners bring to what a good design is. I think we need to be able to actually get planners into a wider sense of what is going on around what good design could be at this precinct level. I think that is the other thing, that at the precinct level we do not actually ask planners to think in this kind of way.

Mr SCHEFFER — Do you think that the safer design principles should be mandated?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — As I said, I think that to mandate them would have little impact on the major providers, so yes, I think that would be fine. But you are going to have to think about your smaller developers, about how they cope with it.

Mr SCHEFFER — At the very beginning you were talking about CCTV cameras. I accept the point that you were making, that they are good provided that we know what we are using them for. I think you said that they could provide evidence. Is that evidence that leads to a conviction? Is it practical evidence or is it just information?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — It is all contexts, so when it is used in the course of an investigation it is evidence that can lead to a prosecution. But I know that when we did inspections of the CCTV in the city of Melbourne the number of drug-related incidents that they collected were really just ways in which hands touched other hands in public space in the viewfinder, which produces this enormous data which is kind of meaningless in the end. It actually produces a lot of noise. CCTVs produce a lot of noise in terms of data. You could easily do some work on that to figure out what the signal-to-noise ratio on that is, but my bet is that it is very, very low for your capacity to actually detect crime. When you put in a lot of cameras you collect a lot of data, but it does not guarantee that you prevent crime.

Mr SCHEFFER — Are there stats on that?
Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — The report I cited in here does that. I recommend having a look at that report, because it reviews the data around the capacity of that data to actually help you prevent crime.

The CHAIR — We talked about that following a contribution from a previous witness. I think I made the comment then that several comments are made in relation to crime prevention but not so much into investigation. It does have other usefulness, I guess, in relation to tools for crime and investigation as opposed to prevention. We are looking for projects or local municipality works where there are good examples of safer design principles and environmental design. We have just come back from New Zealand, where we looked at Christchurch and the work that they are obviously having to do now to rebuild that city. Is there somewhere where this committee could look at a specific design that you think is a good example of a safer design principle?

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Can I take that on notice?

The CHAIR — Yes. I am happy if you want to get in touch with Sandy if something springs to mind.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — That would be great. I do not think it is as simple as making the safer design guidelines mandated. I think you have to work across, get the Planning Institute of Australia and whoever else involved in really broadening the scope of what CPTED can do, to move it from being a kind of very situational approach to a community-based approach for environmental design. The precinct structure planning element of the planning process is critical if you want to have this broad capacity to prevent crime in these growth corridors. Once things are built and in place it is very hard to build that sort of stuff in.

The CHAIR — Thanks very much, John. I think we all appreciated that presentation. You have raised the issue about looking at and tracking some of the drug use, in particular in those growth corridors, and it may well be some work that we do down the track. It would be very useful to start tracking whether it is the demographic that moves into those growth corridors that is creating that shift of drug use into those growth corridors, or it is a shift away because of a range of other things that you have tagged. It would be interesting to follow up on that at some point in time.

Assoc. Prof. FITZGERALD — Thanks.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Thank you very much for attending this hearing of the joint parliamentary Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. My sincere apologies for being late. I do not think we have done that to any witnesses who have come to our hearings, and I apologise, Rob. We had committee members coming and going. It was an internal issue which had to be dealt with. I understand if your time is curtailed by our lateness. Just let us know and we will finalise the hearing.

I will get on with it. I will read you the conditions under which we are conducting this hearing today. Are you all presenting?

Mr SPENCE — We will just have a discussion I think. That is the usual MAV approach to things.

The CHAIR — I will read this to all of you on the basis that you will all be being recorded by Hansard staff. Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees? I suspect some of you have done this before anyway.

We are recording the evidence, and we will provide a proof version of the transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I again thank you. I think you understand our terms of reference for the inquiry in relation to crime prevention and environmental design. We look forward to hearing from the MAV. Thanks, Rob.

Mr SPENCE — Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you today. The issue of environmental design is obviously a complex one for councils in that in those areas where new developments are occurring or change is occurring it is a relatively easy exercise to deal with, and I think most councils give it appropriate attention within their means, but the great challenge with environmental design is how you deal with retrofitting or resolving issues in areas that have been developed from the settlement of Melbourne through. That is quite a challenge for councils.

We have seen some really good examples in the local government space in dealing with environmental design from a community safety and community development viewpoint. The emphasis has been, to an extent, on those areas where there is significant growth and new development. One observation I would make to you is that the great challenge in those areas is when you have an enormous number of projects running. If you go to a Casey, a Wyndham, a Cardinia or a Whittlesea where you have an enormous number of projects running, the capacity for you to get into the fine grain of design is really a difficult one.

Whilst I think pretty strong headway has been made, I think there is the capacity for us to miss some of the critical issues in terms of design, community safety and community development because of the level of work that is required when you are just dealing with the planning issues and the development issues, and they outweigh the issues around community safety.

Gareth is the planning expert, so what I have done today is bring along our planning expert. He looks very young, but he is very experienced. Alison has been our CCTV person, and she understands how it has worked in municipalities and understands the challenges of it. I thought it would be appropriate for us to have a discussion, maybe some questions from you and we will see where it leads us. I think we have an array of people here who can, I hope, answer your questions.

The CHAIR — If I can just quickly start, we have had a number of hearings now with a number of witnesses. We have had town planners, architects, representatives from the police and local councils, and academics. Much of what has been said has been about a lack of training in relation to town planners, a lack of priority through local councils in relation to the safe design principles and a lack of understanding. For me, I guess, I would like you to respond to where you
see local councils in relation to the planners, how they prioritise CPTED and safer designs, where there is a poor understanding, where there is a need for greater education and training and whether in fact they would be a little more committed in fact if it was a mandatory code requirement or there was a mandate to have those principles embedded in the planning act.

Mr HATELY — I think, as Rob said earlier, the ability for planners to have influence in this space is actually through more greenfield development. When it comes down to retrofitting areas, it becomes very difficult. The CPTED designs, which you would have heard about from council planners, have largely become mainstream, to some extent, and are part of good urban design in a lot of new development areas. It just comes down to when you are planning and retrofitting the existing areas you might need to adopt a different approach. So, for instance, in some councils lighting is an issue, where an existing area could be retrofitted with different types of lighting. Passive surveillance over open space is another way that CPTED designs can be incorporated into an existing area. So there are a couple of examples.

Mr SPENCE — I will just go back to the first comment I made. In terms of managing these issues in a council, if you are dealing with these issues in a Casey, Cardinia or Whittlesea and so on, the amount of work that is required to be done by the council to actually manage the level of development occurring is massive, and it is off a system that is not well funded. I think there is a challenge with this if there is an intention to make it mandatory to add this component in. I have to say this: it is always easy for the state government to ask local government to pick up something when the councils actually have to find the funding source for it. I think the challenge with any of these issues is that they have to be weighed against the priorities in the local community about what load is currently on the council, and the solution needs to be properly assessed as to whether it is going to make a significant difference.

In my experience, and it has been a while now since I was the CEO of a council — 14 years. I was the CEO at Footscray and Brimbank, and the load we had in both of those locations from a planning viewpoint in just trying to manage the planning issues, not adding additional layers of scrutiny and so on, when I look at some of the decisions we made in relation to the development of Brimbank when I was there, I feel incredibly disappointed about the quality of the outcomes we got. The quality of those outcomes was in a way led by the development industry’s pressure to get outcomes. The council becomes an absolute stress point between the development industry and the council’s capacity to actually manage the workload and negotiate the outcomes.

In relation to the developed areas, I think it remains an incredible challenge as to how you bring about change there. I live in an inner Melbourne area with a relatively high crime rate. It has all the attributes of what you would say is an effective community in relation to community safety. There are people on the street 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and it is well lit and there is plenty of activity, but we still have a high crime rate. It is hard for me to see how you could make many changes that would shift that.

What am I saying to you? I am saying that if the committee recommends that it wants councils to do this and the government decides it, the councils will obviously have to do it and find a way to do it. I think it is a significant task for them to add to what they have already got, and I do not know enough about whether the benefits are really going to be there. I suppose that is the question I would raise.

The CHAIR — I need to get a bit of a feel for this, because actually part of our work is to make contact with local councils about whether they are incorporating the safe design principles into their planning. It has been a popular theme — everyone says that CPTED is pretty well embedded in the planning, but we hear instances where people when they are starting to design, whether it is a greenfield development or the upgrade of a precinct, the first thing they think about is not environmental design for crime prevention.

It is probably one of the last things they think about, but everyone says, ‘Oh, but CPTED principles are embedded in what we think about’. It is not demonstrated. I am not prejudicing what might come out of our survey, but that is a view that has been expressed to us. Rob is now saying, or I get the feeling he is saying, ‘Look, don’t mandate, because we’ve got enough burden on us already in
relation to that’. Certainly, ‘Don’t mandate without money’ is what I am hearing, I think. The point is, though, if we are not mandating — and everyone says CPTED is embodied, yet there seem to be different approaches in councils in relation to prioritising the safer design principles — how do we actually encourage councils that are not, and we do not know yet what the quantity is of councils that are not, taking that as a high priority in relation to their design?

Mr SPENCE — The point I would like to make is that I think it would be useful, if you have not already had the chance to do this, to actually work through a major development proposal with a council and understand what is involved in it, to understand the pressures that come from the development industry in terms of their outcomes relative to where the council is trying to get through to. Because ultimately, in my view, these things end up being as a compromise. And if you have got one of the developers, for example, like the crowd that did Caroline Springs — they went into Caroline Springs with the view that they wanted it as an icon in the western suburbs. Safety and so on were very important in that development. They have education facilities locked in there, and so on, and if you are in that space as a council, then it is a very good space to be in because there is an alignment between the view of where the council would want to go and where the developer wants to go.

When you are actually dealing with a developer who has got a completely different view to the council on where it needs to go to, it is a significantly difficult project issue to resolve. That is the bit that is challenging me with this, because there is only so far, in my view, a council can go to actually be successful in this. The promotion of it is very important — trying to convince developers that community safety is a great selling point and so on, so that they will shift their strategies. I think all of those things are important, but I think it would be good for you to, if you have not already had the chance to do it, have a look at a couple of case studies and work through what has worked and what has not worked. My view is that community safety is a critical thing, community development is a critical thing. As I say, my experience in councils has been that we got some pretty bad outcomes when we were wedged between the needs of getting development on the ground and the timelines and where the council was at. It was not easy.

Mr McCURDY — Alison, CCTV is your speciality?

Ms LYON — It is.

Mr McCURDY — Can you give us some feedback as to whether that is an area that we should be looking into? Is it successful in what we are doing so far? Or is it lacking monitoring?

Ms LYON — There are a range of issues in relation to CCTV. One is the community expectation that: install CCTV cameras and crime is eliminated. The research shows that that is not the case. There is also often a misapprehension by the community about the purpose of CCTV. It is more generally a passive monitoring than active monitoring; it is not as if an issue starts to arise in a CCTV-monitored public space and all of a sudden a SWAT team descends. It is not of that nature. The Ombudsman’s recently prepared draft guidelines for CCTV in public places — and I am not sure whether you have had the opportunity to look at those — are quite useful in that they identify a range of issues that are going to be issues for the local government sector. We will be working with councils about those matters.

CCTV surveillance is within a quite stringent statutory framework, and I suspect that many councils have introduced some degree of CCTV surveillance without nailing all of the processes and policies that need to be in place. One of the really key issues around CCTV is the objective that the net is going to be not only the capital cost but the recurrent cost and how you determine whether or not there is success against the objectives. One issue that has occurred for councils is that when you install CCTV cameras — it happened in the city six years ago when Russell Street and Bourke Street ended up with CCTV cameras because of the drug trade that was occurring there, and it shifted a block and a half away — what you have is the same amount of crime, relocated.

Generally the US and UK research is saying that CCTV is perhaps a strategy amongst many strategies that may assist in community safety, more particularly in identifying the culprit and
being useful where there is a lack of evidence. If you have got somebody on footage, it makes it somewhat easier in court. But something like physical patrols has a greater impact on immediate community safety. I think it is going to be really interesting. We will be asking councils to be basically creating cost centres around CCTV programs, because there is an enormous number of internal costs, and those internal costs will only increase as better practice is brought to bear on CCTV programs. Did that help?

Mr SPENCE — It is really one part of a suite of actions.

Mr SCHEFFER — I just want to come back to the question that Simon raised with you. You gave a very sobering response to it, but I knew you were going there because one of the first things you said was that ‘councils give it attention within their means’, which I jotted down because I knew where that was going. Then you talked about that mandating the principles might work and various things like that. But I think through it what I was hearing you say is that there seems to be a dichotomy between the practical economics of developing a project and the community safety/crime prevention imperative, that there is not quite a fit there. My understanding is that we are not there, but what we are driving at is that we have got these guidelines that everybody seems to give a tick to — a lovely document; we all think, ‘You beaut’ — but when it comes to implementing it councils, as far as we understand, do not seem to be doing that. That is what we are kind of looking at, so what you are saying is really valuable in that sense, because it is giving us a view we have not actually heard quite so directly before.

Can I just ask you to talk to us about — and I think your advice to go and talk to a developer and see how a project develops through, we have to think about that — what it is like on the ground from your point of view, having been a CEO and now in your present job. Maybe Gareth could respond to this as well. How does it work? How are the guidelines used, and what are the hiccups, if there are hiccups, between the document and then how you go about it? I will say one last thing, and I am not intending to give a speech. We went to New Zealand where we had the privilege of meeting with Frank Stoks, who you might know is one of the world authorities on CPTED. He showed us a couple of projects that were brilliant but he reckons were all done within budget. One was a public housing estate that was completely redeveloped — already existing, many years old — and the other one was a sort of greenfields development within a built-up urban area. In both of those instances, his argument was — and the council was there with him — to say, ‘It was all done within the envelope of a budget’. That leads me to have some sort of optimism that you could do it without that dichotomy that I described earlier.

Mr SPENCE — I agree that it is possible. The desired outcome I think you would want is to have the development industry accept it as a critical component, like the 5-star energy rating or the 6-star energy rating. Then this becomes a component of what they take on in relation to their development, and you overlay that then with the council accepting it, and I think you will get to that point you were talking about. My experience has been — and maybe it is just bitter and twisted by some of the stuff I have had to do — —

The CHAIR — Surely not.

Mr SPENCE — That is right. But in dealing with big shopping centre developments — and I did two of them in my time at Brimbank: the Sunshine shopping centre redevelopment and the Watergardens development. One of them was a lot easier than the other. The Sunshine one was an incredibly difficult project to manage from the council’s viewpoint. The developer wanted outcomes that turned the shopping centre away from the old shopping centre, so it was not in my view the council’s desired, perfect position, but trying to achieve the outcomes we wanted was very difficult to get because the developer did not accept the council’s position. You just cannot, in those sort of projects, just use the planning tools to try and drive it. It is an absolute negotiation on the outcome.

The other one was much easier because it was with QIC — Queensland Investment Corporation. They were very focused on a particular look and feel about the development, and we might not have got it all right but it is a really good development, I think, generally. You would look at it and say we did well. In the ideal world you would get a situation where the development industry
accepted these as appropriate standards, and the developers, small and large, accepted it, and the councils also took it up and used it effectively. In that case I think you would get a really harmonious outcome, and I think it is possible to get to that point but I have not seen evidence yet that the development industry has jumped at it as an issue.

Mr SCHEFFER — What would it take?

Mr SPENCE — I think you work your way through the peak bodies, and once the peak bodies — UDIA, the property council et cetera — accepted it and it went through their boards, then you have got the big guns in the room basically on board. It trickles down. It has its effect.

Mr SCHEFFER — And would you do that through talking to them about how the principles — if not the fine-grain stuff — might be mandated? Do you think the industry would say, ‘Oh, no, no. We need a lot of elbow room here and we will do it in our own time and our own way.’? Or do you think there might be a potential to say, ‘Yes, we can agree on a framework and on some principles being established that we will all abide by.’?

Mr SPENCE — I think you could get to that point. I do. I think it is possible to get it, and if do you get both sides agreeing to it, then I think you have a much better opportunity. Simon knows from the building that he was in with the VFF and I know from where we are, for example, in the Reserve Bank building that the activity that occurs behind that building in the side street et cetera over the weekend causes the security guards in the Reserve Bank serious angst, and if you were developing the Reserve Bank building again, you would expect that the developer would actually think about those issues, but I am still not convinced that they do. Does that make sense?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr SPENCE — So I think there is an opportunity to pick it up, and I suppose the point I am trying to get across is that you can mandate it on the council’s side but if the people with the money, who want to do the projects, are not wanting to play, then we are going to struggle. Is that your view, Gareth?

Mr HATELY — Yes, it is, and I think it needs to be attractive for the market as well. If a safer environment through these guidelines is attractive, then the market will correct itself and deliver it. I think that is the ideal outcome. There is another point you mentioned about where councils are facing hiccups along the way in meeting these guidelines, and I would probably say there are some policy tensions between what the CPTED guidelines talk about, which is passive surveillance of open space and things like that —

Mr SCHEFFER — And active.

Mr HATELY — Yes, and active surveillance — to what the building regulations say, which is often secluded private open space towards the rear of houses; you know, fence it off, pretty much. So there are some tensions. If you think about a lot of the building design where verandas were typically out the front of the property, now you will see a carport and the front door and that is it. So again that is probably what the market wants, but there are some difficult things along the way.

Mr SPENCE — And the market is typically 5 to 10 years behind where good designs are. So the building industry tells me.

The CHAIR — To my mind local councils actually have to lead the way. We do not want to redesign CPTED. I think it is universally accepted that it is a good concept. Victoria has gone one step further and created these safer design guidelines which town planners are supposed to prioritise in their planning. So unless the town planners from local councils are actually active in that spot, it will not be a priority for developers because it is all about money. So our survey might indicate what we need to do to try and encourage and support local councils to think of the safer design guidelines, not the CPTED principles because they are generally accepted and they are so broad that you have plenty of scope. But I am interested in the safer design guidelines and whether we can improve them, because the planning act is going under review, as you know, and obviously
our reference is in relation to that and how councils are responding to those guidelines. So if you could respond to that, then I might ask Tim if he would like to ask a question.

Mr SPENCE — I think I have already responded to it. In my view you will get an outcome, but I do not think it will be the sort of outcome you could get in terms of multipliers running a policeman model, which is using the council with a big stick — —

The CHAIR — No, I was asking you how we actually encourage council planners to — —

Mr SPENCE — I think there are all sorts of ways you can encourage council planners to do it, but the point I am trying to get to is that having a policeman model where the council is using a big stick to try and force the developer to change the design is less successful than, in my view, both sides actually working on a community safety model. It is not hard to sell it to the development industry. For those people who are outliers to the norm, then the council can deal with those, but when you are dealing with the sort of workload that goes through the councils I think it is a tough task.

I should just talk to you about one of the projects we run. It is called the STEP planning process — a performance improvement model in councils. I am happy to take this issue and feed it into STEP. What we do is that we go in and do audits of the performance of councils in the planning space. It is about performance improvement, driving change, and I am happy to add this as a component in that program and see if we can make a difference that way, and because we are doing audits constantly, to just see how this guidance material is being used and whether it is being used from the auditor’s viewpoint reasonably effectively. I am happy to do that.

The CHAIR — You might well be doing our survey for us.

Mr SPENCE — Just to go on a bit further with this, we have experienced and professional planners who are very micro in the way they operate, working through the systems that the councils have, and we have 20 councils at the moment that we are working with, and they work through a cycle of audit with each of these. So it is easy for us to add this to the program and then give you feedback. Easy to do. So maybe if Pete wants to talk to us about it, we can see if we can help you get some evidence.

The CHAIR — All right, thank you. Are there other questions? If not, is there anything else you wanted to present to us?

Mr SPENCE — No.

The CHAIR — If not, I thank the three of you very much for your time this afternoon, and again my apologies for running a bit late. But we really appreciate the feedback. It was important feedback for us.

Mr SPENCE — I was at the doctor this morning. He had only had two appointments before me and he was already 20 minutes late, so I think you are travelling pretty well at 5 o’clock.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Jason, welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. Thank you for your time this afternoon. I will take the opportunity to read the conditions around your appearance this afternoon, if you will bear with me for a moment. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees?

Mr BLACK — I have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. That is in the affirmative. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the transcript at the earliest opportunity so that you can correct it as appropriate. Jason, I see that you are the managing director of INSIGHT Planning Consultants.

Mr BLACK — I am.

The CHAIR — My understanding is that Dr Cook has provided you with the reference in relation to this inquiry.

Mr BLACK — That is correct.

The CHAIR — Your presentation today is based on that inquiry in relation to environmental design. Thank you for your time. I apologise, we are running a tad late, but I suspect the breadth of questions might be curtailed somewhat by the fact there are only two of us here. But it is all quality. We look forward to hearing from you.

Mr BLACK — Okay. I might pass out the presentation so you have a copy.

Overheads shown.

Mr BLACK — I thought the best way to present to the committee was to do a short PowerPoint presentation. The project is a good segue from the previous presenters, but this is about a real-life project that is being built on the ground at the moment. I think some of the things in regard to what the development industry is interested in doing, how they interact with government policy, local government policy and the like hopefully can come out through this presentation. Then what I have tried to do is to highlight the key terms of reference to which this presentation is probably relevant, given that some of the other terms of reference are more specifically targeted at local government.

I come to this presentation as a town planner who specialises in growth area planning in particular. I am also a board member of the Planning Institute of Australia and also the project manager of the Planning for Health and Wellbeing project for the Planning Institute of Australia. That is the context, if you like, and the project that I am talking about today is a project named Selandra Rise, and I will provide some background to that as we go through.

The terms of reference that I believe are relevant to the work that we have been doing are the ones I have listed on this slide. The primary presentation picks up really on the first, and I will reshuffle these. These are not as numbered in your terms of reference, but my primary purpose is to talk about an example where we have applied CPTED and the safer design guidelines as part of a range of other best practice approaches that we have incorporated. We see that Selandra Rise is a planning for health and wellbeing demonstration project, and that is an important theme through this presentation — safety is just one element of this idea of planning for health and wellbeing.

Selandra Rise is located in Cranbourne East. It is on the outer fringe of the urban area within Melbourne and, as I said, it is a community focused on health and wellbeing. It was launched in 2008 with one of the key objectives there being to create a healthy and engaged community. It is a collaborative partnership project which has involved industry, the planning institute, both local and state governments through the City of Casey and the Growth Areas Authority, as well as the
private sector with Stockland as the key development partner for this development and a range of supporting partners as well.

As I mentioned, Selandra Rise is engaged in healthy community. By way of background to the project and to give a little bit of context to what it is that we are talking about, Selandra Rise has approximately 1200 lots, so it is effectively of a neighbourhood scale — a neighbourhood scale being large enough to have primary school support, a local town centre, a community centre and the like. These are just some of the key points I have dragged out and highlighted. This is very much a community focus on providing community facilities early in the development lifecycle and engaging with the community in a slightly different way. These are important elements to the CPTED principles, but also to planning for safer communities as well to having that engagement in the design process.

The CHAIR — Can I ask what size the lots are?

Mr BLACK — The lots vary from just under 200 square metres to just over 600 square metres, so there is a range of lot sizes throughout the development.

Mr SCHEFFER — How does that translate into density?

Mr BLACK — The average density is just over 15 dwellings a hectare, mainly because there is probably a little bit more open space provision than would typically be required and some treatments to some of the urban spaces that take up a little bit more room, to be honest. But you are basically looking at just over 15 dwellings per hectare. In the latter stages of the development it would be closer to 20 dwellings per hectare. It has been a staged development so far in attracting what the market believes it needs. Now the average lot size is just over 400 square metres. There has been a progressive shift since the project launch in July 2010, which is about two years ago now.

The CHAIR — Can I just make an observation, and you can correct me if I am wrong, but I have seen another project which has very similar square metreage per house and it is wall-to-wall brick and concrete because people are trying to cram as much house into a 400 square metre block. Then the importance of public space becomes paramount. I understand it is all related to cost, but to my mind to have wall-to-wall concrete in a suburb is almost contradictory to what we are trying to do in relation to space, health and exercise. The issue around public space then becomes so critical. For that sort of square metreage, is it now a prerequisite for councils to prioritise the public space component, where people can get out, smell the green and get away from that concrete brick environment?

Mr BLACK — Maybe I will take one step back then. One of the other objectives within this project is improving housing diversity, because the issue that you refer to is one where the houses have not necessarily got smaller, but the blocks have. What we have been looking at here, and this is where the housing partners come into it through Henley and some of the more volume builders, is thinking about a different housing typology to the ones that result in boundary to boundary, wall-to-wall bricks and mortar.

That is challenging some of the typical housing design but it also challenges some of the local government building requirements, which was mentioned earlier. That in itself is a real challenge because what we have is a ResCode process, if you like, for assessing dwellings that is almost leading to certain dwellings being compliant where other types of dwellings are not necessarily compliant. There is a previous process and the partnership element of this project is very important. There are challenges in the way we design our open spaces; there are challenges in the way private dwellings are being approved; and in some cases there are challenges in lot orientation and those types of things.

One of the key things I was going to highlight for the committee today is that there are many design agendas, and I see safety as one of those design agendas, which play a constant game of Ring a Ring o’Roses, if you like, to see which one is of most importance on any given project. A lot of the projects that have been tasked on environmental sustainability, water sensitive urban
design and those types of things, are actually prioritising that design agenda above other design agendas. One of the challenges in all of this is that the statutory requirements, if you like, are only picking up bits and pieces of these different design agendas, so none of them actually prevail. The way that they do prevail in an urban growth context is strongly based on the desire of the developer and, if early enough, the priorities of the local council. It is a constant push and pull in these contexts.

Thinking about that and about health and wellbeing, I included some pages at the back of my presentation to try to give a little bit more detail, although they are not in great detail. At Selandra Rise back in 2008 we undertook what we called the health and wellbeing rigour test because it was plainly apparent that each of the different best practice guidelines or toolkits and whatever else there was in the marketplace were kind of all the same, but slightly different.

It was around this idea where they focused on a key design agenda or a range of design agendas. For example, the walkability toolkit was something that we looked at. We also looked at the safer design guidelines, CPTED, Healthy by Design by the Heart Foundation and Healthy Space and Places by the Planning Institute of Australia. All of these include a range of elements that are relevant to the key point of our discussion today, being safety. But safety in itself is just one element of this idea of planning for health and wellbeing. Through the literature listed in the middle of the page, social inclusion, mental health, childhood health, physical activity, safety and accessibility were the constant themes. They were the constant key areas of interest for this notion of putting health at the centre of planning.

What we tried to do as an exercise in the pre-design process at Selandra Rise was to then try to articulate what that actually meant. What does it mean to have those six key interest areas? That is when we dissected some of these guidelines and best practice publications and it became reasonably apparent that there were two things going on. One was that there is a design response, and there is also a social response as we term them. I have put a table at the back of the presentation. They were the things that we could build into place and then the things that would need to be undertaken as community development or social planning activities that would then ensure that the key interest area was being reinforced through the activities of that area.

You can build the best place in the world from a safety perspective, but if the community that then moves in does not actually know how to use it in that way, then that design imperative will not be maximised. That is the thesis behind this. You can have every house overlooking the street, but if people do not sit in the front room and overlook the street, then the design imperative has not delivered the social imperative.

Mr SCHEFFER — How do you get around the problem? We pay lip-service to consultation and designing a partnership with end users and all that kind of stuff. But you are right: if someone is not sitting at the front because they are all at the back with the barbecue, then — —

Mr BLACK — It does not really matter whether they have a front fence or not.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, so how do you rethink that?

Mr BLACK — Can I get to that question in just a moment?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, sure.

Mr BLACK — Because I do touch on that. The idea here is that when you go through these best practice publications, there is significant overlap. So a walkability toolkit, which is based purely on walkability, is picking up elements of the safer design guidelines because it is trying to encourage people to walk by making the place safer. One of the things there is about how you navigate through that. Developments in Armstrong Creek and the like were used as test cases for the walkability toolkit. That could be seen as a missed opportunity for a test case for safer design guidelines or it could be seen as a missed opportunity for broadening the design agenda, because that was purely its focus. So we identified that.
There is also conflict in some of these documents, which leads to confusion as to how you then proceed. This is an interesting element in CPTED’s development over time — how some may be stuck in the pre-2000 approach to CPTED compared to some of the more contemporary approaches. There are potential conflicts in how things are being applied and therefore how some of the guidelines are translating as well.

From a Selandra Rise perspective we needed to draw a line in the sand and say, ‘Which way are we going to track with that?’ Again that leads me back to the point that this was only happening because the partnership between the developer, the council and the Growth Areas Authority was in train. Otherwise you would not go to this sort of strenuous effort to define that line in the sand. You would say, ‘Well, they’re guidelines; we don’t actually have to apply them because over here in growth area world we have to apply the precinct structure plan guidelines.’ I will talk about that later on as well.

Primarily what is happening in the urban fringe developments is practitioners are picking the line. They are the ones picking the line if it is not led by the local government planners who are picking the line. There are two sorts of local government planners. There are strategic planners who are thinking about the big broad picture — where the houses go and where the shops go — and then there are the statutory planners assessing the subdivision applications. The ones in the urban fringe context, if the strategic planners are not thinking about the safer design guidelines, then there is no point worrying about the statutory planners, because by the time it gets to the subdivision application they will be applying what is in clause 56, which is only a small flavour of any of these things. They will not be thinking about the guidelines in their entirety.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — What determines what the strategic planners are thinking about?

**Mr BLACK** — The preferences of the council and what their desire is, so the design agenda preferences basically. If your council is particularly — —

**Mr SCHEFFER** — But that is circular, isn’t it? Aren’t you saying that it is strategic planners who are the ones that are setting it?

**Mr BLACK** — Yes, it is. It is a circular thing. As an example I will use Mernda Villages, which is out in the north. As he went through, he wanted to demonstrate environmental sustainability, particularly around water sensitive urban design. It was the no. 1 priority. That was a Stockland development as well. Here there was planning for health and wellbeing as their design priority interspersed with improved housing diversity and thinking about local employment. What they were doing was saying, ‘That is what we want to do’, and the councils, because of where they were at in the thinking as well, were interested in exploring that. The City of Casey, as probably a more developed growth area, has a lot more information about where fringe communities may end up, particularly from a social perspective, than some of the newer growth areas as well, so they were very heavily focused on this healthy and engaged social connectedness-type of thing.

It is the strategic planners who are dealing with it at that broader planning level. It is a circular thing, but it is where they are at in that circle that they pick the design agenda. But the statutory planners, this whole process I am talking about is gone and finished by the time it gets to the statutory, who goes, ‘Does this plan or subdivision comply with clause 56 in the planning scheme?’. It is the ResCode assessment. To get compliance with clause 56 from a safer design guidelines perspective is fairly straightforward. There is a conclusion there.

This is the way it went: the objective, the priority areas, safety. The question is how CPTED leads us to these, as you are well aware, which is natural surveillance and the access control which translates to legibility and ownership. The practical side of CPTED, which is maintenance and activity support, I believe have just the amount of priority as the first three, because if you do not have the last two, it really does not matter what you achieved in the first three. That goes to that question.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — What does ‘activity support’ mean?
Mr BLACK — Activity support is that social response. It is how you bring those spaces to life, and how they are managed in a way that realises that safer design guidelines principle that was planned into them. Maintenance is purely about the theory that if you do not look after a space, then people are not going to be drawn to it, and that leads to potential undesirable behaviour because the masses are not drawn to it. Those last two points, which are generally delivered as hang-on points, are the two things that are the drivers of longevity into whether CPTED is successful in my view.

Mr SCHEFFER — Urban spaces are all planned, whether they were planned 100 years ago or now — I am not cavilling about planning — but how do you negotiate the kind of spontaneity that is essentially part of a city with the kind of the lean-to, the build-on, the bit in the urban space, the hole-in-the-wall coffee shop, the opportunity somebody sees in a lane to put some chairs out. How do you accommodate that kind of open weave into what you are doing?

Mr BLACK — It is extremely difficult, because that open weave is looking at an existing fabric and thinking how to regenerate and reuse, whereas in the urban fringe context it is not up to that phase.

Mr SCHEFFER — So you are saying historically it comes later?

Mr BLACK — Yes, and it is a reconsideration of space as opposed to something you can plan in, if you like, because at this stage they just plan it in as, ‘We do not need a lean-to or a hole in the wall’. You plan the full box and dice. There is going to be a very interesting social assessment of that in the future.

Mr SCHEFFER — The reason I am saying that is when you say that people go to a space that is not damaged, you can kind of turn the argument around when you say that people will not go somewhere that is not lived in.

Mr BLACK — Yes, that is right. What we have tried to do at Selandra Rise is think about how you engage with the community from day dot, and day dot is before the place is being built but when it is being planned. We use the open spaces, the public spaces, as the trigger to engage with people, and the people we engaged with were people who had bought — this is pre-development — a lot. There is a statistic for growth areas that about 70 to 80 per cent of the people who move into a new growth area of the state come from within 5 kilometres of that estate; it is an aspirational thing of moving into a new place — a place they are familiar with but a new place. So we engaged with the existing surrounding city of Casey community, invited them to a Better Living festival and talked to them about what they would like to see and how they would envisage this place. Then when we got to the allocation of the open spaces, they have been actively involved in the planning of those spaces. They are seeing a translation from that process now into the construction, which they can see on the ground.

The idea is a process of creating ownership because, as the councils will tell you, they do not have the resources to remain in place in all these individual neighbourhoods ad infinitum. What we have tried to trial here is a way in which they buy into this idea of community engagement — not consultation; engagement and ownership — before they even have a place to own. They were engaging because they made what is often their single largest personal investment in buying that block of land, so they had made that commitment or they were within the area and being potentially people who would make that commitment.

I will talk about an element shortly of what we are now using to keep that enthusiasm going and, as they are moving in and as infrastructure is provided, joining the dots for them. So they see the infrastructure there, they are in place now and we do have a process of joining the dots and creating the activation, which ultimately is creating the first step there, which is the natural surveillance.

In a strange way, point 3 articulated that to ownership. I do not subscribe to the public/private space argument as heavily as the notion of, ‘This is my house; this is my castle, and that is the public space’. I think in a place that is truly active and one which affords the highest level of
community activity is one that greys the line between the public and private space. That is not to say your house is not private and it does not belong to you. It is thinking about that concept before, about designing a house in a way in which it interacts more greatly with the public space — perhaps reducing front setbacks, designing front gardens and so on and so forth — which really merges that area. They are the feelgood things about bringing activity back onto the streets. We do not need to do things in the park, and we can still kick the footy on the street. It is thinking about that. That is how you grey the space.

The CHAIR — Jason, I am wary of the time. You have got quite a slab of — —

Mr BLACK — I will jump now, I think.

The CHAIR — I will try to let you run through as quick as you can.

Mr BLACK — Yes. This slide was just to say which of the objectives and design suggestions within the guidelines we applied to Selandra Rise. It is as simple as saying that we knew — and this was really just from a fringe versus an established area perspective — some of the things within the safer design guidelines just are not really easily translated to an urban fringe development, which was a general question or a thought that I felt was coming through. Some of them were, and we chose to apply some other tool that was within that best practice guidelines and toolkits that we analysed, so we were basically saying we did not believe they were the best guidelines for things like lighting, signage, et cetera.

I am going to focus on point 3 here, which is Selandra community place. It is basically a community facility — here it is — which is a house that is built within the display village. Economically it remains a capital asset to the land developer.

They engaged Henley to build a house on their land, and for peppercorn rent council is basically running a community facility within there. It does not have all the maternal and child health facilities et cetera, but this is an informational portal and a connection to all the many, many services that the City of Casey, as one of Australia’s largest growth councils, provides. When you live in Selandra Rise and you go to the community place, which is just down the road, you can access information that is the community — —

Mr SCHEFFER — Is that fence permanent?

Mr BLACK — Is it what, sorry?

Mr SCHEFFER — That fence, is that just there while it is being constructed?

Mr BLACK — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — That will come down?

Mr BLACK — Yes. There are certain elements, parts of this, which are still a construction zone and parts which are the broader display village. But the idea is that people can access this, and there are community development resources within the community place, there are programs that have run out of here — coffee klatches and the like — and people can come down. It probably is the biggest issue but let us say that one of the biggest issues the City of Casey really struggled with is the notion that people move into these growth area communities, are promised the dream — and the dream will come, because it just takes time — and they sit there and they become completely socially disconnected as they sit in a construction zone, if they are one of the pioneers, for up to five, six or seven years. This is basically about giving them a point of contact — A, with the council, and B, with other community members — but also effectively, through this facility, bringing life to the other facilities that have been planned in. It reminds people about how to use them. Yoga classes, the bottom one, are actually held within the house. Yes, there might be only three or four residents who attend, but it provides people with that connection. You can read through; there is a lot more information about the community place. Basically the statistics show that people are visiting the community place.
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There are the housing things, but there are other things that we are obviously thinking about. One is safety. What typically happens in roundabouts is the bike lane stops just before the roundabout, so you join the rest of the traffic in the roundabout at your own peril. This is not a new idea but this is the type of thing that is floated in literature: bring the bike lanes into the roundabouts. We are seeing that now to start to translate more around established areas. With the walking track, as you can see, there is extra width on the side of the park here. It actually circumnavigates the park. Again, there are still paths that go through the park, but these paths are dealing with that idea that some of the open spaces at night we cannot navigate but also encouraging people to use this as a walking trail. That is located directly across from the community place. They are talking to people who go for a walk around the circuit.

The CHAIR — Is it lit?

Mr BLACK — Yes, it is. It is lit, the pathway. As you can see, this was just before it opened; some of the infrastructure is still going into place. But there is also within this park toilets and the like which are located at the key activity point at the top of the park, those sorts of things. This was just a process about again engaging with the community as to what they want in their park. So there is also a link here between the design process, the engagement process and the delivery process. There are a lot of parks that look fantastic that people do not use because they do not know how to relate to them. The idea here is that these parks are being delivered based on the feedback, and the community place and the involvement of the council is encouraging them to use these places that they helped to design. A wayfinding strategy again is about encouraging people to be moving around their public spaces. It is not that far to the town centre. It is not that far to the park that is being planned for you by you.

Here you can see the type of things that have gone into the park. These public spaces, I would say, can only be described as rich with resources within them but not really necessarily at a massive cost. Remembering there is a theory here, a healthy and engaged community, so that is a commitment to thinking about the spaces in a different way, and that is what we start to see occurring.

The last thing I want to talk about is the ‘so what?’ to all this. There is a commitment within this that links to the health and wellbeing initiative, which is a longitudinal study funded by VicHealth and RMIT. VicHealth has funded a research practice fellow through RMIT to evaluate the effectiveness of — you can see the research question — ‘To what extent do best practice planning principles for space and place impact on the health and wellbeing of the community of Selandra Rise?’ What this will deliver for us — and the first survey has just been released to the community — over the next four or five years is a longitudinal study that links back to some of the key design elements within this place, and remembering that safety fits under the health and wellbeing aspects.

Mr SCHEFFER — Will you be doing a similar evaluation on the CPTED dimensions?

Mr BLACK — Yes, so the dimension will be picked up in the way that we have applied safety as one of the key priority areas of health and wellbeing. Elements of the actual design initiatives within this place relate directly to safety.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just on that, you are saying that safety and CPTED principles are incorporated into health and wellbeing?

Mr BLACK — Yes. And they are incorporated as being considered part of the best practice planning principles that have been applied to this place. That is something that is going to now track over time. As I said, the first survey has just been released, and we have had almost 100 responses from the 400 dwellings that are in place at the moment, remembering that this place grows over time.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry to interrupt you. When will you have chewed over those first responses?

Mr BLACK — We are hoping to disseminate some of the information as early as December.
Mr SCHEFFER — Could we maybe have a look at some of that?

Mr BLACK — Yes, absolutely. We could make that information available. The early findings will be coming through. Probably, to the extent of being able to do that, it would be January, I would imagine. It is starting to come into the group. The idea here is that this is also seen as a program that links back — right back to the start when these residents were engaged in the design process. This is a back-and-forward, or a circular, planning process that is occurring here, which is — I guess going back to my early thesis — that the social response is as important as the design response. We can inflict as many requirements as we like on planners and developers to put into these communities, but what we are trying to do here is basically say, ‘Well, let’s take stock here’, and, say we are asking for tenders, if only five things are working, let us stop asking for the other five and let us get them focussing on something else with those efforts. As the way we see it, you can balance these competing design agendas. Because health and wellbeing is one of those design agendas, and rather than being a catch-all, let us focus on the things that are actually achieving tangible results on the ground, and in the context of this committee, in relation to the safety of the community.

I think I am pretty much done, other than to say I just had some comments specifically on a couple of the terms of reference. As I said, one of the challenges is the competing design agendas — I think that is a major issue — as well as the conflicting guidelines and potential overlap of guidelines and conflicting project priorities. That is, if someone wants to do a project that is focused on environmental sustainability, then that does not sit neatly necessarily with CPTED or the safer design guidelines as a priority. We could mandate or legislate for safer communities, but I fear that would be to the detriment of that balancing of the competing design agendas, because as soon as we do that we are going to have the, ‘What about us? What about us?’ approach, which is typically difficult. I have sort of dragged out — —

I guess what I was saying before about statutory planners here is evident in this slide — that is, I can assure I could demonstrate how any subdivision that I have ever proposed complies with those four standards there, which are just ones that I have extracted from clause 56 right now. If anyone suggests that clause 56 — which is the ResCode for subdivision — goes far enough in the safer design guidelines sphere or design agenda, then I would say that that is not factually correct. I would say that it is cursory at best.

How could CPTED and safer design guidelines and principles be facilitated in urban fringe developments? I guess I would come to say that the precinct structure planning guidelines are effectively a growth area or fringe planner’s bible, if you like. There is very little reference to safety in those guidelines, and it is certainly not held as an objective for growth area planning in part 1, section 3. I would suggest that until that is the case there will be a gap. Having thought about how it is not just adding more and more on just because we can, I would say that this concept that we have developed here — and when I say ‘we’ meaning the planning institute and others — around safety being a component of health and wellbeing, the other thing that the precinct structure planning guidelines do not talk about is community health and wellbeing, which just strikes me as a massive flaw.

Just going back to an earlier slide, I would probably conclude by saying that in an urban fringe context the way that we would go about doing this is effectively following that sort of theory, which is that a key objective of growth area planning is planning for health and wellbeing, and a key element of that is safety. That way it is not going head-on into this conflict of design agenda but seeing safety as a core component of this overall health and wellbeing approach.

The CHAIR — Thank you, Jason. It was very comprehensive presentation, and we thank you for that.

Mr BLACK — Sorry I could not do it any quicker.

The CHAIR — No, we are right on time because we were a bit late to start with. You have given us a lot of information that we have recorded. Thank you, Jason, for your time; we
appreciate it. Congratulations on your success in this new greenfield suburb. I will get out there and have a look myself one day.

Mr BLACK — Fantastic. I more than happy to accommodate that if the committee wants to do that as well.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — My apologies again for being a little bit late. I am sure you have probably been back-
grounded in relation to why we are here in Sydney today.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

The CHAIR — I chair the committee, and you have met Johan obviously, who is deputy chair.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

The CHAIR — Tim McCurdy who is on the committee and also a member of the Legislative Assembly. We have two apologies from Shaun Leane who is also a committee person and who is unable to be here and Brad Battin; one from the Legislative Council and one from the Legislative Assembly. Obviously we are doing some work in relation to our enquiry into environmental design and crime prevention and on that basis because we are recording the discussion here this morning I will just read you the conditions in relation to you providing evidence to this committee.

So, welcome to the public hearing of the — well, it is not so much a public hearing, it is a private hearing with a recorded device, of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005, and where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees? Affirmative?

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. And once again thank you for your time. You are Professor and Co-Director, Design Against Crime Research Centre, Central Saint Martins College of Arts and Design. Thank you.

Prof EKBLOM — Right. Okay. Well, thank you very much for asking me to contribute here. I will go through this presentation. I understand you want the presentation and then some questions. This is my background. I started out in psychology. I spent quite a long time as a researcher, a civil servant in the Home Office working on Crime Prevention Research, including evaluating our large scale Safer Cities Programme. I advised on the UK Government’s 2004 Safer Places Guide to Crime Prevention and the Planning System which I do not know if you have got a copy of it, but I can supply a link to one if necessary. I moved to Central St Martins as Professor of Design Against Crime six years ago. I have got a range of interests which we may or may not touch on. Obviously design of products and places. I have to say at this point I am not a detailed expert on crime prevention through environmental design, but I have observed the field for a long time and, you know, I have opinions, et cetera, on it which will emerge.

I am also interested in arms races between criminals and crime preventers and terrorists and crime preventers, crime futures where the requirement is to anticipate new crimes, new tools for committing crime, new targets as these emerge, and also knowledge management in sharing practice in crime prevention. So that is my background. Just as a kind of opening statement basically there is good evidence that crime prevention through environmental design does work and is cost effective and durable in reducing crime and fear. But the line that I want to take is to talk about some of its problems and limitations which constrain its potential and its practice. So just to kind of counterbalance some of the tone which may emerge later on my role is a critical friend. I want to see it — it is good enough but I want to see it a lot better. So with that, just an overview of some of the problems. It is pretty weakly defined by a range of American documents which declared in fairly loose terms what it was about.
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Where CPTED finishes and other kinds of crime prevention begin has not been clearly stated. So it is rather prone to fashion and drift of meaning. Different agencies and different disciplines will actually understand it to mean different things, which is not good for collaboration and efficient performance. So it drifts — there has been a bit of drift with the rise of terrorism issues from public space and enjoyment thereof to hard security and it has not happened in any kind of conscious way. If we had a clear definition then we would be able to say, 'Do we really want to go in that direction?' This is as much a professional and a political question. There has been a bit of drift between CPTED being architectural in nature and some people using CPTED just to mean their kind of crime prevention. I would say it is in a kind of no man's land between — it is not very well connected to other areas of crime prevention like situational prevention and problem oriented policing. It is also not very well plumbed into the design and architecture worlds.

It is a kind of a school or a group of professionals having had inputs from one or two grandee writers like Newman and Jacobs in the past which has gone its own way and not really wired in very well to other approaches. Now, although there is strong proof that CPTED works overall — and Paul Cozens who is coming next did a major review of that in 2005 and there has since been more literature on that, we do not know which of its key processes like surveillance and defence ability are more important than others, how they interact with each other, how they work in relation to specific contexts. Some practitioners, especially the novice ones, tend to uncritically accept all the elements of CPTED and regurgitate it. It lacks a decent process model so we do not really know very much about how practitioners go about doing CPTED in the field, and if we do not know that it is difficult to try and improve practice.

In some jurisdictions it might be starved of local crime incident data to help target and design interventions cost effectively on local problems and hot spots and so on. This varies between jurisdictions, I gather, over here. But if they do not have that local detailed intelligence of crime and incident problems, including modus operandi, how did they get in, was it the back door, was it the window, etcetera, etcetera, then it is very difficult to target and to design interventions. On the architectural side sometimes some people get carried away just with the physical aspect and can neglect the human social aspect. But on the other hand, as I will say in a moment, there is a risk of it going the other way. You often get security set against other design principles, so security versus permeability and accessibility, in a sort of either/or fashion. But the role of designers should be about creative optimisation of all the relevant values and benefits. You want something which is secure and permeable rather than either/or.

Many police users in practice see design just as a set of products like security equipment or secure buildings. Where in fact the critical thing is seeing CPTED as a process; it is a way of doing and thinking which should have a design perspective throughout crime prevention. There has, particularly in the early days, been a bit of a problem with rigidity which, even now, is a problem with novice practitioners. A classic example was Gatwick Airport in the UK which was denied a Secured by Design award because its street lights in the car park were too low, and do you really want high street lights in an airport where planes are coming in to land? So things like that, which may seem daft, but they illustrate problems of working to a completely fixed recipe rather than a discretionary one. Sometimes they have not been very good on user requirements or, they can produce horrid fortified landscapes. But all of these can be corrected by appropriate policy, vision, training, leadership and professional discretion.

So this is what I refer to when I mean sort of potential. Also, obviously, criminals are adaptable. They will make counter moves against security measures, use new tools and techniques. So the most strategic thing we can do is to help crime preventers out-innovate adaptive criminals. So in the long run in order to keep the crime rate down that is what we have to invest in. If you do not anticipate upcoming crimes or make your buildings modifiable so that they can be security upgraded you build something and, maybe it lasts 50 years or more, and so you have got a legacy of crime problems, or expensive and clumsy modifications. This is just an illustration, an anecdote from a major study of a rather fixed design recipe some years ago which stated that if you have more than a certain number of households sharing an apartment block you have to fit an entrance porch. Unfortunately when they did that they didn't look at the building as a whole because the entrance porch then gave a leg up to burglars getting in the insecure first floor windows.
So a certain agility of thinking, and ‘thinking thief’, are important. Another risk with CPTED is cook book copying and adapting design principles to context is vital. There was an attempt to emulate this cycle parking system from Belgium in the UK and for quite a long while it was completely under used. People in the UK were kind of outraged at having to pay for bike parking and walking more than about 100 metres to the next stage of their journey, hence they were leaving that. I think it has improved since then with various modifications. But cook book copying and the kind of organisation and regulations that go with it ——

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, I did not —— with the bicycles I did not pick up what that had to do with crime.

Prof EKBLOM — Right. Well, this is all about secure bicycle parking.

Mr SCHEFFER — So when —— so the bottom picture where they are parked is ——

Prof EKBLOM — Yes. I mean, they are obviously easier to steal but they are also creating a nuisance and a hazard.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes. Okay.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes. This is meant to give security. So always when you design something crime prevention requirements come up against other requirements. I mean, convenience, you can have entry phone systems which, if they are not properly designed can be a nightmare to operate and you sometimes see them propped open by a fire extinguisher. Aesthetics is a problem. Privacy and freedom issues with CCTV of course, social inclusion, sustainability. If you are blasting out lots of street lighting then —— in the name of security among other things, then that is not very good for carbon footprint and safety. Now, you can do designs which serve all these purposes and do not deliver the harm. So this, at the Emirates Stadium in North London, it is actually —— it looks attractive but it is designed to stop a seven tonne truck loaded with explosives from crashing into the stadium. But it looks good. It does not sort of connote where we have fortified and there was a horrible risk of terrorism here.

American fire escape is kind of engineering grotesque, but the critical thing is here it allows people to escape the building via this last run of ladder which drops down under their weight, whilst not allowing burglars to make their way into the building. So a bit of engineering creativity enables you to have security and safety rather than some sort of compromise. Some of CPTED neglects the wider social context, for example, Home Office research years ago found that child density in an area was far more important in determining whether there was vandalism than any kind of design factors. Obviously if you are in social conditions where people are not inclined to intervene, withdraw into their own heavily barbed wired and bolted homes, then the social conditions which make for sort of civil life on the streets are limited. That was one of the reason why second generation CPTED was created in the late ’90s.

This focussed on the social activities and social mix needed to encourage people to take ownership of space collectively and take advantage of natural surveillance, respecting the local subcultures, bringing in social cohesion and trying to move away from pure defensibility into connectivity and accessibility. An example of that —— I do not know if you have them over here, youth shelters; places which young people can hang out in which are safe and not in a kind of nuisance position. They can be surveilled so it enables you to sort of —— well, not exactly control young people in a forcible way, but attract them to particular places where it is good for them and it is for, say, the older people who do not want to be sort of pushing through bunches of kids on the pathway, etcetera, etcetera.

The CHAIR — Do they become a sort of habitat for homelessness?

Prof EKBLOM — I have never heard of that in the UK. But, in certain circumstances that is always a risk. You would have to think where you would place them and in some circumstances you might have to remove it if that is an issue. But then ideally you might want to be looking at other approaches to homelessness as well, so kind of push and pull. Now, some questions about this. Not all social interactions are positive. You might get excessive pressure to
conformity in certain areas. You will get conflict between neighbours or between landlords and tenant over, say, noise, dogs, even weedy gardens and so on. There is a kind of presumption which is sort of mixed use, mixed classes, mixed cultures environments are always beneficial. I mean, from a value point of view it is the right thing to say. But in terms of evidence we just don’t know. I mean, second generation kind of in some ways risks flipping from extreme simplistic architectural determinism to a dilution with vague social ideas.

The position I recommend ending up with is, yes, we must include social processes and social concepts along with the architectural ones, but we have to ensure that they are clearly stated and evidenced. So I have a whole range of ideas about how to upgrade CPTED. Actually this was designed with all sorts of security — this is in Japan, Himeji Castle, security devices including the Nightingale Floor where the floorboards are on some kind of little rollers which means that they squeak whenever you walk on them so you cannot creep up and ambush or assassinate the Shogun. Interesting design ideas. So this is what I think CPTED needs to be fit for purpose, clearer definition in scale and scope, better links to its source disciplines in planning, design, architecture, etcetera, etcetera. All these fields, it is not properly connected up with, and they have got a lot to offer. Strategically it needs to be scientific based on evidence of what works.

Theory — not in a kind of ivory tower sense, but a guy (Kurt Lwein) in the 1940s said, ‘There’s nothing so practical as a good theory’ in guiding you where you’ve got no prior examples of what works. Tested experience also. In the UK there has been a terrific loss in the last two years of experienced design in our crime advisers, partly the whole cohort has been coming to the end of its career. But partly they have been sped on their way because of the financial cuts. It is actually quite a tragic waste of all that experience and the training has gone down the drain as well as we have had change after change in the policing world. I should say we are also at a point where the whole planning system into which crime prevention was inserted is undergoing a major change. The people that are most up to date with that are based at Huddersfield University. Dr Rachel Armitage and Leanne Monchuk.

I do strongly advise you — I understand you are not actually going over to the UK, but getting in contact with them, getting some of their reports and maybe having a Skype conversation or something with them will be extremely valuable. They are the ones with the most encyclopaedic and thorough knowledge of the administration of design against crime. So adaptive to changing contexts, sensitive to different scales, trying to creatively balance the values and priorities of security with other social and policy values, being professional in terms of expertise, quality assurance, ethics and so on.

But not using professionalism as a kind of defensible space to keep other professions or ordinary residents at arm’s length. Probably my colleagues from Design Against Crime will talk about the importance of co-design where people — where professionals work with local users who have got particular knowledge and interest to come up with designs which are then much more effective. A good process model and futures oriented; now, I can expand upon those, but conscious of the time it is up to you whether you want me to continue or whether you want to direct some questions to me now. Whatever the case I can leave the rest of the presentation to you so you can look at it as well. So what — —

The CHAIR — So how much more or your presentation is there?

Prof EKBLOM — I have got probably about the same again potentially. But, you know, it is up to you.

The CHAIR — We do have another speaker at 9.00, scheduled at 9.00. So maybe for the time with you we might take the opportunity to have the committee ask some questions.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes, of course.

The CHAIR — And maybe draw out some of the areas of interest from them.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.
The CHAIR — So, Johan, do you have any?

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I have got two but I will start with one. You talked earlier on about the dispersion or the drift away from the focus on CPTED issues in the UK or — well, in the UK. But — and you said that partly that relates to not having a clear definition of what the process is. The committee went to New Zealand and spoke to Frank Stoks who you may know of.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — He talked to us in similar lines to the way you have about the importance of a process. I got the sense from him that he had a fairly clearly methodology about how to go about developing good projects and, you know, good outcomes. Could I just ask you, is the fact that it is so dispersed a function of it being still relatively new, and almost inevitable given the number of disciplines that are being invited to engage in this sort of discourse?

Prof EKBLOM — Well, I think it has been going really since, on and off in places, since the ’70s. So I would not necessarily characterise it as new. I would characterise it as nobody having attempted to sort of develop a vision which extends right down from ground level practice up to integrated theory, a corpus of well evaluated, detailed knowledge, etcetera, etcetera. So it has kind of been — it has been drifting along as a kind of practice discipline without a — well, if you take a medical science analogy, you have medical practice and then you have medical science. The science informs the practice and the practice can then test the science. There has not really been an adequate science level, shepherding the practice towards ever greater improvement and development I would say. This, incidentally, is a definition which I put together myself which attempts to sort of answer the criticisms that I made. I do not know — well, obviously if I leave this presentation with you you will be able to see that.

The CHAIR — Tim, did you have a question?

Mr McCURDY — I am just like the — your crime prevention, your CPTED, are they embedded in your planning policies? Who drives it?

Prof EKBLOM — Right. Okay. Now, this is — we are literally at the point of the whole of the UK, well, England and Wales planning system getting tipped upside down by the coalition government. From the early ’90s there was a gradual move to include CPTED, or at least crime prevention principles into the planning system, which reached a peak in about 2004 with major planning policy statement, one which said that crime prevention should be a major consideration in the planning system. In parallel with that was this official guide, Safer Places, which showed how that could happen. We also had the more general, not just the sort of architectural crime prevention basis, in the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998 where section 17 says that, local governments should consider the crime implications of absolutely everything they do. So we started to get a firm basis. Also that Act required the police and local government to form crime and disorder partnerships, now community safety partnerships.

Then we had the Association of Chief Police Officers which is the professional lead on policing issues. We have got 43 separate forces. They instituted the secured by design process whereby buildings are certified and awarded crime prevention certificates. That is still going on. As I say, on the planning side we now have what is called a sort of new localism whereby a lot more decisions are deferred right down to the very local level. But at the same time the government is actually trimming all the planning guidance and legislation to — I think it is from about 40 documents of guidance and regulations down to one 59 page document. So any of the detail on crime prevention that has built up in that is just disappearing. Local governments were encouraged previously to come up with local planning guides including local crime prevention guides, but that is being advised against.

We have also got the police and crime commissioners, who you may have heard of, first elected ones on a force level, with an interesting 15 per cent turn out in the vote. But we will have to see how those play out. So that the whole landscape is changing. On the other side the financial cuts have meant that the number of experts available in the police have plummeted. But there is one
model which is quite interesting, the Greater Manchester Force have actually got a body of civilian crime prevention design advisors — and I think they call them something different, embedded in the police. They are all architecturally trained. These people are supported by a kind of levy on developers whose plans are seen as per requirement at the earliest stages of planning. That seems to be working. As I say, the people at Huddersfield University are absolutely up to speed on that and it would be very useful to you to talk to them as an alternative model.

Mr SCHEFFER — And that model would continue under — when you said at the beginning of turning the system upside — —

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — That would continue?

Prof EKBLOM — Yes. It seems to be the one model which is surviving maintaining its equipment, its staff and so on, when the others are not. But, I mean, it depends on your circumstances.

The CHAIR — All right. Look, we had better leave it there because unfortunately we are constrained a bit by time.

Prof EKBLOM — Yes.

The CHAIR — But we do appreciate your time. Thank you, professor. And we look forward to getting the full presentation.

Prof EKBLOM — Well, thank you for the opportunity.

The CHAIR — You are welcome.

Prof EKBLOM — I appreciate you have got a busy few days ahead of you.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — I will just read you a — the sort of conditions around your presentation to us because it is being recorded, thereby it is sort of bounded by some rules.

Dr COZENS — I did get two attachments with all of those details in them.

The CHAIR — Right. No worries. Nothing unexpected. So, my name is Simon Ramsay, I chair this Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee, which is a joint parliamentary committee of the Victorian Parliament. We have an enquiry running now, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, of which we have finished our submission process, we have had a number of public hearings and today was an opportunity to come to Sydney and obviously draw from some of the expertise that is speaking at the conference tomorrow and Pete is attending our behalf. Unfortunately we are sitting in parliament this week so we have had to juggle the weekend to have access to the expertise over the conference. Johan Scheffer on my left up there is the deputy chair.

Dr COZENS — Nice to meet you.

The CHAIR — Pete Johnson is the senior research officer and helping us through today. Tim McCurdy, a committee member, also a member of the Legislative Assembly, and we have two apologies from our other two committee persons. So thank you again, Paul.

Dr COZENS — No worries.

The CHAIR — Again, I apologise to you as I did to the previous speaker that we are running a little bit late, which is my fault. Certainly our questions, we will try and keep them brief so we can get through your time.

Dr COZENS — Okay.

The CHAIR — So I will just read this quickly. The public — well, it is a closed hearing but being recorded, of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005, and where applicable the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand — or I assume you have noted the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees. We are recording the evidence as indicated and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I thank you again. We do like to ask questions so it is up to you whether you — are you happy for us to raise questions as you go along?

Dr COZENS — Yes.

The CHAIR — And/or we can do it at the end of the presentation.

Dr COZENS — Cool. Basically I thought initially I would respond to the 12 broad questions. So I would like to do that initially.

The CHAIR — Thank you. And we have been given a background of your position and your work too.

Dr COZENS — Cool. Okay. Well, the first point I suppose I was reflecting on my position a couple of years back where I worked in Premier and Cabinet on the policy development side of things, which was quite an interesting and very vibrant time and there was lots of support from government as seemingly funding going around. We developed a design our crime strategy. In WA we went for design our crime rather than CPTED. So we have a design our crime strategy which is quite an extensive strategy but I think to some degree keeps doors open rather than guides any activities. We have planning guidelines. We have a planning bulletin. Several of the local governments in Western Australia have developed their own CPTED guidelines. To some degree
following on from the state's planning guidelines but with different consultants, etcetera. There is a slightly different flavour.

But unfortunately the design our crime unit within the Office of Crime Prevention kind of was disbanded when some of the auspices of what we were doing was moved under police. So we were in Premier and Cabinet, which did have a bit of weight behind it. As we moved to police the police office has got a very different way of doing things. It was not necessarily one of their priorities. I think it has still being done to some extent but not to the level that it was before, but we did have our own design our crime unit with two staff. But as I say that is no more and I moved on back to academia when, sort of, the writing was on the wall that I would not have a position anymore. So I do not know if that provides you with some insights as to what is going on in terms of CPTED in WA. I don’t know whether to pause at the end of each one for questions or just keep going.

The CHAIR — Keep going. I am sure our committee are not timid enough not to interrupt if they want to ask a question.

Dr COZENS — Cool.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just since you raised that, just quickly. We have talked about this, about whether the main focus of CPTED functions should be with police or planning, and you have mentioned Premiers as well. Do you have a clear view on — does it matter provided they are interrelated for example?

Dr COZENS — I think it is a difficult one because if you leave it to the planners to some extent they do not have the crime prevention knowledge, background and expertise to necessarily deliver it. They certainly do not have the access to crime data to actually work with and develop — assess risks before they implement the CPTED strategies. But in saying that you can go too far with police involvement and lose the — what planners try to achieve, some do it better than others, the liveability of spaces, the sustainability of spaces, the usability of spaces. So I think it is trying to find the balance between police advice and knowledge of crime prevention and planners' knowledge of, you know — —

Mr McCURDY — Not looking like Fort Knox.

Dr COZENS — Yes. Yes, that. I think certain places — I do know of one local government area in the UK where an architectural liaison officer, which is police trained specifically in CPTED, sits on the development assessment panel of a local government. That is somewhat innovative to my understanding of anywhere else. That seems to work — well, I have been told that that works reasonably well because at least you have got a guy that sits around a table and if there is, okay, we have got a new school. Where is it? What is it going to look like? How will it integrate with the local environment?

Then the police officer is there to say, 'Well, have you thought about this as a potential risk? Have you thought about that as a potential risk?' Rather than separate submissions that will come into a central body that then try and assess things. So I think that is certainly a difficult issue. But in WA the police are not involved at all I would say. They were involved in the development of the — all the policy stuff, because I was running that and obviously from a government department point of view it was open to all departments and DGs for their comments and advice, etcetera. So, yes, I think that is a crucial aspect balancing the police's role in CPTED.

Mr SHEFFER — Okay. Thank you.

Dr COZENS — I will try to shorten the questions to get them on the — key aspects equal [unclear 0:07:53.9] planning strategies and how effective? Very difficult to assess would say, and probably most of your other speakers would say that. One negative angle that I have noticed in WA, and probably a lot of guidelines — and no disrespect to the Victorian Safer by Design Guidelines, it seems to be more about this, 'Let's promote eyes on the street and surveillance,' which really is only one of a suite of CPTED strategies. Interestingly I am seeing that — because I work in a planning department now, that the CPTED guidelines are being refined if you want,
almost to align with what planning policy is, which is high density, mixed used developments and permeable street networks. On the assumption that they, by themselves, reduce crime, when, from the environmental criminology point of view and looking at crime data denser places, more mixed use places, and more permeable places promote crime in some instances.

So I am seeing a bit of a mismatch and a lack of understanding of crime risks in how planners perceive the CPTED stuff. I think that that's possibly because the police are not in the loop to wave a hand and go, 'Hold on a minute. Very dense places can be more criminogenic than less dense places.' As, you know, from Australia's point of view, our cities are going to become more dense as populations rise. I do not know what the — what is it, the 32 million by 2030, or whatever. So, yes, I think that is another crucial issue that the — I think it could be just a matter of accepting what crime risks are associated with the build form and then implementing CPTED rather than changing what CPTED is. I get a sense that it is often used as kind of window dressing for planning documents and they go, 'Oh, yes, we are doing this. Oh, and we also did a bit of CPTED.' But it is very difficult to see what they actually did and what they actually achieved. So to some degree it is a fashion accessory I would say.

The CHAIR — I have heard that word in two different speakers.

Dr COZENS — Oh, dear.

The CHAIR — It is becoming very fashionable.

Dr COZENS — Okay. Criticisms; and maybe I have touched on some of those already, well, certainly two of them there. Dominated by natural surveillance as I have mentioned there, and this alignment with planning policies, and for the want of repeating myself, that no link with environmental criminology. I think that is increasingly essential to delivering CPTED more effectively. If we do not know what crime risks are, if we do not understand how space is used, I also think that there is various theories in environmental criminology that need to be engaged with by those who do CPTED because, you know, routine activities for example, people need to know how spaces are used, when they are dense, when they are not dense. Places are dynamic. They change over time. Different days of the week, different seasons. If you are implementing CPTED then you need to understand those dynamics, and risk assessment is part of that.

The window dressing angle appears there as well. I think as well that one criticism — and it is not of the Safety — Safer by Design, this is generic criticism of CPTED, is that it can often be oversimplified and applied as an outcome, almost as an, 'Okay, we will CPTEDify this place.' Not, 'Here's a process where we analyse what is going on. We see how the place is being used. We look at crime risks. We look at problems and then we come up with a suite of strategies to try and deal with it.' It is almost like if you use the analogy of you would not go to your doctor and accept him giving you some pills before you have told him what is wrong with you. I sense to some degree with people, 'Oh, yeah, throw a bit of CPTED at it and you'll be fine.' Well, what is wrong first? Does it need any of this?

It needs to be refined in relation to those — that local context and those local problems. So it can be a bit of a cook book approach where you have got your CPTED catalogue and you go, 'Okay. Right. Page 7, do this, do this, do this. Page 9,' rather than, 'Here are some thinking processes that you need to go through.' I know time is of essence to everybody these days. Thinking sometimes goes out of the window. But to do CPTED efficiently I think that it is a process that needs — parts of the process need to be in place otherwise you could end up going, either going too far, not going far enough, doing the wrong thing in the wrong place, precipitating crime, accidentally creating it by putting CPTED in the wrong places and the wrong context. A big issue is the training side of things. There is lots of planners who I see and I say — they say, 'Oh, yeah, yeah. I'm an expert on CPTED.' I say, 'Okay, where did you…?' 'I did a two day course.' No disrespect. They may know their stuff and may be very competent planners. But I would say very few think of CPTED as a process and apply it as a process.

The CHAIR — I had a — can I interrupt you?
Dr COZENS — Of course.

The CHAIR — I am sort of a view that we, you know, while we have CPTED — and it is a pretty broad sort of guideline, really for planners, and that is the reason why we incorporated the Safe Design Principles where planners sort of — rather than just tick the box and say, ‘Yeah, that just conforms with the sort of broad-brush of CPTED.’ The Safe Design actually hones down more for the planners where they can sort of articulate their designs with more of the safety issues or crime prevention issues. I guess that is our brief, more so to find out what local government planners are doing in relation to, you know, how much they use the sort of Safe Design principles rather than sort of overarching CPTED stuff.

Dr COZENS — Okay.

The CHAIR — Now, I have got to say I thought WA — we went across there last year I think it was for another enquiry and I sort of got the view that, you know, they were pretty well on the mark in relation to their community safety programs and Eyes of the Street or Eyewatch, wasn’t it?

Mr SCHEFFER — [unclear 0:15:10.5] agree with it anyway.

The CHAIR — You don’t agree?

Mr SCHEFFER — Well, I agree with the current plan, but I thought it was a very heavily enmeshed with policing.

The CHAIR — Yes. I mean, a more policing hands on though.

Mr SCHEFFER — [Overtalking] and all that kind of sense was the sense I got from it.

The CHAIR — Yes. Anyway, that was just the view I was getting along the way that — and you are right from what you have said so far, it seems to be pretty consistent with what we have heard from previous witnesses.

Dr COZENS — And my criticisms — I have got to consider that there are some very good examples out there, I am sure, and people that have got passion for it and are thinking about it as a process. So I am not tarring everybody with the same brush. Obstacles and impediments; I think working in government kind of highlighted the idea that CPTED often needs champions, drivers for this. It can lose momentum. And I think in WA to some extent with the movement of operations into police, I think they have split that and there is — and they do a lot of good stuff within the community engagement in WA. I think that is where a lot of the design crime stuff is done now through local governments and the community safety and crime prevention plan. So it is being delivered. But again I question to what extent the process is being used locally. Expertise and what to do and how to do it; I will mention a little bit more on this a bit later on.

But the lack of local crime data I think is a real bug bear for me. Right back to when I started my PhD back in 1997 I initially was going to look at crime stats. I could not get them. I could not get hold of them. So the whole nature of the PhD changed and basically most of my life has been looking at perceptions of crime because I just cannot get my hands on the data. I wonder then whether that problem permeates local authorities and their capacity to measure local risks first, measure local problems and then react to them, and then come up with strategies. I think that is not an issue that is just linked to WA or Australia. I think there is calls in the UK as well from people in the Home Office that, you know, the crime stats themselves which are largely speaking Victorian in origin need to be updated for the 21st century.

We look at space different. We look at policing differently now. And I think there is a strong argument — and I know it is going to be massively expensive and a really big task, and I am not suggesting that that is something that you guys need to necessarily be engaged with, but I am forever frustrated at the lack of availability and lack of microscopic level analysis of crime. I can get crime data on suburbs, which is fine. But to fully break down, you know, where some of the peaks and the hot spots are, if you have not got the data at the microscopic level it is meaningless.
It is like saying, well, the average height of us four — us five, is five foot 10, which does not really tell us too much. So, yes, crime data stuff I think is a real problem.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Just — you passed over lack of expertise to do it. As an academic what is being done and what needs to be done? We are going to be talking to some — to the police later on and just looking at the notes on that there is — a lot of them are engaged in training in various ways, which we will talk about there. But what do you think could be done in terms of capacity building?

**Dr COZENS** — From a WA perspective it is the training of planners. Since the police are not involved in the development approval process then it is down to the planners to do the doing. Many of those are not trained and I am not sure how this varies from state to state. Obviously the police have more of a role or less of a role depending on different states. Planners view everything through Jane Jacobs', Eyes On The Street, hence the dominance of Eyes on the Street and surveillance when, you know, there is a lot more than just providing spaces that are overlooked.

You see, and I think as well — going back to Paul Ekblom's work, I think there needs to be a recognition that there is some complexity, except it is not an easy concept necessarily. You can state it. 'Oh, yes, it's easy. I've done that.' But in reality it is a complex process of analysis, of consideration and developing strategies based on that analysis. So I think to some extent a real, you know — more in depth training, longer term training, more that highlights this complexity and that you cannot just open up a catalogue of solutions before you know what the problem is. I do not know if that answers your questions at all.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Yes.

**Dr COZENS** — Develop an awareness; I am not — some of the questions are — I can answer more easily than others. My minimal experience with developers is that they are not too aware of it. The limited dealings I have had with developers is that it is just seen as another cost. Such that the benefits that they might receive, you know, there is lots of literature on if you have CPTEDify a house, for example, that the initial costs of, I do not know, a couple of grand, to make that more secure you recoup that within so many years. So there is, like, a cost benefit analysis done on that. But from a developer's point of view they do not see any of that. So from their point of view it is, 'Well, why do we have to do it?' Often — —

**Mr SCHEFFER** — What if they are made to do it?

**Dr COZENS** — That's exactly the point I am trying to make there.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Okay.

**Dr COZENS** — That I find it puts a smile on my face when I read that new housing developers, when they are developing it, they have to put water saving taps and showers in, which is fine. Yes, water needs saving. But I could blow some of the doors open on these new properties because they have no minimum standards. I think possibly as a starting point if, you know, you went down a road of mandatory practices that might be something that is — you could get your hands on a lot easier, the technical aspects of it from the UK. They have got a lot of stuff on their secure by design on — there is six second and 30 second and two minute burglary tests done on doors and windows. So I would like to see that, well, I would suggest that that might be a starting point for any approach that tries to mandate things. Second and third generation CPTED; I was quite enthused to see this as a question actually and an area to be talked about because it is often ignored and it has taken a while for some of this, you know, social stuff to come through.

I think that the second generation CPTED stuff is vital because it helps to develop more of a bottom up approach if you are involved in the local community, and levels of social cohesion, what they are doing on the ground. Do they feel part of the community? Obviously if you have got a community that does not — that is not — that does not feel part of a, you know, the broader society and is excluded, disadvantaged, then they are not going to necessarily carry out guardianship or take control over certain spaces. They may indeed to the opposite. So I think that
particularly under certain socio-economic situations that the social angle of the second generation CPTED stuff is vital. And that you can get some wonderful insights from engaging with the community on where they fear — where they do not want to go, which can provide some nice balance, if you want, at different places that may be problematic.

In spite of my comments about crime data there can be areas that people avoid that according to the crime statistics are safe yet the community do not use a certain park or they will not use certain high streets for a variety of other reasons that you cannot really tell until you start to pull back different layers of what is going on in the community and their perceptions. I think Greg Saville has done a lot of work on this, Wendy Sarkissian has done a fair bit of work as well. I recently read a — one of my masters students has just done a dissertation on CPTED in Botswana, and he has highlighted a couple of reports that the UN-HABITAT have come up with the new phrase, 'Green CPTED.' I mean, a lot of it might just be re-badging but I was reading an article back in 2002 I think it was, arguing that, you know — I think theoretically and — what am I trying to say? The green groups could well have embraced CPTED but it is not green and it is not nature, so they did not.

I think CPTED in cities might put the urban environmentalism, particularly if it starts to link second generation CPTED and this — whatever this new third generation CPTED is. That is what they have called it in these reports. It is a bit vague at the moment and maybe they are just going for — to steal a march on everybody else by coming up with another badge and another category. But I will be keeping my eyes on that one. But I think there is a strong link with some of this second generation stuff and the idea of sustainability, you know, if we are trying to make our cities sustainable and our open spaces sustainable we cannot do this if they are crime ridden. No one wants to use any spaces, things can be problematic and it is patently unsustainable if you have got crime ridden neighbourhoods and crime ridden places; sections within the community. I am also knowledgeable of — it think that is SVB. I think it is, the Dutch one. That is a lot closer to their — they kind of modelled it on the UK Secure by Design, but it has got more of a second generation angle to it and I think they reported something like 80 per cent reductions in burglary. Move on?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Dr COZENS — I have mentioned those. Manchester Police, my moanings about crime data, they have got a — I think I have got a copy of it here, they instigate a crime impact statement before — and I think it is — obviously the police are heavily involved in this. Obviously then they look at, before any building, what are the potential crime risks for it and how can we mitigate them? Not just, we're building a new building how do we build it to CPTED standards? It is, what are the potential risks? Where is this building going? It is going — it is not going in a vacuum. It is going within, you know, a place with its own problems, with its own dynamics, with its own movement, etcetera, etcetera. So they — I think that is a very innovative use. And I had seen a presentation at a conference recently, it might have been here, on some of the work they are doing in New Zealand following the earthquake. That the redevelopment of some of the cities — is it Wellington that got — —

Mr McCURDY — Christchurch.

The CHAIR — We have just been there.

Dr COZENS — Right. So I will not bore you with — —

The CHAIR — No. No. Just — it is interesting you have made a note of that given as a prompt for us to visit the city.

Dr COZENS — I have not seen anything so I do not know how effective what they do, but at least they are thinking from, you know, starting from scratch and if CPTED ideas are part of that then I would suggest that is a positive step potentially. Teaching; my understanding was that most of the CPTED stuff is part of criminology degrees, criminal law, justice. There are some sporadic, I think, that have started to do CPTED as part of urban planning here. I do a little bit at Curtin in terms of urban planning. Richard Schneider, the University of Florida, he does a little bit
as part of his planning. But predominantly I would generalise and say that, you know, if architects and planners do get it it is a CPTED 101 type approach. And bearing in mind if they end up being the ones that have to deliver it I would suggest that that is not enough, and we have also got, in Australia I think there is AMTAC and ICMPI, a sister company to AMTAC.

They offer three and five day courses. I am trying to think — Tony Lake, an ex-Queensland police officer. He has had something to do with that, and Rick Draper, I think they offer courses on that. Which probably, unless there are others being delivered that I am not knowledgeable about, they are probably the most comprehensive ones that we have got, other than the Secure by Design stuff from the UK. Obviously I am looking at — I am just finishing a book on design our crime and going beyond CPTED to link to some of this environment and criminology and social angle. One of the next steps is hopefully to get it delivered as a unit, a special unit, for urban planners. So maybe that is something for the future.

The CHAIR — Paul, can I just ask how much longer your presentation is?

Dr COZENS — Just got to get up to the 12 points and finished.

The CHAIR — Okay. I just — I am mindful we have got someone waiting. I assume she is waiting. It is a quarter to 10. All right, we will just — can we just quickly whiz through those last few points?

Dr COZENS — No role, I would say very little role in police. It varies from place to place but certainly not in WA. Should it be mandated? I think this could be a double-edged sword. I think the process could be mandated. I think in the process itself. But probably minimum security standards might be your best bet to think about mandating to start with because of the — you can block it off in technical terms. You need to think carefully. And the last point there, little point in making CPTED mandatory when there is no — well, little expertise to deliver it. So you can’t —

The CHAIR — What is — sorry, SBD?

Dr COZENS — Secured by Design.

The CHAIR — Okay.

Dr COZENS — That’s the UK’s initiative. So that is —

The CHAIR — Is that the doors, locks sort of thing?

Dr COZENS — The doors, locks and windows, but also street layout, inter-visibility between properties and street networks as well. All I would say, if you are thinking about any of this, the high rise stuff, caution, link to the literature and the evidence. There is plenty of stuff over there. It is the — is the Department of Justice US, they have got some pretty heavy duty guidelines on heavy — the high density properties. And the Dutch as well. They have got quite stringent stuff on doors, locks, windows. Recommendations; for want of repeating myself, I think an area of the future, especially with the poor stats, is local fear of crime mapping. What do the local people think about their area, how they use it and what is going on?

What can we then do using CPTED to make these places potentially safer? Nature and access to crime data; well, I bore you with that one. And, you know, funding and developing CPTED qualified people. That — a body, a growing body of knowledge. You know some of this about me anyway so I will not bore you with any of this. Any of my stuff that you are looking for I am happy to send you. But predominantly it has been on perceptions. I have also used virtual reality scenes to get people’s responses to different environments. A lot of stuff I have been doing lately is on night time economy and clubs and violence and drinking. This is probably a summary of everything that I have said thus far.

CHAIR — Can I get a copy of the presentation?
Dr COZENS — Of course you can. I will leave it on there or I can put it on there.

Dr COZENS — Yes, cool. There are no photos so it going to be a small one. Yes.

The CHAIR — All right, Paul. Thanks very much.

Witness withdrew.
DRUGS AND CRIME PREVENTION COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the Application of Safer Design Principles and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

Sydney — 10 December 2012

Members

Mr B. Battin                  Mr S. Ramsay
Mr S. Leane                   Mr J. Scheffer
Mr T. McCurdy

Chair: Mr S. Ramsay
Deputy Chair: Mr J. Scheffer

Staff

Executive Officer: Ms S. Cook
Research Officer: Mr P. Johnston
Committee Administrative Officer: Ms K. Martinow

Witness

Professor L. Gamman, Professor in Design Studies, School of Graphic and Industrial Design and Director of Design Against Crime Research Centre, Central St Martins School of Art and Design, University of the Arts London
The CHAIR — Well, thank you for this morning and again I forever seem to be apologising. We are running a tad overtime. So hopefully we can make it up during the day.

Prof GAMMAN — No problem, we are here anyway.

The CHAIR — Now, our joint parliamentary committee of the Victorian Parliament, Drugs and Crime Prevention is one of 12, soon to be 14 I think, joint parliamentary committees. Our inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design, I suspect Sandy has given you some background into the work we are doing there. Thank you again for making a time. We do have to just read out a - the rules and conditions of your presentation given we are recording the conversation. So just bear with me for two second while I read this out and we will cover our legal requirements.

All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005, and where applicable the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand you have noted the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees. We are recording the evidence as you can see and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate.

The CHAIR — So thank you again very much and we look forward to hearing from you.

Prof GAMMAN — Okay. How I — I thought I would try and have a conversation with you and I am the Director of the Design Against Crime Research Centre in London. Your Attorney General said he wanted to emulate it when he set up the centre here, so I was very pleased about that. I am also the Vice Chair of the Designing Out Crime Association in London which is a national organisation. Actually in terms of answering the 12 questions set by Sandy Cook I have consulted some of the board of DOCA because I actually feel that you need to hear from practitioners who are really doing the work, as well as the people like myself. So, you know, the first question we were given was how does crime prevention through environmental design and safer design principles be incorporated into planning strategies in your country, particularly at local government level?

Straightforwardly the biggest influence in crime prevention was the Crime and Disorder Act which put a responsibility on both the police and local authorities to be responsible for how any decision they made influences crime. You probably know about Secured By Design which is the way the police have, in Britain, tried to address it and the Secured By Design certification process. I have written all this down. I will give you a copy of this afterwards. At an international level the principles have been used - linked to European standards, [CEN325] which is just a framework. My problem is, with all the work, is that some of it is really good and some of it is not. So I have talked to that in the past, CPTED 1, 2 and 3. You might be aware of those categories. Certainly what I was very concerned about, particularly in Britain, is that it is really easy if you focus only on one problem to design out toilets, design out benches, design out dust bins, but actually the majority of the population are law abiding and, you know, elder people need to go to the toilet more regularly.

Actually it has a really negative effect on sort of social life. So one of the issues is to look at how the problems are addressed in a holistic way. So certainly the law is an important account and you need those references, but also I think that you need to understand some of the philosophies. The police have had a very difficult job. Architecture, which is linked to property development is incredibly powerful. I have heard an architect say to a 30 year serving officer, ‘And what are your qualifications to speak to me?’ I mean, there has been great - many problems. RIBA, is you go online, RIBA is our architectural institution who regulates our architecture. You can see the [rank 0:04:53.4] that Adam Thorpe and myself had with Piers Gough who believes that most of the measures to try and reduce crime in public space are undemocratic. It is a very difficult argument.
Personally the evidence I have gathered is pretty clear that the actual way it has been incorporated does work and has reduced crime. Some of it is better than others.

The second question that was raised by your colleague is what aspects of design in CPTED principles have been incorporated into planning strategies? The short answer is everybody does it differently. But many local authorities now require property developers to provide a crime impact statement. It might helpful for you to get, I suppose, the advice that the different councils put out. I would recommend you look at Brighton - Matt Eastwood's work is very useful; Brighton and Hove have lots of guidance about how this is processed, Camden in London and Westminster. They are the two richest boroughs, and their work is really good. So, you know, the crime impact statement means that it would be very difficult for anyone going through the process not to have some sense of crime. But actually, you know, there are two issues; one is public safety and one is profit. Property developers, you know, I have seen guys come in and show me a drawing and they go, 'You can get 100 bikes in that space.'

Because in Britain you now have to provide bike parking as part of the planning process. I go, 'You can't. You can draw 500 spaces but actually to turn a bike around to get in and out, you would get 50 maximum, 30 probably realistically.' So it is how it is understood and how it is implemented and what the, I suppose, what the law really is. At the moment it is a consultation process. It has to be because there is not one way; there is not a cookbook solution. But at the same time there is not much to compel, so you will have to look at how you might do it better and how might learn from Britain some, I suppose, errors. Is there anything you would like to ask me about those two statements, because I will go through the questions?

Mr McCURDY — So are you saying that the crime impact statement that can actually - that can act as a deterrent against the developers who are obviously profit based, and you are saying if you put in too many rules and regulations in place that you are going to find — —

Prof GAMMAN — I think it is that but I think that when you go to buy a house in Britain now you have to do an energy statement, or if you sell your house you have to create one. So when a property developer is putting the plans together, you know, if it is a night time economy issue so the development is restaurants and bars, they have to work through. So there is no way that they would not have knowledge of what crime might be. But what they choose to do about it is not, you know. And it is about which borough or which bit of Britain is negotiating. You have the same issue in Australia; different parts have different approaches. Some are more robust than others. Some have the police officers working with the planners in the same department. The issue is that where money is concerned profit often goes first.

So how will you deal with that because how it is being dealt with in Britain is that the police officers have to deal with the architects who do not like them, they think they are upstarts. Also you have to see it from the architect's point of view. It takes seven years to qualify as an architect. It is seven years of learning about equal opportunities and disability. Crime is another layer and they become very resentful. So it is a very difficult system to implement. But I am not quite sure how to do it better without so fixing it that you make yourself other problems. I suppose my issues about the principles and how they are understood is how your planning officers know about up to date crime data. So, you know, the property developer has filled in a crime impact statement. How do you know if that information in there is accurate or specific? So it seems to me that there are issues of consistency across the practice.

I do think that, you know, people like Dr Tim Pascoe who is the chair of DOCA and has done this work for at least 20 years would have some strong feelings from a practitioner base about how this might be tightened up or made better. The Home Office will have a different account because it will have resource implications. So what design can do is help you by getting all these people around the table and trying to join it up. That has not been done as far I am concerned. There are many Home Office guide - Paul worked on Safer Places, that he has probably mentioned, but not all local authorities invest the same amount in crime prevention. At the moment Britain is in austerity mode and there are many cuts and crime and prevention is not reduction. So there may be some short term strategies. So again, you could find yourself I that situation and so you need to decide how you think the existing system is weak and what you could do to make it more robust.
The CHAIR — It is sort of a catch 22, isn't it, with your austerity measures and the economic climate I would have thought that it would create more sort of pressure on potential crime increases.

Prof GAMMAN — Well, necessity is the mother of invention. If you take prison, which is a completely separate argument, you know, in Brazil they have realised they cannot afford it. Mainly the issue is literacy, just like it is here with the Aborigines. So they - prisoners can get a week, up to 12 books, if they read a book. I suggested that to our government and they virtually genuflected because the system is not flexible. But I see that the system here is at a time where you might form it. So I would urgently and audibly suggest you listen to, not just what is wrong with it, but what is good about it. I find that the criminologists around a design base, they always know what is wrong but they never quite know what to do. I think that some of do. So for me it is not about risk aversion or even procedures that are accurate, but it is about what do you want to achieve? So for me public space is the most important space and I want to achieve less crime but more wellbeing. So I would never have designed a toilet or a bench because that would actually compromise the wellbeing of many.

If you look at that you can see that if you just look at this from a crime point of view the lens is very narrow and unfocused and you will have problems at a later date. So you have to be slightly more balanced. I talk about that as CPTED 3. So certainly it is about making sure that your system can take the best of what is there but also review the worst of it. It seems to me that it is true of most of your agencies, you will compete for budgets. How will you get crime prevention and those concerned with social wellbeing to work together? How would that be part of your planning system? How would you encourage it? Obviously it might be hard to solve but some of your agencies, for example the Social Innovation Unit in Melbourne, are amazing. Some of the work that is coming out of there is amazing work. So I think that you do have, you know, pockets of really good practice but it is about joining them up. They may not call themselves crime.

One of the questions that we ask is to what extent are developers aware of safer design CPTED principles and how do they incorporate them into residential, commercial and other urban projects? One of the publications I edited with Rachel Armitage sort of discusses how sometimes the drivers compete with each other. So if you are an architect actually putting in a water bar might give you same amount of points as putting in a whole security system. Certainly if you want to understand how it works in Britain, every police force has crime prevention design advisers and architectural liaison officers. They are consulted and try to bring the principles into planning through discussion with the planning office with whom they work. But today's government in Britain are trying to reduce policing numbers by 12, 000. What I have found is that DOCA members seem to be retiring. At 20 they pay 20 per cent of their salary into a retirement pension. By 50 they can leave and actually get another job at a good salary and take quite a big pension.

So we have some issues because what the practice have that has been delivered in Britain has worked it may be the practice that is cut. It is not because it is good practice, it is because the police commissioners sometimes operate - forgive me for saying this, like medieval barons. They just manage their patch because they are being measured on targets. So the holistic focus may go out the window. Certainly the way different agencies deliver it Britain is that the Secure By Design Scheme in practical terms is compulsory and brings in many issues for planning that developers are aware of. But it is not that deep at this stage. It is not that well communicated. So I think that the issue is how to manage, I suppose, the process so that what is delivered is holistic. I will give you the example of CCTV. Everyone thinks CCTV is great. I do not. I think that is really, really expensive.

I do not know if Professor Ekblom elaborated about CCTV but a minister identified some money about 15 years ago and CCTV was promoted to the boroughs as something they could sort of get. Now we have one tenth of the world's CCTV and it does not always work. I work with retail a lot and the pubs go, 'It's ten grand to put in a decent system and nobody looks at it.' 'When I speak to the police I say, 'Do you use the CCTV? Do you look at it?' 'Well, sometimes.' 'But do you look at it if there's a bag theft?' 'No, we haven't got time.' But when they report back to government they say they do look at it.
So there is sort of complex issues raised by the practice. Certainly the Secure By Design Scheme has made, I suppose, a really good effect on burglary. Certainly the architectural liaison officers and the crime prevention designers have had an impact. That might change. Also what I am saying is that it might change because politics are at work and politics have been at work in the past in terms of the implementation of CCTV. The next question we were asked was about, I suppose - maybe I should stick with this one. How do you understand CPTED here? Because in one of the questions I was given it does refer to CPTED 3. Do you know what I mean by that?

Mr SCHEFFER — Not really. It has been referred to but - and maybe we have been provided with material but I am not across it. So it would be good if you would elaborate.

Prof GAMMAN — Well, actually I will have a go. What it is, in North America first generation CPTED drew on the work of people like Oscar Newman which was to develop some territorial principles. You have seen the charts of what they are; access control. It did not really lead to community engagement. That work was then written up as principles to train the police. Have you heard of POP Centre, which is based Rutgers University? Well, if you go online and Google POP Centre, burglary, you will get a training package and anyone in the world can use it. I have written for them. So you can train your police on how to solve the problem of bag theft. So the rules from CPTED were sort of put into that police training program. But actually, you know, it is like a cook book thing, isn't it? You give them a program. You give them instructions. But what really might happen is that in the location there are other issues. So CPTED 2 came from the notion of community engagement.

Now, the British Police really disagreed with that distinction because they said they always did CPTED 2. They said CPTED for them means that. I do not want to split hairs but CPTED 1 seems to be a set of principles where community engagement is not common. CPTED 2 seems to be a set of principles where you engage. But you engage with the community about crime. What I have seen in Korea is CPTED 3, which is that you engage about the problems, you look very broadly, and then the response would be based on the principles but it might promote health was well as anti-crime. So that you get two for the price of one. Certainly I think that the work the Design Against Crime Centre has delivered has always been that, because we are designers and you would look at it holistically. It has sort of been very difficult to get the change. Every year - I have worked for DOCA in a voluntary capacity for 10 years, and every year I resign because I have just had enough.

Then basically they re-appoint me because they have to have a designer and they certainly have to have a woman who can argue back. But the issue has been, I mean, it has changed that at first, in the beginning of the 10 years there was this real trying to get it right and stick to the principles. Then what happened, it is almost like the officers became sort of, like, basically really involved with the community and came up with broader issues. So it might be, 'Well, youth crime is a problem but actually there are no play facilities.' So, you know, I have been - the reason I am still there is I have real admiration for some of the work that has been delivered. So I think that when we are talking about CPTED it is just a framework. It is a set of rule. It does not really mean anything. It depends on how you interpret it.

That has always been the issue. So CPTED 1 is a bit like locks and gates, CPTED 2 is, like, more community consultation, but CPTED 3 is what I think will reduce costs, which is if you get it right and you work out what the problem is you do it holistically. So what I saw in Seoul was precisely that, that they realised they had a problem in some districts with people being attacked, but they also had really overweight and depressed population. So the designs were aimed at more than one thing. So it looked great, it felt great and it got people involved. If you do not get people involved it is going to cost you a fortune to keep mending it and sustaining it. If you get them involved they will be part of the sustainability package. So when we talk about CPTED it is quite important really, I suppose, to understand what we are trying to achieve. That is what I would ask you, what are you trying to achieve?

The CHAIR — So our inquiry is not so much about investigating CPTED. We have some safer design principles in our Planning Act, which we are tasked to see how they have been
utilised by local government planners. There are general principles across the world, as we understand it different countries sort of use the CPTED principles different.

Prof GAMMAN — Okay. Shall I give you some sense of where they do that?

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Prof GAMMAN — Okay. So in Britain, if you ask me for some examples, transport for London would deal with CPTED principles specifically around, you know, it could be graffiti on the trains, it could be a whole range of issues we are trying to bring good practice. The person to speak to is John Stratton. I can provide you with his phone numbers. He is in charge of it. Certainly Tim Pascoe could correlate for you; Dr Tim Pascoe, chair of DOCA, all the examples. So in any area he can pull that together. Art Hutchinson at Tampa in Florida. I love him because he argues that art reduces crime and he can give you some statistics. But basically he has worked with communities in a sort of CPTED 2 way to find out what the problem is about space and the crime, take - give ownership back to the community, and effect community engagement. So I think he is worth talking to. Matt Eastwood at Brighton and Hove Council has done some fantastic work that Adam will talk about with sandscape.

Certainly notions about urban acupuncture have been developed in South America by Jaime Lerner who is really well known. If you read it carefully you will realise that is an interpretation of CPTED. Historically in Europe, Holland, Paul Van Someren might be a person worth speaking to. Singapore has a top down approach. There is a little bit of stuff in South Africa. The Dutch work on bike parking is probably the best. I mean, many people have come to DOCA, UK DOCA, to try and locate - so if it is Estonia, they would try and locate what they need to do. DOCA is a sort of voluntary organisation so we often just put people together who would be - Ian Colquhoun and Ted Kitchen's work might be useful to look at and the Japanese Urban Security Institute again have some good practice. But none of it is the same. So you can draw upon it and look at it but it seems to me that, I suppose you would have to deduce what was good about it. I was also asked what are Safer Design CPTED principles as they are taught in college?

That is sort of quite a problem because certainly with Design Against Crime it has permeated design schools and we would teach CPTED principles in certain concepts. If we were looking at bike project we would absolutely use it, or a bag theft project to do with public space. But in architecture courses, so in courses that are not run within the college in architecture school, because of the hostility of sort of some areas, it is not taught. I always find that really shocking. So think that in terms of setting up centres of excellence there is a real opportunity. For example Monash have a really good school where I have seen some work, but it is not articulated as that. So I suppose, like, the answer to the question would be that it is very patchy. But in design terms because of the role of the Home Office it has been, I suppose, further developed by sort of competitions and, you know, I have been asked to give master classes to 40 different colleges where the government have put up a prize to run - certainly in the US they do not have a consistent approach.

So sometimes CPTED comes out through planning. So the people who will espouse it are from planning. Sometimes they are from design. Occasionally they are from architecture. It is very messy. I do not know so much about how it is done here but I think that your design and architecture is more connected than it is in America and the UK. The next question we were asked was should safer design principles, CPTED principles, be mandated in legislation? I would say yes but with enough flexibility to take local context into account. So I would go for it but I would do it in a very particular way. We have got two more questions. So, how could safer design and CPTED principles be facilitated in new urban fringe developments and new high rise development in well-established urban areas? There are so many examples that have been applied to high rise from many different countries. Tim Pascoe and Art Hushen provide seminars.

There is a Secure By Design Guidance document on high rise and there is ways in Singapore in their guide books, New Zealand has some too. So I suppose it is what you want it for. If this is a gathering of information exercise then you could certainly - finally, the question that we were given was, what recommendations could the committee make to facilitate the effective
implementation of safer design CPTED principles in Victoria? I suppose if it was me I would look at the existing work and cross-reference it to the local planning framework. I would support the implementation with how to do it guides including problem solving, crime analysis, as well as CPTED principles. I support with case studies that reflect the local context. The problem with that is that often when you gather case studies the person who needs them cannot find them. So sometimes, Paul, the work that he does does not sound very straightforward but actually you do need a system that would make it possible, if it was a digit system, for others to find it.

I would also develop adequate police training programs. We do things like train the trainer sessions, but how it is received is often inconsistent linked to funding. There are many practitioners that you could consult and I would try and understand the difference between a practice led approach and a sort of criminological account, because certainly when you are out there trying to apply the principles I suppose you accept imperfection much more quickly than you might if you were writing an article about it. Certainly in the UK the leading writer on the subject is Rachel Armitage and she basically advises the Association of Chief Police Officers to, I suppose, implement. The issue always comes back to the same thing, is how do you deal with combining drivers when there are conflicts about what should go first and what should not. Certainly we talk about wellbeing as well as crime. I have this sort of shout line which, secure design should not look criminal. Actually quite a lot of it does. So that is really it from me and I can leave you this document.

The CHAIR — All right. Thanks very much, Lorraine. I appreciate that. Any questions?

Mr SCHEFFER — Just, I think, a quick one. Going right back to the beginning. When you talked about a good design - needing a good design for everyone, you were talking about older people and toilets and so on. Do you - I think we have trod that way through the disability discourse in a lot of ways. Do you think there are lessons from - because I think there have been big achievements in that area, certainly in Victoria, do you think there are lessons in the way that was worked through and the CPTED 3 aspiration?

Prof GAMMAN — Yes, I do. Again, I think Adam will talk about this, but in the UK there is a centre called the Helen Hamlyn Centre which is design for ability centre. We have recently tried to work with them because sometimes it is over determined either way and it needs to work in an integrated inclusive design against crime way. So, yes, I would see that to be useful. But - I do not know how to this so I am just going to say it, that sometimes there are departments where, you know, you can see the Transport will have a row with [unclear 0:30:09.0] about the crossing or about, I suppose, where the bike stands should go because of spatial arrangements. It would be interesting to try and get something that is more integrated within one department rather than having to compete. Does that make sense? I see quite a lot of negative competition between groups working on the same thing.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just a point, do you think that it has to some extent been solved with the disability question?

Prof GAMMAN — No, I do not.

Mr SCHEFFER — You think it is still silos that are — —

Prof GAMMAN — Yes. I think that it could appear on the surface that it is solved. But if you actually take a couple of case studies and go through what the process is, trade-offs are very interesting. I think that to integrate those accounts you may need to go back and find out what did not work as opposed to what did.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, okay. Thanks.

Mr McCURDY — I have not got a question but I just - I have got more out of your presentation than any others that we have had, so thank you. I appreciate it.

Prof GAMMAN — Thank you. I was a bit worried actually — —
Mr SCHEFFER — No, it is fantastic. I really — —

Prof GAMMAN — Well, I have written it all down. To be honest I feel that it must be very difficult for you to sort of take in what we are saying, so it is all in here. If you want any names, references, phone numbers you are very welcome to have them. I would encourage you to get a centre like this one because this seems to be - and it does not work for us in the same way. I think this is much better. I think Australia is much more can do. But it is a place where other people can go to put those things together. That is how you would resolve it because it would not be an accusation it would just be a discussion. Because if you say to someone, 'You haven't done this properly.' They are just annoyed with you.

The money that is wasted in London, like, one development we did basically we put plans in, about a year later it was being built and they changed it because there was a row internally. So you cannot always, as a designer, be responsible for what happens in the local council. So you can see from the point of property development for the police and the council there is going to be gap. So I would put the police in the planning office. I would have the ALOs in the same place. Then it is just a visual thing. When people walk in they think, 'God, we better adjust this because they are here.' Rather than going around the system. But it is really awful to see the way some senior police officers are spoken to.

I am not too sure because Britain has a very well established class system, as you know, and the police - it is shocking, you know, what they are saying is about residents' requirements for noise. But the way they are spoken to it is almost like they are not as educated and so therefore their opinion is not as valuable. I find that stuff shocking. So how you might make that something that does not happen here, or maybe it will not, is something you should look at. The officers have not spent seven years at architectural planning school and they have had, like, two months' training, but they have had 30 years' experience. That, for me, is the issue, how to deal with that one.

The CHAIR — Now, I might have to close I there, Professor, just in case you incite some more questions because unfortunately we are out of time.

Prof GAMMAN — Of course. No worries. I will leave this.

The CHAIR — I would endorse the comments by the Committee, personally, it was very valuable to us just to have an informal chat. The fact that you addressed our questions sort of, we got a lot of value out it. So thank you very much.

Prof GAMMAN — Well, I keep trying to understanding it myself, actually. Maybe that is why because you don't speak at people you try and understand how - I think the CPTED 1, 2, and 3, nobody has written that down. I actually wrote it for a paper and we have not published it yet. So do not be surprised if it is not familiar to you. But people are now using the terms.

Mr SCHEFFER — But what you have said is familiar to us.

Prof GAMMAN — Yes, you are just finding out how to think about it.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — We are a Joint Parliamentary Committee of the Victorian Parliament.

Mr THORPE — Right.

The CHAIR — Drugs and Crime Prevention. We have a current inquiry in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design which you are familiar with. We are at the sort of end of the — I guess the submission and verbal submission process and our staff will be start by chatting to you shortly, but it was a real opportunity for us to come up to Sydney today and sort of grasp the talent here for this conference in the next couple of days and Pete, our research officer, will be attending tomorrow. We are tape-recording the evidence or the discussions, so I will have to read you some rules of engagement in relation to that.

Mr THORPE — Okay.

The CHAIR — Just to protect you and to protect us at some point.

Mr THORPE — Sure.

The CHAIR — So all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside this hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand you have noted the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees. You have probably been sent that, have you, from —

Mr THORPE — Yes, I think we have seen it.

The CHAIR — We are recording evidence as I said and we will provide a printed version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Johan Scheffer is Deputy Chair of this committee, Tim McCurdy is part of the committee. We have two apologies from two other committee people that could not get up to Sydney today. So again, thank you very much for your time. I apologise for being late —

Mr McCURDY — You sound like you have got some Aussie in your accent too.

Mr THORPE — No.

Mr McCURDY — No?

Mr THORPE — No, I am just a mimic.

Mr McCURDY — Are you? Right.

Mr THORPE — Put me in Liverpool, I starts talking like a Scouse or put me in Australia, give me about four days, I start talking like an Aussie.

Mr McCURDY — All right, all right.

The CHAIR — Is that an important part of that process? So thank you. Over to you.

Mr THORPE — Thank you. No, thanks for the interest and I must say, the opportunity to share some of the stuff we do. So I work with Lorraine Poole as I said earlier. I lead the sort of design side in terms of the actual design of the products and services at the University at the Design Against Crime Research Centre. I had a look at the questions that were sent to me by I believe one of your colleagues, Sandy Cook and sort of took that as a starting point. I am going to do my best to address those that I feel I have got some expertise or experience in. I am going to miss out those that is not really my area, so no point in me guessing. Talk to someone that has got the real detail on that. So one of the areas I want to talk to you specifically about is what we call CPTED 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0, but to start with —
The CHAIR — Yes, we are just coming to grips with the terminology.

Mr THORPE — Sure.

The CHAIR — So this is one, two, three, second generation, third generation, or is this something else?

Mr THORPE — Yes, first generation, second generation, third generation.

The CHAIR — So you call them 1.0. We have had first, second and third from another presenter, then we have had 1, 2 and 3.

Mr THORPE — I would say that the sort of hegemony in this area would be for first generation, second generation, third generation. In design terms, we talk about — well, similar to how the web design talk, web 1.0, web 2.0, web 3.0.

The CHAIR — Right.

Mr THORPE — So as a designer, I am just — I refer to it as one point, two point, three point, but really I would say the dominant discourse is first generation, second generation. And third generation is something that to my mind is emergent, so third generation is something that we are in the process of defining and I think that that is actually a space where there is some real progress to be made. And you know, in terms of making an international contribution with the iteration of these activities that you guys do, I mean, we will get to it, but I think the third generation is a really interesting space.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Mr THORPE — So just to refresh on my understanding of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, again, going through this and I know we are pushed for time, so if there is anything you have seen 20 times already by other people just give me a nod and we will move through it. But this is the sort of environmental factors and considerations and principles that we try and provide within the design solutions. Territory analytics, [exposed] access control, target hardening, engine maintenance and activity support. So in respect to some of these questions, how has CPTED been incorporated into planning strategy at local government level, well, according to my knowledge and according to my experience, it was when the Crime Disorder Act was introduced in the UK.

That was the first time that we explicitly — what we call duty holders, those who have a paid responsibility to the public around these matters — were required to acknowledge and accept responsibility for the consequence of their actions in relation to criminogenic outcomes. And they were also encouraged to work in a multi-agency manner with other local stakeholders and duty holders to try and reduce the criminogenic impact of their actions. So in the work that I do, the multi-agency approach is typically sort of congregated around crime disorder reduction partnerships. So these are made up — these are all groups of multiple agencies made up of the police, local government, depending on the — the department of the local government often depends on the type of project you are doing.

So if you are doing something around transport, you will have the people concerned for transport and so on. Also the businesses who are typically represented by business improvement districts who — so you have already got the representation there, and the communities which are usually represented by local area teams, Neighbourhood Watch organisations or community associations and then these people are all brought together around a specific issue. And so in each of those sort of groups of duty holders and stakeholders, you pull out those that have the most experience in the specific issue you are tackling, be it burglary, bike theft, antisocial behaviour on public seating or whatever it is going to be. Those that have the key insights, so you pull them together for that partnership.

What are the key aspects of social design principles that could be incorporated in terms of that local level? Again, in my experience, the way that we use Crime Prevention Through
Environmental Design, here is an example of one project that we have done around bike theft with the City of London Police, working with Transport for London and here, what we were doing, we looked at the fact that actually you have got these cycle superhighways. So a lot of money has been spent opening up these new channels to deposit 70,000 cyclists in the middle of London city because it is healthy for them, reduces congestion and all these other things.

The trouble is, you put 70,000 cyclists in there and there is nowhere for them to park their bikes and then you start getting people parking their bikes on railings. They are really easy bikes to steal because there is no appropriate locking points, there is no real consideration given to surveillance, access control and so on, and then suddenly in the City of London you get this big crime sort of spike and people having a really negative experience: "Well, I left my bike there in the morning. I went and did my day's work. I came back and my bike is gone. You know, that is not what I am looking for as a person who is sort of, you know, earning my money and paying my tax in the City of London, so I want to do something about it”.

We get pulled in to work out where you might appropriately locate parking facilities. One of the first things we would do is use CPTED principles in this sort of format where we do an audit of the various different hotspots, so where a bike is getting stolen from and also where are the outliers? Where are bikes not getting stolen from? And then we can do is we can go around and look using these principles we can look at what is the landscaping like? What is the lighting like? What is the natural surveillance and the formal surveillance like? Are there any considerations around access control? And you can start to work out what works and what does not work in that particular context. So that is how we use the principles at a local level when we are planning where to put the various interventions and what type of interventions might be appropriate in a given context.

That might not be, and I am pretty sure it is not what you mean when you talk about planning which is probably more at a policy level, but as a designer that uses this in my practice, that is what planning means to me in the way that we apply CPTED on a sort of day to day basis. On a more sort of policy level going to local government, crime impact statements and the review of proposals and site visits by architectural liaison officers who are police employed and Crime Prevention Design advisers, others would have doubtless have told you about those roles and if not, then Lorraine actually and Paul both sort of operate with those guys and know how it works at policy level.

Criticisms of the CPTED principles as a structure presenting or reducing crime at local level. Well, what I would say to that is that CPTED is set principles, so it is not standard. So it is open to subjective interpretation, so you can get someone that really gets CPTED and understands the sort of nuances and understands how to apply it to a context and obviously the same with most other things that are subjective, some people are better at it and some people are less good at it, often depending on experience and often depending on the number of contextual exemplars they have got of "Have I see it work in this context before?” What works, what did not. So actually the opportunity to try and pull together that evidence base and provide training around that evidence base of what works and what does not and in a practical sense it is probably something that you can do to address this fact that it is a principle, not a standard. So, yes, the fact that you leave room for error.

Also interesting, and this is where I would advocate a design-led approach which is more process orientated rather than checklist oriented, because if we are trying to get people to really understand for themselves how to apply things in context, then really that is about going through a process with a bunch of other stakeholders with various experience and various different types of insight and that is something that design does well because nobody has ever designed anything on their own and it actually requires you to put yourself in the position of other types of user and design is good at that, in the way that checkbox policy sometimes is not. So by going through this process, we would advocate that actually that sort of teaches people to understand how to respond to context.

Other issues that I face personally when trying to apply some of these CPTED principles is that actually it is one set of principles in amongst a number of different competing agendas. So I have come up against issues around inclusivity agendas, so DDA which is the Disability Discrimination
Act and so on where you have got different drivers and sometimes they are contradictory. Not often, but sometimes. One of the projects that we are looking for funding to do in the UK, working with the Helen Hamlyn Centre who are all about inclusive design in an aging population is to see where the compatibilities and conflicts lie between Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, design against crime thinking, and inclusive design thinking because as a practitioner, half my time is spent in research and half my term is spent in practice, so I have got more time for these sorts of things than others. For other practitioners, it is like, "Oh, what is this? Another list of sort of rules from another group of people that I have now got to try and apply to my practice?" So if all we can do is try and combine and integrate those different requirements into a more holistic approach, the better it will be and the easier it will be for practitioners to apply and the easier it is to apply, I would argue, the more we will see it applied.

So yes, we have got sustainability agendas. Interestingly, when you are going through planning at a local level, if you put a water butt out on the outside of the development that you are talking about, say we are going to take up some back-land space that is there and we are going to put a house there, we are going to have the planning permission, green roof, water butt, get as many points as full CPTED acknowledgement and the [13:01.8] responds to. So that gives an example of how these various drivers need to be managed at a policy level. And this more holistic approach is what we refer to as third generation CPTED or CPTED 3.0.

So this is one of my simplistic explanations for what is going on here. CPTED 1.0, really we are talking about Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design as sort of locks and gates, so the initial responses that you would expect from a security-centric agenda, if you like, or set of drivers. UK practices do argue that actually they involve community consultation and education and it is has always been implicit in CPTED and I would not disagree with that. But I would say that actually it has not always been picked up by designers over the years in the way that it might which has meant that actually it has not had this sort of more holistic and plurality of different approaches integrated into it.

CPTED 1.0 is supported by Secured by Design standards and accreditation. So CPTED is a set of principles, Secured by Design is a set of standards. You know, that lock has got to last X amount under this level of attack and so on. So those standards and specifications can underpin those principles. CPTED 2.0, basically we are talking about more community-centred approaches. So we are going back over to that side of the circle that is about maintenance and servicing, that bit — so activity support and sort of amplifying some of those elements rather than on these more sort of hard measures.

CPTED 3.0, here we are saying that actually we are interested in the CPTED outcomes, but not everybody needs to know necessarily that this is security-centric in terms of its approach and this is what we are trying to achieve. It is one amongst a number of other drivers, equally important, not more important. A couple of examples, are you familiar with alley-gating as an approach? Okay. So in Manchester in the UK, this is —

The CHAIR — Putting gates on alleys, is it?

Mr THORPE — Yes. So in the UK, particularly in old industrial centres where we used to have terraced houses — well, still have the terraced houses, that is the thing: do not have the industry, still got the terraced houses. They have got the alleyways that used to give access to those back gardens because you cannot — otherwise you have to walk through the house with your dirty boots on. So what happens is now those alleyways obviously are opportunities for access for basically offenders that wish to come in and burgle you. And what we see is that actually more than half of burglaries have gained access from the back of the premises.

One of the things I wanted to do was put up the alleys, so this is what it looks like. This is the old alley. The industrial — the main street, a bit like your laneways, I guess, right? So there is your laneway, this is what they do. They stick an alley-gate on the back of it. So you can say that is the 1.0 response because okay, what we have done, locks and gates. You have got a lock and a gate at the back of it, but the people through community consultation, the community gets hold of it, they turn that into a garden outdoor space. So now they are actually hanging out out there. They are
looking around. You are getting all this natural surveillance, people are enjoying it. Does not look like we have made the space more, sort of, "Oh, dear, we do not want to live around here. It is a crime — it must be a crime problem, got the back alley. But no, it is a nice positive green space that I am experiencing."

So there is an example of how 1.0 might move towards a 3.0 through community engagement. What we are dealing with is territoriality. A bit around the maintenance stuff because people are taking ownership of the maintenance of their own space, as you can see, and a bit here around the sort of surveillance and the access control.

**The CHAIR** — And the results?

**Mr THORPE** — The results are that they have up to 72 per cent reductions in those places where they have put those gates in. That is one of the most successful approaches that has been applied up and down the UK in terms of CPTED. Communities in any of the local governments, communities go to an online site. You have got them for Salford, you have got them for — so you go through a council site and you would say you can go to crime security or community security and there, you would be able to make — here is a free phone number for you to be able to contact and say, "Can I get alley-gates put on my laneway, please, or on my alleyway?" I can send you information about that, if you want. There is a really nice report by Rachel Armitage that really gathers all the evidence and pulls it together from 2011 about that and it is pretty compelling stuff.

**The CHAIR** — So that is only foot traffic, is it, not vehicular traffic?

**Mr THORPE** — Foot traffic.

**The CHAIR** — Yes.

**Mr THORPE** — I mean, vehicles are not allowed up there typically.

**Mr McCURDY** — So I just want to clarify. That is the gate on top. So you have still got the garden and all that, but it is still the gates at each end.

**Mr THORPE** — Yes.

**Mr McCURDY** — So it is not one or the other, it is both?

**Mr THORPE** — Yes. You put the gates up first of all.

**Mr McCURDY** — Yes.

**Mr THORPE** — But then what we are saying is that yes, we can put the gates up, but then we get these other wins.

**Mr McCURDY** — That is right.

**Mr THORPE** — So then on the top of that — because sometimes you put up gates and barbed wire and you deny people access and that is the community that I am starting to think, "Well, do you know what? If I am looking at whether I am going to move in around here, I might not" —

**Mr McCURDY** — I thought you were implying the other way around, that once you put the garden there, you actually took the gates down, but no, they are still —

**Mr THORPE** — No, no. You keep the gates there. All we are saying really is that — so that is a 1.0 intervention that actually with a bit more community consultation and with a bit more of a holistic approach, so it might be that you are saying to people —

**Mr SCHEFFER** — But does that turn — that is public land. It turns public land effectively into private collective land.
Mr THORPE — Yes, semi-public.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes. So local government has to be involved.

Mr THORPE — Yes, absolutely.

Mr SCHEFFER — Anyway, we have been told not to spin this out because we are running out of time, but that is a really interesting issue.

Mr THORPE — Here is another one. ATM art. I will go as quickly as I can.

The CHAIR — There’s flexibility in the Chairmanship, it is all right to go around.

Mr SCHEFFER — I know, but I will keep doing my questions anyway, I am just putting it —

The CHAIR — Okay.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry.

Mr THORPE — Do you want me — are these cases —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, yes.

Mr THORPE — ATM art. So this is the project I am running in London at the moment in Westminster and Camden in the 12 sites that are those that are hit most often for ATM crime. We have tried these yellow boxes, as you have elsewhere, and yes, there is arguments that say they reduce crime, the street offences and antisocial behaviour by up to 60 per cent around ATMs. Manchester Police did some work on that in 2006, but banks do not like them because they look horrible and actually the local neighbours do not like them because it treats people like traffic a bit. So what we started to do was look at whether actually we could use art, local art created by local school kids as a way of defining the defensible space. So what we are talking about here is image and maintenance. The image is not of this negative image of, "Hey, look, do what you are told, stand on this box". The image is of this sort of like creative space that is sort of owned by the local population who have created the artworks for it.

However, we are also getting this thing about territoriality that we would get from the yellow box. The other thing that we are doing now, we have just started a 12 month pilot across these 12 sites looking at how — six months before looking at how people use the ATMs, all these different behavioural characteristics. Without the artwork there, six months afterwards, we have got these indicators: do people look over their shoulder more? Do they cover their card more? What distance do people stand back in terms of shoulder surfing? All these sorts of issues. We are about to pull out the results by the end of January. After that, if it is a positive — we work in the World Bank of Scotland here. If it is a positive, we then go to 60 per cent of the schools that World Bank of Scotland have their cash — you know, money education programs with and then with those 60 per cent of schools, we run this competition in each of the towns that those schools are in about, okay, design your artwork for your ATM machine.

When that form goes home to the kids to fill out the box, on the bottom of it in small print there is a thing for the parents: "Why am I doing my competition with my kid? Why are they putting artwork at ATM machines?" Because it says to the parents, because if someone is standing on your kid's picture, then they can be looking over your shoulder and seeing your PIN. So it is a softly, softly way. Send the kid home with a flyer that says, "Hey, check over your shoulder when you are using your PIN", you will get the same sort of responses that you will get at the moment. Send the kid home with a flyer saying, "Hey, look, get involved in this competition. My kid's artwork is going to be on our High Street and people will see it every time we go shopping and this is why we should be reading this and paying attention to it". We reckon you will get more response out of it.

This is in South Korea where basically they have got an issue in this area called [21:25.7] Way which is an area where it is mainly sort of not very well-off indigenous people, local people,
immigrant community, mainly Chinese workers and students. Lots of street assaults. No lighting, no numbering of houses, no safe routes really. So to create a safe route, they did a consultation with the local community and realised that actually a lot of the students had to go a long way to get to any fitness or recreation activities. A lot of the local people are scared to go out of their house which meant — compounded the issue; they did not know their neighbours. All of these types of things happening.

What they decided to do was create a safe route, in CPTED terms, but instead of calling it, "This is a safe route", they created a fitness circuit because that is what the younger more able-bodied people wanted to do. With this fitness circuit, it actually created a safe route through the neighbourhood. They bussed on street furniture, showed people what to do at these various different points. They created safe houses where they had a web TV because it kept the cost down, alarm bells. They had an oversubscription — they have got about six of these safe houses on the route. They had an oversubscription of the local residents that wanted to be a safe house because it gives them a direct line to the police station in the same way that you would have if you were a garage or — well, in the UK if you were like a petrol station or one of these things, or an off-licence.

So that same direct line meant that people wanted to have that additional security which meant they stepped up which now means that if anybody had a problem on the street, they can go to one of these houses and also the people in those houses can notify the police. This is an example of how the exercise in this sort of area — the machine on the left is combined with a number because now they do not have street numbers, but now if there is an assault, "I am next to number 64". There is a camera and a light next to the machine, so that is a camera and a light that works on the street.

Basically friendly fencing. People doing exercises, but equally spikey as if it was a big barbed wire thing going across the top there. Free paint citizen labour. Getting the free paint from a paint company. They decorated their street, that is the servicing and maintenance issue. More importantly though, when they are out there painting their street together, they actually got to know who their neighbours were.

So West Street story, this is the one in Brighton. I have only got two more of these and them I am out. This one was about a sound installation, so this is an arts project that had some interesting outcomes that we were not anticipating. Basically what they did was — this is a bit like your King's Cross. West Street in Brighton, Brighton is a seaside town. It is 50 minutes on the train from Central London. Stags, hens, jump on the train straight down there. West Street, full of bars back to back and nightclubs. Not 24 hours but like, you know, 3 to 6 in the morning pretty much. Lots of issues, lots of antisocial behaviour, violence, territorial behaviour. They work with a behavioural analyst, so the indicators were about how people's territorial behaviour which they could detect. Are people's territorial behaviours more aggressive or less aggressive and so on, so that was their intermediate indicators and then their ultimate indicators was did we get more or less violent assaults on that night.

The control night was 17 September, the experiment night was 29 October, and they claim you could improve the rigour of the evaluation here, but what they did was they got video evidence — and I have got the papers for this if you are interested. I can send those through — they got video evidence of the behaviours of the people on the night when the music was in the streets and the thing is they have got this music, boom, boom, boom, in the nightclubs. They all kick out the same time. They come out, music has disappeared and it goes straight into this sort of, you know, stark contrast and they start fighting when they are waiting for taxis and this type of stuff.

So what they have done here is you come out of the nightclub, boom, boom, boom. You have got low level music because, you know, it is not like it is ever quiet there anyway. It is always like shouting and screaming, but now it is low level music, so basically turned the street into a chill out zone on this one occasion, and what it has done is it has actually reduced the sort of hostility of the behaviours that they were seeing on the street and the police anecdotally reported that actually — they have got videos of police talking to each other because there is not any sort of activity for
them to go and get involved in and then actually they relocated police away from that street on Saturday night, which they have never done before.

So I can give you that stuff. Now this is going quite a long way from the tree with this one, but I am going to share it with you anyway because it is some work that I have been involved in myself. Fight For Peace is a martial arts charity, engaging young people in London and in Rio. Basically particularly those involved in armed gang violence around drugs and they teach them martial arts. They have got this five pillars model which — basically a lot of the reason kids end up in these gangs in these places is it because it is the most smart thing to do because actually it is the only way they are going to be protected and get the sort of support that they are not getting from other means. So this is one of these positive ways offering that type of support.

We got involved in working with those young people. There is two groups of people that this Fight For Peace has got access to that makes them unique. One is the young people themselves who we got involved in the design process to design sportswear that was then sold and the profits of which go back to more — of their funding their centres. The other group are the ambassadors, so they have got people like the Klitschko brothers who are world champion heavyweight boxers. They are involved in the consultation process. So designed by champions for champions and the profits go back to the centre. That has worked in Rio and London and it has also engaged the young people.

But the real thing that has made the difference here is the diversionary activity and the recent report that came out about two weeks ago actually, in response to it. So they have got 800 young people who are going through there in 2011. An evaluation by Ecorys which was funded by the Laureus Foundation looking at Fight For Peace in the UK for one year, 2011, found that it resulted in 165 crimes being avoided which they claim delivered a £1,059,471 worth of savings to society. So this is real 3.0. So this is like, hang on a minute, you know, where do we make our intervention to actually get the saving that we want in terms of antisocial behaviour and violent crime? You know, and it has been evidenced and we can share that evidence and those papers with you.

Finally, along similar lines and this is some of the work that I am involved with in some of my activity in the UK now, is developing social enterprises. So a lot of the reason these people get involved in this stuff, if we are going to get them to do diversionary activity, let us give them some diversionary activity to develop their skills and it actually gives them some jobs and gives them some income that is not selling drugs and so some of the activities that go on there. This is a case study from a place in Lincolnshire called Hill Holt Wood. It was 14 hectares of privately owned land. The family could not afford to keep it any longer. The family said, "Right, we are going to make this privately owned land public access". They have got 22 young people that were in what they call NEETS, Not In Education, Employment or Training.

They brought them into the wood and the outdoors, taught them sort of carpentry skills and compassing skills, land management skills, and now they basically build these sheds which they sell and get profits in. They do landscaping for the local community, public and private jobs, and the police in that area report a 25 per cent reduction in antisocial behaviour during the time the program has been running and they have got 22 new jobs, permanent jobs, created for these young people that used to be hanging around smashing stuff up. So that is just an example of sort of the extremist, if you like, of the 3.0 where we are working really with a lot of the soft skills and with the hard skills, so you get an idea of how it can work from one end of the spectrum right the way through to the other, with a bit of luck, and that is all I wanted to share with you for now.

The CHAIR — Good, thanks very much, Adam. Any questions?

Mr SCHEFFER — No, that is great. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR — Not? Thank you.

Mr SCHEFFER — Excellent.

The CHAIR — Yes, a good presentation. Thank you.
Mr THORPE — All right. But if you want the presentation, if you want the supporting paperwork, let Roger know and I will get it through to you.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr THORPE — Yes, certainly. No problems.

Mr THORPE — I have got a card out there, but Roger has got my details.

[inaudible voices]

Mr THORPE — Good. No, because from the work that we do, it is often about what we want more of as well as what we want less of. That is what it comes down to.

The CHAIR — Thank you for — I know you pushed through that presentation pretty quickly and I appreciate it.

Mr THORPE — Yeah, as long as it was not too quick.

The CHAIR — No.

Mr THORPE — Thanks very much for that.

The CHAIR — Thank you.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Crime Prevention Committee and thank you very much for your time. We have three of our five committee people here and they will introduce themselves and Pete Johnston our senior research officer is looking after us today in the office. We have, as you know, an inquiry into crime prevention into environmental design. We have been lucky enough to grab some of the expertise in this building, you included.

Prof DORST — There are three of us floating around here, yes.

The CHAIR — But what we do not have is a lot of time unfortunately because of a number of presentations that have been very detailed which is great.

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — But we do have a number of police coming in at 11.45, so we do have a little bit of time. So can I welcome you and thank you for your time and if you allow me just to read you the rules of engagement in relation to the tape recording. So all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by Parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand you have noted the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Committees? Yes, you are nodding your head now, affirmative. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. I would like to invite you to make a verbal submission and as we have done with the other presenters, we like to ask questions along the way because we are —

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — — actually trying to pull information out that will serve our purpose as much as you presenting it will serve your purpose, so thank you very much.

Mr WATSON — Was I meant to be here as well?

The SCHEFFER — Yes. You are here as well.

Mr WATSON — Yes, okay? Yes, okay.

The CHAIR — So just to clear the air, I am sorry, I am getting a bit — I am ahead of myself. I did get very excited about the fact that I had the police here at 11.15; that is not the case, we have actually got the tour of duty which I understand is flexible.

Mr WATSON — Yes.

The CHAIR — So I am not putting you under any pressure. I am sorry about that. We have got some time to allow for that maybe after this presentation.

Mr WATSON — And Kees does have another meeting to get to.

The CHAIR — Yes.

Prof DORST — Yes, I need to be out of here in 20 minutes, too.

The CHAIR — Okay. Well, perfect, good.

Prof DORST — Okay. Where do we start? Shall I tell you a little bit about my background and the background of the centre where you are?

Mr WATSON — Yes.

Prof DORST — So my name is Kees Dorst. I am from Holland originally; moved to Australia five years ago and have a background in industrial design engineering and in philosophy and when I came to Australia five years ago there was a call out from the Department of
Attorney-General and Justice. They were called differently then, swapped names, for designing our crime centre and basically what they set out to do with the – the call was for a centre that would basically look at products and see how they could prevent crime and give some kind of seal of approval to sort of products that were well designed in that sense and I responded to that call by saying, “Well, I understand what your question is but we could do something else that’s also very interesting and that is actually use a particular approach to design”.

So I know CPTED kind of body of work in crime prevention as you have seen it presented by Adam and others here and what always strikes me is that basically criminologists looking at design and trying to extract rules about how your park should be site lines, et cetera, et cetera. And coming from a design perspective, I said, “Yes, design that but design does many other things that could be useful in crime prevention”. So I have actually positioned the centre to sort of more or less sort of go around CPTED a little bit and use design to look at very specific situations and it is part of a bigger movement which is called design thinking. It is very popular in business schools at the moment; lots of books coming out about design thinking; and basically what people often do when they say “Design thinking,” is that they focus on the ability of design as to create lots and lots of solutions.

So it is lots of brain storming, sitting in a room with lots of posters but I have got 20 years of background into research into how experienced designers work and they do not brainstorm. What they do is they are actually focused very much on the problem as it is presented to them and basically what I found out that they do is – so if a problem is presented; what they never do is attack that problem directly, they always look at the context in which the problem arose, attack the context in a sense and from either sort of creating a new context or looking at that context in a new way, they approach the problem in a different way. So that is what we have been doing here. So we have been around for almost four years now.

We have done about 90 projects in New South Wales; also in Holland and we are setting up centres in sort of Japan, Korea and other places, because it actually works and it particularly works in crime prevention because a lot of the problems that are around in this field are actually old problems in the sense that if you look at a project like Kings Cross that we could be talking about. The City of Sydney has been trying to solve that for about 100 years now and they get to a certain point but not beyond that point and that is where you need a new approach and that is where design thinking of the kind of stuff that we are doing actually comes in nicely and handy. So the way the centre is built up is we are sponsored by the Department of Attorney-General and Justice and by UTS sort of matching funding and we do also consultancy projects; about 300k a year of consultancy projects for specific clients and what the Department of Attorney-General and Justice has been doing in the last couple of years is actually creating working groups in major crime areas.

Originally when we started four years ago we were a little bit led by, “Okay, what are the crime figures? Where is crime going up and we should do something about that,” which works to a certain degree but it is very fickle and it sort of – it moves around quite a bit and now the Attorney – the Department of Attorney General and Justice has actually set up five working groups on retail theft, on theft from other people, et cetera, with major players in the field sitting around a table and that works really well for us because we have got then sort of an interface to all of these different companies and institutions that are dealing with these issues. So we become better in that kind of collaboration in a sense over the years and I would really recommend something like that if you have a centre, make sure that it matches well and the people from Lowman that are here, from the Central St Martins, they have the Jill Dando Institute which is also kind of a matching institute that does research into crime prevention and crime.

We do not quite have that here but it is important that these things are embedded and connected to one another because otherwise it is – what you do not want in designing a crime centre like this is just there to be about nice ideas or nice presentations or, you know, slides but because we are funded by the Department of Attorney-General, we have to get on the ground results because it is about impact on society.

The CHAIR— So what sort of interaction do you have with local government planners, do they seek you out for potential green field sites or redoing public space or things like that?
Mr WATSON — Yes, definitely. So as Kees said before, one of our ways of working is with university students and university projects and we team up with real live clients in that regard. So in the semester just gone we had a project with Blacktown City Council doing a greenfields redevelopment from a designing out crime perspective in Blacktown and before that in our interschool we had a project looking at a park in Blacktown that has a number of crime issues, crime and safety issues, including syringes discarded and lack of use. That was a partnership between us, Police, New South Wales Attorney-Generals and Blacktown City Council with their planning department. So very much at the action end of the council sector.

The CHAIR — Yes, yes. No, sorry, I did not mean to cut you off there.

Prof DORST — That is all right. Yes, what more can we say? We have got so much to say that sort of —

Mr SCHEFFER — Could I —

Prof DORST — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Could I - one of the – the previous people who have come to talk to us have talked to us about the reality of a silo problem with different government departments competing for space in this area.

Prof DORST — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — How has the centre been able to address that or —

Prof DORST — Basically because we are so problem-focussed so we look at the problem and then from looking at the problem we go and look at the different stakeholders that are around that problem and that invariably is across different sort of silos in government and sort of everybody who is around and looking from the problem and coming from the problem actually helps to attract people to this kind of thing with the promise that there may be some progress that you can actually move things forward. So we have always – for instance if we worked with New South Wales Housing, we like to work with the people on the ground in Western Sydney where it is tough, because the people on the ground actually know very well what is happening and often what you see is that the people on the ground are very enthusiastic about what we do and then they try within their organisation to get more money to actually sort of extend the project or scale it up and invariably you get no – because the organisation is not set up to deal with these kind of projects.

So that is definitely a thing that we are working towards now. So we have done 90 projects. I really do not want to do a couple of hundred more projects. I actually need to influence those organisations to start thinking in this way so that in the way we can —

Mr SCHEFFER — So – so when you come – sorry when you come across that road block —

Prof DORST — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Are you just going to tell us how you deal with that or how you try to?

Prof DORST — What we do; for instance for New South Wales Housing we have been working strategically with different parts of Housing to show – do basically a proof of concept that this can in principle work and then we are ready to go to the top of Housing and say, “These are actually projects that have happened within your own organisation. This is how they fit with your strategy, et cetera, et cetera, and your organisation cannot quite support them, so let us talk about the organisation.” But we need the proof of concept on the ground first because that is where it really happens.
Mr WATSON — And it is really the methodology that we are proving. CPTED as it is practised and before I came here I was a CPTED practitioner for a number of years with the government and recognised its weaknesses as a practitioner and those weaknesses were really that if you approach someone with a list of solutions to their problem without understanding their problem first, you are never going to get by it so rather than go to our clients and our partners with a certain list of things that they might do, physical things or policy things that they might do, we go to them with a methodology to explore the problem so it is problem focussed rather than solution focussed. Solutions are easy once you understand the problem.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Prof DORST — What we find is that the projects that we are doing are surprisingly solid because there’s a lot of people, especially the people on the ground that know that something absurd is happening or that they want to do something but they cannot and this actually allows sort of an opening up those kind of situations. So we have a lot of sort of fans around, people that are personally motivated although we do just small projects so you hear things like “this is the reason why I am still in my job because this is where I learn, this is what I developed”, et cetera. So they are quite solid which is also important because lots of the projects that we do are ridiculous amounts of stakeholders but normally it would never be stable but the people are personally motivated and actually keep pushing and so also sort of the conference that we are doing in the next couple of days we have sort of – there are a couple of people in there from the City of Sydney and other organisations that have really sort of been working with us really well because they are so personally inspired; intrinsic motivation push, yes.

The CHAIR — So the developers, how influential or how problematic, I guess, in one way, I mean Greenfield site developers have a responsibility to provide a certain public space infrastructure.

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — And I guess governments are currently more concerned, particularly Housing Victoria about the wellbeing issues, that is, you know, we’ve got a rise in diabetes, obesity, lack of exercise.

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — Lack of connection to the environment, maybe green space, all that sort of stuff and now there is a push to put more responsibility on developers to provide and create that sort of environment where people are going to exercise more, they will have to walk to certain areas.

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — And allow that space to be able to do it rather than just sit in a box, next to a box next to a box. I am just wondering where the priorities — crime prevention tags in on that environmental design and do you see that?

Prof DORST — With developers we have had until now sort of mixed experiences that you get sort of into a couple of really good conversations and you can actually tell the broader story that this about quality of public spaces and the environments that they are creating and then the moment that it gets closer to the project it is, “well when we have drawings you can sort of use a red pencil and say where we are doing things wrong and sort of intercept” in that sense. So it is a very mixed story with developers. What we do we are now, we are setting up a partnership with the government architect’s office and I think that is a good way for us to actually get to the developers earlier and get more structurally involved with them because whereas on the one hand you are encouraged and then you are sort of the moment that, I mean, we sort of, the campus here is a madhouse at the moment because we are spending 1.2 billion dollars on new buildings in the next couple of years and for every building I am involved in a master planning committee. For every building you have 27 committees for fire, et cetera, et cetera, and of course these developers have the same thing so and that is the juggling for position with your own agenda or what you can
bring that we just cannot spend too much time on and so they understand it on one level but then all the other agendas come in and it just gets diluted unfortunately.

But I think we have got a real problem. One of the things that we have been doing research here in the Design Architecture Faculty is about the fact that say much more public space moves indoors but the only sort of concept we have of an indoor public space is probably a shopping mall and of course teenagers go there because it is air conditioned, et cetera, et cetera, but they do not shop. So of course they are bored and of course they hang around and of course that causes trouble because they are there with a different agenda than the rest of the people. So how do you then talk to developers about the fact that they are actually creating a public space while – yes, they own it, okay. So I hope that – I mean, the contact with the government architect is – it is about half a year old now so we are starting to chip away at those kind of things.

**Mr Watson** — And the Barangaroo Project is a good one as well.

**Prof Dorst** — Yes.

**Mr Watson** — So Barangaroo Delivery Authority are a state government agency who are basically managing the Barangaroo Development which is about a fifth the footprint of the CBD of Sydney, again, and they have involved us on two projects so far. We approached them saying, “Hey, you have got this great development going on. Would you like to talk about public safety and crime prevention and talk about how design thinking can be helpful in that?” And to their credit they have brought us on. We did a project identifying I guess key aspects which I can give you actually; key aspects of park design, Barangaroo Delivery Authority are working with Lend Lease. Lend Lease are taking care of the kind of city blocks and the middle space and we are now in a project with that.

But the first project was looking at the Headland Park. So they are designing a new park from scratch. What are the key safety crime prevention issues? What can design thinking in that broader approach bring to that problem? So we really looked at I guess what other parks and their physical design; their management strategies, even their governance because all of that really affects the crime prevention and safety of the end product and extracted some of the tools that design thinking brings to this landscape is themed analysis. So analysis of stakeholders and analysis of the common themes that those stakeholders have and it is by identifying those common themes that you really identify the solution spaces to problems that are inherent. So Barangaroo are on board with us at the early stages before a sod has been turned and they are sponsoring our conference this week also.

**Prof Dorst** — Yes, yes.

**Mr Scheffer** — Can I just ask; I know the question has been raised with us by other witnesses and that is about the capacity building of planners or relevant police or other people engaged in it. Has the centre had a – or been able to have a positive influence on —

**Mr Watson** — Yes, absolutely and in that respect some of our [18:50.1 architecture] fellows will be able to tell you more about that. So we do it on a number of levels. We have the next generation of planners being educated at UTS so we have now run two full semester case studies over the last two years. We also have them on our winter school and the architects as well, the architecture school and our winter school. So they are learning designing out crime methods and ways of dealing with design issues and using design to get a better understanding of the problems that they face but we also do executive education so the centre for local government here at UTS has courses. I think it is a graduate diploma in planning and we deliver a unit on that, on design thinking. We also deliver a unit on the New South Wales police safety by design training course which is the – I think we have – and the team of fellows in your next interview will be able to give you the exact figures but I think it was 130 police or local government planners through in this calendar year that we have taught design thinking in a small way.

**Mr Scheffer** — And the developers?
Mr WATSON — The developers do not access that program. We do I guess access – I personally speak with the President of the New South Wales Planning Association, Sarah Hill, and we talk about the issues that planners are facing with a view to, I guess, being able to address that need but that has not happened as yet.

Mr SCHEFFER — No. So when you need in the way you were saying the case about needing developers and you get a certain level of engagement and then it peters out as it gets closer, who are the people you talk to? What level are they and obviously the background – are they the business people or —

Mr WATSON — Yes, that is Lend Lease would be one example. On the Barangaroo site so before we connected with Barangaroo Delivery Authority, we were invited by Lend Lease to submit a proposal and that is when we really – to be engaged on the design of their city blocks that they are doing at Barangaroo.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry just to interrupt you, what I meant was do you mean people for their commercial arm or their —

Mr WATSON — Commercial arm, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — So you are not meaning with the people who are doing their planning?

Mr WATSON — No, the plans were already done at the time that we engaged, so they were very much in the building side of things.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr WATSON — Yes, but again we approached them saying, “Yes, this is what we can help you with,” and they were very much, “Well, here is what we want. Here are some plans, can you draw a red line on it?” That is not going to help anyone.

Mr SCHEFFER — No. So did they get the heebie-jeebies about having to pay more money?

Mr WATSON — I am not sure. Yes. I am not sure what it was. I mean, that could have been, yes.

Prof DORST — But it is just – I mean with these complicated processes you have to be in almost every meeting to make sure that your part of the agenda is there and we cannot do that. We cannot just sort of just jump into a project in that way without any sort of view of on the ground results fairly quickly because that is the way we are funded, we need to get stuff going.

Mr WATSON — I think the Kings Cross example that Kees mentioned before is a great example of how this design thinking approach is being implemented. The actual design thinking project was a number of years ago, I think it was —

Prof DORST — Three years ago.

Mr WATSON — Yes, three years.

Prof DORST — It was one of our first projects.

Mr WATSON— Yes, and that really approached Kings Cross in a different way or came to an understanding of the problem in a different way. So Kings Cross as an event rather than King’s Cross as a crime problem. So the vast majority of people who go there are there to have a good time and are not there to commit a crime and that new frame if you will, really helped the City of Sydney identify what they could be doing to manage 30,000 people in the one place and since that project they have gone away and I think John Maynard is speaking later today so you might be able to talk more about it but they have gone away and trialled the particular elements of
that project so some of the things you might do at an event is have some public toilets that are available.

There are only two structurally there in Kings Cross and that is not enough for 30,000 people so they are trialling portable toilets. Some crowd control, they did have security guards manning the taxi ranks up there but security is a very different way of dealing with people. It is not crowd control. Chill out zones, free water, triage, kind of first aid stations, these are some of these things that they have implemented, evaluated and is now working its way into their policy and those things could never really have come from a CPTED dominated approach, a CPTED led approach, it had to be a design led approach.

Prof DORST — And interestingly by taking the approach of saying, “Well, this is actually an event that needs to be managed,” the City of Sydney comes in the role of being the event manager and to give them a lot of credit they have really taken it on and said, “Okay, this is what we can do,” while before that it was often, “Okay, no, this is a problem for the Police or this is,” but basically because they saw no path to action when you sort of cannot see how it would do anything, you do not want the responsibility either so you get a lot of that pushing around of responsibility and creating a path to action by saying, “Well, these are possibilities. This is the role that you can take and actually it is improving it for everybody,” and to again give them much more credit, they now have an open Sydney strategy and a policy framework which looks about the night time economy through the whole City of Sydney area which is really interesting and they have done two and a half years of homework, research and stuff to see how they could manage different areas of the city better and not look at the city just as a day thing but also as an evening thing and they have come up with many good plans.

They had an extensive consultation process. So the whole, what happened in Kings Cross as us coming up with a different approach, has sort of contributed to them actually being able to feel much more empowered to deal with the city at night in a much broader sense. So that I think, I still count that as one of our biggest successes because they have taken that on, it is not us doing endless projects and doing endless interventions. They have actually seen a way through this to actually do this and while I still remember sort of some of the first meetings I had, they were really difficult because they were not used to dealing with design in this way. They just sort of put a design on the table and somebody criticises it from some perspective and that to a lot of them it was then off the table so this is not good, you know. Well, actually it is a proposal. It is a way forward. This is not how design works but they have really taken it on board, they are really good. So I think that is a major, major win because they have taken it over. Yes, and then we can come in again as a kind of catalyst in specific spots and help them, et cetera, et cetera. But that is the role that we really want to have. Yes.

The CHAIR — And obviously I am interested in the funding mix you talked about the Department of Justice?

Prof DORST — Yes.

The CHAIR — And the uni, how long is the term of the —

Prof DORST — I would say the present is sort of – originally we were funded for three years and then extended for another two and that runs out next year in June and we are now working on the business plan to get another five years of funding because through the Department of Attorney-General and Justice this is a really valuable thing to be doing also because we live in a very visual age. This is a visible thing that they are doing and it is sort of really energises lots of things that they have been doing before and I have been impressed in the whole process that we use. It starts with upfront research but there is so much that is known already about who does what, where in the city that there is an amazing amount of stuff that we know that just has not been actioned in a design way before. So for us going to the Department of Attorney-General and Justice is sort of going into a sweet shop because all the knowledge is already there in a sense. It is just that if it has not been sort of put in a design perspective then it is just knowledge or it is just at least the majors but it does not actually lead to the kind of things that we can do. So for them they
are sort of using lots of stuff that they have known before and it is now sort of slowly given a new shape.

Mr SCHEFFER — But does that also apply to the already existing guidelines around CPTED like in Victoria, you know, you have got certain guidelines and part of what our brief is to see why are they not being used as much as one would like them to be used. What are the barriers, so —

Mr WATSON — I would go out on a limb and say, “No.” The Guidelines in New South Wales by the sounds of it are similar to in Victoria. They are used but in new developments.

Mr SCHEFFER — So do you think from your work in the kinds of engagements that you have described to us, do you connect with the guidelines; do you use them in any way or so they are of relevance to you?

Prof DORST — They are largely irrelevant to us and one of the interesting things that – one of the reasons that this centre can even exist and do these kind of very strong or very sort of pointed projects is the fact that policemen run around with GPS’s now so we exactly know where something happens, where something goes wrong which means that, I mean, it is – you can sort of for break and enter you can almost see a thief go down a street on one night and actually see where the stuff happened. So there is an immense amount of very specific – site specific data that you can use to actually influence the scenarios that are happening there and then the guidelines are very general and they generally make sense but sometimes not. I mean, site lines are great if and sort of people sort of around a park being able to look into it is sort of great in principle but if the people culturally really do not do that then it is useless.

Mr SCHEFFER — So that is an amazing statement which you have just said. So what then would you do? Would you have guidelines or transform them?

Prof DORST — I think there comes a base level of what makes sense definitely but for every specific situation it really needs to look at, okay, how sort of can we improve things here in this specific situation and shall I give the Barcelona – the Barcelona, okay.

Mr WATSON — Give the Barcelona.

Prof DORST — Okay, there is a city in the south of Europe that I am not supposed to mention but it is Barcelona, where a lot of tourists get robbed and years ago it was one of my inspirations to start a centre here. There was a little bit of money left actually from an EU project and so there was an opportunity to look into those kind of scenarios and architects were hired and did an analysis of where does this happen and it turned out it had to do with little alleyways and irregularly shaped squares, and you think well, whatever that is. So then designers came in and actually when you look at the scenario of what is happening you are a tourist, obviously a tourist so camera, you are looking around like nobody would who would actually live there.

You walk through a little dark alleyway, you come out onto a square into the bright sun and you stop because you have to orient yourself and your eyes have to get attuned to the light to do that. The moment you stop, they come from behind, slice open your backpack, they have got these special things that they can – so everything in your backpack actually slides into their skirt and they run off and you have not even seen them. So they have got no chance whatsoever. So a very specific scenario and very specific spots in the city and so you are trying to sort of say, “Okay,” but it is actually basically the problem orientation for people that is why they stop. So the first solution was to put signs up saying, “Okay, this is the way to the Rumbia, this is the way to the Sagrada Familia,” et cetera.

It did not work at all because in front of signs people stop and start negotiating with one another where they should go and they are still in harm’s way. So in the end the design that was made was commissioned to Philip Stark a famous designer; it was actually for pedestrian signage but sort of dark poles with dark signs with white letters, quite small white letters for in the middle of the square. So what happens now is you walk through a dark alleyway you come to the square and you see that there is information there because you see the profile of the arrows and you just keep
on walking and you are out of harm’s way and the letters are so small that you have to get quite close so people are actually close, they are together, they get that kind of safety, et cetera. So this is how signage actually positions people in a city in a very good way and it can do that completely wrong or very elegantly and very right without people knowing that it is even happening and that is one of the things that we do. What we always try to avoid is countermeasures. What we always avoid is countermeasures. We just look at how you can actually behave or how you can influence behaviour in public spaces but for that you often have to be site specific. You cannot in general say that it is a good idea to have dark signs on dark poles because that might be sometimes.

Mr SCHEFFER — But there is the – but in what you have described there is a methodology, there is a procedure, there is a coherency, how you arrived at that solution, a very analytical approach and all that kind of stuff.

Prof DORST — Yes, yes, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — So that implies at a kind of a guide book of some sort or a set of principles or a framework that you work towards or a discipline.

Prof DORST — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Isn’t that kind of what guidelines are trying to do?

Prof DORST — Well, what guidelines sort of – what we have is a process.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Prof DORST — And what guidelines do is more or less short circuit not having a process but this is the situation so this is the solution.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Prof DORST — And there are parts of CPTED that are more procedure like and that we can actually work with but that this is the problem so this is the solution part of CPTED, it can work and if it works in 60 or 70 per cent of the cases, then it is actually absolutely great and very valuable but it does not work always. And we tend to come in in places where it really does not work or where it has not worked or it has sort of solved problems to a certain level but not completely.

Prof DORST — And so we have the CPTED guideline that are really quite, everyone says they’re fabulous.

Mr SCHEFFER — So what do you think the State should do —

The CHAIR — Just bearing in mind, Professor Kees has to go and his time, just have a short —

Mr SCHEFFER — And so we have the CPTED guideline that are really quite, everyone says they’re fabulous.

Prof DORST — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Should we set them aside and redo them and put the primacy issue on procedure and approach or should we leave them as an appendix to – and how do we – what do we do?

Mr WATSON — The way we see CPTED and the guidelines in New South Wales as an organisation, really is the projects that we end up with can be assessed by CPTED as achieving CPTED goals but they were not achieved through going through a CPTED process and that is, I guess a succinct way of saying it.

Prof DORST — Yes, and so one of the things that we do – so we have been working a lot on the method and our own way of working, that has been sort of crystallising over the last four years. What we are doing now with the method cards and other stuff that we are creating is actually because we have been too Sydney-based, we need to get out at the rural New South
Wales. So working with local TAFEs, local councils to do these kind of things too. So it is becoming more of a sort of a methodology that can be communicated and it could be that if that is strong enough, in the end you do not need the CPTED guidelines anymore but for now the CPTED guidelines for lots of people are the best they have and they make sense for certain groups.

Mr WATSON — I think our way of working involves the local knowledge earlier in the process whereas the current CPTED process in New South Wales is that a development application lands on a constable’s desk and a local counsellor’s desk far too late in the process for any real change to occur. What we do is work with those people with that local knowledge and understanding early on in our project so that our process is informed by that knowledge.

The CHAIR — All right. We better leave it there. Thank you both very much. I appreciate that. Thank you Professor Dorst.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Deputy Chair, and Tim McCurdy here is part of the committee and also a member of the Legislative Assembly, and we have two apologies from two of our committee people who couldn't be available today to come to Sydney. We have actually conducted — this is our third enquiry in the term of the government, crime prevention through environmental design, and we are now nearly at the writing stage. So it was a good opportunity for us to come to Sydney today pre the conference tomorrow and access some of the knowledge from the UK particularly, from some of the presenters at the conference, and also obviously from yourselves. So we do appreciate your time.

We have allocated nearly an hour for this session, until 12:45, and I am not sure on what basis you want to present, but we do like asking questions. Be forewarned; we don't want to have an hour of presentation and no questions. So if you will allow us at least through the different presentations to raise questions or if you prefer at the end; nevertheless we do want to try and extract some information for ourselves through the enquiry process. And I do need to advise you that this discussion is being recorded and on that basis I will have to read you the rules of engagement in relation to that. Bear with me, I know —

Commander LYNCH — It cannot be used against us, can it?

The CHAIR — I am quite sure you are very familiar with it but nevertheless I will get it on record, then we are covered and you are covered. So all evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, provisions of reciprocal legislation of Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understood you are well read in the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees; I suspect you have probably done that before. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. And that is the rules of engagement and —

Commander LYNCH — General rules? I could probably start an introduction. I am Ian Lynch, I am in charge of the field support command, which is one of the four parts of the Education and Training command, and one of the four units in my individual command is the Crime Management Programs Unit, which is run by Detective Inspector Rick Cunningham who cannot join us today; he has got a doctor's appointment. The crime — I am not sure the way you are set up in Victoria, but does Victoria have crime management units, the Victorian Police Force?

The CHAIR — Looking to my fellow colleagues, probably not terminology I am familiar with, so maybe it is under different auspices.

Commander LYNCH — About 1997 under the Ryan administration we introduced a thing called the integrated crime management model, whereas prior to that a police station was generally general duty police. You might have some highway police there, you would have some detectives working in every local area command. A model was introduced; New South Wales is divided up into 80 local areas commands, and each local area command now has a crime prevention unit. That is the strategic arm of policing within that particular community, and it contains a crime coordinator or a sergeant that coordinates all events. It has a domestic violence officer; it has a crime prevention officer, which is the role suitable for what we are discussing today, or most directly related to that role. It has a licensing officer which does all the licensing of firearms and licensed premises. It has a youth officer, youth liaison officer which deals with all the kid issues, the cautioning of juveniles et cetera.

Attached to it also is an intelligence wing that is strongly associated with each of those crime management units as well. As I say, they are the group in the local area command which is basically looking at your strategic problems as they occur in a command. If you are really trying to modify a crime environment they are your four main subject areas; it is target hardening, it is youth, it is licensing, domestic violence. If you can really get a grip on those four main offence types, it covers the whole realm of what you are actually doing; you can actually start getting a hold on a more coordinated strategic approach to the activities you are doing. The crime
management unit comes under a Detective Inspector, a crime manager, and that Detective Inspector also has control of the local area command's investigation team.

[unidentifiable] — Protection.

Commander LYNCH — Yes, investigation team as well. There are proactive units that can be associated with a crime management unit or connected to it. The structure varies a bit according to the size of the police station, but that is where it goes. Now, the central pen of a crime prevention officer is really the Safer By Design course. We try to get all our people to do that, including our crime managers. Did you want to say anything here in terms of the history of the place or what we do over a week in terms of —

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — My position in the organisation is the Commander of Operational Programs; I have been there for three or four months. I am relieving there while the current occupant is off long term sick. But Ian mentioned the crime management unit at the police station; if you multiply that — we are a crime management across the whole state pretty much, so we provide support to all those positions in the CMU. So we have a domestic and family violence team, an Aboriginal coordination team, a crime prevention team who support crime prevention officers and in fact I coordinated a conference for them just last week down at Goulburn.

We also coordinate Volunteers in Policing which is used often by the CPOs. Crime prevention officers are known as CPOs. So the CPOs would contact [inaudible] victims et cetera. We also have a mental health intervention team rolling out mental health training state-wide now. I have not had a chance to speak to any counterpart in VicPol to see if they have a similar sort of arrangement, but I imagine they have some sort of similar, may be no different. So whilst Ian's education side of the house is to train the CPOs up, we have a coordinating role to make sure they are all abreast of information and linked then —

The CHAIR — Policy issues, yes.

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — Then we have a link in with all the spokespersons right across the gamut of domestic and family violence, Aboriginal issues et cetera. So we support the executive in that regard and support the field throughout, coordinating their functions in the field.

Commander LYNCH — And as far as actually crime prevention goes, we were lucky enough to get Senior Sergeant Rick Simpson to come and work for us in about 2009, and last year we took over the —

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — The issue.

Commander LYNCH — The issue it was, yes, the Safer By Design course, which had previously set up the programs and Rick can give you something on that just in terms of that. Tim came over with it as the principal tutor, but Rick has been involved in the program since its inception.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — We actually started back in 1992. A colleague of ours, Chief Inspector Phil McCamley was appointed the manager of the actual program itself. That particular program at the early stages was looking — it was a trial or a pilot program, and what it looked at was the number of councils and the number of our — what we called patrols at that particular stage. So it was looking at training for police officers and also for council officers, particularly in relation to development applications in the planning process. So if a council actually got a development application come through that might have — that we believe may have some impact, or crime might have an impact on it, then that was actually referred to generally the police that were trained and also the council officers at that particular stage.

In 1997 there was an Industrial Relations Commission enquiry, 1880, into the transfer of cash and valuables that that was conducted by Justice Peterson here in New South Wales. It was as a result of a number of deaths and serious injuries on security guards whilst they were actually carrying out
their duties and transferring moneys to and from banks and other financial institutions. It was a WorkCover enquiry. Chief Inspector McCamley was actually asked by the enquiry to look at a number of sites to identify what crime risks might be within those particular sites and also to see what we could do to try and reduce the opportunities for crime, that is what we try to do. So as the manager for Safer By Design he was involved and also gave evidence at that particular enquiry.

In 1998, that was basically after Mr Ryan, Commissioner Ryan had taken over in our state. We also introduced what we call the Safer Communities Action Plan, and that was our — the New South Wales Police action plan, and it looked at a number of different things. One of the things was actually the implementation of the — at that stage what they called the community safety officers, and we now refer to them as crime prevention officers. There were one appointed for each of the LACs across the state and their main role is to actually coordinate community safety links between the police and also the various community organisations with the council, also the various community groups in that as well. So that was their main role. That position actually came out of consultation with the community. They said we want a point of contact, one point of contact between the cops and also us. So that is where the then Deputy Commissioner Bev Lawson, who was our Operations Commissioner at that stage, appointed or created those particular positions.

The other thing that we actually looked at at that stage and we followed through with was the continuation of the Safer By Design program providing training to police officers. In 2001 the New South Wales government introduced the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, section 79C, Crime Prevention Guidelines. We found that — at one stage they were looking at changing the legislation but they found there wasn’t a need to change the legislation. The then Deputy Premier, Mr Refshauge, actually introduced guidelines instead.

What it was was to try and provide some information to council as to how they should read the legislation, and the guidelines provided that it is an interpretation of the legislation, basically saying that any development application that may have some community safety issue should be actually checked by police and also accredited council officers. From that point on we followed through with Safer By Design again; it continued on and again our department, because we were actually involved in the training or providing the Safer By Design training we were actually appointed the trainer for that particular area.

**The CHAIR** — Can I just ask something?

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — Yes.

**The CHAIR** — The accredited council officers, accredited meaning what? They had been through a short course on environmental design?

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — Yes, the crime risk reduction and that sort of thing.

**The CHAIR** — We have different branding. We have the CPTED, we also have — well, we have safer design principles.

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — Well, it is the same, sort of. It probably would be a similar type of thing for our state as well. We use the principles of CPTED to look at the design and then try and design out opportunities for crime within those particular locations and that. So that is done by accredited police officers and also the council officers as well.

**The CHAIR** — I ask that because — it is an important part of our enquiry because of the feedback we have been getting is that there is no sort of legitimate course for plans when they are going through architectural school or designers to deal with that.

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — Yes, the crime risk reduction and that sort of thing.
The CHAIR — Yes, so maybe part of our report might actually be formed on the basis there might need to be a course, a specific course, or some sort of education delivery to local government planners to make sure that it is in their mind every time they see a design to talk to think about the crime prevention aspects.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — That is part of — the program that was introduced by government does include that, that basically from that point on, planners that have done the training need to take that into consideration with any development that they are looking at, from a crime point of view anyway. Chief Inspector McCamley did also do some training with some of the universities. The University of New England was the main one that he was involved with because that was where most of our planners were in fact being trained through at that stage. That is up at Armidale. In the early stages he did some training with the planners at that stage and they were looking at incorporating some of those — or the principles into their training in that. I am not real sure exactly what has happened with that since.

Commander LYNCH — Rick’s often in the role and so have a lot of crime prevention officers — in my previous life I was a crime manager detective inspector in the inner city. A lot of development applications come across the desk at the police station from the council where they think it is a fairly large design, for the crime prevention officer and crime manager or appropriate trained staff to put an eye over a DA to see how it conforms to all those CPTED principles, most especially in Newtown, licensing changes, changes to licensing and licensing times. A lot of those things come through a police station so it is not part of the initial process.

Mr SCHEFFER — So under that — as we understand this, you are describing under the changes in the legislation that require a development where you think there might be some safety or crime —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Community safety issue, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Application there and that includes crime prevention. Can you just talk to us like how you actually do that, like what is the nuts and bolts of it? What happens first? A developer, they run a scan over it or you identify it, or how does it really work?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — The way it actually operates at the present time is that the developer makes an application, development application to council for their particular development. So it goes into council. Council will then, depending on what type of development it is, we have what we call local protocols that are actually arranged between the local police and the council as to what types of development we need to look at. Garages, swimming pools and that sort of thing, we don't need to be aware of those ones, as the boss said. Licensed premises, brothels, transport interchanges, public — basically large public venues and that sort of thing are the types of areas that we would normally get involved with.

Mr SCHEFFER — So does the category have a light on it that says these ones —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yeah, the council will generally look at the protocol and say well, yes they are some of the things. For example, I worked at Hurstville as a crime prevention officer there. One of the things was that the major residential developments, multi-storey developments, we used to have a lot of problems with break-ins and also steal from motor vehicle. So we asked for that to be classified on our protocol for the local council. Some also had things like boarding houses or in some cases brothels and that sort of thing they asked for those to be included on their protocol.

So your planner would normally look at those and say well yes, these need to go back through to the police. Under the planning requirements here in New South Wales there is a set period of time in which we can consult. So the council have an obligation to make sure that the developer is not impeded in their application, so there is generally a very strict period of time in which that must be undertaken. So that is — that will come through to us, we will then either sit down with the planner, or depending on what the development might be, either sit down with the planner or we
will go through the actual development application itself. We then undertake what we call a crime risk assessment. That is an instrument that we use to determine the levels of risk.

Mr SCHEFFER — What is that instrument?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Based on the Australian standard, or the international standard now, 31000. It was a tool that was actually developed by Chief Inspector McCamley many, many years ago. What it does is look at the crime risk; it rates that risk, determines a rating within the risk. We also have what we call a crime opportunity assessment. There is a number of questions that we go through to look at a particular site, things — basically using the principles of CPTED, things like surveillance, access control, territorial reinforcement and also space and activity management. So those questions have been developed.

Mr SCHEFFER — Is that process and the standards and the documents, especially the tools that you use to draw that assessment, is that done by a team or is it done by an individual?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — It can be done by an individual or it can be done as a team with the planners in if they — depending on the size of the actual project itself. If it is a large project it will normally be a team. If it is only a small project it will be either the planner or the crime prevention officer or the accredited police officer in that case anyway.

Commander LYNCH — Generally the [inaudible] has something to do with that because you are dropping this particular application into an existing crime environment. So what are the problems that have been experienced in that particular area? What is the proximity of that to public amenities, how is it going to affect traffic, because often the traffic people will be consulted as well; how is it going to affect parking? What are the crime types that occur? A classic I can remember straight offhand was that council put an application to put a pay toilet block outside one of the corner stores. The corner shop had been held up six times in the last 12 months; it was a problematic location and obviously if you put something that big in front of the windows it provides people with the opportunity to get in there and —

Mr SCHEFFER — So you do that, you finish that exercise and then what is the next step?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — The report then goes through to council on the findings. So basically, the recommendations will be looking at what ways we can look at trying to reduce opportunities for crime on that particular location or that development. That will then go back to the council and the council will then consult with the developer on those recommendations and that with it, and then it is up to council as to whether or not it is approved or it needs modification.

Mr SCHEFFER — It occurred to me that if you have got a strong view, or everything you said, that this could have problems.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes, implications.

Mr SCHEFFER — And the planner in conjunction with the developer thinks oh, look, getting too hard.

Commander LYNCH — No, no, no, they —

Mr SCHEFFER — So how does that negotiation —

Commander LYNCH — They think it is time to go to the Land and Environment Court, in my experience.

Mr SCHEFFER — No, well, step us through a bit on this.

Commander LYNCH — Quite frequently, as a crime manager —

Mr SCHEFFER — So if they do not like it — sorry, just to go back — so if they do not like it, they come back to you and say we do not think we do this, and then they go to court or —
Senior Constable FELLOWS — What can happen is council can make conditions on the application. At that point the developer can say I do not like those condition and that is when, as the Superintendent said, that is when they would then go to the Land and Environment Court. Alternatively they may say well, can we talk about this and what was it that formed the opinion and that is when they could say the police advise us blah, blah, blah, can we talk to them about it as well, and then at those times then we would get involved. But it is sort of like a — it can then become more of a joint exercise.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — It is a consultation process; it is the best way to go rather going through to the Land and Environment Court and in a lot of cases you will find they are prepared to consult because they are looking at an alternative. Rather than being held up they will look at the alternative and oftentimes you will find that the alternatives that we are providing are not major alternatives, but there are simple things that can be done; common sense ideas in many cases rather than a considerable expense in most cases for that as well.

Mr SCHEFFER — So I am asking this because overall I think it is fair to say we are getting the impression that is a bit hard yakka to try to get some of these more complex —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Developments through.

Mr SCHEFFER — You know, and because developers are operating on a timeline, they are operating [inaudible] you know they want to get stuff through and this is all kind of community stuff that has not got to do with their business in the end. So that is why this is important, about who — because you are defending public safety and they are defending the commercial outcome but they think it is a [inaudible].

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes, that is understandable.

Mr SCHEFFER — So in the end my view would be that public safety has got a —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes, and that was the reason why it was actually implemented through the Land and — the Environmental Planning Assessment Act.

Mr SCHEFFER — Could you send me that report?

Commander LYNCH — Just for example, Rick recently, just late last week, had to go into the group and oversight the Barangaroo development.

The CHAIR — We just heard about it.

Commander LYNCH — So you can end up in all sorts of places.

The CHAIR — So can we get a copy of those assessment tools that you — is it in a format —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes, there is no problems with that.

Commander LYNCH — Another issue to impact upon that one is say Newtown. I went to the Land and Environment Court in Newtown more than any other court as a Detective Inspector, and most of them were over development applications concerning licensed premises. I do not know if you are aware of what Newton is, it is a —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — It is not far from here.

Commander LYNCH — A trendy area. All the real estate prices were up and there are heritage orders just about on every building up the main street. So when they want to put rooftop bars in and you have got crowded streets below and schooner glasses coming off the top of pubs. There was a raft of things. Then you have got the noise issues that emanate from the roof. There is high multi-storey unit blocks going around everywhere as well, people partying five yards away from you. There are all sorts of complications there, but because they couldn't modify -- they only had so much space because of the nature of the place and they could only make so many
modifications and then there was the need for an outdoor smoking area as well. It was often hard to find compromise. But I think in a lot of the new suburbs those problems are not as prevalent; if you have got space you can work around these things.

The CHAIR — Some of the problems I could see is where a lot of regional cities are looking at trying to consolidate both commercial activity and residential. So a case in point might be a little regional city there is the mall, there is the kids, there is anti-social behaviour. The view of the council was look, what we need to do is try and put an accommodation layer over the top, so they have actually now got sort of a neighbourhood study where you have got commercial on the bottom and residential on the top. It brings in families as opposed to creating —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — It is 24 hour activity and that is what we are trying to do.

The CHAIR — Yes. The trouble of course is when they go into those areas where there is a clash between commercial and residential, people want their own space. They do not want next door to have the pub and the extension of a veranda and 50 people boozed, yelling and screaming at two in the morning. They only want their little sort of vino and their barbie. So there has been some issues about how you both try and bring in a family but also allow them some environmental space around that, some liveability in with the commercial stuff that is going on.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — And that is what they have got to consider. So Kings Cross has got a reputation. There is going to be certain ways you are going to have to deal with that compared to a country town that does not have those same types of businesses. So something where you combine accommodation with retail commercial type premises may work better in a country town than it would in the city, or vice versa depending on what is actually going to be making up that community.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — And malls are a thing that we have moved away from in many respects because they have actually been a problem for us and also the councils because of the safety issues, drug activity being undertaken within those areas because there is a lack of supervision of that space. There is no clear ownership of that space, who owns it? Yet council manages the space, but who clearly owns the space? It is not demonstrated properly. So a lot of our country areas now — or not only country areas, but even our city areas, we have changed the malls from basically just a pedestrian mall to a share way in some cases. So you have got activity 24 hours a day happening within those locations. That is what we are trying to create as much as possible with any of our developments now, is that continuous activity and the ownership by the community as well. Even with parks and that sort of thing, getting the councils to hand over some of the ownership of those spaces to the community. They want to own the space and they will look after the space if you actually give them that ownership in many cases.

Commander LYNCH — The council is always very, very responsive. We had a couple of big parks in Newtown near Redfern where there was an Aboriginal community and the university students would go past the Aboriginal community and we were getting a lot of assault and robs and problems like that. So areas with parks we were looking at lighting, but we could also get the council in as well —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — A bit of maintenance.

Commander LYNCH — And cut bushes, take away the hiding spots for people in the park and those sorts of things as well. So you work — it is a good relationship and certainly the councils — certainly when I went into Newtown we had a very well-established relationship with both the city council — the Sydney council and also Marrickville Council, and yes, it worked very well.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — The other thing that a lot of councils now have done too is their own planning guidelines, what we call development control plans, DCPs. So they have actually set up their own guidelines in relation to crime prevention through environmental design. The first council I worked with on that was Canterbury council with DCP 29, which is devoted just to crime prevention through environmental design. So any development that takes place in
Canterbury Council's area, they need to meet that particular requirement. Hurstville council is another council I worked with, DCP 1 section 3 is crime prevention through environmental design. A lot of councils across New South Wales, not only New South Wales but also other states, have now adopted that same model and that with it.

So we are getting the developers to start considering CPTED before they even put their DAs in. That is what we want them to try and do before they actually come to council or come to us. We can get them to say well okay, yes, we have considered these things. We have considered surveillance, we have considered access control, we have considered territorial, we have considered the space and activity management. So it seems to work quite well in respect of that too. It saves us a lot of time and effort as well because if the council has already got something in place then the developer has to consider that as part of the planning process. They have got to demonstrate how they have actually looked at that in the first place. So that basically takes a lot of the guesswork away.

Mr SCHEFFER — So is that satisfied by, as we have been told, is really to stick a paragraph in saying that [inaudible]?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — It will depend on council because oftentimes it will go back to the council and the planner will ask well, what are some of the things that — that paragraph is not good enough for us. What are some of the things you have in fact considered? Then you will generally find they will explain a little bit more detail; it might be in the planning management of something like that what they in fact have considered for the development in that sort of situation anyway.

Commander LYNCH — The same with the local council area. The people there are generally very, very concerned about what the police think and what they are doing and they see it as I think being a very valuable means of getting the police to come in.

Mr SCHEFFER — Can I just ask too, just coming back to that discussion we were having a bit earlier about the process, that even you were saying that things could — the developer itself can take an issue to court if they are not happy. Could you just talk to us quickly about what the general outcomes of that are and if you think that is a satisfactory avenue?

Senior Constable FELLOWS — It is sort of a mixture.

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry?

Senior Constable FELLOWS — It is sort of mixed outcomes.

Commander LYNCH — Yes it is. It is very hard to tell. Generally, my — and at Newton it would be people, you can certainly appreciate this — consensus was where we came out. We would generally get some of our considerations and they would get some of theirs. And certainly in a place like Newtown, the bohemian side of things, no one wanted to ruin that. I think the Land and Environment Court may have been a little bit less harsh about especially licensed premises needing a smoking area, where they had to have it, and these were old buildings built in the 1800s. They were not designed — one of my arguments was 19th century infrastructure and 21st century commercial premises. And the hotels had to have a smoking area; the legislation said they needed it. So I think the middle ground was generally met quite well.

There were some issues, rooftop bars, a couple of those did get through. To my knowledge, I was there a couple of years while they still existed and we had not had that many problems with them. We have had, as we thought, glasses coming off the street and into the main road, but a lot of the noise issues that we thought would be a problem were not too bad. And sometimes you are lucky; there, the biggest problem for a lot of people is getting a parking spot. They would be more worried about parking than — you know, if you move into the inner city you expect to see a lot of people, you expect a lot of noise. They were more worried about issues of parking and things that had come away from that, and then of course it does put an increased demand on public transport and that often shifts problems towards that.
But no, look, I think for the majority of the decisions I can think of, we reached that level of consensus. It helped one day, I remember. The judge came up in the Land and Environment Court; I had explained the activities of Newtown traditionally on a Friday and Saturday night, and he got egged. He was a little bit more understanding because of that. I certainly did not arrange it. He got an idea of what it could be like at times, and I think that modified his decision. Sometimes other people will go towards the developer, sometimes people go to the side of the community, but that is what courts are all about.

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — And we understand that too. We try to work as much as possible with both parties as far as whether it be with a council or with a developer. We want to just see a good outcome as far as the community goes, but community safety, I think that is the main thing. A lot of the time, once you explain to the developers what you are trying to achieve then you will find the majority of them will try to actually fit in with what you are working to. But as I said, they will often say well, what are the alternatives, can you make some suggestions to us as to how we might be able to improve things there? That is good with the consultation.

**Commander LYNCH** — There is also room for some improvement in conditions, just in discussing those finer points. One hotel wanted to go ahead with a fairly large development, I recall, the Missenden Hotel — it is not called the Missenden, my memory — but anyway, it was fairly large development, and the fellow that owned it owned a chain of hotels and he wanted to move in a security company that had pretty strong association with the outlaw motorcycle groups. So I was able to inform them of that and we kept out all the motorcycle groups as best as we possibly could, out of Newtown, and I was, you know, negotiating outside the court. That particular element was going to be introduced to the place, and I think he went ahead with a rooftop bar but it was not as big as he wanted it to be. And again, traffic is a big thing. If you can start predicting traffic outcomes from a lot of these developments, that is a good way of modifying things as well.

**The CHAIR** — We also found, particularly with drug issues in Victoria, where concentrating police effort in certain suburbs or areas were moving the drug chain from one suburb to the other. So suburbs that are not normally crime-related suddenly find themselves being in the midst of a crime — a drug wave, and suddenly you are looking at all these design issues with unlit or dead-ended alleyways and councils reassessing basically their whole designs of suburbs as the crime waves keep moving in, pushing one out, moves into the next and the next.

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — Yes, the displacement effect, which we have had here in a number of suburbs as well. Cabramatta was displaced across through to Liverpool and that. But again, the same thing is a lot of the malls and things like that, when you start to look at those environments, because the police are not necessarily actually moving through those environments all the time. There is not a lot of supervision or the people that are actually in that space are not clearly demonstrating ownership of that space, then you will sometimes find that negative activity starts to move into those locations and that as well.

**Commander LYNCH** — Often the first time we would find about a crime operation being conducted in neighbouring suburbs was the change of the clientele in the main street the next day. [inaudible] space is a real thing there and there was a — we were doing an assault and robbery operation and everyone else was — you know, if there is a concentration of police at one particular spot and people need a fix, well, the robberies move out of that area to surrounding areas, and that is when we started targeting their houses. So photograph them going out and get the reported assault and the reported crime and photograph them coming back in and you can generally get your match in terms of the time.

**The CHAIR** — We would be actually great is to see the community resist. When you have got a very community diverse environment suburb and you are moving crime from one or crime [inaudible] the community says bugger off.

**Senior Sergeant SIMPSON** — And that has happened in a couple of locations and that where the resistance has been so strong that basically they have decided to move elsewhere, it is just not working well for them, the business is not working well for them. The other thing that we
look at too is perceptions of crime, it is the other thing that we need to consider because oftentimes we look at the risk of crime but the community is more worried about the perception of crime. And so we need to look at both risk and also perception, and some of our recommendations will be based on what the community see as a perceived risk within that location and that as well, so you need to try and build that into it at the same time. We as police, for many, many years we would always just say well, we only need to deal with the crime risk, we do not need to deal with the perception, but if you have got a perception, if the community have a perception of negative activity taking place there then you can end up with like avoidance behaviour. People avoid those areas because they do not feel comfortable with using the space.

The CHAIR — And then it becomes reality.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes. So then we end up with the risk actually taking over there. So we try to, as much as possible, even with developers now, look at that perceived risk and in some cases talk to the community about what they perceive those risks to be at the same time.

The CHAIR — And the government. I mean the media fuel the perception a fair bit and increase the fear of crime. Without any substance. I mean the sensationalism of journalism then creates a fear within the community of which government then responds to.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — And local government; it has a big impact on local government in many cases too, on their funding for some of their projects and that, whether or not they put CCTV in a public space. It may not be required in that space but because the perception is there, and it is sometimes generated as you said by the media, then a lot of money is spent on those — on cameras or CCTV in that space when it may not be really required within those areas.

Mr SCHEFFER — Can I just ask you —

The CHAIR — Tim, you feel free to cut in as well.

Mr McCURDY — No, you go.

Mr SCHEFFER — No, just the — we understand that in the United Kingdom and also in Palmerston North in New Zealand that we visited, there is — police are located in local government offices. They are all in there, I do not think vice versa, that kind of relationship, so develop this crime resistant thinking and shared information. Does that happen in New South Wales and do you think it would be a useful thing to do or is it sufficient the way you have described it with the exchange of documents?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — I spent more time — as a crime prevention officer at Hurstville, I spent more time with council than what I did with the local cops, because most of my work — —

Mr SCHEFFER — In their environment?

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — No, not necessarily in their environment but working with them. Yes, one of my colleagues, one of our colleagues, a crime prevention officer from Burwood actually did make that comment the other day: I should have an office here because I spend probably more time here than what I do with the local police.

Mr SCHEFFER — They say it was very effective in New Zealand, so in Palmerston North.

Commander LYNCH — The other aspect of that to consider, when we set up a crime management unit we try to put people all in the same room so that an issue for the youth is an issue for the crime prevention officer. There is a degree of recency and relevance that you like working in that way, and that was a bit of a challenge with the design of some of the old police stations. If you take a person away — and I notice it too in my current job, with specific lecturers. I know that we have got this big knowledge management project we are working on at the moment.
The person that is giving the information has got to have recency with regards to a knowledge of [inaudible 39:35.0] and that was one of the strengths of the crime management unit, that the person that is doing crime prevention also knows what the youth issues are and what the licensing issues are. They come across to a task in deployment nearly every week so they see what the crime patterns are in a place. And we would get external stakeholders come in or council people coming in to see, these are the problems we have got at this particular point in time. I have had Housing Commission people there when I am trying to highlight problems that surround a particular developer or are an ongoing concern. So that is something when you take cops away from those places that you have got to consider, that the environment is a lot more —

Mr SCHEFFER — Because you can do that as a rotation, could you not, making sure they are not —

Commander LYNCH — Oh, sure, and make sure they go over every Monday and they know what is happening in the place. But it is often an exchange, you know, it is a name, it is a place, it is an occurrence, it is a particular crime dynamic. It is that informal mechanism that occurs in any sort of working place, that cops in this environment can learn a lot from it.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — The other thing that we actually introduced with the Safer Communities Action Plan was what we call community safety committees. So while the councils actually created their own committees, we have representation on those committees. So they will — it varies from a month to bi-monthly meetings, but there is a lot of involvement with that, as the boss said, basically talking about what are the current issues, what role do you need to play as a council, what role does housing need to play, what role does education need to play. So there is a lot of consultation between different agencies as far as that goes. And again, that is informal in many cases too. If there is a particular issue crops up, I know with my colleague at Hurstville council, he had an issue, he would ring me up and say look, can we duck down the road and actually have a look at this particular location?

We did not wait until the next meeting; it was a matter of look at it now, see what we could actually come up with for it, so we look at what strategies we could put in place. Each of the councils, to get additional funding here in New South Wales, actually have applied for what we call community safety — or they have to develop a community safety plan that goes before the Attorney-General’s Department, they look at it, they review it to determine whether or not it is worthwhile funding and then grants can be provided to them for additional projects and that that they are involved with. Most of that is in consultation with the local police and that as well.

I know when I worked with Hurstville Council, their community safety plan mirrored our local area command plan. So what our issues were, were the issues that we were trying to get them to look at at the same time. We as police were not given the grants but we could apply it through the local councils in many cases anyway and that worked quite well as well, because it forced us to get involved with them and basically the same sort of thing from the other side of the fence as well. So there was that consultation taking place.

Commander LYNCH — Just in terms of — I will say it now, they are thinking of making a meeting or something about training, the other thing here, in terms of the normal government approach around it. The way we are looking at taking this training now is we are underway in terms of having a crime risk reduction program as distinct from a separate course, just a CPTED course. CPTED belongs into a whole range of other things, so we’re looking a crime prevention officer’s course followed by the Safer By Design course and then running a number of one day workshops.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Issue-based.

Commander LYNCH — A lot of our people are — a lot of the people that do the course are from the local councils, so we are looking at one in terms of policing public places, exactly what sort of demands they can make upon the cops, what they can do, what they cannot do. Youth again, how do you reduce youth crimes, what are some initiatives that have worked in particular local area commands in relation to youth that might work where you are? What are the powers
that the police have got in relation to youth? Other ones, domestic violence, what are some of the strategies that work in terms of dealing with problematic domestic violence issues? Licensing is a huge one; you could probably go for three days on that, but we are looking a workshop for licensing, and it is just not — it is people from the council, it is local area commanders, this is what you can do with your licensing.

Mr McCURDY — So do you drive these, and then there is the community and the planners and others involved with that?

Commander LYNCH — Yes, they — Rick just — he goes to Tasmania, Queensland, all over the place, often just not speaking to specifically police but local councils in terms of the program. I think he has been to Victoria in the 90s with the course.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Yes, Phil actually did do a course with Melbourne City Council. That was in the early stages on CPTED at that stage.

[Overtalking]

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Tim and I just finished a course with the councils down in Hobart. We did a four day Safer By Design Course. We had no police involved in that particular course; it was councils actually wanted us there, so we actually delivered the course to the council officers. They were from various areas within council. They are not only from planning now, they are finding that the parks and garden people can actually use the principles because they have got certain problems within their own spaces. So they are actually starting to look at things differently, from just the vegetation and what other things were happening there. So it works quite well as far as that goes.

Commander LYNCH — The other things we want to explore with this course as well is police involvement with indigenous communities, things that work in certain places or things that do not work. And there is no one size fits all with a lot of these things, it is here is some ideas of other people, maybe you can put that in your memory, how it fits to your particular area. Diverse communities is a big issue; we just did a Islamic cultural awareness package through the programs unit in relation to the Muslim community in southwest Sydney. Then we would conclude the course — there is another side of this now; there is now CPTED as it applies to counterterrorism, you know, designing a building to be bomb resistant. If you have got a high risk activity occurring around you, what do you do about it, if you have got a piece of critical infrastructure in your area what do you do about it, and how do you plan your developments around that and make [overtalking].

The CHAIR — Make a telecom facility.

Commander LYNCH — Sorry?

The CHAIR — Make a telecom facility. You know, southwest Victoria, you have got a small fire and the telecom facility to close down are not —

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Yes, Warrnambool?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Wiped out the comms system.

The CHAIR — The terrorists could not have done a better job.

Commander LYNCH — And then finally I think where we are looking we will get a busload of people at that point who pass the course, go to a local area command that has a real time problem and say let us do a report for the local council and for the local area commander with regards to a lot of different people's views about the specific issue you have got here.

The CHAIR — Now look, I am mindful of the time. We have got about ten minutes. We have not had a lot from Tim, I am not sure if he wants to have a crack.
Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — I was just going to — if I could to what Ian was saying. In the crime management unit, as part of the ACLOs, which is Aboriginal community liaison officers in those —

Senior Constable FELLOWS — MCLOs.

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — MCLOs in those communities where there are multicultural liaison officers. So it depends on obviously if you are at Redfern, you have got an ACLO, Dubbo would have an ACLO, out at Cabramatta they have got a number of —

Senior Constable FELLOWS — [inaudible].

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — So it would just depend on the communities obviously, but they could link into the CMU and they are the link into the community. As Ian said earlier, you get the community by you, that is when you get them on board, and that is being consigned to the cops or the other government agencies.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Ownership.

Detective Inspector HEYSMAND — So they are the link in and we have been talking with Tim about getting our ACLOs through the Safer By Design Course. So when they are in those communities there is a lot that can be done with those, because a lot of them start at such a low base level, to build them up and make them crime resistant, if you like.

Commander LYNCH — It is also capitalising on the group of people they speak to. But anyway, Tim, over to you, mate.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Yeah, the — I guess what we tend to do is sometimes we just lump all the problems into one barrel, and as we said before, depending on the area, what is already there, what could be there. We talk about surveillance, access control and whatever, but that one area may be completely different from another, certainly when we are talking about with the Aboriginal issues and designing a program for them. We want to design it to suit the Aboriginal communities, depending on which areas we are going to. So that is one of our big things that we are looking at at the moment, because we have recognised that one size does not fit all, which has already been said.

But you have just got to tailor different things; it is not just legislation, it is not just well, this worked in this community, it is going to work here — it might not. And being able to recognise the fact that you need to be able to just change things. So it goes beyond — talking about the broken windows theory, it goes beyond that. Just because the window is broken, it is just a broken window, it doesn't necessarily mean the area is now a crime-ridden area; fix the window and they are not going to have the issues. But as I said, just changing things to suit the environment and you can only do that if you are talking to the community.

The CHAIR — Tim, you had a question?

Mr McCURDY — I do have a query a little bit removed. CCTV, in terms of your monitoring, what level of monitoring do you have? I mean even where we have been talking crime prevention with CCTV people are saying well, nearly a waste of time because it actually is not getting used. In New Zealand I know they use a lot of volunteers over there, like Neighbourhood Watch people.

Senior Constable FELLOWS — It really depends again. The research has come back with yes, it works, no it does not and it might. So in a central business district it is found to have limited effect, simply because alcohol and drugs become one of the factors. So it really does not matter if you put five cameras or 50, if I am off my face with alcohol or drugs I really do not care. They have found from a public transport perspective it has not worked as what they thought it would, but for car parks it has worked very effectively, because that has become the eyes and ears if you like of somebody watching over the cars. Then you have got the difference between
monitored and unmonitored. Under New South Wales legislation police are not allowed to monitor CCTV cameras; it has to be done by —

Commander LYNCH — Either council or a —

Senior Constable FELLOWS — Council or a private security company, so we do not have that. We can do it as a third party, so a security company is actually monitoring the cameras. We may have a camera to — not a camera, sorry, a screen to assist us where they will ring up and say yes, we have got a problem at this particular address, right, yes, we have got it, we will send a car, great. So we can do that but that is all we are going to with the — sort of like a third party access if you like, to the cameras. But the whole thing with CCTV is really do you have an issue that is related to crime prevention and will cameras be the answer, or can you look at that being just perhaps one of your — one of the items in the bag, if you like, that you might look at to solve the problem. But look at what the problem is first; do you have a genuine crime prevention issue or was it just again that perception we have got major problems here? Well, have you? So —

Commander LYNCH — The other way cameras are very effective is where you are channelling people in specific areas, railway stations, bus stops, taxi stands. They have got to come into an area, they have got to get out of an area, and a camera outside a hotel looking on the footpath is generally a damn sight more effective than the camera you have got when they come through the door with a balaclava on their face. So there are certain places were — and then it is not so hard to change. And the reasons why car parks work is because people go there to get the car or leave the car; if they are doing something else they stand out straightaway. It is often harder to get when you are filming randomly large groups of people.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — The research has shown that it works well with property crime and not so well with personal crime. Personal crime is where you are actually looking at the people themselves. So alcohol-related, drug-related in most cases does not necessarily work that well. Alcohol-related a lot of them they will play to the cameras, they will actually play up to the cameras. They will moon the cameras or something like that in some cases. Druggies will just look at the alternative, where else can they move, and that is what happened with Cabramatta. As we put more cameras into Cabramatta they simply moved elsewhere, so we had that displacement effect coming in.

The CHAIR — It does happen. I mean, we had a very tragic death where a young woman was killed and the investigation was absolutely dependent on the —

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — Critical. Yes, the identification.

Commander LYNCH — Again, that is from a private premises going out from a private place, that is why it works.

Mr SCHEFFER — By fluke.

[unidentifiable male] — Yes, yes.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — That is where we will often — you will be looking at a DA, a development application for a particular development, you might ask for that. And what I have done with Hurstville is ask for some cameras to be under awning — two cameras under awning at the front of the business that are actually looking at the public space. So they are providing some public space protection as well, for identification purposes or even to protect that business in that as well. So yes, that can be incorporated in some situations with that one.

Commander LYNCH — The other thing we did at Newtown was we mapped what areas were under CCTV and then private installations from hotels, from shops going out into King Street. And the other very good one, we solved a murder just recently.

Mr SCHEFFER — Are you saying you have mapped it all?

Commander LYNCH — We mapped what areas of King Street.
Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — What has coverage and what does not.

Commander LYNCH — What is the coverage, whether it was a public camera or a private camera. The other stuff too is a very good source of camera work, which as I say, we just solved a murder back from I think it was 2002, we just locked the bloke up the other day after a controlled operation. ATMs, we monitored this fellow's activity via ATMs going up the main street, they have cameras as well. So if every local area commander has got a hot spot and he knows exactly what areas are being covered by CCTV such as we had the other day, it is great, that is the way to go.

Senior Sergeant SIMPSON — We have a state-wide project called [View] and that basically had — we asked businesses and also councils to register with us their camera systems and where there camera systems are, what the coverage and that sort of thing is. So we actually have access to that information if necessary. If there is an incident such as the incident that you are talking about happens, we can actually go to the View project and look at where the cameras might be that may have actually detected the people's activity within that location, and that is state-wide, that is actually being rolled out state-wide. So the CPOs, a lot of the crime prevention officers are involved in trying to register companies with that particular project. The more people we have registered, whether it be councils or businesses, the better the coverage we have got. And it also can work well for counter-terrorism as well, if there is any threats detected or anything like that, well, we may be able to tap into the information prior to something taking place as well.

Commander LYNCH — Also I think City Council, their rangers who are manning the cameras on Thursday, Friday, Saturday night were actually listening on the police channel. So if there was a specific problem at a specific time that is what the [inaudible] the shooting investigation I did. They can zoom on that particular area as soon as they hear the crime.

The CHAIR — Gentlemen, we are very close to finishing. Is there some closing statements you would like to make or questions from the — final questions from the committee?

Commander LYNCH — Good luck with your endeavours.

The CHAIR — Well, thank you. Thank you all very much, we appreciate your time.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — I failed dismally this morning. We have quite a lot to pack in before we have to fly out, so 2:00 to 2:45?

Mr CURRIE — Okay.

The CHAIR — We could close somewhere around there, and we do like to ask some questions, so if your presentations could perhaps allow some time for questions, either along the way or at the end. I will read you the conditions surrounding your evidence because we are recording it and consequently for protection, all evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, the provisions from reciprocal legislation of Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing you may not be afforded such a privilege. Have you noted the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees?

Mr CURRIE — Yes, Sandy sent through, yes.

The CHAIR — Excellent. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. So thank you again, and we look forward to your presentation. Who is in the batting order?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Well, Lester is our Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Manager, so anything that is specifically sort of planning-related is probably best directed to Lester. I am probably best to answer how the crime prevention division uses CPTED in practice, if you like, as far as we work, that we deal with on a local level. If you have got any specific planning questions, probably start —

Mr CURRIE — Yes, and Sandy sent through a series of questions, which we have put down just some dot points too. So if you want to go through those?

The CHAIR — Yes, in your hands. Whatever way you would like to go.

Mr CURRIE — All right, okay.

The CHAIR — So can you just start, can you explain to me, so overarching the crime prevention division, it sits under the Department of Justice, does it?

Mr CURRIE — Yes, the Department of Attorney-General and Justice, and so it is part of the Crime Prevention and Community Programs section, and within that there is my position, which has a CPTED focus and then there is criminologists and statisticians and economists and others within our group of 15 or so.

The CHAIR — Are you an environmental criminologist?

Mr CURRIE — I am not a criminologist. I have got a background in planning and project based work. So yes, town planning is my background.

The CHAIR — Okay. Thank you.

Mr CURRIE — So I guess just some of the questions that came through were in relation to what extent has CPTED and associated principles been incorporated into planning strategies at local government level throughout New South Wales. I think that is fair to say that it has just been varied and dependent on the specific clauses of local planning controls across LGAs and associated documents. So there is a guideline that is a state level, issued by Department of Planning and Infrastructure, but the various planning controls incorporate crime prevention and safety considerations, depending on the individual circumstances of their — of those councils. There were questions regarding the EP&A Act. The EP&A Act is the main planning legislation in New South Wales and it requires consent authorities to consider impacts of developments and that includes social and community impacts, economic impacts, and the public interest which crime prevention and safety fall under all of those.
The Act also requires consideration of other environmental planning instruments, so for instance developments of residential flat buildings that have three storeys or more in New South Wales go to specific planning controls, which are state environmental planning controls, and within those they will have clauses in relation to building design and refer through to other design codes which pick up those design aspects in relation to quality of design and safety of design. So I guess across New South Wales there are a number of different planning instruments that deal with crime prevention, but in general I guess they are managed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. There was questions in relation to formal reviews — or you know, has there been any formal reviews undertaken. I am not aware of any in terms of the effectiveness of those guidelines for formal reviews. Feel free to jump in if you have got any specific questions in relation to these.

One aspect of crime prevention through environmental design is that idea of just recognising that good design and incorporating good design practice deals with those social and community safety issues as part of the design process and there are other aspects within the current guidelines that allow for, I suppose, consultation and direct referral of sensitive land uses and sensitive activities between councils and police to deal with at a local level and provide feedback for development assessments that come before councils. So that might be liquor licensing, large car parks, large tourist facilities, expansions of hotels, things of that nature, so — and those consultation protocols are set up between those councils and the local area commands, so they will have an understanding of what are pre-agreed developmental activities that will be referred across for formal comment from police.

Mr McCURDY — So it this a partnership relationship that exists or is it — which body, I suppose we are getting at, is the key driver in all this? Is it — you are obviously from the planning perspective or back ground, where do you see it being driven by, this whole CPTED? Is it the council and the planning that is driving it and the others jump on board, or is the police pushing down, saying this is what we must do and everyone jumps on board?

Mr CURRIE — I think a combination of both police and councils would be kind of coming to agreement on — you know, they are dealing with each other, crime prevention officers and council officers on a range of issue and they are coming up with a schedule of development activities that they see as requiring formal comment as they come forward to the council, yes. The other aspect is the role of the Safer By Design course that the police operate, so that is a course that is again just designed to bring those two bodies together again. So police, private industry are able to attend it as well but also councils generally attend that and so both ourselves present a small component of that course, DOC RC and different sections of New South Wales police present that, and that is another opportunity of trying to combine skills and knowledge of CPTED in those areas.

The CHAIR — So we had a deputation from the police over lunch and they have gone through their educational programs and their work with stakeholders.

Mr CURRIE — Yes. I provided — I just gave Sandy the contacts for the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and New South Wales Police to say what they will do, you have two key groups. I guess some of the other areas that we in the past —

Mr SCHEFFER — Can I just — sorry to interrupt. Can I just ask you on that Safer By Design course, is than an accredited course?

Mr CURRIE — NSW police provide a certificate of recognition / attendance or completion and it is really run by the police operational programs or education unit.

Mr SCHEFFER — So it would — for example, if a worker in local government is undertaking a planning qualification part time as part of their work and they did that course, would it count?

Mr CURRIE — I am not sure on that. It may have some status or merit with council or council courses, but it is run by New South Wales Police and I guess the actual original crime
prevention and the assessment of development applications guidelines, it was put out by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning but it also references in that just like a process for risk assessment and referral between councils and police, and talks to the Safer By Design course.

Mr SCHEFFER — So I mean, other than having whatever intrinsic merit it has got, there is not really an incentive for a professional working in the field to notch up that particular course because it would add to their — obviously it would add to their skill set but I presume not add to their qualifications and their further study.

Mr CURRIE — Yes, I think it is probably definitely for police officers and probably would be —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr CURRIE — Yes, I would think it, I am just assuming that, just given they are running it and it would be part of their education program, but for council officers and for development industry professionals —

Mr SCHEFFER — Open learning.

Mr CURRIE — Yes, other than maybe like professional accreditations requiring x hours of course matter, so —

Mr SCHEFFER — So is there much take up from planners and non-police people?

Dr MATRUGLIO — You probably need to speak to police to answer that one because they run the course.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Dr MATRUGLIO — No, I do not think that we can really answer that, because we only know who attends on the days that we may have staff attending. So it is probably best to do a bit of a follow up with police to get an idea of participation, and also merit of the course as well.

Mr CURRIE — On the days that we have presented they seemed to have attendees there, but yes, I am not sure of exact police and non-police numbers.

The CHAIR — The reason, or a reason why you can ask that question is because in a number of hearings we have had we have been told that local councils, through their planning departments, are perhaps as well versed with CPTED and the safe design principles which we use in Victoria, and they do not - it is not a high priority in relation to a planning application, it comes, sits on the desk, I am not sure if CPTED or safer designs in our case is the immediate thought from the planners. So part of our brief might be to recommend that an education process, whether through the university or through the architectural planners or whatever, is put in place to allow them to have that appendage to their normal up skilling or degree.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Definitely value in having that.

The CHAIR — Yes, so I guess Johan was trying to ascertain whether there was some credibility in that police, whatever it is, course that they do.

Dr MATRUGLIO —I think it an evolving program anyway, because it was originally just run by police and I think they were the only presenter, but they have subsequently started inviting various CPTED experts, if you like, to come and present as well.

[Overtalking]

Dr MATRUGLIO — So it is growing, it is an evolving course.

The CHAIR — But not really recognised by educational facilities?
Dr MATRUGLIO — My understanding is probably not because it is attended as a certificate course if you like, for work, but I guess there is opportunity for growth and development there too —

The CHAIR — Confirm it, okay.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Yes, but it is evolving. I think it has developed a lot; it has come a long way since it started.

The CHAIR — Is that a true comment? We actually heard a comment today that CPTED does not really incite the plans at all.

Mr CURRIE — Excite them?

The CHAIR — Yes, in the work that they are doing; sorry, I am sort of —

Mr CURRIE — In council or just like a — —

The CHAIR — I don’t know, just the various levels.

Mr CURRIE — Yes, like I just think that is just — across the 152 councils, some are fully resourced with say, social planners and even maybe, you know, specialising in a crime area that is their duty and they may develop some policy around that for their council area which informs their unit on that. Other areas it may just be there is not a designated position or a resource there for that. So I think it probably is subject to the crime levels or the experiences within those geographic areas as well. So, I am just trying to think. There is certainly that idea of social impact and community impact in some of the Sydney City and some of the other councils which may be well resourced, they are really kind of looking at that as part of the submission of the development application, and documenting the impacts and how it related to adjoining land uses and the precinct that — say, a new licence or a small bar or requiring consultation with police and others prior to lodging that application. So yes, I just think it is probably like any other aspect of planning, it would be just dependent on the area and the availability of staff.

Dr MATRUGLIO — And resources.

The CHAIR — Well, yes. Well, we are doing an extensive survey of all the local councils in Victoria so it will be interesting to see what sort of response we get back. Part of the point of this enquiry is that we are reviewing the Planning Act, and obviously the government are turning to see where — or how active councils are in embracing the safer design principles under CPTED, because we might have to change, I guess, or support councils in a different way to incorporate that as part of their sort of normal day business, which what we are hearing is not — you know, it is not really.

Mr CURRIE — Well, I have kind of just had a look at the Victorian example, so as a guideline that is a good document and it covers a lot of — it is very similar to I suppose a lot of design, generic design-related issues, so I suppose that is one component, is CPTED specifically different from good design practice? So there is a lot of objectives there and design suggestions, that can be used by councils.

Mr SCHEFFER — Do you think it is just a subset of good design, in the sense that we would have had people talk to us about the three generations, if you like, of CPTED, that — one, two, three and looking now at not necessarily subsuming but understanding planning around safety as being essentially to connect it with other kinds of positive developments around community wellbeing, rather than just seeing it as lock up your doors kind of thing —

Dr MATRUGLIO — Standalone, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — that kind of process. So how do you conceptualise it when you say something like that, that this document is really just seeing it as being part of a —
Mr CURRIE — Well, I guess again, just looking at the document, I suppose I can see it as there is nothing there that is particularly in contrast to any other kind of urban design policy or document. It is pretty well covering the — it might be kind of the objective being safety or community perceptions of safety, but I think it is probably — the design suggestions are fairly uniformly adopted now as good design practice.

Mr SCHEFFER — The reason that I was interested in this behaviour that is what planners in local government do, they look at it, they are thinking oh yes, it is coming back to [inaudible]'s point, it is just part of good planning and —

Dr MATRUGLIO — Good design.

Mr CURRIE — Good design, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Why would we need to concentrate on it. Because there has also been a bit of a tension that some of our witnesses today have said — our first witness — that there has not really been a clear definition of what we are talking about and one of the consequences of that is it means all things to all people. Many people disciplines are having a go at it so it kind of conceptually is wobbly. So if you are saying that it is really all just part of that seems to feed into that perceptions and would help if it was more structured in some way, so that council planners knew that now I am doing this particular activity, and yes, it is integrated in some way into general planning. Like the third generation of CPTED is — I do not have an answer to this, it is kind of a set of conundrums — I will just ask you if you would like to throw in the ring. It might be all too hard at this point, I do not know.

Mr CURRIE — I suppose the issue with how to get that into an applied setting for planning documents. So when there are principles and ideas of good design practice that are more, I suppose, qualitative assessments, that is harder to actually write down as schedule of a compliance document, like building heights or floor space ratios or even acoustic requirements regarding certain dBA under this and then that can be conditioned and become a requirement for granting consent, that certain windows or glazing or things are installed to actually decrease the noise within a development, and then that can be actually checked against compliance by someone going out and putting a noise logger there and seeing that it complies with it.

So it is probably more subtle around those things about design, so in New South Wales there is planning policies that require certain verification or design verification statements as part of the environmental assessment of certain development types such as residential flat buildings. So that is a way I suppose of dealing with CPTED reports and requiring the architect, the planner or whoever is submitting to actually — I suppose just saying that yes, as far as possible we have complied with the requirements of this document, and where we have not been able to comply with it, these are the reasons, these are the reasons why.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Could I just say one thing too, that just with this issue of standards it is important that not all spaces have an equal opportunity of crime risk. I think you need to be careful, which is what we have discussed previously on —

Mr SCHEFFER — What spaces?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Not all spaces in the environment have an equal chance or opportunity of a crime risk, so you need to make sure that you are not applying really strict guidelines to development of an area.

Mr SCHEFFER — It is done though, is it not? We had the impression that a Sydney council, a local council, would — the police identify certain areas that were risks rather than leave aside the ones that were not and only those —

Dr MATRUGLIO — I would assume that is how they operate, because that is how we work with the council as well, is we get them to identify hotspot areas and they will apply CPTED principles to that. I think if we are going to talk about developing standards that are built into local government conditions, not every space is likely to have the same kind of problem, which needs to
be considered if they are going to be ticking checks and balances and making sure they have addressed issues.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — So do you think that is a good reason not to mandate these sort of CPTED—

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — Perhaps there are tiers, which is something — tiers of requirements, depending on the environment. I do not - I am not a planner and I should not be correcting—

**Mr SCHEFFER** — In Victoria, what we see is that if we go to the mandate, government mandating the principles, we would obviously have to still leave it open how local solutions were developed. You could not—

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — But there could be tiers I guess, of requirements, depending upon the environment that you are dealing with.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Just the fact that it is in the EP&A Act in the way it is codified there, does that in effect make it mandated?

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — It is a guideline I think, rather than a requirement.

**Mr CURRIE** — It is basically — it is not in the EP&A, it is in a suite of guidelines administered by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, some of which are then referenced into environmental planning instruments, so that being local council environmental plans and state environmental planning policies.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — Sorry, have I got the wrong [inaudible]?

**Mr CURRIE** — No, that is the right act.

**SCHEFFER** — The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act?

**Mr CURRIE** — Yes, and I think some of the questions kind of— some of the questions were—

**SCHEFFER** — Because I was referring that section 79C where I thought that it had pretty clear provisions about taking into account — a requirement to take into account such social and economic impacts in the locality and crime prevention was taken as part of the meaning of social and economic impacts in the locality. So when I read that I thought well, if that is not mandating, what is?

**Mr CURRIE** — Well, it is just including crime prevention as part of those social and economic issues and the public interest. So yes, the actual guidelines themselves I suppose are guidelines and do not themselves have any statutory authority without reference in an environmental planning instrument. I suppose where that is different is where a guideline is then referenced in some of these other planning instruments, so that then actually a council or a consent authority in evaluating or assessing an application, then they are required to — if for instance the affordable housing set references in another guideline, then that connection is made. So yes, I think — so they are there just as guidelines at the moment, and yes, they are for consideration but they are not — I suppose they are not mandated as part of every development application.

**The CHAIR** — In fact, we were told they were like a fashion accessory; they are there but basically [inaudible].

**Mr CURRIE** — Well, I think — yes, I think that the planners would be preparing applications around just what is asked of them, and if it is not — I suppose if the relevant planning documents or a determining authority is not asking specifically in relation to CPTED, then — or heritage, or whatever it is, reports on that, then yes, they are probably not going to be part of just a general development application. Whereas maybe hospitals and gaming, licensing, other larger scale developments then it is more likely the council would be kind of asking for a separate report
on that. But yes, that is still quite not — I would not say it was mandated. So the way to have that mandated would be for clauses to be included by the Department of Planning in a State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) that just said — or a clause within it that just covered all land in New South Wales and then listed a schedule of activities requiring a verification of the principles or a CPTED report or something like that. And that would be the way to have like a uniform policy in relation to crime prevention across all councils.

**The CHAIR** — I think from memory, [inaudible] Clancy was suggesting to us that it is very generic and that is probably why — I mean every local planner makes their own interpretation of — yes, probably misplaced. But Tania, I am mindful we have only got about ten minutes, is there — do you want to sort of contribute?

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — I do not know if there was interest in how we work with local councils, I guess from the crime prevention programs unit's perspective I guess there is — there are three main ways that we implement CPTED in our day to day. One of course is through the community compact grants that we provide to local councils on an annual basis. We have over time developed documents with the Australian Institute of Criminology which identify CPTED best practice, if you like, in relation to priority crime type. We have been moving toward CPTED as a crime prevention technique, being mindful of course that that is not just a standalone, it is not the panacea, but it is a fundamental part of all crime prevention, as long it is seen within a suite of place management of course, detection, enforcement, the crime prevention we are seeing as increasingly important.

What we also do — so they will be your local council identified hotspot areas, which is what we were discussing, as they will apply to us, they will have identified a problem, they will have identified a location, we will provide funding for them to implement strategies at that location. Another scheme is our CPTED grants where we will identify councils that have a problem and work with them; specifically on graffiti at this stage to try and reduce graffiti at hotspot locations. Another way we use CPTED which is quite innovative, is where the Design Out Crime Research Centre comes into play as well we have recently developed a number of strategic partnerships and what we will do is identify priority crime types in New South Wales.

Some of the examples of the strategic partnership groups operating now is retail, transport, we have a graffiti one, break and enter, steal from motor vehicles, so we identify high incidence crime types and we get the Design Out Crime centre on board to try and develop strategies to reduce crime, not in the environment per se but for example in the — I do not know if the Design Out Crime Research Centre have spoken to you about some of the work they have been doing in relation to identifying high incidence crime problems, for example in retail. So, for example, we will develop a product to reduce retail theft. So we are using crime prevention through environmental design not just in the built environment per se, but also at specific locations. So they are probably the three main ways that we are looking at environmental design issues in relation to crime, and I guess increasingly so as well. So I don't know if you have got any specific questions that you might —

**Mr SCHEFFER**— Sorry, can you just run over the community grants?

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — So we have our — community grants that operate under the Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997.

**Mr CURRIE** — Just on safer community —

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — We have an annual grant program where local councils apply to us, they identify a crime program.

**The CHAIR** — As we know what to do —

**Dr MATRUGLIO** — As you do.

**The CHAIR** — That is right, and the second one, that was strategies —
Dr MATRUGLIO — But then we have a CPTED grant —

Mr CURRIE — Yes, but there is like a CPTED graffiti hotspot program which, as Tania said, to date has been focused on CPTED treatments of identified public areas that have been subject to malicious damage and graffiti.

Mr SCHEFFER — So the second strategy focuses on the graffiti, that is what it is about, is it?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Specifically at this point, yes.

Mr CURRIE — Yes, it has, but I think we have just tried to — the first year was really around textures and finishes to walls and green screening, and then we tried to move it more toward just activating dead public spaces and just getting the community to utilise public spaces through providing different amenities and facilities and upgrades of those areas.

The CHAIR — Which is again, similar to what our minister has just announced with graffiti grants, exactly the same thing. So we have a similar grant system I am hearing so far. And the third one was?

Dr MATRUGLIO — The third one as our strategic partnerships, which are driven by Attorney-General and Justice. So we will identify the crime types, get the partners on board and develop strategies. CPTED will be part of a suite, but we do not use it as a standalone.

The CHAIR — That goes to councils as well?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Well, it can include councils as well. Typically, sitting at the partnerships is more government and we have the industry partners as well. We do approach councils if required.

The CHAIR — This is just for crime prevention is it, or —

Dr MATRUGLIO — Yes, it is run by the crime prevention programs unit, so CPTED will be part of a suite, typically, recognised as important —

The CHAIR — Sorry, what is an example of a partner? It is not a council?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Oh, for example. We have a retail partnership and we have some of the big retail players on board, security Westfield sits on, for example. So we will get the major players in and they are people who can either bring money or ideas or something in kind to the table where we can actually have a demonstration project, if you like, where we can trial strategies.

Mr SCHEFFER — That is very interesting, that, because we have also had — sorry to —

Mr CURRIE — No, no.

Mr SCHEFFER — We have also had people talk to us about getting developers on — actually, it was the institute, the centre — getting planners on board to — and I take one of the reasons is actually you do not really see what the benefits, and this — it categorised them as a community benefit and they are really into business, so is that really what they should be underwriting, and you can kind of understand where they are coming from. So if you are doing work with non-government bodies like retailers, like Westfield, is that part of — do you think that feeds into that in a positive way?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Absolutely. Sometimes it is difficult to get buy-in from industries, to get them to understand the benefits to them, but we have been lucky to date where we have had some very interested people at the table and it is an issue that people are coming on board with. I think we are seeing a bit of an emerging trend where they are seeing it as a shared problem. And that is the thing, is it not, it is just getting all of the partners at the table to recognise what part they might play and what role they can have in trying to reduce.
Mr SCHEFFER — Okay. Is that actually — sorry, just to drill down into it — is that actually like an objective that you have got, or is that something that is happening anyway? Because for example, if you take Westfield major retailer, would it work there, they are working on existing sites and they have got these problems we don’t doubt, but then next time they are developing another facility, that ought to be part of their toolkit.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Absolutely.

Mr SCHEFFER — They would be thinking well, how can we plan to eliminate those problems.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Exactly, which is why one thing with the partnerships is we like to have our little demonstration projects, if you like, in a particular site, and if they are proven to be effective we would of course like to see rollout in other locations based on the findings.

Mr SCHEFFER — And that is another benefit of having the centre?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Absolutely.

Mr SCHEFFER — Because they were talking about how you would go to a neutral space, people do not get attacked.

Dr MATRUGLIO — And it is quite innovative and we are finding the partners are coming on board with this new way of looking at crime as well, which they have not done before.

Mr SCHEFFER — And community grants now, how do you evaluate those? Or is that just largesse [inaudible], you run it?

Dr MATRUGLIO — There is a requirement that there is some evaluation undertaken by the councils. However, we are also cognisant of the fact that it is quite difficult to properly evaluate local crime prevention initiatives, if you like, so you cannot have your control, it is difficult to use recorded crime because they do not accurately measure it. But for example, if somebody green screens a wall and it is not graffitied again we can be pretty certain that it has been effective. I mean there are different ways that you might measure effectiveness at the local level and I think we need to be mindful of some qualitative input from police and council and community in relation to effectiveness when we try —

Mr SCHEFFER — Do you get to the country areas? Because a lot of our conversations are really city, urban-based.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Yes, absolutely.

Mr SCHEFFER — And there are a lot of resources and all the rest, but one of our problems has been where we do — country councils that just do not have the resources or the wherewithal to fund all this stuff. So do you work with them much?

Dr MATRUGLIO — We do; we will provide grants to regional council areas as part of this process. They are as entitled as every other council, and we do work very closely with them to develop their crime prevention plans as well. So if they come to us with a problem and they say we do not know what to do with this, we have officers who work quite closely with the councils to develop strategies.

The CHAIR — Do you have a question, Tim?

Mr McCURDY — No.

The CHAIR — Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

Mr CURRIE — I think that’s —

Dr MATRUGLIO — I am not sure. [laughing]
The CHAIR — Something that you are hiding, perhaps?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Yeah, I know. [laughing]

The CHAIR — So I will rephrase that. What recommendations could the committee make in regards to its final report? So you have seen the safe design guidelines, you have seen how we respond to CPTED in our state; is there anything you are doing well in this state or think that we can learn from or recommend to the parliament for an improvement?

Mr CURRIE — Well, I guess there is — so some of the things is with the establishing, the department establishing and ongoing funding of this centre, that is one.

The CHAIR — Can I ask, exactly how much money are we talking about?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Do we fund this centre?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Dr MATRUGLIO — It is $450,000 per annum.

The CHAIR — And it is a partnership?

Dr MATRUGLIO — It is a partnership.

The CHAIR — Yes. It was not on the top of your list I suspect.

Dr MATRUGLIO — The university provides funding.

The CHAIR — About half?

Dr MATRUGLIO — Pardon?

The CHAIR — About half?

Dr MATRUGLIO — About half, plus in kind, so they have a substantial — they are quite dedicated to it and contribute substantially as well to the operation of the unit.

The CHAIR — It is very reasonable, it is a lot of money.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Expanding — I mean with a view to developing products and getting income. It is meant to be a generating income unit. But that is the aim as it evolves and grows is to —

The CHAIR — Okay, design centre. What else do we need to know there?

Mr CURRIE — I guess along those lines is the idea of trying to bring together the different groups that are involved with development assessment and a training or education component is an idea, which is basically like the Safer By Design or it could be through university or whatever. And I guess the other one is the idea of the CPTED program and other grants programs is really directly related at applied problems and funding those and therefore informing councils as part of the project and the problem that they have got. So it is kind of a way of educating or together dealing with the issues at a local level. And then in terms of planning policy, I guess it is down to that idea of regulating and mandatory requirements and actually enforcing that through all or certain types of land uses or development across the state — being quite prescriptive in either certification of principles or requiring proponents to actually really sign off on report or some other documentation as part of applications. An alternative to mandatory requirements is to provide guidelines and principles for councils to incorporate as required in their local areas.

Dr MATRUGLIO — And I think it is about at the most basic level too, partnerships are really important as well. For example, with our strategic groups we have got industry, we have got council who will work on projects, we have got police on board who are actively involved in implementing strategies as well, so I think that —
[unidentifiable] — And their experience.

Dr MATRUGLIO — Yes, without that it would be more difficult.

The CHAIR — All right. Well, thank you both very much.

Witnesses withdrew.
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The CHAIR — On behalf of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee, of which you have met some of us before, we, apart from Johan and Tim, two other members are apologies today, they have been unable to come. However, we are pleased to be here because it has given us an opportunity to be able to access some of the speakers at the conference over the next few days and obviously for yourself as well. The enquiry is into crime preventing through environmental design and I suspect Sandy has given you plenty of background information. So I have in my notes here you are the Senior Project Coordinator of Safe City for the City of Sydney and we have allotted until 3:30 this session, so hopefully that sits in with your presentation.

While we are doing the mechanics I will quickly read you the rules of engagement in relation to your evidence. The evidence taken in this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, the provisions from reciprocal legislation of Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing you may not be afforded such a privilege. I assume you have read and received the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees. We are recording the evidence, — and Johan very capably has turned it on — and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. So that is the official work that has been — needed to be done.

Mr JOHNSTON — We are chasing up audio visual, it should not be before long.

The CHAIR — So John, we have — we do like to ask questions, so in part of your presentation if you would allow us at some point just to perhaps grab some things that are of interest to us, that we need some clarifying on or further questioning, and then at the end. But I do have to tell you I am fairly tight on the agenda, so —

Mr MAYNARD — Sure, okay.

The CHAIR — If we can aim to about 3:30 that would be good.

Mr MAYNARD — Fine.

The CHAIR — So I am looking at you now. We need the technology to start?

Mr MAYNARD — Or do you want to just ask me some questions while we are waiting for the technology?

The CHAIR — Or do you want to give us a bit of a background on yourself and the work you are doing?

Mr MAYNARD — Okay. I have been working in local government for about 13 years, in one of the original crime prevention roles which sort of began to be developed in New South Wales around about the early to mid '90s and probably towards the end of the '90s, early 2000s we saw a real establishment of this type of role, more broadly in local government but also across New South Wales Police as well, and I think the whole crime prevention through environmental school sort of came along and rode that wave as well.

So yes, I think crime prevention was certainly peaking in the early '90s, early 2000s. It was probably on the way for a period in the early part of the decade in the wake of the terrorism sort of debate, where more security, urgent emergency management type focus came into play more in terms of the broader world of safety and security. But since then I think it has made a comeback, and as we know it is complex, it is multifaceted, it requires a number of solutions amongst a number of players to achieve a number of desired outcomes, and certainly we like to think we are achieving some of those at the City of Sydney.

My particular role — I will just be a bit more specific about that — in terms of CPTED, basically we have a protocol between ourselves and New South Wales Police where we will provide comment to the types of CPTED settings which we think may carry some sort of crime or safety risk. I think that is where CPTED is still finding its way to some extent in terms of which
particular settings is it which it is most effective in. Because it is primarily a horses for courses type of discipline it's going to vary from place to place, site to site, location to location and it is also a game of collaboration, so in the sense that —

Mr SCHEFFER — Do you see that as a plus or a minus in the sense that one of our witnesses today was talking about — telling the committee about one of the difficulties with advancing things is that the different disciplines have got a different take on what CPTED is, and that is reflected in bureaucracies having silos around it and it being difficult to get a whole of government — of local government shift on it. But the other argument may be that the diversity is going to create some interesting outcomes. Our witness did not accept that that is a good proposition particularly, but what do you think?

Mr MAYNARD — I would agree with both of those points. I think —

Mr SCHEFFER — You should be in politics.

Mr MAYNARD — I played a very straight bat to that one. Look, it does rely on, particularly in a large institution it requires that internal champion to drive this type of thing home and who is that person, that the identified person is not always clear. I would certainly see that as my role in an organisation with 1600 employees, so in and of itself that could be a job, but of course we have got to do a broad range of crime prevention work which is not necessarily limited to crime prevention through environmental design. I think it is down the very bottom there. Can you scroll down any further?

Overheads shown.

Mr MAYNARD — It is the second last one, yes, that one. So it is a case of getting into those internal units, going to those staff rooms, presenting to those staff, looking at who is going to be the champion within that group to take it further from that particular arm of the council, and then going to the next unit and the next unit, whether it is urban design, whether it is strategic planning, whether it is planning and assessment, all sorts of areas can be involved in this type of work. So it is difficult sometimes when you get given facts like a development to comment on, because you are only commenting from your perspective.

So it will come on line to you as a folder, you get a big folder with all the maps and what is planned for that particular site and you go through it individually and you work out what you think are the safety and security issues, and you will send that off in a memo to that planner. That goes into the council report and then there is a resolution one way or another based on your comments. That to some extent is the restrictive side of it, whereas if you are in a room talking about that development with urban designers and strategic planners, with architects, with builders, developers, with police, where you can integrate those cross disciplines around the same table you are going to get a much better outcome. So it depends on the powers of persuasion and influence of whoever the identified champion is, I would say.

The CHAIR — All right, John, do you want to take us through the presentation?

Mr MAYNARD — Sure, I will just take you quickly through this. So one thing we have done in the city is set up design advisory panels, so where we do have some of these larger developments, we do have a structure internally to bring those players together, so that is something that has been organised, which we can do around this kind of stuff. This stuff, you are probably aware of so I probably will just race — that is the history of New South Wales, it is when the legislation came in, as I mentioned consolidation of these types of positions in local government and within the police. We have had the four day Safer By Design training course run by New South Wales Police since about the mid '90s I think. That remains pretty much the only professional development opportunity, which is a real limitation in terms of advancing this sort of agenda in our state.

The CHAIR — Can I just ask, have you spoken to the planning education facilities about whether they would be prepared to annex part of their course, part of it? Someone was saying that
Mr MAYNARD — I will go on to talk about some of our plans around that.

The CHAIR — Are you aware of it, or you do not know?

Mr MAYNARD — Not the Planning Institute per se.

The CHAIR — Or an architects’ college or —

Mr MAYNARD — We are working with the School of Criminology at Sydney University to develop some software, which will be an interactive online resource. I have got a slide which I can show you as it comes up, but yes, we are on to it, if you like, and all of the planners will tell us you have got to get this into your DCPs at the front end. By the time the development comes into council it is pretty much too late to say oh, this runs too much of a safety and security risk. Planners do not have the powers to approve or reject an application based on a lot of the crime and safety advice that they are given, because it is speculative by nature in many cases. So the key is really —

Mr SCHEFFER — So do the police agree with that?

Mr MAYNARD — Yes, I would say so. It depends on their understanding of the legislation. For example, one of the disconnects between police and planners is that they will provide advice and say well, we do not agree that this is a good development to have in this place because these things could happen. Now, our planning controls cannot say — well, we cannot approve or reject an application based on something —

Mr SCHEFFER — But do they not say this is not a good place for this development because these things have happened and this development will exacerbate it?

Mr MAYNARD — They can say that. Again, it depends on the particular set. So for example, we have examples where small bars will make an application. We have a bit of a — similar to Melbourne, we are taking on that issue of activating laneways and spaces with smaller bars, moving away from that sort of beer bar drinking mentality which causes a lot of crime and alcohol related problems in our public domain. Some local area commands will have a blanket policy of we do not want any more small bars because we do not want any more alcohol in our street, and that runs into conflict with our business community. If you say well, we want to activate our streets, we want economic development which is going to benefit all of us, and in that case we would invariably support the business argument because we cannot — we do not have the powers to reject things based on crimes which may happen. It is always the big challenge of crime prevention, is it not, how do you actually prove that your intervention has had some sort of positive effect when something has not happened?

Then each individual council, including ourselves, will develop a CPTED protocol between ourselves and the police, so we will get those particular developments out around particular settings, get those comments coming back and work — I will go on to talk a little bit more about how that works. Now, I think I mentioned earlier, CPTED can be applied in a lot of settings and obviously not all of these settings apply to the local government development assessment process. So the transport interchanges is something of a state government domain; it is an area where people often feel unsafe. It is often a place where would be offenders can congregate, mill about, look to take advantage of people who may be lost, finding their way, walking around with earphones on on their iPhones and so forth, but that is not something we would look at.

So something I have developed is this design guide, which takes you through a range of settings that this kind of CPTED can be applied in. I did the Safer By Design course back in the late '90s; I came away with it thinking what am I going to go and say to my planners about what this is all about? So I basically wrote this guide and went about selling this internally, putting these types of measures into our development control plans based on planning advice and based on police advice in terms of how we could embed this within our institution.

I think the beauty of this kind of stuff is that it illustrates very well, so visually it is quite stunning. So for example, where we get an ATM, this is an example of an application which may come in or
may not come in. Sometimes a bank will make a formal development application to us about where to position an ATM. Sometimes it will just go in. So some of the settings are a bit loose in terms of where we need to make an application or not. You can see there some of the examples of design which may influence somebody with the wrong intentions in that area. We have — skimming is quite a common crime with the ATM machine; people will put a small camera — the police tell us people will put a small camera into that device that will then take your particulars from your PIN card and five minutes later your credit card has been reproduced in places like Hong Kong and then used to access your funds. It all happens very quickly.

One of the settings we are finding we are applying CPTED increasingly is in our apartment living environments. Now, Sydney, like many cities, is gentrifying rapidly, many of our old manufacturing and industrial, brown fields sites are being reclaimed for medium density development. We have got 100,000 people in our local government area living in apartments, that is about 75 per cent, and in another 20 years or so we will have another 80,000 squeezed into our city and most of them in turn will be living in apartments as well, something that would have been unthinkable to our grandparents' generation that families would be growing up in apartments.

The types of crimes that we get in these types of areas according to the police, as you can see the basement car park, somebody lurking in the shadows behind the landscaping and then following the vehicle into the car park and committing multiple steal from motor vehicle offences. When a policeman then has to go to his senior command and present his crime statistics, his or her crime statistics for that month, it often boils down to the one address; you can have multiple offences happening at the one address. So we are trying — again, in our development control plans to have our developers look at how they have assessed this type of issue prior to making the application.

The other really common crime in those types of settings is the cat burglar. It is not uncommon according to again, our local police, for the would-be offender to climb nine, ten storeys. You get a summer night, people with their balcony doors open, and when we took this to our urban designers, they were interested because they said when a person has the sliding door on their veranda open on a hot summer night, when it starts to rain they have got to shut the door just to prevent the rain getting in and then that then does not satisfy the ventilation requirement for that development. So they were interested to know that well, we could maybe put something in — you can see the bottom left hand corner, like a louvered security device, that is what we call a standard condition of consent. Have you heard that expression in your dealings? It is basically a more specific point made within your development control plan for this type of setting.

So we would say to a developer, what types of security measures are you putting on your veranda doors? We would recommend you put something like that and you need to satisfy that requirement to have this development approved. So just giving you some examples of where we're finding this type of thing can be effective. There is certainly an issue around how you educate developers around considering crime prevention prior to putting the application in. So you can see - I'll just grab my pointer here - so you see just with this photo montage here, the types of images that they have got coming in here, you can see you can step pretty easily into the front veranda there. There is a great natural ladder going up there from where the climbing vine is placed, you have got obviously people who are affluent coming in and out, and you have even got somebody in the front here, if you can see, he looks to be casing the joint.

But this is the type of image that will come in and we will challenge and say well, for a would be offender that looks pretty appetising. Something that you may have heard of also which is within our legislation is the formal crime risk assessment that a developer can actually go through a series of questions, a checklist, a process to really assess what that environment is like in terms of its crime and put that in to support the application. I do not know if you have spoken to anyone from Sydney Institute of Criminology but they have been doing some research for us into these types of reports that are coming in from developers.

What we are seeing is that of 33 reports that have been looked at, 80 per cent have shown no adverse findings in relation to crime at all, and in fact we are seeing a pretty glowing commentary about any proposed development in these types of sites. We have even seen some companies subverting the process by cutting and pasting the same crime prevention, crime risk assessment
report from one setting and lifting it into another setting, and very little consultation with the New South Wales Police in terms of putting this development in. But having said that, police are pretty sensitive about the kind of information they sometimes release about crime safety at specific sites, so that can also make it difficult for the developer to actually include that type of information in their application.

Mr SCHEFFER — I thought that was — talking to the police about certain types of proposals like apartment blocks, for example, was obligatory.

Mr MAYNARD — So do we.

Mr SCHEFFER — Oh, okay, we agree then.

Mr MAYNARD — You would think so, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — So some of them just ignore that particular step?

Mr MAYNARD — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — But when it comes to you as the responsible authority over the plans, would you go to the police or do you ask them if they have done it?

Mr MAYNARD — We would ensure that the police received that type of application, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr MAYNARD — And so this is where perhaps we need some sort of review of our existing legislation in New South Wales because we took this research back to planning and New South Wales had said well, look, there are people getting around this process, we need to tighten it up a bit, and their response was we are not responsible, it is a local government issue.

Something I wanted to mention about CPTED is it is not just about crime per se, it is also about a sense of neighbourliness. So one thing we always say when we are looking at making safer communities, if you were to imagine what a safe community looks like, you would probably see people walking and cycling around the streets. You would see neighbours talking to one another over the fence. You would see people gathering in communal areas. You would see people meeting in organised spaces and around common interests. That is something we have tried to build into our development control plans. We want to encourage that social interaction; we want to put developers on notice around what kind of communities they are actually trying to develop here beyond the bricks and mortar — how are people going to interact on a social level in these types of environments?

So you can see the top right hand picture, for example, a good example of an internal courtyard. It is only accessible by an access key card from level one. You can see there will eventually be some shade trees in there, there are barbecues, there is a pond which provides a point of interest, a good space for people to interact which is useful. In some instances you will just get a patch of lawn and people will — again, the applicant will say this is a great place for people to socialise but there is not really a lot there to attract people. Bottom right hand corner you can see something we are trying to get into our control plans around where you have a minimum of say 50 units in one building you will have to have a meeting room.

You have issues around some people only being able to access their level only, so if you live on level five your card will only get you to level five, which affects people's ability to interact with the people in their building. That is fine if you are a private person and you want to keep to yourself, but if there is a fire in your building, for example, how do you notify your neighbours? Modern living means we have got a lot more timber floorboards in our new apartment snow, you are getting the heels, the shoes on the ceiling up above as an issue. It does not really bother people greatly but it is a good opportunity to say to your neighbour oh look, if you would not mind taking your shoes off when you get home, just be conscious of that.
As we become a more densely concentrated city, noise is an increasingly big problem. People will call the council in increasing numbers about the party next door, the party up above, whatever it is. So we are advocating for meeting rooms down the bottom there or multipurpose soundproofed rooms where you can have your party, where you can invite your neighbours, where you can have your kid's birthday party. Whatever it is, you provide that space so that people are not annoying each other in their own private environments. And of course, the rooftop approach to the green roofs is something they are really pushing too. It is interactive and also promotes that sustainable living environment around growing your own fruit and vegetables and gardens and things like that.

Something we are also doing is developing checklists, that is just a very short summary of one of the ones I have done. So that is a completed checklist, that goes off to our city parks people and that is — so I will go to their staff meeting, I will present to them around the kind of issues around safety in parks, they will integrate that, these types of principles into their planning and I will comment on those types of things, because again parks is one of those areas where antisocial behaviour often predominates. How do you bring the checklist to life, though? It is pretty boring to sort of run through a checklist and expect people to do that.

Something we are looking to develop, and this is in light of the lack of professional development opportunities in this field at the moment. In the UK they have got a unit called Secure by Design. Basically, you can click on — it is not a very good image because these types of sites are very well-controlled and a lot of the online courses that exist around information and education for CPTED are payment only. So you have this chicken and egg issue of do you pay for something that you cannot see, and when you pay for it and you see it and it is not really what you are after; this is one of the challenges that we have.

At the City we are at the point now where we are thinking let us develop our own software, our own technology. You click on a neighbourhood development, it will bring up a checklist of all the types of things you should consider when you are looking at your home security, from the point of view of a thief. You can click on an apartment block, you can click on a retail store, transport interchange, whatever it is, and that way we can then, at the front of the development application process we can have the checklist, which most councils will already have a checklist for all the things the developer has to tick off prior to submitting their application to council.

One of those we hope to bring in will be I have looked at the online City of Sydney Safer By Design course for apartment living, that brings up the checklist for that particular application and then the developer will have to prove in some shape or form how they have applied what they have learnt to their application. So again, it is bringing it all in at the front end, because by the time it gets to the planners, or our strategic planners, we are not really in a position to approve or reject something. It is more general comments for consideration that you would hope that the applicant would go away and amend in some form or shape. So that is pretty exciting.

We are at the point now where we do not know whether we can get a licence for an existing product, so we modify something that already exists to suit our own ends, or we have to develop the product ourselves, which will obviously be more costly and take longer, but which we could certainly perhaps sell or provide or promote to other people who might use it. Because it is not just a local government issue, this, it is obviously for developers, it is obviously for police, for planners, urban designers and architects as well.

So I have just got a couple more slides here. These are the issues that I think are existing in New South Wales around CPTED. I mentioned earlier that the legislation itself has not been reviewed since it came in; that is probably long overdue. The only professional development opportunity is the four day course run by New South Wales Police, Safer By Design. It does not have any formal accreditation as a course, although they would claim that it does, but they are the police. It has not gone through a specific accreditation process which recognised courses need to go through.

Mr SCHEFFER — Are there any — because we were discussing that earlier, are there any proposals for courses that would be accredited, that would then, by virtue of being accredited, act as some kind of incentive for planners and others to undertake?
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Mr MAYNARD — Well, we hope to, from the software that we developed, to develop a course out of that.

Mr SCHEFFER — An accredited course?

Mr MAYNARD — Whether it is accredited or not we are not sure because accreditation is a bit of a process to go through and you have got to obviously prove that there is enough demand for the course to get the accreditation, whether it is actually worth going through that process. So that is one of the challenges around accreditation. That course that has been running for four days has a limited take-up. We cannot get our — I think we have got ten per cent of our planners, I think we have got over 100 planners at the City of Sydney, maybe ten per cent of them have done Safer By Design, because it is a four day course so they just — they baulk at taking on a course of that length. We have spoken to the police about modifying it, having a reduced type of course and maybe it would be good to have an evaluation of that course because it has been running now for over a decade and we are still not seeing how effective it is.

Certainly from where local government sits we would like to have some input into that course, because a lot of it is not always relevant to ourselves. For example, you might spend half a day on street lighting. Lighting is a specific area of expertise for a lighting engineer. I can go out with my community and various stakeholders and look at areas and see, well, it looks a bit dark, but it is not my job to go into that street and recommend what kind of lighting to go into that particular site because, as I said, it is not my area of expertise and we want to leave this stuff to the experts where possible. You have got inconsistent levels of expertise where that professional development is not being taken up, so for example we have seven police local area commands within our local government area.

Two of those crime prevention officers in those commands have not done any training at all in CPTED in that they have not done their four day course, yet. They have enrolled to do it. But they are still commenting on applications that are coming in, which means there is a bit of inconsistent advice being provided because there is that varying levels of understanding around what it is. I mentioned earlier about crime data for developers and architects around how they can actually make a proper assessment of the environment in the area that their application is going into, because the information is not always at hand. I mentioned before it is really important to stay on top of embedding this stuff within your DCP and continuing to maintain it, so it needs that internal champion to ensure that it continues to be up to date within the development control plan and more broadly across the council culture. Again, often the problem we have with the police, we have got the staff turnover and it affects the area of expertise and different police commanders will have a different understanding, a different take on how effective this type of work is.

Last slide, where do we go from here? Let us review the legislation, let us see if we can modify it in some shape or form which might support local government a little bit more, they could tighten up a bit. Development of the online resource, which I mentioned, so that we can improve the skills in the sector. Updating our development control plans and standing conditions. We will have our online checklists as part of that application coming in, so that we can see that the applicant has taken these types of crime and safety issues into consideration prior to lodging their assessment. We need that champion internally, whether it is someone in my type of role or someone else to provide the conduit between the police and our planning departments.

So for example, if you get a development for say 300 units, it would normally go off to an individual officer to comment and then it would come back to the planner who would then collate all the comments and put it into the council report. In some of those instances there is a case where I said to make it more of a collaborative approach, to bring all those disciplines together; let us hear what the different voices are saying, come to a common understanding about what we think is the best outcome for this particular development. Because the successful implementation of CPTED is essentially good town planning, and as we said, I also want to try and integrate these types of principles more into the academic environment. It is fairly well entrenched in our criminology courses in masters and undergraduate level at University of New South Wales and at Sydney University, but we are not getting into those architecture departments as yet, and I think that is a bit of a hole.
Mr SCHEFFER — So how would — like is that something that this centre can play a role in?

Mr MAYNARD — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Who would drive it? It could only be them, could it not? Because it is not really a city council's job to push that?

Mr MAYNARD — Not exactly, but we are certainly using our existing contacts through the School of Criminology at Sydney University. So they have given us advice on some real experts around gaming and CAD drawing and new technologies around interactive online environments. We are at the point where we are putting out an expression of interest, who will come forward and give us the product that we are after. Once we have got that, we can then take that to an architecture department and say well, we really need your expertise here to actually fit into this field and we hope we can actually bring architecture and criminology in that way.

Mr SCHEFFER — So you think as a unit in the university as part of a faculty, it would have more traction on sort of a standalone one that you were developing or that the police had developed?

Mr MAYNARD — I think so. As I said, it is a collaborative type discipline, so it should not be limited to a particular faculty at a particular campus at university. And it is incumbent I think on universities to develop partnerships across faculties in any case where there is that common ground around whatever it is. So we are interested in how those inter-faculty relationships operate at the tertiary level as well. So thank you, that is all I have got to say in my presentation.

The CHAIR — Very good. Thank you, John, and thank you for providing the book.

Mr McCURDY — Yes, where did you say you — who has got the copy of this, who have you distributed this?

Mr MAYNARD — I just give that to anybody who wants it, so it is not a formal council document because it applies to settings, like I said, which are not under local government control. But I am in the process of condensing that into these checklists.

Mr McCURDY — So the online checklist or the just —

Mr MAYNARD — Yes, and also in the training so that you can click on it and the checklist will come up, and the checklist will also be brought to life. So it may be that you put yourself into the mind of the thief and you then negotiate that environment as a thief, you can rob the shop and break into someone's home, and then you can go back through around appropriate design where it sort of blocks you off at all these points.

Mr McCURDY — That is right, so they can show you what they have done.

Mr MAYNARD — Yes, it is fun and it is interactive, and as I said, this stuff illustrates well, so we should actually try and build on that and get away from these sort of formal text documents which are pretty hard to wade through, as you would know.

Mr McCURDY — Because you would nearly — if somehow you could prioritise what your biggest threats are in a particular region or what your — I suppose you can sort of spell out the characteristics of your area that you are talking about before you actually move into that because, as we have heard earlier today, there are different answers for different crime spots, is there not?

Mr MAYNARD — Exactly, yes.

Mr McCURDY — Not everything is the same.
Mr MAYNARD — Yes, it is very much a horses for courses, site specific type of discipline.

The CHAIR — So you are winning the battle?

Mr MAYNARD — We think we are now, yes. We have got a good relationship with the postgrad criminology school at Sydney University, so now we have regular interns coming in who pick up this work. So someone will get it to a certain stage and then we bring in the next lot and they will continue it on. So it is a difficult thing for someone in my position to take on because it is very specific and obviously we have got lots of things going across our local government area which do not necessarily relate to the physical or social environment. So yes, it is sustaining it that way rather than taking on new staff or trying to get to it when you can.

The CHAIR — So do you think the facility here is complementary to that work with getting those stakeholders to think about the CPTED principles?

Mr MAYNARD — Yes, definitely, definitely. I mean, this type of organisation can embed that collaborative aspect of CPTED more broadly than someone in a particular council can. We have done a bit of work with DAC around problem laneways, we have done some work with them in Kings Cross where we have had some problems with alcohol-related antisocial behaviour, heavy concentrations, advice that has been used which have been given licences in recent years, so there is suddenly this dense concentration which has caused a lot of antisocial issues, in the public domain largely. So that has really influenced the way that we managed that site now.

So we now have, just for example, 20,000 people going into Kings Cross on a Friday and Saturday, every night, which is as many as you get to a game of footy. You know when you have been to a sporting event the types of security that you see, the presence, your televisions and your police everywhere, and your transport police and so forth. And so we have actually had to change our thinking from what are we going to do about responsible service of alcohol and taxis and transport home and improving the public domain and so forth, but also to looking at it more as an event; how do we actually manage the crowd in this situation. So it is a different way of thinking and I think Design Out Crime skill has a — is a good way to sort of influence that. For a good end.

The CHAIR — All right, thanks very much, John.

Mr MAYNARD — Thank you, a pleasure.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thanks a lot.

Mr MAYNARD — Yes, thanks Johan. If you need any more help, please let me know.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — The rules of engagement in relation to that, in relation to that, so are you aware of that?

Mr BIRDS — Yes.

The CHAIR — And it is of your right of course if you do not wish to be taped, well, we will respect that. But it is only for our purposes, our committee purposes and obviously the findings or some of the conversation will be recorded in our report. So the evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation of other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege.

Now, have you read or received the Guide for Witnesses Presenting Evidence to Parliamentary Committees or noted a copy of?

Mr BIRDS — Yes.

The CHAIR — We are reporting the evidence and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate.

Mr BIRDS — Okay.

The CHAIR — Now, David, can I get your official title?

Mr BIRDS — Yes. I am Acting Director, Policy Coordination in the New South Wales state government Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

The CHAIR — Right, well I hope Pete has got that down, I got halfway through it.

Mr BIRDS — I can repeat that or provide that again if you like.

The CHAIR — And now it is Tatjana, is it not?

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — Tatjana Djuric-Simovic. I am a senior planner and I assist the team in the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

The CHAIR — Thank you both for coming along. I appreciate it. Now, we have allotted time to 4:15 and we do have to respect that for the fact that we have got to get on a plane very soon afterwards, so if we can work to that time frame. How we have done this in previous witnesses is fairly flexible in that you might want to make a contribution, a presentation to us, and then we will raise some questions out of that or we can question as you go. Or if you just want us to ask questions, it might be useful just to give us a bit of backgrounding from your perspective and then we can perhaps ask some questions out of that.

Mr BIRDS — Okay. Look, as you commented, I am afraid we have not put a presentation on today. It has been a little bit short notice for us to organise something but we are more than happy to answer questions and talk around the issue, I guess, as we have been dealing with it in New South Wales. I get the impression from some of the background I have seen that you are aware that we have a guideline at the moment which has been in operation for many years, state government produced with some CPTED principles in it and obviously councils use that — or I say obviously; perhaps that is something we might talk about because you will probably be interested in it. But essentially, the way things work in the state is we produce that guideline, it is available for councils as a consideration.

The heading of it, I think, which I assume you have got a copy of, or we can provide you if you do not, is as a consideration under section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act of 1979. The way our Act works, as again you may have been advised before or may indeed know, essentially sets out the heads of consideration when you assess a development application. So in a sense, whilst we have a guideline there it’s referenced in the context of assessing a development application, so that does that make that connection. Although the guideline itself is
not a legal document, it is something that we produced, and then it outlines how CPTED issues and crime prevention and design issues might be considered when the council assesses a development application.

Mr SCHEFFER — Could I just interrupt?

Mr BIRDS — Sure.

Mr SCHEFFER — You did talk about the standing of 79C earlier and that is not a legal document I understand?

Mr BIRDS — Yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Does that mean if let us say it was known that the police had a particular view on a development, and the council — the developer thought well, it is just a guideline, we do not care, and in the end it was built, that somebody could say look, this was brought to the attention, but now this event has occurred which has affected public safety or whatever, and then they could use that as a ground in a court?

Mr BIRDS — I think — I mean the way things tend to work is, because 79C is broadly crafted for the number of considerations that is captured by the general considerations of the sort of social, economic and environmental or general considerations anyway. We find practice in the state tends to be that a number of guidelines which we produce on all sorts of things get referenced and in our Land and Environment Court, which deals with appeals and the like, the court has generally given a lot of substance to guidelines that the government has prepared. So it is given a consideration and status in that way. The quantification of it maybe depends on the relevance of the issues against many others of balance and consideration and so on and so forth, but our guidelines do get referenced typically by the court so they hold them in some regard and clearly we produce as them as state planners, so we have that expertise.

Mr SCHEFFER — Does that mean, given that the courts do take them seriously and if there is an issue before the court they would draw that into their —

Mr BIRDS — It would commonly and I'm not speaking about this guideline specifically now, and I have not got any examples on it but that is — the court would look — someone would typically raise it as an issue. I mean it would have been a head of consideration anyway and no doubt if that was an issue in the matter before the court they would look at it. Essentially, that's our main document. I mean, we have — we also call the issue up in our — what we call SEPP 65 which is a residential apartment guidance; it might have been mentioned to you by others as well. We referenced the heads of consideration in that, and we are actually reviewing that at the moment; there will be something issued on that very soon. In fact, I think we cross reference it in some of the documents associated with that guidance at the moment. We do not propose to lose that connection and the importance of that issue in the design of our flat buildings, but that is going to be looked at afresh.

So broadly that's the way we go. We have also got some town centres design guidelines which are in draft at the moment, which again make reference to some CPTED issues, and when they come out in due course the likelihood is that that would remain the case. So I guess we do it by reference to guidelines. We do not have a statutory planning instrument like our local environmental plan which has it directly embedded. We find that — and I must admit, a lot of it would be anecdotal in a sense, but councils do use the guidelines and we find typically councils also pick up and take it a step further and produce their own development control plans. You might again have heard, I think the City of Sydney is speaking to you and they have certainly done some work there.

Councils tend to pick it up and look at it that way. They work with the local police command, which again you might have spoken to the police, and they outline that. So yes, that's broadly how it works and our understanding is that it's working reasonably well, that councils pick up on it and use it in their assessment, but I guess I would have to qualify that by the fact that we are not directly involved in that process so I do not have hard information on how many DAs have been assessed by a certain amount of councils in a certain way. We have had a little feedback from
some councils with an interest in perhaps the updating of it and taking it forward, and I suppose I should preface all of this by saying we're designing our Planning Act at the moment, as you might be aware.

**The CHAIR** — So are we.

**Mr BIRDS** — Yes, indeed. So look, you know, it will always remain a consideration. Exactly how it is dealt with in our new planning system I could not really say at the moment but we certainly feel that it is an issue and continues to be one.

**The CHAIR** — What's your relationship with the Ministry of Justice like? Do you -- how do you interact in relation to -- --

**Mr BIRDS** — Look, we have had some involvement on issues. At the moment we're not actively working with them on this design issue. There has been discussion from time to time about reviewing stuff and I know there are the guidances that have been done by the police themselves, I think, is it not, have got a guideline. But if you like, I suppose this is not an issue that we are actively working on at the moment in the department. We have got a guideline and that has been working but I think really the issue for the us is because we are redesigning the planning system we will be looking at all of these issues and guidelines and how they work in the new system in the coming months, but it is probably not the right time for us to be sort of working on the detail of exactly how it works at the moment until we have got the bigger picture established.

**The CHAIR** — You never know, we might be able to negotiate a sale of the report to the New South Wales government people once we have concluded ours and save you some time.

**Mr BIRDS** — I think we are running -- there are little parallels there, are there not, in some of them?

**The CHAIR** — Well, I think there is. I mean, we are both reviewing our planning, we are sort of -- --

**Mr BIRDS** — We find that on a lot of things at the moment.

**The CHAIR** — So the enquiry is not so much about investigating CPTED principles as such, even though it's part of your work, it's the Safer Design Guidelines that local councils use and we are sort of trying to work out how much effort is being put into use of those guidelines.

**Mr BIRDS** — Yes. Well, I guess like I was saying, to some extent I guess the information is largely anecdotal and from experience the various department officers and others dealing with our councils, but it is something that we — the feedback we get from our councils is that our guideline is seen as positive and I guess, as I say, they have been taking it a step forward in a number of councils in their DCPs. But there is an issue for us in the new planning system about how DCPs sit and how they are integrated with what would be our new local environmental plan, which will become a different thing, a local land use plan, how guidances sit with that and how you get consistency across the state, because obviously we have got 150 or so councils. In the same way that we looked at the standardisation of the local plan, then obviously there are issues about guidance as well.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — How do you, given the breadth of the councils, and leaving aside the review of the legislation that you are starting out on and where you are up to with that. Can you group the councils? We sort of have got some interest in smaller rural councils and their capacity to implement the guidelines or aspects the guidelines; compared, for example, to the City of Sydney, irrespective of course they have got a lot of tools at their disposal, and resources.

**Mr BIRDS** — Yes, of course.

**Mr SCHEFFER** — How — it may be outer suburban ones out of Sydney, could you talk to us about that?
Mr BIRDS — Well, I mean a lot of the stuff — well, it is really being reactive. We have guidance out there, a lot of it relates I suppose to urban design and the sort of things, typically the apartments inevitably are about intensification of design in an urban area. I am not aware of major issues being brought to us on this in the regions, certainly in the rural regions. There is an issue about the capacity of councils to do this kind of stuff anyway. We encourage councils to work with the local police command and to get to build up an expertise. I do not think we are particularly aware of any council that has come to us with a difficulty with it, but clearly councils like the City of Sydney have an enormous ability, far greater than a typical rural council to assess in that way. But then they have different issues as well that they are dealing with.

Mr SCHEFFER — See, and I sort of said it in context also, we travelled to New Zealand and we travelled to Palmerston North, which is a town, it is a provincial or a regional town, the size of which would be replicated right across the region of New South Wales, and there they had very significant issues for their town and they were able to come to quite interesting solutions and accommodations of those problems. So that kind of raised the issue for us, we have got Ballarat and Geelong and Bendigo and Traralgon and we have got some — Mildura — we have got some biggish towns and they have a set of issues as well. So you do not have that kind of categorisation or —

Mr BIRDS — We do not have any formal structure around that. I mean, I suppose interestingly that we encourage high quality design, but we would encourage local design solutions, we would encourage councils to build an expertise in that area, but if they do not have it, we have regional offices of the department. They would speak with the regional office. It may be that they would get some help through the regional office team, albeit we do not have a design service that we make available in the broad sense, but we do have an element of expertise in the department. We have got a couple of recent DCPs obviously, and again they are in sort of urban areas but councils are looking at building some crime design issues and advice on that into their DCPs. They would get assistance from our regional team on that if they asked for it, but I suppose people do tend to look for models rather than reinvent the wheel. But we have encouraged that local sort of approach.

Mr SCHEFFER — Simon asked you about the relationship with your department and the police.

The CHAIR — Ministry of Justice.

Mr SCHEFFER — Ministry of Justice, sorry. What about Premier's, is that — sorry, I have not got the structure right.

Mr BIRDS — Do you mean the Attorney-General's?

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, Attorney-General's, that is —

Mr BIRDS — Yes. Well, the Attorney — our Attorney-General's have had a look at this in recent times and we did do a bit of work with them earlier in the year. At the moment we are not actively working with them on it. I think they were looking at some guidance on not just planning and design but in the broader sense. But that is not something we are pursuing right now and I suppose going through the planning review as well and there is an issue of where your resources are applied, what is the core business and what is critical. I suppose to some extent we are hearing that things appear to be working reasonably well on this, although no doubt there is scope for improvements.

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — Just perhaps I — just to clarify, this guidance that we have had and clause 79C is not directly asking council to develop any design guidance for crime prevention, that because we are asking clause 79C, in this subsection we are asking councils or consent authority to consider the likely impacts on development, including the environmental impact on the natural and built environments and social and economic impacts on the locality and the public interest, and crime prevention falls under this subsection 79C. It gives council freedom and initiative to develop their own detailed guidance related to that. Normally it will be contained
within their — we call them environmental planning instruments but they are not legally binding, and these are developing control plans.

Mr BIRDS — I suppose it is an issue that obviously local councils are very live to. They see local design and crime, clearly are always considerations when councils are dealing with development applications, they do not want to create difficulties. So there is quite a bit of interest in them.

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — We left to council a sort of alert with this one, that when they are assessing development applications this is what section 79C is about. We say to have a look and it says any sort of possibility to do crime prevention with design, but the rest was left to councils to develop detailed proposals.

Mr SCHEFFER — What I am wrestling with here, because I do not have anything like the knowledge you guys have got, but what I am wrestling with is as an example in Victoria, if a proponent wishes to establish a liquor outlet, a council that may have an objection to it can only object in terms of traffic congestion, for example. But they cannot argue on community wellbeing, so they cannot argue about public health. So an argument has been put that that should be an objective of the plan, the community welfare, and that would then enable councils to say we have already got six of these things, we have got social levels [unclear 17:43.9] obviously done today. Now, using that as an analogy, what I am hearing what you are saying, councils are open or encouraged to use this tool, but the kind of question I am trying to probe is what kind of a lever does that give you? Because we do hear that developers really just pay lip service to all these guidelines, that they are really treated fairly carelessly, and so what sort of levers are there to — because you want incentives, you want people working together, you want all those good things to happen but there is also a role for government and the law to provide a bit of toughening up on that. So it is that balance that I am a bit interested in.

Mr BIRDS — Yes, I suppose as Tatjana mentioned — I am sure we can give you the document if you do not — but page two of it we talk about this section 79C, which is a sort of catch all for what — if you are assessing a DA, an officer will look at that and say have I covered these things. And we make it very clear here because it says the environmental impact, the social and economic and public interest, pretty broad, then we actually go on to make the connection in this, saying crime prevention falls under these subsections of 79C. I mean that statement is made in the guidance. So you then go to council — sorry, I guess I am quoting from it now — councils have an obligation to ensure that development provides safety and security to users and the community. Now that is something that I guess someone might read that out in a Land and Environment Court hearing if they wished, if it is an issue. So you get that connection through that. We see it as an important consideration.

Mr SCHEFFER — And you are saying that the court has taken a fairly — has been cognisant of that?

Mr BIRDS — Well, I cannot — I must admit I have not done the search to see if they have made that ruling on this, but as a rule they do look at our guidelines —

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes.

Mr BIRDS — And treat them with consideration. I think it is probably fair that — I am not sure that we are as explicit in all our guidelines as we are in this one, by saying this is a 79C issue.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr BIRDS — But we see it as an important design issue, and design is part and parcel of what you look at when you assess a DA. So it is important; I suppose it depends on the facts of the case. It is always going to be the issue.

Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, true.
MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — It could be also that at the moment our zoning system is — if I may say so, it has really developed to the point where it is separating different uses, so it is less of a mixed use. When —

Mr SCHEFFER — Sorry, what do you mean by separating different —

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — Land uses, residential.

Mr SCHEFFER — Oh yes, land uses, yes.

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — From business, from offices and from commercial — well, you would find liquor stores. So in that way our liquor stores would be located exclusively in the very controlled area of business zones. So I do not have detailed knowledge. Normally —

Mr SCHEFFER — I was just using it as an example.

MS DJURIC-SIMOVIC — I am saying because the more mixed uses you have, the more you will have issues like that, opening a liquor store in let us say residential areas. At the moment we do have this segregation of uses which sort of eliminates the problem, brings other issues with that. But it sort of our residential zones are pretty sterile, and they say it is sort of protecting residential amenity and this close contact between. If you are giving this example, for example in the profile of a liquor store whatever it brings with it, in terms of the residential area. It is sort of controlled at the moment, but we do look now with the planning reforms, so opening out a bit and having more urban areas where there is more mixed uses as we call, which is sort of more residential and business commercial together.

Mr BIRDS — I think that is right. We are looking at more density, hence the apartment building guidance and putting people living closer to each other and in mixed use areas, and how do we deal with that, and again part of the planning system reviews about how do you deal with mixed use zoning and the layer of uses and people living in closer contact with other business uses going on. So in that sense you are assessing DAs where something might be permissible which has a potential conflict with an adjoining use, so our guidance becomes really useful and important, and that may be something — I guess I have mentioned, we are looking at the centre’s design guidance. We are reviewing our apartment guidance and design for crime is part and parcel of all that work. Liquor licensing, obviously we have got the dual licensing system as well here, and there are a number of issues about how we assess those things, which are an interesting one for big discussions as well.

The CHAIR — We had a similar situation in Ballarat where Coles were wanting to build yet another branch Liquorland. Ballarat has got high unemployment, quite a number of social demographic issues, and the council to its credit decided it would not, despite a huge outcry because of the potential jobs, and decided not to permit or allow the application. So there is flexibility in the system to make some assessments. I was going to ask you a question following on from Johan, but Tim, I want to give you an opportunity.

Mr McCURDY — No, no.

The CHAIR — So the discussion we have had today and previously is about — it seems to me CPTED — everyone seems to think it is okay, it does not need a lot of tinkering, and different states have underlined the different guidelines that they work on; ours is the Safer Design stuff. But at local government level, which — well, our enquiry seems to be more active in in that space is about the educational process, about those planners making decisions in relation to accepting the Safer Design Guidelines, in our state anyway. So I am wondering, I am asking you — we have heard about the police being actively involved in providing short courses, though it has no accreditation in the education sphere. Given the current weaknesses, what can you suggest to us that we could improve the system where local councils could have a better understanding of the guidelines and appropriate that to applications that come forward? But having said that, we are told that that process is already pretty well sorted out before it gets — when it gets to that stage, so it actually needs to be applied to that...
stage, and I am wondering — I know it is horses for courses on councils but our role is to examine
and recommend more involvement from local councils in respecting the CPTED principles and the
Safer Design Guidelines. That is a very longwinded question — I am beginning to hear myself in
there to stop, Simon — but I am trying to get to a point where we can walk away today hearing
everything we have said and probably clear in our minds that these are the sort of things we need to
look at.

Mr BIRDS — Look, I guess as I said at the beginning, we do not have a lot of hard
information about how it is going day to day in every council in the state, but we feel we have set
up something which appears to be working insofar as councils are assessing their DAs taking this
guidance that we have done in mind and they are getting expertise from their local force on how to
do things. Some councils are referring DAs to their local forces.

One of the things we do for some of the bigger DAs that government assess is that we require the
proponent to do a proper crime assessment as part of his DA, and you will see in — we talk about
for the bigger DAs our guidance invites councillors to require that as well. We actually have a bit
of discretion in there as to what council considers to be a larger DA anyway, and again there is
probably an element of fact and degree depending on the nature of what it is. I think we referenced
a couple of examples of what might be a big form of development to which it might apply, if I
have got the right document. But yes, so I suppose there is an issue which you alluded to about the
smaller councils without the expertise. We are not hearing a lot about that, if it is an issue. I guess
if we were we would be here looking at it.

The CHAIR — They might not be doing anything.

Mr BIRDS — I beg your pardon?

The CHAIR — They might not be doing anything.

Mr BIRDS — They may not be, but by the same token we are not hearing that there is a
problem from the lack of appropriate assessment. But yes, I cannot comment on that, I do not have
that information. We do know there is a lot of good work being done and there is an issue of
course about how many assessments and how many layers of information your require. We do not
want to require more than is appropriate because obviously there is a cost associated with doing an
assessment. You mentioned accreditation; we do not accredit people at the moment but there is an
issue around that for regulation and the cost of that as well, if you go down that road. Sorry, I am
not sure that I can add an awful lot more, to be honest, but I am happy to talk about things around
that if —

Mr SCHEFFER — I can make another departure, unless you want to follow that.

The CHAIR — Well, can I ask just one quick question. There has been talk about —

Mr SCHEFFER — You are the Chair, you go.

The CHAIR — Mandating to actually get councils to get involved, have you got a view
about that?

Mr BIRDS — Well, only that we do not — I suppose no, at the moment we are not
changing where we are with this. Perhaps as a part of our review of the planning system we might
look at the arrangements but I guess just as a comment, there is a cost associated with these things
sometimes if you mandate them, from the proponent's perspective. But also there is a resourcing
issue out of council. So there has been good work done and say our regional officers can help
councils that may not have that expertise and I am sure people will look at other guidances that
have been done in other places and learn from that.

The CHAIR — Thank you.
Mr SCHEFFER — I just wanted to ask about the Design Out Crime Research Centre here, and how you, if you do, as a department relate to the work that the centre doing. Is it informing policy, or just generally?

Mr BIRDS — I guess it is probably fair to say at this stage we are not actively looking at revising the policy and the guidance. So my team, which deals with broader policy work, is not doing that. I have colleagues who are working on more detailed design work who frankly I couldn't say without speaking to them. I am happy to do that and come back to you. So I am not sure if there is a current working relationship with some of the detailed stuff.

The CHAIR — Two whole pages of questions; I think, looking through them, we have probably covered them all.

Mr BIRDS — I am happy to answer anything out of session if you want to send us anything or elaborate on anything that we have said today, if that is helpful.

The CHAIR — All right. Well look, I will take silence as being the message that we have well covered the questions we wanted to ask you tonight. Thank you both very much for making your time available and we do appreciate it was fairly quick notice. So we have had a smorgasbord of presentations today, which has actually covered a lot of the areas that we were looking for during this trip. So I guess you have just complemented that at the end of the day, which is good, thank you.

Mr BIRDS — We would be interested to see what comes of your work. As you said, there is a lot of parallels in some of the things we are doing in our different states at the moment. I guess I would obviously be interested — maybe it is a conversation I have with Pete as to what the process is as to how is your timeline for this, but obviously we would be interested in it and if there is anything we can do to help.

The CHAIR — As I said, we are presently conducting a survey to our local councils and the questions are being prepared by an external consultant and will be a chapter of our report, and we will hopefully deliver the recommendations to parliament by June next year, which might be of some use to you post that date. Thank you.

Mr BIRDS — Okay, thank you very much.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — I’ll just introduce myself. I’m Simon Ramsay and I chair the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee which is a Joint Parliamentary Committee of the Parliament of Victoria and we have two committee persons here. They might like to introduce themselves.

Mr McCURDY — Tim McCurdy, I’m the member for Murray Valley, up round Wangaratta, Yarrawonga, up through there.

Mr BATTIN — Brad Battin, Member for Gembrook which is just the other side of the railway line.

The CHAIR — So, a very close local member.

Mr BLACK — Very good. Okay.

The CHAIR — And we do have two apologies, there’s a, I wouldn’t say a crisis in the caucus, but two of our labour members are busy number crunching or doing what they do. Unfortunately, they couldn’t be here this afternoon. Now Jason presented at the hearing I think with the Vice Chair Johan and myself before Christmas.

Mr BLACK — That’s right. Yes.

The CHAIR — And I think we thank you for the invitation to come down here because we were looking for a living example of a design that is consistent with our Inquiry. So I thank you for the offer. We are pleased to be able to be here this afternoon. So, we appreciate the time all of you put aside too. We are recording some information. I know there was a view to try to keep this informal, and we’ll try and do that but, if you don’t mind, for our own sakes, given we are writing the chapters now for this reference, it would be useful for us to be able to record. So if you’re happy, I’ll just read the conditions around the formal hearing.

So, on that basis, can I welcome you to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken here is protected under parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to Parliamentary Committees has been provided to you at some stage?

The CHAIR — Yes. We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. So, I’m in your hands how you wish to present, whether you each want to make a small presentation but, I think you understand the reference itself, the Inquiry, the work that we’re doing in relation to crime prevention through environmental design.

The CHAIR — So Pete is busily writing the chapters and Sandy you’ve met and Kim is helping us with the recording. So thank you again Jason and over to you.

Mr BLACK — Okay. So I guess following on from my previous presentation I thought it would be a great opportunity to actually come out onto the ground and see a site. I’ve particular interest I guess with the planning and design for Selandra Rise. The CPTED principles were incorporated into the design process and was considered one of the key guidelines if you like, or policy documents, policy guidelines; and best practice was what we used and it was considered one of those in the planning stage particularly. So, with Selandra Rise, a key objective was on planning for health and wellbeing and when we got to the question about how do we actually do that, we had to basically grab a collection of different documents, and CPTED was one of those. So I guess the opportunity to come to Selandra Rise is really about saying, well, here we are in a development that’s been going for a couple of years now. Let’s have a bit of a look around, a talk to the urban designers from Council and from the developer and really just to explore that question about how CPTED is used or otherwise in the planning and design of our new neighbourhood in a growth area context. So I guess in a lot of ways, that’s me the key question in thinking about whether CPTED is effective, or whether it’s a sort of a take it or leave it, or whether it’s not being
used at all. And I guess the hypothesis here at Selandra Rise is that it was certainly one of a number of best practice or guideline-type documents that was considered in its planning. So as I said, to be able to see how that then translates onto the ground and to talk, again, to the urban designers who consider this in a daily context, I thought was too good an opportunity not to take up. I guess the presentation I’d made earlier was an overarching presentation about Selandra Rise and I don’t think we need to go into that again today but really I guess have a bit more of a question and answer-type discussion to maybe get to the bottom of some of those things that you may have also – or explore a little bit further some of the things you may have heard in previous presentations or previous observations. And I think, what we’d like to be able to do is have that discussion and then go and see how it shapes on the ground.

So, I guess from a CPTED perspective, in Selandra Rise, probably the way in which the principles and the guidelines were best picked up was through a general priority area that we term safety. So safety was one of the six key priority areas within Selandra Rise under a health and wellbeing umbrella. And what we found I guess, when we tried to tackle this notion of safety was that most guidelines, whether they’re talking about walkability, whether they’re talking about healthy by design, or active living, there’s an element of safety that goes into all of those. So, rather than saying, well, CPTED is the be all end all, as far as safety, the crime prevention element of safety goes, it was actually a case of saying well, it contributes, and I guess provides some indication, as to what we should be thinking about but it’s only one of many. I think at the previous presentation I gave, I talked about the theory if you like that each development tends to focus on something. And we have our standard local government guidelines, such as res code and those types of things, but generally from a developer perspective, they’ll be looking for a point of difference. And I guess Selandra Rise has got a health and wellbeing focus as a point of difference. But if that point of difference is environmental sustainability or something like that, then the implementation, effectiveness or the focus if you like on something like CPTED is probably diminished. It moves down the slope if you like.

So, CPTED, probably the key areas that we looked at here and probably best just to draw on the principles if you like, but probably the key one was around activity support. And again, that links or ties in nicely with the physical activity objectives of other parts of health and wellbeing. But certainly, and it’s probably a bit early to see – and we’ve talked a bit about this – but the notions of maintenance and those types of things are obviously key to what you will start to see as this place develops. But, I think the best or the most obvious thing that we will see today when we have a look around the development is around that activity support. And how can we effectively try to design these places to encourage people to be involved in them. And probably the other notion of the public and private domain as well, is the other key thing that is obvious within the development at this stage and I think that they’re probably the highlights points if you like and probably the areas of key focus.

Things like the natural access control in an environment like this is a little more grey, it’s actually quite hard to articulate how you go about doing that. Mainly because in a neighbourhood context you’re trying to encourage that all spaces are sort of open if you like. And particularly at this stage where we don’t have the neighbourhood, the local town centre constructed yet, and the retirement village and places like that are currently under construction, as you see it here at the moment, which is a fairly traditional housing development, things like natural access control are probably of lesser consequence, of lesser focus.

So that, I guess, is a bit of a summary. Probably the other thing, to say, in regards to this notion of safety and crime prevention from a best practice guideline perspective, it probably is if you wanted to focus specifically on that area what would be considered the preeminent guideline if you like. Certainly, I think, from a general planning perspective but, the point I’ve made previously is I think a lot of other best practice, those walkability toolkits or some of the other best practice guidelines that have come into effect have no doubt borrowed concepts or principles from the CPTED movement. And I think that ultimately what we then see is them being almost applied, so some of these principles being applied by stealth, for want of a better description, it’s not a ‘I’m doing CPTED’, they’re incorporated into sort of almost the day to day planning and design processes now through either direct or indirect means. I think that that’s probably the other key
point. And CPTED carries through, so it’s not just about the planning and design phase, it’s the – when people move in – it’s the maintenance, it’s the service provision, it continues beyond just that planning phase and I think that –

**Mr McCURDY** — Is it a sales pitch? Is it a sales pitch to your people that you –

**Mr BLACK** — Well, I guess I’m not the developer but I’ll have a crack at that because I do sort of work across a number of areas. I’d say no, not specifically. Again, the elements probably are, you know: ‘feel safe in our park’, ‘this is a great place for your family to live’. Those types of things. Pretty pictures with kids on bikes. But again, I don’t specifically think that that relates to CPTED, but more, and again, probably just drawing technically on the points, that’s more of an activity support. People feel that they could move here and that there’s the support for them to be a part of that sort of broader community. And I guess this building, Selandra Community Place is an element to that, where people feel they can come to this place and talk to someone from the council, and just generally be involved in the community. So I don’t – to hazard a guess, I think that if you specifically focus on that ‘we do crime prevention here’ it probably triggers that thought of ‘is there a crime issue?’ So it is I think more about that activity and participation and a safety in numbers type thing more than specifically thinking about crime prevention.

**Mr RAY** — Just as a comment to add to that, I think there have been good examples, well, they might be bad examples, communities that have had safety issues. New communities that have in recent years earned a reputation. Some of them are developed by very good developers but, they’ve had one or two incidents that have occurred and there’s a clear effect on sales. So, this is less about a sales pitch, it’s more about delivering on the promise of an environment that is safe, and supportive of particularly children and women. If we as a developer get that imagery right at the front end of a project but more importantly deliver that environment, word of mouth is as for most businesses is an incredibly powerful thing. And many of our sales guys would actually say to you referrals are the greatest source of sales for then. If we earn a bad name for safety, if we have too many incidents occur, that has a slowing down effect on sales and it’s not the reputation that you want. We won’t talk about crime prevention for the reason that it may indicate that there’s a problem. We like to make sure we don’t arrive at any phase in the early years of a project where we suddenly have media coverage around safety.

Youth and teen issues are often the big source of that. For instance, hooning can be a big problem, certainly in fringe communities. We get some of that activity into our project and we work very, very hard with police and other groups to work out a way of preventing that sort of behaviour from establishing itself in the community. As you can imagine, ask yourself would you buy into a community where there is a sense that safety is compromised or where you can’t trust the community that you’re moving into for some reason. I think we all know the answer to that inherently. So it’s incredibly important that we get that sense of security and safety right.

**Mr BLACK** — Probably another key factor that went into the planning and design phase which, again, is a little bit hard to see on the ground at the moment, just because there’s still an element of construction zone. So a lot of the infrastructure doesn’t get put into place until a lot of the construction activity ceases. But, it’s this idea of effectively facilitating walking and cycling throughout the estate and it sort of goes to show this point of supportive environments, and it’s a two-fold, so again, Selandra Rise has the health and wellbeing objective, and physical activity is a key to that, but there’s also a lot of indicators that suggest that with people having incidental interaction in the streets, that certainly contributes to people’s perception of safety and how they feel within the neighbourhoods. So, from a supportive environment perspective, things like traffic calming devices, road crossings in locations where people actually want to cross rather than because the traffic engineer said ‘space them at this distance’, those type of things, the connections to key destinations. One of the principle initiatives out here, is way finding signage, which again, provides little triggers to people to say ‘well, if you’re tossing up wether to walk or drive, here’s some information that would probably suggest walking is just as easy’. There’s these types of things that are sort of built in as individual initiatives, if you like but, as a collective, you’re effectively creating a supportive environment for this idea, you’re sort of drawing people out of the private domain and into the public domain for a greater level of time.
Probably the other thing, just following on from some of the background is that, a lot of people, when they move to these estates, they’ve taken on quite an insular sort of – is that they’re working, they’re in a new home, there’s a lot of change going on, that they don’t necessarily have a
great social connection yet, they’re maybe worrying about repayments, and worrying about when
they’re going to be doing landscaping, things like that, and it is actually in those formative stages
that also present a risk to what might happen later on. And that is, I guess from a – again, thinking
about CPTED the risk there is that the focus of peoples activities is on their private domain and not
on their public domain and therefore one of the foundation principles of CPTED diminishes very
quickly. And the foundation principle of interaction is one that if you don’t capture that early, then
it’s very hard to recreate it. I think that that’s been something from the partnership perspective at
Selandra Rise that we’ve been particularly focused on, and probably again why Hilltop Park is
constructed to the level and manner it is; the reason why Selandra Community Place actually
exists: the reason why way-finding signage is occurring when there’s still a lot of construction
going on. Because, if you actually miss that opportunity then as I said, it’s very hard to recapture
that, because you’re effectively then trying to drive people out of patterns that they’ve established
in this new place that they’ve moved to.

Mr RAY — Perhaps it’s not a standard activity for developers but we would typically,
from the moment first residents move in, start to run small events and programs specifically to
draw people out of their homes and allow them to get to know one another and that’s whilst we’re
operational within a project timeframe which might be 5 years, in some cases up to 15, 20 and
even 30 years. It gives us a lot of time to actually help local people build networks and bring them
into contact with council officers and programs, but also with other groups that are focussed on
activation of communities such as YMCA and schools who are an obvious one. From the moment
we can get a school into a project and begin to build networks within the community, between
schools, and certainly children and parents we see a roll-on effect where that community will
typically start to build their own networks and groups faster than they would otherwise. So we find
that’s certainly a good way of drawing people out of their nest and into the streets and parks. I
think that the enemy of what CPTED is trying to promote and see created, is absolutely that
inactivated, disenfranchised public space – the one that people either don’t know how to use or
choose not to use. I can’t agree more that the key principle of CPTED is about active places.
Active public realms are rarely the focus of crime and vandalism and those sorts of things in my
experience. It’s one of the things we tend to focus on.

One thing I’d like to say – and Jason made the point that sometimes other initiatives and other
focus areas of a project can put pressure on things like CPTED, and that at times some of the
principles of CPTED might be compromised to allow a focus on something else. I tend not to
agree with that. I think, to be honest, CPTED has always offered a really simple framework for
urban designers to work with. I think that mostly, if a developer and certainly a consulting team or
an internal design team like we have at Stockland, put CPTED principles front and foremost at the
beginning of the design process, a whole lot of other things can be captured within the design
process of that project. CPTED’s a really good foundation set of principles for setting up both the
broader master plan of a project and the detailed design of the public realm. I think where, at times,
CPTED is compromised is in the ongoing operation and management through the life of a project.
I think some of the principles are very much about the maintenance of landscape, the careful
management of parts of public realm that can tend to be a little bit prone. I suppose, to the wrong
sort of activity: loading docks around shopping centres, shopping centre car parks, those spaces
that aren’t genuinely places that the average person will want to frequent, and often it’s, I find, it’s
the ‘beyond construction’, the ongoing management, the loss of focus perhaps on safety that can
lead to negative issues. So, I think, easier to capture in design; more difficult to deliver on when
you’re talking about hedging plants in the landscape or maintaining trees in a certain way. Often
the priority to have a screening reserve overtakes the sort of practical issues around dense planting
on the edge of a part of a project where that dense planting may actually be encouraging hiding
places and what not. So sometimes environmental priorities around conservation areas, reserves,
creek lines, the sorts of areas that are being protected might lead to situations where fences are put
up to protect plants, that actually create natural barriers to good circulation, to appropriate use of
public space and those sorts of things. So every now and then, in the operation and the day-to-day
running of a community you find those conflicts start to occur. All of the good design principles
have been put in place but we do kind of run into barriers. I can think of one project where we’ve got a very large grassland reserve and the fencing regime for that grassland will actually make use of public realm and connectivity between parts of the project quite a challenge. It certainly can make applications of CPTED difficult.

The CHAIR — Did you seek some advice from the Victoria Police in relation to the incorporation of the Safer Design Principles here?

Mr RAY — At Selandra.

The CHAIR — Yes.

Mr RAY — Jason might be best to talk to that. I wasn’t around in the earlier stage of the Selandra master planning process. Jason?

Mr BLACK — I actually want to say yes. When we started this project, very early on one of the key drivers was Stockland’s Community Development Manager who had ties with the Victoria Police and a range of other organisations. We did hold one session which involved them. I’m just trying to recall, was there a specific discussion around CPTED or the Safer Design Guidelines? Probably not directly but certainly it was a discussion around gathering information from non-traditional planning people. That was one thing that we were trying to do very early on when carried out the Health and Wellbeing Rigour Test. Given we were drawing on such a variety of best practice documents, we were also trying to draw on the opinions of others.

As planners and designers, we can often become insular in own right, so we sort of work together, we’ve done 3 or 4 projects together before we know what we’re doing. You do, from time to time, and I’m not saying that’s the case here – here was quite different in that we sort of opened up a bit more and tried to draw in as much information as possible. I don’t specifically recall where they came from, but I do recall when we had this session that the Victoria Police and some organisations in regards to domestic violence as well and community violence – not necessarily domestic violence – community violence, and some of the health organisations as well. So we had a general workshop around ‘have we missed anything?’; ‘are we looking at the right guidelines?’, those types of things. And I think, like you tend to find with the health organisations who have, it’s not health dealing with sick people, it’s preventative health organisations, they tend to have very much of a focus on Healthy by Design, Healthy Spaces and Places, their pillar documents; safety organisations Safer by Design, CPTED. So this is a project where you sort of bring, try to sort of mesh together a range of different interest groups and a range of different focuses into this umbrella of health and wellbeing. The –

The CHAIR — The difference is though Jason – correct me if I’m wrong – is that these housing blocks are nearly all house, not much land and it’s what, 400 – 500 square metres? Whereas in the old days you could control your health and wellbeing in the backyard with 60 to 100 square metres to romp around in. Now it’s virtually nothing so you’re dependent on open space and then you’re dependent on some sort of security like had in your own back yard. And I guess that’s what I’m trying to work out, whether the Police are active in creating that security, like your back yard, but in the open space area? Is there a need for it? Maybe there isn’t, I don’t know.

Mr RAY — To be honest, I think, firstly we don’t in an ongoing way involve the police in master planning reviews and viewing new plans for new stages of the project. In the past I’ve had involvement in projects were we have had the police actually walk though both new plans and areas that we’ve been working in as part of a, I suppose, a reference group walk around. So, we’d have the police, a number of residents, in particular we’d choose some mothers, we’d do some day time and night time walks around an area and actually identify areas of concern and problems. So, it’s something we don’t do actively, but I actually think it’s a very good idea. It’s something we probably should be considering if we really want to test what we’ve delivered. And there’s always, it’s not a perfect world, so there’s always something that can be added to a space to improve its sense of safety. It might be an additional light; it might be a different treatment for a garden area; more seating or something. So, I think those sorts of sessions are invaluable.
Mr ISLIP — We have worked quite closely with police, especially in some of the more retrospective work. We try to draw on their knowledge as best as we can proactively. So, with new applications, we’ll often be advocating to have much better frontages onto these open space areas. So, it’s not just having the parks with residential frontages or active frontages, but it’s also about the way that frontage is designed to encourage people to occupy the front of the building. Whereas, a lot of the time we struggle to get traction with houses which are fully introspective and backyard focused. So what we are often encouraging is just a simple gesture such as a porch or an element that will encourage occupation of the front of the building. It changes it, it breaks it down and it creates opportunity for informal contact, social contact, and it also is dragging that eyes onto the street which is what we see as one of the key creeds in our feedback on developments.

We also work with the Victoria Police on audits. We’ve got them happening in Hampton Park, Doveton at the moment, Cranbourne, and we’ve got them happening at Casey Complex as well. In each of these instances, sometimes their reactive, a little bit like with the roads scheme where you’re trying to get black spot funding, you’re waiting for an incident to happen, sometimes we are aware of inappropriate behaviour so we’re trying to respond to that with the police, but we’re also trying to be proactive - in a development like Casey Complex where it’s a long term project which is yet to really hit the ground, but we’re trying to identify now where the opportunities are to create a much better public realm.

A lot of the things that have been mentioned by both Justin and Jason are spot on in terms of what we consider really important. There is a tension, so Justin just mentioned lighting, and we had this constant struggle between tree canopy and vegetation which is really high value from an amenity point of view and what encourages people to be out on that microclimate space, but then once you put a light in, that shades the light spill and so trying to find ways to design open spaces, pathways, in a way is not going to end up in this constant tension.

Also we look to link between the estates. So today we’re very focused on Selandra, but we would like to see how we link from an estate to a destination and we’re working quite closely with Vic Roads on improving the quality of that linkage through either wider paths and better tree canopy and making sure there’s no understorey planting so that passing traffic is constantly in visual contact with that pedestrian / cycling corridor, but also clearing out on the other side because we’re still dealing with the legacy of old developments which have back fences right along these long corridors and it’s something that we struggle with, something that you can’t easily undo but we do what we can, by at least clearing out under storey plantings and widening paths to encourage that amenity.

Mr MCCURDY — So Nathan, does the City of Casey demand certain requirements as we go through or do they expect that the developers will implement these CPTED or these guidelines as they go? Then when they bring the plans to you and say ‘this is what we’re going to do, do you then say, hang on, you haven’t included this’ or do you start from the top down approach?

Mr ISLIP — We try to hit whenever we can get involved in things. We’ll often have referrals from the planning application process and so we’ll always be responding from a CPTED point of view. That’s one of our key criteria. We’ll look at several issues, CPTED is one of them and we refer them specifically to the Safer by Design Guidelines which we have found excellent to have as a common reference point, as an agreed government document. And from our point of view, we would love to see that strengthened with clearer case studies and potentially even data that backs up – I know that there has been evidence-based research into certain open space areas that demonstrate where the crime happens around open space. And so this is really strong for us to push back to developers to say ‘well, we want this to be a well-used space’, or ‘this housing development to be a safer environment’.

Activity centres is another classic for us, so while we’ve talked residential today, activity centres classically we get a very difficult discussion with developers around internal shopping malls, where we end up – and if you take numerous of our existing shopping centres in Casey, we had vast expanses of blank wall which are surrounded by a sea of car park and that car park is where people are going from their shopping to their car and this is where we’re at great risk of unsafe
behaviour. So, we would love to see those guidelines really reiterated or in some way strengthened, we see them as valuable.

Sometimes a graphic really tells a story and so on numerous occasions I’ve referred people to – there’s an image in the Melbourne 2030 document on page 32 which is your classic car-based centre versus what happens if you turn it into a people-based centre. And that’s really telling because it shows the built form outcome of that. We’ve talked today about walkability – now there’s a very basic and simple diagram, it was page 101 which is a walkable neighbourhood and the street structure patterns, which really encourage that permeability, the linkages and so all of a sudden if we can have that common reference point, we can say ‘this is what it might look like’, you can obviously innovate on that foundation, but at least we’ve got an agreed language where we can say ‘this is going to deliver at least good building blocks’ for a walkable, social and safe environment.

Mr BLACK — Do you want to maybe talk about the grid network a little bit?

Mr RAY — Talk about this project?

Mr BLACK — Yes

Mr RAY — It’s hard to – I’m looking out the window hoping that I can kind of show you the panorama, but you can’t really see – . But in very simple terms, if we have the Selandra Rise master plan in front of us, it’s an orthogonal grid, it generally orients to a north-south-east-west road network. As we’re sort of discussing, the fundamental advantages of a grid like that is the ability to see from street to street and block to block and have long, clear, fairly direct views from where you are to where you want to go, seeing the destination that you want to get to, without the concern of hiding holes, nooks and crannies. It certainly improves that sense that I’m going to step out of my house confidently and walk to that place. Obviously, at night, one of the advantages of a grid is certainly that the street lighting tends to light the way fairly clearly and you can see in a well-lit street over a fairly long distance when it’s based on a grid. So, I think, from a circulation permeability and visual permeability point of view the grid here is a good example of what works.

The other important aspect of a grid is how does it interface with some of the natural elements of a site and some of the man-made elements, such as drainage lines, creek lines, pieces of open space that are to be kept within the plan. Nathan mentioned the issue of lots backing onto public open space and in the past that has been a problem. With new master plans, mostly both council and state government require that roads interface all of those pieces of open space, all of those creek lines and that homes front onto those spaces so the benefit of that is a really clear definition of public and private realm, and all of those front doors are looking at the space that hopefully the community’s concerned enough to care about. I think in the past, by backing onto those sorts of spaces we ran the risk – and I think the evidence is probably out there to suggest that people stopped caring about those sorts of spaces. The moment normal people, the average citizen stops caring about that sort of space it opens it up to other sorts of use and activity that are probably antisocial. So I think all of those characteristics are in the Selandra Rise master plan.

School sites are also fronted onto. If you go back a few years, home sites were often developed to side on or back onto a school site; nowadays you’ll see a school site very much front and centre within a community. You’ll see that here at Selandra Rise as well. Roads will run around the perimeter of the school, there’s an effort made to bring the school buildings to the front of site to hopefully front onto houses. So the school’s no longer a little patch of buildings in the middle of a 3.5/4 hectare, sometimes 8 hectare site. You’re getting really good interaction between those sorts of public community facilities and homes, which brings about a level of care and concern for the school grounds. Again, you’ll see that – if we actually brave the heat and the wind – we can actually have a look at some of those sorts of examples.

So, the plan incorporates obviously a clear grid, really good interface with public space, a positive interface, and equally when you get up to the future town centre which is obviously just coming out of the ground, you’ll see that that grid continues, but where you get to a more intensive, higher density, more heavily used area like a small town centre, you start to see that grid become even
more fine-grained. There’ll be more access ways, there’ll be laneways, a greater focus on public realm, the quality of public realm, reflecting the future high level of usage that we’d expect to see in those sorts of busy centres. So things like lighting are increased, the quality and durability of pavements and those sorts of things, so the maintainability of that mixed-use environment around the neighbourhood activity centre is a real focus.

We believe that civic pride and people caring about public realm is important and certainly important to the safety of places. We want to make sure that where we are going to experience intensive use and in a space that might be loved to death – a bit like the Fed Square of Selandra Rise hopefully – that we make sure that we invest money in the quality of those spaces so that they can stand test of time and not become run down and potentially prone to antisocial use over time.

**Mr HODGETTS** — It’s no mistake, Justin, the state park and youth park have been located in town centre as well.

**Mr RAY** — Yes

**Mr HODGETTS** — It’s not located in the normal grid of the subdivision, it’s where the busiest part of the community will be during the day, so that’s located just off the town centre where the community can survey the youth that are recreating in that park, rather than being somewhere else and not very frequented. That was a design decision that was made at a high level.

**Mr RAY** — A comment about destinations within a project like this – so we talk about a youth-oriented space, we’ve got the Hilltop Park behind us, there’s a heritage park being developed down at the other end of the project – making sure that the grid and the master plan connect all of those destinations together in a really clear and simple way is a very important feature – you would argue any successful master plan is one that feels, I suppose attractive to people who want to get out of their cars and walk and cycle and actively use a place. So that ability to take a direct route from home to the park down the road, a place that’s simple to get to, you don’t need a whole lot of signage to find it, you can clearly navigate there and if you wanted to send your children down the street on their bikes and kind of see them most of their way to that park and see that they safely get there, you know, that’s an important feature of the plan and an advantage of that nice simple orthogonal grid. So hopefully what we see at the end of the day is all of those destinations joined up really clearly by really high-quality, safe routes.

I do think one of the challenges for us is going to be that night time experience of this community. I think we need to think more about that. I think we’ve got a terrific plan by daylight, but I think how I or any resident might feel at night moving through this environment ‘do I feel safe?’, ‘are the destinations well-lit comfortable places that I want to go to in the evening?’ We know that we’re all time poor and that night time activity in suburbs is actually very critical and to Liam’s point we’ve got a strong migrant community who we know are great users of our parks. To side with your point, we’ve got less backyard, so in the evenings particularly at this time of year we want to be out utilising communal tables and parks, barbecues, all of those sorts of things, and we know that people are demanding that sort of amenity in our projects. It’s one thing to deliver it, but it has to feel usable. I think we’ve got a plan that supports a feeling of safety in those sorts of environments, but needs further thought about night time use.

So, you can’t underestimate the eyes on the street principle, homes that at least facilitate surveillance of the street. We have our own internal guidelines that are applied here, we call them ‘Design Essentials’ that are then part of, become basically a covenant to the title through an MCP and those design codes are actually in part about the same issues that Nathan’s raised. We make sure that windows are on the front of every house, we try and make sure that living spaces are at the front of house, that we have a bedroom and perhaps a living room, and porches clearly identify front doors and obviously presentable front yards we think are all important to giving people who are visiting a community and certainly people who live here the sense that the community cares about the place they live in and are also watching what’s going on.

**The CHAIR** — How does City of Casey feel after you’ve created this lovely open space, lots of lawns to be moved and trees to be watered and maintenance because there’s no backyard,
you pack your bags and off you toddle to another development site and the City of Casey is left here with 6 acres of manicured lawn to look after? How does that cost shift work? Is there an expectation that councils will take over from developers in relation to the open space? Is there a long term financial arrangement?

**Mr Battin** — Increase my rates.

[inaudible]

**Mr Ray** — This is something certainly Liam and me and Nathan will want to talk to, I’m sure. But from our perspective the open space we provide is actually meeting standards and requirements that we’re required to meet. So state government, through the growth areas planning process, through the PSPs, and the long structure planning process that both council and state government engage in place very clear requirements on us in terms of the quality and quantity of open space. So we’re meeting the requirements that are outlined in our development contributions plans. We work really close with council throughout the design and construction processes for each of those spaces, so we –

**Mr Hodgetts** — Right to the fabrication of signs for example – one that can’t be set alight or that are more durable than others – are decisions that council officers will make to and advise Stockland. So, to pick up your point, when we do get that asset handed over to us to maintain, we know it’s reasonably low cost and it will last.

**Mr Islip** — We do identify these areas quite early on through the precinct structure planning process and so some councils radar from day dot when these growth areas are kicking in and we do our developer contribution plan forecasting that identifies likely and ongoing costs. So, there are elements of that long term planning which council try to be on front foot about. So that we find synergies between different activities in that open space, being located near kindergartens, being located near the schools and so that way there’s capacity to share elements such as car parking, and that helps to stop us having multiplicities of car parks and lots of circulation space. So if we are on a front foot and manage it well, we can try to reduce that long term cost burden and have a bit more efficient use of the space.

**Mr Hodgetts** — Normally you will have maintenance agreements in place with developers over time – there might be one, I’m not 100% sure on this one – until you finish up here and have 1,500 lots completed [inaudible] maintaining the local parks to a certain standard. They often like that because they’ve got a higher standard of maintenance usually than council because it’s all about appearance and the brand, which is very important, and we acknowledge that, so we give them a maintenance window to maintain up until they finish and pack up and leave the development at which time we then take over.

**Mr Battin** — With the estate here which we hear is a good example of crime prevention. How do you assess that it’s a good example of crime prevention? And you can’t compare this to an estate in Cranbourne North that’s forty years old – at the same stage as other estates, have you got crime statistics or statistics of antisocial behaviour here compared to other estates at similar stages?

**Mr Ray** — I can’t point to statistics, but what I can point to is what we call a Liveability Survey which provides us with a sense of what’s important to our residents. It’s very detailed, it’s more detailed than a census, but it is put together to ask a whole range of questions. Some of those questions are purely around safety and ‘how do you feel living in this community?’. We now have our own read on how safe the community members are feeling at any given time. Highlands has 10,000 residents in it so you can get a really good sample out of that 10,000 people. Obviously, Selandra being a newer community will have only a small amount of data. I can’t give you the results from – I would if I had them here – the results from our Liveability Survey for Selandra. That’s how we read it. Council would hear about it I think through their own customer service group and the local police would certainly have a bit of a read on whether this is a hot spot or not.
I think for me, I drive around a lot of our projects and a lot of other developers’ projects, I always look at the environment and you can certainly see a project that’s having trouble. We’ve had ‘issue streets’ – a street at Highlands recently was getting multiple break-ins while homes were being constructed, on a weekly basis. Really, really difficult to police and the number of glass doors we replaced is kind of crazy. Again, in my experience in Selandra, I can’t see obvious evidence from homes that are open and occupied; I can’t see obvious evidence of problems. But, I do know crime is always an issue on these projects during construction. You can almost say it’s a given. You know, people will have the wiring put in one day, the next day it’s gone. So that’s something the building industry work hard to deal with. So I’d say without a shadow of a doubt, there’s a level of crime going on in this community.

**Mr BATTIN** — Yes, there’s always going to be something. I think as you said, and rightly too, I think it’s perception, perception can be everything. But, I suppose it’s finding out, I suppose from Casey too, how it compares? If you’ve got statistics perception-wise.

**Mr HODGETTS** — No, not really, we don’t.

**Mr ISLIP** — Not specific to this development. The lineal study that is being carried out for this project will inform perceptions of safety because the degree to which people occupy and get active in this environment will be determined by how safe it is. So, that will be an informative thing from the perception. We do have information generally for Casey around family violence which has been directly linked to mortgage stress and so we know generally in the outer growth areas that we have issues with crime, but it’s not specifically attached to a development but more the typology of growth. So the way that we are growing is introducing or reinforcing the social issues. It would be very interesting to analyse any police data on this.

**Mr BLACK** — So we do have a study that Vic Health has funded RMIT to carry out in Selandra Rise which will roll-out over the next 4 or 5 years which will answer those questions. It’s just that we’re not there yet, but they do – it sort of builds on the Liveability Survey and tries to ensure it doesn’t overlap and what have you but, it will pick up on the notion of safety because it’s one of the key health and wellbeing pillars or priority areas here, and it is asking the types of questions that would not just deal with the perceptions of safety, but the real feeling of safety. Often people feel unsafe in environments that the majority of people might actually feel quite safe in. So there’s lots of different examples. I don’t know if you can track that culturally, age etc. So, we’re hoping – and that’s why I want to bring you here – because we’re hoping that in following years we will have that research and we’ll be talking about what that research says: this, that and the other thing and as I said, safety will be an element, physical activity, a range of other things. We’re just not there yet, so it’s good to come now and come later.

**Mr BATTIN** — I’ll have to get voted back in to get back.

[inaudible]

**Mr BLACK** — Well, we’ll leave it up to you but, I think the point to that is that commitment of actually tracking whether an initiative that you’re incorporating into the planning and design phase is actually achieving the outcome that you set out to achieve and I think that really, that’s not a question that’s asked very often in the planning and development world and hence, why we’re getting a proper research organisation or academic research process involved into this place because of the effort that’s gone to thinking about how you might plan –

**Mr BATTIN** — Cheers, thank you for that.

**The CHAIR** — Now Jason, I, we have to be in Melbourne by 4, CBD.

**Mr BLACK** — Okay

**The CHAIR** — Do you think we have time to have a bit of a look?

**Mr BLACK** — We’ll go for a quick look.
Witnesses withdrew.

Committee adjourned.
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The CHAIR — Welcome, Mark, to the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee, which is a joint parliamentary committee. The committee is conducting an inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design. We thank you for your participation in the inquiry. We are running a bit late, and I apologise for that. I understand that Sandy has suggested maybe 20 minutes for your presentation, and then the committee would like to ask you some questions for about 10 minutes if that suits you.

Mr ALLAN — Great.

The CHAIR — Before you start, Mark, I have to read the riot act, so to speak, in relation to how you present and on what basis you do so. I welcome you to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and is further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and, where applicable, the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. Have you received and read the guide for witnesses presenting to parliamentary committees?

Mr ALLAN — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — We are recording the evidence and will provide a proof version of the transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate. Mark, you are the chairman of the sustainable buildings committee from the Property Council of Australia?

Mr ALLAN — Correct.

The CHAIR — Again, thank you very much, and over to you.

Mr ALLAN — Thank you. To begin, I might just outline the role of the Property Council of Australia (Victoria). It is the largest and most influential advocacy organisation in the property sector. It has over 2200 member companies that represent property assets worth over $600 billion, and approximately 500 of the members are part of the Victorian division. Members of the Property Council represent the entire property investment cycle, and that goes from finance to design, property development, property maintenance and services that underpin the sector, and being a critical part of the economy Victoria’s property sector is responsible for producing $36.9 billion worth of GDP, employing 312,000 people and generating 39.5 per cent of the total state tax revenue each year.

I understand my CV has been circulated to you, so I will not repeat that other than to say that I am a member of the Property Council and, as you heard, the chair of the sustainable buildings committee. I am also an architect and an urban planner.

I would also expect the committee to be well aware of the definition of crime prevention through environmental design, which is on the Victoria Police website and also that which is stated in the Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria. Suffice it to say that it is an analytical tool used to redesign and modify the built environment to reduce opportunities for crime, and CPTED focuses on the effective design and use of the built environment to reduce the incidence and fear of crime and improve quality of life. Another point that I would make is that planning schemes in the state require the responsible authority to give consideration to the Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria 2005 when determining planning permit applications.

I have looked at the nine questions which the Property Council received in advance of this meeting, and if it helps you, I am happy to talk briefly in response to each of these and/or take questions as we go.

The CHAIR — Fine.

Mr ALLAN — The first question was, ‘To what extent has the property development industry incorporated the safer design principles and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) into their projects?’ My answer is that safer design principles have been
proactively incorporated by property developers, and that includes Property Council membership, to some extent in urban development projects in Victoria over the past 15 to 20 years — I would suggest certainly since about the late 1980s — and safer design principles have been applied across a range of property types of varying sizes in varying locations, notably in retail centres, in the capital city, Melbourne Docklands, inner municipalities in particular in addition to other parts of the city of Melbourne and the state.

It is difficult to be more definitive about the extent of incorporation given the wide range of activities which occur in the Victorian property industry both in the public and private sectors and also the multiple development types and subcategories, the wide range of players, both large and small, and the fact that they are working in every municipality across the state. The nature of the property sector means that retail, be it shopping centres, supermarkets or shops; commercial offices; residential, be it greenfield or urban infill; hotel; leisure; or a mixture, covers a broad range.

The CHAIR — Mark, I was just going to ask you about that, because you seem reasonably confident that that is the case. But we wrote to 58 developers in relation to getting an opinion from them about whether they incorporate CPTED or the safer design guidelines, and we got two responses.

Mr ALLAN — That is disappointing. In my experience it is probably testament to a lack of awareness of CPTED. I think that a lot of developers, but in particular their advisers, be they architects, urban designers or planners, are very aware of the outcomes of CPTED but probably do not use that term. They probably talk about best practice urban design, and so while they might not say top of mind, ‘Yes, of course, our developments incorporate these principles’, I think in practice they do.

I guess one of the points I would make is that certainly the larger development organisations and their advisers would be very aware of the value that comes from creating safer and higher amenity and having a clear demarcation between the private realm and the public realm. I accept what you are saying, and I think in some respects it is just that lack of awareness on the part of many and the fact that they probably do not use that specific term of CPTED.

Mr SCHEFFER — Just on that — and I know you have a lot of things to get through — with the proactive incorporation you talked about at the beginning, how do you know that?

Mr ALLAN — Sure.

Mr SCHEFFER — I am not disputing the veracity of it, I am just wondering how you pick it up.

Mr ALLAN — In my experience as a practising architect, and I was for over 10 years the general manager of planning and urban design for Melbourne’s Docklands Authority and VicUrban. Prior to that I was an urban designer with the City of Melbourne, so those issues would come to the fore in day-to-day negotiations and evaluations of development approvals under the Planning and Environment Act. Planning officers and urban designers, certainly in the public sector, will talk about aspects of active frontage, proper landscaping and how to design out what might be unsafe practices or the potential for unsafe spaces and so forth. So it would be in my role in a former life in the public sector and also as a practising architect in terms of the advice I give to clients on that range of property types.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay, thanks.

Mr ALLAN — I might turn to the second question, which is really about the key aspects of the safer design principles that have been incorporated in those projects. Again, it depends on the type of development and a range of other factors, including existing and proposed land uses, the location, the context and the nature of the developments themselves. I guess the six headlines for me would be:

- passive surveillance, and that is really about eyes on the street and good sightlines;
• active ground-level uses with activated frontages, especially those that adjoin public streets and spaces; limiting the extent of blank walls and those inactive ground-level uses such as mechanical plant and car parking;
• careful design of building exteriors, and that would include the location of pedestrian and vehicle entries, avoiding potential hiding spaces and so forth;
• the design of car-parking spaces in particular;
• high-quality lighting, certainly in areas of egress and ingress; and
demarcation of public and private spaces, which are often best achieved through design and a change of materials to make those clear. Generally the principle of integrating open design and landscape are key factors, which I think we see in many developments.

The third question was, ‘What obstacles or impediments may prevent property developers from successfully implementing CPTED safer design principles in their developments?’ I think there are four headlines for me. The first is awareness; the second is decision making; the third is skilled implementation; and the fourth is training and education. I will talk briefly to each of these.

In terms of awareness, as I have already discussed, I think there could be and should be more up-to-date best practice advice. The limited awareness is probably reflected also in limited access to public evidence, including post-evaluation analysis. As I have said before, the larger property organisations tend to have access to high-quality urban design advice. Developers with less resources are reliant more on the quality of the government guidelines and advice that they receive through planning approvals.

In decision making I think an impediment is protracted approval processes or those less resourced local government offices that do not have access to either on-staff urban designers or personnel with those skills, and I think that varies across the city and the state.

In terms of skilled implementation, the reality is that the safer design principles are in part subjective and they are reliant on value judgements, so the quality of decision making and the skills of those charged with recommending or approving planning applications need to recognise that there are no off-the-shelf solutions. It will often rely on a judgement call and balancing views. It is certainly the case in members’ experience that a design intervention may be done with the very best intentions, but that may have flow-on effects. If, for example, as a planning officer in local government you are advocating for an active frontage in a location, it might be wholly unsuitable for retail or some human habitation and might in fact have the counter effect that leads to a less safe outcome.

I think the other reality in that space is that it is often better to not design out opportunities for safe built environments, such as a potential to bring a higher order use in at some later stage. Sometimes you will see car-park structures that might have additional headroom that might see a different land use go in there as a particular development matures over time.

In terms of training and education, I would certainly be an advocate for increasing training for local government planning officers and supporting the training with high-quality design guidelines.

The CHAIR — Mark, can I just stop you there? Sorry. A thing that has been flowing through the entire inquiry is the education and training issue. If we ask the educators, there seems to be a lack of any sort of education and training for CPTED in any of the curriculum, whether it is through the unis or through the architecture schools. From memory, the police have their own course, which now has not been recognised or accredited. Can you expand on that to give us some guidance on where you would see that sort of training facility provided and how?

Mr ALLAN — Sure. Chairman, if you asked me the question how would I best see that achieved, my suggestion would be for DPCD is skilled urban designers to run intensive day-long workshops with, say, four or five local government officers per session, perhaps supplemented with consultant advisers and Victoria Police, and really apply a sort of practical approach: showing
examples that work, and where are examples that do not work? While I would be an advocate for tertiary education, clearly there are limits to the number of professionals who can be trained in the sort of time frame of a tertiary design education.

Often in preparing this evidence it came to me that we sometimes just do not use the terms ‘CPTED’ or ‘safer design principles’ because they have largely been mainstreamed into good urban design practice. When I am called upon to assist training undergraduates at Melbourne University, for instance, we will often talk about creating safe spaces and the role of the built environment in seeing a future for livable cities.

Mr SCHEFFER — Does the language matter? When we talk about crime prevention we talk about a range of specific activities that are dangerous to people, and safety might imply more in occ. health and safety that you do not hurt yourself or you come to grief because you slip or something like that, but it seems to be they are different things. If you run them together just into safety, do you lose the edge that CPTED is really attempting to focus on?

Mr ALLAN — It is a good question, and I probably have not got a definitive answer for you. I guess it is just not an expression that is readily used within the development community. Practitioners will be aware of it, architects and urban designers will be aware of it, but as property developers the reference would probably be to high-quality public realm and really best practice urban design.

Mr SCHEFFER — You raised that first when the Chair mentioned about the 58 or whatever it was organisations that we had written to and we only got two responses, one of which was you. It means that is quite a massive miscommunication that is going on and a huge quantity of the industry does not know what we are talking about, which is pretty serious.

Mr ALLAN — It is interesting. We as an architectural practice tendered for a project in Christchurch in New Zealand. My understanding is that there is a form of regulation there, because we were certainly required as part of that tender to express our expertise and our support for CPTED. Clearly in our office it was well known, and we had no qualms at all about saying with our joint venture New Zealand partners that, yes, we were very aware of that. But again, just to reinforce your point, it is probably a language thing and it is not a term that would be readily used outside perhaps practitioners, designers and planners in particular.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

The CHAIR — It is recognized through local government and internationally. We have been to New Zealand and Christchurch and had a look at their CPTED work over there, but I would assume in different countries CPTED is probably more universal. In Victoria we have the safer design guidelines, which people do not quite understand; they certainly do CPTED, as do the other states. There seems to be a sort of a national flavour of CPTED. Yes, it is interesting that we seem to have this disconnect between, I guess, your vernacular, if you like, and what is seen by local governments and other states as being a well-known mantra.

Mr ALLAN — It is. In my work for a previous national developer it was certainly known in New South Wales and in particular in developments in Brisbane where CPTED was often used. There would often be an invitation provided to whether it be a local government or another planning agency that we would conduct a CPTED workshop. Often in Victoria that would be greeted with, ‘You’d better explain exactly what that is’, whereas, as you would know, in Brisbane it is much more recognised, I think.

The CHAIR — Okay.

Mr ALLAN — Question 4 is, ‘How helpful do developers find the Victorian safer design guidelines to be? My point would be there is not a strong awareness of the guidelines amongst property developers. I accessed a copy of them online, and they are quite available. In terms of seeking some input from my colleagues in the property development industry, again the response is, as we discussed, they are aware of the principle and not so aware of the detail. I think that is also evidenced in that I had to search the state planning provisions to determine that it is a requirement
to consider those. I think you would generally find — and you would no doubt be taking evidence from others — that implementation of these guidelines tends to be reliant upon both the skill set and the interest in particular local councils.

What I would suggest is that the content of these guidelines is generally sound. I think the presentation could be significantly improved by better and more instructive photographs, more up-to-date case studies, clear exemplars and in particular what to do and what not to do shown in diagrams.

Number 5 was, ‘How can principles of safer design/CPTED be better integrated into the system?’. I have suggested that would be through building awareness both within the community and within industry, increasing education and better guidelines. I would not advocate for regulation in implementing or increasing the use and potential of the guidelines.

Mr SCHEFFER — Why not?

Mr ALLAN — I think simply adding a level of regulation will not necessarily achieve better outcomes. I would advocate that you may simply see increased time lines, and that might have an even more adverse effect on the part of the development industry. Anything that is seen to add time will be seen to add costs. While they might not know them by name, I would suggest that the property development industry would be much more likely to pursue the very real and important objectives of CPTED if that was done through better guidelines and strategies to increase the skill sets of government decision makers.

Mr SCHEFFER — So there is no way to balance a set of principles or broad aspirational guidelines that could be mandated and then allowing the kind of flexibility that you are saying the industry needs? There is no way of matching that? It is either mandating or not mandating?

Mr ALLAN — My answer is possibly. I would not advocate for mandating, and that is simply because a lot of the decisions about the public realm in particular but also in the built environment, more generally, there are no black and white answers. There will be a value judgements required.

Mr SCHEFFER — We absolutely appreciate and understand that you cannot be locking everything down for the reasons you have said. Having agreed on that, we are also examining the idea of what you can set in place that acts as a kind of a beacon or marker for developers and planners to think around while they are doing the work they are doing.

Mr ALLAN — I think the answer would probably be around evidence. If you could clearly produce published evidence that said, ‘Apply these principles when you are designing buildings that interface with public spaces or locations’, then you would probably find that property developers would be very interested in that. At the moment I am searching a bit to find that evidence. I guess I know and feel that the design of the built environment will impact how we feel and how we appreciate the public domain in particular, but in terms of hard evidence I would very much welcome seeing local examples of that. I think the other reality is that we need to be careful, because if you mandate an outcome in one location and accept it is in some respects a value judgement or subjective, then it could be counterproductive in another location.

Mr SCHEFFER — Absolutely; I understand.

Mr McCURDY — Instead of mandating, do you believe it would be more beneficial to gather evidence? Do you think there would be a stronger uptake of the guidelines if there was evidence to produce it rather than saying, ‘You need to use these guidelines’? If you give them the proof and the evidence, they will take it up.

Mr ALLAN — I think it is most likely to be successful, yes — to build awareness. If you can provide evidence, I think it just makes for a much stronger case. Property developers want to do good development because they understand that by doing so the value of the project will be increased. I would just like to reiterate that I would take that approach: build awareness, have really good guidance and then work with the decision-makers to improve the skill sets.
Mr SCHEFFER — The difficulty with that is that you yourself spoke before about cost and time pressures. We are aware that CPTED is just one of a whole range of things that developers need to be aware of — environmental stuff, sustainability, the whole bizzo. So if the pressure becomes too great, then what is going to drop off? We might say that the CPTED issue is going to be put aside because in the end it is cost that is going to govern the project. The very lofty aspirations you described where developers want to do the right thing is great — we appreciate that — but the guideline that strengthens that and says, ‘Even when the going gets tough, we still think that community safety and crime prevention is really important to citizens’ is really not that negotiable. You can be negotiable in terms of innovation but not negotiable in its aspiration.

Mr ALLAN — Mr Scheffer, I would say that I do not think there is a direct correlation between money spent and the quality or safety of the adjoining public environment. Firstly, I would suggest that good design practice need not cost more; it is about the skill of the advisers and developers. I always caution undergraduates, both in our practice and certainly when I am talking with them during their studies, to be very careful in an urban design setting of saying, ‘Make it more beautiful, Mr Developer’, because no-one knows where to go with a statement like that. If you, however, give good, clear, instructive advice on what is known to work where there is evidence of that, that is really compelling and powerful. I would say that it is not a matter of a developer saying, ‘We don’t want more regulation’. In this instance I just do not believe that that is necessarily going to lead to a better outcome.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

The CHAIR — Mark, we had better move on from question 5.

Mr ALLAN — Move on? Okay.

The CHAIR — We have 10 minutes in which to do it.

Mr ALLAN — Right. I will go straight to question 6, which was whether there is an awareness among Victorian architects and urban designers. I think the answer is yes, there is an awareness. On question 7, ‘Should CPTED principles be mandated’, I think we have had that discussion. I would be advocating ‘No’ for the reasons I suggested before.

One thing the committee may wish to consider might be some way of looking at that package of measures I mentioned before, which was awareness, better guidelines and training. There might be some form of voluntary measures that could say, ‘There is a red, yellow and green’. There is a list. I am always cautious about setting up a check-the-box system, but if there was a way of saying, ‘Red is compliance, yellow is good practice and green is best practice’, and that could then be interpreted in such a way that decision-makers were able to then standardise the language that is being used, that might be something of benefit to the community and also the property sector.

The CHAIR — I guess at the end of the day though it is going to be local government that dictates development guidelines for CPTED principles. There is a permit attached to a dwelling or infrastructure. I am posing a question to you so you can tell me if I am right or wrong. The responsibility at the end of the day will be with the councils that oversee the final footprint of a CPTED-designed suburb. The developers might take a cautious view around using CPTED as they see fit, whether it is money or something else I do not know, but if councils do not dictate in some way that developers meet the council’s permit regime, then I guess we are losing the battle in relation to the acceptance of CPTED.

Mr ALLAN — Chair, I think the answer lies somewhere in between, because having the very best intentions on the part of local government or planning officers does not always determine a very positive outcome. Likewise, having a developer who might have the very best intentions but who finds it difficult to obtain approvals does not achieve the best outcome. So my answer is that it really relies on a cooperative approach between the players, because individually I do not think they would meet the objectives of the committee or the community on their own; they really have to find genuine ways of working together. I am certain that if other members of the property industry were sitting in this chair, they would give you examples where they have been supported
by local government decision-makers and state agencies in achieving excellent outcomes. They would probably also have a list of situations where poor decision making actually brought about the counter outcome.

I would respectfully suggest that it would need those parties to work together, and that is why I would be going down the path of good working relationships supported by good guidance rather than regulating and saying to local government, ‘You’ve got to solve this problem’, because they only have certain levers that they can pull in that process. It is a bit like what an old boss of mine at the City of Melbourne used to say, ‘You need the open-top container’—that is, that the container needs to have sufficient strength in its walls to stop the very bad or the worst outcomes, but the top need not be screwed down so hard that a really good result cannot rise, like a soufflé. Maybe it is a poor analogy, but in part my point would be: we have some very skilled practitioners in this state and we need to find ways for them to share and build positive outcomes.

Mr SCHEFFER—Using your analogy, what are the elements of the walls then?

Mr ALLAN—I think if you look at the basic principles, the ones that I mentioned before, some of them are fairly straightforward. If you have a frontage that joins onto a public street, then you want some activation there. You want some habitation, you do not want to park cars or just have plants there.

Mr SCHEFFER—So you would call that a wall and not the top? Because I would say that is a part of the top part of it and the wall needs to be a bit tighter than that. But I get your point.

Mr ALLAN—Yes.

Shall I go on with question 8?

The CHAIR—Please.

Mr ALLAN—How could safer CPTED principles be facilitated in new fringe developments and high-rise developments? I would suggest that they are equally valid for both. Having worked certainly as a practising architect and planner on both sorts of developments, I think the opportunities are there. I think the differences are essentially that in growth areas they tend to be characterised by low-rise housing, supported by town centres with retail and other services, which often follow the residential development, and greenfields communities often will have few existing residents or service providers.

That then means that property developers involved in the master planning of those new communities therefore have to rely on advisers and planning authorities and service providers in the absence of that direct community input, because essentially they are working in greenfields. Then I would suggest that there is a role certainly for the state government—the GAA, DPCD, the Office of the Victorian Government Architect and others in producing good guidance. That is particularly important in that up-front precinct structure planning phase and obviously as more detailed approvals come through.

In the established urban areas I think the processes and the relationships between the decision-makers and the developers are as important, but clearly they need to be underpinned by new strategies to engage existing communities, be that business or residential. Chairman, I might finish with the recommendations, and I know there was a request to talk about some possible benchmarks or case studies.

My recommendations, or at least those of the property council, would be for the committee to respectfully consider further effective implementation of the principles through increased awareness, and that is building on the work and knowledge that exists in best practice examples; acknowledge that there is no one-size-fits-all—just as there are numerous types of urban development, likewise there are numerous categories of crime, and it is important that the principles are kept at a high level; that we as an industry and as a community will benefit from improved government guideline documentation; that, as I have said before, I think commissioning some specific academic research from other jurisdictions applied in this local context would be
incredibly helpful to the property sector; facilitating education and training for decision-makers, likewise; and building those partnerships between industry, government, property developers, advisers, the GAA, responsible authorities, Victoria Police, service providers and so forth. There is also the notion that we might streamline planning approvals if we could put in place a traffic light approach to CPTED. I will end by saying that the promotion of good design is something that I think is first and foremost in CPTED principles.

The CHAIR — Very good. We really appreciate the amount of work and thought you have put into your presentation. We took the view when we were given this inquiry that part of it was about how councils particularly engaged with CPTED, but also given we are going through a whole-of-government approach, looking at planning in general, obviously if there are ways to improve the safer design guidelines or in fact CPTED, it was an opportunity for us to do so also. I note your commentary about the booklet, and perhaps there is a need for improvement there. From memory, I cannot remember if it has been raised with us about how to improve the communication. It is more about how we engage with what we have got. So you have put a different slant on it, which has given us some food for thought. I thank you for that.

Mr ALLAN — It’s a pleasure.

The CHAIR — I invite the committee members, if they wish, to ask any questions.

Mr McCURDY — Just briefly, you said we might be able to get some knowledge from other jurisdictions. Is there anything that springs to mind?

Mr ALLAN — Generally I think Brisbane City Council guidelines. The Brisbane City Council have quite a good reputation in this space. I must say that nobody I have approached in sounding out advice for this meeting said it was a bad idea. Everybody agrees it is a good thing to do, it need not cost more and we can get better outcomes. The one that is often used is Brisbane, and, although I do not know the detail, New Zealand often comes into that discussion as well.

The CHAIR — I think you have covered it very well. Again, I thank you for your time and the work you have done obviously before coming here to provide the presentation. Hopefully we can get a copy. I know we have it on the Hansard record. Is it possible to have a written — —

Mr ALLAN — Can I take that on notice and get back to you on that?

The CHAIR — Yes.

Mr ALLAN — The only other thing — and I am conscious that we are right on time — was just in terms of case studies and examples, I would recommend to the committee both the Victoria Harbour and NewQuay precincts at Melbourne Docklands. They are relatively new, or at least those projects really started whatever it might be — 10 or 12 years ago now — but I think they probably show some really good principles in how to interface development with public streets and spaces.

The CHAIR — It has been a long time coming — Docklands.

Mr ALLAN — We could talk about that for a while, Chair, and if you would like to, I would be happy to.

The CHAIR — Another time. Thanks very much, Mark.

Mr ALLAN — It’s a pleasure.

Witness withdrew.
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The CHAIR — Michael, I give you a warm welcome and thank you very much for your time speaking to this parliamentary committee this afternoon on its inquiry into crime prevention through environmental design. I understand you have agreed to speak to us on the basis that it will be recorded.

Mr CHAPMAN — Yes, that is all right.

The CHAIR — On that basis, I am going to have to read you the conditions around this public hearing. Welcome to the public hearing of the Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the Constitution Act 1975 and is further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. Any comments you make outside the hearing may not be afforded such privilege. I understand that you have received a copy of the guide for witnesses presenting evidence to parliamentary committees.

Mr CHAPMAN — I have.

The CHAIR — Thank you. We are recording the evidence, and we will provide a proof version of the Hansard transcript at the earliest opportunity so you can correct it as appropriate.

Michael, I understand also you are the general manager, design environment, for Lend Lease Communities?

Mr CHAPMAN — That is correct.

The CHAIR — And you have been given some background in relation to our inquiry into CPTED?

Mr CHAPMAN — Yes, I have.

The CHAIR — I just want to advise you that we have had some technical problems in relation to an overhead presentation that we were going to synchronise with your verbal testimony; that technology is not available to us. Our executive officer, Sandy Cook, has raced upstairs and is going to bring back a written copy. We are going to go through that with the committee.

Mr CHAPMAN — Okay.

The CHAIR — We might have to fill in for a few minutes until Sandy comes back with written copies. Perhaps you could give some background in relation to what you want to present to the committee, bearing in mind that we will have to finish the teleconference at 3.45 p.m.

Mr CHAPMAN — Okay. The presentation was purely some photos just to talk through the principles and how we apply them. There are a whole lot of other aspects that we are going to address. The half a dozen points were just the aspects of the safer design guidelines we use and how we use them. The presentation was just having a look at Caroline Springs to illustrate how we incorporate those types of principles into our communities. We were told we should offer an opinion regarding the mandating of the guidelines and talk about actions that could be done to increase the awareness of good design. We made reference in our submission to occupancy evaluations. I have to admit that we have had some changes of staff in Victoria, and I have not been able to pull up any of those at this point in time, and I guess what are the challenges to design. That was where we were going to go. If you would like to me to start on it, I am happy to start and just hold off on the second section about Caroline Springs until the presentation comes back.

The CHAIR — That is fine. I should also note that we have received your submission, and we have had the opportunity to go through it. I suspect that some of the committee members might well want to ask some questions about your submission. I thank you also for providing that to the committee. I am very happy for you to proceed, Michael.

Mr CHAPMAN — Okay. As a developer of planned communities, we tend to develop from a set of principles that have evolved from many guidelines. The Victorian safer community
guidelines are just one of these sets of guidelines. While we do not put these guidelines as a book beside ourselves as a set of rules, we do use these guidelines plus other set guidelines that have been written plus other guidance that exists in many urban design texts and guidance documents around Australia and the world to evaluate the design that we do. They are all incorporated into the approach we take on this. The five principles of surveillance, access, movement and sightlines, activity, ownership, and management and maintenance are underlying principles in every design decision that gets taken on a community.

I will jump over to Caroline Springs unless you have got them.

The CHAIR — We have. Sandy has just given them to us.

Mr CHAPMAN — Just working through them, we tried to quickly put some photos there knowing the amount of time you had just to illustrate some of the principles at play in some of our communities. I am not suggesting that every time we do something we get everything right, so I am quite sure we could walk around Caroline Springs and find places where the surveillance, for example, was not as optimum as it could be, but generally we try to take it into account every possible time. These are some examples of showing the requirements through design and surveillance, if we go to the third slide. We put requirements on built form to surveil where we do not have a road. We like not to have roads. These processes will come up further on in the presentation. In every place it is about people, cyclists and the public using a space that is not dominated by roads. We tend to make sure that we have good surveillance of every public round space we create, and in fact of every private round space, whether that is coming from a large commercial building, as is shown in the bottom left-hand corner, or individual houses. The one on the bottom right-hand corner is actually a rear-lane loaded product, and if we were to go up the rear lane behind it, we would actually see that there are also access units that overlook that lane.

Jumping to the next slide, when we start to look at access, movement and sightlines, this is the sort of surveillance we also like to get on these. This is the first set of images of houses at Caroline Springs. This is the set of parks within an area of Caroline Springs. What we try to get is clearly legible and yet it should respond to the aspirational aspects of what makes a community a community and always give them a clear public realm that has great access and great movement and sightlines. We operate a number of tiers of accessibility. We operate on the one that says, 'I live here and I need to get somewhere else'. That one will often be on the road — that accessibility network. Quite often we also have the highest order of use as, 'I want to just walk around and enjoy my community. I want to be healthy, and I want to walk around. I don’t have a target of where I am going. I am literally going to leave my home, do a lap around something and come back'. This is what we find quite frequently as a higher order of use. Subsequently our movement paths do not always follow a road. We try to create points of enhanced activity.

So moving towards slide 5, most of all we try to balance activity within a community that talks about the points of activity, like you have there, which is right in the middle of Caroline Springs near the library and the resource end that sits in the middle of the community versus actually getting people out of their cars and trying to create activity across the whole community, as you saw in slide 4. I am sorry for the photos — we tend to take photos when there are not people there rather than when there are people there who might be offended by photos being taken. Consequently there are no people in our photos. Activation is an activity or something we try to get, but we try to get it balanced around the community with high points of activation.

Moving to slide 6, the reason we put that in was to suggest that one of the few spots where we merge private and public realms, because the guidelines talk about really trying to clearly identify the difference between the realms, is in the points of high activity. Where we have lots of activity, we tend to merge the two realms. Elsewhere we tend to make the realms very separate.

Jumping to ownership, on slide 7, this is an amalgam of slides to sort of start to talk about ownership, I guess, the way we see it. While very much the guidelines are written about making sure it is clear who owns what spaces and how they work, we actually find that ownership by the community of its both private and public realms is the bigger issue. While you look at the top left-hand photo, it looks like we have a lane full of driveways, which is probably a bad outcome.
There are a couple of points of surveillance put in on that. When we put laneways in that are quasi-private or public spaces, we try to get surveillance out of them. There are other examples just of the types of spaces that occur. If we look at the house on the top left-hand side, you can see surveillance coming out over the public realm, and then fencing to that public realm to make sure that the person who lives near the adjoining public realm can never actually take over that public realm.

The guy with the chainsaw down in the bottom left is one of our many attempts to come through and get the community to own parts of their spaces. We find that clear ownership by the community of what it owns as the public realm is almost more critical than definition between the public and private realms, much as we do keep that up.

If we jump to the next slide, slide 8, the photos vary from the top left — which is a park on The Grange at Caroline Springs, where we created a gathering spot for the community and once again gave them a sense of ownership of the space — to a couple of entry walls. The safe design guidelines are quite silent on entry walls, but we find that giving people an ability to own a bite-sized piece of their community is essential, so subsequently the one on the bottom left is the main entry to Caroline Springs and has a big lake behind it, for those of you who know it. The one up on the top right is an entry into one of our villages, which are bite-sized pieces of the community where people tend to spend a bit more time within their immediate community. The one on the bottom right is a grape-growing area where we established a community ownership initiative by bringing in a community association, not a paid one, where people come and pick these grapes and produce a Caroline Springs-based wine. It is giving the community ownership of some of the park spaces that it has.

Coming to the last slide, which is on management and maintenance, it is really easy to do the maintenance of the community, hopefully, so that you do not degrade the facilities. The hardest part is the management of the community. When community infrastructure goes in that requires ongoing management and ongoing costs to the local authority, that is the hard part. Our most difficult task in all of our community creation is to create sustainable social engagement — that is, sustainable mechanisms where people have the management of the community at the heart of all the decisions they make moving forward. That was a quick run-through of some of the principles as they apply to Caroline Springs.

We were asked to supply an opinion about mandating the guidelines. In the written submission we suggested that you have to be really careful because you can get what we call a potato stamp approach. If we have a look at the livable neighbourhood guidelines in Perth, I can go to pretty much any community in Perth that has used those guidelines as the guide to the development and I literally cannot tell where I am. We end up losing the local context out of that type of development.

We have concerns with some of the guidelines — and I have a list here — that we think limit the ability to produce unique outcomes. There are three clauses in the guidelines about cul-de-sacs, yet cul-de-sacs provide quite a viable living alternative. In fact about 15 per cent of the customers who come into our communities wish to buy in a cul-de-sac, not because they want to be snobs or they think they will get more or less privacy but because they actually get a great sense of community — a micro community — in that cul-de-sac.

Clause 1.2.1 talks about activity centre spacing, and it goes back to something that was originally tabled by the Congress for the New Urbanism in the United States about 400-metre walking distances to local activity centres. We do not know of any community in Australia that can make those work in a commercially viable manner, so we think an open space network that allows you to walk to those centres is more important than the spacing of those centres. Putting them in places and spacings that allow them to be commercially viable is more important.

There are references in clause 1.3.1 to a dispersive grid. We do not run a dispersive grid, not because we would not want to — we would love to — but because we are forced by the engineering standards in all of your local authorities, and in fact most local authorities around Australia, to run a modified grid, meaning that we do not disperse the traffic equally through the grid. When we hit the higher order roads, the intersection spacings that are forced on us by
engineering standards do not allow the dispersive grid to continue, so subsequently we do not run one.

There are a lot of references within the guidelines, in about four or five places, that try to keep all the pedestrian networks on major roads, and we disagree with that in a major way. We believe as long as you can get the surveillance right that there are many times where walkways and networks can run through open spaces and run towards schools. We find by reference to the users of those pathways that if we can provide a well-surveilled pathway off the major road, we have got a higher chance of younger kids using it and we have got a much higher chance of recreation use on it. We try to run a lot of our networks away from major roads as well as having the ones still on the major roads.

There are notes within it about density and we think density should be clustered through all communities. If you create a good and active community, you do not need to turn around and wrap your parks in high density or wrap your activity centres with high density, because people are prepared to live up to 400 or 500 metres away from those points of high activity.

There are other points about the lead-in to clause 1.7.8 We actually believe topography and the affordability of building in the aspects dictate where we put roads so that we can create blocks of land that people can afford, and then make sure the road network provides this great linkage as well as the lineal open-space network to create good communities.

There is another reference in clause 1.9.1 about having dwellings always fronting every order of road. There are a whole lot of roads, like your freeways and arterials and even the sub-arterials that are just not liveable on, so there have to be other mechanisms not to front buildings onto those roads. We look for places where we can turn around and get activation to the road, but we generally will not front a residential lot onto it.

In clause 1.4.2 there is talk about the park system. We prefer to run a whole lot of different sizes of nodal parks but all within a linear connected system so we can get people moving within the park system and get them out of their cars. There is talk in clause 1.10.3 of deeper lots on major streets and about planting to help reduce the impact. In fact plants reflect noise, and they reflect the noise back onto the property behind them. For every 10 metres I move back from a major road, I will lose 3dB, which is not very much. Subsequently bigger setbacks on major roads do not work, and we do not use them for that reason.

There are further examples of what happens. There are examples within the guidance that talks about not allowing front fences, because you do not want front fences to block surveillance, so subsequently always having private backyards where people can use their backyards. We think the sense of activity outside of the house should be created in the most climatically advantaged place, and if that is the front yard and I get activity in the front yard, with the fence not necessarily an 1800-high one but something over the 1 metre that your guidance points towards, then I get greater surveillance from the activity that occurs in the front yard than any house could ever have given. To me, we have got to make the most of the climate and the best spaces we can make.

There is a lot of reference in the guidance about activity and points of activity. We much prefer to develop a community where there is activity spread everywhere, with points of activity, as I referenced in Caroline Springs. You have got to be really careful how much you try to activate, because every bit you try to activate pinches some activity from somewhere else within your community. The more activity we can get by spreading a great network of walkability and cyclability getting more people into the parks is more important than some of the other points of activity. There are notes in there about constant setbacks within commercial zones; yet if you go down to any commercial zone, you will see a variation of setbacks that deliver the points of activity along those spots.

There are points on the amount of road frontage to parks, and some of these have been applied through different guidance in Victoria, which has meant that we have little parks of a couple of thousand square metres with a couple of thousand square metres of road around them. In fact we find that there are really good ways to front properties straight onto parks so that the parks are not
road dominated and people might come and use them. When we put in small parks, like 5000 square metre parks, with roads the whole way around them, we find we hardly get any use because they are so road dominated. That is the type of stuff that we would shy away from saying you should mandate in the guidelines. There are so many ways to do so many positive things, and it is very hard for a guideline to cover them all without excluding some options that might otherwise be good.

You asked about actions that could increase the awareness of good design. We think it is promoting the good places that are created, and in Victoria there are some really good places through the old VicUrban — I am not sure of its name now — where communities have created good outcomes. There are really good places where some of the inner-city development is in the process of generating some good outcomes, although not all of them have quite achieved that yet. We think the best awareness is being able to highlight the places where it is good rather than bad.

You asked about a reference to occupancy evaluation. We tend to run constant community engagement, so the community is always coming back and engaging with us, because a master planned community takes 10 or 15 years to deliver. Basically our occupancy evaluations are done on the run all the time through focus groups, and through using the SurveyMonkey tools that exist on the internet to try to get people to engage in future work et cetera. At the end of a project we try to have a look at the social engagement we have created. We look at not necessarily whether we succeeded in creating a great place or a bad place, because hopefully we would have solved that on the way through, but at how much did we get the people who live in the community to engage in that community, because seriously that is the best thing to make a community.

Lastly, we were asked what are the challenges? I put four out, because I think there are four really important ones. The first one is not building a place — about building a subdivision that does not have a mixture of uses and does not create a place, and people just live in it as a dormitory. That is a massive problem for a safe community, so place is critical — in other words, people owning and feeling they own somewhere is a major issue.

The second one is affordability as a challenge — moving to a response where people can afford to move into a house and we can increase the affordability factors back so we have not wiped out half the community by saying, ‘Sorry, houses are no longer affordable to you’. It means we need to move back to a closer network of housing, which is more dense than we exist with currently. Affordability is a major challenge to that. Interestingly affordability leads towards density, and density normally leads towards better engagement. Affordability also offers opportunities to move forward.

The other two big challenges — and I think these are the really big ones — are the engineering standards, which currently do not let us do lots and lots of bits and pieces. They make sure that every bit of public realm is dominated by the cars that use it rather than by the pedestrians and the people. These are well entrenched. We said before that we do not run a dispersive grid, and that is because we cannot get that through any engineering local authority in Victoria.

The last one is the car. I know we have had the car for a long time, but the car is the biggest enemy to any engagement we get — any way of creating safe communities through activation of a community. Everything we can possibly do to make people park their cars when they do not need to use them and actually get them out and walking is the best tool for creating a safe community.

The CHAIR — Thank you, Michael. You certainly covered some ground. I appreciate the thought that has gone into your presentation.

Mr SCHEFFER — I just want to come back to your response to the question on the mandating of the principles in legislation. One of the things the committee has wrestled with is whether there is a role for government in setting some parameters that might act as a bit of strengthening to encourage the kind of innovation that you were talking about. One view would be to leave it completely open to the market and to the gradual development of a design culture which will be to everyone’s ultimate benefit.
I guess another approach is accepting that innovation is very important in an area like this and that there may well be some role for government to set some standards or principles around that. You say that many of the innovations you are referring to come from a set of guidelines and an innovative approach. How do you see that relationship between the guidelines and innovation? What is the balance between what is not as negotiable and what is very negotiable and flexible?

Mr CHAPMAN — The principles are not necessarily the baseline principles that have been put into the design guidelines. The best documents we have worked with around Australia are documents that very clearly set out what you are trying to achieve, not how to achieve it but what you are trying to achieve, and then to provide guidelines that are not considered at all enforceable, so it is basically as long as you achieve the principles and can show you have built this great community; it was ordained that you had achieved those principles. If you were not creative enough to be able to show that you could achieve those principles in any way, you could then go and use the guidelines at the bottom and say, ‘Well, I did the following things, which means I must have achieved your principles’.

Mr SCHEFFER — Should the principles you are talking about be mandated — not the guidelines but the principles?

Mr CHAPMAN — I think principles for good design, assuming you can get them written effectively, should be mandated. We do not have any problems with something that says, ‘You should build a great community. You should get great community action. You should get social engagement. You should have a safe place for people to walk’. I would have thought that mandating those is a good call rather than a bad call, yes.

Mr SCHEFFER — Thank you.

The CHAIR — I notice in your last comments, Michael, that you suggested one of the best outcomes would be for people to park their cars and walk. I thoroughly agree. I am quite involved in some of the health programs we have running to try to offset the diabetes and obesity issues that now face us. My view is to get people to park cars, particularly at night, and walk, but that means creating a safe environment. I guess part and parcel of this inquiry is lighting, access, line of sight and things like that. You have indicated that Caroline Springs is an area we could look at. That is a new suburb that provides a lot of the safer design guidelines within its development. We also looked at Selandra Rise, which is another new suburb that incorporates some of these safer design guidelines. You mentioned VicUrban. Docklands was mentioned to us as a potential new development that incorporates CPTED. Are there other areas you might like to direct the committee to which demonstrate what you have incorporated in your presentation?

Mr CHAPMAN — This might be a Lend Lease plug, but most of our communities attempt to do this. I have to admit a lot of them do not do it very well at night; you raised the issue of ‘at night’. We have great difficulty getting local authorities down there to accept that major circulation networks that are not near roads should have lights on them because that is a maintenance cost to them. Inevitably that is why we tend to have a multitiered circulation network, where we can put a network near the road which does not require extra lights as well as one in the park that we cannot necessarily get lights through.

For a short period Queensland had an Urban Land Development Authority, which has now been taken over by Economic Development Queensland. It wrote a guidance document — one of about a dozen documents it wrote — in which it provided guidance about what networks should be shaded and what networks should be lit so that you actually increased the mobility of people outside of those areas. Unfortunately there are no developments in Queensland that have been based on this, but in Victoria I think Caroline Springs is a very good example of where things have gone positively.

Our Edgewater development, which is in the city, tends to do things relatively well, although I have to admit there are some lighting issues on some of the quasi-private–public interfaces that might limit the safety of some of the movement there. There is also no lighting at the end of the
escarpment through that project, although we have resolved that by putting housing through one section of it.

Running through other projects down there, I think most of them are planned communities. I would have thought the stuff that Stockland is doing at Highland would be an example; it has some really nice movement corridors through it. We tried to put a similarly good movement corridor through our adjoining development at Craigieburn, but once again the night componentry is inadequate because it was not recognised at that point in time as being important or acceptable to the council. I think the Aurora and Cairnlea developments are both relatively good examples, but once again they all have problems with night-time lighting.

The CHAIR — You have given us some good leads. I have one more question before I hand over to the committee. A recurrent theme throughout our inquiry has been about education and training. Given that you are from an architecture and design profession, how do you think we could improve education and training for planners, whether it be a graduate course or a workshop, so that they have CPTED and safer design guidelines in mind when they are developing or casting a permit for residential use?

Mr CHAPMAN — One of the things we found which used to happen a lot but which has not happened in any Australian state for a while is that design courses used to work with master planned communities. We would often call in for at least one of the design exercises, whether it was an urban design, architecture or a landscape architecture qualification, and work side by side with the university or institution. They would go and do an exercise and we would come back and tell them why it did or did not work, what made it work, what were the good things and what could be improved. To me that is where CPTED needs to step in.

That has died off over the last few years. I cannot tell you why; I do not know. In the last 10 years or so I cannot recall any design professionals around Australia being asked to run one of those exercises. But I think it would be good if you could get it introduced as a compulsory course or a semester of study; I think it would be really interesting to have that for every designer. Another way to do it would be to try to get those design exercises up and running again. Most of the developers would work with them, I would have thought; I know we certainly would.

Mr SCHEFFER — I have one more question. The committee put a question to you about how the guidelines could apply to new urban fringe developments on the one hand and new high-rise developments in well-established areas on the other. I understand the point you make in your response about the constraints that apply in an already existing urban area, which mean you may have to pick and choose what things you can implement. I am clear on that. But I have read this a few times and I do not understand where you go after that. You talk about high-rise developments really being just low-rise adjacent buildings stacked up. I can understand that conceptually, but it is a bit like saying 20 cars in a row are the same as a bus. The issue about high rise or non-high rise is about footprints and about building safer communities. I do not quite know where that is going. What point are you making about high rise as distinct from low rise?

Mr CHAPMAN — I guess what we were saying is that in the communities we work with it is about creating the community. I can put 30 dwellings into a high rise and do nothing that makes those people come together to either walk somewhere or do anything else. I have nothing other than 30 houses in an estate that has no place or community facilitation. Alternatively I can turn around and put the same effort into a high rise that I put into a master planned community to try to create community and I will actually get community out of it.

Mr SCHEFFER — Okay.

Mr CHAPMAN — So I guess we are saying that in our mind we do not believe high rises are any different. You have to put in the effort and the facilitation to get community development and a safe community out of it or else you just end up with a whole lot of housing, be it vertically stacked, that does not necessarily deliver anything better — in other words, we see so many high rises where there is no integration between any of the residents that they might as well be living on acreage.
Mr SCHEFFER — Yes, I understand. Thank you.

The CHAIR — Michael, I think we have come to the end. Are there any further comments you wish to make?

Mr CHAPMAN — We have probably confused you enough with our words; I am sorry about that.

Mr SCHEFFER — Michael, it was a very good and thorough response. Thank you.

The CHAIR — Thanks, Michael. We appreciate your submission. It gave us a bit of background prior to this teleconference, which was useful, as were the photographs of Caroline Springs. Thank you for that. We hope to present our report to Parliament by the end of June, which may be of interest to you. I am sure Sandy will get you a copy once it has been tabled. Thank you again for your written submission and for your verbal comments today.

Mr CHAPMAN — No problem. Thank you.

Committee adjourned.