This article was downloaded by: [Daren Fisher]
On: 21 April 2012, At: 07:59
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Australian Planner
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rapl20

Crime prevention through environmental design: a case study of multi-agency collaborationin Sydney, Australia

Daren Geoffrey Fisher [a] & Awais Piracha [b]

[a] National Centre in HIV Social Research, University of New South Wales, Robert Webster Building, University of New South Wales, Kensington, 2052, Australia

[b] School of Social Sciences, University of Western Sydney, Penrith, Australia

Available online: 20 Apr 2012

To cite this article: Daren Geoffrey Fisher & Awais Piracha (2012): Crime prevention through environmental design: a case study of multi-agency collaborationin Sydney, Australia, Australian Planner, 49:1, 79-87

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2011.608689

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Australian Planner
Vol. 49, No. 1, March 2012, 79–87

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Crime prevention through environmental design: a case study of multi-agency collaboration in Sydney, Australia

Daren Geoffrey Fisher[a]* and Awais Piracha[b]

[a]*University of New South Wales, National Centre in HIV Social Research, Robert Webster Building, University of New South Wales, Kensington 2052, Australia;* [b]*University of Western Sydney, School of Social Sciences, Penrith, Australia*

(*Received 21 February 2011; final version received 25 July 2011*)

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) has been legislated in every State and Territory of Australia despite the lack of clear empirical evidence that it is successful (Homel, 2005). Despite a commitment in the literature surrounding CPTED to isolate 'what works' (Cherney and Sutton, 2007), there is a distinct lack of empirical evidence in Australia that details how CPTED theory operates in practice. To address this gap in the existing literature, this paper presents the findings of a case study that was conducted on Martin Place, a major pedestrian thoroughfare located in Sydney, Australia. Following on from the research conducted by Zahm (2005) that explored the transference of CPTED knowledge from criminologists to those involved with the design of public places, this paper analyses how CPTED theory was understood and utilised as part of the multi-agency implementation of CPTED-based initiatives that occur in Martin Place. Furthermore, this paper presents a brief history of the development of CPTED in New South Wales (NSW), and a unique framework for understanding the application of CPTED within these contexts. With the help of this case study, this paper addresses the absence of research and evaluation of how CPTED has been implemented in Australia.

Keywords: CPTED; crime prevention; criminology

Introduction

Centred on the idea that, 'the proper design of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear of crime and the incidence of crime' (Crowe, 2000, p. 1), manipulations of the physical environment have been collected under the title of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). Drawing on Jacob's (1961) '*The death and life of great American cities*', it has generally been recognised that certain environmental designs unintentionally lead to the commission of crime and social decay (Geason and Wilson, 1989). It is from this realisation that CPTED can theoretically be seen to have begun and be seen to draw value (Cozens *et al*., 2005).

In contemporary literature, CPTED is conceptually part of the design process within planning and architecture (Atlas, 2008; Sutton *et al*., 2008). Through eliminating certain design features and enhancing others, it is proposed that the behaviour of those who use these environments will be altered, and crime will less likely be committed. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991) have contended that any crime requires four elements; the law, an offender, a target, and a location. The first three elements in this equation are often not easy to control or influence. The built environment, the fourth element, however, is easier to alter. CPTED therefore has been presented as a pragmatic means to influence the factors that promote the incidence of crime (Sutton *et al*., 2008).

In a policy environment where the success of CPTED is evaluated based on what it achieves and not its intentions (Schneider, 2005, p. 276), CPTED has been legislated in every State and Territory of Australia despite clear empirical evaluative evidence that it is successful (Homel, 2005, p. 355). To help bridge this nexus, this paper seeks to explore how CPTED theory has informed the multidisciplinary and inter-agency collaborations that occur as part of the design process. Since the late 1990s, inter-agency collaborations and partnerships have become a prominent element of crime control policy (Crawford, 1998). Allowing for more detailed knowledge of the

*Corresponding author: Email: d.fisher@unsw.edu.au

ISSN 0729-3682 print/ISSN 2150-6841 online
© 2012 Planning Institute Australia
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2011.608689
http://www.tandfonline.com

dynamic people/place relationship to be incorporated into crime prevention initiatives (Cozens and Love, 2009), inter-agency collaborations are essential to coordinate resources and present a coherent crime prevention strategy (Samuels, 2005). Furthermore, physical/spatial crime prevention interventions have also been observed to have limited efficacy without supporting social strategies that involve high levels of inter-agency collaboration within Sydney (Judd *et al.*, 2006). Thompson and Gartner (2007), however, note that while the advantages of inter-agency approaches to crime prevention are often promoted, the difficulties associated with implementing these strategies are often not discussed. Competing professional priorities, ideological differences, and inter-agency conflicts all present significant hurdles to effective inter-agency collaborations and require further exploration to move 'beyond the level of policy rhetoric and into genuine and worthwhile practice' (Blagg *et al.*, 1988; Thompson and Gartner, 2007, p. 14).

Exploring some of the negative consequences resulting from conflicting priorities within CPTED initiatives, Coleman et al. (2005, p. 2511) has noted that:

> the trajectory of regenerative discourse and practice that surrounds CPTED is resulting in a stabilisation of opportunity structures for corporate crimes and harms, whilst at the same time further exposing the relatively powerless to the punitive gaze of the extended surveillance capacity being developed as part of the entrepreneurial landscape.

Rather than minimising the harms done to a local community, Coleman and Sim (2000) posit that initiatives that prioritise economic, political and dominant social frameworks may damage and alienate large sections of the population. The affects of inter-agency policy, politics, and fiscal considerations have been shown to influence the efficacy and consequences of CPTED initiates (Minnery and Lim, 2005; Parnaby, 2006), and are a necessary aspect that requires exploration to further understand how CPTED theory is translated into practice.

There has been little exploration of these prevailing trends within policy and planning structures within CPTED particularly in Australia. Heeding Cozens' (2008) call to investigate whether practice follows theory and policy, this paper aims to describe how CPTED theory has permeated the perspectives and actions of 15 individuals with professional backgrounds in planning, architecture, policing, criminology, politics, and hospitality. To enable discussion of how crime prevention theory has operated practically, this paper presents a case study of how these 15 professionals understand and use CPTED as part of a collaborative process centred on a single public place. Through describing how CPTED policy has influenced the practice of these individuals who share a connection to an existing public place, this paper aims to explore what *does* work instead of what *ought* to work (Jacobs, 1993) in the multi-agency collaborative implementation of CPTED.

Case Study

As much of the justification behind the use of CPTED initiatives is grounded in the notions of 'problem solving' (Cherney, 2006), and a 'what counts is what works' mindset (Cherney and Sutton, 2007), this paper aims to fill the aforementioned gap in empirical knowledge by exploring how CPTED theories have been used by those in charge of the design and maintenance of a single public space. In order to investigate the complicated and tangled nature of CPTED initiatives (McCord, 2005), a case study approach was employed by this study to enable an exploration of the boundaries between phenomenon and context that are not clearly evident in the application of CPTED theory (Yin et al. 1976). To allow an in-depth exploration of how CPTED theory has informed and influenced crime prevention practice and inter-agency collaboration, the public thoroughfare of Martin Place was selected as the focus of this study (Figure 1).

Martin Place was chosen for this study due to its prominent and well-established character, as it is a site where user conflict is likely to occur (Atlas, 2008), it has a temporal usage pattern, is a site for public congregation for cultural events, and is an easily identifiable space from which discussions may be drawn with professionals that are involved with the implementation of CPTED. While this study could have explored the use of CPTED theory in a broad context over a larger geographic area, it should be noted that such a broad subject of analysis may not be conducive to producing any meaningful findings. Due to the natural and serendipitous actions of local communities, it is difficult to isolate any valid overarching trends when evaluating CPTED initiatives (Wilson and Wileman, 2005).

To explore how CPTED theory had been interpreted and whether it had made any impacts on Martin Place, a combination of purposive and snowball sampling (Sarantakos, 2005) techniques were used. Participants were initially selected who were directly involved with the management of Martin Place. As part of this initial round of interviews, participants were asked to identify their colleagues who they routinely consulted with and assisted in

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

Figure 1. Martin Place, Sydney. (Source: City of Sydney, http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/AboutSydney/HistoryandArchives/VisionsOfSydney/images_lrg/MartinPlace.asp.)

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

the daily functioning of Martin Place. A series of 15 semi-structured interviews was conducted with Police Crime Prevention Officers, private town planners and architects, crime prevention consultants, City of Sydney council workers, business owners, and property managers who were directly involved in the daily operations of Martin Place. To provide details on how CPTED policy had developed within New South Wales a series of interviews were also conducted with key individuals from the New South Wales Department of Planning and a former State Minister for Planning. All interviewees were asked about what they understood CPTED to be, whether it influenced the ways in which they approached their professional duties, and what measures of success or failure would they use to evaluate the use of CPTED.

An exploratory document study (Sarantakos, 2005) was also conducted on *s79c of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* (s79c), the s79c *Guidelines*, the supporting literature for the NSW Police's *Safer By Design* Course, and City of Sydney Council's *Design Guide for a Safer Community* (Maynard, 2004). Due to the significance that was placed on these documents by those interviewed, it was vital to include them in this exploration of how CPTED was used in Martin Place.

Findings

A local history

The impact of the local political context on the implementation and effectiveness of crime prevention initiatives is well documented in the CPTED literature (Parnaby, 2006; Wilson and Wileman, 2005; MacDonald and Kitteringham, 2004). As the policy context, fiscal considerations, and local politics all contribute to the success and failure of initiatives (Minnery and Lim, 2005), documenting the local history and identifying the impacts that a local context has on crime prevention is an important part of developing a useable evidence base.

In New South Wales (NSW), the primary policy manifestations of CPTED theory are s79c of the Environmental Planning Assessment Act (1979) and the complimentary Safer by Design program. Prior to the introduction of the s79c guidelines however, Planning's relationship with CPTED was governed through the old s90 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. According to the interviewed planners, the old s90 differed from the new section s79c and its guidelines in several fundamental ways. The first key difference was described as the functional approach that was taken in s79c instead of the numerous and specific requirements of the old s90. In the s79c guidelines, the effects of CPTED are outlined, the form and purpose of a crime risk assessment are mentioned (Part A) and the basic concepts of CPTED are described (Part B). It is through this document that councils are required to consider the principles of CPTED when assessing all Development Applications (DA), with the broad aim that; 'effective design can be used to reduce crime opportunities' (Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, 2001b, p. 1). Although the di-

rections of when to use these guidelines are clear, the implementation aspects are very broad. The primary author of the s79c guidelines however stated that he had deliberately kept the language and concepts open to interpretation as;

> These guidelines needed to stand the test of time and be adaptable to the breadth of development design types and be able to encapsulate all the individual issues of these design types (KII, p. 5).

The authors of s79c guidelines envisaged a large number of people enrolling in the New South Wales Police's Safer by Design Course. The presence and importance of Police in the design process is mentioned several times in these guidelines. The NSW Police are presented as holders of CPTED knowledge and a primary source for those wishing to gain greater understanding of the CPTED principles and their usage. However, it was explicitly stated by the author that there was no intention to 'instil an expert mentality' on those who read the guidelines, and it was of great importance that these guidelines were understandable to those without a background in criminology (KII, p. 5).

Furthermore, the accessibility of these guidelines was described as a way to increase CPTED's political popularity and 'as a way to fight crime without locking up the poor innocents of crime' (KII, p. 11). The common sense nature of the subject matter, the fact that s79c wasn't wholly prescriptive, and the idea that it wasn't going to cost the State Government any money were also cited by the respondent with a political background as reasons why the notion of CPTED was so exciting for him (KII, p. 11). Indeed, the introduction of this legislation was seen as such a favourable political strategy that the hardest part of the policy's induction was choosing a site for the press conference; 'I didn't find a downside, nobody found a downside, you might have found one by now but its eight years later now that you've found it. It seemed to be completely positive all the way through' (KII, p. 11).

The second major change in this new legislative initiative was that the provisions were now labelled as CPTED. By associating s79c with CPTED, literature that was previously in the domain of Police and Criminologists became relevant in the minds of planners. This attempt to help planners and councils engage more with the criminological world was presented as an important and intentional part of this legislative change. It was revealed through the interviews that the inclusion of CPTED had been 'brought into minds of planners and architects' through the introduction of the s79c Guidelines of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, as an integral part of good design (KII, p. 5). CPTED theory, however, existed as just one of a series of competing priorities in the design process. Despite the aforementioned progress achieved by the introduction of the s79c Guidelines, the accessibility of CPTED knowledge on a practical level was still viewed as a challenge by all those interviewed. When asked about the Safer by Design course, it was noted that due to its long duration (four full days) and its infrequent offering (four times a year), this source of further information and training was difficult to access (KII, p. 5).

Martin Place

Martin Place was described by respondents as a major public thoroughfare, that is primarily used between 7am and 7pm Monday to Friday by those who work in the surrounding area, and by more casual users on weekends. It is a stage for political activism, a retail centre for the workers of the area, and a site where both skateboarders and the homeless would occasionally congregate. While there was no explicit community that was described as residing in Martin Place, it was portrayed consistently as a pleasant, safe space that was successful in meeting the often conflicting needs of a broad cross-section of Sydney's population.

Responses from all of the interviews clarified that a nexus existed between the theoretical nature and the practical uses of CPTED. Across the interviews, CPTED theory was utilised for three distinct purposes; to guide the design of the physical environment; to implement actions that change negative aspects of the physical and social landscape of an area; and to maintain positive features of the physical and social landscape. Each of these three phases has been described separately below.

The design phase

In all the interviews it was recognised that the successful implementation of CPTED 'requires the cooperation of a number of different professions' (KII, p. 3), including but not limited to architects, planners, the police, developers, the local council, various consultants, and the community concerned. CPTED also was dominantly portrayed as being only one element for consideration under the motif of 'good design'. Although the meaning of 'good design' appeared to vary between respondents, it was generally seen to encapsulate a number of artistic and practical considerations (KII, pp. 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11). Although the concept of 'good design' was often seen

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

to be self-explanatory, when probed, respondents described that this concept includes the brief from the client (KII, pp. 3, 13), how the site will ideally function (KII, pp. 2, 7), and how aesthetically pleasing and innovative it is (KII, pp. 2, 10). Rather than being a separate consideration in its own right, CPTED was seen as a part of the necessary approach to fulfil all of these criteria (KII, p. 3).

In responding to how CPTED was used within the design phase, it was often commented that the respondent was just 'thinking out loud' or 'hadn't really thought of [CPTED] like that before' (KII, pp. 3, 7, 10, 11). This indicates that the above thoughts and the placement of CPTED theory within the design process may not be an explicit part of the internal analysis and assessment processes that planners and architects undertake. The importance of CPTED and crime in general within the design process was noted to vary depending on the type of the project, and often was of lower importance than fiscal and specifically design-related criteria.

The interviews revealed that along with the necessity of considering the needs of potential tenants in a retail setting, the context of the built environment was seen to be a major consideration in the success of public spaces as well. Although the s79c legislation is unlikely to make the design process consider things that are more than two blocks away from a site, incorporating the dynamics of the existing social and built elements of an area was seen as pivotal to both the success of CPTED and upholding the notion of 'good design'. Conducting community consultation and employing the views of many external consultants was seen as a necessary step to 'understanding the city as a whole instead of as a series of components, and recognising that each [site] should be knitted into the fabric of the city' (KII, p. 2).

Even though this design phase sought primarily to 'inject CPTED and other theories into the design of places and spaces' (KII, p. 2), the practical uses and the effects of these designs on potential users was presented as being necessary for the success of this process. 'Liveability', client, peer, and legislative approval were also noted as major motivations within the design process (KII, p. 3).

The intervention phase

After a plan has received DA approval, the majority of those with a planning background saw this as the end of their role and the beginning of a new phase in CPTED use (KII, p. 10). In numerous interviews it was noted that designs that have received DA approval and have met the CPTED-based requirements associated with s79c of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act are still not comprehensive (KII, pp. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9). At this point, it was revealed that the plans are often at 1:100 scale and a lot of practical details on material connections, façade final detail, and details on how things work practically are missing from the design (KII, p. 10). While this finalisation process could be seen wholly as a construction and design process, it was viewed by one of the Crime Prevention Officers and the crime prevention consultant as highly relevant to CPTED (KII, pp. 1, 6). Painting dark areas white and the addition of mirrors were seen as things that were not necessarily thought of at this stage, were only added after construction, and did contribute to preventing crime. This approach to crime prevention was intended to be inherent in the concept of *Place Management* in s79c (KII, p. 5); however, limitations in the ability to foresee many of these issues were mentioned by the crime prevention consultant (KII, p. 1). It was further noted that many people had also become savvy at evading this area of the policy and viewed it more as a box ticking exercise (KII, p. 1). This was not seen as an inherently bad outcome by the respondent with a background in politics, as even box ticking would increase safety;

> I say, using [the s79c Guidelines] or any two or three of the things associated with this will increase safety, and it doesn't really matter which ones they were. You would find there would be prevention occurring in opportunistic crime, and it would be valuable. That's why I see that whether it is a checklist or sort of a theme that it is still valuable. (KII, p. 11)

The issues outlined above were seen to be relevant to pre-existing sites such as Martin Place as well. Rather than conducting Security Audits on areas that have been identified as crime hot spots, one of the Crime Prevention Officers would approach businesses with design-related crime risks, and spend time educating other Police Officers to assist with this proactive identification process (KII, p. 6). The impact of professional respect and the level of knowledge about CPTED was said to play a pivotal role in how stakeholders responded to these issues;

> It is important for me to be on a first name basis with everyone as people generally do not see it as appropriate to contact the Police in these situations ... People just need to understand why this is important and need to know that I will deliver on requests ... It is important for my role that I do not get a reputation as an office dweller. (KII, p. 6)

The Crime Prevention Officers reported that when recommendations were delivered, most businesses and

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

stakeholders responded positively to them (KII, p. 9), but would frequently state that financial constraints prevented them from acting on these recommendations (KII, p. 6). Coupled with the aforementioned attempts to gain respect and promote knowledge of CPTED, the Security Audit Reports were structured in a way to help combat financial limitations as well. In the Security Audit Report a brief explanation of the statutory requirements and definition of CPTED adapted from the Safer by Design guidelines was provided, and these reports detail why these CPTED based interventions are important by explaining how they will likely affect the minds of potential criminals (KII, p. 6). After establishing the rationale for CPTED, one of the Community Safety Officers described that three levels of recommendations are then made (KII, p. 6). The first level included a 'wish list' of ideal interventions that should be taken, and included structural changes that may be expensive (KII, p. 6). The second level included initiatives that involve the inclusion of less expensive resources and would likely include training courses, hedge trimming, painting and the addition of extra staff (KII, p. 6). The final level of recommendations was described as 'methods to mitigate structure rather than change the structure' (KII, p. 6). This final layer of interventions aimed to redirect resources in more efficient ways, and was seen to be the most successful, as it required little effort on the part of business owners (KII, p. 6).

When this was discussed with the Licensee from a Bar located in Martin Place, the common sense nature of CPTED coupled with the idea that safety is connected with commercial viability made this a notable consideration in the running of this venue (KII, p. 8). The sharing of intelligence over usage patterns, individual users, and staff procedures was noted as being important to the ability for tailored CPTED interventions to be implemented (KII, p. 6). Despite this, information sharing and its relationship to commercial viability was noted as being one of the primary issues that inhibited crime prevention strategies in Martin Place (KII, p. 9).

A similar problem was also noted by one of the architects interviewed who reported that when working with the police from a design perspective it was not really a discussion and more like being told to address a series of issues. The responding architect equated it to beating one's head against a wall at times (KII, p. 2). This architect also saw that there was a lack of understanding about the interconnectivity of design issues by the police, and CPTED was seen to inappropriately override some of the broader priorities that are inherent in the 'good design' schema used by architects and planners (KII, p. 2). Furthermore, all respondents from a business background were also critical of the police's ability to suggest appropriate crime prevention solutions.

In public spaces, CPTED intervention was seen to potentially take on another design-related form. In a well-established site such as Martin Place, many of the respondents felt that there was little that could be changed structurally to incorporate current s79c criteria into the layout. Despite this, the inclusions of the amphitheatre as well as the inclusion of commercial kiosks were both seen to help to reinforce the surveillance and territorial reinforcement of Martin Place (KII, p. 2).

While whether it was appropriate to attribute these interventions solely to CPTED theory was questioned, physical interventions were described as an important and often underused application of CPTED (KII, p. 7). Overall, very few changes of this nature were viewed as being necessary for Martin Place as it was seen as 'a nice location and a safe place to visit' (KII, p. 9). After noting Martin Place's function as a thoroughfare and a promenade (KII, pp. 2, 3, 7, 9), the major structural change that was recommended for Martin Place was that it had more seating to provide people with a reason to go to and stay in Martin Place, particularly around the inactive fringes (KII, pp. 2, 7).

The maintenance phase

Alongside the design and intervention of public spaces, CPTED can be seen to take on a different role in directing how individuals maintain and influence how a space functions. In line with Wilson and Kelling's Broken Windows Theory (1982), rather than trying to change or produce a site, the maintenance phase can be seen as a process where places are managed, sustained and developed to mitigate and minimise the impacts of crime. Although it could be argued that the methods that are presented as part of this stage could still be considered as interventions, this paper presents the following as a separate but related stage where mechanisms were seen to involve promotion and consolidation, rather than a change in form.

From the interviews, it became evident that the maintenance of a distinct culture of Martin Place was an important part of daily management, and existed as three connected but separate mechanisms. The first form of culture maintenance was described as the professional working cultures that helped to manage and mitigate the risks associated with crime. This culture involved communication between stakeholders regarding changes to the character of the space, and was described by one of the Crime

Prevention Officers as not only a way to better manage a space, but also a way to move away from a purely reactive mindset (KII, p. 6). This professional culture helped to increase positive interaction between the police and other external bodies, and enhanced professional confidence among those who were a part of this process. Internal meetings and training sessions that established contacts and protocols on both official and casual levels were viewed as a positive way to establish an environment that 'keeps both the patrons and staff safe' (KII, p. 8).

The second form of (positive) cultural maintenance was observed among casual and regular uses of public spaces (KII, p. 2). Hosting structured events that give users a reason to come to a space was considered to be a great mechanism for integrating community with the physical environment (KII, p. 4). This interconnection between social maintenance for the success of the physical world was seen as a common issue in judging the success of a space in regards to both crime prevention and design. For the Crime Prevention Officers, the promotion of culture within a space was a challenge that could make their jobs at the same time both much easier and incredibly difficult (KII, pp. 6, 9). Community networks and the presence of official commercially-based outlets were both presented as factors that could make a space function safely and more efficiently (KII, pp. 6, 9).

The final social maintenance process that was reported existed as maintenance of the users of the space themselves. In all of the interviews there was a sense of fatalism about the way that people use a space. Even after the design of a place, and how the impact of other users can influence the behaviour and safety of others, had been discussed, it was assumed that there would always be groups of people that would jeopardise the safety or perceived safety of a space (KII, p. 10). It was noted by one of the planners that even an attractive, well-managed place, which has a positive culture, can be conducive to pickpockets and other types of crime (KII, p. 7). A great deal of the Crime Prevention Officers' work revolved around the identification and removal of those with a 'yobbo mentality' or those belonging to a 'hoodlum element' (KII, p. 6). This was presented as being part of a strategy that was aimed to proactively target offenders, and had resulted in substantial reduction in theft amongst other crimes. While it was stressed that investigation always preceded any reaction, a catalogue of suspicious looking people was collected and added to a facial recognition database in some settings (KII, p. 6). These proactive measures were portrayed as a means to regulate the space, and encourage the presence of more legitimate users in Martin Place.

Conclusion

CPTED application in Martin Place is very typical of the use of urban design for crime prevention. This study highlights the specific aspects of CPTED theory that have been used in Martin Place by a number of different players. The way it is understood and used varied immensely across the professional, business or social outlook of those involved in CPTED application. Coupled with legislation and policies that may be broadly interpreted, and limited access to extensive CPTED training and information, a situation where there is no dominant strategic approach to CPTED in Martin Place emerged through the interviews. The absence of cohesion between many of the key stakeholders professional actions and conceptual understanding of CPTED, displays the potential value for coordinated training programs that seek to engage the multiple agents involved in the design and maintenance of any given space simultaneously.

Despite this, the apparent uncoordinated individual responsibilities of private stakeholders, the police, and the local council did not appear to be detrimental to the prevention of crime in Martin Place, with most parties reporting that the space was a safe and enjoyable place to be. While it may be argued that better coordination of activities and the strategic use of resources would assist in the application of CPTED, attention should also be paid in the future to enhancing the understanding of CPTED theory. This could particularly be improved through the introduction of a more consistent dialogue between those who are involved in the ongoing running and maintenance of Martin Place, and those who hold professional positions that are specifically tasked with crime prevention. With this in mind, it is important for all users of the space to maintain good connections professionally, as well as providing an atmosphere that is conducive for casual users to have good connections as well.

Rather than attempting to analyse whether crime prevention has occurred in this example, this case study attempts to explore how CPTED knowledge has been understood and used by each of these individuals in their contrasting professional roles. While this paper acknowledges the importance of understanding 'what works' in preventing crime, it highlights the importance of exploring how CPTED knowledge has been perceived and amalgamated into varying professional mindsets. Although the external validity of this data is limited by the sample size (15), the comparison of these individual professionals' interactions with CPTED identifies the need for further exploration into any disciplinary effects that may influence crime prevention collaborations.

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

While CPTED exists on one level as the promotion of design devices that make crime harder to commit, this study has shown that CPTED is far more than efforts to increase surveillance and promote defensible space. While CPTED is far from a panacea for all social harms, it has implications that reach beyond how crime is committed in a single space. The need to recognise these impacts and to integrate their consideration within CPTED strategies that are employed by multiple agents simultaneously are vital to its positive use. Furthermore, understanding the mechanisms that control and regulate CPTED's use is equally important. While it may seem 'common sense' to determine 'what works' and to implement it, this is still an ongoing challenge for CPTED as it attempts to determine how it operates as a process instead of just an isolated theory.

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012

References

Atlas, R., 2008. *21st century security and CPTED: designing for critical infrastructure, protection and crime prevention*. CRC Press, Florida.

Blagg, H., Pearson, G., Sampson, A., Smith, D. and Stubbs, P., 1988. Inter-Agency Co-operation: Rhetoric and Reality. *In*: T. Hope and M. Shaw, eds. *Communities and Crime Reduction*. London: HMSO.

Brantingham, P. and Brantingham, P., 1991. *Environmental criminology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Cherney, A., 2006. Problem solving for crime prevention. *Trends and issues*, no. 314, Australian Institute of Criminology.

Cherney, A. and Sutton, A., 2007. Crime prevention in Australia: beyond 'what works?'. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of criminology*, 40 (1), 65–81.

Coleman, R. and Sim, J., 2000. 'You'll never walk alone': CCTV surveillance, order and neo-liberal rule in Liverpool city centre. *British journal of sociology*, 51 (4), 623–639.

Coleman, R., Tombs, S. and Whyte, D., 2005. Capital, crime control and statecraft in the entrepreneurial city. *Urban studies*, 42 (13), 2511–2530.

Cozens, P., 2008. Crime prevention through environmental design in Western Australia: planning for sustainable futures. *International journal of sustainable development planning*, 3 (3), 272–292.

Cozens, P. and Love, T., 2009. Manipulating permeability as a process for controlling crime: Balancing security and sustainability in local contexts. *Built environment*, 35 (3), 346–365.

Cozens, P.M., Saville, G. and Hillier, D., 2005. Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED): a review and modern bibliography. *Property management*, 23 (5), 328–356.

Crawford, A., 1998. *Crime prevention and community safety: politics, policies and practice*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

Crowe, T., 2000. *Crime prevention through environmental design*, 2nd edn. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, 2001a. *Crime prevention and the assessment of development applications: section 79c of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. Accessed via www.duap.nsw.go.au on 19 September 2008.

Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, 2001b. *Crime prevention and the assessment of development applications: guidelines under section 79c of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. Accessed via www.duap.nsw.go.au on 19 September 2008.

Geason, S. and Wilson, P., 1989. *Designing out crime: crime prevention through environmental design*. Albury: Renwick Pride.

Homel, P., 2005. A short history of crime prevention in Australia. *Canadian journal of criminology and criminal justice*, April, 355–368.

Jacobs, J., 1961. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: The Modern Library.

Judd, B., Samuels, R. and Barton, J., 2006. The effectiveness of strategies for crime reduction in areas of public housing concentration. *Social city*, 1, 2–15.

MacDonald, K. and Kitteringham, G., 2004. A case of rogue gatherings (and other CPTED tales). *Security management*, 48 (6), 129–133.

Maynard, J., 2004. *The City of Sydney's Design Guide for a Safer Community: A Framework for Planning a Safer City*. Sydney: City of Sydney.

McCord E.S., 2005. Saftey in apartment complexes: the influence of the physical environment and management policies. Presented at the 10th International CPTED Conference, Santiago, Chile.

Minnery, J.R. and Lim, B., 2005. Measuring crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). *Journal of architectural and planning research*, 22 (4), 330–341.

Parnaby, P.F., 2006. Crime prevention through environmental design: discourses of risk, social control, and the neo-liberal context. *Canadian journal of criminology and criminal justice*, 48 (1), 1–29.

Samuels, R., 2005. Afterdark design, night animation & interpersonal interaction: Towards a community-security paradigm. *Journal of architectural and planning research*, Winter, 1–15.

Sarantakos, S., 2005. *Social Research*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schneider, R., 2005. Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED): themes, theories, practice and conflict. *Journal of architectural and planning research*, 22 (4), 271–283.

Sutton, A., Cherney, A. and White, R., 2008. *Crime prevention: principles, perspectives and practices*. Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, R., and Gartner, S. 2007. Effective crime prevention in Toronto, Canada. *Enhancing urban safety and security: global report on human settlements 2007*. Accessed at http://www.unchs.org/downloads/docs/GRHS.2007.CaseStudy.Crime.Toronto.pdf on 1 July 2011.

Wilson, P. and Wileman, B., 2005. Developing a 'safe city' strategy based on CPTED research: an Australian case study. *Journal of architectural and planning research*, 22 (4), 319–329.

Yin, R.K., Vogel, M.E., Chaiken, J.M. and Both, D.R., 1976. *Patrolling the Neighbourhood Beat, Residents and Residential Security*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Zahm, D., 2005. Learning, translating and implementing CPTED. *Journal of architectural and planning research*, 22 (4), 284–293.

Downloaded by [Daren Fisher] at 07:59 21 April 2012