

# Crime and Control in Australian Urban Space

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN<sup>1</sup>

---

## Introduction

*Stadtluft macht frei* ['city air makes you free']

- Old German proverb.<sup>2</sup>

There are a number of stories told about crime and control in our cities. One familiar story, made more so in last year's State election, is that there is a running 'fight against street crime' being fought in urban Australia,<sup>3</sup> necessitating increased police powers over public space.<sup>4</sup> Another is told in the enthusiasm for crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED), and particularly the claim that it is possible, or indeed necessary, to manipulate the built environment of a place to prevent deviance (Geason & Wilson 1989). More generally, the wonders of the 'Living City' are being rediscovered by governments, planners and wealthy urbanites;<sup>5</sup> meanwhile, the story of the dramatic restructuring of capital and the increasing inequality between places and populations, continues to unfold.

The best known and most horrifying, critique of these themes is Davis' exegesis of the LA story: a fortress-city 'on the bad edge of post-modernity, [where] one observes an unprecedented tendency to merge urban design, architecture and the police apparatus into a single, comprehensive security effort' (1992:224). The description of the fortified suburbs of Los Angeles has prompted some, like Hillier & McManus (1994), to look for Australian examples; unfortunately they do not also emulate Davis when he firmly grounds his critique in the political economy and gross social inequalities of his city.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 B Ec(Soc Sc) (Hon) *Syd*, LL.B (Hon) *Syd*.

2 Cited at Hall (1998:2).

3 Paul Whelan, Minister for Police, in his second reading speech for the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Police and Public Safety) Act 1998 (NSW)* (hereafter *CLAPPSA*): *New South Wales Parliamentary Debates*, 28 April 1998, p 3971; see also examples at Hogg & Brown (1998:22-29).

4 See *Summary Offences Act 1988 (NSW)*, *Children (Parental Responsibility) Act 1994 (NSW)*, *Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997 (NSW)*, and *CLAPPSA*.

5 'Living City' is the City of Sydney's current guiding philosophy: see, for example, Sydney City Council (SCC), *Living City: Residential Conversion Manual*, SCC, Sydney, 1995; and SCC, *Sydney: A City for People: Central Sydney Development Control Plan*, SCC, Sydney, 1996.

6 Hillier & McManus report on the development in Australian suburbs of walled estates and a 'fortress mentality' after the American model; too often, though, they end up resorting to Davis' description of Los Angeles. Indeed it is quite difficult to know when these writers are reporting from the Australian experience or repeating the ideas of Davis.

This article seeks to find a critical and contextually informed perspective on how and why Australian urban space is being 'secured', by looking at post-modern, post-Fordist urban Australia and the spatial implications of economic change. This also involves picking over the vague notion of 'community', and the different potentials communities have for dealing with their respective environments. This analysis will then light the way for a critical appreciation of the design and administration of urban space in this State, and especially Sydney, and the way in which different sections of the population are experiencing crime and control very differently.

First of all, what is required is a brief historical account of CPTED - and of what passes under its guise.

### **CPTED - Building Urban Villages or Fortress Cities?**

Crime prevention through environmental design first emerged in cogent and rational form in Jacobs' *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961).<sup>7</sup> As well as presenting a powerful and appealing screed against the 'Great Blight of Dullness' of unlovely post-war planning, Jacobs offered the traditional urban neighbourhood and its face-to-face community as a model of safety. Full of mixed uses and thus reasons for people to be out and about, places like Jacobs' own Greenwich Village kept 'eyes upon the streets' and made residents, passers-by and local storekeepers 'allies... keeping the peace of the street' (Jacobs 1961:35-39).

A more programmatic formulation of Jacobs' vision was made by Newman with his concept of 'defensible space... a model for residential environments which inhibits crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric that defends itself' (Newman 1972). Indeed, Newman (1972:2) went as far as to suggest that this was 'a means for restructuring the residential environments of our cities so they can again become livable and controlled, controlled not by police but by a community of people sharing a common terrain'.

Specifically in the context of public housing development, but also of more general application, Newman urged firstly planning for the creation amongst residents of a sense of *territoriality*, through a clearly readable hierarchy of increasingly private spaces, from street to residence. Both real and symbolic barriers could be deployed to give this proprietorial effect and to warn off outsiders (Newman 1972:63). Secondly, physical design must conduce to natural *surveillance* by residents of their territory: open lines of sight deter potential criminals and lessen the anxiety of residents (Newman 1972:80). Thirdly, *image and milieu* were crucial to security - safe development was one not 'stigmatised' by brutal austerity in design, nor one located amongst unsafe public streets (Newman 1972:105-113).

By the mid-1970s, radical pluralistic planning as inspired by Jacobs could be described as 'mainstream' (Harvey 1990:40), and criminologists had begun following the planners' leads. In theory, situational crime prevention and CPTED had an affinity with conceptualisations of rational action and individual choice; in practice, both were rapidly taken up by governments and police forces in Australia and abroad (O'Malley 1994:284-5). Amongst planners, CPTED has, with a few occasional aberrations, become 'completely integrated' in the project design process.<sup>8</sup> For instance, Sydney City Council's 1996 Local

7 To flag an issue dealt with below, I say 'cogent and rational' to differentiate this line of thought from the vaguer crime prevention argument used by the middle class slum reformers who, in Australia also, destroyed working class neighbourhoods and so contributed to the urban 'death' lamented by Jacobs. See Spearritt 1974.

8 Planning Officer, City of South Sydney Council, in interview with the writer, 24 April 1999.

Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan require the siting and design of buildings to maximise opportunities for surveillance and reduce opportunities for concealment. Put another way, CPTED is now considered, in essence, 'just good urban design.'<sup>9</sup>

'Just good urban design'? Certainly many of Jacobs' and Newman's criticisms were well-founded - Newman was especially motivated by the 'indefensible space' of the infamous Pruitt-Igoe housing development - and for the residents of such projects their proposals would have made life more secure. But there is more to the story than that. Of Jacobs' contribution, Hall has noted:

It sounded good to her overwhelmingly middle-class readers. The irony, pointed out twenty years later, was that the result was the yuppification of the city: 'Urbanism proved as susceptible as modernism to having its egalitarian impulses subordinated to the consumer interests of the upper middle class.... It took over forty years to go from the Bauhaus manifesto to the Four Seasons; it took only half that time to go from Jane Jacobs's apotheosis of the humble corner grocer to his replacement by Bonjour, Croissant and all that implies' (Hall, 1996:235).

What this process of gentrification implies, as Harvey (1990:82) points out, is the production of a specific sort of marketable community, imbricated with 'so many codes and symbols of social distinction'.<sup>10</sup> The organic 'urban village' of the supposed Jacobs tradition is rather more likely to be a construction of symbolic capital, replete with the actual and symbolic barriers that money can erect.

A more poignant example involves Newman directly. Amidst the media scare ensuing from a murder in their community, the affluent white residents of Guilford, Baltimore enlisted the support of Newman for their efforts to make their suburb 'defensible' (Harvey 1996:291-4). Such places, Newman suggested, should physically limit their points of access in a large-scale territorial effort against the supposed predations of 'drug dealers, prostitutes, muggers and other criminals' from outside. The murder, it turned out, had been committed by a family member; and Fernandez-Kelly saw rather another agenda in the residents' proposals and their unreal depiction of criminals wandering the streets of well-to-do Guilford:

What's happened is the word crime has become a receptacle for a series of concerns we cannot mention, the unmentionables; class and race.... When we say 'crime' we're really saying we are afraid of lower-class black people (Harvey 1996:293).

The development of CPTED into 'class war at the level of the built environment' is most memorably recorded by Davis (1992:228). In contemporary Los Angeles, the basic ideas of Jacobs and Newman have been perverted completely. Genuinely accessible public space is being destroyed as streetscapes have been 'hardened' against the poor and especially the homeless. Above and beyond standard strategies such as fencing parks, installing cameras and hiring guards, innovations deployed to keep the homeless moving on include 'bum-proof' half-barrel seats at bus stops (uncomfortable to sit on and impossible to sleep on), overhead sprinklers, caged garbage bins and a deliberate policy of limiting access to toilets (Davis 1992:232-5). For the working poor, the public space of the street and the neighbourhood shopping centre have also become rather less friendly. Effectively privatised in private shopping malls, these spaces have become intensely security-oriented in design and management, the use of video surveillance, police substations and security guards reassuring insurance carriers and tenants (Davis 1992:242-3).

---

9 Crime Prevention Officer, Department of the Attorney-General, NSW, in interview with the writer, 3 May 1999.

10 Harvey is 'not at all sure that this is what Jane Jacobs had in mind when she launched her criticism of modernist urban planning' (1990:82).

At the same time and according to Davis (1992:226), no less threatening to the possibility of all classes of people accessing and freely using the city's spaces, downtown areas are being redeveloped to support elite, high value lifestyle consumption, secure in a defensible space whose image and milieu and semiotic barriers are 'just about as subtle as a swaggering white cop': ramparts, separated walkways, security cameras and other signs 'warning off the underclass "Other"'. A parallel fortification is taking place around upper middle class residential areas. Outside the city proper, 'fortified cities' have been developed to be completely gated and walled: access is by residential invitation only (Davis 1992: 244; Blakely & Snyder 1998:61). Within the city too, some communities have succeeded in gating the public streets around them; others rely on more subtle appropriations - for example, closing parks or car parking spaces to non-residents - or very conspicuous private security patrols and warnings of an 'armed response' to incursions of community security (Davis 1992:248). Davis observes:

Although law enforcement experts debate the efficiency of such systems in foiling professional criminals, they are brilliantly successful in deterring innocent outsiders. Anyone who has tried to take a stroll at dusk through a strange neighbourhood patrolled by armed security guards and signposted with death threats quickly realises how merely notional, if not utterly obsolete, is the idea of the 'freedom of the city' (Davis 1992:250).

And it is not just Los Angeles. Throughout the US, two and a half million citizens live in gated communities; national chains such as 'Leisure World' develop these enclaves; a sophisticated market segmentation has been devised to sell these packages of community security (Blakely & Snyder 1998). Oscar Newman 'may well now be one of the most influential of all thinkers about urban design in the United States' (Harvey 1996:402).

But is the emerging 'global-city' of Sydney on the same bad edge of postmodernity as Los Angeles (Watson 1993)? Against the alarmism of Hillier & McManus (1994) it should be acknowledged that neither Australian crime nor Australian public spaces play 'a part in a script that has already been written' (Iveson 1998:21-2; Hogg & Brown 1998:28-9). Peel's advice provides some balance:

Fears that our cities are becoming 'Los Angeles' may lack precision, but they can nonetheless be a useful tool. The urban debate, new and old, has always been about alternative societies, not just alternative urban designs. 'Los Angeles' raises the spectre of social disintegration, and shows the enormous costs we will all bear if we persist in excluding more and more of our fellow citizens from a decent existence (Peel 1995:64).

In particular, we will examine the spatial aspects of inequality of Australian urban society along the crucial fault lines of income, employment, ethnicity and age, and see what sense can be made of 'community' crime prevention amongst the tumult. The purpose for which the following picture is built up, it should be made clear, is to ask not what these divisions mean for different groups' experiences of crime and victimisation,<sup>11</sup> but rather what they mean for control and public space.

## **Economic Change, Space and the Problem of 'Community'**

Over roughly the same period as the history of CPTED unfolds, another familiar story: that of a global 'market triumphalism', transforming throughout the world's industrial economies - both their institutions of macroeconomic management and their structures of capital and labour (Harvey 1992:597). The result, or more correctly a work in progress, is a regime of flexible accumulation, characterised by 'entirely new sectors of production,

---

11 For more on this parallel story, see for example Hogg (1988) and Hogg & Brown (1998).

new ways of providing financial services, new markets, greatly intensified rates of commercial, technological and organisational innovation'; the rapid shifting of capital between sectors and regions; and the increasing amenability of labour to 'flexible' work practices like casualisation, the roll-back of union power, and high structural unemployment (Harvey 1990).

At the level of cities and regions, the structural-spatial shifts effected in Australia under this economic regime included large losses of manufacturing jobs in the capital cities, especially Sydney and Melbourne; the stagnation of employment in agriculture and the flight of services from rural regions; and the reduction to 'rust-belts' of the steel cities and less diversified manufacturing centres (Stilwell 1993). On the other hand, as these jobs have dispersed from the industrial centres, there has occurred a centralisation of the new functions of decision-making, service transactions, and informational and cultural production - and cities compete fiercely and internationally to secure this investment (Hall 1996: 403-04; Watson 1993:111-2). Not only that, but cities and towns also compete for consumers, especially the affluent, and do so at the level of the built environment. Harvey (1996:298) notes how '[i]nvestment in consumption spectacles, the selling of images of places, competition over the definition of cultural and symbolic capital, the revival of particular vernacular traditions associated with places as a consumer attraction, all become conflated in inter-place competition'. In Sydney this contest has been joined with the remaking of the Rocks and Darling Harbour into permanent pleasure domes, and the whole city into a spectacle in the upcoming Olympics, but as the above critique of Jacobs' legacy indicates, it can extend to residential neighbourhoods.

The impact of these spatial-structural shifts can be gauged at a finer level - within cities and across neighbourhoods. Examining unemployment across Sydney in the early 1990s, Stilwell (1993:25) finds clusters of other spatially-defined inequalities - disproportionately high numbers of unemployed youth, and of migrants from non-English speaking countries - around the higher rates of unemployment through the central western and south-west suburbs. By the 1996 Census, the disparity in unemployment rates between the south and west and the north and east had decreased, but remained entrenched (ABS 1998:75). Lengthening terms of unemployment are likely to result in lengthening the time people spend in poverty (Gregory & Sheehan 1998:125). On the other hand, the fortunes of those in Sydney's north, east and far south were much less affected by recession (Stilwell, 1993:25). Income inequality has 'ratcheted' rapidly upwards throughout and since the 1980s (Raskali & Urquhart 1994).

Gregory & Hunter fill in this picture further with data on the dispersion of economic opportunities across neighbourhoods (Gregory & Hunter 1995a).<sup>12</sup> A summary of their findings is sufficient to show how severe are the changes in the relative fortunes of the neighbourhoods in their sample since the mid 1970s:

- In 1976, the mean income of households in lowest 5 per cent of Census Collector Districts (CDs) by SES area was 60.4 per cent that of the highest 5 per cent - a 'fairly equal dispersion'. Within 15 years, the ratio had fallen to 37.9%, representing 'extraordinary' polarisation. For the bottom 70 per cent of neighbourhoods, average household income had fallen *absolutely*; on the other hand, it increased 23 per cent in the top five per cent of Socio-Economic Status (SES) areas (Gregory & Hunter 1995a:4-5).

---

12 The neighbourhood units used in this analysis are Census Collector Districts (CDs), ranked according to Socio-Economic Status (SES) - they are not identifiable neighbourhoods, so are most useful in providing detail to analyses like Stilwell's.

- In 1976, irrespective of where they lived, Australians had similar rates of employment. By 1991, 'circumstances had changed dramatically': while male employment ratios fell 20 per cent in the top CDs, they fell 42 per cent in the low SES neighbourhoods. The much remarked-upon feminisation of labour occurred in the top half of CDs, where female employment ratios rose by 10 per cent; in the bottom half of the CD ranking they fell by 40 per cent (Gregory & Hunter 1995a:14).
- Both young and older residents of low status neighbourhoods have been disproportionately deprived of access to jobs compared with those in high SES areas. Compared amongst themselves, however, the younger residents of the low SES neighbourhoods have disproportionately borne this burden (Hunter 1998:49).

On a neighbourhood basis, 'the poor are getting poorer [and] the change is large' (Gregory & Hunter 1995b:22). One can reasonably assign these increasingly poor, increasingly unemployed neighbourhoods to a spatial pattern around the manufacturing cities and suburbs, where they are cut off from other areas by inadequate transport and other economic opportunities by a network of friends and family insufficiently employed to provide job contacts (Gregory & Hunter, 1995b:21). It should be said that this would not be the case everywhere: fairly high unemployment rates co-existing with increasing median incomes in the inner city suggest that these gentrifying suburbs still hold heterogeneous populations - those favoured by the post-Fordist economy and those left behind. But one's overall impression must be of an increasingly divided society: by access to employment, by income, by age, by ethnicity, and spatially divided too.

What does widening class inequality mean for communities' experiences of space, especially as it is designed and administered through the crime prevention lens?

The first part of an answer comes from Harvey's analysis of class agency and how '[d]ifferent classes construct their sense of territory and community in radically different ways' (Harvey 1994:370). There is a tendency,<sup>13</sup> Harvey (1994:371) suggests, for low income populations, 'usually lacking the means to overcome and hence command space, to find themselves for the most part trapped in space'. More particularly, for those whose access to housing and transport is insecure, the main way to dominate space is through 'continuous appropriation'. This may be read in the youths' tagging of public space with graffiti<sup>14</sup>; less furtively, space is appropriated by maintaining a physical presence amongst the potentially useful or interesting public concourses of the street, park or mall. And of course, the most extreme and stark instance of this is the experience of homeless people, simultaneously trapped in space and struggling to make some shelter of it.

Communities in these circumstances will tend to be small scale, built up and bounded by the various transactions and relationships - both extended as assistance and those maintained as predation - that people of limited means will use to get by (Harvey 1994).<sup>15</sup> As a result, Harvey sees these communities characterised by 'tight but often highly conflictual interpersonal social bonding in both private and public spaces... [and] an often intense attachment to place and "turf"'. Ethnic, religious and racial discriminations might also be called into play in constructing the boundaries of these communities, and their hierarchies strengthen as informal means of survival - lawful and otherwise - substitute for wage and welfare earnings (Harvey, 1994:373).

13 I emphasise 'tendency' here because a realistic sense of *gradation* is not given by Harvey's very schematic analysis.

14 See the discussion and, especially, the interviews at Mendes (1995).

15 See also Clarke, cited at Cunneen (1988: 189).

According to Harvey, more affluent groups construct their own community spaces to another pattern. Command over space is assured through ownership of houses and transport; the excitements of social life and communities of interest are more far-flung and deterritorialised; and tight-knit survival support networks are not needed (Harvey 1994: 371-72; Hogg & Brown 1998:206). Instead, 'the construction of community is then mainly geared to the preservation or enhancement of exchange values', while 'use values relate to matters of accessibility, taste, tone, aesthetic appreciation, and the symbolic and cultural capital that goes with the possession of a certain kind of 'valued' street environment' (Harvey 1994:373).

But we still need to see how these constructions of community - or better, how Gregory & Hunter's spectrum of worsening 'ghettos' and increasingly favoured enclaves - sit alongside one other, relate to one another, in the wider spaces of towns and cities. Marcuse finds it useful to conceive of the residential city as 'quartered' into 'separate but interdependent cities':

- a dominating city, with its luxury housing, not really part of the city but enclaves or isolated buildings, occupied by the top of the economic, social and political hierarchy;
- a gentrified city, occupied by the professional-managerial-technical groups...;
- a suburban city... sometimes single-family housing in the outer city, other times apartments near the centre, occupied by skilled workers;
- a tenement city, sometimes cheaper single-family areas, most often rentals, occupied by lower paid workers... including substantial social housing;
- an abandoned city, the end result of trickle-down, left for the poor, the unemployed, the excluded.... (Marcuse 1995:245-6).

As the restructuring of capital over the last few decades has variously altered the size and fortunes of these 'cities', definition is given to these quarters by *walls* in Marcuse's formulation, less often physical barriers than symbolic walls or intangible demarcations of status (Marcuse 1995:248). A further variety of distinctions between types of wall is possible, in terms of its purposes and the interests it serves. Walls may protect or shelter, or provide an opportunity for cohesion and reinforcement, as the concept of defensible space was originally intended to do on the public housing blocks. On the other hand they may exclude or segregate, or protect privilege, as the power of money already had done in Guilford without any gates going up. Marcuse (1995:250-1) does see in urban planning a potential for reducing inequalities and levelling walls, as does Harvey (1992:598-601; 1996) in his affirmation of the progressive potential of a politics of difference. The crucial point for our story, however, is that at least under conditions of market triumphalism, 'walls do not play equal roles for all quarters' (Marcuse 1995:244).

In the next section, we turn to a review of some contemporary Australian developments in CPTED and the regulation of spaces. Hogg & Brown note that 'in accord with, if not irreducible to the emergent neo-liberal strategies of government', we are being told that 'the key to crime prevention and community safety in Australia into the next century rests with the community, including corporate entities, taking responsibility for its own security' (Hogg & Brown 1998: 181-82; Federal Justice Office 1992). In New South Wales, the Police Minister speaks of '*the community*' making itself safe, by drafting local crime prevention plans and deploying local knowledge<sup>16</sup> - this at the same time as the government extends the power of police to control public space and remove young people from the street, and as everywhere 'community' becomes more fragmented, polarised and 'quartered'.

---

<sup>16</sup> See the Minister's second reading speeches for the *Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act* 1997 (NSW) and the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Police and Public Safety) Act* 1998 (NSW) at *New South Wales Parliamentary Debates*, 21 May 1997 and 28 April 1998, respectively

## CPTED and Public Order: Some Contemporary Developments

'Sydney has matured into an international city of world renown', declares the Lord Mayor. 'It has a distinctive identity which is attracting significant growth in residential population' (SCC, 1995a: foreword). Indeed, the City of Sydney is now the fastest growing municipality in Australia, its population soaring by more than 25 per cent in 1998 (*SMH*, 28 April 1999:3). The adjoining local government areas of South Sydney and Leichhardt are also experiencing strong post-industrial population growth.

The design principles for fostering this renaissance, as laid down in the plans of these municipalities, are those of Jacobs.<sup>17</sup> Since the election in 1991 of the 'Living City' team of independent councillors, the City of Sydney particularly has captured the commentary of local architects and planners with its 'vision to develop a 24-hour, mixed use city with a critical mass of residents, a high quality public realm - parks, plazas and streets, more cafes and restaurants - and abundant arts and cultural facilities' (Lochhead 1999:70). The Council's most substantial material contribution to this end has been a massively expanded capital works budget, most notable in the upgrading of the city's streets, footpaths, street furniture, parks and the public art works on the Sculpture Walk. The transit nodes of Circular Quay and Railway Square have been renovated to become, it is claimed, 'liveable' places and destinations in their own right (Lochhead 1999; Petrykowski 1999). With less fanfare, some of the low cost accommodation provided by boarding houses and the 'traditional corner pub' has been retained by SCC policy (SCC 1995b:20). At the most obvious point of comparison with Davis' Los Angeles - the street furniture - Sydney's new seats and benches are solid and expensive-looking, but not apparently sadistic.

Leaving aside for the moment, the equation of 'high quality public realm' with 'more cafes and restaurants', it must be recognised that some positive results have been achieved in inner Sydney's urban design. These have, however, been achieved in the fashion of holding the line against some losses by the poor to the powerful. On the other hand, much greater endeavours with new over-arching forms of development have been made by capital looking after its own. Most conspicuously, so much of Sydney City's population growth has taken place beyond - or rather, high above - the streets. At the 1991 Census, before the 'Living City' program commenced, 47 per cent of the City of Sydney's residential stock were in high-rise buildings (SCC 1996:13); the current boom, and the particular enthusiasm for tower development, will now have pushed this ratio much higher as 'Generation Xers... [venture] into the CBD in search of a 'Manhattan' high-rise lifestyle' and the decidedly rich buy into specially-legislated luxury citadels (*SMH* 28 April 1999: 3; 8 May 1999:1). A 'citadel', reminds Marcuse (1995:249), is a 'little city... a fortress commanding a city, which it serves both to protect and to keep in subjection': an appropriate description of the Dominating City located around the Harbour and throughout Sydney's centre.

For all the superiority expressed by their height, and the power of their residents to range over space, these structures do, of course, have to meet the ground at some point and their defensible positions must be drawn against the public space of the street. For most high-rises, being in Sydney City itself, there exists a mediation of other uses, through space for serviced apartments to offices and then to retail and eatery malls. As vibrant and enjoyably populated - seemingly genuinely 'public' - as these malls are, they are spaces of private property and they enclose and sort public activity in very particular ways. Their most basic defence is the blunt threat and power of exclusion attached to property and exercised by private security guards employed in increasing numbers by these developments.<sup>18</sup> Private security personnel

---

17 See SCC (1996:Part 2); City of South Sydney (1997: Parts C and D).



and their proxies - security cameras and screens - also quite deliberately function as an inescapable symbolic warning and control to young people and some minorities, especially Aborigines.<sup>19</sup> Less deliberately, but scarcely less overtly, market segmentation and commercial symbolic distinctions also sort out what 'quality' of public circulation is to take place. The playing of classical music, for example, is at once an appeal to the sense of tone and taste of one's target market and a device of situational crime prevention useful for excluding the young.

These physical and symbolic techniques of sorting and turning away can now also be seen in the public street proper. Over the municipal boundary in residential Potts Point, the new Horizon Tower, with no quasi-public mall to mediate its contact with the life of the street, hits the ground with a thud: security guards, video cameras and gates in an open-sighted drive/foyer area. When the tower first opened, on the footpath outside, South Sydney Council had stenciled the words 'Proposed No Loitering Area' - since then, after a campaign by insurgent stencillers ('Proposed No Lycra Boardshorts Area') and the Council for Civil Liberties querying whether local councils had this power under the *Local Government Act* 1993, the Minister for Local Government has instructed councils not to attempt anti-loitering regulation (Anderson 1999).

An equivalent policy continues, however, to be executed by guards, surveillance and commercial function around the bases of residences in the City. In notionally public streets like the Pitt Street Mall, one can observe guards moving on the homeless from the shop-fronts. The power, though perhaps not yet a practical direction,<sup>20</sup> to do the same in any public space has recently been given to police in the *Summary Offences Act* amendments of 1998.<sup>21</sup> Along George Street, natural pedestrian surveillance after Jacobs is being superseded by a high-tech municipal effort after Bentham's panopticon. Forty-five closed circuit television cameras have been mounted along the length of the street, concentrating on the entertainment precincts around Chinatown, the cinemas, the Rocks and the end of William Street where real vibrancy and social mixing occurs and occasionally becomes conflictual.<sup>22</sup>

In the 'Living City' and its affluent suburbs, as one type of street life is being celebrated against other types, walls are going up. This is the street life of outsiders to the new urban culture, exploring the City's entertainments and being watched for transgressions; and most acutely the street life of the homeless, increasingly numerous and increasingly young (SCC 1995b: 11; also Burke 1998). The welfare agencies of Surry Hills report growing intolerance to the homeless, ranging from extreme assaults - 'we've had people set alight, they've had buckets of urine poured over them, they've been abused, spat on, vilified' - to the slow withdrawal of seating, toilets and welfare services (SMH 8 July 1999).

And the new 'liveable' spaces offer no comfort. There are subtle manipulations of public space designed into the street furniture - not so as to open here the architectural 'class war' described by Davis, but neither do they represent entirely honorable engagements with those who live on the streets. The narrow mouths of the new bins inhibit rummaging; the blue lights in the proposed new toilets are designed to discourage their use as sites for drug

18 For an extended discussion, see Sarre (1994).

19 This writer once worked in a City department store, where store security practice was to follow every Aboriginal person who entered.

20 In the context of the Olympic Games, Premier Carr has denied that move on powers will be used to 'clean up' the homeless and others from Sydney streets. According to Stuart, homeless for fifteen years, 'in the last six months, we have been moved on a lot more [by the police] than we used to' (*City Hub* 22 July 1999, p 1).

21 *CLAPPSA* Sch 1; *Summary Offences Act (NSW) 1998* Div 4 28F.

22 See SCC (1998: 'Closed Circuit Television Camera Details' and 'Map').

injection (*SMH* 7 May 1999). While the park benches still permit a body to sleep, at least in some cases this might be a design flaw. Every one of the seats at the revamped Circular Quay has had 'grandfather' arms attached to divide the bench twice along its length. They have not in reality worked this way, but the suspicion is that the feature might have been intended to prevent the grandfathers and other people who sleep on the streets from spoiling the much-admired 'buzz' of Customs Square and the Quay.

Just how partial the concept of 'liveability' can be is revealed at the other end of George Street, at the newly transformed Railway Square. 'One of the key beneficiaries as the city cleans up for the Olympics', Railway Square has been made 'human' again, according to its designer at the Department of Public Works and Services:

The design focuses on the idea of 'liveability', a complex balance between good pedestrian amenity, improved access, and the creation of a high quality of public realm [sic]. The design balances traffic and public transport demands with the need to provide safe and attractive public space.... It is now a destination, with activities focusing on a centrally located cafe and the front entrance to the newly completed Mercure Hotel (Petrykowski 1999:16).

However on what may be the barest, most fundamental test of the 'liveability' of a space - how well it supports those who actually live in it - Railway Square must be regarded as a failure. It is still the exception in Sydney, but here, street design has become outrightly antagonistic. The cafe, one of the Michel's Patisserie chain, provides a perfectly liveable environment for paying customers. It also holds a large part of the seating on the site, and in fact contains the only seating worthy of the name. At the bus stop itself, rows of seats have been removed and in part replaced by Sydney's first 'bum-proof' convex seats and bar perches. The whole structure is so open and transparent that neither the homeless nor commuters are sheltered. No one sleeps there any more.

Moving further out, into the gentrifying and already affluent suburbs, walls are being strengthened and spaces made defensible too, if on a different scale of resource mobilisation and without some of the tensions of the City. A development that has captured attention is the Raleigh Park estate, 'a prestige residential neighbourhood' over 12 hectares in Kensington (*Green Streets* A5 no date). It would appear to be a model of CPTED, with open sight lines and windows onto its street. While not a walled or gated community after the US models<sup>23</sup> - its street is publicly accessible, and this writer strolled through without any of the terrors visited upon Davis - Raleigh Park does employ 24 hour security patrols and is surrounded by cameras. The orientation of the development is towards its internal parks and the neighbours' front yards - a very formal image is presented, with circular gardens, stone arch and hill-side spring. Taken overall, the ultimate function of Raleigh Park's defensible space is to allow intense concentration on the maintenance of a precisely designed piece of symbolic capital. The flip side of this is a studious ignorance as to what lies outside the estate - its own anchor point to the surrounding space is the 'Security Station' posted at the street intersection.

It is not quite the fortified stockade and the wall of imperial aggression that Marcuse (1995:248) reads in the design of gentrified estates in the United States, but the difference in terms of its selfishness and paranoia is a matter of degree. The aesthetics and posturing - if not all the hardware - of the fortress are appearing further out in Sydney's middle suburbs: for example, under construction near Concord, with chutzpah almost too good to be true, is the walled prestige development of 'Liberty Grove'. Before the Minister for Local Government intervened, in parts of Canterbury and even Port Kembla 'No Loitering' ordinances had been passed by councils to keep pushing away the eyesore of urban poverty (*City Hub* 22 July 1999).

---

23 See 'Walled estates spark fear of 'urban apartheid'', *SMH*, 20 January 1996: 7.

In those suburbs and town centres where communities are sliding deeper into poverty, the practice of CPTED, situational crime prevention and defensible space is revealed as 'moral minimalism' (Hogg & Brown 1998:206-7). To the extent that these principles are deployed in securing space, it is on an ad hoc basis<sup>24</sup>: for example, through the formularised design used by private shopping centre developers; a local government or government department attending to design insufficiencies in a local facility; private citizens securing their homes. That is not to say that such initiative is wrong, but how deficient - 'morally minimal' - it is when viewed against the problems of poor, often highly conflictual and internally victimised communities (Hogg & Brown 1998:207; Harvey 1994:371). The poverty of social sense in CPTED in these circumstances was shown recently in Bankstown, where the public space of that suburb's central pedestrian mall was found too easily susceptible to appropriation by youths. The mall itself has now been forfeited back to motor traffic; pedestrian space is now monopolised by a private shopping centre and subject to the manipulations of its design and administration.

In poorer places, police power against the public disorder of sections of these communities remains the main instrument of administering space. Recent extensions to police power have already been noted. In the local crime prevention plan process, which in form appeals to community-based horizontal organisation against crime, it is police authority resorted to when community action cannot be materially sustained. In the draft local crime prevention plan for Liverpool-Green Valley, the Council hopes to 'reclaim' public space from drug dealers with the institution of public markets and other pleasant uses - but necessarily complemented with a 'zero tolerance'-style crackdown by police.<sup>25</sup> Other councils have been cruder with their draft plans, specifically 'planning' to 'ask for more police'.<sup>26</sup>

The other side of that story is that as poverty deepens for communities, and as access to and control over private space slips away, their members' appropriations of public space become more alarming because of the 'unconventional' uses to which they put it, such as young people socialising in streets and malls. And in Harvey's (1994:373) analysis, the appropriation of these spaces is likely to become a more pitched action as inequalities grow and the informal hierarchies and predatory relations, such as of Green Valley's drug-dealers, intensify.

## Conclusion

For the moment then, the story of crime and control in the urban spaces of Australia must have a rather grim ending. If not at the very bad edge of postmodernity like Los Angeles, urban Australia is increasingly unequal, these inequalities are being polarised spatially, and the spatial strategies of crime control are being experienced in very different ways by increasingly different communities. But a positive comment is warranted. If the history of CPTED and defensible space has included some dubious uses, there does remain with planning a role in positive, remedial public action. Some rehabilitation of the original projects of Jacobs and Newman is indicated by Marcuse in his plea for a more fundamental restructuring of urban political economies:

We need cities that will be conditions of life, of full and free and unfragmented lives, not cities of discretion and domination; we need walls that welcome and shelter, not walls that exclude and oppress (Marcuse 1995:251).

---

24 Interview with Crime Prevention Officer.

25 Interview with Crime Prevention Officer.

26 Interview with Crime Prevention Officer.

## References

- Anderson, T (1999) 'Government Warns Local Councils on "Loitering" Signs', NSW Council for Civil Liberties news release, 6 December.
- ABS, Australian Bureau of Statistics (1998) *Sydney ... A Social Atlas*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Blakely, E J & Snyder, M G (1998) 'Separate Places: Crime and Security in Gated Communities' in Felson, M & Peiser, R (eds), *Reducing Crime through Real Estate Development and Management*, Urban Land Institute, Washington DC.
- Burke, P (1998) 'The Poverty of Homelessness' in Fincher, R & Nieuwenhuysen, J (eds), *Australian Poverty: Then and Now*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.
- City of South Sydney (1997) *South Sydney Development Control Plan*.
- Cunneen, C (1988) 'The Policing of Public Order: Some Thoughts on Culture, Space and Political Economy' in Findlay, M & Hogg, R (eds) *Understanding Crime and Criminal Justice*, Law Book Company, North Ryde.
- City Hub* 22 July 1999.
- Davis, M (1992) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, Vintage, New York.
- Federal Justice Office (1992) *Creating a Safer Community - Crime Prevention and Community Safety into the 21st Century*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Geason, S & Wilson, P (1989) *Designing Out Crime*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Green Streets* A5 flyer, no date, Department of Urban Affairs & Planning.
- Gregory, R G & Hunter, B (1995a) 'The Macro Economy and the Growth of Ghettos and Urban Poverty in Australia', *Centre for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper No 35*, April 1995, Sydney.
- Gregory, R G & Hunter, B (1995b) 'Further Remarks on Increased Neighbourhood Inequality', *Social Security Journal*, June 1995, pp 20-28.
- Gregory, R G & Sheehan, P (1998) 'Poverty and the Collapse of Full Employment' in Fincher, R & Nieuwenhuysen, J (eds), *Australian Poverty: Then and Now*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton.
- Hall, P (1996) *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, updated edition, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hall, P (1998) *Cities in Civilisation*, Weidenfield & Nicholson, London.
- Harvey, D (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Blackwell, Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Harvey, D (1992) 'Social Justice, Postmodernism and the City', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol 16, no 4, pp 588-601.

- Harvey, D (1994) 'Flexible Accumulation and Urbanisation: Reflections on "Post-modernism" in the American City' in Amin, A (ed), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Harvey, D (1996) *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hillier, J & McManus, P (1994) 'Pull up the Drawbridge: Fortress Mentality in the Suburbs' in Gibson, K & Watson, S (eds), *Metropolis Now: Planning and the Urban in Contemporary Australia*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt.
- Hogg, R & Brown, D (1998) *Rethinking Law & Order*, Pluto Press, Annandale.
- Hogg, R (1988) 'Taking Crime Seriously: Left Realism and Australian Criminology' in Findlay, M & Hogg, R (eds), *Understanding Crime and Criminal Justice*, Law Book Company, North Ryde.
- Hunter, B (1998) 'Addressing Youth Unemployment: Re-examining Social and Locational Disadvantage within Australian Cities', *Urban Policy and Research* vol 16, no 1, pp 45-57.
- Interview with Planning Officer, City of South Sydney Council, 23 April 1999.
- Interview with Crime Prevention Officer, Department of the Attorney-General, New South Wales, 3 May 1999.
- Iveson, K (1998) 'Putting the Public back into Public Space', *Urban Research and Policy*, vol 16, no 1, pp 21-33.
- Jacobs, J (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jonathan Cape, London.
- Jeffery, C R (1977) *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design*, revised edition, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Lochhead, H (1999) 'Sydney Afresh', *Architecture Australia*, September /October, pp 68-73.
- Marcuse, P (1995) 'Not Chaos, but Walls: Postmodernism and the Partitioned City' in Watson, S & Gibson, K (eds), *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, Blackwell, Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Mendes, C S (1995) 'Signal Driver: From Bus Stops to Bus Shelters - the New Art of Appropriating Space', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, vol 6, no 3, pp 362-370.
- New South Wales Parliamentary Debates*, 21 May 1997; 28 April 1998.
- Newman, O (1972) *Defensible Space*, Macmillan, New York.
- O'Malley, P (1994) 'Neo-Liberal Crime Control - Political Agendas and the Future of Crime Prevention in Australia' in Chappell, D & Wilson, P (eds), *The Australian Criminal Justice System: the Mid 1990s*, Butterworths, North Ryde.
- Peel, M (1995) 'The Urban Debate: From "Los Angeles" to the Urban Village' in Troy, P (ed), *Australian Cities: Issues, Strategies and Policies for Urban Australia in the 1990s*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Petrykowski, M (1999) 'Liveability: Can Railway Square Become Human Again?', *Architectural Bulletin* 4.99 (May): pp 14-16.

Raskall, P & Urquhart, R (1994) *Inequality, Living Standards and the Social Wage During the 1980s*, Study of Social and Economic Inequalities Monograph 3, University of New South Wales.

Sarre, R (1994) 'The Legal Powers of Private Police and Security Providers' in Moyle, P (ed), *Private Prisons and Police: Recent Australian Trends*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt.

Spearritt, P (1974) 'Sydney's "Slums": Middle Class Reformers and the Labor Response', *Labour History* no 26, pp 65-81.

Stilwell, F (1993) *Reshaping Australia: Urban Problems and Policies*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt.

Sydney City Council (1995a) *Living City: Residential Conversion Manual*.

Sydney City Council (1995b) *The City of Sydney Residential Strategy*.

Sydney City Council (1996) *Sydney: A City for People: Central Sydney Development Control Plan*.

Sydney City Council (1998) *Central Sydney Safety Strategy*.

*Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 January 1996; 28 April 1999; 5 May 1999; 7 May 1999; 8 May 1999.

Watson, S (1993) 'Work and Leisure in Tomorrow's Cities' in Rees, S, Rodley, G & Stilwell, F (eds), *Beyond the Market: Alternatives to Economic Rationalism*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt.

## **Legislation**

*Children (Protection and Parental Responsibility) Act 1997 (NSW)*

*Children (Parental Responsibility) Act 1994 (NSW)*

*Crimes Legislation Amendment (Police and Public Safety) Act 1998 (NSW)*

*Local Government Act 1993 (NSW)*

*Summary Offences Act 1988 (NSW)*