

The Role of Place Management in Crime Prevention: Some Reflections on Governmentality and Government Strategies

Murray Lee & Peter Herborn*

Introduction

For the past fifteen years there has been an increasing emphasis on local, community-based forms of crime prevention (O'Malley 1997). This emphasis has been part of a broader, although by no means all-pervasive, shift from state-centred forms of social control to forms of regulation developed and implemented at local levels by local governments. In turn, this has resulted in local government becoming increasingly responsible for various kinds of crime prevention strategies, plans, and audits. This has also involved the implementation of various forms of urban planning designed to 'harden the targets' of crime, to 'reduce the rewards' of crime, to 'design out' crime, and the development of alternative activities and spaces for those who might engage in criminal activity. It is in the context of these new rationalities of crime control and prevention that we are increasingly seeing the implementation of various forms of 'place management'. Place management is a 'whole of government' approach to social and spatial problems. As Untaru (2002:87) argues:

Places are not just the spatial organisation of phenomena in a particular area, still less the physical landscape of buildings and natural forms. They also comprise meanings that embrace public perceptions, evaluations, rights and associations. Places are evaluated with respect to whether they facilitate people's place-based objectives. These place experiences may relate to spatial access, convenience, comfort, security, or to satisfying interruptions.

* Murray Lee is a Lecturer in Criminology, School of Applied Social and Human Sciences, University of Western Sydney, PO Box 1797, South Penrith DC, NSW Australia 1797, <m.lee@uws.edu.au>. Peter Herborn is a Senior Lecturer in Urban and Regional Analysis, School of Applied Social and Human Sciences, University of Western Sydney, PO Box 1797, South Penrith DC, NSW Australia 1797, <p.herborn@uws.edu.au>. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for their constructive commentary on an earlier version of this paper.

Place management has recently been regarded as an innovation in governance. As a 'community building' and crime prevention strategy originally adopted, in NSW at least¹, by the New South Wales Premier's Department, it is gaining increasing support in political and academic circles and is being hailed as one of the government's best 'defences against crime'. Concurrently, some local governments are also taking the initiative and implementing their own place management programs. The focus of this paper is upon 'conceptual issues place management', and the local government role in crime prevention more generally.

Place management

Terms such as 'social capital' (Putnam 2000), 'community regeneration' (Randolph 1999), 'community capacity building' (Moore 2002), 'social partnerships', 'social entrepreneurship' (Latham 2001), and 'place management' (Mant 2000), have recently found their way into academic writing and government policy pronouncements around a new configuration of state, market and civil society (Reddel 2002). All of these terms reflect the growing re-emergence of the notions of place, locality, community, and citizen participation as vital sites of governance (Reddel 2002:50). Much of this terminology has its genesis in the 'third way' politics of British New Labour (Blair 1999) and associated work by sociologist Anthony Giddens (1998; 2001). However, place management's origins can be traced back more specifically to developments in urban and regional planning (Mant 1998; Zappalà & Green 2001). As with much of the above terminology there are ambiguities around the concept of place management. At the heart of this ambiguity lies the question of practice. Largely, good place management practice will be dictated by the specifics of locality, various stakeholders, the nature of specific government instrumentalities and the like. Place management, it is argued, should be a reflexive and reflective process and the tools with which it operates will largely be dictated by the particularities of specific localities.

In one sense place management is almost a synonym for local government. 'Local' and 'place' are etymologically very similar, as are 'management' and 'government'. Local government is a multi-functional form of government with a focus on relatively small territories. It operates close to the ground and through the 'grassroots' of community organization. More so than with other levels of government, local government is concerned with places and spaces. While local government functions vary widely from State to State in Australia the core responsibilities found almost everywhere relate to place, building and land-use regulation and basic community facilities. In some senses this ambiguity between the terms 'local government' and 'place management' serves to highlight the novelty or political dimension of the concept. As Stewart-Weeks (1998:29) argues, '... at its best, local government has been delivering a version of place management for some time ...' However, Walsh (2001) has provided perhaps the most sustained attempt to shed light on the meaning of place management. He suggests that although place management has been 'used as a shorthand expression to indicate attempts to reform the delivery of government services to disadvantaged communities ...' (Walsh 2001:8). A number of characteristics can be identified: equity and targeting aimed at redressing significant disadvantage; outcomes and accountability encompassing a clear account of what is to be achieved and how; coordination and integration in service delivery, responsive and efficient delivery of

1 For example, the Victorian Government currently avoids the specific term 'place management' but in 2002 established the Department for Victorian Communities which arguably has as its main focus 'place' and 'community building'.

service; and flexible governance generally (Walsh 2001:9). Boyce (2001) suggests that if there is a definition for place management it is the achievement of positive results in a community through coordinating and acting as a catalyst in focusing government and private organizations to effect improvements in social, cultural, and economic conditions in a place, particularly for the disadvantaged. 'In a nutshell it is about focusing on social and economic disadvantage and using the dynamics of a community to effect improvements' (Boyce 2001:4). So in this context place management is essentially about coordinating existing social, government, and private institutions in a reflexive way, in order to facilitate outcomes that make a particular place as liveable, civil, and indeed crime-free, as possible. Mant (1998) characterises 'traditional' local government as operating with a 'guild' mentality and as being structured according to specialist functional lines like engineering, building inspection, road maintenance and the like. These, he suggests are the 'outputs' or 'functions' of an 'input' based model. However, with the rise of 'contractualism' and 'purchaser/provider' in local government, more emphasis, he suggests, can be placed on 'outcomes' as opposed to simply 'outputs' (Mant 1998; Zappalà & Green 2001).

Neo-Liberalism, Cost Benefit Analysis and Governmentality

Broadly speaking there have been two types of approaches to crime prevention. First, there is the positivistic welfare perspective, which prescribes an interventionist state where crime is prevented through the reconstruction and correction of social conditions, communities and/or individuals. Here criminals are imagined as victims of circumstance or a product of environment. They are essentially to be corrected and trained; saved from circumstance, normalised. Second, there is situational crime prevention encompassing target hardening and actuarialism. Here the conception of the criminal is one of a rational actor. While the welfarist approach has come in for sustained criticism for being wasteful, ineffective and as creating dependency — from the right (Buchanan & Hartley 1992; Currie & Wilson 1991²) and for being a coercive net-widening exercise — from the left (Cohen 1985) — the situational approach has found considerable acceptance through its amenability to current neo-liberal political rationalities which emphasise accountability, rationalisation, and devolution of traditionally state responsibilities to local government, private citizens and private enterprise. Sutton (1997) states that schools of crime prevention premised on environmental design (see Brantingham and Brantingham 1991) and routine activity theory (Felson 1992) all share the assumption that potential offenders are rational actors whose capacity for motivation is heavily influenced by manipulating the environments in which potential 'targets' are located; this is done by increasing efforts, increasing risks, and reducing the rewards of crime (see Clarke 1992). Crime prevention has become, or is increasingly becoming, an exercise in cost benefit analysis (Chisholm 2000), simplistic often politically motivated versions of which, when they are irregularly applied, often paint welfarism and other forms of social intervention as resounding failures despite what many would argue about such policies being long term propositions and less amenable to the rather superficial forms of evaluation usually applied³.

Place management as a strategy can fit neatly into this set of neo-liberal rationalities. The fact that place management can be used to promote and practice a neo-liberal agenda, however, does not mean that it cannot be used to promote other ideologies and value structures. Thus, we should not be so presumptuous to accept simply the negative

2 JQ Wilson in a debate with Elliott Currie (Currie and Wilson 1991).

3 See Karoly et al (2001), and Schacter (2002) for examples of how more in depth cost benefit analysis might be applied to such programs.

hypothesis regarding the forms of governmental power place management enables to be exercised. Rather, drawing on the work of French philosopher Michel Foucault (1991) we view these new technologies as extending the possibilities of governance into ever more minute domains. The democratisation of knowledge made possible via place management can potentially empower citizens to make decisions about their own activities and make a contribution to the decisions of local government. Citizens can essentially become subjects of their own governance and also influence the governance of their communities more generally. The exercise of governmental power, then, is not inherently negative or positive; rather it is 'productive' (Foucault 1991). By this we mean it has the effect of producing and constituting both the space we use and the users themselves. It produces particular forms of subjectivity whose constitution depends not on the technology itself or the power invested in it, but rather on the manner in which this power is exercised. As a scholar of governmentality Nicolas Rose has argued:

For a domain to be governable, one not only needs the terms in which to speak and think about it, one also needs to be able to assess its condition. That is to say, one needs intelligence or information as to what is going on in the domain one is calculating about. Information can be of various forms: written reports, drawings, pictures, numbers, charts, graphs, statistics, and so forth. It enables the features of the domain accorded pertinence — types of goods and labour, or ages of persons, their location, health, criminality — to be represented in calculable form in the place where decisions are to be made about them ... (Rose 1988:184).

Thus, government in this sense is a contact point (Burchell 1993:268) where techniques of domination and techniques of self-governance 'interact'. Technologies of the self are integrated into structures of coercion and vice-versa making individuals visible subjects of governance rather than simply objects to govern on the one hand or invisible to governing bodies on the other (cf Henry 2001). Technologies such as place management then have both dominating and liberating potentialities and possibilities. They actually produce new domains of governance and imagine particular types or subjects of governance. We will turn now to some examples in order to discuss just what liberating role, or otherwise, place management may play in crime prevention.

Place Managers and Planning Crime Out

In NSW, a number of localities now have place management programs with personnel specifically appointed by the New South Wales Premier's Department to 'place manage' very specific problems and places. Indeed, there are more than 17 place management programs operating in NSW the first of which was instituted in the King Cross area of Sydney in 1997. However, Zappalà and Green (2001) make a vital distinction between place managers as appointed by the Premier's Department and place management programs developed at the instigation of local governments. They suggest that place managers appointed by State government could be better characterised as 'place coordinators' because of the top-down nature of their appointment and indeed their practice. On the other hand they suggest that place management initiated at the local level, through local governments (best illustrated through the Fairfield City Council experience discussed below) has the potential to facilitate a form of 'place entrepreneurship' which is likely to result in sustainable 'outcomes'. They also point out the political nature of the Premier's Department appointments as being 'quick fix' responses to politically problematic places.

One of the by-products of an increasing emphasis on place management in both guises is that local government planners are becoming increasingly aware of their potential to prevent crime through design. Planning informed by a place management agenda generally involves a departure from traditional approaches to land-use planning and this in turn opens up a new field of crime prevention possibilities. The traditional approach to planning is dominated by land-use zoning. Land-use is classified into broad categories such as residential, commercial, industrial, rural and so on. These categories are often subdivided; residential zones are often broken down into categories on the basis of density. Zones are precisely mapped and categorised and the property owner is restricted to land-use options determined by the zoning. A developer proposing a particular type of land use is directed to the zones in which it is permitted. Under this model there is a zone for (almost) everything and everything is supposed to end up in its zone. This traditional approach tends to produce homogeneity and segregation and takes little advantage of the crime preventative potential of planning through the 'designing in' of forms of natural surveillance, to take one pertinent example. Place management in planning is less directly concerned with classifying and segregating land-uses (an input) and more concerned with defining the overall desired future character of the place, which includes making the area less criminogenic (an outcome).

In this context freedom from crime and 'fear of crime' are basic components in a statement of desired future character. They are the basic pre-requisites of public spaces functioning as genuine public places. Advocates of the place management approach to planning argue that it can address crime prevention in a more direct way than traditional approaches. The land-use based approach tends to relegate 'problem' land-users to 'less sensitive' zones — problems are simply displaced. Boarding houses, for example, are treated as problem land-uses and are excluded from many residential zones. Likewise, in New South Wales, brothels were illegal land-users and were not mentioned in zoning tables. Now that they have been legalized, for the most part, they are frequently assigned to industrial zones. Problems are dealt with by spatially separating the problem from the land-users considered to be sensitive. Place management can be much more attuned to dealing with land-use conflicts in situ and on a continuous basis in the short as well as long term. However, there is still scope within a traditional land-use planning and development control approach to improve upon current practice and build in a level of crime prevention (New South Wales Department of Urban Affairs and Planning 2001). The weakness of the land-use zoning approach to planning lies in essentialist assumptions about incompatibility between certain land-uses and compatibility within land-use classes.

Fairfield City Council

Place management at Fairfield City Council in Western Sydney is currently a whole-of-council approach. Indeed, the council recently developed a small key division called 'Outcomes', responsible for the strategic directions and results of the council's activity. The whole local government area is divided up into five 'Places', which are individually managed by council-appointed place managers. Moreover, Fairfield also has a State government-appointed place manager. The Council has responsibility for Cabramatta, parts of which have received heavy media coverage for social problems associated with drug-dealing and other crime, much of which is drug-related. The Fairfield Council faces formidable challenges and has adopted a place management approach to respond to them. Traditional departmental organizational structures would be less effective in dealing with crime prevention in this context. The scale of the problem in Fairfield illustrates the need for a whole-of-council approach, effective cooperation with state government agencies and

a clear focus on the management of place and space. However, despite the current 'whole of government' approach there is some evidence from the Fairfield experience that place management can also align itself closely with the harder edge of social control and technology. For example, place managers at Fairfield have advocated the introduction of closed circuit television (CCTV) and more police to deal with the problem of drug-related offending (Fairfield Council 2003). There must be a question as to whether this can really be regarded as a whole of community response and whether increasing surveillance is a desired 'outcome'.

Sutherland Shire Council

Urban design overlaps to a very large extent with the concept of place management. Urban design however, places more emphasis on the product than the process. It also emphasises the physical and visual more than the social character of place. However, elements of this form of place management are often found in planning systems, which are primarily based on land-use regulation. In New South Wales development control plans can be based on classes of development or on places. Place-based development control plans complement the broader framework of land-use zoning. These plans are used to achieve urban design objectives in both new urban developments and areas of redevelopment. Land-use zoning provides the macro 'traditional' framework while urban design addresses the detail of public space. In this context many councils have closed off streets to create pedestrian malls in town centres for example. That activity, however, often constitutes their main commitment to a form of place management.

The term place management was not used at Sutherland Shire Council in the mid-eighties but some council projects involved place management within broader traditional frameworks. The Cronulla Plaza project⁴ offers the best example of this. Part of a 'traditional' main street, Cronulla Street, was closed off to traffic and converted to a pedestrian plaza. Great care was taken with urban design to reinforce the character of the place. A Bicentennial Grant enabled substantial works to be undertaken. The Cronulla Plaza is located on an isthmus between the ocean beach and Gunnamatta Bay, which is part of Port Hacking. Smaller than Sydney Harbour, Port Hacking is geologically similar with numerous sandstone peninsulas providing a very attractive landscape and residential environment. At considerable cost the Plaza was paved to recall the pattern of waves at the beach. An Art Deco theme was adopted in a very strict and detailed development control plan. This pays homage to its role as a seaside holiday destination for country families in the inter-war period. Cronulla is the only Sydney beach with a railway station, so young people with surfboards and no car can access it. Thus, it functions as a metropolitan recreational centre with a catchment well beyond the boundaries of the local government area. Cronulla Plaza had a place manager appointed to provide ongoing coordination of activities in the Plaza. However, the Council's desired character of the place as the focus of upmarket tourist development was at variance with its actual functioning as a 'hang out' for young people. As a result of this skewed and imposed vision of place skateboarders discovered the haven the Plaza offered early after its completion. More serious problems of crime and disorder followed and now have been addressed more punitively by Sutherland Shire Council. Contracted private security guards now patrol the Plaza night and Council enforcement officers control it by day. Video surveillance is being installed on a trial basis (Sutherland Shire Council c.2001; Business Risks International 2001). The place management vision of Cronulla has been superimposed upon a traditional land-use plan,

4 One of the authors, Peter Herborn was involved with this project.

and not implemented as thoroughly as place management advocates such as Mant (2000) might have suggested. This example, therefore, offers a warning of the need for a highly integrated 'whole of council' approach to place management and for a 'whole of community' consultative approach. Here, arguably, key stakeholders such as young people were ignored in a process, which privileged a particular vision of place.

Place Management as a New Mode of Governance

The evidence suggests that these attempts to design urban environments resistant to crime using place management may well have their place in inter-agency strategies aimed at preventing crime. However, along with many other crime prevention techniques introduced at the level of local government, they are underscored by a number of possible operational flaws that require attention. First, planning — either social or spatial — often imagines or presupposes a particular type of social and cultural use for urban space that might actually be antithetical to the local community, or, might serve to develop a form of mono-culture to the exclusion of other cultural forms and identities. The Cronulla Plaza development was indicative of this. Second, the increasing modes and technologies of surveillance often built into these new strategies might have the 'unintended' consequences of surveilling and/or criminalising whole cohorts of people through their capacity to trace and delineate ever more minute elements of everyday behaviours. Particular forms of place management are likely to make particular populations more visible. This raises questions of race, ethnicity and subculture and the ability of the dominant culture to prescribe an 'authentic' vision of particular social space. Third, many of the factors contributing to rates of offending are social, political, and economic and these lie largely beyond the domains of municipal government and certainly place managers or place management. One might argue that this focus on the local is in fact a tactic aimed at taking the focus off a state that has failed to provide a comfortable socio-economic setting for its citizens. The political expedience of the Premier's Department's place management program in NSW gives some credence to this. There are also consumer-driven imperatives, which limit the possibilities of local government intervention. From an urban planning perspective, for example, the growth of the enclosed privately-run mall has become an expectation of both consumer and retailer yet may well be antithetical to broader strategies of crime prevention and of any form of place management.

The over-riding connection between each of these flaws is that place management, although a seemingly apolitical technology, can be a potentially coercive or regulative political instrument. For, while it embodies the potential to ameliorate, or at least identify particular social ills — 'fear of crime' or crime itself for example — it also embodies the potential to intensify surveillance, coercion, and regulation with the added problem of local politics. Whilst we might welcome place management as a progressive governmental innovation with democratising potentialities, we would also advise that safeguards and checks be in place to monitor its actual functioning in particular localities — that is place management must practise the reflection and reflexivity it makes claim to. Perhaps our concerns are best illustrated by the words of a leading theorist on surveillance, Christopher Dandeker (1990:37), in a summary of what he believes defines surveillance⁵. He suggests:

5 Our attention was redirected to this quote by its use in Whitaker (1999).

The exercise of surveillance involves one or more of the following activities: (1) the collection and storage of information (presumed to be useful) about people or objects; (2) the supervision of the activities of people or objects through the issuing of instructions or physical design of the natural and built environments. In this context, architecture is of significance for the supervision of people — as for instance in prison and urban design; (3) the application of information gathering activities to the business of monitoring the behaviour of those under supervision, and, in the case of subject persons, their compliance with instructions (1990:37).

Given Dandeker's definition, the very potentialities that make place management what it is resonate with the notion of a tightening and intensification of surveillance. However, we want to reject an altogether negative hypothesis. We believe that despite these criticisms place management does offer the potential to democratise overall planning processes. Nonetheless, the level of this democratisation will largely be a component of particular local communities, particular place managers and political determination.

Challenges and Limitations

An integrated multi-agency approach to place management is needed to restore the quality of public space in many town centres. Our use of urban space is changing and the street as a site of consumption (vicarious or otherwise) is fading in importance. Consumers are becoming increasingly inclined to expect to drive their automobile into a large enclosed shopping mall in order to not only consume retail items such as clothing and groceries, but also to go to the cinema, visit the post-office, do the banking, pay bills, even have the car serviced. These malls are primarily privately policed. Large companies such as Westfields employ private security firms to regulate the social order and use of this space in line with their vision of how this space is to be used; primarily as a site of consumption. Those not using the space for this purpose will be excluded. Sutton (1997:19) argues that the 'epitome of this trend is the contemporary United States "dispersed" city', where secure shopping malls, office blocks, private housing enclaves, and entertainment complexes are embedded in less closely supervised and surveilled public streets.

Let us look at the effects this has on the streetscapes outside of the mall; often the traditional sites of consumption, commercial exchange, and social interaction. As the primary service providers and popular retailers move to the private malls, a void is left in their wake. This tends to be filled with less mainstream businesses and those requiring more affordable rent. The trend around much of urban NSW has been for a mix of pawn shops, second hand dealers, adult shops, 'ethnic' food outlets and the like to move in, profoundly altering the aesthetics and usages of this space. The presence of the larger retailers, banks and other services, meant that the street was a popular and well-worn space. Natural surveillance was afforded through such use. With the disappearance of these, the street became something of a dystopic space. The order that once seemed so natural is replaced by groups of rowdy teenagers — they have been excluded from the mall — the homeless, and people passing quickly through the space to get to the mall. Often the two now sit side by side, the mall constructed as an adjunct to the traditional shopping space.

There are similar economic forces facing regional and rural Australia, however, the spatial shifts are subtly different. Here, commercial activity is increasingly being centralised in large regional cities and towns. For example, Dubbo in central western NSW has been identified as one of these 'sponge' centres, which lure both retail and commercial entities from smaller regional and rural towns and again change the aesthetic and spatial qualities of the towns. Small rural towns can become marginalised by the construction of

malls in larger regional centres. The consequences of such retail competition are likely to be more serious for rural towns than metropolitan suburbs, yet the processes are similar to the urban mall model.

Place management at the local council level may be able to address some of the concerns these shifts pose. Local communities can potentially have much more input into designing just what type of space they consider appropriate and this can be mediated by 'expert' knowledge. A broader discussion of such cultural shifts, however, also highlights some of the limitations of place management. When local crime prevention plans, place management included, become politically detached, or are developed in isolation, from broader social and economic policy, such strategies become, at best, band-aid measures or, at worst, new strategies of coercion and criminalisation. The fact remains that many of the factors associated with offending, poverty, unemployment, inadequate health care, family breakdown, relative deprivation (see Weatherburn 2001) are beyond the reach of local councils and place managers. The same can be said in terms of the decline of economic opportunities in regional Australia. As discussed earlier, it could persuasively be argued that place management might actually operate as a means of directing criticism away from poor social policy on a State and Federal level by 'responsibilising' local government to deal with social issues (O'Malley 1997). Thus, place management has a place in crime prevention only as an element of a broader inter-agency crime prevention model.

An Inter-Agency Approach to Crime Prevention

As Pat O'Malley (1997:263) has rightly identified, 'virtually all crime prevention programs have their origins in initiatives promoted by state agencies', the police or the Attorney-General's department for example, even those that develop or are implemented at the local level. So while place management may be coordinated through a range of local government and planning initiatives it is the state that has the power to define both criminality and, perhaps more importantly when it comes to place managers appointed by the Premier's Department, community. Indeed, this constitutes a sleight of hand which entails the 'expert' determining precisely what should be the role of 'community' itself (O'Malley 1997:263).

Perhaps these dilemmas are most profoundly obvious in the interactions between local consultative committees, presumably the type of groups which would influence local government in place management decision-making, and state-based organisations such as the police. O'Malley (1997) outlines a number of difficulties associated with such negotiations. Firstly, that police are likely to have different agendas to particular committees — police already operate under a precarious balance between coercive state agency and social workers. Second, there will be difficulties in negotiating expertise; the police see themselves as experts when it comes to crime prevention and may not take kindly to the advice of amateur local committees. Thirdly, there is the problem of sustained commitment from local groups; tensions are likely to emerge over the perceived 'apathy' of locals and the 'commitment' or knowledge of professional agencies (O'Malley 1997:265). These policy dilemmas are not specific to the technologies of place management; rather they are endemic to contemporary strategies of crime prevention more generally (O'Malley 1997:265).

Moreover, place management, which seems to be premised on community input, operates under assumptions which might be, at least to some degree, problematic. For example, for communities to be able to participate actively in crime prevention and/or urban design that community must have a level of organisation that enables collective action to take place. One North American study suggested that only 20% of households are located

in areas where these opportunities present themselves (Whitaker 1986). Moreover, it has been suggested that neighbourhoods with the highest levels of 'fear of crime' are those less likely to participate in forms of collective action. 'Surveys and experiments generally indicate that high levels of fear reduce people's willingness take action — including simply calling the police when they witness crimes' (Skogan 1989:440). Indeed, all this suggests that it may be easier to organise communities that are less in need of crime prevention (Skogan 1989:441). Yet place management has been largely focused on 'problem' communities.

In many local government areas there are spaces of private affluence adjacent to spaces of obvious disadvantage. Many new housing estates in outer suburbs of Sydney and redevelopments in the inner city have a high degree of enclosure. Some are effectively sealed off from the surrounding suburbs with prominent fencing and restricted entry points. Many are comparable with the 'gated communities' of the United States but most do not have that same level of enclosure. Some new estates are essentially lifestyle packages including recreational facilities restricted to residents of the estate. Others are landscapes of affluence and high status but are hardened targets by the level of investment in security systems. Socio-spatial polarisation becomes very obvious when new affluent estates are close to poorer residential areas.

Place management can feed into this enclosure and privatisation of space. It may be seen as more economically viable to privatise space, to lock out and exclude the public, than to keep 'fixing broken windows' (Wilson & Kelling 1982). O'Malley (1994) has even argued that placing the responsibility for crime prevention in the hands of local groups, indeed potential victims, potentially feeds into the privatisation of security and the zonal segregation of urban environments based on low and high risk. If public places are not highly valued then privatisation can be favoured by the logic of economic rationalism and neo-liberalism. Place management should be about creating 'inclusive nodes ... and ... promoting an urbanism of tolerance and social cohesion' (Madanipour 1999:890).

As Sutton (1997:23) has suggested of the French 'Bonnemaison' crime prevention model, it could not have been implemented without a hierarchy of committees dominated with representatives of key national and local authorities. Its success was, to a large extent, due to effective liaison between national government and a number of socialist mayors with the power and expertise to negotiate not only with central authorities, but to coordinate the delivery of services locally:

It exemplified an inter-agency approach with representatives of major institutions such as education, housing, law enforcement, welfare, and employment services locked into concerted effort to assess local problems and implement solutions (Sutton 1997:23).

'Bonnemaison' was dependent on stoic political discipline. Indeed, with the collapse of socialist control over many of the key institutions, in the late 1980s, the scheme was all but dismantled and replaced with alternative criminal justice responses (Sutton 1997:23).

There are other reasons to question place management if its implementation simply results in a further delegating of crime control measures to the municipal level without state support. And, indeed the complete converse offers little promise, that is having universal state sanction of notions of community imposed on places. Comparatively, for example, the Netherlands has had both lower crime and imprisonment rates than most other western states. Yet, there exists there a culture whereby un- emotive approaches to crime and other problems have been coupled with a practice of delegating responsibility upwards, to élites (Sutton 1997:25). This is precisely the opposite approach to the neo-liberal approaches we have been detailing.

Perhaps some of our broader concerns are best highlighted by drawing attention to Adam Sutton's (1997) post mortem of the \$10 million 'Together Against Crime' strategy undertaken by the South Australian Labour government beginning in 1989. For Sutton, what began as a comprehensive strategy with the best of ministerial intentions gradually became a set of 'spray on solutions'. Political support — tenuous in the first place — waxed and waned, and the vision of administrators and bureaucrats became somewhat divergent to that of the minister. Ad-hoc consultancies replaced coordinated expertise and the program became an adjunct to criminal justice responses rather than an alternative.

Conclusion

We have argued tentatively that there is a role for place management in crime prevention. The main issues concern the nature of this role. Traditional land use planning has not adequately addressed the issue of crime prevention, and locally-based place managers have much to offer local councils in terms of coordination and expertise. More contemporary approaches to local governance such as place management articulate much more easily with crime prevention through environmental design and other community-based approaches. If place management helps create vibrant attractive public spaces and tolerant multicultural communities, then there will be less need for extensive surveillance systems — albeit that place management is also part of a surveillance system in itself. Public spaces need to be owned and managed by communities through an integrated planning system (both social and urban) with meaningful public participation supported by access to detailed spatial information and intimate knowledge of social institutions and cultural identities. Crime prevention needs to be incorporated into this system in conjunction with a broader inter-agency set of responses. However, place management can also be interpreted much more narrowly and justify increasing surveillance and mono-cultural forms of community rather multi-cultural usage of place. Constant reflection and external checks will ensure that this later interpretation is avoided. That is, 'outcomes' require constant evaluation and reflection from a set of stakeholders much more broadly-based than simply a state-appointed place manager or, indeed, a new 'outcomes' department of local government. Moreover, place management in practice still seems to have two distinct roles: one in urban development and one in social development. Although both of these roles incorporate aspects of the other, there is still considerable evidence that communication between the two needs improvement (Drummond 2001).

O'Malley (1994) has long suggested that contemporary crime prevention is more likely to complement rather than replace law and order responses (cited in Sutton 1997:31) and likewise with place management we need to be cautious of such outcomes. What place management offers is another important site for pooling resources such that crime prevention becomes increasingly inter-agency and politically and socially broadened rather than narrowed. The achievement of positive outcomes for place management programs will be heavily reliant on continued political support — as opposed to imposition — such that agendas are not hijacked by those pushing for quick-fix solutions which inevitably turn out to be exclusionary and self defeating.

References

- Blair, T (1999) *Modernising Government*, British Parliament, London.
- Brantingham, P & Brantingham, P (1991) *Environmental Criminology* (rev ed), Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Boyce, J (2001) 'Crime Prevention in a Plains Town — Moree', paper presented at 'The Character, Impact and Prevention of Crime in Regional Australia' Conference, Townsville August 2001.
- Buchanan, CL & Hartley, P (1992) 'Criminal choice: the economic theory of crime and its implications for crime control', Centre for Independent Studies, St Leonards.
- Burchell, G (1993) 'Liberal government and techniques of the self', *Economy and Society*, vol 23, no 3, pp 267–282.
- Business Risks International (2001) 'Report on the Proposed Installation of a Public Safety Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) System in the Cronulla Precinct for Sutherland Shire Council'.
- Chisholm (2000) 'Benefit-Cost Analysis and Crime Prevention', *Trends and Issues*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Clarke, R (1992) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow and Heston.
- Cohen, S (1985) *Visions of Social Control*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Currie, E & Wilson, J (1991) 'The Politics of Crime: The American Experience -- A Debate Between Elliot Currie and James Q Wilson' in Stenson, K & Cowell, D (eds) *The Politics of Crime Prevention*. Sage, London.
- Dandeker, C (1990) *Surveillance, power and modernity. Bureaucracy and discipline from 1700 to the present day*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Drummond, B (2001) 'A Sea Change of Public Space Management', paper presented at 'The Character, Impact and Prevention of Crime in Regional Australia' Conference, Townsville, August 2001.
- Fairfield City Council (2003) <www.communitybuilders.new.gov/building_st.../127.htm> (1 April 2003).
- Foucault, M (1991) 'Governmentality' in G Burchell, C Gordon, & P Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
- Felson, M (1992) 'Routine Activities and Crime Prevention', *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention: Annual Review*, vol 1, pp 30–34.
- Giddens, A (1998) *The Third Way*, Polity Press, Oxford.
- Giddens, A (2001) *The Global Third Way Debate*, Polity Press, Oxford.

Henry, M (2001) 'Fragmented Looking Glasses: Surveillance and Metaphors of "Panopticism" and "Big Brother"', paper presented at the 'New Zealand Geographical Society and Institute of Australian Geographers' Conference, Dunedin 2001.

Karoly, L, Kilburn, M, Bigelow, J, Caulkins, J & Cannon, J (2001) *Assessing Costs and Benefits of Early Childhood Intervention Programs: Overview and Application to the Starting Early Starting Smart Program*, RAND, Santa Monica.

Latham, M (2001) 'Myths of the Welfare State', <http://www.cis.org.au/policy/spring01/PolicySpring10_9.html> (1 April 2003).

Madanipour, A (1999) 'Why are the design and development of public places significant for cities?', *Environment and planning B: Planning and Design*, vol 26, pp 879–891.

Mant, J (1998) 'Why it Works and How to Do it', *Sydney Vision UTS Papers in Planning*, no 13, April.

Mant, J (2000) 'Putting Place Outcomes at the Centre of Planning Law and Administration', *Australian planner*, vol 37, no 2, pp 59–63.

Moore, G (2002) 'Community Capacity Building: Fact and Fiction', address to Cooperative Federation of NSW Conference Dinner, 14 November 2002.

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

O'Malley, P (1994) 'Response to Adam Sutton's article "Crime Prevention : promise or threat?"', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 27(1), pp 21–24.

O'Malley, P (1997) 'The Politics of Crime Prevention' in O'Malley & Sutton (eds) *Crime Prevention in Australia: Issues in Policy and Research*, The Federation Press, Annandale.

Putnam, R (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon and Schuster, New York.

Randolph, B (1999) 'Beyond Place Management: Why Partnership Matters', Working Paper No.3 presented to the 'National Housing Conference Reform and Renewal in Social Housing', Homebush Bay, Sydney 29–30 November 1999.

Reddel, T (2002) 'Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: "New" Governance and Place Politics', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol 61, issue 1, pp 50–63.

Rose, N (1988) 'Calculable minds and manageable individuals', *History of the Human Sciences*, vol 1, no 2, pp 179–200.

Schacter, M (2002) *Not a 'Tool Kit': Practitioner's Guide to Measuring the Performance of Public Programs*, Institute On Governance, Ottawa.

Skogan, W (1989) 'Communities, Crime, and Neighbourhood Organisation', *Crime and Delinquency*, vol 35, no 3, pp 437–457.

- Stewart-Weeks, M (1998) 'Place Management: Fad or Future', paper presented to the Institute of Public Administration Australia (NSW Division), 20 August 1998, State Library, Sydney.
- Stewart-Weeks, M (2000) 'Place Management in an Urban Context', paper presented at 'Place Management: Governance in the Network Society' conference March 2000.
- Sutherland Shire Council (2001) *Closed Circuit Television in Cronulla* Information Sheet.
- Sutton, A (1997) 'Policy Dilemmas — A Personal Account' in O'Malley & Sutton (eds) *Crime Prevention in Australia: Issues in Policy and Research*, The Federation Press, Annandale.
- Untaru, S (2002) 'Placed Based Planning for Local Government', *Australian Planner*, vol 39, no 2, pp 83–89.
- Weatherburn, D (2001) 'What Causes Crime?', *Crime and Justice Bulletin*, no 54, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Whitaker, C (1986) 'Crime Prevention Measures', *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington DC.
- Wilson, JQ & Kelling, G (1982) 'Broken Windows: The Police and Neighbourhood Safety', *Atlantic Monthly*, March, pp 29–38.
- Zappalà, G & Green, V (2001) *Addressing Disadvantage Through Place Management; Is There a Role for Non-profit Organisations*, The Smith Family, Working Paper No 3.