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Content of the Presentation:

• Outline the key policy documents in England and Wales

• Delivery of crime prevention on the ground

• The planning process

• Is crime prevention a consideration in the planning process?

• Greater Manchester Police (GMP) – the way forward in designing out crime?

• Similarities/differences between GMP and NSW
Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 states that local authorities have a duty to consider crime and disorder implications:

‘...it shall be the duty of each authority to...do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area’

(HMSO, 1998)
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: Law and Key Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Safer Places (2004)</strong></th>
<th>Argues that seeking and incorporating crime prevention techniques should form part of the planning process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) (2005)</strong></td>
<td>Developments should “...create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Class Places (2009)</strong></td>
<td>Discusses the importance of ensuring that developments are carefully designed to ensure they do not encourage crime and disorder: “Bad planning and design and careless maintenance encourage crime”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities should ...develop design policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the local area, aimed at: – Creating places, streets and spaces which meet the needs of people, are visually attractive, safe...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: Delivery on the ground

- 43 police forces
- 1 dedicated officer in each force responsible for the delivery of crime prevention
- Architectural Liaison Officers (ALOs) or Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDAs)
- In the majority of cases these officers work within an active police station
- They are serving police officers or retired officers who have returned to post in a support staff role
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: Delivery on the ground

Over 300 local authorities in England and Wales
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: Delivery on the ground

- Architectural Liaison Officers (ALOs) or Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDAs)
- Numbers in post decreasing...
- Cost cutting
- Role not viewed as a priority
- Concern regarding remaining resources
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: Delivery on the ground

- The police are **NOT** a statutory consultee
- No obligation that the police must be involved in the planning process
- Research undertaken in 2009 – comprehensive review of crime prevention across all police forces
- Highlighted there is no systematic process of ensuring that the police are involved in the design of new developments
- Ad-hoc
- This applies across police forces and within the forces

*There is no force policy. There is no direction. And whatever level of operation we have is down to individual development and partnerships – which is a shame*
...a lot of developments will bypass us at the pre-planning stage and we won’t see them until it gets to the planning application – which is far too late down the line...

[Police Force]
• Police become aware of planning applications by viewing weekly planning lists

• ‘Cherry pick’ relevant applications

• Planning application already submitted

• Potential for designing out crime reduced

_I think we just go through the planning lists and pick what we’re interested in_

_The trouble is that once they are on that planning list, they are a full application and it’s too late_
The Planning Process:

- Client
- Architect

Planning Application submitted to Local Authority

Planning application submitted

Planning Permission Granted or Refused

Development

Retrospective advice

Advice preferred to be given at pre-planning
Crime Prevention in England and Wales: From policy to practice...

- Section 17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998
- National Policy PPS1, PPS3 & Safer Places
- Research

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)
**Example of Local Documentation:**

**Unitary Development Plan:**
Development will not be permitted unless it is designed to discourage crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime, and support personal and property security.

**Supplementary Planning Guidance:**
Crime and the fear of crime can have a significant impact on the quality of life of individuals and the wider community. The causes of crime and anti-social behaviour are complex and the reduction and prevention of crime depends on a wide range of measures. Whilst the planning system cannot solve the problem of crime it can play a key role in achieving attractive and well-managed environments which can influence the level of crime and anti-social activity.
There currently lacks the mechanism of implementing policy and guidance on the ground.
- Footpath between dwellings 22 and 23
- Footpath connects development to a main road
- Public House located 50 yards away
Issues with the footpath: What the ALO said...

• The pedestrian link between the gable walls of plots 22 and 23 is one area where I have grave concerns. This footpath provides an unrestricted escape route into and out of the development. It could have a major impact in relation to crime and anti-social behaviour and will most certainly effect the quality of life of residents in plots in 22 and 23.

• There will be no surveillance in this area and the link will provide a space for people to congregate which can often lead to disturbance and nuisance to residents and could raise fear of crime levels.

• I believe that this link is unnecessary.
Footpath: What happened...

• The applicant said they would omit the pedestrian access between plots 22 and 23 as advised by the ALO

• However...this did not happen and the footpath was included

• Resulting in:
  • Footpath used as an escape route for offenders
  • People loitering in footpath / anti-social behaviour
  • Negative impact on quality of life for residents
Although there is policy outlining the importance of designing out crime, does not happen in practice.

Opportunity for preventing crime lost.

Areas need to be policed in the future – cost of policing?

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security

The way forward in designing out crime in England and Wales?
Greater Manchester Police
Design for Security Consultancy

• Design-led Consultancy

• Work with built environment professionals at the design stage/pre-planning application stage of a proposed development

• NOT warranted or retired police officers, ex-built environment professionals

• Work with the 10 local planning authorities in Greater Manchester

• Aim to ensure a development incorporates CPTED whilst simultaneously not detracting from the design of development

• Crime Impact Statement (CIS) – fee-charging service
GMP Design for Security: From policy to practice...

Section 17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998

National Policy PPS1, PPS3 & Safer Places

Research

Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

VALIDATION CHECKLIST

Embedding CPTED into the planning process
Validation Checklist:

• Each local authority has a validation checklist

• Outlines the documentation which **must** accompany a planning application

• If any documentation is missing, the application will not be validated

• National requirements and local requirements

• Across Greater Manchester it is a local requirement that a **Crime Impact Statement (CIS)** must accompany any major planning application. Eg:

  • Residential developments 10 dwellings or more
  • Commercial developments 1000 sq m or more of floorspace
  • Hotels, nursing homes, schools
What is a Crime Impact Statement?

The document

- Document which must be submitted with Planning Application

- Aims to identify, predict, evaluate and mitigate crime and disorder issues of a proposed development early in the design process

- Includes information on:
  - Visual Audit
  - Crime statistics and analysis
  - Risk Factors
  - Design and Layout Appraisal

- May not include all communications, concerns and compromises

- Represents a process
What is a Crime Impact Statement?

The process

• Involves a Consultant from GMP Design for Security liaising with the client/other stakeholders about the proposed plans:
  
  ➢ undertaking site visits to proposed development location
  
  ➢ meetings
  
  ➢ communication via email/telephone
  
  ➢ liaison with police departments eg: local Neighbourhood Policing Teams, Counter Terrorism Unit, Traffic Management, Licensing...
Planning Process across Manchester:

Pre-planning stage

Client

Architect

VALIDATION CHECKLIST

Planning Authority

Planning Permission Granted or Refused

Development

Planning Authorities in Greater Manchester stipulate that all major planning applications must include a Crime Impact Statement.
Local Authority 1:
The Crime Prevention Plan must demonstrate that the development has been designed to achieve an appropriate level of security based on the principles of CPTED.

Applicants are strongly advised to discuss the proposals with GMP Design for Security.

Local Authority 2:
A Crime Impact Statement should be provided for all Major Developments as defined by law including 10 or more residential units or 1,000 square metres of floor space. Crime Impact Statements must be prepared by Greater Manchester Police Design for Security.

Local Authority 3:
The Crime Impact Statement must demonstrate how the development will achieve an appropriate standard of security...

You are required to contact Design For Security, who are part of Greater Manchester Police to produce the Crime Impact Statement. Crime Impact Statements produced by any other person or organisation will not be accepted.
Crime Impact Statement: 
Fee-charging service

- Completion of a CIS by GMP costs the applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of development</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>£500 ($740)</td>
<td>£30 per dwelling ($45)</td>
<td>£10,000 ($14,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>£500 ($740)</td>
<td>£30 per 100m² ($45)</td>
<td>£10,000 ($14,800)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This allows Design for Security to be self-funding, with minimal financial support from the police

- Not-for-profit organisation

- Maintain staffing levels

- Deliver a consistent service across Greater Manchester
In conclusion:

• Crime prevention resources in England and Wales are being reduced

• Not seen as a priority

• Although a plethora of documents outline the importance of designing out crime, this is not being implemented on the ground

• Police involved in the planning system too late

• Advice if considered, often ignored

• Do the Local Planning Authorities need to take more responsibility?

• Is the approach adopted by Greater Manchester Police the way forward?
Points for discussion:

• Similarities/differences between Crime Impact Statements and Crime Risk Assessments in NSW?

• Police background *versus* built environment background?

• Should the local authorities stipulate that the police must author the Crime Impact Statements?

• Could a third party gain access to the detailed level of crime data (including counter-terrorism information) which the police have access to?

• Should the police charge for the service?
Thank you for listening
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