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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

![Graph showing the number of ALOs/CPDAs in England and Wales from January 2009 to September 2011.](image)
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]
Local Authority Weekly Planning List:

• 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:

1. Planning application submitted to Local Authority
2. Planning application submitted
3. Planning Permission Granted or Refused
4. Development

Advice preferred to be given at pre-planning
Retrospective advice
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)
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.
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)

There currently lacks the mechanism of implementing policy and guidance on the ground

Embedding CPTED into the planning process
Example...

- 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
Bridging the gap between policy and practice

• 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

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
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:

Planning Authorities in Greater Manchester stipulate that all major planning applications must include a Crime Impact Statement.
Examples of Validation Checklists:

**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?
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