

2016

Doing Community Safety by Locality Working: Regime Theory and Micro-Climates of Crime and Disorder Co-Governance

Chappell, Neil

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/5280>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.24382/3397>

Plymouth University

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

Copyright Statement

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis

and no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior consent.

Authors Declaration

No part of this thesis has been submitted for any award or degree at any other institute. Whilst registered as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy the author has not been a registered candidate for another award of a university.

Neil Chappell

**Doing Community Safety by Locality Working:
Regime Theory and Micro-Climates of Crime and
Disorder Co-Governance**

By

Neil Philip Chappell

A thesis submitted to Plymouth University in partial
Fulfilment for a Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Plymouth Law School

Faculty of Business

April 2015

Acknowledgements

I would like firstly to thank my supervisors and mentors Dr Daniel Gilling and Dr Lesley Simmonds for their support, assistance and patience with me. I would also like to thank my family for all their love and encouragement, and my examiners Professor Gordon Hughes and Dr Oliver Smith for their assistance. I would like to dedicate my thesis to all of them, including my late brother Ian, who sadly passed away last year.

Abstract

The co-governance of crime and disorder and the involvement of the public within quasi-deliberative consultations of participatory forums to this end has been the subject of significant bodies of research (Clarke et al, 2007, Barnes, Newman and Sullivan: 2007). Such forums were applied to the micro-level of the neighbourhood during New Labour's tenure in office in an attempt to reduce crime and disorder and to improve the responsiveness of service delivery. This has created situations whereby the governance of communities has been shifted to the micro-level of the neighbourhood (Stoker: 2004). Hughes and Edwards (2005) have proposed examining these micro-climates of crime and disorder co-governance in attempts to understand the importance of contextual factors in structuring of forms of community safety. My research utilises grounded theory to examine the impact of differing aspects of economic redevelopment within the context of the inner City, to both foster particular crime problems, and the typical solution-sets (Jones: 1998) utilised by practitioners in addressing them. In addition, I examine the structural role and impact of economic and cultural forces of urban redevelopment in creating and managing the 'majorities' (Stoker: 1998) amongst the public, and their perceptions of crime and disorder patterns. My research is conducted across three separate neighbourhood 'localities' within Plymouth City Centre with the intention being to understand how the individual particularisms of these areas contribute to the formation of different forms of community safety, and allied with it, subtly different forms of policing.

1 Contents

1.	Chapter One Introduction.....	8
2	Chapter Two: Literature Review Part One	14
2.1	Introduction	14
2.2	Crime Prevention and Community Safety.....	15
2.3	Regime Theory	20
2.4	Community Safety Regimes	22
2.5	Neighbourhood policing	27
2.6	Mixed Policing Families.....	30
2.7	Summary	34
3	Chapter Three, Literature Review Part two:.....	35
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Plymouth.....	35
3.3	The City	38
3.4	Participation.....	46
3.5	Summary	53
4	Chapter Four: Methodology	54
4.1	Introduction	54
4.2	Critical Realism and Grounded Theory	54
4.3	Ethnographic Approaches and Reflections.....	60
4.4	Ethics and Obtaining Data.....	65
4.5	Sampling.....	69
4.6	Coding and arranging Data	70
4.7	Summary	72
5	Chapter Five: Youngtown.....	74
5.1	Introduction	74

5.2	Booze: Glass shatters, Crime ‘spikes’	76
5.3	Bins: Signal Crime, Signifier or Service Demand? Resident’s vs. ‘Tenants’ in Youngtown ...	87
5.4	‘Bad planning’: The changing face of the locality	97
5.5	Meetingcraft and the management of dissent: Politics versus Procedure in Youngtown .	108
5.6	Summary: University-Town, Doing Community Safety <i>with</i> Plymouth University	119
6	Chapter Six: Fort Matthews	122
6.1	Introduction	122
6.2	Business and urban development.....	124
6.3	Arrested Development: Sex, Drugs and Social Exclusion.....	136
6.4	Community, Priorities and Prioritised Communities	146
6.5	Summary: Castles in the sky and realities on the ground.....	157
7	Chapter Seven: Ernest Lea	159
7.1	Introduction	159
7.2	Infrastructure and Industry.....	161
7.3	Parks and Recreation: The battles for Ernest Lea	172
7.4	Communication and Control: Who has the last say at <i>have your say?</i>	183
7.5	Summary: Kerb your enthusiasm: One-way systems and ‘small adjustments’	194
8	Chapter Eight: Discussion.....	197
8.1	Introduction	197
8.2	Business and the City	197
8.3	Regulating Space	209
9	Chapter Nine: Conclusion	219
9.1	The ‘division of labour’ in Locality Working: Governing through Crime Prevention	219
9.2	Community Safety and Comparative Advantage.....	235
10	References	244

1. Chapter One Introduction

Attempts to improve public services by making them more accountable and responsive to citizens has been one of the identifiable trends in local government discourses from the turn of the century onwards. Such moves are often referred to as the advent of ‘new localism’ under New Labour (Stoker: 2004), typified by attempts to include the public in deliberative forums to facilitate improvements in service provision at the micro-level. More recently there have been Conservative proposals, based on the concept of ‘big society’ and attempts to ‘nudge’ publics towards socially acceptable goals (John, Smith and Stoker: 2011). Whilst there exists significant divergence between approaches, both may be viewed as focussing on the level of participation citizens may have in shaping public services, and setting parameters in the relationship between the individual and the state. Whatever the initial rationale, attempts at localism have been applied to discourses about partnership and crime prevention. Here public engagement with state partners is viewed as part of holistic attempts to address crime prevention needs across communities. In Plymouth, such exercises are referred to as ‘locality working’ with the City split into thirty-nine localities. These attempts to take community safety discourses down to the neighbourhood level, also allow us to examine issues within co-governance at the micro level of the ecological context in which such localism is realised (Herbert: 1982). In doing this we understand that particular safety contexts at the local level, in turn are shaped by neighbourhood and community-specific concerns, crime problems and the public services tasked with addressing them (Lowndes and Skelcher: 1998). This leads us to the consideration of individual partnership dynamics, and their variations across communities and areas, dependent upon local conditions and considerations (Hughes and Edwards: 2005).

My research is directed at understanding area-specific micro-climates of crime and community safety discourses across three separate ‘localities’ within Plymouth City Centre.

The data is partially drawn from ethnographic notes taken in locality-specific public-partner community forums, which succeeded the Partners and Communities Together (PACT) meetings known locally as *have your say*. To this end, the research is conducted as a multi-sided ethnography of 'place' whereby the context in which people act contributes to their analysis of the locality and their role in shaping it. This is done in a two-fold way with the meeting notes serving to construct both the particular context of the *have your say* meetings, as well as being one part of a broader discussion, contributing to the establishment of meaning in what 'locality working' constitutes. This is achieved by utilising some of the data as ethnographic vignettes of the locality, its salient issues, and the residents 'life experience' of that area (Hughes: 2007). These ethnographic notes are coupled with semi-structured interviews taken with some of the regular partner attendees at the *have your say* meetings across these three localities.

Furthermore, the use of the data obtained from the *have your say* meetings allows us to examine the potential functions of particular forms of civic forums with regard to public engagement with crime and community safety. Given the prevailing influence of New Public Management (NPM) discourses on public services, Newman (2011) warns of the potential for such engagement becoming part of NPM discourses, a 'tick box' exercise for public agencies. This leads in to discussions as to how the public partners utilise the resources of public forums to pursue agency agendas either in terms of 'quick wins' in community safety (Gilling:2007), or to discipline publics to pre-existing procedures (Lipsky:1980) . This allows us to examine the fissures between the 'community' within safety discourses and the technocratic crime prevention paradigm from which such discourses emerge (Tilley: 2009). From this we can examine the limitations on partnership between the public and agencies and understand how the context in which debates on partnership takes place, construct the rationale of partnership (McCulloch: 2004). This is especially pertinent given the impact of

austerity discourses acting on public servants, and corresponding attempts to manage public expectations as to what might be achievable when doing ‘more with less’. From this we may understand the impact of austerity on engagement and the means by which dissent is managed or neutralised (Harfield: 2010).

The structure of my thesis is as follows:

Chapter two is the first part of my literature review. This includes a discussion of policing developments from the period of 2002 onward and particularly the rise of forms of neighbourhood policing which work alongside the emergence of additional policing partners such as PCSOs. This section also examines developments in community safety under New Labour in the period of 1998-2010 and some of the debates which attend the institutionalisation of safety across England and Wales. This section then goes on to outline regime theory and its potential in studying the dynamics of urban governance before considering its particular applicability to the study of community safety co-governance.

Chapter three is the second part of my literature review which concentrates on contextualising the contested site of the urban environment and the relevance of city-dynamics in shaping actions and conceptualisations of community. Such a discussion includes an examination of key thinkers including Lefebvre, as well as an examination of elements of the urban economy including potential developments following the 2008 crash. Furthermore, the section will examine some debates concerning the role of participative forums established by New Labour. These include discussions on the relative power of individuals within community forums, the ability of meetings to structure and channel dissenting publics (Barnes and Prior: 2009) and the rise of citizen-consumer (Clarke et al: 2007) as users of public services.

Chapter four sets out my methodology. This chapter discusses the utility of interpretivism as method for understanding the subjective connotations of engagement within socially constructed safety regimes. This chapter also examines pertinent issues regarding the selection and use of case study analysis as method for examining locality working and disseminating findings. Furthermore, my methodology justifies my utilisation of grounded theory and critical realism an appropriate method for the examination and analysis of community safety contexts at the local level (Hughes and Edwards: 2005). From this, the chapter discusses the use of ethnographic approaches to gathering field data and from it understanding the working practices of community in situ (Hughes: 2007) as well as some reflections that arose from the process of doing research.

Chapter five focuses on the first of my localities, Youngtown which features the rise of the University, student-centred politics and the manner in which this duopoly interacts with established residents and structural concerns to produce the particularisms of the locality's political settlement of community safety. This chapter discusses the 'rise' of the University as a 'growth machine' (Harding: 1998), set within the parameters of Youngtown and the overarching context of the relative decline of Plymouth's traditional industries connected to the dockyard. Following the growth of the University, the Night Time Economy (NTE) has gained salience within the locality's crime prevention and community safety discourses, with the vivid spectacle of binge drinking, commodified leisure and identity (Hall, Winlow, Ancrum: 2008) creating tensions between the 'new' transient communities, including students, and the 'old' communities of owner-occupiers. This leads to an analysis of the means by which social differentiation (Payne: 2000) is achieved between the transient tenants and the long-term residents, from focus group data obtained in the area.

Chapter six moves to the next of my case studies, Fort Matthews, and examines the impact of neo-liberal development on shaping issues of crime and disorder as well as the response of

governing parties within the locality. This is partially a reflection on the urban gentrification within the locality, particularly its gated communities, and the new 'majorities' this has made (Stoker: 1998) with regard to crime and safety. This is pertinent because the locality also plays host to a complex array of social problems, some relating to the Night Time Economy (NTE), linked with this is the historical legacy of prostitution in the area and the creation of 'exclusionary, gendered space' (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular:2008). Finally, the locality is also one of Plymouth's chief sites for housing homeless people and providing services for those with alcohol and drug addictions. This lays the basis for discussions on social exclusion (Levitas: 1998) and the provision of needs within community safety.

Chapter seven is my final analysis chapter focussing on the Ernest Lea locality. Ernest Lea in contrast to the other two localities has had some of its redevelopment led by the council and not private business. Furthermore, in contrast to the other two localities, Ernest Lea is arguably an older 'industrial' community (Bauman: 1997) with a static long-term community and generations of families living in the area. This creates issues in the form of 'problem families' living in the area and intergenerational politics between older residents and young people played out in the 'commons' (Cohen: 1979) of the locality's parks. Given the influence of the council on the area's development and the importance of state partners in addressing Ernest Lea's community safety problems, we may start to identify the means by which community safety is achieved within the locality, and to understand such attempts, as are made to responsabilise or 'nudge' publics towards alternative actions (McCulloch: 2004, John et al: 2011).

Chapter eight is my discussion. This focusses on examining the forces underpinning variations of engagement and types of community safety dynamics operating within the three localities analysed. This section describes the specific 'form' of policing, the lead partners within its co-governance, and the forces and processes which created these settlements. The

chapter progresses to show how the functioning of these specific localities is involved in the overall functioning of the City itself. The discussion then moves to discuss the potential overall division of labour (Kaut and Pease: 2013) prevailing within each community safety regime, including partners and publics and the various mechanisms whereby this is established. Such approaches inevitably touch upon discourses regarding responsabilisation, and the various methods by which publics are engaged in attempts to reduce their own risks from crime (Garland: 2001).

Chapter nine is my conclusion. This chapter will be inclusive of reflections on the research process as well as discussing the implications of locality particularisms for crime prevention and community safety discourses (Hughes and Edwards: 2005). This discussion attempts to understand imbalances within partnership relationships and the potential outcomes these may generate in ‘governmentalities’ of crime and safety (Gilling: 2010b) within locality-specific contexts. I then move on to attempt to ascertain what the broader functioning of Plymouth’s regime may be, based on my analysis of some of its constituent parts. Finally, I conclude by examining what generalisations may be feasible on the basis of my research and the basis for other pieces of research in the future and by discussing what the overall parameters of Plymouth’s City-wide regimes may be, both for economics as well as for urban safety (Stone: 1989, Edwards and Hughes: 2013)

2 Chapter Two: Literature Review Part One

2.1 Introduction

This Literature review shall concentrate on four areas which are identified as being central to understanding participatory crime governance within the inner City. The four areas identified are Governance, with an enhanced acknowledgment of the role of crime governance played by the establishment of Crime and Disorder Community Partnerships (CDRPs), and the role of regime theory as an analytical tool for understanding contemporary urban politics as set out by Stone (1989) and applied by Hughes and Edwards (2012) to the analysis of urban safety regimes. Following from this shall be an examination of contemporaneous changes in police working practices as they relate to crime governance and particularly the concept of neighbourhood policing. The specific period covered for examinations of Crime and Community Safety and Policing is the period of 1998-2010. This is because the focus of my research is primarily concerned with an examination of different community safety contexts at a local level, which have been impacted upon by the formation of 'locality working' and neighbourhood policing during this period. The arrangement of the literature review shall be as follows: Firstly, an examination of contemporary changes to governing structures and the emergence of the concept of governance alongside what this may mean for studies of urban politics. In coincident with this there is the necessity for a re-examination of some debates concerning the institutionalisation of Crime and Disorder and Reduction Partnerships and the conceptualisation of Community Safety. Following on the literature review will move on to consider the utility of regime theory as an empirical tool for examining how urban governance works, and its direct application to the field of crime and disorder partnerships at the local level.

For clarity sake it is necessary to make a distinction at this point, whilst I utilise regime theory for the purposes of this piece of research, regimes are held to be city-wide coalitions formed in the pursuit of particular policy actions. My research operates at a level below this, that of the locality which are smaller geographical sub-units established by Plymouth City Council for the purposes of engagement and neighbourhood management. The reason for the utility of regime theory when addressing negotiated settlements below the level of the City is that it is felt that whilst there will be particular differences, nonetheless the dynamic of community life and neighbourhood management will fundamentally be exercised in accordance with the concerns and priorities of the overarching regime and its policy directions for urban governance. In this instance regimes compose the deus-ex -machina of political and urban management at the sub-level of community. Just as regimes are impacted by central governmental directives, so too are local community settlements a reflection of the city regimes above them.

This section shall begin by discussing some of the issues regarding the formation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and positioning these alongside contemporaneous changes in urban governance. From there this chapter will move on to examine the utility of regime theory for studying how community safety is achieved at the local level. The chapter will then examine developments in policing from the period of 2002 - 2010. The reason for choosing this period is that from this period reassurance policing is established as a national priority for forces to work towards. With this moves are made to create neighbourhood policing teams and with this, neighbourhood management is firmly established as a formal means of police and local community partnership.

2.2 Crime Prevention and Community Safety

When considering the term ‘community safety’ it is useful to acknowledge that whilst it is applied in the instance of this research to the specifics of an English context, there nonetheless exists a plurality of forms of community safety or urban security throughout Europe (Hughes and Edwards: 2013). Whilst such acknowledgements are complimentary to aid our understanding of the impact of local considerations and circumstances on the formation of distinct ‘regimes’ of community safety (Hughes and Edwards: 2012), this first section shall begin by mapping-out the chronological moves which have been instrumental in shaping what is understood by the term ‘community safety’.

Hughes, Edwards, Gilling, Bowden, Henry and Topping (2013) identify three ‘broad phases’ in the evolution of the term, beginning with the voluntary (1982-97), the National Mandatory (1998-2010) and the localised-devolved which is ongoing from 2010 onwards. What is termed ‘localised’ and devolved’ may be understood to be an ongoing process, the impact of which on community safety is uncertain (Hughes, Edwards, Gilling et al: 2013). Potential factors that impact on the direction of community safety include the absolute reduction in resources affecting the police and local authorities, as a result of austerity measures adopted by central government. Alongside this has been the move towards the privatisation of elements of the Criminal Justice System, particularly elements of the probation service and a more general trend towards the inclusion of a greater number of non-state providers. This literature review shall concentrate on the era identified as the ‘National Mandatory’ period. The reason for this being that whilst my research concentrates on the period of 2011-2015, the literature which influenced this is taken from the previous period, with the foundations for locality working effectively arising from changes made to policing and crime governance under the governments of the Blair-Brown era. In this respect, my research can be viewed as a contribution to debates as to what post-New Labour community safety paradigms may entail.

The phase between 1998 and 2010 is notable for contradictory attempts by the New Labour administrations to delegate crime reduction and community safety targets from the national level to accomplishment at the local level. Gilling (2007) has characterised this phase as one of potential conflict between goals imposed from above and those arising from below as New Labour attempted to influence or control local outcomes from the centre by use of managerialist techniques, such as targets and other facets of New Public Management (NPM). This section shall examine developments in policing as well as the evolving architecture of strategic policy management and implementation with its implications for the overall governance of crime and disorder.

The formation of CDRPs under the 1998 Act was an attempt to ‘depoliticise’ the process of incorporating local authorities into the process of crime prevention, in a move which was intended to satisfy police concerns about their operational independence by placing the Chief police and the local authority’s Chief executive officer as jointly responsible for the implementation of the local plans. Furthermore, these plans were to be designed around and influenced by the privileged status of ‘objective’ data, and its objectivity and applicability to crime problems. This accorded in tandem with New Labour’s emphasis on ‘what works’ (Gilling: 2007) and the emphasis given to particular forms of technocratic solutions which seek further to remove crime from political-social contexts, save as a precursor to other interventions which possessed the pre-requisite pedigree of being evidence-based.

In taking a top-down approach to the issue of community safety whereby it remains a subcategory of crime prevention, it is argued that the emphasis is automatically placed on the punitive; criminal justice focused aspects rather than a substantive attempt to contextualise social ills and place crime as a subcategory of them. Hughes (2005) citing Byrne and Pease (2003 287-8) reflects their belief that the problem of this prioritisation for community safety being that it:

“distorts the recognition and prioritisation of all the threats to safety which a community may encounter, and neglects the distributive justice which is appropriately achieved by the equitable sharing of unavoidable risks...Rather than start with crime per se we believe that it would be more useful to start with the broader issue of hazard and hazard management, of which crime and disorder are then sub-sets”

Following from this, much legislation aimed at the functioning of CDRPs from the period of 2000 onwards increased both the influence of centrally issued missives to these partnerships by the use of statutory responsibilities for reductions in drug-use and anti-social behaviour.

Hughes and Edwards (2005) suggests that almost from its inception, ‘community safety’ has had a level of ambiguity associated with its purported aims and conceivable direction. Whilst the aims of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act were focussed largely on the reduction of crime and disorder, the more nebulous concept of community safety was associated with social perceptions of risk (Beck: 1992). This produces a tension between managerialist assumptions associated with best value (Gilling: 2007) and NPM measurements of crime control alongside opaque definitions of ‘quality of life’.

It is a significant criticism of discourses on community safety that they often ignore the inherently political nature of the calls made as well as the importance of the “diverse social, economic and political histories and the consequent cultural milieu that particular localities have on the generation of problems such as crime and disorder and on governmental responses to these problems” (Hughes and Edwards: 2005:26). What is most insightful about local community governance are their community particularisms, citing Coleman’s 2002 study of the Safer Community partnership in Merseyside, Hughes and Edwards discuss Coleman’s findings whereby the efforts of policing were made to service the regeneration of Liverpool by coercively policing populations in the interests of capital. They also cite

Stenson's 2002 examination of the Thames Valley area where governmental prioritisation of resources to less affluent regions left the CDRP having to manage its own pockets of crime and deprivation in innovative ways with a variety of partners. Furthermore, there is Hallsworth's 2002 study of street crime in Southeast London where he documented the approach of practitioners tasked with implementation and found that it highlighted the shortcomings of simplistic assumptions of direct policy transfer from the design to implementation.

It is from this that Hughes and Edwards suggest that the locality and subnational units should take primacy in comparative examinations of crime and community safety. This may be applied both to 'world cities' such as London, New York, Paris, Tokyo and Berlin, which ostensibly may have more in common with each other than with other rather than more provincial Cities, which have a different contextual backdrop and political history. This does leave the issue of the relative cultural embeddedness (Crawford: 2005) of particular forms of crime control and whether it is possible or desirable to disentangle them from this for comparative purposes. Citing Nelken (1994) that there can be no culture-free theory of crime, Hughes and Edwards (2005) propose that there can be no pre-political techniques of crime prevention.

One of the biggest potential problems associated with partnerships and their relative failures with regard to tackling particular crime problems is that they often abstract the crime problem they are dealing with from the conditions in which it exists and how the crime prevention measure is employed. In addition to this is the over-simplification of reducing crime prevention and safety to a neat set of inter-organisational solutions or templates to be followed and copied. At the micro level, the inter-organisational agreements are based on trust between individuals from different agencies with no formal authority over one another and as Gilling (2005) notes, the actions of the personnel involved are often influenced by the

‘baggage’ of those individuals and the respective cultures of their workplaces. Furthermore, the organisations themselves may also provide their own baggage in the form of particular views as to the technocratic nature of the work that they do, and challenges posed by the climate of socio-economic change affecting their particular agency, alongside its copy mechanisms.

2.3 Regime Theory

Regimes are informal associations and coalitions which exist as an adjunct to more formal political mechanisms of power. Stone (2012) in opposition to Dahl’s tendency to emphasise power as an individual exercise over others, instead power is viewed as an outcome of the collective and that such collectives are in turn, constituted by an array of components, individuals and groups and other interests. The strength of this collective and its ability to achieve outcomes is, in turn dependent upon the stability, cohesiveness of those involved and their ability to pursue their jointly agreed outcomes. This includes mobilising and utilising the resources to achieve their outcomes. With this in mind the issue of critical import to researchers examining urban politics, is more complicated than outcomes from linear conceptualisations of power as will. Instead, as Stone suggests, we need to:

“Think beyond the question of who prevails when A and B, with their fixed preferences clash. A wider range of possibilities is at issue and one lens for viewing them is asking who is and is not part of a governing alliance at a particular time and why. Questions about alliance formation are a first step for moving past the question ‘who governs’, and it can be taken without letting go into the inquiry of choice-making agents. Asking simply ‘who governs’ tends to reduce power study to a question of which body of individuals governs, when political scientists in reality are interested in the choices key actors make within structures and constraints, and in the light of the leanings and choices of other actors” (Stone:2012:12)

In doing this, it is argued that the conceptualisation of power as amorphous or devoid of context, is abandoned and instead power is understood more properly within the bounded context of the urban political landscape and studies of political economy which elucidate how the urban context impacts upon the urban experience. This effectively allows us to view power not as a force which is exercised directly from above but instead as a distinct product of interests and alliances and that the forging of these, influences the priorities and direction in which that power is exercised. Such examinations on power, its exercise and potential outcomes returns us to the chief dimensions of political power namely, those observable decisions, agenda –setting whereby certain interests combine to remove issues from discussion and thus create ‘non-decisions’ and finally, the importance of ideology in shaping or formulating policy and outcomes. Stone (2012) argues that the real impetus of his work has been to shift the object of examination away from the short-term objects of the individual outcomes which is more suited to individual conceptualisations of governance. Instead he suggests that it is the political relationships between individuals and the forms of power that they foster which are the real objects for examination as “choices are made in a social context, and how relationships pervade the pursuit and foreclosing of choices is at the heart of the study of urban politics’ (Stone:2012:15).

Stone (1989) discusses the formation and attributes of the regime in Atlanta from 1946-1988 as an example of the emergence of a particular form of City regime where the individual actions are less crucial to understanding the workings of urban power, but instead the trajectory of power and the policy directions associated with it. The Atlanta City regime was understood to be an association between black business and political leaders and white business and political leaders formed a coalition which functioned to further the aims of the white business class as well as some of the aims of the black political leadership, particularly towards desegregation. The importance of business interests in Atlanta, and indeed in most

Cities is of crucial import, even if it is not the sole determining element. Stone (1989) discusses this in relation to the particulars of the American political economy with its concentration on private control of business alongside formal institutions of government which are subject to popular mechanisms and democratic checks. This political economy context is somewhat removed from the reality of the U.K. which is subject to a greater degree of central control over local government (Stoker: 2004), and a greater state involvement in the economy. However, as Stone (1989) posits, such a dichotomy is less absolute – governmental conduct is often constrained by the necessity to grow the urban economy and promote the City in this interests, leaving the formal mechanisms of political power to act with, and to promote, the private interest of business. Furthermore, Stone (2012) points out that economic development contributes toward ‘place changing’, as indeed does crime-control initiatives, whereby the impact of economic development over-time changes the nature of those involved in the coalition. One example he uses is the ‘ed and med’ sector where Cities economic future is increasingly viewed as being tied to Universities and medical research centres. Harding (1998) refers to as ‘growth machines’. These are local manifestations of economic development serving as motors of growth. Beyond this, such ‘machines’ have a normative impact on policy makers and professionals when addressing the attendant problems within the City, some of which may relate to the impact of business and industry. Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1996) suggest that many contemporary ‘growth machines’ are the result of conscious planning decisions made during the 1980s by local authorities deliberately attempting to foster large employers within their City by encouraging investment and relaxations of the planning process.

2.4 Community Safety Regimes

Edwards and Hughes (2011) apply the concept of regime politics to the urban governance of crime as a means to observe and to test the impact of political economy by an analysis of community safety regimes and the negotiation between groups involved in the co-construction of community safety. As we have seen, regimes are inclusive of a variety of state and non-state actors and the empirical approach adopted by political scientists, which addresses the diffusion of power and responsibility between state and non-state actors, including the business and voluntary sector and how these are realised in particular forms of policy direction at the local subnational level.

In adopting regime analysis the impetus is to understand that the coalitions which are built around range of interest groups, have the potential to facilitate a range of policy agendas or alternative policy directions. Therefore the focus is examining the particular context of the urban regime and the ability it has to pursue particular alternatives and the factors both constraining and enabling such actions. One of the great advantages of this approach is that it avoids blanket explanations by reasserting the primacy of how such factors which may be felt to be all-encompassing, such as neoliberal capitalism, are in turn mediated by, and situated in, particular geo-historic contexts.

In applying the concept of regime theory analysis to criminology, part of the importance lies in moving on between artificial distinctions between the legislative/political and the administrative, which is particularly the purview of the liberal tradition in criminology. Instead of the dichotomy between the political and the administrative function of crime governance and policy formation traditionally offered plus the general conceptualisation of this form of criminology as being 'administrative', seeking to downplay the role of political value-based judgements in determining the policy process. From this, the separation of 'crime science' from criminology and its socio-political contexts is shown to be problematic and instead the focus is shifted not simply onto the evaluation of policy per se but moreover,

the basis on which the policy was formulated and what the normative understanding arising from such evaluations are.

Edwards and Hughes (2011) suggest that regime theory is particularly relevant to the study of criminology and particularly the formation of urban safety regimes which are negotiated and mediated amongst a variety of actors and are not the consequence of sovereign authority or central diktat. As Hughes and Edwards note, governmental directives aimed at reducing crime have long acknowledged the limitations of state power in pursuing the aims of crime reduction and have called for the inclusion of a multiplicity of actors ranging from the general public, to business and the voluntary sector, to assist in dealing with root causes and particular situations which are criminogenic.

As applied to the particular area of multi-agency partnerships, the suggestion has been that the institutionalisation of partnerships has created ‘corporatism’ amongst local stakeholders. Whilst the potential for partnerships to create dynamic policies which are driven by local requirements is contested, as indeed whether these policies if implemented allow for a move away from authoritarian approaches such as those associated with Marxist-structuralist analysis of crime control, or governmental criminology and its attendant focus on power and control through layers of government. Citing Stone (2005) Edwards and Hughes (2011) outline pertinent questions for examining local politics and governance, these are:

- What specific concerns generate policy agendas?
- What motivates actors to participate in governing coalitions seeking to deliver these agendas?
- What resources are relevant for the governing capacity of coalitions?

- How are the schemes of co-operation constituted through blends of shared purpose, selective incentives and established inter-personal and inter-organizational networks?

Edwards and Hughes (2011) discuss how framing issues as a problem to be addressed, is one of the most important facets of being able to govern and in determining the resources available, and the services responsible, in leading the response to the aforementioned problem. In the West, and particularly England and Wales much of the framing of the issues of crime and disorder has taken place within an overarching narrative of crime prevention with some suggestion being that the overriding narrative is one associated with risk management and prevention abstracted from the socio-political contexts where they arise from. There are suggestions following from Garland's (2001) work of increasing homogeneity in Western crime control methods, often associated with 'americanisation' and that this exists more broadly as a corollary to global trends associated with a more limited state, and enhanced role for the market. Hughes and Edwards (2005) citing Hepperrecht and Duprez (2004) outline three particular forms of security operating in Europe, which exist in varying degrees across Europe. These are, the Neoliberal model, based around actuarial risk management, Social democratic security, which is based around redistributive justice and social solidarity and finally, the moral conservative approach which is predicated upon strong formal and informal controls on publics which might otherwise be expected to err. However, Hughes and Edwards suggest that such categorisations are less suited when applied to the reality of governing and the exercise of power. Instead, they advocate a four-fold typology of agendas, these are:

Criminal justice with an emphasis on anti-social behaviour and increased surveillance of prolific and priority offenders (PPO).

Risk management with an increased emphasis on situational preventative measures, criminogenic interventions, particularly with groups who are deemed 'at risk' as well as inducements towards groups to take more personal responsibility for their own security and to reduce their own chance of victimhood.

Restorative justice concentrates on reintegrating offenders, diverting them from custody and on mediation between parties.

Social justice is where primacy is given towards policies which foster political and social inclusion. In this circumstance community safety policies work with other governmental programmes in health, education, and housing which are substantively socially democratic in nature.

Hughes and Edwards note that whilst the involvement of many partners in CDRPs is statutory, and that some partners are subject to an array of targets, there nonetheless exists a considerable amount of discretion in what forms of community safety they pursue, either in terms of how many anti-social behaviour orders they impose, the relative importance they place on CCTV, restorative justice and other programmes. In addition to this, Hughes and Edwards point out that the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act of 2011 and the formation of Police and Crime Commissioners has the potential to impact on policy directions policy both by the relative dilution of centrally imposed standards and by the inclusion of a greater variety of actors. Another structural change that is highlighted is the impact of devolution in Scotland and Northern Ireland and the attendant consequences this may have as community safety is realised to meet specific political contexts. Finally, there is the impact of financial constraints associated with austerity and the initial drive that the coalition administration gave to the 'Big Society'. Taylor-Gooby and Stoker (2011) have critiqued the Big Society as constituting a renewed emphasis upon private or other non-state

providers, coupled with a delegation of control and responsibility for provision to these new providers. The suggestion is that the structural impacts of both absolute reductions in public finances coupled with an enhanced role for private providers will influence the direction of community safety and crime control towards particular ends, or entail the enlistment of new partners at the local level. What this is to say is that the relative ability of community safety regimes is dependent upon both the potential partners available, as well as the resources they have at their disposal and the extent that political support amongst the public, and agency buy-in can be established. Whilst there is a large body of work concerning the importance of actuarial risk-based modes of governance, particularly with regarding crime and disorder (Garland: 2001, Beck: 1992) the suggestion is that other potential forces exist located in either the charity/ voluntary sector, as well as forces mobilised from civic society or as the result of political scandal.

2.5 Neighbourhood policing

The context of the initial trial of the National Reassurance Policing Plan (NRPP) of 2002 was the ACPO policy document 'Open All Hours' which had highlighted the 'reassurance gap' between falling crime rates and the public's fear of crime (Millie and Herrington: 2005). Part of the rationale for the NRPP therefore was an implicit requirement that more visible policing was a necessity, not only to allay the public's fear of crime but also as a means of improving the public perception and accessibility of the police. This was because that many of the targeted approaches toward reducing crime and criminality under operational practices such as Intelligence Led Policing (ILP), whilst successful at reducing the volume of crime were not visible to the general public. This created a need not just for policing to be effective but also to be seen to be effective by an enhanced presence in the community (Innes: 2004). The NRPP of 2003 was influenced by three key elements, namely, that police should be

visible, familiar and accessible. The guiding principles underlying the pilot were namely: to foster greater public confidence in the police and to inform police priorities more by public consultation, plus to create a more visible presence in the neighbourhood both in terms of personnel and by being seen to target community defined problems. Furthermore to work in a targeted and intelligence-led fashion identifying the root cause of problems, and to work in greater partnership with agencies particularly to help realise the goals of the local CDRPs and finally, to allocate dedicated and specific resources to neighbourhoods (Millie and Herrington: 2005).

The National Policing Plan (NPP) of 2005 served to scale up many of the developments of the earlier NRPP and its pilot areas. By 2008 there was to be a dedicated neighbourhood policing team in each ward covered by a Basic Command Unit (BCU) with approximately three thousand, six hundred being created and serviced by thirteen thousand police personnel and sixteen thousand Police Community Support Officers (Flanagan: 2008). The key aim of the NPP was to increase public confidence in the police as it was measured by the British Crime Survey (BCS) and as such was included as a key performance indicator under the Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF). However, the Home Office also deemed it possible that neighbourhood policing could lead to a reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour and therefore there exists a distinction with the NRPP and its emphasis on reducing the fear of crime (Quinton and Morris: 2008). In keeping with this theme of trying to reduce the overall crime rate, the ten principles underlying the NPP of 2005-8 were more prescriptive than those of the NRPP. These included a greater integration of neighbourhood policing with other aspects of policing such as investigation and protection services, an enhanced emphasis on the National Intelligence Management service (NIM) as a basis for the targeting of resources, the extensive utilisation of performance management techniques to ensure that work was proceeding in accordance with strategic and force level goals and a

general emphasis upon evidence-based and need identified practice (Quinton and Morris: 2008).

Innes (2004) describes how the broadening of what NRPP includes constitutes an attempt to address the dichotomy between policing crime reduction and security provision discourses. Innes notes that especially under the complexities with which the modern state must deal, it is impossible to have a reassurance strategy without simultaneously having crime and disorder reduction strategies and that whilst security is being provided by a visible presence, that presence must also be active and helping to foster intelligence which can better be used to reduce crime. Such an approach is perhaps best encapsulated within the framework of multi-agency partnerships adopted by the police especially since the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act. Innes and Fielding (2006) show that the rationale of such partnerships has long been an implicit understanding of links between social exclusion, crime and quality of life issues for residents with a need for a more focussed targeting of combined resources to strengthen social order whilst reducing crime, the opportunity for crime and the perception of lawlessness. The implementation of this strategic model of crime reduction and quality of life provision by reassurance is most visibly demonstrated at the micro level of the neighbourhood utilising Innes (2004) conception of the control hub model of policing with the police forming the centre with different 'spokes' of agencies working around them.

Flanagan was also keen for neighbourhood policing to be systematically combined within an overall plan of neighbourhood management which would also be covered by the Local Authority Agreement (LAA) which as a performance management tool for Local Authorities was inclusive of the need to promote community safety. In doing this it was felt that burdensome and overly bureaucratic procedures could be streamlined allowing more police to be released for front-line operations and crucially that the potential for perverse 'target-chasing' instead of problem solving, could be avoided. In keeping with this Flanagan (2008)

is generally sympathetic to attempts to reform some of the key performance criteria. In particular, the replacement of Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) by the Home Office in 2006 was seen as a positive outcome as it was replaced with the Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS). APACS was viewed as an acknowledgement that many policing functions were produced in collaborative partnership and therefore served to review performance in terms of policing and the performance of CDRP's. Moreover this move came as a response to police criticism that PPAF was too narrow and rigidly focussed and that the police were ultimately left with responsibility for any failures under the CDRPs.

This model of policing is evocative of developments elsewhere in public institutions and particularly with the tensions involved in service provision being simultaneously 'moved up' and geared toward national standards whilst simultaneously 'moved down' toward local responsiveness and the enhancement of service (Savage: 2007). Such an approach is reminiscent of the arguments made by commentators such as Barnett and Sikkink (2008), whereby the reform agenda is intertwined with the governmentality technology of governance. Under this the police constable as neighbourhood manager is deputised into the process of modernisation with greater power but significantly enhanced responsibilities and an emphasis to take ownership of 'their patch'. Such improvements that are made or intelligence gathered then may be fed-back from the local policing family to the national one, to ensure a virtuous cycle of continual improvement based on public choice and responsive services (Bailey: 2006).

2.6 Mixed Policing Families

Thus far we have seen how tendencies in the modernisation of policing have coincided to help shape the nucleus of a definable neighbourhood policing strategy. The twin pillars of this strategy might be interpreted as being on the one hand, a greater degree of centralisation

of policing in terms of standardisation and bureaucratic managerialism. The second pillar might be viewed as entailing a greater drive towards reassurance away from the fear of crime and a move toward a more active engagement and partnership with local communities. Indeed, McLaughlin (2006) identifies one of the key modernisations of this period as being a move away from traditional policing by consent and toward a more active partnership between communities, the police and responsible agencies. Alongside these moves toward reassurance and problem orientation in policing must be placed the emergence of neighbourhood wardens in 2000 and the creation of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). Some of these moves were initially supported by the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) with an emphasis on neighbourhood renewal. Crawford et al (2005) point to this as the emergence of 'the mixed economy' of policing, whereas Savage (2007) describes this in terms of the 'auxililarization' of British policing with the corresponding rise of the 'professional assistant'. Such moves reflect developments in other public services, for example the emergence of the teaching assistant in education. The 2003 Anti-Social Behaviour Act granted these assistants alongside suitably accredited local authority workers, the power to dispense 'summary justice' in the form of fixed penalty notices (Crawford et al: 2005).

Such developments have inevitably impacted not just on the character and outlook of policing but also upon those constables tasked with it. Savage (2007) refers to this as the 'reinvention of the constable' with the constable increasingly viewed as a manager of a policing team and a community leader 'owning their patch'. Such an approach is invocative of Innes (2004) work on the 'control hub model of policing', whereby the police sit at the centre of the hub due to the special significance of policing in terms of understanding risk and disorder.

Around the police sit the various partnership agencies of the CDRP but also representatives of the benefits agency, representatives of private business, the local community and other

members of the extended policing family (Crawford et al: 2005). Such an approach is at times characterised as the 'empowerment of the police' with a reduction in police targets which skewed performance toward narrow goals (Innes and Fielding: 2006) and instead a move toward targeted policing (Innes and Roberts: 2008).

Crawford et al (2005), point to the mixed economy which developed in policing as having roots prior to 2002. In particular they note the creation of neighbourhood wardens in 2000 as a move toward neighbourhood renewal by the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU). Additionally, there is the Private Security Industry Act of 2001 which entailed the formal screening and vetting of private security staff inclusive of a criminal records check, and the licensing of the industry. However, it is the 2002 Police Reform Act which establishes what is later to be referred to as PCSO's. The PCSO was primarily designed to act as a reassurance foot patrol and whilst they would be given limited powers and training they were intended to function as an auxiliary to the police, not to replace front-line officers. Crawford et al (2005) also are quick to see another rationale for the creation of PCSO's in 2002 and their extension following 2005/6. Under the provisions of the Magistrates Court Act of 1994 the police were entitled to sell certain levels of policing for special events such as football matches.

Moreover, the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act enabled local authorities and other responsible agencies to identify whether there was a need for routine patrolling of a given area and enabled those authorities to purchase in its provision from outside sources if required.

Therefore the establishment of PCSO's effectively enabled the police to steal a march on private providers by creating a network of patrol-orientated uniformed auxiliaries with some police training and viable links with established forces and BCU's.

These trends in the diversification of public policing continued apace but were closely interlinked with developments which were occurring in other parts of the crime reduction and community safety agenda (Hughes and Rowe: 2007). Partly this was due to the

neighbourhood policing agenda which was formalised in the 2005/6 Police and Justice Act but also coincided with the CDRP reform programme of 2007. The other development of this period was the expansion of powers of 'summary justice' (Savage: 2007), to other non-police players. For example the Anti-Social Behaviour Act of 2003 extended powers to give fixed penalty notices to PCSOs local authority workers and other accredited persons (Crawford et al: 2005). From 2005 onward moves were made to expand the powers of PCSOs to enable the detention of suspects, to search individuals, direct traffic and confiscate alcohol. Alongside this were developments to accredit or regulate by closer partnership with the police various other agencies which may find that they were adopting a more policing function in terms of the powers they possessed to fine, patrol or investigate on behalf of either the police or CDRPs.

Thus the police were subject to pressure to adapt working priorities towards both meeting a political demands to be seen to be doing something about crime and disorder to combat perceptions (not facts) that crime is rising, and public insecurities. McLaughin (2007) suggests that this is 'post-modern policing' whereby acts are abstracted from reality and the necessity is that something is seen to have been done, rather than the substantive acts themselves. Furthermore, this section has examined how the emergence of reassurance has been attended by the emergence of PCSOs, the auxiliaries of modern policing. The emergence of the PCSO demonstrates the move towards bifurcation in policing, both with an increasing number of civilian jobs within the service, and a special rank designed towards reassurance. In addition to this, the suggestion is that the police more formally move away from sole ownership of community safety and are increasingly, at least in terms of neighbourhood working, the manager of a number of direct support workers and alliances with other agencies.

2.7 Summary

This chapter has mapped out some of the changes to urban governance and specifically the governance of crime control and community safety. In doing this it has concentrated on partnerships and the necessity for them to be located within particular social/geo-historic contexts (Hughes: 2007). In doing this the intention has been to elucidate some of the challenges posed to our understanding of how community safety is conceptualised and some of the limitations to partnership arrangements. This section has also sought to frame discussions about partnership within contemporary debates about urban governance and the increasing importance of sub-units such as Cities in both realising the policy outcomes from the centre and adapting them to suit their individual contexts. Finally, this section has examined some of the changes in policing during this period so as to better understand the changing nature of policing as its tactics adapt to fulfil a more formal requirement towards reassurance. Furthermore, the police service has adjusted its working practices so as to become managers of a team of stakeholders, including PCSO auxiliaries, all included under the auspices of partnership. The questions arising from this are, to what extent are partnerships able to adapt to the local contexts in which they work and what is the impact of the increasing pluralisation of the police service on this at the neighbourhood level?

3 Chapter Three, Literature Review Part two:

3.1 Introduction

Part two of the Literature review examines key theoretical contributions to our understanding of the City as well as contemporaneous debates regarding participation in urban governance. The first part of this literature review concentrates on placing the City within discourses on modernity, exclusivity and the relationship between spatial dynamics and how we experience them. As such, this section explores issues of how City life creates narrative for its citizens. This chapter shall examine the work of some key thinkers on the nature of the City and the foundations of urban life before moving on to examine how other scholars have researched this subject. This section shall begin by discussing the City of Plymouth both as a political entity as well as some of its pertinent characteristics in terms of how its geo-history has shaped its identity (Hughes and Edwards:2005), before moving on to consider the urban life and potential considerations relating to crime, and conflict. Following from this the literature review shall move on to examine the issue of participatory forums and their limitations. This is pertinent since much of my research as much of the data was obtained from recording field notes taken from *have your say* meetings in Plymouth. Such forums are redolent of New Labour's attempts to introduce participatory co-governance between agency partners and the public in an attempt to improve the responsiveness of services and increase their accountability to the public.

3.2 Plymouth

Plymouth is a unitary authority in with a population of approximately 258, 700 (ONS: 2011). The largest section of the population is white at 96.1 percent (ONS: 2011) although this percentage of the overall population has reduced relative to the City's population since the last census in 2001. With regard to the affluence of the City, according to Plymouth's 2020 vision for growth, the Gross Value Added (GVA) per head in the City as measured in 2008 was £16,500, this is below the National Average of £20,500. This is described by the authors of Plymouth's economic review 2011 thus:

“The city's GVA per head is closer to the North East (£15,900) and North West (£17,600) averages than the relatively more prosperous South West (£18,700). To give a little more context – Hull and Sunderland recorded GVA per head values of £16,700 and £17,500 in 2008, while Bristol city and Swindon recorded rates of £27,200 and £30,200 respectively. It is not surprising that Plymouth is often described as a northern city on the southern coast”
(Plymouth Economic Review: 2011: 18)

With regard to crime and anti-social disorder the City performs relatively well when compared with other Cities and urban areas within its own national comparator group. For example, Plymouth's Interim Report of 2012 discussed the slight increase in crime during the period of 2011/12 was driven by rises in acquisitive crime. These statistics when placed within the overall context of Plymouth's Home Office National comparator group is relatively positive with an overall crime rate of 81.7 per thousand of population against a group average of 91.1 and an overall performance of second best amongst its family grouping for crime and serious acquisitive crime during this period. However, the report acknowledges that Plymouth performs less well by comparison with its family group of Cities with respect to violent crime and criminal damage being twelfth out of fifteen and above the average percentage on both issues.

However, a key factor in determining the context of Plymouth City Council and its potential challenges in the period from 2010 onwards has been the impact of austerity and reductions to funding available to local government. Plymouth City Council's budget was reduced by approximately £30 million from 2011 – 2014 and the City will be required to make more significant reductions in the coming years (PCC: 2014). Alongside these challenges faced by Plymouth at a City-wide level are the challenges posed directly to Devon and Cornwall police by the reduction in funding. By 2015 the force will have had to make spending reductions of £51 million with the service forced to make significant reductions in both personnel as well as changes to working practices (HMIC: 2012). Some of the proposed changes already outlined include replacing I.T. systems, improved response handling procedures and, as the report noted:

“Neighbourhood policing teams have an expanded remit and are quite stretched, and in fact many teams now ‘multi-task’ different roles such as patrol and investigation; but every area still has a named contact” (HMIC:2012:4)

The report went on to highlight that whilst the overall level of satisfaction with Devon and Cornwall police was high, nevertheless the force, like many others around the country was faced with the challenge of reductions in funding. This reduction in funding was not only felt in reducing the number of personnel available but consequentially, forcing changes in working practices and greater ‘flexibility’ in tasking. Therefore, the underlying context for community safety from a police perspective is one of the austerity and the necessity to economise resources to meet competing needs whilst preventing escalating costs, both monetary and in terms of crime numbers.

Beyond the numbers and official designations there is however, a more intimate and personal understanding of the city which I as both researcher and as a native of the City have.

Plymouth lies in the South West of England, towards the border with Cornwall. The City has an extensive maritime history being associated both with Sir Francis Drake and also claims to have been where the Pilgrim Fathers embarked from when sailing to America in the Sixteenth Century. It is for this reason that Plymouth's Football team, Plymouth Argyle are also referred to as the Pilgrims. The importance of the Sea in shaping Plymouth's identity has been strongly felt, particularly in the presence of Devonport Dockyard and more generally the relevance of military personnel from the navy and the marines to the City, many of whom are based locally, including at the Citadel in the City Centre. The Dockyard itself is the largest naval base in Western Europe and home to significant portions of Royal Navy. However, recent developments mean that from 2017 portions of the fleet will be based in Faslane in Scotland and Portsmouth.

Location is clearly a very important factor in determining Plymouth's characterisation and identity with the influence of the maritime being felt more recently in the City's rebranding to 'The Ocean City' and 'Destination Plymouth'. The largest City in Devon, Plymouth's relative isolation from the rest of the country also plays a part in forming its character with the nearest motorway, the M5 stopping at Exeter forty miles away. Surrounding Plymouth is the rural county of Devon and across the border, Cornwall. This creates an interesting contrast between a wealthier rural hinterland and the City itself.

3.3 The City

Examinations of the City have traditionally been associated with a nexus of symbolic interactionism with the City often viewed in terms of its relationship to means of production and accompanying forms of social solidarity that these engender (Bauman 1997). This

section shall examine the centrality of the City to discussions on crime and disorder as well as perceptions of risk and social inclusion/exclusion. Further to this, there is a need to tailor some of the general theorising to the particular context of Plymouth as research site. To begin I will briefly summarise the four key thinkers and their contributions to debates regarding the nature of the city as identified by Parker (2004).

Weber examined the creation of the City as being interlinked with the move towards modernity whereby the processes of capitalism and the move away from antique and feudal society accentuated the historical-cultural shift. Here the emergence of the City is portrayed as part of a historical-dialectic process which is marked by specific connotations. These criteria are characterised by the increased political autonomy of the City and its position as a challenge to the monopolies of power previously held by religion and the state. From this, the emergence of the city and the accompanying conceptualisation of the urban and how it is experienced are felt to be attributes of modernity with accompanying shifts in economic, technological and social life being played out with the City as the arena both shaping and being shaped by these developments.

For Simmel, part of the importance in understanding the role of the City lies in its impact on formations of moral order in attendance with civilizational progress and change. Here, the City is accompanied by a move away from the traditional community and its accompanying levels of surveillance where the anonymity permitted by urban space. Simmel's particular emphasis is on the personality and rationale of the individual as they negotiate their own urban experience. The move away from organic forms of community associated with pre-urban villages and communal life is linked with the disassociation between individuals and conflict with the City as the arena in which a variety of struggles, between individuals are played out.

This issue of struggle and the contestation of space is a strong feature of Walter Benjamin's work on the City dynamics. For Benjamin, the City was understood as a place with no one constant and this sat in opposition to conceptualisations of the rural. This dichotomy between urban change and dynamism was in contrast to the 'passivity' of the rural with its settled boundaries and constants. In this one can view the clash between the duopoly of *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* – community and society. As this occurs, there is an increasing blurring of boundaries between the public and private spaces which mediate exchanges between individuals. Such distinctions between the communal and the personal are indicated by semiotics – walls, gates as well as spaces of ambiguity such as concourses separating traders shops from their apartments. Benjamin, in anticipation of Marxist-ecological analysis of the City, also highlights the potential for conflict and that such distinctions in spatial ownership are often contested – the use of graffiti and other signifiers which challenge delineations between the personal and the common.

Lefebvre adopted a Marxist analytical framework, examining the creation of the City as part of a dialectic process. For Lefebvre, the City was problematic as its construction was impinged upon by the theoretical and the empirical and the dichotomy between the 'concrete' constructs of the buildings and infrastructure of the City and the social interactions and the nature of living for the City's inhabitants. Within this, Lefebvre turns his attention to the production of space and its use within the City, as space is appropriated for consumption and is in turn consumed. Here, the City is fragmented by the use of and value attached to it. This process of commodification is not irreversible or instantaneous, Lefebvre is highly critical of the influence of urban planners and architects in attempting to control the function of space and with it, idealised conceptualisations of urban life and community. Instead, urban life was constantly in flux as the purpose of space was contested and each epoch brought with it a different realisation of the City and its meaning for inhabitants. Such contestation of the

purposes of space could include campaigns for a public park or more recently, the actions of groups such as occupy, taking back spaces which hitherto had been the preserve of others.

In placing the urban environment within the overarching framework of dialectic materialism (Habermas: 1986), it is clear that the city is associated both with particular forms of historical epoch and accompanying changes in the nature of production, as well as alterations in human solidarity which attend these changes. Lefebvre (2000) suggests that with the emergence of the City there arises ways of thinking about urban life, and that in tandem with modernity was the acceptance of positivistic and rational ways of viewing urban life. In these circumstances, there is a tendency to view the functioning of surroundings as part of an ecosystem which has its own inherent equilibrium, a position which Lefebvre rejects as it is viewed as being incompatible with the changes within the City, and the way in which the city encroaches on the rural. Furthermore, Lefebvre (2000) identifies tendencies in the rise of urban planning departments and architectural schools for the purposes of social engineering and to foster order. Such moves have been instrumental in both the formation of types of community such as the ordered suburbs, as well as the new urbanism (Grant: 2006) with its attendant mixing of neighbourhoods, with affluent housing and social-housing placed in close proximity. Such moves were designed to foster solidarity across social classes with joint spaces such as parks being common areas which all local residents would have a vested interest in maintaining.

Such assumptions however have been contested. Smith (1996) discusses how urban gentrification linked to speculative bubbles in the housing markets from the 1980s, onwards combined with City policy in the United States to produce policies which were exclusionary to marginalised groups including the homeless, and minorities which were not only priced out of parts of the City, but were also actively policed as potential problems or threats. Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular (2008) show how urban gentrification of parts of the inner City has

increasingly encroached upon areas where prostitutes traditionally worked. Simultaneously, the expansion of the NTE has been attended by increasing sexualisation, with massage parlours and strip-clubs intermingling with the bars and clubs. The result of such a combination of forces has been to create 'gendered' space within the NTE, where women are at heightened risk of victimisation, whilst also potentially moving prostitution activities to 'zones of exclusion' where the activity is widely ignored, as well as the harm to the sex workers involved. Deukmedjian, (2013) has demonstrated the impact of policing in responding to the requirements of capital in policing particular groups in the interests of capital. Further to this, there is the potential associated with forms of urban development and renewal to create 'mixophobia' (Bauman:2011), this is especially true where new forms of gated community emerge within the city. Mixophobia relates to the fear of contamination by the strange or different and the preference for sameness. Such preferences may be attributed to general associations of risk and uncertainty prevalent in late modernity (Beck:1992) or attempts to possess the freedom but with the illusion of safety and complete security (Boutellier:2005). In Bauman's view (2011), mixophobia is an attempt to build communities based upon a rejection of participation and a desire for conformity. In such circumstances, the ability to exclude means that the individual's ability to understand or adapt to even small changes in routine or the presence of the uncommon instead create heightened anxiety and greater imperatives to exclude.

For Amin and Thrift (2002), the importance of community as a concept to understanding how people relate to the spaces they inhabit cite five particular areas of importance. Firstly there is the idea of community as a collective of people which are directed towards common goals and think and behave in the same way. This vision of the collective community is rooted in a view of face-to-face human interactions – the very existence of these social interactions is of themselves the sine-qua-non justifying and maintaining the pre-existence of community.

This existence and 'pre-existence' of community makes the community both a contemporary and historical entity which is both visible, and quantifiable. Such conflating of community with geographical boundaries has been critiqued (Hughes: 2007, Wilmott: 1987) as inherently problematical, when applied to criminogenic discourses and attempts to build communities which are stable and resilient to crime. Such an approach is increasingly difficult to apply in a globalised world subject to migration, moreover, attempts to engineer new forms of community may rest uneasily on top of established settlements of community cohesion and community 'tolerances' to crime (Walklate and Evans: 1999). Studies of crime patterns and their place alongside communities and the growth of urban environments are often associated with the Chicago School, and the model of concentric zones within urban structure with its impact on structuring crime (Burgess 1967 cited by Einstadter and Henry, 2006). In addition to this, urban geographers have studied crime within the inner City (Herbert: 1982), emphasising the spatial concentrations of crime within the inner City and its concomitant concentration on particular groups, such as the young, who are at greater risk from crime (Gilling:2010b). In doing this assumptions are made about crime and criminogenic situations which are closely tied with the overall development of the urban environments, and that perhaps particular forms of crime and criminality are associated with particular contexts and communities (Cohen 1979).

What these debates on the City have in common is the importance and contested nature of space and its uses. Such debates have influenced discourses on crime control (Newman: 1972), with an emphasis on the use of architecture, to reduce criminogenic scenarios through building design and improved surveillance. However, the improvement to building design in the interests of crime prevention is of particular interest when we consider the development of 'mass private space' as a contemporary part of the modern City. Bottoms and Wiles (2003) discuss how the appropriation of parts of the urban environment is accompanied by the rise of

instrumental discipline over populations. The use of space and surveillance as a feature of a system of social ordering and instrumental discipline within the urban environment has been noted by Coleman and Sim (1999) with regard to the use of CCTV within Liverpool City centre. What this suggests is that the impact of space on crime prevention largely depends on the ownership of the space and therefore, in whose interest surveillance and crime prevention is used. Furthermore, when considering the impact of environmental crime prevention narratives, we must also consider the potential impact that the dispersal or displacement of crime from the central business districts may create (Barr and Pease: 1990) for other areas in the City. Against the potential problems that may arise from the displacement of crime from the City Centre to the other parts of City, which accompanies situational crime prevention discourses, is the supposed 'diffusion of benefits' (Guerette and Bowers: 2009), where areas not covered by situational crime prevention measures register benefits in crime prevention.

There is also a necessity to examine the contemporary urban economy and how changing forms of economic activity shape the development of both local economies as well as the City environments which surround them. Much discussion has been made around the post-crash city focussing on the impact of the economic crisis of 2008 and whether this may change the nature of the urban economy and what the attendant effects of this may be. One particular suggestion has been that the nature of production in western societies may change with a move away from financial dominance to an increased role for culture and creative industries (CCIs). Hutton (2008) suggests that governmental policy alongside speculative finance interconnect with these newer industries to produce the circumstances in which tech and culture start-ups are generated. Florida (2002) has suggested that increasingly the world of work and the leisure activities of the individuals engaged in these newer forms of industry will interconnect to a greater extent with a significant correspondence between how people live and the recreational opportunities which they have available, correlating with economic

growth and productivity gains. This assumed duopoly between leisure and treasure has many notable detractors, Indergaard (2012) points to the significant impact that financial services had on New York in not only creating the speculative bubble but in distorting the housing market of New York City itself, such moves drive out many in newer, creative industries and effectively promote the homogeneity of the city and its production purpose. Florida's approach is associated strongly with examinations of urban economies which place a heavy emphasis on the role of social capital as a causal factor in explaining shifts in urban production and growth patterns. In contrast to this approach are those who assert that human capital must be placed alongside pre-existing forms of production and consumption, as well as social lives, viewed through the prism of their particular historical and geographical contexts.

Furthermore, a coincident element in addressing how the City is experienced relates to how it is consumed and the impact that such consumption has. One element in the urban environment and its political economy that has been of relevance is that of Night Time Economy (NTE) as both an adjunct to the main-stream economy as well as a specific cultural and economic site in its own right. Ferrell, Hayward and Young (2008), show how the expansion of the NTE is closely related to attempts to regenerate the inner City by relaxing licencing laws, and increasing the density of bars within the urban environment in a bid to create a 'bistro' environment with European attitudes to drinking. However, the expansion of the NTE has corresponded with a binge drinking culture in the U.K., which is characterised by Hall, Winlow and Ancrum (2008), as 'commodified leisure and identity' with increased sessional activity, as well as the use of other narcotic substances. Such research has gained traction recently with some academics concentrating on the rise of leisure and consumption as distinct forms of activity which encourages conformity and deviance (Smith:2014).

This section has sought to elucidate on some of the theoretical conceptualisations which are relevant to studying the urban environment. The following section goes on to examine issues relating to participatory governance including the level of engagement on offer to the public as well as the means by which those attending have your say meetings and other community forums may be influenced by partners.

3.4 Participation

This section shall examine issues that relate to the establishment of deliberative forums by New Labour as part of its approach to governance and attempts to remodel public services as well as some of their potential limitations and shortcomings. My research is based around observations made at local *have your say meetings* held across the City and specifically in my three case study localities of Ernest Lea, Fort Matthews and Youngtown. This section shall briefly outline what HYS is, placing it within the context of deliberative forums established under New Labour for purposes which included improving the responsiveness of public services, increased accountability and attempts to inculcate a more active civic engagement. This section shall then move on to examine some of the criticisms levelled against such forums, including what degree of is participation established, and what may constrain it.

Starting with the 1998 White Paper 'Modern Local Government: In touch with the People', this conveyed a statutory obligation for councils to consult publics. However, there was no official mention as to what form such a consultation should take. This has caused a variety of mechanisms being utilised for this purpose ranging from questionnaires and surveys to more deliberative methods such as citizen juries. This move toward consultation and participation was further strengthened by the formation of Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) in

1999 which, as part of their thrust towards regeneration of urban areas, set up citizen forums as a means of including the public and other parties. Such an approach was visible in the 'Northeast Gateway' amongst others which pursued a redevelopment agenda based upon public involvement and professional expertise (McCulloch: 2004). New Labour's enthusiasm for such Area Based Initiatives (ABIs) in terms of the New deal for Communities, or action zones in health, education and unemployment, was maintained with the underlying rationale for holistic solutions and partnership work (Stoker: 2004). In Plymouth, moves to move towards a form of neighbourhood-level working have been called locality working with the City divided into forty neighbourhoods, with each being assigned a Neighbourhood Liaison Officer as a link between the public in the area and the council. Other agency representatives which were commonly in attendance include representatives from the police as well as other council services or voluntary groups which were associated with the area.

The first *have your say* meetings I attended were during the October of 2011. When I first embarked on the research there were approximately forty localities across Plymouth which were later rationalised down to thirty – nine as some localities were split or merged. Previous community consultations between partners and public had taken place under the auspices of PACT meetings. These meetings were ostensibly viewed as 'police-led' or 'police-run' with a common misconception being that PACT referred to 'Police and Communities Together' as opposed to 'Partners and Communities Together'. The *have your say* meetings held by the council were held quarterly across the year. The supplanting of PACT by *have your say* was partially due to the an internal review commissioned by Plymouth City Council which highlighted a deficiency compared with other councils in terms of engagement with the public.

Arnstein (1969) discusses the 'ladder of engagement' with an eightfold typology of differential types of participation and interaction between publics and state bodies. The top

rungs of this ladder comprise partnership and citizen power whereby the public is actively involved within the co-construction of policy, and possess influence and power on outcomes. At the bottom of the ladder, Arnstein (1969) leaves space for the modes of participation, which reduce public involvement, or are otherwise not conducive to communities contributing to outcomes. These are characterised as ‘therapy’, consultation or ‘tokenism’ where efforts made at public engagement are in reality, designed to limit public engagement, or use it for the purpose of legitimising pre-determined actions. Applied to policing and attempts to increase the accountability by public forums and community ‘calls to action’ (Crawford: 2007), it is necessary to note that such forums have often been used by the police for the purposes of legitimising pre-determined policing actions (Wilmott: 1987, Harfield: 2010). Furthermore, Bulloch and Sindall (2014) have also highlighted some of the means by which the police may actively use the procedural tactics to mollify residents’ concerns whilst ostensibly pursuing their own core business.

With this in mind, we may accept that there exist significant limitations on partnership and public participatory co-governance which are fostered by how the forums themselves, interact with established norms of consumer choice and citizenship, so as to influence behaviour and identity. This suggests that there will be variable forms of participation available and that such participation may vary depending upon the rationale for engagement and the influence of consumerist tendencies to potentially encourage, or to advantage, certain forms of participation. Furthermore, it is also suggested that such forums may actively encourage or discourage particular forms of behaviour, by legitimising some forms of behaviour or elements of language which are may be more conducive to particular groups, yet conversely may restrict others. Such procedural norms of behaviour may contribute to false positives or false negatives (Loader and Walker: 2007), whereby certain societal groups, normally those with a reduced need or risk from crime, are able to exert a disproportionate impact on

discourses on crime and disorder within the forums (false positives). It is conceivable, the impact of such groups on such discourses may dissuade certain other potential participants from attending, thereby rendering the level of engagement less representative and potentially further entrenching inequalities between communities (false negatives). In these circumstances it may be necessary for those partners present to act with regard to egalitarian concerns in order to filter out and distinguish between groups on the basis of what needs to be achieved by the forum, or for the broader functional requirements of due engagement.

Therefore, an important consideration concerns whether public participation amounts to a reflection of societal and procedural bias, which is may be utilised by public servants for their own purposes. Barnes and Prior (2009) discuss this in terms of whether the participatory forum is considered 'open' by citizens involved. Do they deem it to be an arena for the free discussion of ideas and the questioning of public servants? Alternatively, is the perception of the public forum as a separate entity, which harbours and maintains strict procedural norms and codes of behaviour with formalised language and where issues are discussed in a more structured, even prescriptive way?

So far this section has examined some of the difficulties and limitations placed upon participative forums and public involvement in co-governance. This has included Harfield's (2010) examination of how such public forums may be used by state agencies to legitimise pre-determined responses in the eyes of the public. From here, the literature views some of the means by which 'participation' may be neutralised by the impact of structure and agency on partners and their involvement in the forum. This impact may take the form of normative assumptions as to what constitutes participation or engagement, as well as the rationale for such exercises i.e. what the aim of the participatory forum may be. In doing this it is necessary to examine some of the pressures which may influence how partners perceive public forums and the attendant issues for them. The suggestion is that participatory forums

may effectively be subsumed within technocratic discourses on governing, or otherwise be utilised for the purposes of control and regulation (Foucault: 1979).

Such preferences suggest an idealised version of participatory frameworks which are apolitical in nature, and therefore are not capable of resisting overarching narratives of responsabilisation. Furthermore, the ‘apolitical’ approach of such exercises may mean that political challenges to the forum or the outcomes of engagement are undermined. Wilmott (1987) shows how interventions by councillors in the Police Community Consultative Groups (PCCGs) in the 1980s were often restricted or undermined due to their apparent ‘politicising’ of policing. Further to this is the acknowledged difficulty of politicians such as councillors adjusting to participative forums which may undermine their credentials to represent and therefore, to speak for, their community (Barnes and Prior: 2009).

The ‘de-politicisation’ of such participatory forums may potentially allow for such exercises to be included within technocratic management structures represented by NPM. For example, if we look at the usage of consumer participation as a tool for finding best value and best practice then we can arrive at an instance whereby a narrow section of public service users and ‘participants’ construct a template for regional or national programmes of engagement (Newman: 2011). Furthermore, the impact of NPM discourses on the inclusion of consultative or participative forums to attend public service delivery may ultimately render consultation into a facet of NPM as a key target to be achieved. Newman (2011) discusses the potential for a participatory exercise to become a routine or internalised action of public services, as being merely another part of a requirement under the auspices of practices of governance such as NPM. Michels and De Graaf (2010) are also aware of the attendant dangers of a ‘public participation/consultative’ phase being ‘bolted on’ to conventional procedures of governing and institutional practices.

What this is to say is that there are very real restrictions to what is achieved by participation and what the potential outcomes may be. In addition to the Arnstein's (1969) typology of hierarchies of participation, there exist hierarchies within participation, i.e., hierarchies between those who are able to contribute and actively engage. This is partially a reflection of the difficulty of New Labour's use of participative democracy forums to advance the cause of citizenship, cohesiveness and social capital production, in a similar manner to those suggested by Robert Putnam (2000). One issue with the accumulation of social capital is the existence of social exclusion (Levitas: 1998) limiting the ability of differing groups to participate within society. A second and no less important problem for social capital theory itself is that a great deal of empirical research conducted has traditionally been weighted in favour of men and ethnocentrically white and of middle age (Lowndes: 2004, Walters: 2002). The issue here is that there is still significant ignorance as to how women, the young or members of ethnic minority groups might accumulate or spend social capital. The potential for forums of engagement and participation and engagement to actively challenge the marginalisation of some groups within society is attended by the acknowledged ability of particular groups of middle class home-owners to entrench their advantage or otherwise game the system (Bailey: 2006) by greater understanding of procedural norms and their ability to frame their interactions accordingly.

Furthermore, Barnes Newman and Sullivan (2007) show that many of the attempts to use participative forums to facilitate community building during New Labour's tenure, tended to become associated with strong moral-communitarian overtones. In these circumstances the potential exists that 'participation' and inclusion are associated with the 'conditional citizenship' associated with much of New Labour's approach to social policy and welfare. Under these auspices there may exist tendencies to use public forums as 'window dressing' for policies whose real intent is to responsabilise the public for their own welfare and security

needs. McCulloch (2004), discusses how New Labour's initiatives in neighbourhood renewal and civic regeneration, alongside economic regeneration in the North West was overshadowed by the local authorities 'going for growth' agenda, whereby social policy was formed within the context of neo-liberal orthodoxies about the limitations of state intervention and the responsibilities that communities had in gaining training, education and skills, to lessen their dependency on the state. In doing this, McCulloch (2004) suggests that the role and involvement of 'community activists', was less in tune with assisting community members to participate or otherwise take ownership of the process, but instead was aimed at adapting communities to self-include within the established parameters of the 'what works' paradigms associated with many of New Labour's initiatives in social policy and crime reduction (Stoker: 2004).

What this suggests is that 'participation' from the public within the context of forming responses to social problems, exists within broad structural constraints and 'common-sense' assumptions as to the purpose of engagement and the limitations of participation. Whatever the intentions of some of New Labour's initiatives to gain greater public participation within service construction and delivery, there exists some of the dirigisme of New Labour's centralising tendencies over social policy, whilst it attempted to inculcate norms of self-inclusion, to particular groups. Furthermore, there is an acceptance amongst some social policy theorists that communities not only shape the civic institutions which they use but are in turn, shaped by the performance and norms which their civic associations and participative forums demonstrate (Lowndes and Skelcher: 1998). In this context, the shaping of public attitudes towards the functional purpose of engagement and participation becomes acute, as through such actions, we understand that majorities are not simply 'made' (Stoker: 1998) by economic forces, but are developed by how civic society and the state interact to disseminate and normalise models of behaviour and expectations. For crime prevention and local

government, two particularly significant models impacting on behaviour and expectations are rational choice-theories of crime prevention and crime control, and an increasing tendency towards consumerism, and consumerist outlooks amongst members of the public. The section below shall examine the potential impact that these two paradigms may have for public inclusion and participation in public forums.

3.5 Summary

This chapter has examined how the City is conceptualised and the significance of the urban in contemporary society in framing many of the debates we have about, the relationship between economic development and societal change. How individuals perceive the City and experience it affects how they feel about notions of community and the impact of social transformations. The significant research questions arising are, in what ways does location within the centre shape the community and its attendant problems and, what role do participative forums have in addressing these issues, or otherwise managing the publics attending?

4 Chapter Four: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the utility of ethnographic methods and grounded theory for the analysis of the social constructs of safety regimes and the lived experience of community (Hughes: 2007). This section also examines some issues with regard to the dissemination of findings by case study analysis and reflections on the researcher's involvement in the process of 'doing' research. This chapter shall outline the utility of critical realism to researching the functioning of community politics and its attendant implications for studying city-wide regimes.

4.2 Critical Realism and Grounded Theory

Critical realism is a philosophical approach for academic enquiry which concentrates upon how human agency including actions, motivations and understandings are coupled with and interacts alongside, existing structures such as rules, norms and procedures to produce a tangible 'reality'. Houston (2010: 75) puts this succinctly when he states that:

“For critical realism the world is essentially real; that is, there are real, social structures and yet actors apply their social constructions and their meaning making activity to their experience when confronted by these structures. In this sense, critical realism stands as a subtle form of realism. It suggests that there is an *intransitive* world that is real and a *transitive* take on that world through the perceptions and theories that we develop about it. The transitive dimension is

a human construction – it is only a picture of the governing reality, much like the distorted view in Plato’s cave”

Such a view of the philosophical underpinnings of reality is directly applicable to studies of regime politics being as they concentrate on the collaboration, deal-making and concessions made to obtain policy-coalitions whilst under the constraints of statutory requirements, public opinions and financial constraints. Critical realism therefore starts from a point where there exists an objective reality, even if we cannot be fully aware of it and that around this assumption, most individuals address their day-to-day life. In doing this, individuals make causal connections between individual acts and phenomena, between place, context and motive which critical realism mirrors in addressing itself to the everyday assumptions by which individuals rationalise their surrounds and make sense of their environment (Easton:2010). With reference to this research we may understand this to mean that whilst individual conceptions and experiences of their urban environment or community may differ, individuals make causal relationships between what are perceived as objective facts, and that their experiences are based upon how the relationships they make between these facts are perceived to interact with each other. When applied to the research setting of attending *have your say* meetings, the inference is that the experience of the meeting is subjective and is accompanied by individual perceptions of the purpose of the meeting itself. However, these subjective understandings of the meetings are made with reference to a tangible reality outside the meetings to which the participants are referring. In this way *have your say* allows us to examine how causal connections are communicated between public and partners and how those communications are interpreted. Furthermore, by utilising critical realism I am able to utilise some of the data that emerges to pursue speculative hypothesis as to the overall functioning of the regime (Stone: 1989) that Plymouth may be said to be operating based on

reasonable deductions arising from by comparison or the localities, with trends which impact them all, or have differential impacts being observed.

For the analysis I have utilised grounded theory, the strength of which lies in the ability to use data to provide inductive reasoning about the social world from empirical findings found in the data (Gilbert : 2008). According to Oliver (2011) the usefulness of grounded theory as an appropriate method for applied critical realism is due to its ability to tie research more firmly to practice. This is appropriate as the aim of the research is to understand how differing partners across localities, create meaning behind the subjective concept of ‘doing’ community safety, and what ‘locality working constitutes. The value is that respondents can explain the forces involved that serve to contribute to structure the practical outcomes of ‘doing safety’ within the specific contexts in which they work (Hughes and Edwards: 2005). This approach allows for preliminary attempts at analysis whilst fieldwork is undertaken, allowing for the research process to be exploratory without an overarching, prescriptive methodological framework. This enables for the research process to be more flexible with the potential that the research may adapt as fresh data presents itself, without having to return to a ‘pre-conceived theoretical framework’ (Glaser and Strauss: 1967: 45, Cited in Gilbert: 2008: 85). With regard to my research, the original theoretical approaches outlined in the literature were used to facilitate the purposes of research by identifying core themes which could then be examined. These themes included the tensions between New Public Management Discourses (NPM) and attempts towards localism and neighbourhood level governance within both the police and local government. This was combined with an examination of recent attempts towards increasing public engagement with public services such as citizen’s juries, as well as the problems that relate to this. Finally, these issues were contextualised within debates concerning the impact of context within the City.

The use of grounded theory for understanding the mechanics behind differential community safety regimes is pertinent because it allows for a greater understanding that the accomplishment of safety is a dynamic, ongoing process. Binder and Edwards (2010:233) discuss Hayes (2000), who calls for “less hypothesis and more systematic observation to help managers deal with their actual problems”. This approach was applied to the study of operations management within the automotive industry in Germany to ascertain how car manufacturers Operations Management (OM) could manage inter-firm relationships. The advantage of this approach lay in the ability to provide rich data from ‘practitioner speak’ (Binder and Edwards: 2010) and from understanding the connectivity between actors and their environment. Kempster and Parry (2011) applied Grounded Theory Methodology to the concept of critical realism in the study of leadership. This was due to the necessity of studying the social and procedural concept of leadership, by examining the ‘processes’ within particular or distinct contexts. Furthermore, it is pointed out that with regard to the ‘social process’ of formulating leadership the use of critical realism allows the researcher to concentrate on achieving a ‘tolerance with reality’ by allowing a greater flexibility in data interpretation. The example they use is that ‘leadership’ is not simply a process but also an activity which is learned and that respondents in the process of learning may not be conscious of this.

Applied to the specifics of my research, grounded theory allows me to understand how partners engaged in the formation of safety recognise the context in which they operate. Whilst I entered the field with broad themes to explore, and a desire to examine how economic development impacted upon community safety, there was no overarching hypothesis or premise to test. The underlying rationale was simply that spatial differences would likely produce area-specific forms of crime prevention and community safety. In this context the use of empirical data was to ascertain what the ‘intrinsic’ parts of the locality-

specific context may be, and how these interact to produce particular discourses on crime prevention. A further strength of this approach was that there was no 'artificial' distinction made as to when research ends and analysis begins. The utility of this approach is that it allows the researcher a greater degree of flexibility, and the ability to adapt research practices and data collection to suit the requirements of data collection and, reflect trends found in the data.

In the context of my research, the causal connection is twofold; firstly, that spatial differences and structural inequalities will yield differing results in the construction of community safety problems, and the dynamics they engender. Secondly, these specifics will in turn yield divergent 'settlements' of safety (Hughes and Edwards:2005) with the potential that a partner's underlying perceptions of locality contexts, may in turn foster 'governmentalities' of crime and safety (Gilling:2010b) with the potential to normalise pre-determined 'solution-sets' (Jones: 1998) of policing and partner actions in the field of crime prevention strategies.

This approach is reminiscent of the importance of hermeneutics in the understanding of how structure and agency impact on public professionals engaged in producing community safety.

This study is specifically concerned in the examination of the factors which contribute to establishing 'locality working' as a context. From this, it becomes useful to understand how the various actions and understanding of partners contributes to understanding what that context is, or means. From this we understand that within the 'objective' reality of facts helping to construct specific locality contexts, there resides the 'use' of these facts in the construction of particular forms of 'common-sense' thinking (Bryman:2012). It is this 'common-sense' approach to the specifics of 'doing community safety by locality working' which allows for critical realist approaches to understand the impact of structure and agency in determining role and preference (Gilbert: 2008). Moreover, such an approach allows us to understand the role of 'objective facts' as they impact on partners preferences and

expectations. Such an approach is sympathetic with those undertaken by Clarke et al (2007), investigation into the rise of ‘active sceptical citizen-consumers’ where respondents were actively engaged in utilising approaches from a number of sources in determining meaning.

This approach serves to further enable the use of grounded theory as a method for the exploration of data, by allowing for the respondent’s reflexive analysis of their involvement within the creation of community safety by locality working. Moreover, the application of a critical realist interpretive stance allows for the researcher to examine the implications of such ‘common-sense’ assumptions about the social reality behind safety and locality working. It is for this reason that I ask respondents to discuss both the specific locality context to which they belong, their role, and more broadly their perceptions as to the rationale behind the forum of *have your say*. This data may then inform my understanding of the variety of competing rationales behind ‘common sense’ as it appears to partners and furthermore, by understanding what may be bracketed as part of the ‘day-job’ to help create an understanding as to what ‘doing community safety’ is perceived to entail. Finally, by examining the issue of what potential value public forums such as *have your say*, have for partners, we may understand how the contested nature of ‘the public sphere’ (Newman: 2005), with its problematic delineation between public and private, can in turn become contested by elements of New Public Management discourses (Newman:2011). This allows us to examine both the limitations on public engagement as well as understanding the methods by which participation may be ‘steered’ towards agency goals (Gilling: 2007).

From this, a grounded theory approach in association with critical realist practices is useful for the interpretation of ethnographic and qualitative data. The utility of such an approach is that formal and prescriptive adherence to hypothesis, is rejected in favour of an approach that is exploratory, and allows the researcher to adapt to the reality of the research contexts as they make themselves known. Such an approach allows for an understanding of the ‘actors’

and the environment, by understanding the processes and procedures that are familiar to those engaged in substantive acts that help create or reinforce meaning (Binder and Edwards:2010). Furthermore, in adopting a critical realist standpoint, I accept that the creation of meaning behind ‘doing community safety’, whilst possessing particular structural barometers in terms of crime rates, is effectively a social process (Kempster and Parry: 2011), where respondents involved in locality working, or community safety may not be aware of the influence of other paradigms competing to influence working practices or discursive frameworks.

4.3 Ethnographic Approaches and Reflections

The utility of ethnography in longitudinal analysis is the provision of analysis of ‘substantive’ acts, situated within the life-world from which such data derives its meaning and significance. Moreover, such an approach lends itself to a longitudinal analysis whereby the special organisation of processes and acts can be interpreted within broader sociological and societal narratives (Giddens: 1991). The main focus of my research is to examine how the locality specific context contributes to particular community safety contexts (Hughes and Edwards: 2005). In utilising ethnographic approaches, we can both appreciate the ‘lived identity’ and history of place (Hughes: 2007) attached to specific localities and communities whilst simultaneously being able to understand the interconnectedness between the local within the global (Castells: 1996). This is useful for my research with its concentration on development, with the concept of differing localities being more integrated within networks of capital and the significance that this may entail for the construction of the cultural site investigated.

In taking account of the constituent pieces of the system there is one aspect that I as researcher need to reflect upon, namely myself. The rationale for this is, as an attendee of *have your say* I am arguably functionally part of the system which I am in the process of researching (Silverman: 2010). Furthermore, my research of these areas corresponded with my own move into the inner City of Plymouth and during the course of the fieldwork I have lived in three of the four areas that I investigated. Ultimately therefore, it is difficult to isolate myself from my research as the result is both an academic and personal discovery of Plymouth's urban context. This means that the socially constructed places of Ernest Lea, of Youngtown and of Fort Matthews are, to an extent, elements of my own co-production via my representation of them whilst ostensibly attempting to discern what it is to reside in them and to be present in their discourses of community safety. Denzin (1997) discusses how the achievement of critical distance must include aspects of a stand-point reflexivity whereby the researcher claims subjective involvement whilst maintaining objective sense of purpose and process. When applied to my research this requires that I acknowledge and make myself visible so that the reader may account for what I may recount. In doing so, I allow the reader to form their own conclusions as to the relationship between myself as observer, as participant and the distinction between talking about systems and constructing them (Leydesdorff: 2010). This difficulty in attempting to impartially discern and relay what is being done, and speculative arguments as to the causal connections between the events relayed and their place within the overall functioning of community safety dynamics is expressed by Clegg, Courpassoun and Phillips (2006) below:

“From a researcher's point of view, the recognition of the constructive role of language problematizes the very nature of research as the objectivity, neutrality and independence of the researcher are called into question, as the nature of what passes for truth and knowledge is scrutinized, and as the question of how things

work is replaced by questions about what things *mean* (Winch 1958). Today, the social sciences are no longer only about counting, a relatively recent and historically aberrant view of their project in which defining and measuring variables and the relationships between them were seen as paramount; they also concern what, historically, they were always concerned with, namely interpreting what social relationships signify, to which a long history of qualitative research bears witness. With the linguistic turn, however, the demands of interpretive research are multiplied. As researchers we are no longer simply interested in what the social world means to the subjects who populate it; we are interested in how and why the social world comes to have the meanings that it does.” (Clegg, Courpassoun and Phillips: 2006: 294).

What this reminds us of is the difficulty of ascribing significance to particular events or comments, especially when engaged in a piece of research which aims to examine the relationships between contexts, action and how these are communicated.

In this regard, I wish to discuss the impact of such distinctions on the research process involved in attempting to analyse systems of communicative action (Leydesdorff: 2010). For me, the arguments put forward are broadly conducive to discussing the systems of community engagement and technocratic responses at *have your say* meetings. Firstly, I must be clear about my distinction between those individuals involved at *have your say*, for the purposes of my research the term ‘partner’ is applied to those individuals present which represent statutory agencies or significant social or institutions which are active within the area. This typology is not problem-free; such a definition encompasses both representatives from the council such as Neighbourhood Liaison Officers (NLO), the police which would often be represented by PCSOs, yet it also encompasses Social Housing providers and in the case of Youngtown, potentially the University. In the case of the University, the institution may not necessarily constitute a formal provider and therefore it is arguably more an

‘interested party’, yet the scope of its resources and involvement within the area makes it qualitatively different from other ‘interested parties’ such as individual residents and smaller local businesses. Furthermore, one particular Social Housing ‘partner’ for the Ernest Lea locality, also attended the Fort Matthews *have your say* as a resident, providing an interesting contrast of how the forum looked from differing positions at different meetings. One of their insights was the relatively ‘formal’ nature of Fort Matthews *have your say*, perceived to be driven by a small number of special-interest residents, which contrasted with Ernest Lea’s relatively informal, style. Another suggestion made was that Ernest Lea’s meetings tended to be more procedural, with resident’s queries raised at *have your say* answered at the following meeting, whereas Fort Matthews attendees tended to be in email contact with partners and therefore could keep in touch with progress on priorities.

Furthermore, I must also examine my own involvement within the meetings and any potential changes of status, or what impact the process of conducting research may have had. At the beginning of the first meetings I attended, all those at *have your say* introduced themselves. Partners generally used their name and their organisation, although councillors would often state the ward they represented, rather than the locality to which the *have your say* meeting belonged. Residents would introduce themselves by giving their name and often the place where they lived e.g. ‘Mary from Wildhouse Street’. By contrast I would always introduce myself and state that I was conducting research into the meetings. The reaction to this initially varied with some councillors being interested whilst others were somewhat less so. One councillor in particular, stated after I had introduced myself ‘oh are you indeed’. The reactions amongst residents were more often relatively ambivalent, although in one meeting I had to repeat myself and my stated presence at the meeting due to one of the residents being hearing impaired. Over time my relationship with some participants changed, I was able to discuss my research to a greater extent with some Council workers and councillors; however

I did become aware of some issues which related to this. For example, from one council worker the suggestion was that I should provide feed-back at some point, although what sort of feedback and on what particular element associated with *have your say*, was not stated. In tandem with this, I became aware that the Council was trialling different forms of community engagement exercises in other parts of the City, potentially as a replacement of *have your say*. I did consider attending some of these sites but due to this occurring late within the research process this was discounted as I would effectively have had to analyse another form of community engagement exercise within various locations, as well as that which I had examined so far.

The three year time period during which I conducted the research is of some importance in that a number of changes occurred which had an impact both at a national and local level. Of particular importance is the impact of resource reductions associated with austerity. When I first entered the field, the impact of reductions to both police and local authority budgets was beginning to become felt and in some interviews the issue was addressed directly. In addition to this there was the formal establishment of Police and Crime Commissioners with their election in 2012. Whilst I did raise this issue with some of the respondents it was not necessarily felt that the impact of the emergence of Police and Crime Commissioners was going to particularly alter working practices in the short term. Potentially this was a reflection of individual's emphasis on locality working to the exclusion of developments elsewhere. Alternatively this may be due to the relatively recent introduction of the post which meant that those not directly involved in addressing the changes were not necessarily sure of what the outcome would be or if it would affect locality working. Against this there is a backdrop of events which whilst not necessarily having a direct impact on Plymouth, nonetheless impacted in shaping the context in which the research was produced. The riots of 2011 which affected much of the country, whilst not reproduced in Plymouth (I am tempted to suggest

that Plymouth's relative isolation from the rest of the country may have had an impact here). Of more direct consequence was the emergence of the occupy movement which was active for a time in Plymouth, firstly taking over an abandoned job centre and later moving to a camp established in the City Centre opposite the shopping Mall. Alongside this, the three year period covered by the research included other national events which had some impact on the city of Plymouth; the 2012 Olympic Games witnessed the torch passing through the city as it made its way round the country and in the same year there were celebrations for the Queen's diamond Jubilee.

What this serves to do is to place the overall research process itself within the context of events. The 2008 Financial crisis had severely hurt the U.K. economy and played a significant role in the election of a Conservative-led Coalition government in 2010. This government aimed to reduce the budget deficit by reducing state expenditures and two of the most affected areas were local government and the police, previously the two lead partners for community safety.

4.4 Ethics and Obtaining Data

My research was funded as a studentship from Plymouth University. The original intention behind the studentship was to broadly to examine 'doing community safety by locality working'. Whilst I was aware that there was a level of buy-in from the local authority it was not necessarily apparent what their intention was that the research should produce. The piece of research I have produced effectively reflects both the impact of considering a social science as a piece of empirical enquiry as well as my interpretation of the brief of examining what 'doing community safety' constituted at the level at which it was observed.

For the purposes of the research I anonymised both the data from the participants, the focus group as well as the names of the localities researched and place names within them. In the data respondents are identified by their job title and the name of the locality which they work for or represent.

There were a number of ways I could have interpreted this task which I will examine a little here. It may have been possible to have created a set of questionnaires and distributed them at the have your say meetings to the public, possibly providing a separate set of questionnaires to the partners.

However, I decided against this approach partially because I felt that the data provided would be less substantial and that the research would in essence be rendered down to a tick-box exercise which would fail to encapsulate the complexity of issues such as community, politics and the nature of locality working. Further to this, as I became immersed in the fieldwork it became increasingly obvious that in some respects, *have your say* was established as a form of community engagement which took place to meet requirements arising from central government for community engagement. Under these circumstances, I felt that in order to understand what community safety meant at a local level, a qualitative approach was appropriate as then those individuals who were tasked with giving form to the policy could speak about what they believed were the pertinent issues leading to the contextual factors which influenced what locality working was and how it was done. Alternatively, I could have shadowed individuals involved in community safety in Plymouth and volunteered to be a Neighbourhood Liaison Officer for a particular area. This would undoubtedly have provided rich data on what the day job of community safety entailed and over time I would have become very familiar with one particular locality as well as in the department in which I worked. However, such an approach would have been difficult to achieve – obtaining a council job and surreptitiously working on a research project. Furthermore, such an approach whilst telling me much about the organizational dynamics of community safety at Plymouth City Council would potentially have overlooked the contextual factors that impacted on creating community safety dynamics.

The research process involved attending have your say meetings in the three areas identified from October 2011 till Oct 2014, a period of roughly three years. Have your say meetings are deemed relatively informal with those attending able to ask questions and at the end of the meeting three

priorities for the area would be agreed. In one area, Fort Matthews, the Neighbourhood warden would have distributed have your say cards prior to the meeting and the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) would sum up what the majority of the concerns on the cards were which were then also put to the meeting for consideration. In this way residents who were not present could have some input into the outcomes of the meetings however, ultimately the priorities for the area were those that were agreed at the meeting.

Meetings often began by the Chair reading back the priorities agreed at the previous meeting and what progress had been made towards them, after which there may be reports by individual agencies. For example, it was common for some of the representatives of the police; usually PCSOs who were present to deliver a 'crime report' at the beginning of the meetings when crime and anti-social behaviour issues affecting the area were discussed. At some meetings representatives from other agencies would produce reports on issues that related to their work which were relevant to the immediate area, this was notable particularly in Ernest Lea where representatives from youth services and South West Water would often attend and discuss the issues with regard to youth outreach work and sewage treatment in the area. Thereafter, the public would ask questions of the specific partners in attendance, and the meeting would ultimately revolve towards setting the three priorities for the next meeting. This is a broad categorisation of how *have your say* meetings worked and in reality, partners were often challenged at different stages of the meetings, alternatively some meetings had a greater discussion at the beginning, particularly if the previous priorities were in dispute or had not been viewed as obtained. Often after reports from the partner agencies members of the public would query issues or ask about specific developments which related particularly to the area. Sometimes the responses to agencies were positive, acknowledging the improvements that had been made, sometimes the public would dispute what had been put to them by the representatives in attendance and occasionally (though not frequently) some members of the public may offer to assist – particularly if they themselves worked for a local charity or were otherwise engaged in organising community events.

I kept a note of the discussions at the meetings by writing ethnographic notes during *have your say*. I had previously worked as an administrator in a health care setting and from this had learned shorthand. I used this approach to attempt to record as much of the data from the meeting as possible. This was not always easy as at times there were multiple individuals speaking at once, and sometimes members of the public would speak to one another quietly when one of the partners was attempting to address the group as a whole. I also attempted to include elements in my note-taking which reflected the mood of the meeting and individual participants, for example, if an individual was demonstrably annoyed or angry I included a brief note reflecting that this was the manner in which the statement was being made. This also applied if a joke was made at the meeting to which people laughed; the underlying rationale was to attempt to reproduce a realistic account of how the meeting had transpired including not just what was said but the manner in which they were said and to try to convey the overall tone of the meetings themselves.

In tandem with this, I was able to live in the three areas covered by the research for periods of time ranging from six-eight months. The reason for choosing to do so was that by immersing myself more deeply within the localities studied I felt I would be able to produce a richer form of narrative concerning the causal relationships between the residents, their area and those tasked with giving locality working form and substance. In the section discussing my reflections on doing the research I reflect a little more on the issues surrounding this.

In addition to the field notes gathered from the *have your say* meetings I interviewed a total of twenty-four respondents, for reasons of brevity, not all of these were included in the research. The respondents were selected based on their regular attendance of the meetings as well as any duties to the local area which were perceived to be relevant. Respondents included local councillors, PCSOs, a Neighbourhood warden, representatives from social housing who were present at meetings in Ernest Lea and Fort Matthews.

The reason for gathering these interviews was so that I could discuss with respondents their experiences of locality working and their views of the *have your say* meetings. The interviews took

place late in the second year of the research, and into parts of the third year. The reason for this was that I wanted to have as much time as possible to pursue the longitudinal aspects of the research, to see what further developments occurred nationally and in the localities and what impacts these had. Furthermore, in doing this I could identify who key participants were for the relevant areas based upon their attendance at the meetings.

In addition to this I conducted one focus group in Youngtown which had six attendees. Whilst all were currently residing in the area, five were longer term residents who had lived in the area for greater than ten years and many had lived in Plymouth considerably longer. The one who was resident for only a few years had been a student at the University and was currently a sabbatical officer who was the youngest participant. The group included two women, one of whom was accompanied by her husband who was another participant. The rationale for this focus group was that the locality had just split from the neighbouring one and I wished to examine if this had impacted on the way in which they viewed their community – as attached to Brittlebridge or distinct and separate from it.

4.5 Sampling

The decision on which localities to select for analysis was based on their geographical location, with all three localities being near to each other and close to the City Centre. This was a reflection of the influence of ‘Theories of Urban Politics’ (Judge, Stoker and Wolman eds: 1998) on the preference for inner-city, urban sites of data collection. The aim in doing this was to examine the impact that marginal geographical differences and ‘artificial’ locality boundaries may have on the creation of crime and disorder discourses and their resulting forms of safety (Hughes and Edwards:2005). Furthermore, the intention was to examine the extent to which differing ‘models’ of urban development would influence the construction and direction of the ‘majorities’ made (Stoker: 1998) amongst publics, in favour of particular

forms of action, or otherwise foster perceptions about particular forms of crime and disorder. The three localities I concentrated on were Youngtown, with its growth led by the University and its development agenda, Fort Matthews, with its growth led by private developers and Ernest Lea, which had recently had some redevelopment accomplished by Social Housing and Plymouth City Council.

Whilst I accept that each locality will 'do' community safety differently depending upon its individual particularisms, the case study selection is based on identifying particular forms of 'community' and the impact that differing methods of development has had on it. However, in selecting localities from the inner City, the impact has been that my research is disproportionately focussed on areas which are not affluent, or have crime and disorder rates which are higher than the City average. For example, twenty-three percent of the City's overall recorded anti-social behaviour incidents for 2011/12 (3358) can be attributed to three specific localities; Youngtown, Fort Matthews and the City Centre (PCC: 2012). Burglary in the City has traditionally been centred upon the Youngtown locality "driven by a combination of high volume multi-occupancy residences and students" (PCC:2012:27). Other affected areas include the nearby localities of Brittlebridge, Churchwood and Ernest Lea. Cumulatively, these four areas are responsible for twenty-five percent of domestic burglaries in the City. Such an emphasis on the City inevitably impacts on the types of problems arising and the overall levels of crime present.

4.6 Coding and arranging Data

Field notes taken from the *have your say* meetings were collated over the three year time period covered and were arranged chronologically in their individual area case studies. These

were then examined with emergent trends in the data being identified and these typologies were then pursued thematically throughout the analysis of the meeting notes for that area. The categories emerging from the research broadly related to the individuals/focus group's perspective of the neighbourhood, including its pertinent features – architectural, the sort of people who lived in the area, as well as its history. Another category which arose from the data was issues which were primarily criminogenic in nature – references to crime and anti-social behaviour. This was partially a reflection of the nature of the research project, to examine locality working and the co-governance of crime at a local level. This category was broad, including a range of behaviours which varied in their severity. A final category concerned the meetings themselves and other forms of public consultation and what purpose these served. These categories were used in the creation of my semi-structured interviews with the intention being that the data would furnish questions that I could use as a basis for examining in greater depth the contextual factors involved in. Below I have put a sample of some of the questions that I put to the interview participants.

Research questions

How do individuals describe the area/locality which they are responsible for as part of locality working (what are its important characteristics e.g. wealth, population, physical architecture of the area etc.)

What is the respondent's job and what does it entail?

In what capacity do they attend HYS meetings (are they a Neighbourhood liaison officer or do they attend the meetings in another capacity?)

What sort of priorities do they think commonly arise at the meetings and why?

Who do they think comes to the meetings? (Are the attendees of the meetings representative of the area/is anybody not there who should be?)

Do they think that the priorities agreed at the meetings are representative of that area? (What might be considered alternative or ‘real’ priorities for the area and why?)

Does the respondent attend any other *have your say* meetings and if so, in what capacity?

Thinking about the locality in question, what does the respondent feel may be the biggest problems/challenges in the upcoming years and why?

The intent behind these questions was to encourage respondents to reflect on what they viewed as the most important elements of locality working, in terms of the context of the locality, what their role was, and what relevance *have your say* had with regard to community safety discourses and contextual crime dynamics within the locality. Such questions encourage the respondent to reflect both on their individual judgements, their perception of the relevant issues for that locality as well as their organisational prejudices.

In utilising the data I decided that in order to produce a richer narrative I would incorporate the ethnographic notes alongside the interviews and the focus group for Youngtown. This was done so that references to the locality and its specific issues could be placed alongside each other wherever possible to view the relationship between the individual discussions and the *have your say* dynamics. Further to this at the beginning of each of the sections of my analysis chapters I provide a brief overview of each locality’s relevant data taken in part from Plymouth City Council’s strategic needs assessment of 2011 and supported by my own ethnographic notes taken from when I lived in them.

4.7 Summary

This chapter has outlined the utility of critical realism as a means for understanding what locality working is and how it is done. The onus here is for the researcher to seek to interpret causal relationships and to try to understand those connections which are either directly made

or are alluded to by the research data. This chapter has then established grounded theory as the method by which the data was analysed so that the categories arising were felt to have arisen organically from examination of the data and immersion in the field. I have also sought to provide a brief overview of some of the contemporaneous developments of the period of 2011-2014 and the ways in which they have impacted on broader contextual backdrop of the research. This chapter has discussed my position as a researcher with longitudinal position in the field having a primary focus on the contextual factors, with *have your say* representing one of a number of 'windows' through which we may examine the social world in which community safety is constructed. At the same time this chapter concurrently also includes my rationale for selecting the case studies where I have, influenced by the work of Urban Theorists such as Stoker, Judge and Jones (1998). This approach has allowed me to concentrate on the ecological concerns of urban geography (Herbert: 1982) and its influence on the formation of differing sets of crime and disorder problems within the context of micro-climates of locality working (Hughes and Edward: 2005). The next three chapters concentrate on the dissemination of my findings.

5 Chapter Five: Youngtown

5.1 Introduction

Youngtown, with a population of 13, 513 was identified by Plymouth City Council's strategic needs assessment of 2011 as being the City's twenty-first most deprived locality of the City's thirty nine. However, this effectively serves to make the locality the City's eighteenth least deprived, a fact reflected in the lower percentages claiming benefits (8.7) and jobseekers allowance (2.5). The rate of crime per ten thousand head of population is 128.7 and the rate for anti-social behaviour 44.6. The rate for children being classified as 'in need' per ten thousand of population was 1094.5 with the percentage of students getting five A*-C grades at GCSE, including English and Maths, being 47.8 percent. The life expectancy for Youngtown was 78.1 years with a rate of emergency admissions to hospital being 843.9 per ten thousand head of population. Youngtown's all age all-cause mortality rate was 70.2 per ten thousand head of population and the rate of people in receipt of care packages aged eighteen or over per ten thousand head of population was 175.4. The rate of dementia and the rate of people diagnosed with a learning disability aged eighteen to sixty-four was 45.4 and 30.6 per ten thousand head of population. Of the privately rented accommodation in Youngtown, 42 percent was classified as 'non decent homes' with 19.2 percent classified as 'not in a reasonable state of repair'.

However, alongside these descriptive statistics is a narrative of the locality as ethnographic site and its impact on discourses on crime and disorder. The locality known as Youngtown is a compound of two areas which were previously linked as one for the purposes of locality working, namely Brittlebridge and Youngtown. This was the case for the descriptive data gathered by the council above and so for the purposes of this analysis, the distinction between

them has been removed and both areas are referred to as Youngtown. The locality itself is situated in the centre of Plymouth, close to the City Centre and plays host to the University's main campus. Additionally there are elements of the Night Time Economy (NTE) which have long existed along Brittlebridge's Plain or clustered in the area, linking with the City's own NTE and potential crime that may stem from it. As seen in the descriptive statistics, the area is increasingly affected by an increase in the proportion of rented accommodation, particularly Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) in the locality, some of which are of poor quality. The presence of the University leads to an influx of students into the area creating attendant problems with regard to perceptions of anti-social behaviour and the students own risks from crime. Additionally, there has been the arrival of a Polish and Eastern European migrant community in the area following the expansion of the E.U. and the businesses they have established in the area. In some parts of the locality there are a number of Retirement Communities which may be inferred from the data concerning the relatively high rate of dementia in the locality. As an inner City locality much of Youngtown is characterised by the age of some of its housing stock and in some places, narrow back lanes which connect some of the terraced houses. The narrow lanes running along the rear of properties serve to create the potential for crime, and particularly burglary of the properties adjoining the lanes, via forced entry at the rear of the properties also providing an escape route for those committing such offences. Additionally, such places simultaneously constitute 'short-cuts' for those making their way home from the NTE but may also create risks of violent attacks or sexual assaults.

This summary of the potential issues in Youngtown serves as preliminary guide as we examine the ways by which community safety is 'done' in the area. Following is a look at how the *have your say* meetings have attempted to address these issues via joint problem solving between the agencies and the community plus issues that arise from this. Such issues

may include concerns as to representation – who attends the meetings and which communities are not present. Issues may include community differences and grievances and how these are resolved and managed. For example, is the University itself made responsible for the behaviour of the students, and in what ways does it interact with other agencies and publics for the purposes of community safety? Undoubtedly there exists the bigger question of how the other agencies attending meetings engage with the public and indeed, with each other, and is that relationship harmonious? From this we can understand a little of what it means to be actively or passively engaged in the formation of community safety for Youngtown and how this comes to influence what partners feel can/needs to be done. Analysis of the data has identified three distinct yet interrelated issues linked to the NTE, namely Anti-social behaviour, waste and a proliferation of HMOs. Simplified in terms of problematic perception by partners and residents these issues comprise the three b's of booze, bins and bad planning, with the examination that follows revealing how they are addressed or managed.

5.2 Booze: Glass shatters, Crime 'spikes'

Youngtown PCSO: "...how do you police a culture?"

Youngtown's most notable thoroughfare is known as the Plain which hosts many pubs and bars. It is perhaps not surprising that one of the chief factors involved in 'doing community safety' in Youngtown involves managing aspects that relate to the Night Time Economy. The issue of drinking and its associated problems often interrelates with other problems, notably those of waste and planning. These issues are conjoined with the presence of the students

living in the area and the division between the established communities of home owners and the new transient population. Additionally, when discussing the issue of drinking culture and the Night Time Economy we need to avoid artificial distinctions as to where that Night Time Economy may begin or end. This relates to the nature of the area with its narrow streets and relatively high population density, it also touches on planning, with the perception that Youngtown is 'saturated' with converted Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) and student accommodation. This creates the issue of anti-social noise either from revellers coming back at the end of the night or from parties and the increasing use of 'pre-loading' as people choose to drink at home before heading out. Additionally, there is the direct impact of crime from the Night Time Economy including drunken brawls or, as occurred during the period of research, a number of sexual assaults. Whilst these are undeniably the more serious issues, what is interesting about them is that they create dilemmas for public service professionals as the students who are often accused of anti-social behaviour are themselves disproportionately at risk from these criminal acts. This makes the business of reassuring the various publics in Youngtown about crime, more difficult, as the need to reassure publics about crime coincides with the need to raise awareness of potential risks. Moreover, as the City itself moves away from older, established industries such as the dockyard, it was noted that the NTE of the City was potentially re-orientating itself to accommodate this, with the closure of some older clubs in Fort Matthews, whilst Youngtown's proliferation of night-time venues seemingly continued apace. This section shall examine the implications of some of the changes affecting community safety and crime prevention discourses within Youngtown by concentrating on the anti-social and crime-related aspects of the NTE in the area. Ultimately such considerations are inseparable from the 'rise' of Plymouth University as a 'growth machine' (Judge: 1998), with its contributions to problems and solutions and more broadly, the 'shadow' that its presence within or outside meetings, casts over public discourses. Therefore

we shall begin with an examination of how the University, the NTE and its regulation are discussed at *have your say*:

Field note

UNI Manager: We run campaigns at the University for the students. The issue is that when people are drunk they get louder and in this area in particular, noise carries.

PCSO: Recently we have been concentrating our activities on the nights of action by the Sherwell arcade by the Fresher and Professor Pub, Bang Bang, Ride and Cuba. The focus here is mainly on violent crime and ASB. There are daily updates on issues in this area and issues which receive primary tasking. We have had a CCTV camera van in the area recently, and we have had CCTV put in Portland Square on the University Campus so it has a direct view of the Arcade. We have had a few issues with people doing a lot of their drinking on Union Street and then come up to North Hill for the late licence areas. I know that people from the forces are advised not to drink in this area because it's a designated student area. In addition to this we are looking at people who are too drunk to be served coming out of the Students Union and causing trouble in the other bars on North Hill. So it's about trying to reduce the volume of people and if we can try to reduce the number of people or stagger them a bit more then we can reduce the noise, the number of complaints should go down as well as vehicle crime, vandalism, waste and of course ASB.

Resident: If they are planning on being noisy the students use the back alleys. And student accommodation is always very noisy.

Above we can see the student focus in terms of the NTE in the locality. This is partially because of the involvement of the University Manager in discussing the issue. Additionally, the PCSO's list of the direct criminogenic problems for the area focuses on the main bars that serve the University or are particularly close to it. The issue of noise from the NTE shows a slight divergence between how policy practitioners conceive the issue of the NTE and the public's own preferences. The focus for the police and PCSOs is on ASB and violent crime

in the area whereas the public's attention is more focussed on the anti-social behaviour matter of noise from the NTE and those who use it. This relates back to the nature of the area and how it encourages or enables certain forms of behaviour, for example, when the University Manager mentions how in the area 'noise carries'. The point of this is to reiterate the ability of architecture to develop or reduce certain forms of criminal or anti-social behaviour (Newman: 1972). This is supported by the resident talking about how the back alleys are used by students who 'want' to be noisy. This issue of noise and the NTE is one part of the story of Youngtown's relationship with its bars and clubs both in terms of people on their way to and from the NTE making noise and the nature of the area with high population density and narrow back lanes, trapping that noise. Moreover, there is the issue of the nature and plan of some of the bars and late-night cafés themselves. Many are open air and in the summer host live music events, this in addition to the smoking ban leaves people standing outside bars and restaurants smoking, creating further issues revolving around the NTE.

Field note

Resident: I just want to mention about the live music coming from the Ride Café. It goes on beyond midnight. The noise is so loud the police must be able to hear it at Charles Cross. It always used to be the voodoo lounge. Then it was the Uni. It might not be Ride. It could be the one next to it where the gazebo has fallen down (a recent storm hit the city, the impact on one bar on North Hill was that the gazebos it had outside were knocked down and the bar had to close as a consequence. When the bar later re-opened it was a different venue). If I hear it again I shall email you all.

The extract above helps to further our understanding of the problematic issue of anti-social noise and the Night Time Economy within Youngtown. Whilst the main issue for the resident appears to be noise, they simultaneously highlight the difficulty of pin-pointing its origin in an area saturated with bars, HMOs, and other possible contributors to anti-social noise.

Moreover, the issue of noise and the night-time economy lends itself to a discussion about the

division in the area between the established communities and the transient communities of students and others. In this context the “symptoms” in the form of anti-social behaviour are arguably of less importance than the ‘established’ community’s feelings of alienation and uncertainty about their locality and the speed with which it is changing. This ontological insecurity (Garland: 2001) has the possibility to turn the creation of community safety in Youngtown into a divisive enterprise (Hughes: 2007) whereby the finite availability of resources for crime reduction and community safety, could turn the processes of consultation over priorities into a divisive form of locality politics.

Focus Group

RSM: “They come back, they’re out of mum and dads grasp so they get drunk and then they throw up all over the pavements and then they smash bottles and that’s worse between middle of September and middle of October”.

JD: “Freshers fortnight is a nightmare”.

RSM: “... I think the Uni ought to cut back on that”.

CG (Student representative): “It’s part of the student experience. There’s no encouragement for students to drink. There isn’t”.

JD: “They do encourage it to some extent I mean, having been here twice as a student I, I remember being taken on tour buses, there was a little choo-choo train that went all the way from Brittlebridge into town and we were encouraged through our social groups organised through the Students Union to take, to partake in these drinking, really pentathlons in a way. You know, you know and your pub golf and so on”.

This perception that the University, or certainly the Students Union encourages or maintains a drinking culture which affects the lives of more established residents is debateable.

Undeniably some students do drink but the danger of such a broad statement is that arguably

serious problems concerning violence and its place within Plymouth's Night Time Economy are overlooked. Indeed, whilst the resident attendees of *have your say* tended to concentrate their claims to the locality on the anti-social behaviour aspects of drinking culture and the University's culpability there was a degree whereby some acknowledged the dichotomy between the anti-social and the criminal.

Focus Group

JD: "Even though the students are very noisy and they do things like tend to vomit in your front garden and urinate everywhere, they are not the aggressive ones, they are not, there is no fear from students... The thing that scares me is the women with the two inch skirt and the two inch heels with a bottle of vodka in her hand down the back lane, that's the one that scares me... Students tend to keep themselves to themselves... It tends to be the local population and it's not just local to Brittlebridge its anyone who comes to Brittlebridge and thinks it's great to drink there that actually starts picking fights."

In the above extract, one of the residents articulates the difference between anti-social student related issues and the criminogenic in the context of the Night Time Economy. This extract is significant as it constitutes an acceptance of the violent potential of the established Plymouth population. This theme of the violence in Plymouth and its Night Time Economy is further developed if we look at some of the more serious criminogenic issues that have been raised at the meetings:

Field note

Resident: What about people going up North Hill and punching people at 5:30am. The guy involved had to take sanctuary in SPAR.

Uni worker: There is going to be a designated place of safety put on North Hill from July-Oct which will be manned by St John Ambulance and the police. The Crime and Disorder Partnership has commissioned a single decker bus to help provide coverage during the hot times of 9pm to 6am. We

haven't been able to place this because at the moment we don't have a volunteer to drive it who has a HGV (heavy goods vehicle) licence. The street pastors are already a partner involved in the project. We are still in discussions about where to place the bus, we were thinking by the Museum on North Hill might be the best place. What the designated place of safety will do is provide a safe place for people to if they are too drunk or have been assaulted so that they can be checked out and if necessary sent on to Derriford (the local hospital) or home.

As the fieldwork progressed, the severity of some of the violent incidents occurring within Youngtown grew with sexual assaults and even a stabbing occurring. It is important to consider that these more serious events may not be directly attributable to the NTE; the stabbing particularly being viewed as gang related. Interestingly, the issue of the sexual assaults in Youngtown was raised by the student president at the meeting and not by other members of the community. This is possibly a reflection of the potential victimisation of students and other young people who use the space differently and are consequentially at greater risk, therefore requiring the president to act on behalf of her constituents. Further to this, one of the bars of Youngtown, in their attempts to draw in custom will give out free drinks to women who dance on their poles, which creates the potential that later when drunk, those women are at proportionally greater risk from the NTE's 'gendered space'(Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular:2008). Nonetheless, such occurrences close to the NTE in Youngtown do serve to heighten public feelings of insecurity with regard to crime and violence in the locality:

Focus Group

RSM: "It's not always students in the bars but it's not very nice walking along Brittlebridge Plain of an evening as a women on her own, I don't enjoy it...everybody stands outside the bars smoking and it's not very nice... You just feel very vulnerable."

So far we have seen the importance of Plymouth University in setting the context in which Youngtown's crime prevention and community safety narrative is discussed. This section shall aim to examine the implications of the University's growth within the locality and its possible emergence as a partner within Youngtown's crime prevention dynamic. Alongside this shall be an analysis of some of the ways in which 'community safety products' of reassurance and problem-orientated policing strategies are delivered within the locality so as to identify the types of solutions on offer to both public and partners at *have your say*. However, it is first necessary to understand how crime is discussed in the meetings so as to better understand the methods by which it is addressed outside of the meetings and what links there are between the two discourses. Below the PCSO is discussing some of the recent crime trends in the area.

Field note

PCSO: At the moment we are seeing a slight spike in acquisitive crime in the area but I will go into more detail. There is currently an upsurge in burglary but this appears to be a city-wide problem. Currently we are running operation Bodie which is 2 teams of plain clothes detectives in the Brittlebridge and Youngtown area. So far there have been 6 arrests for burglary and 1 cannabis factory has been discovered and shut down. In this area assaults are currently down 17% but drug arrests are up 10%.

NLO/Chair: (to the residents) there are some things you can do yourselves to improve your own security which is part of the reason why we gave out the leaflets at the beginning. We don't want to raise people's fear of crime but we have noticed there has been this crime spike in the area. What the Local Strategic Partnership and the Community Safety Partnership want is your (the resident's) views. Some of the things which are being done are bringing in portable boards with information for the public. It is a high risk area and is highly policed.

NLO/Chair: The crime levels in Youngtown, the crime spike in the area, are mostly related to issues of noise and ASB. This is because of the nature of the area and its demographics.

These extracts describe the balancing act that public professionals involved in ‘doing’ community safety, must accomplish. In the first, the use of the term ‘slight spike in acquisitive crime’ to describe an ‘upsurge in burglary’ is particularly relevant with connotations suggesting that such a ‘spike’ was unusual or an otherwise freak event (Gilling: 2010a). This is followed swiftly by operations that are currently active and statistics showing that actions are being taken and results obtained. The extract by the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) from the same meeting further reiterates the message. The NLO makes it clear that they are not seeking to raise communities fears about crime in the area and that the area is ‘highly policed’. Nonetheless, the NLO confirms the use of the term ‘spike’ whilst simultaneously noting the ‘high risk’ nature of the area and encouraging the residents to take literature to help them manage their own risks from crime (Garland: 2001). The final extract comes from the *have your say* meeting following the previous one and again we see the use of the term ‘spike’ to describe the increase in crime in the area. Moreover, the NLO then goes on to highlight ‘the nature of the area and its demographics’ as a potential cause for a more normal amount of crime which inclusive of noise and ASB as factors. The discussion of the locality’s ‘risks’ and demographics (Gilling: 2010b) links back to the previous discussions concerning violence and the Night Time Economy. Given the interconnectivity of the issue of the NTE and the issue of students, this issue is of salience for the University:

Interview

Uni Manager: “So it’s about being really positive about the student experience but actually just framing it for them. You know you are away from home, it’s the first time and this is what we expect from you with your behaviour, these are the consequences if you don’t...look after your possessions because I don’t know if you know but there is lots of burglaries...and about keeping their money safe

and also about responsible drinking. Don't get so drunk ladies that you are on your own walking through Primrose Hill at night because funnily enough that's not very good for you"

Here the emphasis that the University places on making its students responsible, not just in terms of their potential to create problems for the established residents but also, so they appreciate the potential risk posed by their environment. The reference to women is particularly revealing as there had been a number of sex-attacks in the area during the period researched. More broadly, the issue relates to the debates put forward by the likes of Matthews (2008) about gendered space in the Night Time Economy and the concurrent risk to women. The University's interest in the welfare of its students to an extent influences the institution's involvement within crime prevention paradigms within the locality. This was suggested in the section on Booze where the PCSO discussed work that was ongoing near Sherwell arcade, and at the top of this section the same PCSO uses the term problem-solving. Given this, it is necessary to examine what the 'problem-solving' approach to the Sherwell Arcade constituted and what involvement the University had in it.

Field note

NLO/Chair: On this subject of the NTE which keeps returning, what are we saying? Has the work done by the Sherwell Arcade helped? Do we want to keep the focus on Sherwell? Or do we need to focus on other areas like by the Junction?

Resident: Yes it has got a bit better I think since the nights of action.

Resident: It was also probably because of the revellers hanging out by the burger van when leaving and starting fights.

NLO/Chair: The burger van wanted longer opening hours, he was refused and lost his appeal to stay.

PCSO: The van was open till the early hours and PCSOs are not on duty after midnight. We had to get big seagull proof bins because of some of the litter in the area.

Uni worker: The University has CCTV focussed in on Sherwell.

Here we see the links made between the Night Time Economy, violence, litter and licensing combined by residents and partners in a discussion on targeted working. This extract highlights the salience of the problems-solving techniques used, in this instance ‘nights of action’ and proactive work to reduce the potential waste from the burger van alongside its eventual removal due to fights occurring there between customers. What is interesting about this extract is the inclusion of University and its CCTV within the overall context of crime prevention in the Sherwell Arcade. This is a continuation of the trend noticed earlier where the University is increasingly a partner within Youngtown’s crime prevention paradigm, sponsoring ‘nights of action’ and allowing its CCTV and property to be used by the police for crime reduction purposes. Arguably this constitutes ‘corporatism’ amongst partners (Crawford, 1994, 2004) with the resources of the University being utilised in the broader interests of protecting its students and the regulation of the NTE. In this respect the University moves from a ‘tertiary’ to a primary position (Kautt and Pease: 2013) in the regulation of certain elements of crime and anti-social behaviour within Youngtown. This theme is one which is common to much of the data and will eventually entail changes to University policy and engagement within communities. Also useful from the extracts above is the references to the ‘visible’ signals and clues of disorder from the NTE provided by the reference to litter in the area. Later on the University would begin to fund end of term waste collections in the area, another telling reference to its power within the City and inclusion within anti-social behaviour initiatives. However, the ‘signs’ of waste also lead us to our next issue which is also highly student-centric, namely the impact of waste on the locality and divisions created between communities via the cultural signifier of bin storage.

5.3 Bins: Signal Crime, Signifier or Service Demand? Resident's vs. 'Tenants' in Youngtown

Resident: What about enforcing the Green bins and Brown Bins policy?

WASTE 1: We wish. We can take it to the brink but normally have to pull back. As I said before people can just turn around and say that they didn't put that rubbish in that bin.

Extract on the problems involved in enforcing Plymouth's green and brown bin policy.

Whilst aspects of the NTE are undeniably more crimogenic in nature, perhaps its greatest impact for *have your say* attendees lies in terms of ASB. One of the most important of this, at least for the longer-term residents, appears to be issues relating to bins and litter within the area. This issue relates to the waste produced by the NTE in terms of litter, but also more broadly to the 'saturation' of the area in terms of bars and burger vans, which each produce waste and the increase of HMOs. This increase in HMOs serves to increase the capacity of the locality's transient populations and Landlords, who the longer term residents criticise for failing to properly dispose of their waste. This can be done in a variety of ways; it may be that the people living in an HMO do not put their waste in the 'right' bin or otherwise fail to bring their bins back from the pavement once collected. Alternatively, this discussion of waste may be targeted towards the Landlords of the properties either directly or indirectly, taking the form of wanting to hold the Landlords responsible for the behaviour of their tenants and their waste, or the behaviour of irresponsible Landlords for issues such as Fly-tipping and mattresses left in back lanes. Added to this is the way in which these issues are articulated to the agency representatives at *have your say*. This may take the form of a discussion on whether the area is getting the level of service it requires from waste collections and street cleaning. Alternatively, some residents may make suggestions to the

partners which can range from the placing of large communal skips, to the enforcement of existing fixed penalties by the local authority. Finally there is the issue of how this matter is discussed and resolved between the partners and the public. In what ways do partner agencies, particularly waste services, react to anti-social waste as public concern and how do they attempt to manage the issue, both within the locality and as it arises in the meetings?

Therefore, the issue is how attendees present at *have your say* choose to frame their demands for the issue of waste to be settled. This could be either in terms of the residents present seeking to 'maximise' the issue and therefore bring pressure to bear on partners, particularly waste services, present at the meeting for more resources and improved results. Under these circumstances the reaction and behaviours of differing partners becomes crucial, as certain partners and particularly councillors may ostensibly opt to 'bandwagon' with the community against the council on the issue. Whilst this dynamic is not unique to the management of the 'politics of waste', nonetheless for anti-social rubbish it has greater resonance. The importance of waste and how it is managed in Youngtown lies in its position as a 'signal crime' (Innes: 2004) or signifier (Giddens: 1992) for the residents present at the *have your say* meetings in Youngtown. Under these auspices the issue of waste appears to exist on a continuum for residents where litter and improperly stored waste foster perceptions of lack of service at one end of the scale. At the other end of this continuum is litter as a part of a discourse on anti-social behaviour, where the focus is arguably less on whether council workers are doing their jobs and more on whether other residents, particularly tenants and the Landlords, who rent them their housing, are behaving responsibly. From this the importance of litter and waste in Youngtown lies in its capacity to act as a visible reminder of the social differentiation (Payne: 2000) between the long-term residents and the transient populations of 'tenants' and Landlords:

Focus Group

CG: *“What do you mean quality of life?”*

Interviewer: *“I’m thinking very much quality of life as things that you see, things that irritate you, waste.”*

MS: *“That’s anti-social behaviour putting waste out.”*

As this exchange shows, waste is very much placed within the context of discourses on ASB within the locality. In this situation, waste is perceived as personal and the inability of other residents to put waste in the correct bins or to remove bins following collection is often viewed as thoughtlessness or selfishness by *have your say* attendees:

Focus Group

MS: *“...I have a neighbour who shall remain nameless who isn’t very careful with his rubbish and doesn’t put them in the proper bags. It’s just thoughtless people really”.*

The issue of how to make ‘thoughtless people’ less thoughtless exercises both policy makers and the public within the area, the solutions preferred by both tend not to be the same with the residents preferring enforcement and fines as a means to ensure compliance. This highlights the difficulties of discussions on personal responsibility within an area which contains a plurality of communities, some of which are transient in nature. Discussions on the best means to pressure individuals to conform to social bin etiquette is the subject of debate at the *have your say*:

Field note

Councillor (CS): *“We should number the bins. People will know which bin belongs to who by what the number says on. These things make people more responsible and so they will bring their bins in and we won’t get people jumping over the bins to get into backyards and stealing.”*

Councillor (SR): *“It’s not all about facts and stats though; crime is about how you feel. I don’t know that stickers on bins is necessarily going to change how people feel about an area or make people feel*

more responsible. Many of the properties in the area are rented accommodation and they may not be living in the area long enough to become house-proud.”

Councillor (CS): “If Mark (NLO’s name) had a bad bin, one which had contaminated waste in it, something that could lead to infestation, or one that was where it shouldn’t be, then if we have no way of identifying it then we cannot find out who’s it is or what the other issues might be. However, if we have them labelled, its clear then that your bin is your responsibility and we as a community will force you to look after it.”

Resident: “They never enforce anything.”

The above extract demonstrates the continuum of waste as criminogenic, ASB, and quality of life issue. At one end of the spectrum the issue of bins is viewed as a matter of personal responsibility with the discussion centring upon how best to get people to bring their bins in. The ability of stickers on bins to make Youngtown residents house-proud is also couched within a discourse of crime prevention with Councillor CS drawing upon the idea of bins being used by thieves to climb over back walls and burgle. This signal crime (Innes: 2004) drawing direct links between anti-social waste and criminal acts, serves to create policy dilemmas for public service professionals and councillors alike. This is evident in the second part of the extract where Councillor CS’s use of stickers on bins is debatably part of a broader civil-communitarian attempt to foster public-spiritedness and community ownership of a reoccurring issue (Hughes: 2007). Evident from this extract is the difficulties and limitations that exist in Youngtown with its large transient populations. These difficulties are laid out by Councillor SR but are made visible by the statement that ‘they’ never enforce anything. The ‘they’ in this instance, we may presume, are the authorities, particularly those of local government and waste management and, to a limited extent the police and PCSO’s. If the issue of waste is conceived as a signal crime (Innes:2004) running along a broad spectrum

from nuisance to potential criminality then the issue of how it is dealt with essentially falls under the established communities claims to service from the partners.

One means by which partners and political representatives may choose to handle the political issue of waste is via the utilisation of meetingcraft or otherwise attempting to manage public expectations. The intention here is to examine particular difficulties that arise for councillors and agency representatives as they attempt to navigate their way around the entrenched issue.

Field note

Council (Environmental Health): We have spoken to the Landlords forum about this issue. This is a group which represents some of the City's Landlords. I have to tell you that the response we got back was that many of the Landlords said that they were amazed that the students were putting out the bins at all. The issue for them was that leaving the bins out was preferable to the alternative which was 75 bin bags in the back yard which would create smells and attract rats. But I think we are perhaps in danger of losing it. We have spent 20 minutes talking about waste and bins. It is an issue in many ways about community safety and personal responsibility.

Councillor: I understand that people are angry about this, it's a passionate issue. The budget is being cut and waste is a particularly stretched department. I will take back that we are not satisfied with how things are in the area. However I don't think that in this area we are ever going to solve this. It's the nature of the area. These things I can see as still being issues in ten years' time. Residents should come and see all three of us – both myself, Chris Swinger (Labour Councillor for Drake ward which is covered by the locality) and Paul (PCSO) .Tell us where the issues are and we can take this specific information and get something done about it.

The extracts above show the Council worker attempting to place the issue of bins within a broader context of a discussion on community safety and personal responsibility. The issue of 'personal responsibility' and the invoking the term 'community' may ultimately constitute attempts to responsabilise the public for the issue. Notice also the Environmental Health

Officer's reference to the amount of time spent discussing the issue, suggesting that the agenda for the meeting needs to move beyond this single issue 'I think we are in danger of losing it'. The councillor by contrast, discusses the issue with regard to the reduction of resources available and the intractable nature of the issue for the area 'These things I can see will still be issues in ten years' time'. However, the councillor also appears to suggest that if he, the other councillor or the PCSO is given 'specific' information then something will be achieved in that specific area. This leads us to how the public may attempt to deal with the waste issue, which agencies they may appeal to and the manner in which they make those appeals. This could be the means by which they couch their demands, as consumers seeking service or alternatively as citizens, pressuring their democratic representatives for action or as both (Clarke, Newman and Smith: 2007):

Focus Group

JD: "Can I just ask out of interest who did you email?"

BY: "I emailed Stan Rowland and Chris Swinger (ward councillors)".

JD: "The reason I'm asking is because I am also a Plymouth City Council employee ... you said you emailed Stan Rowland and Chris (local councillors) and said I'm going to dump them on Tommy Evans (Council Leader) door... we have got a number of ways where people can report it and people will come and do something about it and it's, I just find it really interesting that the first thing that happens is that people will go to their councillor and complain".

Here we see a demonstration of some of the tensions between councillors and representatives of the local authority. JD, a Plymouth City Council employee, appears to challenge BY over the manner in which he resolved his complaint about the waste; by threatening to dump it over the Council leader's door. However, the challenge is made in terms of their non-following of council procedure and instead 'went to their councillor'. Indeed, during the research one of Youngtown's councillors revealed photos that they had taken on their phone

of litter and waste within the area. This suggests almost an irritation on the part of JD and possibly her employer, with the tendency of Councillors to ‘play politics’ on behalf of their constituents at the expense of partners. This ‘gaming the system’ (Bailey:2006) via property-owners using their elected representatives is familiar to many discourses on community safety and crime prevention and more generally, the middle classes ability to secure advantageous returns from crime prevention and policing (Gilling:2007). This ability of the middle classes to get disproportionate results from their interactions with public bureaucracies leads us to the issue of bins being deliberately positioned as a ‘signal crime’ (Innes: 2004) and the other partner named by the councillor to whom the public should bring ‘specific’ information, the areas PCSO:

Field note

Resident: I know the police say they can only do something about bins if they are creating an obstruction but bins can be an obstruction, particularly on the pavement or coming out of drives.

PCSO: I would like to add that if the bin is there causing an obstruction then we as PCSOs are happy to help with that.

If we take the first two extracts, the debate is about what the police, or PCSOs are able to do with regard to enforcement on what is essentially a civil issue. The resident asks whether the police (and by extension PCSOs) might act if bins were to cause an ‘obstruction’. The resident’s use of a hypothetical scenario where bins effectively create an obstacle to daily life is important as it demonstrates the citizen-consumer (Clarke, Newman and Smith: 2007), attempting to appeal to the Police’s necessity to deal with such obstacles as an emergency service. In this instance, the resident is aware of the ambiguity of whether the police are the partner required but nonetheless attempts to persuade the public servant by appeals to the potential that such an ‘obstruction’ could create greater problems. The resident is attempting to persuade the public servant to act, and utilise their power and discretion to achieve the

resident's goal. Lipsky (1980), describes this as the ability of the public to influence public bureaucracies by appeals to public servants and Levitas (1998) develops the idea of the 'stakes' to influence that the public bring to bear when attempting to influence the direction of policy. The PCSO however appears to maintain a neutral tone when acknowledging the request, demonstrating a general willingness to help with obstructions, the PCSO does not change the official position in such a way to take 'ownership' of the bin issue.

Thus far we have seen the evidence of the consumer part of the citizen-consumer' (Clarke, Newman, Smith et al: 2007) albeit alongside some attempts to encourage the residents to enforce bin storage as a community. Given the charged nature of the issue, representatives from the Waste services department are often in attendance as the partners attempt to find a solution to the seemingly intractable problem. As JD made clear, one potential cause of friction between the council and other partners, particularly councillors was the tendency of these representatives to help their constituents to negate official procedures and systems. This is partially a reflection of the council's preference for its own methods of service delivery and their corresponding ability to manage workloads and public expectations (Lipsky: 1980):

Field note

NLO/Chair: The more people use it the more it helps drive resources. It's all part of an evidence-based way to deliver services.

NLO/Chair: If you can name the specific streets where this is happening we can go and knock on some doors if the bins are there.

NLO/Chair: There was a study conducted on waste in the area so what are the real problems that you see.

These three extracts describe some of the moves being made towards targeted working and waste disposal in the locality. Arguably, such pressures from the centre towards national targets, service standards and 'best value' (Stoker: 2004, Stewart: 2000) are redolent of New Labour's attempts to utilise community forums for improving service delivery (Levitas: 1998). However, the quandary faced by many public servants in this context is that in order to improve standard procedures, there exists a necessity to 'move' publics toward using them. This is particularly visible in the first extract 'the more people use it the more it helps drive resources'. Whilst ostensibly both the councillors and the council require 'specifics' arguably both use the data quite differently; the council with 'strategic' aims on service delivery and the councillor on 'tactical' targets based on their credentials of representation and their influence 'over' the council's systems (Barnes and Prior: 2009). Moreover, in seeking to utilise the public's input to improve efficiency, service delivery and assist prevention the public servants must also be wary of the potential 'false positives/negatives' (Loader and Walker: 2007) 'specifics' the have your say publics may provide.

Therefore, if we understand the issue with waste as a service demand rather than a signal crime (Innes: 2004) then arguably, the importance for the partners lies in what they perceive the public to want. Such management of dissent (Harfield: 2010) lies ultimately in the ability of the public services professionals to manage public expectation as to what is possible or to successfully lay blame elsewhere. However, as we have seen the 'politics of waste' is inherently problematic, consisting of signifiers of differentiation between communities, (Payne: 2000), service demands from citizen-consumers (Clarke et al: 2007) and divergence between political and procedural methods. Arguably, the data suggests that the issue of bin waste is rather more a cultural signifier of identity (Giddens: 1991) rather than necessarily criminogenic in nature. The 'thoughtless people' and their anti-social behaviour vis-à-vis waste placement and storage of waste used to differentiate between the long-term residents

and the transient new communities arriving in the area. In demanding ‘enforcement’ some amongst the public are arguably engaged in attempts to ‘criminalise nuisance’ (Hughes: 2007) caused by the effects of development and the changes in residency this creates in the locality. This is most apparent from the quotation below where JD reflects on the ‘otherness’ of the ‘concept’ of students and new communities and their differentiation (Payne: 2000) from established publics.

Focus Group

JD: “... it’s the concept of students, you know they have lived on Brittlebridge all their lives and over the years have been terrorised by different sets of them and just the concept is ‘oh my god more students’ and it’s not a person, it’s not you it’s just the concept of them and it’s a generic term. Student just encompasses anyone who just doesn’t own their house and isn’t planning to stay there for over a year”.

MS: Any young people.

JD: Any young person. Exactly. It’s just you look around and you see people and think ‘you have got to be a student’ and it is really unfair but that’s how it is. The problem is that for certain people, their opinion is never going change and it’s going to be, you’re always going to have this dichotomy of them and us and them being anyone who isn’t us.

MS: That’s right, the ‘foreigners’

These extracts reveal the real source of some of the residents concern about bins, waste and their linkages with young people and other transient communities. Much of what is revealed here is similar to debates about ‘ontological insecurity’ (Garland: 2001) and feelings of risk and uncertainty within contemporary society (Beck: 1992). Potentially, the real issue of waste is not necessarily about the positioning of bins, or what litter is placed where but instead the feelings of uncertainty and lack of service of which waste is a signifier (Giddens:

1991). Therefore, whilst the tenants are blamed for the waste and their lack of the correct ‘bin etiquette’, the real ‘culprits’ are those who have changed the nature of the locality by encouraging the transient populations into the area:

Focus Group

RSM: “Well that’s what we think the council ought to do is take these issues up with the landlords. Find the landlords”.

JD: “Have responsibility with the right person”.

RSM: “And I think that if they’re going to have these houses as HMOs and give them planning then they need to say, you have got to do this or we’ll come after you”.

JD: “Hence why my beef is with planning and not with the occupants”.

This combination, between the ‘absent’ in the form of landlords, and the ‘transient’ in the form of students and others, are indelibly linked with the impact that the growth of the University, the NTE and their accompanying consumers have had to impact on the area and undermine the claims of established residents. As we shall see, these claims and the signifiers which enable the differentiation between groups are part of an ‘ontological angst’ (Garland: 2001) associated with late modernity and given greater impetus by the changes wrought on the locality by a combination of the NTE and the growth of HMOs.

5.4 ‘Bad planning’: The changing face of the locality

Uni Manager: “I had a taxi driver this morning that was absolutely hideous who said that University was the worst thing that ever happened to the city. Well I don’t think you will find that’s true, I think you will find that the 1980s was the worst thing to ever happen to this city”.

University Manager reflecting on the development of Youngtown and attitudes toward it.

From the data we see that the issues of the night time economy, waste and anti-social behaviour are interlinked in the construction of many of Youngtown's community safety issues. Ultimately this relates to the third of the three 'B's identified from the data as shaping locality working in the area. Bad planning, in this context is not necessarily the nature of the area in terms of demography and architecture, although these do impact upon discussion as to what 'bad planning' constitutes. 'Bad planning' in the context of Youngtown's community safety concerns serves a dual role with it being perceived by *have your say* publics as the singular cause behind the interrelated issues of waste, the NTE and associated anti-social behaviour. Under these circumstances 'planning' and the community's ability to control the process represents the ability of long-term residents to maintain a sense of ownership over the locality and its proposed future development. Moreover, planning in terms of how the area is used, the future developments proposed and the resources and facilities available are key determinants for partners when determining the limitations of what is possible in the area. As might be expected, the partner's success in blaming 'bad planning' varies considerably with publics supportive of policies designed to tighten planning regulations on the creation of HMOs. However, at times the seemingly Byzantine nature of planning regulations serves only to further antagonise or alienate the attendees of *have your say*.

We must accept that when it comes to the politics of 'bad planning', the interconnectivity between elements of the NTE the signifiers and signal crimes of waste and litter are very much in evidence. 'Bad planning' in the eyes of the *have your say* public may be the increasing number of bars and pubs along the Plain or elsewhere in the locality, increasing demands on resources and creating issues in the form of ASB and waste. Bad planning may also impact directly on the management of waste and litter in the area with insufficient storage space for bins in HMOs often being identified as an issue due to bins being left on the

pavement after collection or waste piled up in black bags. In addition to this there is the perception that irresponsible landlords may leave large-scale household waste such as mattresses in the back alleys of the area or on the pavements as they would be unwilling to pay for it to be taken away. Finally, the contentious issue of planning relates back to the theme of urban redevelopment and regeneration in the area. Such a discussion is, like the previous two related issues, indelibly entwined with the growth of the University and particularly the student population. The creation of purpose-built student accommodation and the ways in which the area may change to service that population with regard to bars, clubs and HMOs creates a multi-sided political discourse between long-term residents, the council, developers and the transient population:

Interview

Councillor: "Well lately there has been the University plan to basically accommodate another nine hundred students...the University will get their way, of course they'll get their way... We've got purpose built accommodation in the City which hasn't been at capacity for years and then the University want to build a load of extra first year homes... It's a bit greedy, it's gone a little bit too far and obviously it means it's extra pressure on the local community with all the issues you have when you have students in them... I've looked into this subject, it's called studentification and there are some prime examples in places like Brighton where they've built loads of purpose built accommodation and then those parts which had loads of students in the houses have just become very run-down areas".

Undeniably the thrust of this councillor's argument is aimed at the University and its development agenda. The use of the term 'greedy' and the idea that 'they' the University have gone 'too far' is unmistakably an indication that planning and particularly the University's own development is a charged political issue for the locality. If we accept the arguments put forward by the councillor that the University will 'get its way' and then

arguably, the University constitutes a ‘growth machine’ (Judge: 1998), the local ‘face’ of business which local planners are keen to accommodate. This theme is developed further in the extracts below where the ‘politicisation of planning’ (Brindley, Rydin and Stoker: 1996) both historically and contemporarily has led to a degree of paranoia concerning future developments in the locality.

Field note

Resident: Can I ask about the Eye infirmary – I heard that the University was going to build more student accommodation there. I heard they were going to change the application at the last minute.

Chair (Councillor): I don’t like the way they have gone about it, not as part of a campus plan but as individual units. I think that’s because they felt it would be easier to get permission that way. But enough of conspiracy theories.

In a later interview a University worker invoked this concept of ‘conspiracy theories’ the residents appeared to have with regard to the University’s development:

Interview

Uni Manager: “There has been a whole conspiracy theory built around that eye infirmary. That it is sneakily going to get changed at the last minute for student use...the argument that should have been put forward is “well you’re telling us that when they are in private accommodation that they are a nuisance now we are trying to move them out of private on to campus where we will have residents assistance and wardens, where they will be very much subject to the university’s disciplinary, where our own security guards and our own CCTV and everything kicks in to allow us to manage our campus”.

What is interesting here is the portrayal of the University as a victim of political intrigues by the use of the term ‘conspiracy theory’. The councillor involved did maintain great resistance to any proposed new developments in the area proposed by the University. Moreover, the University worker is quick to portray the rationale for any further expansion by the

University in terms of more student accommodation being an active contribution to crime and disorder prevention. The ‘nuisance’ caused by students in Youngtown has been documented previously but bears reiterating with regard to its spatial impact on the broader environment:

Interview

Councillor: “The biggest problem in the area is getting the balance right between the students that live in the community and the fixed community because obviously they live completely different lifestyles...If you’ve got a family home next to a student house, it can be pretty horrendous for the family...You know, obviously when you’re young you have people round, parties, noise”.

This serves to establish a situation where neighbouring residents have divergent lifestyles and interests and consequently, live parallel yet dissimilar lives within the same area:

Focus Group

MS: It’s sort of a parallel universe.

MSM: Well there were several parallel universes in each street. I’m out at seven o’clock in the morning and not back to six o’clock usually and there were people in our street who I never see.

From this we gather the impression of communities that simultaneously live in the same area but who ultimately use the area differently. The parallel Universes of late modernity construct a context where the transient and the established live next door but do not interact or only see each other through the visible ‘signifiers’ (Giddens: 1991) by which each differentiates themselves from each other. The divergent lifestyles in the locality is complicated by the presence of the Night Time Economy and the ‘commodified leisure’ (Hall, Winlow, Ancrum: 2008), tailored towards younger demographics. This is underlined in planning terms by the potential for developments to increase the number of bars and clubs within the area and therefore compound the problem for residents:

Focus Group

JD: "I think it's about forty-five per cent of the available properties have got a licence of some description of something like that. It's incredibly high. Whether they're all actually pubs, probably not but it's something like forty-five per cent of the available properties have been licenced at some point which is, not right you know and a lot of them are closed down and you find that a lot of them are closing down. Banks are closing down on Brittlebridge which is quite scary you know, I remember when the corner shop closed down to be a bank, that's closed down again. And do you remember Natwest? Used to be where the Wetherspoons is".

RSM: It's bad planning decisions.

JD: Yeah because they are linked to each other.

RSM: The licensing laws as well.

These issues were combined by the respondents in the format of a discussion of the Night Time Economy and the homogenisation of the area (Smith: 2009). JD in particular lists the high percentage of properties on Youngtown's plain which have licences to sell alcohol. Arguably there is an element of 'ontological angst' (Garland: 2001) to JD's statement where she discusses how businesses on the plain are closing down and the only ones opening appear to be more venues for the NTE industry 'remember NATWEST? Used to be where Wetherspoons is'. All the respondents from the focus group identified the problem as being a coalescence of both the development of the locality and the council's granting of licences in a relatively densely inhabited area. Such feelings are reflected in criminological texts with Ferrell, Hayward and Young (2008) demonstrating how much of the recent growth in the NTE is a by-product of National governmental policy designed to regenerate the inner City by relaxing licensing. Moreover, since it is generally the young and the at risk that dominate the use of the NTE (Wikstrom: 1990). Given the salience of the 'new communities' of students, this suggests that the concept of 'community owned space' (Newman 1972) in the area is problematic because the exercise of one community's ownership to the locality, in this

case the NTE, creates consequences for other communities. Therefore, the issue is the means by which such these tensions between the established communities and the ‘new’ student community are resolved. We have seen previously how the development of the University has been termed ‘greedy’ and its conceptualisation as a ‘growth machine’ (Judge: 1998) with wide powers over the development of the locality and the nature of some of its problems. From this some of the residents appeared to make the University culpable for the actions of their students’ off-campus and wished the institution to provide redress:

Focus Group

JD: “My point was that it’s before you get to that point so where you have the instances of anti-social behaviour, is if you approach it informally and somebody from the University explains, or the Union...explains the consequences of their action before the residents turn round and go right, we are calling the police because you’ve got to remember you think ‘oh right there’s a bit of noise I’ll give em, you know a verbal warning, what if they get caught with drugs in the house which is quite likely all of a sudden someone’s career is going to go down the pan for, something to be honest that could have been avoided had someone had a chat to them and said we’re not going to tolerate you terrorising your neighbourhood and that behaviour will not be tolerated if you want to stay here”.

Such sentiments were not universal; at the same focus group one respondent, a sabbatical officer, outlined the difficulties of Institutions such as the University becoming involved in off-campus governance:

Focus Group

CG (Student representative): “For me, from my perspective if, if the University came round ... came round and told me stop making so much noise, stop smoking, stop doing whatever I would be like, you are an institution but you have no right really to tell me what I should do in my personal life”.

However, in a similar manner to the dichotomy between anti-social behaviour and genuine fear of crime noted in the booze section, feelings about ‘bad planning’ were linked to

generalised feelings of risk (Beck: 1992) posed by development. When the conversation turned to what problems the area may face in the future the ‘students’ were clearly the less of two evils as the broader impact of welfare cuts and the areas stock of HMOs was considered:

Focus Group

JD: “My personal feeling with Brittlebridge is because of the changes with the Welfare legislation, the welfare reforms, there’s going to be a lot more HMOs and that’s going to deteriorate the area because it will bring problems in that we might not have at the moment in that, it might be a magnet for people who like to drink and have a good time...I think at least with the properties being student properties you kind of know what you’re getting and I think that with the University building a lot more houses, with accommodation for students...will leave these homes being open to being HMOs which will, I think that’s going to bring a whole lot of trouble that’s going to make things even worse”.

Here the respondent articulates a range of potential problems associated with Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs). Firstly is the issue of who might occupy the HMOs. The fear appears to be that other transient populations ‘worse’ than students would move into the area. Given our previous discussion on waste, ‘tenant’ populations are often perceived by the ‘residents’ as contributing to many of the problems of the area in terms of waste, noise and anti-social behaviour. If we examine this quotation in greater depth we may see that it represents the fears of some longer-term residents over the changes occurring to the area and feelings of powerlessness over events. Such ‘ontological angst’ (Garland: 2001) was not unusual from the members of the focus group:

Focus Group

BY: “The long-term people are diminishing in numbers I think. You know, we’ve had all sorts of different groups, we’ve had the asylum seekers, refugees, we’ve had the Eastern European migrant

workers, so called. And we have the students and the big thing is in a couple of weeks' time, when they all come back to University. And then, we'll be bagged out in the area".

Therefore, when seeking to assign blame for the 'diminishing numbers' of residents, attendees tended to direct the issue not merely to planning but by association the signifiers and signal crimes (Innes: 2004) of waste disposal but also to the fear of a selfish 'other' (Levitas: 1998). Indeed, the quotation above is replete with a veritable list of potential 'others' ranging from asylum seekers, refugees, Eastern European migrants and finally, students. This suggestion of the 'otherness' of Youngtown's new communities is developed further in the extract below:

Focus Group

JD: ...my next door, not next door but one-up said, she said to me the other day that she didn't like Polish people not in because they were Polish people but she couldn't understand what they said. They scared her. She said 'I don't like it when they walk down the street in big groups, I'm scared because I don't know what they're saying' and I said 'oh Gretta they're probably talking about the weather like we do' and she said 'yeah but I don't understand that' That was her concern, as a result she doesn't want to mix because she feels that I'll at ease and that makes her scared and I think that's a big thing in any area, not just here but I think with that influx of people moving in and everyone says oh it's students. I don't know, maybe the people moving in across the street from me, I assume they're students because they're going in with carrier bags and bin liners and settees and computers but actually, you know, I don't know if they are or not, I just assume they are.

The 'fear' of the stranger demonstrated above is redolent of discussions regarding the 'ontological insecurity (2001) accompanying late modernity with attendant feelings of insecurity and risk (Beck: 1992). From this, much of the frustration vented in the focus group was aimed at the council's planning department. This has been apparent from our discussion on bins where JD discussed how her 'beef' was with planning. Feelings of a lack of control of

the planning process and the established community's requirement to be consulted on changes to their locality serve to politicise the planning process. This politicisation of planning (Brinley, Rydin, Stoker: 1996), ultimately serves to create further tensions between partners addressing the issue:

Interview

Uni Worker: "You know the fact that most of the politicians involved in these things will bugger off home and not worry about it unless it is in their interest i.e. with blaming the University and standing up to them so they can guarantee a vote for them next year".

Such politicking may win votes however; the issues involved are far more complex than the assessment that growth equals crime and disorder. Looking back to JD's previous comments then we perceive such 'ontological angst' (Garland: 2001) as concern as to the lack of community amenities and worry as to whether 'their' community will be sustainable. There is no definitive answer to such worries as development ultimately creates both winners and losers and potentially displaces problems between localities. Indeed, JD made the point when discussing how the impact of changes to benefits combined with the move to bring more student accommodation on campus may ultimately lead to greater problems. Such sentiments were in a different fashion conveyed by the Councillor in his discussion of 'studentification'. However, against the risks and potential problems that development may bring there is also the potential for regeneration and urban renewal to produce more positive results. In the extract below the University representative discusses the impact that the University has had on the locality. Apparent in the sentiment is the University as 'growth machine' (Judge: 1998), altering the locality and 'transforming' parts of Plymouth.

Interview

Uni Manager: "I'm a Plymouth girl historically so I remember the Youngtown area was very very working class, family, residential and it has transformed beyond belief I would say in the last fifteen

years. A substantial part of that is due to us, our expansion there's no two ways about it and I think it's that habit that all human beings have of looking over their shoulder at days gone by when things were perceived to be better. The reality is Primrose Road which runs adjacent to the office here was ten years ago full of heroin addicts and drunks and is now actually full of quite smart student apartments and so in that way it has regenerated the area and it brought in income".

We may potentially combine these sentiments with those expressed by the University manager at the top of this section to gain a greater understanding of some of the economic forces affecting change in the City. Interestingly, the University Manager positions the 1980s as the period when the problems of the City really began. In this context the meaning is arguably twofold. Firstly there is the impact that structural changes have had on the political economies of U.K. cities in the form of neoliberalism (Stewart: 1990, McCulloch: 2004).

The impact of broader national economic policies upon the City is inclusive of the Thatcherite economic reforms of the eighties, defence spending cuts since the end of the cold war and most visibly now demonstrated by the changes to benefits represented by the 'bedroom tax'. Moreover, as Brinley et al (1996), many of the contemporary 'growth machines' (Judge: 1998) are actually the product of attempts by local government to encourage a pro-growth agenda via the planning process. Effectively, many of the complaints about planning, be they relating to the rise of HMOs in the area or the expansion of the NTE cannot be removed from broader discussions on neo-liberal economic growth and structural changes to Plymouth's economy. The issue that arises is how partners attempt to manage that growth and the complaints that arise from it. The final section below shall examine the methods by which various *have your say* grievances are channelled by the partners at the meeting and the impact that this may have on the function of *have your say* meetings within the locality.

5.5 Meetingcraft and the management of dissent: Politics versus Procedure in Youngtown

BY: What I actually do is, my first action is to ignore the council because they've set up a system but that's only to cover for themselves

Systems analysis.

This section shall consider how community safety is regulated via examining how the discourses about it are managed in the have your say forum. This 'management' is inclusive both of the subtle rules and methods of controlling community meetings, but also, the apparatus of complaints handling procedures and systems that are used by partners as a means of controlling demand and prioritising resources (Lipsky: 1980). At this point it should be noted that *have your say* meetings are held quarterly and common features are the establishment of community priorities at the end of the meeting to be taken to the council and partners and acted upon. Whether this 'timetabling' of engagement is a further reflection of the constraints on public participation (Arnstein: 1969) is debateable. This section shall concentrate on some of the issues that have arisen thus far in the analysis of some of Youngtown's community safety particularisms, namely the utilisation of specific norms of behaviour at *have your say*, and complaints handling procedures outside of it, to steer the direction of community engagement. During the first *have your say* I attended for Youngtown it was announced that the locality's boundaries were changing and that the area that had previously constituted Youngtown would now be divided into two separate localities. This technocratic exercise in the fixing of boundaries to meet criteria that may be more in tune with locality working but were not necessarily in keeping with the community's view of their area drew complaints concerning a lack of consultation:

Field note

NLO: Perhaps before we begin I should inform you of some of the changes to locality working which are going on. From this meeting Brittlebridge will be a separate locality and Youngtown's meetings will be called Youngtown and University... (To the residents) How do you feel about the boundary alterations? Do you feel it's a good move?

Resident: I don't like the lack of public consultation

Resident: These meetings are supposed to be for us, not for the officials. I don't think any of the community associations were consulted

Councillor: The community consultations for Samuel ward were done in Little Haven. I couldn't believe it myself.

Here we see the emergence of two significant issues. Firstly, there is the debate as to who 'owns' the community meetings of *have your say* – is it the partners or the public and how are the meetings shaped to legitimise or encourage particular types of participation. Secondly, is the issue of the divergence between what the council perceives as being correct consultation in terms of processes adhered to against the perceptions of 'the community' and councillors as to what constitutes proper engagement with the community. This issue of politics versus procedure is one that occurs across multiple issues in the micro-governance of crime and community and safety in Youngtown. From this, it is necessary to discuss the issue of ownership of the meetings and with that, what the function of the meetings may be. Is the purpose of the meetings to act as a means of joint problem-solving between the community and the partnership agencies? Does it serve as a means to improve responsiveness and service delivery? Alternatively, is the role of *have your say* one of making public services more accountable to neighbourhoods they serve? The extract from one of the residents 'these meetings are supposed to be for us not officials' suggests that the dynamic involved in community governance in Youngtown is not one of joint problem-solving with the

community, but one of residents attempting to hold to account organisations and institutions which actively or passively affect their quality of life. This desire for consultation, and public indignation when such consultation is perceived to be insufficient, is supported by public reactions to the news that the parking review had completed its consultation and was about to publish proposals. The annoyance of participants at the *have your say* was perhaps exacerbated by the fact that the parking review had been long-running affair, City-wide in its dimensions and years long in its completion.

Field note

Resident: Will we be part of the consultation for this parking document?

NLO: The consultation has already taken place

Residents: (Loudly and angrily) WHEN?!

Chair: It's been going on for years; the document will be forwarded to the residents

Resident: That's not consultation. They asked us our opinion on parking, not on the parking document.

One way of understanding the functional nature of the *have your say* meetings is to examine how residents and partners articulate their concerns or requests in the public setting. The ways the public make their claims and whether those claims are legitimised serve to clarify both who has ownership of the community safety discourse in Youngtown and what the perception is of the aim of the meeting.

Field note

Resident: I have a letter from 2008 from Transport and Engineering (produces letter) saying that the review would be over by now. Why is it taking so long?

Resident: Somebody is getting paid sixty grand a year, that's why.

NLO/Chair: Comments like that are not helpful

From this exchange we start to see a pattern emerging whereby certain comments and ways of speaking are legitimised or delegitimised as being helpful or unhelpful. This ‘Meetingcraft’ (Barnes and Prior: 2009) shows the actions of public service professionals in the public setting of the meeting to establish norms of acceptable conduct which are more conducive to moving the meeting towards particular ends. This attempt to shape public discourse by articulating what is and what is not appropriate behaviour, is accentuated further by the extract below which shows the same resident being less than ‘helpful’.

Field note

Resident: Why are we worried about Sherwell?

PCSO: It's a PACT priority. If it's a PACT priority here as well then we stand a good chance of getting the resources for it.

Resident: I don't care about that. I care about the shit in my street.

NLO/Chair: Don't swear in a public meeting.

PCSO: (Residents name) you have been dominating this meeting and acting very aggressively

Resident: Have I? All I said was shit

If we look at the comments by the resident concerning how they ‘only care about the shit’ in their street, we can see that the issue of how locality working is done has not necessarily diminished. Wilmott (1987) makes the point that most communities visualise their immediate neighbourhood in the localised terms of a few streets and not necessarily in a broader context that may appeal to community safety practitioners. Additionally, we can see the nucleus of the statutory partners attempting to bring the meeting back under control by utilising the language of public meetings as a means to exert norms of what is and is not acceptable

behaviour in that setting (Barnes and Prior: 2009). This disagreement occurs in the context of the PCSO attempting to draw community priorities towards established policing priorities in a bid to get resources. This attempt to ‘move majorities’ (Stoker: 1998) in favour of certain types of actions could be interpreted as the utilisation of public forums as a means to pursue ‘quick wins’ (Gilling: 2007). Under these auspices, the power of the community to influence actions is reduced and *have your say* is interpreted as a method by which statutory bodies may seek to strengthen their negotiating position to get resources by making claims to action on behalf of community. This leads us to the problems of the problem-solving approach (Gilling: 2010) as it is realised in Youngtown and at *have your say*. Arguably one of the principal difficulties with such an approach to community safety in a public setting is the police’s ability to frame the crime debate (McLaughlin: 2007) and then attempt to manage majorities of attendees present at the meeting in favour of particular, and pre-determined policies (Stoker:1998, Harfield; 2010).

Field note

NLO/Chair: Right the time has now come to be tough and make decisions as to what our next three priorities should be. I have heard from the Brittlebridge and Stankton trust that Graffiti may be an issue. What do we think about making this an issue?

PCSO: It’s something we can tangibly challenge. If we made this a PACT priority which is specific then we can get resources to address this. I feel that a difference can be made on this. This is after all one of the highest hit areas in the city.

Here the PCSO is attempting to persuade members of the public present at *have your say* to support a particular priority on the basis that resources can be obtained and outcomes achieved. It should be noted that many members of the public present at that meeting and later at the focus group did indeed appear very satisfied about the graffiti task-force:

Focus Group

MSM: "Graffiti was mentioned early on, there was an issue with graffiti, three years ago was it? Three or four years ago and the police set up a task force with one or two of them and it was dealt with and generally speaking it hasn't been so bad since".

However, there is debatably the image of the police 'managing majorities' in public opinion towards certain prescribed policy goals. Therefore this arguably creates a dichotomy between problem-solving policing and the pursuit of 'quick wins' (Gilling: 2007).

Field note

NLO/Chair: Compared with other meetings we are well attended. Some of these issues are on-going or city wide and they are not really able to be addressed in 3 months. Instead we could have some issues which can be dealt with in this period.

These extracts demonstrate the approach undertaken by public service professionals in pursuit of accomplishing community safety goals via problem-orientated or targeted working. Firstly there is the desire to combine public preferences with police priorities to accomplish a verifiable result in terms of crime prevention. Simultaneously, the inclusion of public support enhances the potential for resource allocation towards agency goals and to increase their claims upon community safety resources (Lipsky: 1980, Barnes and Prior: 2009). The NLO, a council worker supports such an initiative, possibly because the 'quick win' achieved that the graffiti task-force could provide is viewed as desirable by many of the partners. However, part of the challenge for professionals in public forums like *have your say* is to attempt to adjust public preferences and perceptions in a bid to get achievable results. This sets the scene for the tensions which arise between the politics and procedure of local government and community safety provision. These tensions exist on multiple levels being both inter-agency, between the statutory authorities and the public and between the councillors and other partners present:

Field note

Councillor (CS): They commissioned a bus with no driver?

UNI Manager: The University supported it, as to there not being a driver, I couldn't comment on that part of it.

Uni worker: At least now there will be the extra capacity in the North Hill area.

Councillor (CS): What extra capacity is there if the bus has no driver? I find it a bit pointless. It's the Sam Higgins (Anonymised name for leader of the council department in question) Department. It's a waste of money for that van to be sat in Devon and Somerset Fire Authority's depot on a Friday and Saturday night.

This extract demonstrates the potential for 'buck-passing' and 'finger-pointing' between partners present at *have your say*. Here the Councillor may be seen as attempting to bandwagon with public concerns regarding how their council tax is spent and the waste of money involved. Such moves may potentially be viewed as the Councillor's difficulty as a political representative in adjusting to a more deliberative forum (Barnes: 1999). Moreover, given the nature of political terms and the need to garner support from a demographic of voters likely to attend *have your say* meetings, it arguably does the partner, a councillor in this instance, no disservice to 'get out ahead on the story' (McLaughlin:2007). The Councillor's relationship with the *have your say* forum is further examined by the extracts below:

Interview

Councillor: "It's just one of those things that you have to do as a councillor... at least everyone's hopefully in it together and at least there are some key people around a table, you know, it's always good to have that communication, that forum. But just keep it short and brief and not too often".

Councillor: "It could be perceived as a classic tick-box exercise, just because everyone's happy, everyone one can say... the police can tick the box, the University can tick the box, the council can tick the box".

Here we can see that this particular councillor views *have your say* as something of a chore that needs to be accomplished and indeed, managed. The danger here is that such engagement renders such participatory forums as merely another 'box to be ticked' under the auspices of new public management (Newman: 2011). Such sentiments were to a large extent mirrored by other councillors and partners across multiple localities:

Interview

PCSO: "...it is a minimum number who has raised certain solutions or ways that they can help to move forward and try and resolve a problem and then there are other residents who basically just come to the meeting to say how they feel, what they want done and that we should be doing it, why haven't we done it and why can't we do more...it was suggested by the agencies that we could hold a clear up day which was taken on board by the residents but I do remember on the clear up day itself a couple of the residents came out and they were quite abusive and aggressive about the clear up day and were very anti the whole situation".

Here the area's PCSO demonstrates the partner's perception of the negativity of the attendees and their unwillingness to do more themselves and instead demand that agencies do 'more'.

Another chief complaint made by partners, particularly councillors, concerning *have your say* was the 'unrepresentative' nature of those attending and consequently, the issues that were raised:

Interview

Councillor: "It's the same people, talking about the same issues again and again and again".

This repetition of people and issues and the unrepresentative nature of both within the confines of *have your say* create dilemmas for the local ward councillors. As we have seen

the story of Youngtown is of multiple communities who use the locality very differently. Therefore, the partner's concerns must not simply be on the public present but also on those who are not present, as well as arbitrating between these groups. In this manner, the partners involved must attempt to strike a balance between the 'false positives/negatives' (Loader and Walker: 2007) of priorities from those attending and what they perceive as the broader requirements of the locality. Given this, the issue must turn towards what the residents themselves thought of the *have your say* meetings including what their expectations were from the meetings and what they felt they obtained from them:

Focus Group

BY: "... they said 'oh it's the same old faces and it's the same old problems again, we're not going to have them anymore' (Area Committee Meetings) and they didn't but the point being that the same old faces were the people who were interested in the community (murmurs of agreement) and the same old problems were because these problems were not being sorted".

This quotation sums up the attitude that appears to be commonly-held by the *have your say* attendees, that the purpose behind such public forums is the ability of the community to hold agencies accountable for service delivery. This quotation appears almost as a direct answer to the previous response from the Youngtown Councillor where the repetition of attendees and issues caused frustration. Here the resident puts forth the attendee's credentials as constituting those citizens 'who were interested in their community'. This level of interest is, as we have seen previously, limited mostly to service demands on those partners present at *have your say*. Given the methods by which the *have your say* meetings are managed the results can be that at times such residents do not fully feel engaged in the process of community safety:

Focus Group

BY: "...you find sometimes that the councillors will Chair the meeting and their main aim is to get it over with as quickly as possible... I think they tend to try and steer us round to agreeing with them that they (the priorities) have been dealt with when in fact they haven't".

It should be noted at this stage that not all residents felt similarly about the outcome of *have your say* with some reporting more positively on the meetings:

Focus Group

MSM: "Yeah generally, it does hold the various people accountable because they know they're going to have to come back in what, three months time and report and we do, we do see a difference particularly with the waste issue and with some of the policing issues".

CG: "I mean, from my perspective I come to the meetings because it gives me, given my role and my job, it's important for me to actually know what the problems are within the community because if it does become student orientated, if it's a problem I can fix I'll fix it, if it's a problem I don't think is particularly something that the students have created it's my opportunity to actually justify why students have not been the cause of the problem so for me it's an interaction with the community rather than my interaction with members of the police, members of the council".

Interestingly, the importance of the *have your say* meetings for its attendees appears to lie in its ability not just to hold partners accountable but also as a place where individuals can meet and discuss issues. This might be interpreted as a form of therapy (Arnstein: 1969) potentially limiting the scope of the citizen-consumer's ability to be empowered and therefore limiting what might potentially be achieved. However, there is one final 'partner' which is present at the meetings and which impacts upon the locality's community safety dynamic, namely the University. Given the salience of student-related issues and the resources which the University can provide, we therefore must examine its presence at *have your say*:

Field note

Uni Manager: I will speak for the University. The University takes its place in the City very seriously. We now have disciplinary procedures in place. We feel bad that we have not given the residents a more active voice and input before now...We are changing the student welcome week so that it is clear as to what is and what is not acceptable behaviour. I am the direct point of contact for all queries. You can call me, email me or drop in and have tea. We are looking to join in with more community events. I have just recently disciplined two students. I understand that the UPSU kick out is a bit like a zoo. I have spoken to some residents already and I am very sorry about the situation and I will be doing all I can to help.

Of particular interest is the suggestion that two students had been disciplined, as the inference is that students off campus may have been subject to censure for activities which upset residents and concomitantly damaged the University's reputation. This raises the issue as to whether the University's desire to engage or, to be seen to engage reflects a change of tactics or strategy by the institution and whether such changes stem from a desire to legitimise its presence? (Arnstein: 1969). Demonstrated below is the use of language to convey the purpose behind the University's change in policy:

Interview

Uni Manager: "we have to reframe the way which we engage with communities. The university gives an awful lot more than it takes and I don't think that is publicised as well as it could be and it does tend to get lost because you have got the stories of "I was kept awake and my eleven year old son saw people having sex outside the bedroom".

This desire to 'reframe' the Universities relationship with the community is the fundamental issue as it expands throughout the City. In part, this might be viewed as a corollary to the Universities re-branding exercise from earlier in the year when, amongst other things, the logo was changed to 'with Plymouth University'. Such changes may be interpreted as a linguistic tool accentuating the ethos of partnership and reciprocity. Moreover, there is an

overtly political motif attached to this where the University in its function as a growth machine (Judge: 1998), seeks to expand. This requires the careful use of PR to assuage public concerns, particularly with regard to the attendant consequences of such expansion in the form of public perceptions of students and ASB. From this, the issue is the ways in which the *have your say* ‘publics’ of established residents react to the University’s change in engagement, and their expectations of their new partner. This question about expectations cannot be separated from established resident’s perception as to what degree they believe the University to be responsible for the actions of the students themselves.

5.6 Summary: University-Town, Doing Community Safety *with* Plymouth University

This summary addresses the chief issue that arises from the research in Youngtown, namely the ‘rise’ of Plymouth University and its impact as ‘growth machine’ (Judge: 1998) on the discourses and physical construction of some of Youngtown’s community safety particularisms. Through its growth, the University itself creates needs within the area, needs for space to grow, needs for accommodation for its students. These needs create pressures in the locality in terms of the available supply of rented accommodation and Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) needed to supply the demand from new transient communities, arriving to live and work in the area for relatively short periods. Such factors work in tandem with the established presence of the Night Time Economy (NTE) in the locality, creating further fissures via the ‘commodified identity’ (Hall, Winlow and Ancrum: 2008) of the NTE and its spectacle of binge drinking. The changing nature of the area, and the use of its space, interact to undermine the claims (Lefebvre: 2006) of established residents who have lived in the locality for a period of years or are otherwise home-owners. The visible signifiers

(Giddens: 1991) of differentiation between these communities are apparent from discourses on bins where correct 'bin etiquette' is synonymous with the 'long-term residents' and litter and inappropriate storage of waste is ascribed to its 'other' (Hughes:2007). Amidst this backdrop of issues the University moves to centre stage as the *have your say* public seek to hold the institution accountable for the actions of its students and the broader consequences of its development. In this way the University emerges as a partner within the locality's overall crime prevention paradigm, sponsoring policing activities such as 'nights of action', utilising its campus for CCTV aimed at bars nearby and potentially changing some of its disciplinary procedures for students.

However, as is inferred from the sub-heading at the top of this summary, there are arguably two distinct consequences for Plymouth University's growth within Youngtown. Firstly there is the debatable suggestion that as the University grows it will further influence the development of the City, redefining Plymouth economically from its traditional armed forces and docks focus towards being a 'University town'. However, there is a secondary consideration of 'University-Town' which is arguably apparent from the data, namely the idea of the University via its 'mass-private property' (Bottoms and Wiles: 2003) and its influence on locality discourses, effectively creating a 'town' within the confines of the City-centre. In this manner the University is both an indispensable partner in Youngtown's community safety dynamic, providing resources for crime prevention purposes whilst simultaneously affecting the broader social context of the locality and its residents. In this respect we may view the 'growth machine' (Judge: 1998) of the University as indirectly contributing to some of the community safety problems which antagonise the public attending Youngtown's *have your say*. However, the real issue is one of a cycle of neoliberalism impacting upon the City of Plymouth through political, cultural and economic forces, challenging the established order through urban development. In this scenario the

University and its growth agenda is but one manifestation of broader national trends, exercised within the microcosm of locality working. In this way, by ‘doing community safety *with* Plymouth University’ arguably the corporatism involved between partners merely serves to confirm and legitimise the process taking place.

6 Chapter Six: Fort Matthews

6.1 Introduction

According to Plymouth City Council's (PCC) strategic needs assessment of 2011 Fort Matthews, with a population of 10,476 is the second most deprived locality in the City. The overall percentage claiming benefits was 31.5 with 8.1 percent claiming jobseekers allowance. The crime rate per thousand head of population was 260.5 and the anti-social behaviour rate 105.9. The rate of Children classified as in need was 1622.2 per ten thousand head of population and the percentage of students getting five GCSE's A*- C, including English and Maths was 45.5. Life expectancy in the locality was 77.5 years and the rate for emergency hospital admissions per ten thousand head of population was 996.8. The all age, all-cause, mortality rate per ten thousand head of population was 56.7 and the number of people in receipt of care packages aged eighteen or over was 318.7, again per ten thousand head of population. The rate of people with dementia and those aged eighteen to sixty-four with a learning disability per ten thousand head of population was 14.8 and 58.4 respectively. Housing in Fort Matthews was close to Plymouth's overall average percentages with 34.6 private sector housing stock classified as 'non decent' homes and 13.7 identified as being 'not in a reasonable state of repair'.

However, alongside these descriptive statistics there needs to be the qualitative narrative of the locality. Fort Matthews, running from the west of Plymouth City Centre to the ferry port is a historic part of the City with the locality being one of the original constituent three towns that were combined to form Plymouth. The area is arguably mixed use incorporating both residential and business interests including office space, gyms, off-licences, used furniture shops and discount supermarkets such as Lidl and Aldi. Further to this there are a number of Schools, Churches, charitable organisations, a barracks where armed forces personnel are

stationed plus in the marina, a business which builds luxury yachts. These Yachts are not the only testament to wealth to be found in Fort Matthews as the locality includes two gated communities with attendant up-market bistros and bars. However, alongside the affluence of the 'new' Fort Matthews' there exists considerable poverty, as demonstrated by its position as the second most deprived locality in the City. The 'old' Fort Matthews is characterised by its traditional uses; as the centre for the City's main Night Time Economy (NTE) with the associated trades of takeaways, taxi-ranks, strip-clubs and 'massage parlours'. Possibly as a consequence of a combination of these factors of poverty and the NTE the locality has a higher crime and anti-social behaviour rate relative to the City average. In addition to this the area has traditionally been the site of much of the City's prostitution activities. Finally, the area includes an amount of social housing, houses of multiple occupancy (HMOs), hostels and RESTART homes where homeless people and drug and alcohol addicts are housed while seeking to rehabilitate.

All of this serves to create a dynamic context in which those tasked with locality working and producing identifiable community safety gains must work. The obvious dichotomy between the 'old' and 'new' Fort Matthews and their attendant signifiers is interconnected to a diversity of issues and publics. Firstly, there is the distinction between the wealthy and the less affluent, the former represented by the gated communities and the latter contrasted by hostels and HMOs. Additionally, there are the requirements of business either in the form of patrons of the NTE, or developers from elsewhere, who come to the City as investors to redevelop the area. Functionally, the issues involved revolve around the process of establishing, maintaining and exercising the claims of various groups to the locality and perhaps more fundamentally, to the City itself (Lefebvre: 2006, Smith 2009). Thus, how can the claims of RESTART clients and their facilities be reconciled with those who live in gated communities? How may Catholic Churches and Primary Schools survive and assert

themselves in an area known for its historical use as a centre of prostitution? What are the claims of revellers in the NTE to Fort Matthews and do they matter, or appear to matter more than those of Residents?

6.2 Business and urban development

Fort Matthews Councillor/Chair: I have seen it before, these lines of demarcation, you can almost draw a line where the money ends.

Ernest Lea Social Housing (Resident and Attendee at Fort Matthews have your say): "...people are more content in one half of Fort Matthews behind their wall".

Reflections on spatial inequalities in resource allocation and urban renewal.

This section shall examine the impact of business and urban development on the locality of Fort Matthews. As noted above the footprint of 'business' in the locality is wide and covers a diverse range of activities, ranging from the Night Time Economy (NTE), urban redevelopment and gentrification, industry and the illicit activities of prostitution and 'massage parlours'. Attempts to disentangle or otherwise subtract the various strands of 'business' and development in the locality are risk-prone – can one really remove the historic legacy of prostitution from Plymouth's naval heritage and links to the sea? Can the impact of the NTE be subtracted from considerations of Plymouth as a 'garrison town' or its placement near to the City's previous main employer, the dockyard? Therefore this section begins by taking its cue from the City's rebranding exercise 'Destination Plymouth' by examining who is heading there, who is already there, and what that might mean? To this end it is necessary to allow the respondents to describe the locality so that it may be better understood.

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 3: “there are several Fort Matthews in terms of peoples view of neighbourhoods...It encapsulates all aspects of the City I think apart from the northern estates so, very varied economically,. It’s a changing area; the old industries of the Dockyard and Princess Charlotte Yard have changed. Its architecture reflects its garrison past and I think where the gated communities are springing up, I think that if we make people feel welcome and they make us feel welcome in these gated places then the gates and the walls won’t matter in the end I suppose”.

NLO Fort Matthews: “It’s probably the most diverse neighbourhood in the city...we have some of the poorest and the richest people and everyone in between really”

The data above demonstrates the ‘diversity’ of Fort Matthews as a site where community safety is produced. Visible in both extracts is the influence of wealth and deprivation on debates and its importance to the overall dynamic of locality working in Fort Matthews. The issue is the impact that ‘wealth’ or the concentrations of wealth has on community safety in a locality noted for its socio-economic inequalities (PCC: 2011). Notice that the Councillor refers to the gated places of the gated communities in the locality, this theme came up a great deal in the course of the research with other respondents noting its salience. Both respondents also touch on the ‘other’ parts of the locality, ‘everywhere in between really’ and the ‘several Fort Matthews’, raising the question as to the type of Fort Matthews which lies beyond the ‘gates and walls’?

Interview

NLO Fort Matthews: “...the piecemeal regeneration I’m referring to is about physical redevelopment and that tends to be individual developers coming in and they get a site and they develop it. But what goes on around that site doesn’t change”.

In the extract above the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) uses the term ‘piecemeal regeneration’ suggesting that some of the area’s problems have not been arrested by

development but is exacerbated by them. These problems have in turn, been exacerbated by the impact of austerity, with reductions to funding for public services and welfare and benefits.

Field note

Chair/Councillor: One of the problems is that a lot of women living in the area work unsocial hours, particularly shift workers who are returning home from work and because there have been some cutbacks with the buses they are having to walk and they are being crawled by these men.

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 1: "One thing we do have in our ward which I find difficult is a food bank, ...local residents go and they get vouchers from work and pensions and other agencies so, I think that kind of reflects the economic problems that the residents in the parts of the wards out there are suffering with unemployment, with the impact of a recession".

These extracts serve to underline the aspects of poverty within the locality as well as the area's historic legacy of prostitution (Herbert: 1982). In the first section the councillor discusses the impact of cuts to bus services with the attendant effect that women living in the area doing shift-work are jeopardised due to a combination of the locality's reputation for sex workers, changes in working patterns and budget cut-backs to bus services. The quotation by councillor 1 makes more apparent the effect of austerity on sections of his ward with reference to the 'food bank' and the 'parts of the ward suffering with unemployment'. Later the councillor would highlight the differences in the types of issues arising between the affluent parts of his electoral ward in Fort Matthews as opposed to the austerity and deprivation noted above:

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 1: "Obviously you've got the other side of the ward, people living in quite affluent areas, planning seems to, you know they get very excited about planning applications and

how it impacts on their lives, because they find it really difficult that a developer can have an impact that really changes what they're used to, what they want and what they see as their community”.

Here, the emphasis on ‘their community’ serves to emphasise some of the distinctions which redevelopment has brought to the area and the gentrification of certain parts of the locality. The story of urban redevelopment in Fort Matthews is arguably complex and unfinished; nonetheless ‘their community’ is redolent of arguments put forward by Lefebvre (2006) and Smith (2009) concerning the impetus of regeneration to attract middle class homeowners back into the City from the suburbs. The impact of this is reflected in the ability of these individuals to alter discourses on law and order, or to otherwise secure disproportionate resources (Gilling: 2007). The full impact of these middle class publics and the new ‘majorities’ established by urban regeneration shall be discussed later. For now it is useful to discuss the concept of ‘destination Plymouth’ with regard to both the influence of urban redevelopment and, the historic legacy of Fort Matthews housing the City’s main Night Time Economy (NTE). Below, two extracts discuss the incorporation of disparate and dissimilar elements of the NTE within Fort Mathews. In the first, the planned creation of a new club in Fort Matthews overall NTE is discussed, whilst in the second, the debate is framed within the context of developments taking place behind the walls of the Princess Charlotte Yard gated community.

Field notes

Extract 1

Councillor: I want to bring up the proposal that’s been made to open a new club in the area. It’s to be called Odyssey I believe and will be put in where the old Millennium Club was. I know that some of you were not living in the area when the Millennium was in business with all the related Anti-social behaviour problems that it created. I really don’t think it would be a good thing for Fort Matthews

because of the cumulative impact. I really don't think it's a good way for Fort Matthews to move forward in terms of developing the area for the local community.

Resident: What about the Skipper? That's a pub that's open 24hours and it causes all kinds of problems. There have been times when I have had to cross the street to avoid drunken fights around there and once I even had to give someone first aid.

Councillor: I am aware of the issues with drinking in the area. I know that some people will feel that any jobs for the area is a positive and that the planners will say that clubbing has evolved but given the choice I would not want these kinds of developments in a residential area.

Extract 2

Resident: I was just wondering, given our priorities, what about Princess Charlotte Yard? It's a spectacular area but I am worried that it might be over-commercialised and that will bring drunkenness. Already some of the bars there are un-packing or bringing in deliveries in the very early morning. (Note: Princess Charlotte Yard is a Gated Community/Commercial Development).

Chair: When Plymouth Development Corporation took control of Princess Charlotte Yard from the MOD (Ministry of Defence) it was supposed to be used for commercial development of the area. I know a lot of businesses have moved into the area, River Cottage for example. I think that if individual bars are causing a problem if you let us know which ones and we can deal with them and if necessary use licensing laws. I know that Seco lounge brought in new management so I think that most of them are fairly reasonable.

Resident (Princess Charlotte Yard): I understand, I just feel it would be a shame for the commercial aspect to undermine the living standards of the residents.

Whilst both extracts are ostensibly about the NTE and the rights of residents, there exist substantive differences between how the issue is framed in each. In the first extract the debate centres upon the broader impact of the NTE within the locality. Notice how the Councillor refers to some of the potential 'new' publics of regeneration who may be present at the

meeting but arguably were not present for some of Fort Matthews previous history with the NTE 'I know that some of you were not living in the area when the Millennium was in business with all the related Anti-social behaviour problems that it created'. Additionally, the councillor is directly touching upon the anti-social behaviour and crime related aspects of the NTE. Given the data on Fort Matthews crime problems seen earlier (PCC: 2011), the councillor's pursuit of this line of argument seems plausible and reasonable. In addition, the councillor also highlights the salience of the issue of jobs in a locality which has some of the highest percentages of people on jobseekers allowance in the City 'I know that some of you will feel that any jobs for the area is a positive'. However, the ultimate thrust of the councillor's remarks is aimed at resisting the development on the grounds of the legacy of the NTE, its attendant problems, and the correct way to develop the area for the community and for residents. In the second extract the battle once again takes place over aspects of the NTE undermining the quality of life for residents 'I just feel it would be a shame for the commercial aspect to undermine the living standards of residents'. However, the crucial difference is that Princess Charlotte Yard is a gated community/ commercial development and the residents' concerns appear to be based upon preserving their particular piece of that development from the impact of the locality's use as a night-time leisure destination. Whilst the above extract does not reflect 'revanchism' towards individuals outside Princess Charlotte Yard, nonetheless it can be placed with debates held in the area about 'conservation'. These debates which are redolent of attempts to use access to services to sanitise or socially cleanse problematic others (Bauman: 1997).

This issue of 'access' is crucial to understanding some of the issues behind Fort Matthews community safety dynamic. 'Access' within the area is both structural and spatial due to the impact of the locality's relative deprivation (PCC: 2011) and the uneven effects and new 'majorities' (Stoker: 1998) made by urban redevelopment. In the extracts below we can view

some of these issues of access, both in terms of the structural and spatial dimensions which restrict or enable certain populations to visit ‘destination Plymouth’. In the first extract the Councillor discusses the structural limitations impacting upon some of her constituents in the locality. The second extract arises from a *have your say* meeting in the locality where a proposed cycle path was being discussed with regard to the possibility of it linking the locality via access through the Plymlico estate, Fort Matthews second gated community.

Field notes

Extract 1

Fort Matthews Councillor 3: “I think perhaps, in a more sophisticated level I would sum it up as access because some people have better access to educational opportunities. Some people have better access to healthier ways of living so their life expectancy and life chances are better...St Mark’s Primary and Hexagon, a school where on a bad night in clubland we had teachers clearing away condoms and needles away from the playground on a Monday morning...”

Extract 2

TRANSPORT: Well the problem, especially in the case of trying to incorporate the old Naval Hospital would be political not infrastructure. It’s about having the permission and the funding.

Resident: The Plymlico people value their security more than anything else. They might not want a cycle path or a gate in their area.

The first extract reminds us both of the deprivation and inequalities that the area suffers from with regard to life expectancy and life chances. Furthermore, the reference to the Primary School in the area and the ‘bad night in clubland’ reinforces debates about the locality’s overall NTE of ‘commodified excess’ (Winlow, Hall and Ancrum: 2008), impacting upon a residential area which has some of the highest levels of children classified in need in the City (PCC: 2011). Extract two serves to reinforce the uneven ‘piecemeal’ regeneration within the

locality by placing the ‘structural’ issue of inequalities with the spatial dimension of mass-private space (Bottoms and Wiles: 2003). The ‘Plymlico people’ are unlikely to suffer the aftermath of ‘a bad night in clubland’, in a similar way that the people worried about drunkenness and commercialisation in Princess Charlotte Yard are unlikely to feel the effects of the broader dynamic of the NTE outside their walls. The people who use such mass-private space arguably do so in a different manner to those using the public space remaining in the locality, and as such are removed from concerns about access, the problems of prostitution and its cumulative effect with strip-clubs and the NTE to produce ‘gendered space’ (Matthews: 2008) and the risk this poses to women. What this serves to do is to remind us of the problem of identifying and policing ‘community owned space’ (Newman: 1972) where a combination of business interests, either in the form of urban redevelopment, or the continued salience of the NTE have interacted to remove large segments of ‘space’ from the community.

This ‘removal’ of space and the impact of business in the form of ‘Destination Plymouth’ with attempts to generate more investment and to bring more people to the City, create tensions for policing in the locality. In the extracts below the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) is discussing the extra provision of police patrols against sex-workers in the locality during Plymouth’s hosting of the Americas Cup. After this, the issue of anti-social driving in Fort Matthews is raised by the Friends of Dovetail Square with regard to the ‘boy racers’ who use the area.

Field note

NLO: I know that there were additional patrols in place during the Americas Cup. Our contact at the Stonehead docks is currently off sick. I have spoken to P.C. Murray about this issue and what is needed is for more evidence to be gathered. However police resourcing for this might be a problem.

We are trying to look at this problem from the other end with more support for women who want to change from that lifestyle however; it is finding them and identifying them which is the problem.

Resident (Friends of Dovetail Square): I think something really needs to be done about the speeding taking place in Dovetail Square. We are getting boy racers here and I just feel that it's an accident waiting to happen.

Resident: They never enforce the law round here. What about down by Stone Road?

NLO: There is a difficulty in putting a speed trap on Stone Road but I know that the Police do run operations in the area where they check car modifications and insurance. This might partly be because there is a necessity to discipline the drivers before the new marina is built but I am aware that boy racers and anti-social driving going up to Pilgrim Point is an issue.

Interestingly the spatial limitations on access to service appear to be revisited in many of these sections. The inference of the extra patrols mounted during the Americas cup is that there is a requirement to protect the 'brand' of Destination Plymouth and the potential investment generated by the event. This is suggestive of policing as an overall neoliberal policing strategy involving the control of 'problem populations' of the at-risk and the risky (Simon: 2007) in the overall interests of business and enterprise (Waquant: 2010). This idea is arguably reinforced if we examine the extracts concerning the impact of 'boy racers' in the locality. Firstly, it is notable that the 'Friends of Dovetail Square' are those who raise the issue. This community group regularly attended Fort Matthews *have your say* meetings and may be viewed as constituting some of the majorities 'made' (Stoker: 1998) amongst middle class residents by urban gentrification. In a similar way to the police patrols during the Americas cup the suggestion appears to be that the police are acting in the interests of business by 'disciplining drivers before the new Marina is built'. Notice that one of the residents states that 'they never enforce the law around here' the inference being that policing

is enforced to a greater extent in some parts of the locality over others. This theme was often taken up by one of the councillors at the *have your say* meetings:

Field note

Chair: The City Centre seems to be sacrosanct for these sorts of things. They just disperse things from there to Freedom Street. The only exception seems to be the Plymlico gated community which gets protected.

Chair: The City Centre is a Business Improvement District which means that they will pay for extra PCSOs but they don't care if the problem gets moved down to Fort Matthews. Plymouth City Council seem to think that Fort Matthews should get second best service.

Here the Chair expresses the view that the area is given less in terms of resources, particularly policing, 'Plymouth City Council seem to think that Fort Matthews should get second best service'. In the first extract she refers explicitly to the Gated Community of Plymlico 'which gets protected', again suggesting preferential policing for particular developments either in the area, or the City centre which is 'sacrosanct'. The relative sanctity of the City centre and its accompanying main business district, reminds us of debates concerning the displacement of crime and anti-social behaviour from the centre, through a combination of CCTV and dispersal techniques (Coleman and Sim: 1999, Grabosky: 2010). The final issue of importance is the rise of the issue of the Business Improvement District (BID). A BID is given the ability to collect business rates for an area and in return offers improved services and advertising in an effort to create economic growth. Given the historic architecture of much of Fort Matthews and the City's label as 'the City of Discovery' it was perhaps inevitable that sooner or later a BID would 'discover' the area. Below is an extract from the meeting notes where a representative from the Waterfront Partnership, a BID, addresses the *have your say*:

Field note

Waterfront: Thank you. Good evening everybody and thank you for having me here today. I just would like to comment that the previous presentation, about opening up the Waterfront area to more people. This is exactly what we at the Waterfront Partnership are about. In Plymouth we have a wonderful Waterfront but I sometimes don't think we make enough of it. The area we are talking about taking over ranges from the Marine Leisure Park to Princess Charlotte Yard and from the Civic Centre to the Flatlands. What will happen is that there will be a vote by the business owners in the area and if successful the Waterfront Partnership will take control of the management and business strategy for the area. The businesses will then pay a levy to us and with this money we will be able to ring-fence certain higher standards of services for the area. What we are really trying to do is improve the way the area is used and generate investment here. We are looking to create £6.2 million in investment in the area. One way we can do that is to try and improve the signage in the area to attract more visitors and more investment. What we are really looking at is how Plymouth is promoted. We already have some big events like the Armed Forces Day and the Americas Cup come to the city. We want to build on these successes. By 2020 which will be the 400th anniversary of the Mayflower we are hoping to have built links with many cities along the U.S East coast. So we are going to meetings like this to try and get feedback from residents about our ideas for the area.

Chair: Well as a councillor for the area I have some feedback I would like to offer. Whilst in general I find that there is a lot that is positive about these proposals – I do like the protection of services but I do think that you have almost cherry-picked the best bits. You have excluded many of the difficult areas from the proposal like Freedom Street and Harbourside. How can you have a campaign for 'destination Plymouth' which doesn't include Harbourside Bus station?

This section makes apparent the influence of money and development on the potential future community safety of Fort Matthews and the spatial lines of access to this development. The first section by the Waterfront Partnership's representative shows that a BID is a commercial enterprise with the ability to collect business rates and pay for improved or protected

services. The Waterfront's representative describes their attendance at the meeting due to the need to publicise and inform the community about the upcoming vote on whether the BID is accepted. Additionally, the phrase 'hopefully some of you residents will want to act as ambassadors and that you can speak to people on our behalf', suggests the Waterfront representative is attempting to co-op residents to lobby on behalf of the partnership proposal. However, if we examine the rebuttal from the councillor, then the segmented and 'piecemeal' nature of the development on offer is accentuated as 'cherry-picked the best bits'. This selective development is part of the overall narrative of 'destination Plymouth', where access to the 'destination' is determined by affluence and life chances. These 'structural' limitations to access, are recognised by the physical and spatial inequalities in 'lines of demarcation' and the 'walls' of the new gated communities. Finally, it noteworthy that during the course of the research one other set of visitors came to 'Destination Plymouth', although these were almost certainly less welcome than developers or revellers in the locality's NTE. One of Fort Matthews historic buildings, the Palace theatre had previously been a Nightclub 'Funk Academy', the owner of which had been jailed for allegedly allowing drug-dealing to take place on the premises. Upon his release the owner attempted to restore his business but was thwarted by the police and council, leading him to suggest that he may turn the premises into a Mosque.

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 3: "...the EDL are coming to our ward on Saturday, on Freedom Street because of a council decision to not award a licence to Funk Academy and the owner said he's going to turn it into a Mosque in that case".

What this section means is that effectively 'Destination Plymouth' is a conception geared towards 'certain' types of people, presumably those with money to spend in the City as it diversifies away from traditional industries. However, this leaves certain parts of the

population unable to gain access to the ‘destination’ due to the relative deprivation in some parts of the City and particularly in Fort Matthews (PCC: 2011). This serves to make certain parts of the population vulnerable, both to the extremism of the EDL and more generally, to societal pressures and crime. The next section shall examine some of the groups ineligible to reach ‘Destination Plymouth’, and the methods by which partners attempt to create access to services for them.

6.3 Arrested Development: Sex, Drugs and Social Exclusion

Fort Matthews Councillor/Chair: A police car might turn up occasionally but nothing will come of it and hardened street drinkers are adept at hiding the drink on them, knowing that the police are unlikely to search them. We put our names to things like CDRPs but they don't enforce them.

In Fort Matthews, the Chair raises the contentious issue of street drinkers and police enforcement at the *have your say* meeting.

This section shall explore in more detail some of those populations in Fort Matthews excluded from ‘Destination Plymouth’ by concentrating on who the domestic ‘outsiders’ (Becker: 1966) are within the locality. In Fort Matthews these populations chiefly consist of the street drinkers and homeless people living in the area, many of whom have a variety of social needs, alongside these are the sex-workers who have been a historic and ongoing problem for the locality. Furthermore, the discussion of what is accomplished within the context of community safety and its particularisms within Fort Matthews, needs to include the particular context of austerity under which public servants are required to work. This is particularly relevant given the overall high levels of need within the locality (PCC: 2011) and

the absolute reductions in resources for services. When placed alongside the introduction of the 'bedroom tax' during the period covered by the field work, it was clear that many of the partners involved in community safety within the locality, were bracing for the impact of these changes and concerned about what their potential impact on Fort Matthews might be. Therefore, the final issue for discussion here is the impact that some of these structural changes have had on the partners, and their perceptions of potential problems in the future. Underlying all of this is the issue of social exclusion (Levitas: 1998) within the locality, and the various means by which partners attempt to manage the issue and promote access to services. However, we shall begin with the issue of Fort Matthews historic 'label' (Herbert: 1982) as a place for prostitution and the salience of this for discourse on crime and disorder within the locality.

Field note

NLO Fort Matthews: We are trying to get money for a pathways funding scheme. It's called HALO and allows partners to earn links into it. What happens is if people are caught drinking or committing ASB then there are punitive measures but firstly it is about placing people back on the path to treatment. It's going to start with a 2 year pilot which will run in conjunction with dispersal areas in the City Centre and Fort Matthews. There are now also dispersal areas which cover Stankton and Brittlebridge.

NLO: In terms of the issues relating to sex workers in the area, we have several services working on the issues however it is a case of different agencies doing different bits and pieces without an overarching framework. This is now changing because we have started to work with the Eddystone Trust which will be helping us with consultation and mapping the problem to better understand how we can help some of these ladies out of this situation as well as make life better for residents. Additionally, the police have changed their tactics in how they intend to deal with the issue.

Here, the Fort Matthews Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) outlines the approach being adopted towards dealing with some of the long-standing issues of prostitution and street drinking by the 'outsiders' (Becker: 1966). The issue of salience here is the extent to which both operations, and the particular 'pathways' they represent, are multi-agency in nature. In the second extract, this is combined with a move towards a more targeted approach toward policing the issue of sex-workers, involving a mapping of particular areas and an understanding of needs. This issue broadly relates to debates about intelligence-led or 'predictive' policing, focussing on offender, location and related issues of criminogenic salience (Ross and Pease: 2008; Herbert: 1982). This issue of mapping the problem of sex-workers within the locality is important, as it furthers the suggestion that policing of the issue in the locality is attempting to move to a more pro-active, enforcement model (Harfield: 2010) with patrol being used as a means of 'pushing' these women away from the street and into targeted assistance.

Field note

PCSO Fort Matthews: Our team of police officers and PCSOs which have traditionally worked with the working girls of the area have been making efforts to engage with a range of services including health. We have traditionally tried to take a proactive approach and target the curb crawlers and the male customers. In the past we have traditionally issued cautions to the girls but there is perhaps a greater emphasis on enforcement now.

NLO Fort Matthews: There are perhaps between 12 to 15 persistent women who are all on 2-3 street cautions and another who is on a full caution. It's part of a 7 step programme before they end up with an ASBO. After they receive the full number of cautions then the enforcement route is primarily the way that is used however, at each step they are directed to support services. We are hoping to force women to seek support or treatment if that is what is needed however the message now is very much that this is not acceptable and it is a criminal offence.

In this extract, a change of direction towards dealing with the ‘persistent women’ is obvious with the PCSO discussing the move away from targeting the crawlers to centring on the women. This suggests that prior to the change to the emphasis on enforcement, the area where the prostitutes had worked could be described as a ‘space of exclusion’ (Matthews: 2008) whereby sex work was functionally tolerated by authorities. Additionally, we can view this as coinciding with what is termed ‘the urban geographies of adult entertainment’ (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular:2008) whereby the coalescing of the City’s main Night Time Economy, the ‘massage parlours’ and strip clubs and urban gentrification combine to create some of the particulars of Fort Matthews community safety paradigm. This, combined with the impact of the Night Time Economy (NTE) creates a locality culture of commodified leisure (Ferrell, Hayward, Young: 2008), which debatably runs a continuum from commercial sexualisation to the illicit and the illegal:

Field note

Councillor/Chair: Also there are other issues which I think link with this. We have just received notification that 2 sex establishments or strip clubs want to set up in the Fort Matthews area and another 1 in the City Centre. Legally they don’t have to consult the residents because they will call it a change of use. I wrote in against it, the area already has lots of these types of places and the proposed area where they want to put them, it’s yards from a Sure Start nursery, a children’s play park, a Catholic Church. There are residential flats and schools in the area.

We might interpret this as what Young (1999) termed the ‘Cannibalism and Bulimia’ of society. This is where societal culture is inclusive but the structural constraints which underpin are exclusionary of the risk posed by particular groups. In this instance the ‘inclusion’ is the culture of sexualisation and leisure within the NTE, manifested in the growth of strip-clubs and massage parlours within the locality. The exclusionary aspect is both the perception of risk posed by the sex workers within the locality and more generally

the 'gendered space' created in the locality by the commodification of female sexuality (Matthews: 2008) and the risk this poses for both the prostitutes and for other women within Fort Matthews. The issue of how 'gendered, commodified space' is policed and the steps made by agencies, particularly the council, to address the issue will be revisited. For now, it is necessary to take this issue of 'spaces of exclusion' (Matthews: 2008) and apply it to another of Fort Matthews socially excluded groups, namely the street-drinkers and those people who are dependent upon the area's hostels and RESTART homes.

Field note

Resident: What about the RESTART houses in Northern Fort Matthews? There are at least 3 houses up there, maybe more. One resident in the area came forward to the Friends of Dovetail Square (local community conservation group) to complain. The Landlords just take the rent and the housing benefit and don't care what else happens.

Resident: We've all seen people drinking in the street.

PCSO Fort Mathews: The highlighted areas around Stone Bay and John House (Note: John House is a homeless hostel) are patrolled areas which are part of primary tasking for the area. My personal view is that often times the problem is just getting moved on to another part of Fort Matthews. I am calling it a problem because, well the street drinkers may not be actually making trouble but some members of the public do find it intimidating. If we see people drinking by a designated public order area then we can confiscate the alcohol and move them on however sometimes they might see us and move or try to hide the alcohol. I think and this is particularly the case with regard to sex workers that we perhaps need to find ways to give them some support rather than use the big stick all the time.

This section demonstrates both the importance of the issue of street-drinkers, sex workers and their status as the outsider (Becker: 1966) within the locality. Additionally, we see the relative importance of the residents group the 'friends of Dovetail Square' on discourses of community safety within the locality 'One resident in the area came forward to the Friends of

Dovetail Square to complain'. This is suggestive of the relative power of particular sectional interest groups to influence discourses on community safety (Gilling: 2007). Notice too, that the police patrol certain parts of the locality disproportionately, with Stone Bay and John House both being part of 'primary tasking' for the area. This suggests that particular parts of Fort Matthews population are disproportionately policed due to the 'risk' (Beck: 1992) they may pose for other residents. Taken together with the influence of the Friends of Dovetail Square, and the belief of the councillor in the first section that certain areas receive more resources, the inference could be that parts of the area receive disproportionate policing, whilst certain populations are disproportionately policed. Simon (2007) refers to this as governing through crime where 'dangerous' populations are 'managed' via the criminal justice system to control the perceived risks they pose for the broader public. This issue of the clash between the social needs of some residents in the locality and perceptions of disorder and risk that accompany such 'risky populations' (Simon: 2007) is discussed below:

Field notes

NLO: The real difficulty in the area is trying to manage both the enforcement aspect and also making sure that people who need it, people who are addicted, and have access to services for treatment. One of the ways that we are trying to deal with this issue is combine treatments for addiction with other treatments and appointments because unfortunately many of the people who have one type of addiction often have many other problems as well which might well impact in terms of ASB and of course their own welfare. So with this in mind we are trying to get funding for a pilot in the area which will allow community psychiatric nurses see patients and then they can be seen for a variety of things, not limited to addiction. This is because whilst in the past we have been able to get people to come for appointments for addiction but it has been more difficult to get people seen about alcohol addiction due to waiting times and obviously if someone is inebriated then they cannot be seen.

Chair: That is positive work however I want to stress that we don't really want a wet-house in the area.

Resident: What's a wet-house?

NLO: Where all the street drinkers are placed together in one building.

Resident: I have to say that none of the services or hostels seem to be dispersed throughout the city.

They just seem to be concentrated here where it's cheap.

In this section the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) outlines an initiative for 'community psychiatric nurses' to be piloted in the area to help address some of the needs of those in with addictions. However, this issue is complicated by the cultural construction of the 'wet-house' in Fort Matthews and its association with an inadequate or absent regulatory regimes and therefore the multipliers of risk (Beck:1992). This is apparent from the Councillor/Chairs statement 'I want to stress that we don't really want a wet-house in the area' and ultimately cannot be subtracted from her previous statements made where she articulated the view that the area got 'second best treatment' or was relatively under-policed compared to the City Centre. This view appears to be supported by the resident who feels that the area receives a disproportionate number of hostels, RESTART homes and addiction services relative to the rest of the City on the basis that 'they just seem to be concentrated here where it's cheap'. It is difficult to know whether this sentiment is a reflection of socially-exclusive concerns based on wanting to limit the access of certain populations to the area (Smith: 1996), or based on the idea of the locality serving as a dumping ground for some of the City's problems. . For now it is necessary to look in greater depth at the means by which some welfare is delivered in Fort Matthews, and the means by which it is sold to the public at these meetings. Noted previously is the construction of a 'wet-house' in the area, however the locality also houses a number of RESTART homes for those attempting desistance. This issue of when is a wet-house not a wet-house meant that at one *have your say* meeting a representative from some of the RESTART homes within the locality attended the meeting to explain to the public the differences.

Field note

Adam (RESTART): Good evening everyone, I am here tonight to try to de-mystify some of the conceptions of what we do. I have had a meeting with people from the Friends of Dovetail Square already and I thought I would come along tonight to speak to more people about what we do.

RESTART homes are housing for recovering addicts. We offer support for people seeking to abstain from alcohol and drugs addiction. We have three projects currently in Fort Matthews; these are in Neptune Street, Dovetail Square and a third which is where we are renovating the old Prince Frederick Pub. I am aware of the concerns that some of you may have about the number of projects in one area. I think it is important to note that we don't take any offence from offenders. Does anyone have any questions about what we do?

Resident: Yes, I do. I understand that if people are becoming clean then they need a decent place to do it but I have to ask, what happens if they go backwards?

Adam (RESTART): We have a two-strike policy for any misdemeanours or actions. As I said I am aware of people's concerns about people coming in from outside the area with problems however, most of the people we are dealing with are single people, not families and they tend to be local to the area. Our clients are here for 18 Months on the programme and then they move on to housing elsewhere. We have a good structured programme with decent success rates. I am not aware of any ASB issues which are taking place. I originally had the idea to set up the RESTART homes in the area from my own personal experience of overcoming my own addictions. I am also a local resident and I grew up in the area so I know Fort Matthews.

Interestingly 'Adam' from RESTART has already been in contact with the residents group the 'Friends of Dovetail Square', an indication as to the potential influence that such a community group may have on community safety discourses in the locality (Clarke et al :2007, Barnes and Prior:2009). Moreover, 'Adam' also discusses the issue of RESTART using the language of actuarial risk management and regulatory regimes which is familiar to the risk-needs paradigm of rehabilitation and recidivism (Garland: 2001). This is apparent

from the speed with which he reassures the have your say attendees about the type of offenders who might be present 'we don't take any offence 1 offenders'. There is also a move to increase awareness about the 'regulatory regime' in existence, if individuals do 'go backwards' with the two-strike policy highlighted. Additionally, 'Adam' places the issue of RESTART and its clients within the overall context of him and his own 'clients', 'belonging' to the area. This is apparent from his discussion of how his 'clients' 'tend to be local to the area' and 'Adam's' own discussion of his past addictions, his residency in the area and his growing up in the area. This could be interpreted as an attempt to support the competing 'claims' of RESTART and its clients to the City, alongside those of other residents with differing agendas.

However, it was not just the influence of the 'new' majorities made by development (Stoker: 1998) which impacted upon Fort Matthews community safety dynamic. As noted at the beginning of this section, the four year period covered by the research was greatly affected by the reductions in resources arising from austerity measures from central government. Given the overall high levels of need within the locality, and the inequalities caused by 'piecemeal' urban regeneration, some respondents demonstrated concern over the potential implications for the area:

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 2: "when society becomes much more visibly divided and a majority feel disassociated from society and are visibly feeling disadvantaged, the potential for crime increases. Unfortunately that crime tends to happen against people in a similar sort of situation so it's victim against victim, it's disadvantaged person against disadvantaged person....welfare reform is going to be a big hit and that's not just this year but next year the cumulative impact will further distance people from what could be seen as a normal society and we know we have fuel poverty and high levels of food poverty. How are people going to meet those needs? Are we going to see increased

prostitution? I hope not. Are we going to see increased domestic abuse and violence which often happens in financially constrained homes? I hope not. Do we get to the point where we have civil unrest? We avoided the riots last time. I hope we can avoid them in future and actually, what happens when the EDL starts demonstrating on our streets as they're planning to do again this weekend. We have community tensions being exacerbated at times that we don't need".

From the statement above it is clear that the councillor is concerned about the cumulative impact of welfare reform in an area where a high percentage of the population are in receipt of benefits (PCC: 2011). The discussion as to whom the victims may be reminds us of the problematic assumptions behind victimhood where inequalities in resources and access are involved (Mawby and Walklate: 1994, Lea and Young 1984). However, whilst Fort Matthews 'concentration' of deprivation and inequalities is familiar from the descriptive statistics at the start of this chapter, these concerns were often not remarked upon at *have your say* by the public. In the extract below the areas NLO discusses the dichotomy between the community safety requirements arising out of the meetings and the social problems within the locality.

Interview

NLO Fort Matthews: "...I suppose there are two layers of issues really. The things that people most readily tell us are a problem tend to be issues on the street scene. So for instance there's bins and dog mess and parking....a small part of the neighbourhood includes the people who have the highest levels of deprivation in the country, the top 1 per cent in the country and the worst in the City and so people who are financially very much restrained, got education or attainment, very little belief in their ability to get a job and training...there's a lot of drug and alcohol and antisocial behavioural related issues...so there are major social issues in the neighbourhood but when you ask people what is important to them it would be bins and dog mess and parking".

This suggests that much of Fort Matthews community safety discourses, at least those at a public level, are dominated by *have your say* attendees, who are divorced from some of the significant social problems within the locality. This is visible from the divergence between the ‘major social issues’ such as having the some of the ‘highest levels of deprivation in the country’ as opposed to the ‘street scene’ where people discuss ‘bins, dogs mess and parking’. This dichotomy reveals the balancing between the social wants of *have your say* publics and the social needs of other individuals living in the area and is addressed in the following section.

6.4 Community, Priorities and Prioritised Communities

Councillor Fort Matthews 2: “It tends to be people who’ve got a specific beef about a specific thing and they will always have that specific beef about that specific thing.”

Chair: I am afraid they have various ways around these things. They call them strategies, I call them ploys.

Fort Matthews Councillor/Chair on the ‘strategies’ and ‘ploys’ involved in Plymouth City Council’s complaint handling procedures and the ‘normal’ attendees of the have your say meetings.

What all of these themes identified so far have touched upon is the concept of community, and its limitations within the specific context of Fort Matthews. This section shall examine the impact of redevelopment within the locality and on the discourses arising at Fort Matthews *have your say* together with the priorities agreed at the end. As we have seen, the impact of urban redevelopment within the locality has been to engineer ‘new’ publics in favour of particular issues, with one group, the ‘Friends of Dovetail square’ particularly

noticeable for their support of the issue of ‘conservation’. The issue however is, where do these community priorities sit alongside the very real ‘social issues’ and long-standing agency priorities within the locality, especially given the impact of austerity and the tendency for public bureaucracies to reduce their liabilities, or to pursue individual bottom lines (Lipsky: 1980, Gilling: 2007). Finally, what does engagement mean for partners within Fort Matthews community safety discourses, what is the function of *have your say* within this, and is such engagement ultimately another ‘tool’ to legitimise, to responsabilise or act as a facet of New Public Management discourses (Arnstein: 1969, Newman: 2011). With this in mind we will begin by looking at one of the residents groups in the area, namely the ‘Friends of Dovetail Square’, their issue of conservation and the impact it has on the *have your say* meetings themselves:

Field note

Resident (Friends of Dovetail Square): I would like some work done on conservation in the area. Dovetail Square is a conservation area but people keep on putting sky dishes and other things on their buildings and when we try to contact someone about it nothing gets done. It’s a poor area and people they just don’t care. It’s the same with the restart homes that are happening everywhere. I mean what is the point of a conservation area if it’s never going to be enforced?

Here, the ‘Friends of Dovetail Square’, a local community group, articulate their concerns as to the development of the neighbourhood of Dovetail Square and their particular issue of ‘conservation’. In this section the impulse to ‘conserve’ is interlinked by the desire to exclude those whose claims to the area clash with their own (Young: 1999). This is demonstrated by the statement ‘It’s the same with the restart homes that are happening everywhere. I mean what is the point of a conservation area if it’s never going to be enforced?’ Arguably the intention behind the term ‘conservation’ is exclusionary, (Bauman: 1997). However, the issue that needs to be discussed is who are these ‘Friends’ and what do they represent. In the

extracts below a local councillor and resident, discuss this group and their issue of conservation in markedly similar terms:

Interviews

Ernest Lea Social Housing on Fort Matthews have your say: "...because it's a Conservation area and they want the roads done, and they want the bins done. Everything has to be done because it's a Conservation area".

Fort Matthews Councillor 2: 'oh well we're a conservation area so we shouldn't have any UPVC windows and we shouldn't have any HMOs because people like that shouldn't be living in a conservation area and we want the pavements to be better than the pavements are because we've got to have it beautiful because it's a conservation area and why do people leave their bins out' (laughs). ...people who are just so fixated on their little patch that they can't perhaps see other patches. So, you know, and they tend to be the people who will cluster and represent or nominally represent, those that are better off".

Both respondents highlight the special interest of the 'conservation' issue in the area and by implication, its vocal advocates, the Friends of Dovetail Square. There is also perhaps the influence of debates on the 'outsider' (Becker: 1966) within the locality and the 'other' that is the people who live in HMOs (Houses of Multiple Occupancy). This is interesting as this issue has been raised in Youngtown and is debatably linked with perceptions about the 'type of people' living in HMOs, their 'bin etiquette' as a cultural signifier (Giddens: 1991) and more broadly, the risk they may pose in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour. This serves to reiterate the influence of the middle-class owner-occupier and their privileged position in setting the tone for crime and community safety discourses (Newman: 1972, Gilling: 2007). In the extract from the interview below, the same councillor reflects on the ability of particular community groups to receive greater engagement or disproportionate amounts of community safety resources:

Interviews

Fort Matthews Councillor 2: "It's interesting to see that some community groups get a lot more police attendance than others. It tends to be the community groups that shout loud, whose chairs come along to the community meetings who you will discover tend to have more frequent visits from the police"

Ernest Lea Social Housing on Fort Matthews have your say: "...those who shout loudest get more, as is the norm"

The ability of community groups who 'shout loud' to get more is a reflection of the ability of certain groups within the locality to utilise the skills of the 'citizen-consumer (Clarke et al: 2007) in navigating their way around procedures and public bureaucracies. Debatably, such trends serve to accelerate the process of 'piecemeal' reservation within the locality with the 'new' majorities made (Stoker: 1998), attempting to influence public sector workers towards their goals. Whilst these community groups may get more attendance from the police than others, it does not necessarily mean that they receive disproportionate outcomes. However, via their attendance at the *have your say*, such groups may influence the nature of public debates about community safety within the locality, or otherwise utilise meetingcraft (Barnes and Prior: 2009) to ensure that their issues are always part of the agenda. Indeed, one of the most interesting things about this particular community group is its ability to influence the debates about crime and community safety both within *have your say* and outside of it:

Field note

NLO: I know that Friends of Dovetail Square are meeting with Oscar Coston (local MP) who are intending to lobby the planning department in a meeting on the 6th June.

Resident (Friends of Dovetail Square): The event is by invite only, so if any of you are interested in conservation please let me know and I can invite you. We can also put your name down on the civic society website.

Interview

Neighbourhood Warden Fort Matthews: "...Fort Matthews has always been quite formal the meetings there. It's been quite really led by residents wanting that and it can turn out a bit like let's bash the council sort of meetings at times"

These extracts suggest that this particular group is able to 'game the system' (Bailey: 2006) by direct lobbying of political representatives. Access to the lobbying of the political representative Oscar Coston is dependent upon other residents buying in to the Friends of Dovetail Square and their particular issue of conservation. Furthermore, the implication of the quotes by the Neighbourhood Warden is that the residents, are capable of using their superior 'meetingcraft' (Barnes and Prior: 2009) to establish the rules, norms and procedures of the public forum of *have your say* by making the meeting more formal. The impacts of the 'informal' formalness of Fort Matthews *have your say* creates two key issues. Firstly there is the rise of what Loader and Walker (2007) call the false positives of community policing. These are issues which are given particular importance by sectional interests, but are arguably a distortion away from broader public sentiment and community requirements. The second potential issue is the creation of 'false negatives', these are issues which are of salience for community safety dynamics but are not discussed at *have your say*, or even with partners, due to the unlikelihood of certain sections of the community attending such community forums. In the extracts below, one of the area's councillors and a resident, discuss the impact of the issue of conservation and the 'formal' natures of Fort Matthews *have your say* meetings:

Interviews

Ernest Lea Social Housing:(about Fort Matthews have your say meetings) "...for the conservation area it is always the same problem which sometimes actually quells the rest of the meeting".

Fort Matthews Councillor 1: "I think the residents meetings are more what I would say, community-based as opposed to have your say meetings which, if I'm honest, is a large part of articulate, quite

bright people who know how to achieve their aims, know how to put their case...it's always worried me, I go to some of these meetings and ordinary everyday folk can get intimidated at these meetings when they use terminology, local government terminology and sometimes when there is particularly articulate intellectual people at these meetings, I think some members of the community become shy or brow-beaten or find it's intimidating for them to speak".

Above, the impact of the influential groups, providing what might be termed 'middle class priorities' of conservation in Fort Matthews *have your say* is apparent. This is demonstrated by its ability to 'quell the rest of the meeting' and is accentuated by the councillor's suggestion that 'ordinary everyday folk can get intimidated' by those members who know 'local government terminology', or 'know how to put their case'. What is interesting is the extent to which the 'false' positives are felt to contribute directly to the creation of these 'false negatives' by intimidating other people at the meeting. Whilst it is unlikely that the direct intention or 'aim' of such groups is to deliberately do this, nonetheless, in achieving this position, the group is able to dominate discussions on community safety within the meeting and ultimately, set the tone for how future discussion may be done. This creates dilemmas for the partners at *have your say* as to how to create a more inclusive way to manage these issues. This 'gaming the gamers' is demonstrated in an extract from the meeting notes below where the priorities are being finalised at the end of the meeting:

Field note

Councillor/Chair: I think it would be better to make enforcement the issue. That way, like Alice in Wonderland, it can mean anything that we want it to mean.

NLO: Ok, so we have two very broad ones, the enforcement priority which covers a range of things and the conservation priority which does the same. Perhaps for our final priority we could have something more specific?

Resident: The environment.

NLO: What specifically about the environment?

The particular solution applied here is the creation of ‘very broad’ priorities, inclusive of a range of different problems to be addressed. Notice how the NLO attempts to move the priorities towards something ‘more specific’, possibly in an attempt to garner priorities redolent of a ‘quick win’ (Gilling: 2007) which are feasible within the time-frame and resources available. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that the councillor, the Friends of Dovetail Square, or the police interpret the ‘enforcement’ priority in the same way. Another way in which partners might attempt to manage the problem of false positives (Loader and Walker: 2007) arising from the publics at *have your say* meetings is by *have your say* cards which are handed out in the locality. These cards can be filled in by residents with what they think are the area’s most pressing problems so that if the individual cannot attend the *have your say* meeting, their input can be summarised in terms of votes for particular priorities at the meeting’s end. Fort Matthews was the only locality I visited where this approach was in evidence and this was led by the Council through the NLO and Neighbourhood Warden. In bringing these cards and attempting to use democratic pressure, the Council’s representatives are engaged in an attempt to ‘make majorities’ (Stoker: 1998) towards more broadly-based ‘community priorities’ or possibly, toward agency goals (Gilling: 2007). Below is an extract from Fort Matthews meeting notes where *have your say* cards are used in conjunction with the meeting to determine the area’s priorities.

Field note

NLO: Well we do have these have your say cards which we send out into the community. From these we gather people’s concerns, what they want done in their community. Additionally we are going to put a suggestion box in the area where people can put in suggestions for community activities and we are keen to hear about where people think this should be placed. I will now summarise the neighbourhood issues that have been raised by people from the Have your say cards. In Stonehead we

have 13 people listing inconsiderate parking as their chief concern. Around the John House area we 11 people reporting ASB and street drinking as a priority and another 3 by Sidney Street also making ASB a priority. Apart from that we have 7 cards which are about bins, 1 which is about a tree and another which was concerned about a swan from a local pond. Now resources are tight and we can only have 3 priorities so what I need to know from you is what are your priorities? What do you think we should pick to concentrate on?

(At this point there is a show of hands from the people at the meeting)

NLO: Finally, there is some information on sport activities for people in the city as part of a campaign towards better health in the area. Right after a quick tally our 3 priorities with the most votes appear to be dogs mess, particularly around the Hawkins Court area. Our second is Enforcement of Resident parking. Our third is car and motorbikes racing. Other close runs including access and parking by Princess Charlotte Yard and Sex Workers.

(Note: I am a little confused at this point because the previous priorities seemed to be in favour of more action ASB and street drinkers. Is it possible that this tally is exclusively from the people at the meeting?)

Again the Fort Matthews *have your say* attendees appear to have been able to game the system, moving the priority away from anti-social behaviour and street drinking and in favour of the issue of dog mess. However, it is the influence of the ‘systemic power’ (Stoker: 1998) of austerity on the community safety discourses in Fort Matthews is demonstrated by ‘resources are tight’. The issue now is to understand what the impact of austerity has been on engagement and the view that partners take on such engagement more generally. In the extracts below we see the impact of police cuts upon the ability of the service to engage with the public at the *have your say* forum.

Interview

Interviewer: “Have your say replaced the PACT meetings. Did you ever go to any of the PACT meetings?”

NLO Fort Matthews: “Yes, yeah”.

Interviewer: “Did you notice any particular difference between the two?”

NLO Fort Matthews: “Yeah, the police don’t come to these ones”.

Fort Matthews Councillor 2: “...We have seen some changes in policing and the ability of police to always attend the neighbourhood meetings, they will quite often concentrate on existing community groups”.

Such sentiments suggest severe limitations to the level of engagement between the police and the *have your say* forum. The concentration on existing community groups is redolent of the ‘shout loudest’ arguments put forward earlier where property owners and those at less risk from crime, were able to grab disproportionate amounts of police engagement (Gilling: 2007, Newman: 1972). In Fort Matthews the police would turn up to the meetings but generally leave shortly after delivering a ‘crime report’ for the area. It is possible to view this as the tendency of public service professionals to concentrate on particular agency targets (Gilling: 2007) at the expense of broader, but more nebulously defined, ‘community priorities’. This may be due to the belief that certain issues within the locality are not the responsibility of the police (Harfield: 2010) and therefore is the duty of other agencies to address. Alternatively it could be due to the impact of cuts to services, forcing more police from neighbourhood policing onto rotation around the City’s main Night Time Economy. However, the net effect of this visit by the police is to further limit any idea that *have your say* is a participative forum for joint problem-solving of community safety issues in the locality. The police engagement with the forum in Fort Matthews may appear tokenistic but possibly, this is as much a reflection on the forum as it is on any partner:

Interview

Councillor Fort Matthews 2: I think they've been set up as a tokenistic approach to community engagement.

Such tokenism has the potential to make engagement another facet of New Public Management (NPM) discourses, limiting genuine participation (Arnstein: 1969) and effectively making the process of engagement an end in itself. Additionally, there is the potential for some partners to treat the priorities that arise from the public as an exercise in codification, turning broad public concerns into a targets more in keeping with agency tendencies (Lipsky: 1980) which can be assigned a status such as resolved or unresolved:

Interview

Fort Matthews Councillor 3: "...you've got a managerial and systematic and formalised way of doing things which you obviously have to have in these formal organisations but then you've got the randomness out there where things aren't systemised or encapsulated very neatly"

Transport (Plymouth): "...one of the meetings I went to the neighbourhood officer had actually made a chart showing all the actions, all the topics that had been flagged-up over the last twelve months and he had rated them red amber or green depending upon whether they had been resolved completely, partially, or whether they were still ongoing".

However, the issue is that in 'bureaucratising engagement', the potential result may be that people disengage. Furthermore, such systems inherently strengthen the positions of certain parts of public bureaucracies which can successfully avoid public engagement or otherwise direct public and partners to systems designed to reduce input (Lipsky: 1980):

Interviews

NLO Fort Matthews: "... when we put the request through we get an automated saying "we get many requests during the year. All of the reviews are in January and they go on to the list of the following year". But we never get to know if this request made it on to the list or not and whether it's likely to

be on next year's list or not, you never get any feedback...You know, the only other classic things you get an issue around are a waste problem in a back lane and either there's a contaminated bin say that's made a mess everywhere and either you get the cleansing team who will come and clean around it but they can't take the bin away or the refuse guys who say "we can't take that its contaminated"

NLO Fort Matthews: "I think because realistically, there hasn't ever been a genuine buy in by the services to operate, to respond at that level".

In these extracts the NLO is discussing some of their dealings with the council's highways department and others. The relative power of the highways department is also noted in the next chapter concerning Ernest Lea. For now it is necessary to note that the impact of austerity and 'functional engagement' appears to have decisively impacted on certain elements of inter and intra bureaucracy working with certain departments with strategic remits finding their position strengthened. However, this coupled with reductions in resources and the necessity of engagement as part of NPM (Newman: 2011) can create strange outcomes.

Interviews

Neighbourhood Warden: "sometimes I feel it can be a little like making priorities just for the sake of having priorities"

Neighbourhood Warden Fort Matthews: "...we can't go out and do the whole double yellow lines again for the whole of Fort Matthews because we don't have the resources so, it's trying to explain to people that there is a process that goes in and things get prioritised to get redone...it's quite time consuming afterwards because I then have to visit every site and look at every double yellow line and try and figure out which ones are safety issues and should be prioritised".

What is revealing about the quotation from the Neighbourhood warden is the influence of the of absolute reductions in funding to alter working practices for the locality workers, in this

case the neighbourhood warden. Furthermore, there is perhaps postmodernism whereby policing actions and crime reduction outcomes are abstracted from one another (McLaughlin:2007) added to this whereby the public official is aware that there are insufficient resources to ‘do the whole double yellow lines’ for Fort Matthews but perhaps, ‘must’ be seen to be ‘doing something’ about the issue.

6.5 Summary: Castles in the sky and realities on the ground.

Fort Matthews, like Youngtown is a locality which is being greatly affected by socio-economic forces which are creating frictions between the area’s ‘old’ uses and its ‘new’ ones. In Fort Matthews the engine driving these changes has incontrovertibly been the impact of urban redevelopment and gentrification within the locality. This growth has combined with other aspects of the City’s reinvention, particularly with the branding exercise ‘Destination Plymouth’ as the City attempts to diversify its economy, by marketing its waterfront and developing its credentials as a place for tourism and inward investment. This redevelopment has led to the creation of new ‘majorities’ (Stoker: 1998) amongst the urban middle classes within the locality, whose desires for the locality work in tandem with those of the developers attracted to the area. Both of these groups interact to alter the physical landscape of the locality, and the surrounding discourses on crime and community safety within it. This is achieved by both groups creating realities on the ground, or otherwise exerting claims to ownership over the locality. These claims are exerted by developers and business by the ‘removal’ of segments of the locality’s space by the process of urban gentrification and renewal, either in the form of gated communities, or in reducing the amounts of ‘community owned space’ (Newman: 1972) left available to the bulk of the locality’s residents. The actions of the ‘gentrified’ urban middle classes serve to complement this ‘removal’ of space

by the impact of their particular issue of ‘conservation’, and their ability to ‘game the system’ (Bailey: 2006) via influencing discourses on community safety within the locality.

In returning to the subheading at the top of this summary, the ‘castles in the sky’ are metaphors for urban redevelopment in the locality particularly the gated communities and developments within the area. These ‘castles’ remove community ‘space’ from the locality and place it out of reach to certain segments of the population in Fort Matthews. Furthermore, these ‘castles’ exist within part of a larger narrative for ‘Destination Plymouth’, based on the idea of expanding the role for private developers within the locality, rebranding the City and diversifying its range of business activities and industries. The exclusivity of these ‘castles’ is redolent of Bauman’s (1997) ‘dream of purity’ with the fairy-tale narrative of ‘destinations’ in the sky existing beyond the reach of those without the means to access them. Perhaps this leaves the final issue as to the realities on the ground, or conversely, does the ‘dream’ of a destination, serve only to distance further those in society who cannot reach such aspirations? The NLO in the first section suggested that the ‘piecemeal regeneration’ had not changed the locality other than the developments. Whilst many of the severe social problems in Fort Matthews remain, it is possible to consider that the impact of private development on the locality has extended far beyond its actual confines, conceivably this has occurred by influencing policing practice, and potentially encouraging a more exclusive, revanchist attitude (Levitas: 1998, Smith: 2009) attitude, towards those segments of the population, who are unable or deemed too risky (Simon: 2007) to gain entry.

7 Chapter Seven: Ernest Lea

7.1 Introduction

According to Plymouth City Councils Strategic Needs Assessment of 2011, Ernest Lea with a population of 6,035 was Plymouth's fourth most deprived locality. The percentages claiming benefits in the area were 21.9 percent with 6.1 percent claiming jobseekers allowance. The rates of crime and anti-social behaviour per thousand of population were 186.1 and 66.8 respectively. The rate of children 'in need' per ten thousand of population was 1317.4 and 42.4 percent of students got five grades A*-C at GCSE which included Maths and English. Life expectancy in Ernest Lea was 80.5 years with a rate of emergency hospital admissions of 1023.2 per ten thousand of population. The locality's all age, all-cause mortality rate was 57.8 per ten thousand and the rate of people in receipt of care packages per ten thousand in the area was 244.7. The rate of people diagnosed with a learning disability per ten thousand head of population was 60.5 and the rate of dementia per ten thousand head of population was 16.3. In Ernest Lea 44.9 percent of private sector rented accommodation was classified as 'non decent homes' with 20.6 percent 'not in a reasonable state of repair'.

Ernest Lea lies to the east of Plymouth City centre, at its western end it borders the City's main business district and at the other sits a bridge connecting the City to its eastern districts where the main City dump is situated and beyond that, the wealthier suburbs. Due to this, the area has effectively served as a transit route into the City for those from the eastern suburbs making their way into the centre. Recently efforts have been made to reduce congestion and encourage the use of public transport via infrastructure projects and information campaigns run by transport workers at Plymouth City Council. Beyond its use by commuters Ernest Lea is a mixed use neighbourhood, alongside its terraced houses and housing estates sit industrial businesses such as a fish-processing factory, sewage treatment works, Timber Merchants,

scrap metal dealers and various small shops. Visible from the statistics above are trends towards the creation of Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) and other forms of rented accommodation which are impacting on the locality. In a more limited way than Fort Matthews or Youngtown the locality does possess some elements of Night Time Economy (NTE). This takes the form of a Leisure Park including a Cinema, Gym, Bowling Alley, Nightclub and a motel. However, the area is also home to a number of social clubs preferred by some residents instead of chain venues. The area incorporates a large number of the City's parks utilised by local residents and young people, some of which have in the past been affected by crime and anti-social behaviour. Finally, Ernest Lea has lately become home to numbers of migrants from Eastern Europe following the enlargement of the E.U.

Ernest Lea is best described as a 'mixed use' locality where the area and its space are shared between residents, industry and commuters. Whilst both Youngtown and Fort Matthews are also 'mixed use' in the sense that business and development are considerations for the community safety dynamic, with Ernest Lea it is arguably the 'industrial' conception of the locality which assumes the greatest importance, when contextualising the area's safety dynamic. Industry in Ernest Lea presents itself iconographically reflecting both the direct influence of business, including the housing of treatment works and industrial enterprises within the locality as well as the locality's 'industrial community' (Bauman:1997) of long-term residents and generations of families raised in the local area. Many of the issues of Ernest Lea's community safety dynamic revolve around this dual-industrial conceptualisation with certain problems arising from the industrial infrastructure like the Sewage Treatment works, or from traffic congestion caused by the Eastern Corridor Scheme. Furthermore there are problems of social exclusion linked to the locality's relatively deprived nature and low educational achievement (PCC: 2011). These may be referred to as 'industrial strife' and is a reflection of the combination of poverty and its concomitant effects on a community which is

relatively sedentary. The issue for Ernest Lea's community safety therefore is whether the locality has been 'left behind' by urban development or whether its community safety dynamic is a product of dual-industrial considerations.

7.2 Infrastructure and Industry

Chair: We have had someone from transport come here. They came here with statistics showing you the data on the accidents in the area with regard to the one-way system.

Resident: Let him come here and tell us dates and times!

Resident: (angrily) I told him I wanted to see proof of it!

Resident: (angrily) If you don't police restrictions then it's a waste of time pretending to have them!

In Ernest Lea, the *have your say* public use their 'life experience' to dispute the official version of events

This section considers the impact of industrial activity and infrastructure such as road works as they combine to establish Ernest Lea's community safety dynamic. The reason that this issue of industry and infrastructure is emphasised arises from the salience of issues such as the 'smell' from the South West Water (SWW) treatment plant in the area, or other contributing businesses like the fish-processing factory. Moreover, the impact of the Eastern Corridor transport scheme within the locality has been a significant issue at many of the areas *have your say* meetings creating tensions for the residents because of delays and alterations to familiar road-layouts. However, the real reason why this section shall concentrate on the 'industrial' nature of Ernest Lea is due to its ability to help construct the contextual narrative

of the area. Ernest Lea is an 'industrial' and possess corresponding forms of solidarity (Bauman: 1997) with a large proportion of residents who have lived in the area for lengthy periods of time including generations of some families. That said, perhaps it is best to allow the partners to describe the area that they work in:

Interview

PCSO Ernest Lea: "...it's half industry and half residential it has a school that is infant and junior and it has a line of shops, retail shops which are very useful for the community, quite a good little area for that. It has a whole variety of other businesses in it including a very large nightclub and there's quite a lot of pubs and privately owned clubs, so it's a good mixture. It has a couple of big parks..."

These extracts describes the locality with Ernest Lea possessing elements of business, industry and the Night Time Economy (NTE) and reiterates the extent to which residents are not the only people who are part of the locality and that space is shared with business rather than wholly owned by the community. This serves to mentally construct the 'local' as recognised by the partners and the issues they feel are of particular importance. The issue of the parks in Ernest Lea is a matter for attention as this has traditionally been one of the places where anti-social behaviour has occurred within the locality reminding us of the impact of historic labels attached to geographical (Herbert:1982). These themes, of historic problems and the impact of inequalities are developed below:

Field notes

Resident: We have a huge problem with fly-tipping in our lane. Here, my wife has taken photos (shows photos) someone has set fire to it before. It was all up against someone's garage and the garage caught fire.

PCSO: Historically Queens Ground has been used for fly-tipping. What it's about is vigilance. If you see someone fly-tipping take the licence plate number. Or if you notice any patterns then you can always speak to us or phone it in on the 101 number which is anonymous.

Resident: I am worried about the fly-tipping in the area. Some idiot could come along and set it on fire.

Councillor: Also I don't know how this may affect it but the Biffa bins are going to be removed.

Social Housing: Yes, I know that the other day I reported an abandoned fridge. I was also wondering about fly-tipping because there are going to be redevelopment by the G.P's surgery and that's often where a lot of it starts, by building sites and redevelopment.

Resident: I've heard that it's that furniture shop that is particularly responsible for the fly tipping. What they don't want gets put in the back lane. I've had a sofa and all sorts of other things up against my wall. I recognised a door in the rubbish left because it was similar to one that I bought from that shop a few weeks ago.

SWW: We are also trying to increase awareness of our Bog it and Bin It campaign. This is because we have some people emptying rubbish down the drains. If you can believe it we found the contents of a car down one manhole. It's like fly tipping and it is obviously no good for the drains.

Here criminogenic issues such as fly-tipping are linked together with business, urban regeneration and redevelopment to establish the narrative of 'antisocial businesses'.

Interestingly, the alleged culprit is a local business with regard to the door found which is suggestive that the community believe they 'know' who the perpetrators are (Innes and Roberts: 2008). This serves to create a vision of Ernest Lea as a place where the area's 'industrial heritage' suggests that the area is effectively used as an unofficial dumping ground for waste. This 'dumping ground' analogy is useful as it allows us to examine the 'continuum of waste' within the area – the sewage treatment works and the narrow back lanes are

ostensible parts of a broader narrative, where the area is used for the disposal of waste, both legally and illegally. This is further developed by the appearance of a representative from South West Water (SWW) at the *have your say*. Whilst in the previous extract the issue relates to fly-tipping, including the ‘contents of a car’ found ‘down one manhole’, the overarching narrative is that Ernest Lea serves the broader functioning of the City and as such deals with some of the ‘waste’ produced elsewhere, and the broader effects the City’s development. In the extracts below this idea of anti-social waste and the part Ernest Lea plays in the broader functioning of the City centre, is further developed from extracts by the SWW representative who was present at the areas *have your say* :

Field notes

Extract 1

Resident: We did have a lot of trouble with a firm called Interfish.

SWW: The waste from Interfish comes to South West Water as well.

Resident: It was the two smells, waste and... I guess you would call it a fishy smell.

Extract 2

Resident: Why is the smell so bad sometimes but at other times you cannot smell it?

SWW: Its sewage and seawater. We cannot do the works in season. We have to do all the work out off season. And it is going to be more difficult. There is supposed to be something like another 5000 people moving into the area.

What both of these extracts demonstrate is the impact of industrial concerns on shaping some of the locality’s community safety problems. The smell mentioned, coming from either the sewage treatment works or ‘interfish’ is a reminder of how the area is effectively shared between industry and business interests. Moreover, the second extract suggests something

more, with treatment of waste taking place ‘off season’. The logical inference being that treatment works have to take place outside of the peak times when tourists are in the City. This, coupled with the belief that things will be made ‘more difficult’ as five thousand people move into the area suggests that Ernest Lea is effectively servicing the development of Plymouth, creating additional housing and coping with pressures for waste. However, the issue arising here is the extent to which the locality benefits from the City’s development and in what other ways the area services the City’s growth. This issue is particularly relevant if we turn to the next issue for examination, namely the transport infrastructure works done in the locality as part of the Eastern Corridor scheme.

Interviews

Ernest Lea NLO: “Ernest Lea is obviously physically an older part of Plymouth characterised residentially by mostly terraced housing, we have quite a lot of private rented housing. It, there is quite a big impact from the road, highway system particularly from Moor way which effectively turned part of Ernest Lea into a roundabout. So the, the streets are very narrow, there are issues about parking, noise etc. There is also quite a large part of Ernest Lea which is industrial-commercial. There is quite a lot of cheek-by-jowl industry”

Ernest Lea Councillor 1: “I think mainly because we’ve had this huge problem with, we’ve had the Eastern Corridor you know and that’s presented huge amount of work actually because it’s impacted mostly on people in Ernest Lea...So there’s been that and all sorts of other things, transport is a huge problem, the Highways, because you’ve got people who want to park here because you can walk into town, so you’ve got all sorts of systems that have been designed to cope with that, not terribly successfully. Obviously it’s helped but not as much as I would like but obviously you can’t make space where there isn’t any”.

In the quotation by the NLO they reiterate some of the locality’s ‘industrial’ features ‘cheek-by-jowl industry’ and ‘terraced housing’. However, the NLO highlights the salience of

transport issues, particularly parking and more specifically the impact of the infrastructure changes which 'turned part of Ernest Lea into a roundabout'. This theme of the impact of transport and specifically the Eastern Corridor infrastructure works is continued in the other two extracts. The Councillor also talks about the 'huge amount of work done' and its disproportionate impact on people living in Ernest Lea. Of particular note, is the belief that people from elsewhere in the City are using the area for parking 'you've got people who want to park here because you can walk into town', effectively turning the locality into an unofficial park and ride. Furthermore, the councillor highlights the issue of space in the locality 'you can't make space where there isn't any'. This is arguably a reference to urban density but more specifically the difficulty of establishing the parameters of community owned space (Newman: 1972) in an area which is shared with industry.

At this point it is necessary to discuss the impact of Eastern Corridor infrastructure works and the thorny issue of parking within the locality in greater depth. The issue of transport within Ernest Lea is demonstrative of both the specific complaints of residents regarding the changes to road lay-out and more generally highlights the conception of the area as constituting 'industrial communities' (Bauman:1997). Using this conception then we may understand some of the community concerns arising from changes to infrastructure as being rooted more in perceptions of risk (Beck: 1992) engendered via altering the lay-out of the area. Below are some extracts from residents from have your say regarding the changes to the road lay-out in the area:

Field note

Resident: It's people coming up St Stephen's and going back behind the buildings, using the lanes to cut through. A child was nearly knocked down there the other day. One of these days somebody is going to be killed.

At this point it should be noted that this particular resident was often in attendance at the meetings, often complaining about the area being used as a 'cut through' or 'rat-run'. Very often such concerns were accompanied by indications of 'ontological fear' (Garland: 2001). Such feelings of risk and danger were personified firstly, as 'somebody' before gradually becoming 'a child' or a 'pregnant woman'. This resident had lived in the area for forty years and was a regular attendee at the *have your say*. The fact that this particular resident and many others would often use their 'life experience' of having lived in the locality for long periods of time is also potentially relevant. By stipulating the amount of time they have lived in the locality, residents are by default establishing the claims or stakes (Levitas: 1998) that residents possess over transient tenants. Furthermore, by using age as a basis for their 'community credentials' the residents accentuate the 'industrial' (Bauman: 1997) nature of Ernest Lea as a relatively static community, dominated by an established population of residents and their families. These 'credentials' are often used in the course of meetings, particularly when representatives from the highways department are in attendance to use personal experience against officialdom.

Field note

Resident: I have a problem in that nearby there is a NO ENTRY sign but there is no N so it just says O ENTRY.

Resident: Was it always no entry? Why have they made certain parts one way?

Chair: The reason for the change was a history of accidents in the area. We needed it to be safer for the pedestrians and particularly disabled people who lived in the local area.

Resident: I've never heard of any accidents.

Resident: Can I ask, is it legal to have cones to protect your parking space?

PC: No, it's illegal. It's an obstruction.

Resident (who is a bin man): Well in theory bin men have the authority to get the police to have these obstructions removed however, most of the time if you get a policeman to look at it they will say its awkward parking but not an obstruction.

PCSO: Well some of the issues are more complicated than that. The police can move something if it's and obstruction however, we have no power to enforce yellow lines anymore. I understand your frustration but the camera car has spent more time in this patch than any other.

Resident: When is the camera car here? Is it here early?

Above, the public appear to challenge the 'official version' of events. This is obvious from the extract 'I've never heard of any accidents' from one of the residents but is also implied by the question 'when is the camera car here, is it here early?' Residents at the have your say would frequently and vociferously dispute what the partners told them with regard to transport and road-works in the area. Also noteworthy is the 'they' identified by 'why have they made certain parts one-way'. 'They' we may presume, are the professional and technical experts; some represented at *have your say*, others, like the Highways department, occasional visitors to the forum. The suggestion appears to be that 'they' the highways department have altered the road lay-out in the locality, but that nothing is done to enforce restriction on parking and that ultimately the residents have not benefited from the changes. In the extracts below, this theme is taken up by residents again, particularly with regard to the vexed issue of parking.

Field notes

NLO: You said that there were cars parked there for days, how many cars would you say are doing this?

Resident: Five or Ten. I have photographs with the date of them there on. Some of them are there for 3 days or more.

Resident: They should have their deliveries at the back of the shop.

(General discussion about the changes in the area and how they may have made it less easy to have goods delivered at the back of the shop. A Resident mentions something about how someone, possibly a mother might have to walk out into the road. Another one suggests that there will be an accident there at some point. At this stage it's difficult to make out which individual is speaking but a lot of the sentiment is familiar from previous meetings)

Chair: (Raising voice and banging table slightly with a pencil) one at a time please!

Resident: The trouble is Residents Parking doesn't guarantee anyone a parking space any more. On our street it's all flats and bedsits.

To place this extract in context, the resident who had been taking photographs of parked cars was also a store owner in the locality who was irritated at parking by his shop and the problems caused by other stores unloading nearby. In previous meetings he had expressed some sentiments suggesting that the chief beneficiaries of the changed road lay-out had been larger stores, especially given his view that parking restrictions were not being enforced. This is linked with other ontological concerns regarding the changing nature of the area as represented by 'on our street it's all flats and bedsits'. Arguably, the resident is articulating the view of 'residents parking' as being the exclusive domain of 'residents' as property owners, that is, a moral and cultural signifier (Giddens: 1991). The ontological insecurity (Garland: 2001) for the resident arises from the perceived devaluation that they, a home

owner, may feel at not being able to park outside their house, alongside the inconvenience caused.

This leads us to the question as to what precisely is ‘being done’ by agencies, particularly highways, to change behaviour or otherwise alter how the public engage with their transport infrastructure. During time spent in Ernest Lea a representative from the City’s transport team visited the meetings on behalf of a new City initiative called ‘Plymotion’. Below is an extract from the meeting notes where ‘Plymotion’ is described in greater depth:

Field note

TRANSPORT (Plymotion): Hello everyone, I am here to tell you about the transport scheme for Plymouth. Plymouth City Council which is getting this money from Central Government for cycling, walking and bus programmes in the city. One of these is going to be the Plymbridge to Stone House cycle track. What we are doing is just promoting all the public transport options you have on your doorstep. We are really excited about the work we will be doing with the community we will be doing to give the community the information they need about what their transport options in Plymouth really are. Now how we are doing this is basically we are going door-to-door and speaking to people in the local area. If you’re not in, what we do is we leave a little post-card. I have one here (shows postcard) so that if you do want to get in contact with us, you can and you can find us, we will be based out of Samson community centre. This will be going on from July-Sept in Ernest Lea area and we have a few things we can give away like bus ‘taster’ and we have these coasters (gives some of them out). There is also going to be a survey going out to the people in the area which is about travel and general health.

It is possible to view Plymotion as part of a holistic solution to travel, general health and fitness across the localities that directly lead into Plymouth City-centre. Such activities arguably constitute a ‘nudge’ (John et al: 2011) to civic behaviour in favour of public transport or healthier modes of transport such as cycling. Whilst the transport representative

does point out that ‘car-driving itself, we’re not against that’, it is also noticeable that this happens within the context of handing out ‘bus tasters and shortly before telling the attendees of the survey which will be directed to ‘travel and general health’. What is perhaps most interesting about this extract is not what is being said but rather, the context of the meeting itself. As noted, the result of physical engineering is a form of social engineering to daily routines and perceptions of safety within locality boundaries. In attending *have your say*, with their reminiscence of earlier attempts to promote civic-society via deliberative democracy (Habermas: 1986), the issue is one of a ‘deliberative forum’ hosting the different cognitive process, the ‘nudge’ (John et al: 2011). During an interview later the representative from ‘Plymotion’ would expand on the themes of parking and transport within the broader context of City-wide priorities:

Interview

Transport (Plymotion): “...I imagine that it will be parking because that’s an issue for most of the City because as we hope that affluence in the City increases, car ownership increases and road space doesn’t...in densely populated areas and in our more traditional communities where parking wasn’t built in during the planning of the space, that will be an issue for some people”.

Here the representative places this within the overall context of the City’s growth ‘as we hope affluence in the City increases, car ownership increases and road space doesn’t’. This is useful because it leads the representative to discussing the sheer physical limitations on infrastructure work. Moreover, such a sentiment ‘car ownership increases and road space doesn’t’ appears to echo comments made by the councillor earlier ‘you can’t make space where there isn’t any’. This suggests that the overarching City-wide priorities require adjustments in the lifestyle and routine of some of the residents in Plymouth and to responsiblise them for their own health and transport by nudging them towards alternatives to

cars. What this serves to do is to underscore the importance of state-agency actors within the locality's overall community safety paradigm.

7.3 Parks and Recreation: The battles for Ernest Lea

PCSO Ernest Lea: "When I first went down there, there was a huge amount of anti-social behaviour, youth anti-social behaviour, a massive amount of drinking in the parks and on the streets. There were running battles between our neighbourhood and another neighbourhood and the consequence of that was there was also a lot of other crime, the area has improved in the, to quote the community 'oh my god what a different place to live'"

Resident: Can I add that I work at the Sutton Play Project which works with children 6-13. I have some good news to share. The Ernest Lea Development Trust and Plymouth Play have been awarded £306,000 for 3 years in lottery money. Over 100k of that will go to the Ernest Lea. With this we can have services set up in our parks and we can keep our youth groups up and running. Last year we have taken 16 kids camping. They really are good kids. I think that if they grow up like this then Ernest Lea is going to be ok. I have lived in this area a long time, I remember when there were burnt out cars all over Ernest Lea

Crime and Community in Ernest Lea.

The extracts above give a flavour of what doing community safety was historically in Ernest Lea and what it may be evolving into now. As was visible from the statistics at the start of this section Ernest Lea is Plymouth's fourth most deprived locality with the attendant problems in educational attainment, crime and need that accompanies such deprivation.

Nonetheless, there were discernible gains made in crime reduction during the period covered by the research and attempts were made to address the needs of some of the locality's young

people. This section shall examine some of the crime and anti-social behaviour issues within the area and the means by which they were addressed. By understanding the methods used to address crime and anti-social behaviour in Ernest Lea we may begin to identify the types of solutions on offer to partners, namely those chiefly engaged in producing community safety outcomes, and from this, the type of safety governance available. We begin below with an extract taken from the first *have your say* I attended for the locality. The meeting was unusually busy with forty members of the public attending due to a number of crime and anti-social behaviour incidents that had recently occurred in the area.

Field note

PCSO Ernest Lea: Knowing about this meeting in advance I have compiled data on the facts for the area. The police are concerned about some of the houses of multi occupancy in the area. In September we had 30 incidents of ASB logged in the area. In October this was 37. Of these 9 were for youths, 2 were house parties. These were around the Stevedore road area. There have also been incidents of mini motor bikes around Crosspatch Gardens. However, some of these might relate to Halloween especially the incidents of drunken youths. Additionally, there is the potential for incidents from the Marine leisure park. In terms of violence there have been some reports of harassment of the Coop staff and reports of incidents in Stern Park. Violent incidents for the period of September to November includes 5 incidents attached to the Night Time Economy (NTE) This is particularly the area of the Marina and Longtide Road, there was 1 assault which was related to mental health issues. We have had an ABH – this was a man hit approaching motorcycling youths. There was an act of violence on a bus and there have been some incidents involving young people and a street fight. I am aware that more happens than gets reported. I would stress the importance of the 101 number. If it is an emergency then please use 999. With 101, if you don't want to have your name stored, it can be anonymous.

Resident: What about the assault? You mentioned the assault in the park; it was her husband (points at another resident attending) who was assaulted. It was the same people who stole from her (points at another resident). He was peed on as well.

PCSO Ernest Lea: Well I have to be honest; the community just isn't supporting each other against this. It needs to be phoned in. Otherwise there is not enough information for us or evidence for the CPS to prosecute.

Resident 2: Nothing gets done; they are youths, about 17 years old.

Noticeable here is the extent of 'youth' involvement in the causes of crime and anti-social behaviour within the locality. This is apparent from the PCSO's data regarding the '9 incidents' of the 37 recorded for October which related directly to youths. Arguably the incidents relating to 'mini-motorbikes' and 'house parties' during Halloween may well be youth-related as is evidenced by the statements 'Nothing gets done; they are youths, about 17 years old'. Interestingly, the PCSO tells the community that it is not 'supporting each other' which is said within the overall context of the PCSO having previously discussed the ways in which members of the public can report crime using the 101 number and of the need to gather evidence to prosecute. This issue of the community providing intelligence (Innes and Roberts: 2008) is an important one for the area and is closely related to the way policing is done in Ernest Lea, which is revisited later. The violent assault in the park serves to reinforce the difficulty faced by partners in establishing and maintaining communal spaces (Newman: 1972) within the locality's public areas. This issue is further developed in the extract below where the issue of youth drinking in public spaces is again raised by residents:

Field note

Resident: (Directed to the PCSO) you said you were happy for them to be drinking in the park.

PCSO Ernest Lea: No. I said that once 18 they cannot be stopped from drinking in Stern Park because there is no alcohol banning order for that area.

Here, the practical problems of attempting to police the issue of youth and what might be termed 'generational-space' are discussed within the locality. The issue is the legal power of PCSOs to enforce or control the actions of Ernest Lea's young people is complicated by the absence of an alcohol banning order for Stern Park. However, the other issue for policing public order and the issue of young people within the locality lies with the architectural physicality of space within Ernest Lea:

Interview

PCSO Ernest Lea "we're always going to have neighbourhood disputes in the area because as I said, we've got a lot of extended families, there's a lot of deep, deep history there...There might be issues regarding street dealing of drugs because of the area we work in, the sheer physics of the place with all the back lanes makes it easy to get away and it's part of the town so it's accessible".

This quotation is useful as it reminds us both of the problems of the physical structure of the area within effective crime control and prevention methods. This is apparent from the PCSO's discussion of the 'sheer physics of the place' making enforcement against drug dealing difficult. Furthermore, some of the long-standing problems of the area are highlighted 'we're always going to have neighbourhood disputes'; this is interesting as previously the PCSO discussed the 'running battles' between neighbourhoods. The potential inference of this statement is that there are certain families within the locality who are 'known' to the police and contribute disproportionately to some of the crime and anti-social behaviour in the locality. Similar findings were concluded by Walklate and Evans (1999) in their study of Oldtown in Salford, where particular criminal families exercised a degree of influence over their local communities. This idea of 'problem families' within the area and

their familiarity to the local community is developed in greater depth below with regard to the issue of young people:

Field note

YW (Youth Worker): Thank you; well recently we have been seeing the usual group of people.

However it has been dark weather so they have been in doors recently.

Resident: Usual baboon troupe.

PCSO Ernest Lea: Some of them have been placed under curfew. On one case we are working towards getting an ASBO. In all the cases we are also trying to work with the parents.

Chair: Watch the back lanes, because in summer they use them as escape routes, they use them to take things from the parks and to vandalise things.

PCSO Ernest Lea: Yes, they do tend to use the back lanes, there are many in the area and unfortunately they run through them trying to avoid us.

Resident: No, I don't agree. It's in the front lanes I see them. They tip over the bins and I saw one of them peeing.

PCSO Ernest Lea: I think I know who that is.

PC: Our main focus is on the Silverback Estate as that's where a lot of the trouble generally is.

Here we view the impact of Ernest Lea's layout on the co-construction of offender opportunity within the locality. The narrow back lanes and other 'escape routes' within the locality combines to create avenues of access and retreat for youth anti-social behaviour. Additionally, the 'Silverback Estate' is identified as a particular area where 'trouble' occurs. This might be due to what the PCSO earlier identified as some of the 'deep history' between families living in the area. More generally, it reminds us of the arguments put forward concerning police concentration on 'areas' as being perceived as inherently risky and

criminogenic (Herbert: 1982, Gilling: 2010). What is particularly interesting, is the implication that the offenders were 'known' to the community, as recognised by the statements 'usual baboon troupe' by the resident, and 'I think I know who that is' by the PCSO. This is redolent of criminological arguments whereby the offender and the victim are often from within the same community (Lea and Young: 1984, Gilling: 2010b). This issue of the 'known offenders' living within the locality, and the problems they create for others in the community is particularly salient when combined with the problematic issue of space represented by the localities parks and the issue of dogs mess:

Field note

Resident: There is a lot of dogs mess in Stern Park; I found a lot of dogs mess in the play area.

Resident: Yeah, I saw a staffie there, the owner didn't have it on a lead and it was going round doing its business everywhere.

Resident: It's not the responsible owners.

PCSO Ernest Lea: Dog wardens can request that a dog walker put his dog on a lead if they are there. However, there is only one full time and one part time for the entire city. Two years ago this was a real problem in the area.

Resident: Apart from the fact that it's disgusting it's worrying for the health of the children.

PCSO Ernest Lea: If you see people doing it...

Resident (interrupting): If you say something to them you just get a mouthful of abuse from some eighteen year old tattooed idiot.

Resident (nodding): We know the ones.

The extract above highlights the extent to which the offenders in Ernest Lea are from within the area and are 'known' to the community, either in terms of knowing specific individuals or

alternatively, the construction of a 'type' of offender. What is particularly useful about the construction of this 'type' is the extent to which 'youth' is involved in the construction of the 'other' as viewed by 'you just get a mouthful of abuse from some eighteen year old tattooed idiot'. This is reminiscent of arguments put forward by Hughes, Maher and Lawson (2011), whereby the articulation of the concept of 'status dogs' is connected with the creation of a 'criminalised' other, often a young dog owner. This leads to the presumption that particular 'breeds' of dog have particular 'breeds' of owner, who are younger, more aggressive and less responsible when looking after their dogs. Once again, this issue has taken place within the overall context of Ernest Lea's public Parks, creating tensions as young people, young dog-owners and other residents each exercise their competing claims to the area's space (Newman: 1972). The issue that arises is the extent to which 'dogs mess' is interpreted by Ernest Lea's *have your say* public as a signal of potential criminality, and the risk posed in the parks by the young people who use them. This issue of the potential links between the parks, the 'wrong' types of people who use them, and potential criminality is further strengthened if we examine the issue of drug use within the area.

Field note

Resident (hand up): Yeah I was just wondering, I found some needles the other day and I was wondering who to phone? Is that the council or is that you?

PCSO Ernest Lea: Weekdays I believe it's the council but I would need to check. You phone them up and they will be there right away with boxes to take them away. It's a parks priority.

PCSO Ernest Lea: We have people knocking on doors on Dolphin Road, dropping leaflets about car crime. We have this on the Radford estate too. I have told you about what is being done about drugs in the area although last time it was only a priority for four people at the meeting. We are trying to do what we can about the 'drug type' people that some are reporting on Silverback Park at 11pm at night and also at Tintagel terrace.

Here needles arguably constitute a signal crime (Innes: 2004) reminding residents of the contentious nature of public space within Ernest Lea. This is reinforced by the establishment of the ‘outsider’ (Becker: 1966), ‘drug type’ people who share the same space but not the same norms and morality (Ferrell, Hayward, Young: 2008). This issue of ‘outsiders’ has added relevance for Ernest Lea, given the ‘industrial’ constitution of the community and the attendant dangers this poses for exclusion and marginalisation based on race and ethnicity (Bauman: 1997.). Given the data about the EDL march through Plymouth mentioned in the Fort Matthews, it is worth reiterating the ‘fragility’ of community safety gains within the localities, and the cohesiveness of some of Plymouth’s communities, especially directed to criminalised others. In the extracts below, one resident appears to make assumptions of criminality by Eastern Europeans within the locality, newly arrived since the enlargement of the European Union.

Field note

Chair: I just have to inform you that we have heard of a woman going through the bins looking for I.D. to use for identity theft.

Resident: Yeah, I have heard of thefts from charity. Those bags you leave for charity, well there is a gang of Eastern Europeans going round with this van taking them.

PCSO Ernest Lea: Well there is also a group of Eastern Europeans in the area who do that as a job and we must be careful not to confuse them as they have a legitimate purpose in doing this.

So far, this section has laid out some of the issues with regard to crime reduction and community safety in Ernest Lea. However, the real issue is the way in which those tasked with policing and public order; seek to affect these issues by how they ‘do’ community safety in the area. As noted, one of the recurring issues for Ernest Lea was the necessity that

members of the community came forward and provided intelligence to the police so as to obtain prosecutions. This theme is expanded upon below:

Field note

PCSO Ernest Lea: Hello, yes one of the priorities we agreed from the previous meeting by me and Ross (the NLO) was drug dealing. We had a big job started 2-3 weeks ago in Liverpool which was high yield. Most of our information comes from intelligence from the Residents. We are pushing very hard for more plain clothes units because as you know some of the street dealing is very difficult to catch. What we really need is more intelligence. We need more people coming forward from the community because we need more than one piece of intelligence in order to get a drug warrant. People can use the 101 crime stoppers number or they can come and talk to me. I wasn't able to consult with the crime mapping of the area before one came to the meeting but actually this is not a high crime area. There are some domestics, but most are related to the NTE. The patch is generally quiet at the moment; there are one or two big things which are on-going and being dealt with.

Here the links between the community and the prevention of crime are apparent with the PCSO appealing for people to come forward from the community so that drug warrants could be obtained. Arguably, the large scale policing operation is a manifestation of the move toward a more 'targeted' approach to policing (Flanagan: 2008), concentrating upon high-yield operations designed to disrupt criminal networks on the micro level (Innes and Fielding: 2006). The inclusion of the reference to the 'big job' that related to Liverpool furthers discourses at to the interconnectivity of networks, both legal and illicit, within a globalised and networked world (Castells: 1996). Once again there is an attempt to persuade members of the public to come forward with intelligence for drug warrants. However, what is of greater interest is that the priorities agreed for the area involved the police's representative, the PCSO and the councils, the Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO). Thus the apparent emphasis within the locality constitutes a move toward 'police-led' priorities which have

supplanted possible community's priorities due to the residents at the previous *have your say* not putting any forward. This serves to remind us again of the importance of the state partners, and particularly the police in community safety provision in Ernest Lea. Below, the area's PCSO discusses the type of work that they undertake in the locality:

Interview

PCSO Ernest Lea: "...We deal with low-level crime, we deal with the issues that take police a long time to solve, things that aren't necessarily policing issues but things like neighbourhood disputes, there is a lot of hours of input on behalf of the police. Response officers don't have time for that so they are the kinds of jobs we would take over and would deal with over a period of time, working with multi-agencies. Lots of working with multi-agencies for people with special needs, people with other needs that could be alcohol abuse, drugs abuse. We assist in gathering intel on the patch for further police interaction which could be drugs warrants".

Here we can see the impact of changes to working practices as they affect the role and duties of the PCSO. Arguably, the role of the PCSO has evolved from reassurance to a wide range of activities which may not necessarily constitute reassurance in the strictest sense of the term (Millie and Herrington: 2005). Many facets of what the PCSO now does, including reassurance, 'gathering intel' and 'working with multi-agencies' are debatably more in keeping with the traditional conception of 'community policing' (Skogan: 1994). It should be noted that the PCSO never states they are doing the police's job, more that they are assisting by handling issues that are long-standing or, not directly police related but nonetheless have a quality of life impact. This serves to remind us of what Crawford, Lister, Blackburn and Burnett (2005) arguments concerning the 'auxiliarisation' of public policing and by extension, the auxiliarisation of anti-social behaviour and quality of life issues. This issue of multi-agency work and the combination of the Police and the Council working together to set priorities leads us to a look for the secondary partner in Ernest Lea, namely Plymouth City

Council. Due to the combination of young people and anti-social behaviour as an issue within the locality, youth workers were often in attendance at Ernest Lea's *have your say*. Below are two extracts where we can view the impact of multi-agency approaches towards desistance and social inclusion within the locality:

Field note

YW: Hello, yes thank you, my name is Katy and I am the team leader for the South East Locality. We are located mostly down in Shadymoss. We have 30 or more lovely young people come to our port-a-cabin each week. Some have ADHD and some have had some issues with ASB before in the past. Some of the kids have learning difficulties. What one of the things we do is to get the kids enrolled on courses. We teach them about citizenship and they get an accreditation for it. We do work with them on drug and alcohol abuse and sexual health. We have taken them on some trips and the take up has been wonderful, we have had all the places taken up. We are trying to get a health worker to come and join with our team on a permanent basis. 2 of our kids are now volunteers themselves and they are volunteering down in Grecton Park. What want to know from you all is how we are doing, here is my card (gives out card to attendees) this is so is can get your responses and you can help us identify the children who might need help. If you contact me I will get back to you in 5 working days.

YW: Hello, we are your youth workers. We work in the area on Wednesday and Fridays. We chat to the young people and offer support. We need to speak to Andi (PCSO) about one of youth services, specifically with what we have heard about ASB in the area. We have a specialist service called streetwise which is designed towards ASB reduction. We work with the police and other services to help target those youngsters who might be at risk or need assistance. We have mobile provision 3:30-5:30 and a youth drop in project in Mount Stephen on Thursday.

What is revealing about the first extract is the extent to which a multi-agency response is required when addressing the particular problems that young people in the locality. This is supported by the range of issues that some of the 'lovely young people' face, including ADHD, learning difficulties and a 'low level of knowledge about alcohol abuse and sexual

health'. Indeed, during the course of the research the Youth workers in the locality would 'stretch' the range of young people they dealt with, with some youths younger than teenagers and even some people in their twenties being dealt with. This need creates the corresponding requirement for health workers to be seconded to the team, arguably in a similar fashion to the secondment of community psychiatric nurses in Fort Matthews. This discussion of the needs of the young in the locality is broadly reminiscent of arguments concerning the problem of young people and young offending as being the particular construct of structural issues such as class, culture and deprivation (Gray:1997). The moves to provide education in citizenship provide an indication of the direction which is taken by moves toward social inclusion within the locality (Levitas: 1998) with education serving the dual role of providing qualifications as well as assisting in socialising the individuals (Foucault: 1979). This is more pronounced in the second extract whereby the youth workers create specific provision for anti-social behaviour reduction in the form of the specialist service 'streetwise'.

A common theme in the data presented has been the importance of state partners, particularly the police and the council via youth services, in establishing the parameters of community safety within the locality. The next section shall examine what the implications of the power of these state partners are for participative community safety discussions within the locality. Did the attempts by the police and council agencies, particularly youth services, 'nudge' (John et al: 2011) the public to new civic actions? Did the community come forward and 'support itself' against crime? Alternatively, has the influence of the state partners confirmed the area's dependence on its state partners with little corresponding community actions working in tandem?

7.4 Communication and Control: Who has the last say at *have your say*?

Resident: This is the First Time I've come to one of these meetings, I'm not sure that I'll come again

Chair/Councillor Ernest Lea: Well what would you suggest?

Resident: I want the Council to come here with solutions.

Chair/Councillor Ernest Lea: Sometimes we cannot give you solutions in which case we owe it to you to come here and explain why not.

Resident: Can you get them (the council presumably) to come here with answers?

Chair/Councillor Ernest Lea :(irritably) How will you know the answers before you know the questions?

In Ernest Lea, a citizen-consumer and a deliberative democrat reflect on the *have your say* forum.

This section concerns itself with the purpose of *have your say* as it is recognised by partners within the locality. The intention is to understand what the function of *have your say* is within the overall community safety dynamic by examining who attends, what is achieved, and what the original function of such meetings was construed to be. This cumulatively creates the particularisms of what *have your say* means in Ernest Lea and its perceived function as seen by partners. Furthermore, in understanding what the perceived utility of the *have your say* forum is recognised by partners, together with its perceived weaknesses then we can begin to understand what the limitations are on residents as co-producers of community safety, and the level of participation that the meetings might offer (Arnstein: 1969). Partially this is an issue of how Residents groups and others present at *have your say* act as conduits for particular forms of ‘community knowledge’ regarding their specific neighbourhood (Wilmott: 1987) and as ‘gatekeepers’ to political representatives. Below is an extract from the second *have your say* meeting I attended in the area. After the lengthy and heavily attended first meeting which was concerned with violence and anti-social behaviour in the Parks, this meeting was shorter in length and with fewer people attending.

Field note

Chair: I feel it's a positive development but I want your (the residents) input before I can support it. I think there may be an issue with access, not the proposed development itself. Ruby thinks that because of the access issue it needs to go to the planning committee.

NLO: Ruby?

Chair: Sorry, I thought everyone knew. Ruby has been the Longtide Residents Chair for the past 35 years.

(At the meetings end I speak to the Residents. They are all from Residents associations. I ask about the meetings length which at 45 minutes is shorter than most meetings and significantly shorter than the previous meeting. They say words to the effect of that the residents tell them their concerns and they share them with the councillors. They also believe that the councillors are busy and therefore no more of their time should be taken up than is absolutely necessary).

The importance of the first extract is that it places the issue of Chairs of residents associations in the locality within the overall context of Ernest Lea's 'generational politics'. 'Ruby', having held the post for thirty-five years, is arguably a 'long-service' gatekeeper in the community and as such has privileged access and influence with her councillor, who herself lived in the area for a long period of time. The context of the Universities expansion into the area reinforces arguments put forward in the Youngtown section concerning its aspect as a growth machine. In the second extract, the sentiments expressed, suggest residents associations in the area are capable of acting as a filter for community concerns. The Residents associations appear to act occasionally to assist their representatives by disseminating what they 'need' to know, or otherwise speeding up proceedings within the community forum. This is not the full story of 'doing community safety' in Ernest Lea, and later on the meetings would become more argumentative. This was partially due to the influence of the Eastern Corridor Scheme on Ernest Lea but was also influenced by the

relative decline in attendance by these Chairs of Residents associations. Given their importance, the question is who are these members of Residents associations and, who do the partners *believe* they represent? Below are extracts from the meeting notes and a quotation from the locality's Neighbourhood Liaison Officer and a Social Housing representative for the area. In the extract, the Chair of Bayside Residents Association is discussing taking a proposal for crime prevention community grants to his members for their input:

Field note

Resident: I am the community of Bayside. I am the Bayside Residents group. I am a one man band, most of my members are asleep now but I will take this to them (note: the meeting started at 6:30 and continued for on average about an hour, not entirely sure what to make of the members of Bayside Residents group being asleep at 7:30pm, maybe this is why the Parks were taken over by Young People and Drug dealers in the evening?).

Interviews

Ernest Lea Social Housing (about Ernest Lea have your say meetings): "You have, for want of a better word, the die-hards who will always come, will always bring issues and sometimes will bring umbrage because they don't think that enough stuff is being done".

NLO Ernest Lea: "I think they're people who like to be involved. A few of them are in one way or another involved. A few of them are in a small little resident group or call themselves that, probably not very active. They use the meetings as a way of delivering whatever their own target is so I think it's easy to say well these are a small minority of people who like to come along and have a good moan but they're often, they are often people who are raising issues which I think are representative of that area. If you were to tell me, If you were to go to Gaston (another locality) and ask what the top three issues would be I bet I could line them up with what the residents who come to the meetings would say because it tends people tend to voice common issues even though they're not clearly any particular representation of that community".

Implicit in the first extract is the suggestion that many residents groups in the locality are not particularly active or otherwise involved in their community, “most of my members are asleep”. This reminds us of the relative ‘long-standing’ and demographically aged population of Ernest Lea’s *have your say* which is implicit in the use of the term ‘die-hards’ by the social housing representative. The NLO suggests that whilst the attendees of the meetings are not necessarily ‘representative’ or ‘active’ that the issues they bring may be typical or common to that community. This point is interesting as it allows us to conceive as to both of the ‘problems’ faced by communities in common, namely in terms of being felt and experienced by the community at large and therefore arguably, the ontological insecurity (Garland: 2001) apparent in some, may be ‘common’ as well:

Field note

Councillor/Chair: (exasperated) how do you resolve parking in this city? Or in this area where you have split homes with people living over several floors and they all want a parking permit.

Resident: Who allowed the houses to be turned into flats?

Councillor/Chair: (very exasperated) it’s legislation! You cannot stop a development just because you don’t like it. It has to meet a very specific set of conditions for you to reject it.

In the above extract, the councillor is left with the task of trying to ‘manage’ the dissent (Harfield: 2010) in the community forum. However, whilst the concern may centre upon parking the real thrust is aimed at the changes to owner-occupier dwellings within the locality. Arguably there is an element of suspicion of the ‘types’ of people who may live in flats, redolent of the ‘othering’ that the Youngtown publics directed towards those who live in HMOs (Ferrell, Hayward and Young: 2008). Furthermore, this connection between the ‘threats’ posed to the established ‘homeowners’ by the undermining of their claims to the area via the cultural signifier of ‘residents parking is a reminder of the broader social and

structural changes impacting upon Plymouth. This suggests that the ‘industrial community’ (Bauman: 1997) of Ernest Lea is to an extent becoming ‘frayed’ at the edges as the locality is more directly impacted upon by changes and urban development’s occurring elsewhere in the City:

Interview

Transport (Plymotion): “...as part of Plymotion we use a tool called Mosaic which is a social demographic modelling tool so we understand the communities we are working in before we go and engage and we do that because different groups respond differently to press releases, radio adverts and social media so it’s finding the best way to communicate with those groups. So because of that we have quite a lot of knowledge about the communities that we engage with which may not necessarily be apparent from say the neighbourhood meetings. So Ernest Lea...within that (area) there are two core groups, there are the terrace housing groups which are quite densely occupied and then there’s also quite a high student population in that area because it’s starting to touch onto Greenacre for example, which is increasingly within the commuter area for the University”

There are several key issues noticeable from the quotation above. Firstly there is the impact of the University as ‘growth machine’ within the City of Plymouth. This was most directly felt within the Youngtown locality but appears to be spreading to the ‘commuter area’ of the University, including sections of Ernest Lea. Perhaps more interesting is the discussion on the methods by which ‘Plymotion’ identifies differing communities and with it the means to engage with these groups. This issue of engagement is important as it leads us to an analysis of how the various state partners work together, or seek to include the community in crime co-governance and the limitations placed upon this. As noted earlier, many of the residents attending the Ernest Lea *have your say* were demographically older. In the extracts below a housing officer and the representative from Plymotion discuss some of the problems with getting a greater range of people to attend *have your say*:

Interviews

Ernest Lea Social Housing: "The meetings are not widely advertised. I don't think. They say they put the posters up. You may glimpse a poster. The youngsters aren't interested because there is nothing on there, in the first step that interests them. They're not worried about traffic, they're not worried about water works, they're not worried about car parking".

Transport (Plymotion): "...that can be a challenge, awareness of the meetings. Perhaps if they are advertised on community notice boards, but then the people who saw them would mostly be the kind of people who check community notice boards".

The housing representative concentrates on the issue of the relative lack of engagement from young people within the locality with the forum. Whilst it is perhaps not surprising that young people do not attend *have your say*, the issue is salient given the generational aspect of the locality with extended families living in the locality. This is arguably accentuated by the issues of young people and anti-social behaviour in the parks noted earlier which requires youth workers to attend the meetings and be active in the locality. However both quotations also discuss the importance of advertising with the possible suggestion that in using traditional forms of media, the tendency was that 'traditional' people who used those forms of media would be aware and consequently attend. This suggests that the *have your say* meetings in the locality are functionally used by certain segments of the population and potentially may be viewed as 'belonging' to particular agencies involved in the area:

Interviews

PCSO Ernest Lea: "... all of our have your say priorities for nearly the last two years have been council related, it doesn't reduce crime at all".

PCSO Ernest Lea: "We have to have the meetings...it's the new way of the Council having their quarterly meetings".

Visible here is a division between what is, and what is not considered ‘police business’ or, which issues fall under the categorisation of police ‘property’ (Reiner:2000 cited in Johnston 2003). This is apparent from the statement ‘most of the problems over the past two-years have been council related’. The PCSO clearly does not feel that *have your say* meetings contribute towards active crime prevention or reduction, a common theme across the localities studied. This particular PCSO would later discuss actions they undertook to directly engage with the public including street-surveys as well as their interactions whilst on patrol. Furthermore, the issue of ‘who’ the meetings are for, is indirectly raised with the respondent identifying *have your say* as belonging to the council, ‘it’s the new way of the Council having their quarterly meetings’. The emphasis on the word ‘their’ should be noted as it reiterates the position of the PCSO that such meetings are not police-related, nor indeed representative in a way as to constitute ‘community meetings’. Whilst this does not necessarily suggest that agencies are pursuing their own priorities ahead of ‘community’ goals of partnership targets (Gilling: 2007), nonetheless the suggestion is that certain partners perceive *have your say* as existing for the purposes of other agencies. To understand this ‘silo-effect’ on public engagement, it is first necessary to understand the origins of *have your say*:

Interview

Ernest Lea NLO: “...the meetings originated from a survey early on, a place survey which showed that Plymouth compared with other councils in its family group, local authorities came off pretty badly in terms of listening and kind of delivering on promises and engaging”

This section demonstrates the impact of managerialist approaches to participation where public engagement arguably constitutes a new form of target to be achieved (Newman: 2011). What is interesting is how New Public Management (NPM) discourses have influenced the direction of the public-participative side of ‘doing’ community safety (Stoker: 2004). Such bureaucratic engagement may serve to limit public engagement by accentuating the

managerial elements within the partnership. In the earlier extract where the Councillor discussed the issue of rented accommodation and parking rights with the *have your say* public for Ernest Lea, it is noteworthy that they discuss the limitations of what is possible, given the legal rights of planning. Later, the Councillor reflected on the restrictions and the difficulties of managing expectations in *have your say*:

Interview

Ernest Lea Councillor 1: "...we are restricted because of the finances. I mean obviously we always get a good proposal about the parking, why don't you do this or why don't you do that and that's not easy because you might think that it's a good idea but you have to listen to what the professionals are saying, is generally quite different and real restrictions why (interrupt as Councillor chases after granddaughter who was present during the interview)

Here the Councillor identifies the 'systemic power' (Stoker: 1998) of austerity as it influences the discourses on community safety within the locality. This reinforces arguments about the 'falseness of choice' where there are inadequate resources to make such choice meaningful (Bailey: 2006). Whilst there are 'real restrictions' as to why this is not feasible, it is interesting for the implication of a 'governmentality' (Gilling: 2010) with a preference for officially sanctioned 'solution-sets' (Judge: 1998). Given the importance of state partners within Ernest Lea's overall community safety dynamic, the importance of such actors lies in their ability to manage discussions on safety and construct the parameters within which community safety discourses exist (Barnes and Prior: 2009). This theme is reinforced in the quotation below:

Interview

Transport (Plymouth): "...I think that often residents will put forward problems that they are experiencing and there will be a group discussion and then it will come back to the official to put

forward the solution because often the solution is an official solution. You know, if your bins aren't being collected, community spirit won't get those bins collected".

In various other extracts, particularly relating to the highways department, the impact of 'the official' was much in evidence. However, this extract, with its emphasis on the limits of 'community spirit' and its inability to achieve certain outcomes leads us to the problem of what *have your say* meetings are for. Was the intention to include the public more in the co-governance of their locality, to improve service delivery, or something else? Arguably part of the intention was to attempt to make the community more involved, so that certain deep-seated problems within the locality could be addressed:

Interview

NLO Ernest Lea: "... In terms of the bigger picture, the bigger issues in the area perhaps worklessness you know, a degree of poverty, housing conditions, educational... There are bigger issues there but people don't talk about health or fitness or things that policy makers want to talk about. Local people don't talk about them, they're in a local meeting so you've got a big difference there with what policy makers want to talk about".

In the interview there is a clear divergence between what *have your say* publics think is important in terms of community safety, and the real issues of poverty, deprivation and education which combine to affect the locality (PCC:2011). This might be partially due to the traditional tendency for people to view their neighbourhood in terms of the 'street scene' of the immediate area around their homes (Wilmott: 1987). However, it could be that 'people don't want to talk about what the policy makers talk about' because neither party is, in reality, engaged in a true discussion with each other (Arnstein: 1969). Ernest Lea is an area which is reliant upon the council and state partners and from this, a certain dependency is engendered. Thus, the officially sanctioned or state-led solutions are the only viable means for development within the locality:

Interview

NLO Ernest Lea: "...well I have been here thirteen years, fourteen years. Initially a lot of the change was public sector driven or funded in one way or another. None of that is around any more so, the changes seem to be led by the University with their own redevelopment, there doesn't seem to be much else. However I think even if there was an upturn in the economy with property taking off again I don't think it would be in Ernest Lea"

However, this state-led development is no longer possible due to economic constraints impacting on the local council. This in turn leads those living within the locality to be dependent upon council-services and correspondingly, the various 'nudges' (John et al: 2011) by which these state partners may attempt to responsabilise individuals more for their own welfare and inclusion (McCulloch:2004).

Interview

Transport (Plymotion): "It's more communication because consultation advises on a scheme for them to chip-in whereas Plymotion is happening".

In the quotation above the Transport representative is referring directly and explicitly to 'Plymotion' and its travel advice and planning assistance work within the locality. However perhaps the issue of 'communicating, not consulting' might also apply to *have your say* within the locality.

Interview

NLO Ernest Lea: I think it's about a community being stable and not being, as I've said before, having access to facilities and not being rocked by particular issues of crime or anti-social behaviour which might characterise certain parts of an inner City...I think that things like parking and frustrations to do with noisy neighbours will be, always going to be there. So I don't think that a public authority can, if we can deliver the best quality public services in that area and we need the early warnings like the neighbourhood meetings, people shouting when things go wrong. Whether

that's a pot-hole or street lightings not working, whether it's a policing issues. When the performance of the primary school starts dropping, these become alarm bells don't they.

The above quotation suggests *have your say* functions as a form of 'therapy' for residents within the localities (Arnstein: 1969). Notice the importance of the term 'stable' and 'not being rocked by crime or anti-social behaviour'. Perhaps the real function of these neighbourhood meetings is in the 'alarm bells' they send and potential early warnings they may provide to public authorities in terms of service delivery, as vocal, established residents and citizen-consumers (Clarke et al: 2007) air their grievances. This issue is perhaps more pressing due to the impact of austerity requiring the adjustment of council priorities and public expectations:

Interview

NLO Ernest Lea: "It doesn't seem now that we're into an era of major change does it? I think we're into an era of small adjustments so we're not going to see any major investment sadly, in housing and the roads have been done to death....I think what's important for the residents is that they have an acceptable living environment, many of them have been living there for a long time, their friends and family are there, it's particularly important that the local primary school for example, achieves so that the local young people have the best opportunities".

7.5 Summary: Kerb your enthusiasm: One-way systems and 'small adjustments'

Ernest Lea is arguably what Bauman (1997) terms an 'industrial community' with a population of long-established residents and equally long-established problems in terms of educational attainment, drug abuse, and crime and anti-social behaviour (PCC:2011). This industrial categorisation is joined by the locality's function as a transport hub, and home to

various elements in the City's infrastructure, combining to create some of the particularisms of Ernest Lea's community safety dynamic. The various one-way systems operating in the locality are demonstrative of its twin 'industrial' functions. The one-way systems of traffic and infrastructure demonstrate the importance of the locality in contributing to the broader functioning of the City and access to the centre of Plymouth. Moreover, the term 'one-way' can be ascribed to the various attempts to 'nudge' (John et al: 2011) the public towards actions more in keeping with civic goals and agency priorities (Lipsky: 1980). It is possible to view the actions of various agencies and partners as constituting attempts to foster greater community resilience, or otherwise responsabilise the residents for their own life chances (McCulloch:2004). This is arguably demonstrated by the influence of Plymotion in the area and its offers of travel planning, and as part of holistic solutions to health and lifestyle in the City. Such attempts at promoting community cohesiveness and stability are also apparent from the community safety work being pursued by the police and youth services in the locality.

What this means is that Ernest Lea's community safety dynamic is relatively settled, with its reliance on state partners effectively serving to reduce the amount of input that service-users may have. Changes to public services in the area are likely to be incremental and proceed in accordance with the priorities, or the demands of local government as to what 'needs' to be done in the locality. Often this appears to be an issue of 'adjustments' within the locality, with the state partners involved in attempts to include citizens to a greater extent to ensure a level of resilience in the area. These 'adjustments' include attempts to get the community to 'support itself' by assisting the police by reporting crime, for young people to 'self-include' by engagement with youth services, or more generally for the area to 'adjust' by accepting proposed traffic changes and making alternative, healthier arrangements. Finally, the community must 'adjust' its expectations as to what it may expect from service providers due

to the impact of cuts to local government and policing budgets and priorities that exist elsewhere.

8 Chapter Eight: Discussion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter shall examine the ways in which community safety is ‘done’ across the three localities examined in the analysis, taking into account both similarities as well as the particularism that gives each its distinctiveness. Each of the themes discussed shall be linked to broader societal changes to place the issues within an overarching narrative. The intention is to explain how the micro level of community safety politics is susceptible to being affected by or orientated around particular local concerns (Hughes and Edwards:2002). These local concerns are subject to broader structural forces and therefore changes on a local level are in turn affected by policies, decisions and ‘non decisions’ (Stoker: 1998), made elsewhere. The first section is titled ‘Business and the City’ and concerns the impact of business networks on the development of community safety within the City Centre. These business networks range from legal businesses to illicit markets such as prostitution and illegal drug dealing. The intention is to demonstrate how networks of capitalism interact with each of the locality’s particularisms, to establish the type of community safety issues arising (Hughes and Edwards: 2002). The differing manifestations of growth and economic development, constitute the broader functioning of the capitalist city and the role of each locality in contributing towards the broader city-wide regime. This section shall establish the ‘type’ of area that each of the localities constitute based on the direction its development, its function within the City, and demonstrate how business networks, legal or illicit contribute to its crime prevention dynamic.

8.2 Business and the City

The rise of the University is for Plymouth and especially for Youngtown, a matter of great importance with potentially wide-ranging implications for shaping the political settlement of crime control in the area and the City. At the first meeting attended, one of the early discussions focussed on boundary changes where the older locality encompassing Youngtown was split to create a new locality which could include the University as a factor. This raises the issue as to what degree the politics of crime control and community safety in Youngtown is dominated by the University? To understand the issues arising when we discuss the importance of the University as co-constructor of Youngtown's community safety narrative, we must revisit the theories of Urban Politics which informed this study. Harding (1998) discusses 'growth machines'; structures of local economic development and urban regeneration constituting a significant part of the normative cognitive architecture for policy makers, practitioners, politicians and publics. However, the University's position is complicated as the 'new communities' of students its growth creates, impinges upon the constituencies of long-term residents. This discussion of the University and its students is shaped by the dichotomy between the 'problem' of students and the 'opportunities' and potential investment that the University creates in its guise as a 'growth machine' (Judge: 1998). This duopoly serves to form the basis for discourses on crime and disorder within the locality. Furthermore, if we view the University as a business, then we can view the attendant problems that its 'growth' creates differently. The University as a major employer within the City and the region exists at the top of its own network of partners and contractors, including its own workforce, security and mass-private property. Additionally, there is an extended chain of 'indirect contractors' integrated into its growth including letting agents, private landlords and bars, hoping to gain from student custom. Using the analogy of the University as a corporation, we may view some of the disorder created by its expansion as the 'by-products' or social waste connected with its extended and outsourced supply-network.

This 'social waste' accompanying urban development is often reflected in the physical waste that animates the *have your say* public of 'long-term residents', and acts as a signifier of identity. Put succinctly "if we want to understand the geography of crime, we have to understand how place over time is part of the practical consciousness of social actors, who engage in behaviour, including actions we define as criminal" (Bottoms and Wiles: 2003: 114). The importance of waste and causal linkages made to it by the 'long-term publics' of *have your say*, is significant insofar as the linkages between the 'signifier of waste' can be viewed through a criminogenic lens. Bluntly, the issue of rubbish in Youngtown is not of importance, the importance derives from associations made by 'long-term' residents as to who is to blame, and to what other problems this may lead. In this way, correct 'bin etiquette' is synonymous with the owner-occupier class of the established residents and the wrongful disposal of waste, with its 'other' (Rose 1999), namely students, and other transient 'new communities' of tenants. To make this point apparent, below I have disentangled the issue on the perceptions of *have your say* publics regarding the issue of waste:

The students and the 'new communities' cause waste. They cause anti-social behaviour through drinking and this creates more waste. They live in noisy halls, or in poorly-insulated and hastily converted Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs), with no place for bin storage or an insufficient number of bins for occupants which causes even more waste. The occupants do not put the correct items in the correct bins and fail to bring their bins back in off the pavement after collection, thus enabling Seagulls to attack the bins and spread their contents across the road. This causes yet more waste. The HMOs they inhabit are owned by irresponsible Landlords, who refuse to take ownership for the waste issue, or otherwise take coercive steps to enforce bin etiquette. These same irresponsible Landlords will, when term finishes and their tenants leave, take waste left in the house by the tenants and leave it in the back lanes, improperly disposed of, which will mean more waste added to the amount

stockpiled. Such waste left in the streets will act as an incentive to crime either by encouraging fly-tipping (more waste) or, in the case of bin placement, enabling thieves' entry to back yards by criminals standing on the bin in the back lanes and climbing over the back walls of properties. Finally, this will ensure that the area does not receive the levels of service required to 'address the problem' as public servants will view such waste accumulation as 'normal for the area' (Gilling: 2010b, Grabosky: 2010, Herbert: 1982) or seek to find ways to avoid a large and costly operation (Lipsky: 1980) to remove the by now putrefying rubbish. Police officers and PCSOs will be unable to reconnoiter the litter-strewn streets which will further encourage crime. The cumulative effect of all this will be the further deterioration of the area, the fraying of social bonds, more crime and anti-social behaviour and more waste.

Cultural Criminologists view crime and disorder as the expression of 'tectonic' collisions of social and economic pressures endemic in contemporary society (Ferrell, Hayward, Young: 2008). Thus far, one 'tectonic' plate offered has been the University, where visible signifiers of physical waste and disorder are viewed as manifestations of the social waste created by the University's growth. The other 'plate' offered is the emergence of a 'binge drinking culture' and the commodification of leisure and identity (Hall, Winlow and Ancrum: 2008). The resultant commodification of lifestyle, as defined by Ferrell, Hayward and Young (2008) is an outcome of governmental policy attempts to regenerate the inner City. The outcome of this has been an increasing number of bars and clubs, compressed into a confined area, with alcohol zoning prohibiting drinking outside of the bars and clubs own premises. This they claim has created a tendency for the Night Time Economy (NTE) to direct marketing strategies toward younger demographics and effectively establishes a 'post-modern alcohol order' 'characterized by a penchant for increased sessional consumption and a desire for liminal experimentation (Ferrell, Hayward and Young: 2008: 105). Symbolically, the NTE of Youngtown directly borders the University's main campus. To the north of the University it

gathers in Youngtown's Plain, swelled by steady custom from locals and the seasonal 'surge' of students before making its way down the Hill and into the City-Centre itself. At intervals along its journey, smaller tributaries run into it, increasing both its size and salience as an issue. It is from this that we begin to see the fault lines in this 'clash' of tectonic plates where the University, as the face of 'growth' runs into what long-term residents might construe as 'consequences'.

Issues regarding bins, HMOs and waste are also familiar in Fort Matthews where the issue of the 'consequences' of the Night Time Economy (NTE) creates similar problems for residents in the area. This is complicated as the use of the locality as a centre of the NTE is joined with Fort Matthews reputation as being the City's main area for prostitution. Arguably, the NTE establishes a cultural continuum within both Fort Matthews and Youngtown, coinciding with the commodified excessive consumption (Winlow, Hall and Ancrum: 2008), combining the legal 'titillation' of alcohol and strip-clubs with adult entertainment in the NTE (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular: 2008). Here, the coalescing of the City's main areas of the NTE, 'massage parlours' and strip clubs, combine to create some of the particulars of both area's community safety paradigms. Many studies have examined the role of the City Centre in the spatial distribution of urban crime (Herbert: 1982, 2010, Bottoms and Wiles 2003). Such studies have generally concluded that the use of the space in the City Centre varies with the young and at risk dominating the use of the NTE at night, an issue of particular salience given the impact of the student demographic in the Youngtown case study. Examining the risks associated with the NTE of Fort Matthews and Youngtown, we may view incidents like the curb crawling of women in Fort Matthews, or sex attacks on young women occurring near the student dominated bars of Rose Hill in Youngtown as manifestations of gendered space in the NTE (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular:2008). In Youngtown this may take the form of particular bars giving cheap drinks or free bottles of wine to women who pole-dance in the

club, attracting custom yet potentially heightening the individual's own risks when leaving the club and walking home. In Fort Matthews, the historic legacy of prostitution, and its relationship to the legal aspects of 'titillation' in the form of strip clubs and massage parlours, creates the potential for victimisation of women living in the locality or using its NTE.

Alongside the impact of the NTE in Fort Matthews, representing the clash of coincident business networks, there is the growth of private development in the area. This is apparent in the rise of gated communities, the importance of residents groups, such as the Friends of Dovetail Square, and the potential impact of the Waterfront Partnership Business Improvement District. The importance of the impact of this urban redevelopment lies in its capacity to establish new 'majorities' (Stoker: 1998) related to the changes in the residency and use of the area. From this we view the importance of the residents group the 'Friends of Dovetail Square' regarding discourses of community safety within the locality. This is indicative of the relative power of particular sectional interest groups, particularly the property owning middle classes of citizen-consumers (Clarke, Newman, Smith, Vidler and Westmarland: 2007), to influence discourses on community safety. The 'Friends of Dovetail Square', whilst ostensibly a community group, are not necessarily 'friends' of the people of Fort Matthews, but are instead 'friends' of a place, their particular neighbourhood of Dovetail Square and the concept of 'conservation' attached to it. Here we can view an element of revanchism to the discourse with those residents who live in the gentrified areas, challenging the 'right' of the 'outsiders' to Fort Matthews in the form of the RESTART homes clients, and other 'undesirables' (Smith: 1996). Moreover, this issue of conservation is redolent of attempts to use access to services to sanitise or otherwise socially cleanse places of problematic others (Bauman: 1997).

From this, the perception exists that certain parts of the locality get greater police resources, either because they are the ones who 'shout loudest', or are otherwise the gated communities

which get greater protection. This idea of disparity in resource allocation and ‘preferential policing’ is a recurring theme for Fort Matthews, and cannot be separated from the impact of the ‘piecemeal regeneration’ in the area, the new ‘majorities made’ (Stoker: 1998) and their respective claims to the City. In contrast to Bauman’s (1997) work on the formation of post-modern identity and the potential to deconstruct the ‘Berlin Walls’ of modernity, the impact on the locality appears to be the reconstruction of physical barriers between communities based along socio-economic lines. The importance of business and redevelopment and the ‘new’ majorities it makes for community safety, is implied by the mounting of policing operations to ‘discipline the drivers before the new marina is built’ and efforts made in patrol against prostitution, during the America’s Cup. Visible here is the conflict between some of Fort Matthews historic activities, in the form of prostitution, with anti-social driving, the NTE and its use by government agencies as a place to locate services including hostels and RESTART homes, in stark contrast with its use by developers and new publics. Discussions concerning the impact of development in the form of ‘growth’ versus the ‘consequences’ of social exclusion and ontological angst (Garland: 2001) are relevant to the discussion of both the ‘new communities’ of students in Youngtown and the ‘new majorities’ (Stoker: 1998) made in Fort Matthews. This is demonstrated by the quotation below:

“The profoundly precarious position of most of those ‘included’ in late modern society in turn spawns anger, vindictiveness and a taste for exclusion. From this precarious social perch, it can all too easily seem that the underclass unfairly live on *our* taxes and commit predatory crime against *us*. It can seem that *we* are afflicted by our own hard work and decency, while *they* are free to hang around and pursue pleasure...the very existence of the excluded, their imagined moral intransigence and unearned indulgence, makes the uncertain circumstances of the included somehow all the more unbearable” (Ferrell, Hayward and Young: 2008: 62)

Set against the ‘new majorities’ and ‘new communities’ prevailing in Fort Matthews and Youngtown is the more ‘industrial’ locality of Ernest Lea. This area is ‘industrial’ both due to the impact of industrial plant and infrastructure in the locality as well as the aspect of generations of extended families living in the area (Bauman:1997). That is not to say that the impact of business networks and development do not affect the area, more that the particularisms are recognised in differing ways (Hughes and Edwards: 2002). Firstly, there is the impact of industry and infrastructure works in the area, directly impacting upon residents in the form of the smells associated with the Fish Processing Plant and the sewage treatment works, or delays and inconvenience caused by the new traffic system. Concerns about traffic are in turn associated with the locality’s misuse as an unofficial parking lot, or the area otherwise becoming a roundabout for City commuters. Here, Ernest Lea exists as a transport and infrastructure zone, feeding the City’s growth by acting as an artery into the City Centre as well as housing treatment plants that manage the City’s waste. However, alongside the legal business of assisting the City’s growth via infrastructure, there exist illicit networks using the area which impact on the locality’s community safety dynamic.

Alongside Ernest Lea’s characterisation as a parking lot is the problem of fly-tipping in the area. This may be linked to the area’s relative lack of surveillance, as opposed to the City Centre (Coleman and Sim: 1999), suggesting that certain crimes are displaced in the locality from elsewhere (Pease, cited by Grabosky: 2010). Often it is presumed that the culprits are builders, businesses, including some from the local area, illegally disposing their waste in the area’s back lanes. The issue of Ernest Lea’s back lanes also raises the problem of the illicit networks of drug dealing that exist within the area. The reference in Ernest Lea’s analysis to the ‘big job’ in countering drugs arriving to the City from Liverpool accentuates the interconnection of networks, both legal and illicit, within a globalised and networked world (Castells:1996). This interconnectivity of networks has accentuated some trends to alter the

area, in the form of increasing numbers of flats and bedsits and the arrival of Eastern Europeans in the locality. These new communities collide with Ernest Lea's 'industrial' (Bauman: 1997) composition to create similar exclusionary impulses directed over the issue of 'residents parking' to the issue of bins occurring in Youngtown and Fort Matthews, that is, as a moral and cultural signifier (Bottoms and Wiles: 2003) of property ownership. The ontological insecurity (Garland: 2001) for the resident arises from the perceived devaluation that they, as home owners, may feel at not being able to park outside their house, alongside the inconvenience caused. This may work in tandem with cultural assumptions as to the type of people who might live in flats and bedsits and their inferred indolence and larceny (Ferrell, Hayward and Young: 2008). This issue may also relate to the area's Eastern European community where 'industrial' communitarian bonds are directed outwards to exclude the 'less white' (Webster: 2008) on imagined associations between 'the foreign' and 'the criminal' (Webster: 2008).

From this we can view the particularisms of the community safety dynamic evolving in each of the separate localities. In Youngtown, the University as 'growth machine' (Judge: 1998) expands its business, attracting thousands of students each year and contributing to the City by providing jobs and investment. This growth creates corresponding pressures for accommodation, creating the need for flats and HMOs, some of which are run by irresponsible landlords, as reflected by the high percentage of housing found 'not in a decent state of repair' (PCC:2011). The increasing number of young and transient populations, coupled with the regeneration of City Centres via commodified leisure (Winlow, Hall and Ancrum: 2008), creates an expansion of the NTE and higher crime rate than the City average (PCC: 2011/12). This is an issue at the beginning of each term, particularly Fresher's Fortnight, when the sudden influx of people into the area is viewed by longer-term residents through an anti-social behaviour lens, via signifiers of waste and rowdiness. These new

populations are in turn, disproportionately at risk from crime, both in the NTE and from theft occurring in rented accommodation, serving to complicate the policing issue.

In Fort Matthews the fault-lines revolve around the impact of the area's regeneration and plans for development, including the new publics created (Stoker: 2008), against the area's historic problems including prostitution, the NTE and its overall high level of need. Fort Matthews is the second most deprived of Plymouth's thirty-nine localities with high levels of need on the Index of Multiple Deprivation. These issues extend to a crime rate nearly two and half times the City's average, as well as high levels of care packages per head of population (PCC:2011). These factors combine with the new publics brought in by urban gentrification, as the middle classes return to the City (Smith: 2009), creating tensions as the area is sanitised or otherwise made safe for business. Added to this are issues concerning the vulnerability of individuals, including the elderly in such a deprived area and the dangers posed by gendered space in the locality, for women generally and for prostitutes in particular (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular: 2008).

For Ernest Lea, the issues also revolve around the locality's high levels of need, being the fourth most deprived in Plymouth, including lower standards in housing and GCSE attainment relative to the City average (PCC:2011). This is joined by its nature as a 'industrial' area (Bauman: 1997), with 'problem estates' and young people, and the impact of drug use, creating problems in an area whose generational aspect renders some of the population as static. The cumulative impact of this is the potential for young people in the area to fail to attain educationally and become 'locked' into an area where drug use occurs and opportunities are few. This reinforces arguments concerning young people and delinquency being a product of class, cultural forces, spaces and contexts (Gray: 1997). The area is also 'industrial' as it services the City by housing, and suffering the impact of, infrastructure works in the form of the sewage treatment works and traffic schemes designed

to improve access to the City Centre for those living in the Eastern Suburbs. This industrial use of the area runs as spectrum with the area unofficially serving as a parking-lot for commuters from the east, as well as an illegal dumping ground for fly-tippers. Finally, the 'moral communitarianism' of the industrial community (Bauman: 1997) may impact on the area's crime prevention discourses by exclusionary sentiment (Levitas: 1998) either toward young people, bed-sit occupiers, Eastern Europeans or others.

These three areas combine to form the functioning of the business-orientated City centre. It is quite possible to imagine scenarios where the impact of events in one area has consequences that impact across either of the other two. For example, the congestion caused by the infrastructure works in Ernest Lea causes a woman from Fort Matthews to miss her bus and have to walk home along Stone Road, where curb crawling occurs. A Landlord from Youngtown getting rid of rubbish taken from converting a property to an HMO drives to Ernest Lea and dumps it in its narrow back lanes. Residents in Youngtown, familiar with Fort Matthews reputation as home of the City's main Night Time Economy and transient populations, become alarmed at the growth of the issue on their doorstep. One interesting episode where this transpired was when the EDL came to the City. The event that brought the group to demonstrate was the proposed change of Fort Matthews historic Palace theatre into a Mosque. However, it is alleged that the EDL within the City had, or were proposing to, take over and run their base of operations from a pub within the Ernest Lea locality.

Here, we can view the emergence of a capitalistic cycle directing certain events in the City via networks, legal and illegal, within the localities, which sometimes come into conflict with one another. In this cycle, Ernest Lea is an industrial zone, functioning to serve the growth of the City by providing access and infrastructure to the City Centre. However, by facilitating this growth the area it finds itself encroached by a tide of change, represented by bed-sits, the arrival of Eastern European workers and the area's sundry other activities variously legal,

illegal and illicit. Fort Matthews and Youngtown by contrast are localities in inverse positions within similar capitalistic cycles. In both areas the issue of bins and waste arises, as well as that of the Night Time Economy. Where they differ is that Fort Matthews, the home of Plymouth's main NTE and rented accommodation, is gradually being gentrified as business invests in the area, initially via gated communities and more recently by the arrival of the Waterfront Partnership. This is joined by the return of the middle classes from the suburbs and other areas of the City (Smith: 1996), creating new majorities, (Stoker: 1998) in favour of actions such as 'conservation' and influencing community safety discourses (Gilling: 2007). Against this, there is what one respondent in Youngtown called, 'the long term people diminishing' in that locality. If the middle classes of property owners are returning to Fort Matthews, in Youngtown their claims are being undercut. Partially, this is due to the University's growth in the area and the corresponding needs this creates for affordable rented accommodation. The young and transient populations in this rented accommodation combine with the urban density and the Night Time Economy to create concomitant pressures regarding waste, crime and anti-social behaviour. These moves have accelerated with the dockyard industries relative decline increasing the importance of the University as growth machine for the City (Harding: 1998) and the NTE's reorientation to fresh demands. Additionally, the impact of the 'bedroom' tax, coupled with Youngtown's stock of HMOs and the University's bid to develop more of its own accommodation, may lead to some of the 'socially cleansed' of Fort Matthews, making their way to the area. This section has identified the 'type' of areas involved in each case study and the impact of various networks of business and development on the creation of their community safety particularisms. The next section will examine the 'type' of regulatory regime operating in each, with regard to who owns and controls 'space' within the area.

8.3 Regulating Space

The differing manifestations of capitalism within each of the localities examined, create the potential for dynamic partnerships between state and non-state actors. Partnership, when invoked for crime prevention strategies is invariably discussed with regard to the ‘hub’ model of policing (Innes: 2005), with the police at the centre due to a combination of visibility and accessibility (Millie and Herrington: 2005). However, the important issue for a hub in determining its direction of movement is a combination of both its spokes and its axle. The argument of this discussion is that within the context of locality working, this ‘axle’ is capitalism, albeit recognised differently in reflection of locality particularisms. Furthermore, we must examine the implications of differing spokes and locality-specific axles for the crime prevention partnership in each of these different areas. This section shall start with the premise that in each locality studied, the ‘axle(s)’ in the community safety paradigm are those bodies with greatest influence over space in the area and its usage. Furthermore, such community safety problems that arise are invariably due to a conflict between differing publics and partners over the use of space and its ability to be ‘community’ owned (Newman: 1972).

Therefore, it is worthwhile examining the physical and architectural contours of Plymouth’s Urban districts in more depth. Symbolically, the signifier of the old order of ‘moral discipline’ (Shearing and Stenning: 2003), in Plymouth City Centre is a bombed out Church, atop a roundabout across from the main City police station. Against this there exist the ‘twin peaks’ of the City Centre’s ‘instrumental order, the mass-private spaces in the University and the Shopping Mall, close to each other and adjacent to the police station. West of the City Centre is Fort Matthews, containing what is still the City’s main NTE and its continuum, ranging from strip clubs to prostitution and the ensuing ‘gendered space’ (Hubbard,

Matthews and Scoular: 2008). However, this is increasingly overshadowed by the 'gated spaces' of urban redevelopment, gentrification and the presence of half the City's building conservation areas within the locality. To the East of the City Centre is Ernest Lea where the clash over space is played out between the legal and illegal use of the 'commons' (Cohen: 1979) in the locality's parks. Additionally, Ernest Lea's 'community owned space' (Newman: 1972) is impacted upon by the locality's role facilitating the City's overall development via its infrastructure, particularly with regard to traffic works providing access to the centre.

One of the biggest stories from Youngtown's *have your say* has been the rise of the University as a partner within the locality's overall crime prevention paradigm. As outlined in the previous section, the University's importance to the co-construction of community safety in Youngtown lies in its position as a growth machine (Harding: 1998). However, the University's expansion in some places collides with other structural forces at work. Each term sees a 'surge' as students move into the locality which increases demand for accommodation. This leads to the attendant growth in HMOs and mass-occupancy dwellings within a densely populated urban area. This interacts with elements of a binge drinking culture and an array of businesses aligned to service it (Ferrell, Hayward, Young: 2008). It may seem the seasonal 'surge' of students, is in turn, allied to a customary 'spike' in crime, creating perceptions amongst some members of the community that the University itself is the culprit for the 'social waste' of its development. However, its formal inclusion within the context of a crime prevention partnership blurs distinctions between the disciplinary and educational aspects of the University. This is exemplified from the use of CCTV on campus, tracking student activities in bars across the road, or formal disciplinary procedures being taken against students living off-campus who 'make their neighbour's lives hell'. This serves to establish a disciplinary matrix beyond the University's main campus (Foucault: 1979).

This in turn creates conflicts between the University's role as a business, its role as a higher education institution, and the welfarist signifiers attached to it.

Applied to the University the implication is that yes, the University is an educational institution but its salience for crime prevention is derived from its position as a business. The importance of the University as a business within the context of a post-industrial urban landscape, the shape and scale of its modern buildings constitute what Gospodini (2006) terms 'Entrepreneurial urban islands' and 'Signifying Epicentres'. These 'islands' have exist as signifiers of the University as a land-owner and contribute to debates about mass-private space and the sphere of influence the University can project beyond its boundaries. The purpose of surveillance in the form of mass-private space is arguably twofold. Firstly, institutions that designate and own space attempt to create enclaves of order within its boundaries with their own norms and procedures delineating ownership and control (Shearing and Stenning: 2003). Furthermore, the concept of mass-private space representing the 'instrumental discipline' of surveillance creates another potential function. Using the analogy of a fortress, the creation of an ordered and protected space was the secondary function of the building. Its primary role lay as a force multiplier for those tasked with disseminating order across a geographical area. In this guise the mass-private space owned by the University and its relationship to the surrounding area, the importance of the 'Signifying Epicenters' and 'Entrepreneurial urban islands' (Gospodini: 2006) is viewed as the ability of the University to utilize this resource for power-projection purposes in the interests of crime prevention strategies.

Additionally, the mass-private space owned by the University for its own 'instrumental discipline creates the issue of the apparent 'visibility' of the actions or consequences of the University's presence within the locality yet the largely 'invisible' or unknown practices by which it governs its own space (Shearing and Stenning: 2003) . This was summed up by a

PCSO who, when asked about the boundary changes to locality working replied that by changing the name of the area to include the University, effectively the opposite was the result as it created the impression that the University was not part of the surrounding area. Whilst one may be aware of the impact of the University's presence within the locality and some of the disorder issues arising, what is less certain is the governance of crime and disorder on campus or the relationship between public policing and the University's own security operations.

This issue of the 'removal' of space by development is one which is also familiar to discussions in Fort Matthews and was demonstrated by the potential problems of attempting to incorporate a cycle path connecting through the Plymlico Gated Community. However, against this is the belief expressed that certain parts of the locality, particularly the gated communities and conservation areas, were given preferential and disproportionate resources from the police in the form of engagement and patrol. The answer to this dichotomy regarding the salience of 'removed' space for Fort Matthews lies in the forces which impacted to 'remove' the space. These forces are what the locality's Neighbourhood Liaison Officer (NLO) referred to as the 'piecemeal regeneration' of the area, and the neoliberal forces underpinning it. The special measures taken to protect areas removed for neo-liberal development in the form of patrols during the America's Cup or other instances of 'preferential policing', and the ability of businesses like the Waterfront Partnership to ring-fence resources combines to remove spaces from the locality's overall community safety paradigm.

This leads to the impact of groups such as the Friends of Dovetail Square, their issue of conservation, and its corresponding links with debates about the relative claims of sectional interest groups to the locality and the City. When respondents discuss the disproportionate influence and levels of engagement enjoyed by particular residents groups, they are referring

to the ability of middle class interests to impact upon discourses of crime prevention (Gilling:2007). This middle class ‘gaming the system’ (Bailey: 2006) is reflected by this particular group’s recourse to the direct lobbying of political representatives, such as local councilors and MPs, as well as their greater understanding of council procedures.

Additionally, these moves towards urban gentrification reflected in this particular Residents group are to an extent mirrored by developments occurring in Fort Matthews *have your say*. In establishing the rules by which the public forum is played, by using and understanding official terminology and procedure, the new publics (Stoker: 1998) serve to alter the dynamics of community safety discourses in the locality. In a similar way to the development of the locality, the emergence of ‘new publics’ at *have your say* and the ‘new’ priorities they bring with them, is both a reflection of, and catalyst toward, the area’s increasing urban gentrification and the ‘new’ majorities that this creates (Stoker: 1998). Potentially, the priorities these individuals bring, in terms of their specific issue of ‘conservation’ are a reflection of the desires of such groups to exclude risky populations from the area (Young: 1999). The combination of middle class meetingcraft, coupled with particular sectional issues, contributes ultimately to generate ‘false positives’ in the non-representative nature of priorities submitted, as well as false negatives in the potential for other residents to disengage from the process as a consequence (Loader and Walker: 2007).

This ability of ‘those who shout loudest to get more’ reminds us of the spatial dynamic involved in the unequal distribution of urban development and community safety resources in the locality. This was summed up by one of the area’s ward Councillors as ‘lines of demarcation’ where ‘you can almost draw a line where the money ends’. Given the influence of debates concerning the ‘claims’ to the City and the revanchist attitudes of certain groups coupled with Bauman’s (1997) own work on the dream of ‘purity’ and the corresponding desire to exclude, perhaps the real issue is, what type of safety and policing exists in the

spaces after ‘the money ends’? In doing this, we must refer to Simon’s ‘Governing through Crime (2007) and the control and management of risky or problematic populations which it addresses. In Fort Matthews the conflict between the revanchist sentiment of urban gentrification clashes with the use of space in the area by the ‘problem’ populations of sex workers, street drinkers and the locality’s housing of facilities to assist them. For these populations, Fort Matthews (NTE) and its cultural continuum poses direct challenges in the form of ‘gendered space’ (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular: 2008) for women, and the temptations of the NTE for those seeking to abstain from alcohol and drug use. However, for property owners and new residents, the risks posed by these populations coincide with the facilities placed in the area to assist them, including RESTART homes in the area. This issue is complicated by the cultural construction of the ‘wet-house’ in Fort Matthews as a place where street drinkers are housed under an inadequate or absent regulatory regime. Here the issue is of spaces ‘removed’ from the discourses of community safety due the risks they pose, both for the populations who use these spaces, and the inability of said population’s uses to be incorporated into discourses of urban gentrification.

In Ernest Lea the criminogenic problems of ‘space’ takes place within the locality’s parks and alleyways where the salience of space lies in the ‘battles’ in the park and the back lanes as escape-routes for young people and drug-dealers. Indeed, one of the chief pre-occupations for the police at the beginning of neighbourhood policing in the area was to take control of the parks and to curtail drug dealing. Here the focus is upon young people within the locality with ‘youth’ in Ernest Lea being largely from the area and their delinquency, a product of locality and its particular problems and spaces (Gray:1997). The issue of youth drinking and anti-social behaviour in public spaces is compounded by drug-dealing in the area and the issue of ‘status dogs’ fouling the parks. This takes place within the overall context of Ernest Lea’s public parks, their legal and non-legal uses which create tensions as young people, dog-

owners and other residents exercise competing claims to the City (Lefebvre: 2000). These issues are exacerbated by what the PCSO defined as the 'physics' of the area and could be characterised as the difficulty of creating or defining defensible space (Newman: 1972) within a densely occupied urban area.

The other problem of space within Ernest Lea stems from its neo-liberal use as an area that houses infrastructure and industry to service the City's growth. As has been shown, this runs a broad continuum including waste from the fish processing plant and the sewage treatment works as well as changes to the area's traffic flows. At the other end of this continuum are the unofficial and illegal uses including the locality acting as an unofficial 'car park' for people from the eastern suburbs or a 'dumping ground' for fly-tippers. In recognising this continuum we accept that industry contributes to micro-climates and environments in criminogenic as well as environmental ways. Alterations to traffic flows in the area are accompanied by associations of risk as the changes undermine established resident's routines (Beck: 1992). This includes the impact of new one-way systems and are linked to broader reflections of ontological insecurity (Garland: 2001) in the form of 'residents parking'. As has been noted, the issue of 'residents parking' in the locality is connected to the problem of the other (Rose: 1998) and the impact of changing property ownership in the area with an increasing number of flats and bedsits in the locality. This is reflected in Ernest Lea's high percentage of privately rented housing stock that is not in a fit state of repair, or otherwise 'non-decent' (PCC: 2011). This urban density is arguably exacerbated by the area's mixed-use nature, combining industry, infrastructure and housing and placing spatial limitations on community safety.

In both these conflicts over space, Ernest Lea's particularism as an 'industrial' community is apparent. The locality is 'industrial' both in the form of being home to physical plant and infrastructure works which service the City Centre. Moreover, the area is 'industrial' in

Bauman's (1997) sense of the term, an older community where solidarity and social bonds are marked by longevity, exclusivity and routine. Arguably, the battles over space in the locality are locality specific manifestations of this 'industrial nature' and the area's deprivation. Indeed, it is difficult to separate the 'battles for the parks', 'problem' young people and drug abuse from the relatively low level of educational attainment, high levels of need and inadequate housing stock within the locality (PCC: 2011). Such public 'commons' (Cohen: 1979) that exist in the locality were hosts to conflicts between Ernest Lea's 'official' and 'unofficial' uses. The physical contours of the area, narrow back lanes, industrial plant combined to crowd the space left available as well as providing avenues of escape or, lacking surveillance, further places where the 'unofficial' could function and displacement from elsewhere could occur (Pease cited by Grabosky:2010).

To conclude, the physical architecture of space informs the mental architecture of individuals involved in co-creating the community safety within that space. This consequently influences which partners or forces are the most significant actors in establishing each locality's community safety settlement. For Youngtown, the rise of the University, the urban density in which it develops and the consequences of that development in the rise of HMOs and the Night Time Economy, coincide with its visibility and mass-private space to establish its partnership credentials. The use of space here lies in the ability of the University to project instrumental discipline from beyond its campus in the form of CCTV or a disciplinary matrix over its students (Foucault:1979). The use of such powers, combined with the sponsorship and assistance of policing, creates a duopoly between these partners in the governance of the locality's crime prevention strategy. This is given greater salience between perceptions that exist amongst some residents, of causal connections between influxes of students and crime 'spikes' in the area.

In Fort Matthews, the impact of the removal of space from the locality via the processes of urban development and their attendant new majorities (Stoker: 1998) has effected to create spatial dividing lines where resources are disproportionately allocated. This serves to 'remove' or separate the crime control elements from the locality's overall community safety paradigm as police either pursue core business with regard to established crime problems which are more in keeping with enforcement models of policing (Harfield: 2010). This preference for 'enforcement' coincides with the area's overall economic development and the ability of the new majorities to 'game the system' of community safety (Gilling: 2007) fostering the impression that it is neoliberalism and business that decides the community safety settlement on one side of the 'line of demarcation'. On the other side of the line, the vast bulk of Fort Matthews, including its significant needs (PCC: 2011) and specific issues such as housing homeless hostels and RESTART homes, means that the Council is the other partner actively engaged in community safety through its provision and governance of welfarist services and specific area teams such as the Neighbourhood Manager and Warden.

The main partners in Ernest Lea's community safety are the police, and the council through agencies such as youth services and the highways department, who often attended the *have your say* meetings. This is a reflection of the spatial dynamic involved in the locality with physical engineering, in terms of the physical plant and infrastructure in the locality, giving rise to 'social engineering' of specific quality of life issues. This manifests itself in the 'smell' of the area, congestion and air quality and generally problems caused to the area by its industrial use. Added to this are the crime and disorder aspects where the use of space for illegal or intimidating behaviour is exacerbated by its visibility in the parks and the lack of surveillance in back lanes. In this we view the area as an 'industrial' community (Bauman: 1997) with the attendant problems of deprivation, educational attainment and potential exclusionary impulses. In both, the 'industrial' uses of the area run a continuum of legal to

illicit, requiring responses from the police and Council to serve the localities public, as well as the needs of the City's growth.

In each of the above localities the battle over space is shaped by both the 'physics of space' and the impact of neo-liberal networks to establish locality specific problems which are manifestations of their respective areas uses and problems. The conflicts between these manifestations of networks and others using the area establish the particulars of 'risky' populations in each area, in need of governance (Simon: 2007). In Youngtown, the rise of new transient communities of young people, and the perceived problems they bring is the issue to be governed. Young people are also an issue in Ernest Lea, although many of these are considered 'of the area'. In Fort Matthews it is drinkers, homeless people and prostitutes who need to be regulated. However, the identification of lead partners allows us to see as one other 'space' as regulated and one final population whose risks from crime and to crime prevention discourses, partners are required to manage. That space is the *have your say* meetings themselves, and the population are the publics present. This theme is taken up in the conclusion where the *have your say* forum is directly addressed and its place within the management of public discourses on crime and disorder. The management of individual locality forums, what the engagement means and the diffusion of responsibilities between partners allows us to understand what 'doing community safety via locality working' means in each specific area.

9 Chapter Nine: Conclusion

9.1 The 'division of labour' in Locality Working: Governing through Crime Prevention

Behind this discussion of community safety lie the larger structural forces of urban development, cultural continuum and accompanying ontological insecurity (Garland 1996, 2001) concerning the use and ownership of urban space (Smith: 1996, Lefebvre: 2000). These are what Stoker (1998) refers to as the impact of systemic power on the context in which public officials make assumptions as to what is practical or possible. The other form of systemic power under which public agencies operate is the reduction to funding due to the impact of austerity on U.K. government spending. Together, these impact to establish 'governmentalities of crime' (Gilling: 2010b), common-place assumptions of 'normal' crimes and amounts of crime for the localities, given the structural forces of development involved in each. These governmentalities are often recognised by partners in the form of predispositions towards particular forms of action or 'solution-sets' (Judge: 1998) from which they may draw disproportionately in constructing individual regimes of community safety. Given the impact of the differing 'lead' partners in each locality, we are reminded that in crime prevention and community safety discourses, the division of labour (Kaut and Pease: 2013) between actors is dependent upon each sectional interest's distance from the means of production. This 'means of production' refers to both the extent they can be made, and to what degree each partner may be said to 'own' the particular disorder issue, as well as possessing the resources to address it. This section aims to determine what the division of labour between partners involved in co-constructing community safety, both at *have your say* and what this may mean for the work that takes place outside it. It will examine how this division is realised in the form of the 'types' of safety regimes operating, via their 'governmentalities' and respective solution-sets.

Firstly, it is necessary to examine the ways by which attendees from *have your say* may seek to control the community safety agenda, or attempt to mobilise the resources of partnership for their own goals. One way in which *have your say* publics across all three localities in this study attempt to influence community safety, is by means of exercising some input into the control stage to influence planning through the enforcement of planning regulations within their localities. This discussion is difficult as its inclusion inevitably raises questions concerning politicisation of planning (Rydin, Stoker et al: 1996). In seeking to control urban space through planning and the enforcement of its regulations, residents are attempting to control the pace of change and development, and with this, the ‘problem’ communities (Young: 1999). This is visible in Youngtown with the issue of waste and Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs), in Fort Matthews with the issues of waste and enforcement of conservation, and in Ernest Lea where alterations to roads and parking exercise the HYS attendees. This is not to say that planning or development is value neutral or lacking in bias, Rydin, Stoker et al (1996) demonstrate how the direct and indirect consequences of planning decisions by local governments during the 1980s contribute to the structural issues involved in doing community safety today. One particular manifestation of this may well be the emergence of the University as ‘growth machine (Harding: 1998) into Plymouth’s landscape. However, attempts to ‘govern through planning’ and its enforcement are redolent of attempts to ‘govern through crime’ (Simon: 2007). An example of this could be the problem of waste in Youngtown, where the issue of bins acts as a cultural signifier to exert normative values for *have your say* publics. Here the correct disposal of waste is demonstrative of ‘community values’ such as being house-proud and responsible, and a prudent management of one’s own responsibilities and risks (Garland: 2001), by which the ‘established’ community distinguishes itself from the ‘other’ (Rose 1999).

However, attempts to ‘govern through crime’, or ‘govern through planning’ create problems for partners as they pursue community safety goals within the ‘systemic’ (Stoker: 1998) context of funding cuts. Given the impact of significant resource reductions to governmental partners alongside corresponding initiatives for a more targeted or evidence-based approach, it is reasonable to assume that this may be one way in which ‘community safety’ is increasingly being delivered (Stoker:2004. Flanagan: 2008). Firstly, there is the problem of ‘signal crimes’ (Innes: 2004) as they relate to ‘signifiers’ of community identity. The use of signal crimes within the context of ‘governing through crime’, effectively means using the signifiers of one community to identify and regulate other ‘problem communities’ in the locality, and to govern through crime (Simon: 2007). In a similar manner to the ‘false positives’ of those present setting community safety agendas, (Loader and Walker 2007) the problem of ‘false signals’ which are constructed by residents as criminogenic in nature, may ultimately lead to a waste of resources, skewing priorities in strange and counterproductive ways. An unbalanced concentration on bins or students, may result in an upsurge of arrests or penalties, yet it is highly unlikely to be conducive to an effective policing or community safety strategy. This is especially true given that causal linkages between bins and crime have yet to be empirically established with the risk of students and others in rented accommodation to crime (Gilling:2010).

Partners reluctance to act on such ‘community’ priorities such as enforcement of bin etiquette may result from the unlikelihood of such operations to return ‘quick wins’ (Gilling: 2007) or indeed, any tangible results for crime prevention. Moreover, due to the impact of austerity there may be an increased tendency for some state partners to concentrate on particular ‘agency targets’ (Gilling: 2007) at the expense of broader, more nebulously defined, community safety ones. This may be due in part to the belief that certain issues do not constitute police business (Harfield: 2010) or the council’s responsibility, and therefore is the

duty of other agencies to address. This is partially a reflection of the increasing 'auxiliarisation' of policing (Crawford et al: 2005) and partnership that occurs within the localities. This auxiliarisation occurs both within partners and between partners involved in the governance of crime and disorder. Firstly, there is the 'auxiliarisation' of partnership to include a wide range of potential stakeholders including businesses. This is undoubtedly true in Youngtown and its University, and is also salient to a lesser degree with the NTE in the area with bars encouraged to join crime prevention initiatives such as 'Pub watch'. Pub watch is an initiative for businesses to work with the police to control the problems that the NTE generates in terms of anti-social behaviour or actions such as drug use. A notable sanction utilised is the extension of banning of individuals from one NTE premise to multiple premises. It is not for discussion here the issue of the extent to which these representatives of the NTE are culpable for such behaviour in the first place. What is relevant is the extent by which private security of the NTE interacts with the formal crime control apparatus of the state to produce a greater variety of partners involved in addressing anti-social behaviour.

Attending this is the rise of the PCSO to be an important element in policing strategy.

Arguably, the role of the PCSO has evolved considerably from reassurance to cover a wider range of activities, which may not necessarily constitute 'reassurance, high visibility patrol' in the strictest sense of the term (Millie and Herrington: 2005). Many facets of what the PCSO now does, including reassurance, 'gathering intel' and 'working with multi-agencies' are more in keeping with the traditional, Aldersonian conception of community policing (Skogan: 1994) At the meetings it is generally the PCSOs who attend, and from observations of them on the beat and at the station, it is clear that they serve the police in a number of important and interrelated ways. Firstly there is the importance that is attached to the police as cultural representatives of the 'state (McLaughlin: 2007), this may be said to be the 'reassurance angle' (Millie and Herrington: 2005). This reassurance may take the place of

the PCSOs being on particular streets at specific times, the police jargon for this being ‘hotspots and hot times’. This visibility, both on the street and in the meeting makes the PCSO a political actor within the locality working setting. At *have your say* the PCSO may attempt to gather intelligence, decide what is, or is not, a police priority or issue or ‘make majorities’ to legitimise prior determined actions or agency preferences (Stoker: 1998, Harfield: 2010). This was visible in Youngtown where the PCSO attempted to gather support for action against graffiti in the area.

Moreover, this ‘auxiliarisation’ within community safety co-governance alongside reductions in resources, serves to entrench hierarchical power-relationships within partnerships, especially if differing agencies pursue individual bottom lines or preferred working practices (Gilling: 2007, Lipsky: 1980). This at times leads to tensions between some partners and the overall locality working dynamic. An example of this is the impact of the Highways Department in Fort Matthews and Ernest Lea where the impact of austerity appears to reinforce the position of their ‘evidence-based’ and strategic ‘solutions-sets’ (Jones:1998) relative to those involved in delivering ‘locality working’. The tendency of public agencies to pursue individual bottom lines, instead of a broader amalgam called Community Safety is noted (Gilling: 2007) and is demonstrative of tensions between the local and central more broadly, and in particular, the impact of ‘systemic power’ and centralised power on the capacity for micro-governance (Stoker: 1998, 2004).

The systemic power of reduced funding, extended partnerships and hierarchical relationships, coincide with established knowledge about crime and disorder problems within the areas. These in turn foster common-sense assumptions about crime levels and types of crime within each locality, producing governmentalities as to the constraints on locality working and community safety (Gilling: 2010b). The impact of this is that partners seek ways to responsiblise individuals for their own safety, or otherwise find ways to ‘self-include’ by

adjusting themselves to the new realities (Levitas: 1998). McCulloch (2004) describes this as ‘community building’, as instruments in the pursuit of a neoliberal responsabilisation exercise whereby communities in the North East were compelled to accept the ‘going for growth’ agenda that was the back-drop against which social policy was made. This is demonstrated in Ernest Lea where *have your say* was joined by a representative from Plymotion, offering travel and lifestyle advice. Given the deprived nature of the area, attendant health problems and finite road space, we may interpret this as an attempt by planners to ‘nudge’ publics towards broader civic goals (John, Cotterill, Mosely, Richardson, Smith, Stoker, Wales: 2011) such as using public transport or cycling to work. From this, the overarching tendency may be for the council to use procedural tactics or, as one councillor put it ‘ploys’ to responsabilise the public for community issues (Garland: 2001). Moreover, the use of ‘meetingcraft’ within the context of the *have your say* has the effect of allowing some partners to actively legitimise particular forms of behaviour (Barnes, Newman and Sullivan: 2007). The cumulative effect of this is to reinforce the legitimacy of particular working patterns and solution-sets (Harfield: 2010, Jones:1998), maintaining the status quo, and directing the public to pre-approved procedures, which are more in keeping with partners own desires (Lipsky: 1980).

This places the method of public engagement in community safety represented by *have your say* as constituting another form of managerial exercise, where public engagement constitutes a new form of target to be achieved (Newman:2011). This is partially demonstrated in the creation of three priorities from each meeting, potentially leading to conflicts with publics over the priorities decided, and occasionally, what one respondent referred to as ‘making priorities for the sake of having priorities’. This creates three noteworthy problems for locality working and community safety. Firstly, there is the potential for the exercise in engagement to be effectively the synthesising of a broad range of community safety

particularisms to targets which differing individuals and agencies can interpret in differing ways. This is demonstrated by the broad priorities arising from a locality's *have your say* which, as the ward councillor said, 'like Alice in Wonderland, could mean anything we want it to mean'. If we apply this to the enforcement priority arising then such an issue encompasses a wide variety of perceptions and interpretations. For the Friends of Dovetail Square, enforcement involves taking action against RESTART homes, HMOs, satellite dishes and anything else that they may feel is inappropriate in a conservation area (Lefebvre: 2006, Smith: 2009). For the Councillor, enforcement arguably means the police taking greater action against street drinkers and generally, greater visible public policing. For the Police, such a priority arguably reinforces the move towards the 'enforcement model' (Harfield: 1997) and accompanying beliefs as to what is and, what is not 'police business' (Reiner: 2000 cited by Johnston: 2003). The impact of such operationally vague priorities is that much like Schroedinger's Cat, it is entirely possible that these priorities could be resolved and unresolved at the same time, depending entirely upon who is involved, their interpretation of the priority, and ultimately what they 'want it to mean'.

Secondly, in having priorities 'for the sake of having priorities' then arguably the logical conclusion of the managerial system may be that such sentiment, irrespective of its causes, may be assigned a finite status such as resolved or unresolved. However, many of the particular community safety problems within the differing localities are manifestations of deeper structural issues, with the cultural impacts of changing property ownership, leisure activity and deprivation all being salient. The particular issues arising at each area *have your say* were arguably more representative of the 'ontological insecurity' (Garland: 2001) concerning particular long-term residents and property owners about these issues via visible clues and signifiers of change. Given this, many councillors expressed scepticism that locality working through *have your say* could substantively improve conditions within the locality

and was instead something more akin to therapy (Arnstein: 1969) for the public. In establishing priorities that must be addressed at quarterly meetings, the potential is that some partners use the meetings to make majorities (Stoker: 1998) for actions that are targeted more in keeping with agency heuristic tendencies (Lipsky: 1980). In doing this they may well be attempting to utilise the resource of ‘community demands for action’ to garner resources in pursuit of their own ‘quick wins’ (Gilling: 2007).

Finally, the impact of bureaucratising engagement potentially leads to post-modern policing (McLaughlin: 2007) whereby public officials are aware that there are insufficient resources to act on community desires, or that there are more pressing concerns for safety but they must be seen to be doing something about the issue. This was demonstrated by the Warden from Fort Matthews, who after yellow lines were made a priority at *have your say*, had to go round the locality prioritising the order of lines to be re-painted. Here financial constraints clash with perceptions of risk and fear of crime amongst the ‘long-term residents’ and regular attendees at *have your say*. This may be joined by the relative ability of some of those attending *have your say* to use their superior meetingcraft in the forum (Barnes and Prior: 2009) or their external influences to game the system and to receive disproportionate returns (Bailey: 2006). In doing this they may take full advantage of their affinity with complaints procedures and other consumer-orientated reforms that have taken place in public services since the 1990s (Stewart:2000, Stoker:2004). This is termed the rise of the ‘citizen-consumer’ (Clarke, Newman, Smith, Vidler, Westmarland: 2007) reflecting that at differing times and on differing issues, either the individual as ‘citizen’ with responsibilities to the civic entity, or the consumer, with transactional rights, is recognisable. These managerialist and consumer-orientated cultures permeating public services clash within the context of locality working and reduced resources. This raises the issue as to what type of community safety exists in each locality and what types of solutions-sets are available to partners (Judge: 1998).

Using Kautt and Pease's (2013) work concerning the division of labour in criminology, crime prevention and crime science, we can arguably view the particulars of Youngtown's 'governmentality' (Gilling: 2010b) and the response of partners. Each term the seasonal 'surge' of students creates opportunities for crime and perceptions of disorder which may distort the statistics away from the accepted 'normal' level. This aberration elicits a 'surge' in policing activity, including a number of policing strategies such as targeted working and reassurance policing to bring the 'spike' under control and crime numbers back to 'normal'. The University as a business is made accountable for actions occurring in its extended supply chain of students, student houses, halls of residents, and the NTE they use. This is not altogether fair for whilst the presence of the University is visible both in terms of space and presence at the meetings, the NTE and its proprietors are not. However, the result is that the University sponsors community safety actions and therefore increasingly moves from a tertiary to a primary role in crime prevention within the locality (Kaut and Pease: 2013). Examples of this include the University's funding of rubbish pick-ups at the end of term and 'Nights of Action', whereby PCSO's are taken off normal duties to check on noisy student parties. More subtly, this may take the form of allowing University CCTV to be turned upon bars across the road, not on University property, which students are known to frequent. This does not mean that University property is not, or has never been included within situational crime prevention. Campuses host leaflets urging students to 'drink aware', to take care when walking home at night and to invest in bicycle locks and other methods to reduce their risk from crime. Nevertheless, there exists a qualitative difference between these acts which are state initiated, and these new methods whereby the University's actions represent a formal inclusion of the institution within a problem-orientated policing paradigm (Goldstein: 1979). However, Johnston (2003: 187) shows that despite the communitarian language associated with community policing, the ultimate form is a 'police-led state-centred initiative against

crime and disorder'. Within the context of Youngtown, it is arguably the University which wields the power over many of the relationships within the partnership through its growth and funding of partners responses, influencing initiatives against crime in the area. Therefore, the question arising is to what extent is Youngtown's community safety still police property and what are the implications for this? This raises an issue if we consider as to whose interests are really being acted on by CCTV operators, the police, the University or the students?

(Coleman and Sim: 1999) Conceivably this represents the potential use of partnership and community engagement as a tool by the University (Arnstein: 1969), and a means of obtaining legitimacy for itself and its agenda (Bailey 1995). In this context, actions undertaken by the University – sponsoring 'Nights of Action', whereby the University funds PCSOs who then patrol for signs of loud student parties or incidents of 'pre-loading', appear more self-serving. The sponsoring of public policing, or the funding of end of term waste collection can appear to constitute either 'corporate responsibility' in the broadest sense of the term, or is suggestive otherwise suggestive of PR gimmickry in the interests of the University's agenda. Furthermore, whilst the salience of the University has been in its role as a business or 'growth machine' (Harding: 1998), when this is placed within the context of partnership working, its characterisation as an educational institution becomes significant, as it may wish to limit its 'ownership' of problematic issues. To this end the University may be tempted to brazenly play on its nature as an educational institution and welfarist signifiers attached to it.

Here we view what McLaughlin (2007) described as the influence of post-modernism and the twenty-four hour news cycle on public policing. If there are 'Nights of Action' then the question remains as to what is achieved by such 'action' and when compared with the 'inactive' days and nights? Innes (2005) reminds us that community policing is a compound of differing policing techniques and operational strategies. An effective community policing

strategy, he suggests, would include a reassurance angle, a problem orientated approach, targeted working and community accountability. What is interesting as this relates to the particular characteristics of Youngtown, is the extent to which it is almost impossible to discern the difference between the various strands being used. However, given the nature of the problems involved and the absolute reduction in funding available, we can perhaps view the particular ‘solution-set’ (Jones: 1998) available for community safety in that locality. This is ‘Targeted Reassurance’ the use of policing and procedure to attempt to make interventions not in the causal chain of crime, but rather, addressing the fear of crime. Targeted Reassurance is operationalised to the extent that it may be supported as being ‘evidence based’ and that such evidence, either from police intelligence or a ‘signal crime’ is validated by partners. This may lead to the dispatch of officers to particular ‘hot spots’, especially during ‘hot times’. Alternatively, it might entail occasional targeted operations to address or disrupt some of the issues, seen as salient by virtue of constituting a ‘signal crime’ (Innes: 2005). More often it takes the form of work ostensibly given the label problem-orientated, but is actually an orchestrated move by partners to reassure the public that ‘something is being done’ by removing the visible ‘clues’. This explains the and clean-up operations such as graffiti and large-scale, sponsored waste collection. However, the best indication of the targeted nature of reassurance may be seen in the ‘governmentalities of crime’ (Gilling: 2010) at the *have your say* meetings themselves, whereby the crime ‘spike’ is the issue of importance. The importance of the ‘spike’ derives from its deviation from the norm and this is promptly accompanied by a report on actions being taking to combat this sudden fluctuation. The inference from this is that *have your say* is utilised by partners for the broader purposes of regulating the public and allaying their fear.

At the Fort Matthews *have your say* meetings the police provided a fleeting presence owing to other duties. Given the demands of the Night Time Economy (NTE) in the area and the

placement of neighbourhood police on rotation to cover it, this may suggest that the issue was effectively removed from the broader discussion. This is in keeping with other aspects of policing in the locality, where the impact of differing uses of space and the needs of business for policing resources serve to effectively 'remove' the police from elements of the locality's community safety paradigm. This police concentration on 'core business' (Gilling:2007) in the locality in terms of managing the area's NTE, prostitution, and patrolling particular crime hot-spots, suggests that significant public policing takes place in the locality which is based on the 'enforcement model' (Harfield:2010) and attendant crime-control discourses. This concentration may include regulating crime and anti-social behaviour activities around pre-existing business interests such as the NTE, the dispersal of drinkers from the City Centre plus new interests including patrols during the America's Cup and the mounting of policing operations to 'discipline the drivers before the new marina is built'. These policing operations may foster the perception of 'preferential policing' for certain areas. Such attitudes have the potential for policing to be interpreted as the control of troublesome populations and the patrol of certain areas that must be kept safe for neoliberal business (Simon: 2007, Deukmedjian: 2013). These perceptions are accentuated by the apparent ability of certain groups to ring-fence state resources, such as the Waterfront Partnership, or receive disproportionate partner engagement via their ability to navigate official and unofficial channels within state bureaucracies (Barnes and Prior:2009, Bailey:2006). The undoubted ability of some groups to get a greater share of official resources also combines with the spatial inequalities in development in the locality to accelerate trends to urban gentrification and discourses on social exclusion. Taken together, this helps to rigidify the locality's 'lines of demarcation', raising the question as to what forms of community safety and regulation operate on the other side of the line?

This issue of regulation leads to the discussion of Fort Matthews management of its ‘problem populations’ (Simon: 2007) such as sex workers and street drinkers. Visible in the data is the emergence of a multi-agency approach to dealing with prostitution in the area, including enforcement and targeted assistance to enable the women to escape from prostitution. Such an approach is also visible in some of the methods used to address street drinkers in the locality such as attempts made to get community psychiatric nurses. Such overarching programmes, designed to reduce street drinking, sex working and anti-social behaviour coincide with the ‘neo-liberal’ perceptions of the police enforcement strategy (Deukmedjian: 2013). Punitive approaches such as these, including the use of dispersal orders and extra patrol of key areas, works in conjunction with welfarism and attempts at desistance to create an overarching disciplinary matrix (Cohen: 1972, Foucault: 1979) within the locality. Sherman and Neyroud (2012), term this Offender-Desistance Policing whereby the actuarial measurement of the potential harm that offenders or ex-offenders may cause is combined with the diversion of the relatively low risk to a separate regulatory regime. This regime includes offers of assistance to offenders under close supervision to ensure compliance and track progress. A good example of such regimes operating in the locality is the RESTART homes and the methods and language by which they distinguish themselves from the ‘wet-house’ in the area. Looking back at the data, it is noticeable that ‘Adam’, the representative for some of the locality’s RESTART homes, used the language of actuarial risk management and regulatory regimes which is familiar with the risk-needs paradigm of rehabilitation and recidivism (Garland: 2001). This was apparent from the speed by which he reassured the *have your say* attendees about the type of offenders who might be present ‘we don’t take any offence one offenders’. There was also a move to increase awareness about the regulatory regime operating, with the two-strike policy highlighted. This language of two-strike policies is redolent of that of the criminal justice system and particularly, the police, and serves to

reinforce debates concerning ‘governing through crime’, put forward by Simon (2007) as well as the blurring of welfarist boundaries and the disciplinary matrix of state power (Cohen: 1985, Foucault: 1979).

One reason for the use of such actuarial language may potentially be due to the resonance of the ‘made majorities’ (Stoker: 1998) of urban gentrification impacting on Fort Matthews community safety discourses. Arguably, debates in the area on ‘conservation’ are redolent of attempts to use access to services to sanitise, or otherwise socially cleanse places of problematic others (Bauman: 1997, Rose: 1999). From this, the representatives of RESTART homes and the Council as the locality’s other ‘co-governor’ with business, are engaged in attempts to ‘sell’ the welfare services they provide to individuals like sex-workers and street drinkers by entering recourse to the language of risk (Beck: 1992). This serves to create another ‘line of demarcation’ within Fort Matthews *have your say* with partners and publics engaged in attempts to ‘game’ each other into agreeing divergent priorities. The impact of the priorities of urban gentrification and ‘conservation’ has been noted. Against this, the council may seek to mobilise community concern in other parts of the locality via the use of *have your say* cards. The possible intention of this is to attempt to move the area’s priorities towards targets and more tangible community safety outcomes, inclusive of those in genuine need or at risk. In doing this, we can identify the particulars of Fort Matthews community safety dynamic, as in essence being the regulation of the effects of business within the locality. This includes the police concentration on enforcement which, whilst removed from the discourses on community safety, contributes cumulatively to the management of the impacts of the effects of business and redevelopment in the area. This is apparent from the patrolling concerning prostitutes, managing the impact of the NTE and engaging with new interests that development creates. Thus the Council is engaged in the regulation of the side-effects and compounded inequalities created by the uneven development of the locality. This

is demonstrated by attempts to provide assistance to the homeless, recovering addicts and prostitutes, old victims of the previous NTE and its gendered space (Hubbard, Matthews and Scoular: 2008) and progressively, new victims of its gentrification and exclusion.

Ernest Lea's community safety settlement is influenced by its representation as an industrial community and the issues that accompany this. This industrial characterisation is inclusive both of the impact of industry and infrastructure within the locality, as well as the normative assumptions and attendant problems of exclusive solidarity amongst the generations raised there (Bauman: 1997). This establishes the dynamic whereby 'industrial strife' in the locality relates both to problems caused by 'industrial' uses of the locality – waste treatment, fish processing and fly-tipping, as well as problems derived from its 'industrial' nature – static communities, relative deprivation, problem young people, drug dealing and drug abuse. These problems are exacerbated by the relative urban density with Ernest Lea's differing 'industrial communities' sharing the locality's space but using it differently. This serves to create the particulars of the area's community safety governmentality (Gilling: 2010b) with partners engaged in 'industrial regulation'. This takes the place of the monitoring of the 'smell' in the area by public protection officers. Furthermore it is noteworthy that South West Water did send a representative to the *have your say* meetings, a stark contrast with other businesses influencing community safety elsewhere. Such regulation of intractable 'industrial' problems is also apparent in discourses of crime and disorder where a combination of the narrow back lanes and the 'deep history' between families, require partner's management.

However, part of the reason for some of the area's community safety issues lies in its industrial use to service the growth of the City Centre. The roads which allow access from the centre to the suburbs also service the demands for access of residents elsewhere in the City. The treatment works that process waste, and the oil refineries both serve populations outside

the locality. The narrow back lanes where crime can transpire due to the lack of surveillance exist within the overarching narrative of the mass use of such techniques within Plymouth's central urban districts (Coleman and Sim: 1999). To an extent, if Ernest Lea is an industrial community, then it is because the City needs it to be. Whether this involves taking waste from the City, either in the form of traffic congestion, fly-tipping or crime displaced, the area facilitates the broader functioning of the City's growth. Therefore, part of the requirement for the functioning of community safety discourses in the area is to responsiblise the public to accept their part in the overall capitalistic settlement and to make alterations to routine and lifestyle towards this end (McCulloch:2004). This was demonstrated by the importance of representatives from the highways department, the representative from Plymotion, and their broader attempts to 'nudge' (John et al: 2011) publics towards healthier options and public transport.

From this back-drop the two leaders of Ernest Lea's community safety arrangement arise, the police and the council. However, there is a distinction between them and their functions within the locality, with the police ostensibly leading a form of 'community policing' in the locality (Skogan: 1994). Due to their high-visibility and high-profile actions undertaken, such as patrols to gain control of public commons (Cohen: 1979) such as the locality's parks, the police arguably constitute the hub (Innes: 2004) for 'locally driven' community safety. In support of this the council lead important youth services in the area to complement the role of the police. Inclusively the council provide tailored community safety services such as 'streets wise', and providing training, knowledge about sexual health, as well as support for those trying to give up drugs. The success of such work is relatively unknown, and may ultimately be interpreted as evidence of the increasing tendency for welfare to be assigned based on determinations of criminal risks posed (Gray: 2009). However, the cumulative impact of public policing and targeted assistance for young people appears broadly complementary in

the locality's crime reduction paradigm, with the *have your say* attendee from 'Sutton Play' discussing how the area had changed and the decrease in burnt out cars. It is probably too soon to determine the relative success of community policing in Ernest Lea as to 'activate' the community in an Aldersonian fashion. Furthermore, given the importance of state partners to the functioning of community policing, the impact of spending cuts to services may correspondingly affect this area more than others.

9.2 Community Safety and Comparative Advantage

This section shall examine the extent to which we may generalise on some of the themes that emerge from the research. In doing so I wish to refer back to two crucial pieces of work, namely Hughes and Edwards (2012) examination of the emergence of community safety regimes and Stone's (1989) work on regime politics. The question I feel is relevant is how urban regimes which attempt to pursue their own policy outcomes, and more generally, advance the comparative advantage of their city in gaining investment, may interact with crime and disorder policy processes to facilitate this and what the attendant consequences may look like in the form that policy takes. In this respect I wish to ascertain the extent to which city-regimes are analogous to community safety regimes - does the plurality of regimes on offer reflect the diversity of individual cities and their particular contexts? Alternatively, are the security regimes that operate at a city-wide level in turn influenced by specific considerations which operate at other levels of governance – the regional, national and supranational and what potentially may be the tensions arising from this? Furthermore, I wish to examine in greater depth potential tendencies towards congruence between crime and disorder and community safety policies across state boundaries and examine what may potentially give impetus to such eventualities.

Firstly, however, I wish to elucidate on the specifics of the city regime operating in Plymouth and its attendant consequences for the type of urban safety dynamic in operation. Previously I have discussed the extent to which business is felt to be a significant contributory element in shaping what community safety by locality working means in each of my three areas of Ernest Lea, Fort Matthews and Youngtown. As noted in the subsection Business and the City in chapter seven, the impact of political economy in shaping the nature of the localities studied has been demonstrated. In Youngtown and Fort Matthews the manifestation of capitalistic interests, either in the form of the University's growth machine or the interests of developers in Fort Matthews is apparent. In Ernest Lea this differs substantially, here the influence of capitalism derives not from the actions of specific interests within the locality but instead, from the presence of industrial plant within the locality and more generally, Ernest Lea's position as an effective container of infrastructure that served the City's needs, housing oil storage tanks, sewage treatment works and containing one of the main transport arteries into the city. Arising from this is that the overall city-regime of Plymouth is invariably following a pro-growth agenda; where constituent localities play their individual roles in maximising the overall growth of the city. The growth agenda is based upon a marketing of Plymouth's geographical location by the sea and its history to accentuate the brand 'The Ocean City', with developers moving to take advantage of its waterfront location and its place on the South Western Coast, close to the surfing destinations of Newquay in Cornwall, being a selling point for the University to prospective students. In these circumstances, the utility of places such as Ernest Lea lies in their capacity to facilitate the overall needs of the city towards urban development. Put another way, there is an argument to suggest that places like Ernest Lea exist because the functioning of the capitalistic city *needed* them to exist.

What this may suggest is that an examination of other community dynamics at the local level may lead to broad categorisations of place which are analogous to some of those arising from this research. Youngtown may be said to reflect a traditional zone of transition, with the University as an engine of economic growth, exercising a decisive impact within a relatively constrained geographical area. Fort Matthews represents parts of the city which are in a state of flux, areas which were previously relatively poor but are increasingly being developed and the process of gentrification impacts upon pre-existing community dynamics. Ernest Lea with its lack of comparative advantages to attract investment and its more traditional reliance on heavy industry is easily categorised as a form of industrial community, set close to the city centre yet in many respects far removed from agendas focussed on economic growth and marketing the city for investment. Alongside these will be other forms of communities/localities with specific identities and traits, this study, for example, has concentrated on the inner city so it has not examined in sufficient detail the importance of the suburbs and the particularisms to community safety done there. I do not suggest that city regimes are aggregates of these localities, nor that the community safety regime in operation at the level of the city is a median or amalgamation of the forms of safety generated locality-specific circumstances. Ultimately the whole is greater than the sum of the parts and key determinants in producing these forms of urban safety at the city level are affected by interests and structural forces which, whilst experienced at the local level, are often not produced there. Nonetheless I feel that from examining neighbourhood/locality specific trends in crime and disorder co-governance it is possible to gain a broad understanding of the dynamics involved in the overall functioning of city-regimes. It is not unreasonable to suggest that a preponderance of affluent neighbourhoods or deprived neighbourhoods is part of an overarching consideration that city-elites (Stone: 1989) make when setting policy directions and influencing the direction that community safety takes. Moreover, in examining

community safety relationships at this level, we are able to view the impact of City-changes at the level of the community, to measure how communities experience economic and social change and within this, how its impact is experienced across a diverse range of communities.

From this bottom-up approach to assessing causal relationships between political economy and crime control processes we may view some of the underlying tensions and relationships between geographical sub-units of cities and their place within the functioning of a broader city-regime dynamic. This approach may be of use when attempting to assess relationships which exist between the city and other levels of governance at the region, the national and the international level. For example, a key consideration in determining the direction of Plymouth's regime and its accompanying community safety dynamics is its geographical location, both in terms of its relative isolation from the other parts of the U.K. as well as the marketability of its position by the sea. What this seeks to accentuate is the impact of the region in influencing the characterisation of places and in setting their political context. The city of Plymouth is juxta positioned against the rural counties of Devon and Cornwall and the Police and Crime Commissioner responsible for Plymouth is the Police and Crime Commissioner for the entirety of Devon and Cornwall. This distinction between the urban and the rural may create tensions in adapting regional strategies to accord with the individual dynamics of urban areas as well as rural locations, especially given budgetary constraints. Further to this, there is the issue of how city-regimes, or other forms of elite-governance of specific geographical areas, relate to the emergence of Police and Crime Commissioners and their accompanying Police and Crime Panels.

This is a particularly pressing given the greater emphasis towards devolved solutions in policing and community safety which is viewed as being a feature of the localised/devolved phase in community safety (Hughes, Edwards and Gilling et al: 2013). One issue that allows us to generalise is that the impetus for the localised devolved era in community safety is to a

large extent, not driven from below, from cities and other units of sub-national government, but is imposed from above through reductions to funding, the creation of police and crime commissioners and a governmental emphasis more generally on an enhanced role for the market at the expense of the state (Taylor-Gooby and Stoker: 2011). This may suggest that the plurality of forms of safety regimes adopted nationally will be accentuated as new partners are brought in at the local level and a diverse collection of Police and Crime Commissioners with varying opinions on how to address crime, or the relative emphasis given to safety increase the range of safety governance in operation. It is conceivable that one particular issue that may impact upon community safety discourses in the future is how differences between cities and regions are resolved in terms of crime and disorder prevention given that potential tensions that may arise between a popular mandate of Commissioners and the professional expertise of the police and other agencies associated with community safety.

The importance of regional emphasis as a unit of governance and in shaping distinctive approaches to crime and disorder has been growing for some time. Hughes and Edwards (2005) rightly point to the importance of specific geo-historic contexts in setting the parameters in which regimes are realised. Such moves to accentuate the importance of mid – level governance have been given extra impetus by devolution across the United Kingdom, with the importance devolution in creating the potential for new forms of safety regimes.

Hughes and Edwards (2012) noted the particular emphasis of Welsh third sector groups and particularly churches, in giving a distinctive restorative justice emphasis to crime and safety regimes in Wales. However, whilst I accept that there is likely to be a case for a Welsh exceptionalism from other forms of community safety regime offered, founded in part upon the resilience of Methodism and other forms of religious influence. It may be useful to examine more instrumental regional gatherings to ascertain the relative importance city-regimes to these groupings. From this, there is a necessity to expand on city-region

dynamics. especially if business and economic development are some of the lead drivers in helping to formulate policy agendas at many city levels, with attendant consequences for urban governance including crime control. This begs the question under what circumstances we might view a synchronisation of safety policies between regimes and to what extent may we view this as the formulation of ‘regional regimes’? For example, if one were to examine the suggested creation of a ‘Northern Powerhouse’ with a number of cities from differing parts of the north of England seemingly working together for economic growth, should we expect to find a level of congruence between their policies on crime and disorder and general urban governance as they align aspects of their economic and business policies to encourage growth and lobby government more effectively? Alternatively, is it possible that whilst there may be areas of alignment between forces and city-regimes, that there may yet be crucial areas of distinction between them? It is therefore useful to examine some of the constituent safety regimes involved in larger regional groupings to ascertain the ways in which certain policies may be brought into alignment as well as the potential reasons attending to this, or the tensions arising. Such a piece of research would require both longitudinal as well as multi-site analysis. It would be necessary to examine both the formulations of city-wide regimes in a number of the urban centres, rhetorically located in the ‘Northern Powerhouse’, to this we would need to examine the community safety regimes in operation, including what form of community safety they each may be said to be operating. Such research may well need to examine the relevance of Police and Crime Commissioners with their own respective regional preferences and the relationship they have with the city-units which are under their jurisdiction.

The potential regional-city tension developing within discourses on crime and disorder governance may potentially be resolved in one of three ways. The city and its direct satellite towns may take precedence in determining the shape of how security is shaped locally with

police and associated agencies by default assuming a role which is roughly analogous with the functioning of city-police forces in the United States. Alternatively, policing and safety policies may be impelled to operate more at the regional level, in accordance with and shaped by preferences of elected representatives such as Police and Crime Commissioners but potentially including other forms of regional governance units. Finally, and possibly most likely, there may exist a compromise whereby regime-dynamics remain at some levels of crime governance but are overlapped or shaped by requirements from regional sub-units of government and contrasting claims from elected representatives. In many respects this is not a new tension with Gilling (2007) amongst others pointing to the stresses in the relationship between central-local considerations when addressing crime and disorder. Whilst the importance of central-national considerations will endure I suggest that in many respects certain functions, particularly those with their emphasis on community safety and local policing will become less a priority for central government whilst other elements of security discourses, such as immigration and terrorism will be distinguished as national considerations. This distinction between the city/regional safety apparatus and the national security structures is likely to be one which is an ongoing process of how security is governed by a range of interests.

The issue of distinctions between safety and security, especially within debates concerning the appropriate level for comparative analysis is especially pertinent when placed within a European dimension and accorded to the refugee crisis arising from the Syrian Civil war. Here the issue is a trans-national one, influenced by broader considerations about perceptions of risk and immigration, impacting upon a variety of specific political contexts amongst European Union States. However, this trans-national issue is one which is ultimately experienced in a variety of differing geo-historic contexts in separate nations, whose national political alignments may be relatively fluid. Furthermore, when refugees are dispersed around

Europe, they ultimately arrive in, and impact upon, pre-existing political contexts in the localities in which they live. This has been demonstrated not simply by the differing responses to refugees across Europe, for example between the Eastern European States and particularly Hungary, as opposed to earlier reactions in Sweden and Germany which accepted proportionately large numbers of those arriving in Europe and Germany which accepted proportionately large numbers of those arriving in Europe. However, the arrivals are already having attendant consequences in their host countries where the rise of right-wing extremist parties in Germany after the New Year's Eve attacks in Cologne has sparked political controversy and discussions on cultural differences between the host nation and those coming from the Muslim-majority countries.

It is my view that regime theory, with its antecedents in political economy research, can suggest a closer link between the way policing is done and the relationship between the local economy and the political choices preferred. In doing this I suggest that community safety which is done at the city-wide level will to a large extent be heavily influenced by city-wide concerns about crime and safety which are in congruence with the attempts of individual cities to pursue their comparative advantage in attracting investment. However, such a concentration on economic determinism, whilst useful for investigating the functioning of particular city-dynamics and crime and disorder within them, is not the sole contributing factor to an analysis of the functioning of community safety regimes operating at levels above the city. Under these circumstances issues of national political inclination, the relative importance of the state and other partners need to be taken into greater account. Undeniably, structural forces, particularly budgetary constraints will be a significant factor in determining choices. However considerations in attempting to understand the causal reasons for divergence and convergence between units at the local, regional, national and supra-national level will also be determined by the type of safety being articulated, the way the issue is

framed, as either a security or safety issue, and the cultural backdrop of the places examined and compared.

10 References

- Amin, A and Thrift, N (2002) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Andrews, R and Turner, D. 2006. Modelling the Impact of Community Engagement on Local Democracy. *Local Economy* 21:4, 378-390
- Arnstein, S, (1969) A ladder of Participation JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 216-224.
- Bailey, N, Barker, A and Macdonald, K (1995) *Partnership Agencies in British Urban Policy*, London, UCL Press
- Bailey, S. J. (2006), Facilitating choice in English local government, *Economic Affairs*, 26, 1: 11–17.
- Barnett, M and Siklink K (2008) From International Relations to Global Society in Smit C R and Snidal D, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Barnes M; Newman J and Sullivan H (2007) *Power Participation and Renewal: Case studies in public participation*. Bristol. The Polity Press
- Barnes M and Prior D (eds)(2009) *Subversive Citizens: Power, Agency and Resistance in Public Services*. Bristol: Policy Press
- Barr Rand Pease K, *Crime Placement, Displacement, and Deflection*, 12 *Crime & Just.* 277 (1990), Available at: <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/facpubs/109>
- Barry, A, Lines of Communication and Spaces of Rule In Barry, Osborne, Rose (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, London, UCL, pp123-141
- Bauman, Z (1997) *Postmodernity and its Discontents*, Cambridge, Polity Press

- Bauman, Z (2011) *Collateral Damage: Social inequalities in a global age*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Beck, U, (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London, Sage
- Becker H, (1966) *Outsiders*, New York, Simon and Schuster
- Binder, M and Edwards J S, (2010) Using grounded theory for theory building in operations management research: A study on inter-firm relationship governance, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*
- Blackman, T, (1995) *Urban Policy in practice*, London, Routledge
- Botterill, D, Pointing, S, Hayes-Jonkers, C, Clough, A, Jones T, Rodriguez, C, (2013) VIOLENCE, BACKPACKERS, SECURITY AND CRITICAL REALISM, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 42, pp. 311–333,
- Bottoms A E and Wiles (2003) P, *Explanations of Crime and Place*. In McLaughlin, Muncie, Hughes (eds) *Criminological Perspectives, Essential Readings*, London, Sage
- Boutlellier, H (2005) *The Safety Utopia: : Contemporary Discontent and Desire as to Crime and Punishment*, New York, Springer
- Brindley, T, Rydlin, Y and Stoker, G (1996) *Remaking Planning: The Politics of Urban Change*, London, Routledge
- Bryman, A (2012) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Bullock, K. and Sindall, K. (2014) The Nature and Extent of Citizen Participation in Neighbourhood Policing, *Policing and Society* 24 (4) 385-404
- Butcher, H, Law, I.G, Leach, R and Mullard, M (1990) *Local Government and Thatcherism*. London, Routledge.

- Castells, M (1996) *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*
vol 1: *The Rise of the Network Society* Blackwell
- Clarke, J and Newman, J (1997) *The Managerial State*. London, Sage Publications
- Clarke, J, Newman J, Smith N, Vidler, E and Westmarland L, (2007) *Creating Citizen Consumers*. London, Sage Publications
- Clegg, S, Courpasson, D and Phillips, N (2006) *Power and Organizations*, London, Sage
- Chhotray and Stoker (1999) *Governance Theory and Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan
- Cheng, Y L (2012) *Ethnomethodology reconsidered: The practical logic of social systems theory*, *Current Sociology* *vol. 60 no. 5* 581-598
- Cohen, S (1985) *Visions of Social Control*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Cohen, S (1979) *PUNITIVE CITY - NOTES ON THE DISPERSAL OF SOCIAL CONTROL, CONTEMPORARY CRISES* Volume:3 Issue:4 Pages:339-363
- Crawford A, 'Dispersal Powers and the Symbolic Role of Anti-Social Behaviour Legislation', *MOD LAW REV*, 71.5 (2008), 753-784
- Crawford A, 'Networked governance and the post-regulatory state? Steering, rowing and anchoring the provision of policing and security', *THEORETICAL CRIMINOLOGY*, 10.4 (2006), 449-479
- Crawford A (1999) *The local governance of crime: Appeals to community and partnerships*. Oxford. Oxford University Press

Crawford A; Lister SC; Blackburn SJ; Burnett J (2005) *Plural Policing: The Mixed Economy of Visible Patrols in England and Wales*. Researching Criminal Justice. The Policy Press.

Crawford A, 'Governing through Anti-Social Behaviour: Regulatory Challenges to Criminal Justice', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49.6 (2009), 810-831

Currie, E (1997) *Market, Crime and Community: Toward a Mid-Range Theory of Post-Industrial Violence* *Theoretical Criminology* vol. 1 no. 2 147-172

Davies, C A (1999) *Reflexive Ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*, London, Routledge

Denzin, N (1997): *INTERPRETIVE ETHNOGRAPHY (P): ETHNOGRAPHIC PRACTICES FOR THE 21st CENTURY*, London, Sage

Deukmedjian, J, E, (2013) *Making Sense of Neoliberal Securitization in Urban Policing and Surveillance*, *Canadian Review of Sociology* Volume 50, Issue 1, pages 52–73

Easton, G (2010) *Critical realism in case study research*, *Industrial Marketing Management* 39 118–128

Edwards, A and Hughes, G (2013) *Comparative European criminology and the question of urban security* *European Journal of Criminology* 10(3) 257–259

Edwards A and Hughes G (2011) *Public safety regimes: Negotiated orders and political analysis in criminology*, *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 12(4) 433–458

Ellison, N. and Ellison, S. (2006) 'Opportunity for All?': *New Labour, New Localism and the Opportunity Society*, *Social Policy and Society* 5 (3): 337-48.

Einstadter, W and Henry, S (2006), *Criminological Theory, An Analysis of its underlying Assumptions*, Oxford, Rowan and Littlefield.

Ferrell, J, Hayward, K and Young J (2008) *Cultural Criminology*, London, Sage Publications

Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class*. New York: Basic Books.

Flanagan, R (2008) *Independent Review of Policing*

Fielding, N. and M. Innes (2006) "Reassurance Policing, Community Policing and measuring police performance", *Policing and Society* (16/2) pp.127-45.

Flanagan R, (2008) 'Independent Review of Policing' HMIC, London, The Stationary Office.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin

Giddens, A (1991) *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, Polity Press

Gilbert, N (2008) *Researching Social Life*. London Sage.

Garland, D (2001) *The Culture of Control*. Oxford. Oxford University Press

Gilling, D (1997) *Crime Prevention: Theory, policy and politics*. London UCL Press.

Gilling, D (2007) *Crime Reduction and Community Safety: Labour and the Politics of crime control*. Cullumpton. Willan Publishing.

Gilling, D (2010a) *CRIME CONTROL AND DUE PROCESS IN CONFIDENCE-BUILDING STRATEGIES: A Governmentality Perspective*, *The British Journal of Criminology* Vol. 50, No. 6, pp. 1136-1154

Gilling D (2010b) Problems with the Problem-Orientated Approach. In Homel (eds) *The politics and practice of situational crime prevention*, London, Lynne Reinner Publishers

Gilling, D, Hughes, G, Edwards, A, Bowden, M, Henry, A (2013), nPowers, liabilities and expertise in community safety: Comparative lessons for 'urban security' from the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, *European Journal of Criminology* 10(3) 326–340

Goldsmith, M (2012) Cities in Intergovernmental Systems in Mossberger, Clarke and John (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Gospodini A (2006) Portraying, classifying and understanding the emerging landscapes in the post-industrial city, *Cities*, Vol 23 Issue 5 p311-330

Grabosky, P N, (2010) Unintended Consequences of Crime Prevention In Homel (eds) *The politics and practice of situational crime prevention*, London, Lynne Reinner Publishers

Grant, J (2006) *Planning the Good Community, New Urbanism in Theory and Practice*, Trowbridge, Cromwell Press, Routledge

Gray,P. (2007) 'Youth Justice, Social Exclusion and the Demise of Social Justice', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 46(4): 401-416

Gray, P. (1997) 'Deconstructing the Delinquent as a Subject of Class and Cultural Power', *Journal of Law and Society*, Vol. 24: 526-551.

Gray, P. (2009) 'The Political Economy of Risk and the New Governance of Youth Crime', *Punishment and Society: The International Journal of Penology*, Vol. 11(4): 443-458.

Guerette, R and Bowers, K, (2009) ASSESSING THE EXTENT OF CRIME
DISPLACEMENT AND DIFFUSION OF BENEFITS: A REVIEW OF
SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION EVALUATIONS *Criminology*

Volume 47, Issue 4, pages 1331–1368,

Habermas, J (1986) *Autonomy and Solidarity*, Thetford, The Thetford Press

Hall, Stuart and Jaques, Martin, (1983) *The politics of Thatcherism*, London, Laurence and
Wishart

Hall, S, Winlow, S and Ancrum C (2008) *Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture*,
Cullompton, Willan Publishing

Halpern, D. (2005). *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Hancock L (2001) *Community, Crime and Disorder, Safety and Regeneration in Urban
Neighbourhoods*. Basingstoke, Palgrave

Harding, A (1998) *Elite Theory and Growth Machines* In Judge, Stoker and Wolman (eds)
Theories of Urban Politics.

Harfield, C (2010) 'Consent, consensus or the management of dissent? Challenges to
community consultation in a new policing environment', *Policing and Society* vol 7 Issue 4

Houston, S (2010) *Prising Open the Black Box Critical Realism, Action Research and
Social Work* Vol. 9(1): 73–91

Hubbard, P., Matthews, R. and Scoular, J. (2008). *Regulating sex work in the EU: prostitute
women and the new spaces of exclusion. Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist
Geography* [Online] 15:137-152.

- Hubbard, P. *et al.* (2008). Away from prying eyes? The urban geographies of 'adult entertainment'. *Progress in Human Geography* [Online] 32:363-381.
- Hughes G, and Edwards, A, (2005) Crime Prevention in Context in *The Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety* in Tilley, N (eds) *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*
- Hughes, G. (2007a) *The politics of Crime and Community*. Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Hughes, G (1998) *Understanding Crime Prevention, Social Control, Risk and Late Modernity*, Maidenhead, Open University Press
- Hughes, G, Maher, Maher J and Lawson L, (2011), *Status Dogs, Young People and Criminalisation: towards a preventative strategy Working Paper 139*, Cardiff School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University. <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/78197/1/wp139.pdf>
- Hutton, T. (2008). *The new economy of the inner city: Restructuring, regeneration and dislocation in the twenty-first century metropolis*. New York: Routledge.
- Indergaard, M (2012), *Beyond the bubbles: Creative New York in boom, bust and the long run*, *Cities*, 33 43–50
- Innes, M. (2004) “Reinventing tradition? Reassurance, Neighbourhood Security and Policing”, *Criminal Justice*. (4/2) pp.151-71.
- Innes, M. (2011) “Doing less with more: The New Politics of Policing’, *Public Policy Research*, June-August: 73-.
- Innes, M. (2004) “Signal crimes and signal disorders: notes on deviance as communicative action”, *British Journal of Sociology*. (55/3) pp. 335-55.

Innes, M., L. Abbott, T. Lowe and C. Roberts (2008) "Seeing like a citizen: field experiments in community intelligence-led policing", *Police Practice and Research*, 10/2: 99-114.

Johnston, L and Shearing C, (2003) *Governing Security*, Oxon, Routledge

Johnston, J (2007) The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market, *Theory and Society*. 37:229–270

Jones, B (1998) Bureaucrats and Urban Politics: Who Controls? Who Benefits? In Judge, Stoker and Wolman (eds) *Theories of Urban Politics*.

Joyce, P (2011) *Policing: Developments and Contemporary Practice*. London. Sage.

Kaatt, P and Pease K, *The Division of Labour in Crime Prevention: Crime Science, Criminology and Criminal Justice, The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice Volume 52, Issue 1, pages 39–54,*

Kempster, S, & Parry, K. (2011). Grounded theory and leadership research: A critical realist perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, 22(1), 106-120

Kubler, D and Pagano, M (2012), *Urban Politics as Multi-level Analysis* in Mossberger, Clarke and John (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Urban Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Lefebvre, H (2000) *Writings on Cities*, Translated and Edited by Kofman E and Lebas, E, Oxford, Blackwell

Leydesdorff L (2010) "The communication of meaning and the structuration of expectations: Giddens' "structuration theory" and Luhmann's "self-organization" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* Volume 61, Issue 10, pages 2138–2150,

Levitas, R, (2013) *Utopia as method*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Loader, I and Walker N (2007) *Civilising Security*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Lipsky, M (1980) *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*.

New York. Russell Sage Foundation

Lowe, T. and M. Innes (2012) “Can we speak in confidence? Community intelligence and neighbourhood policing v2.0”, *Policing and Society* 22/3: 295-316.

Lowndes, V (2004) *Getting On or Getting By? Women, Social Capital and Political Participation*, *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* Volume 6, Issue 1, pages 45–64

Lowndes V and Skelcher C, (1998) *The Dynamics of Multi-organizational Partnerships: an Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance*, *Public Administration* Volume 76, Issue 2, pages 313–333,

Mawby, R I, and Walklate, S (1994) *Critical Victimology*, London, Sage publications

McCulloch, A.(2004) *Localism and its neoliberal application: A case study of West Gate New Deal for Communities in Newcastle upon Tyne, UK*. *Capital & Class* Summer2004, Vol. 28 Issue 83, p133-165

McLaughlin, E (2007) *The New Policing*, London, Sage Publications

Michels A and De Graaf, L *Examining Citizen Participation: Local Participatory Policy Making and Democracy*, *Local Government Studies* Volume 36, Issue 4,

Millie, A. and Herrington, V. (2005) ‘Bridging the gap: Understanding reassurance policing’, *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(1) 41-56.

Mir, R and Watson, A (2001) *CRITICAL REALISM AND CONSTRUCTIVISM IN STRATEGY RESEARCH: TOWARD A SYNTHESIS*, *Strategic Management Journal*

22: 1169–1173

Newburn, T (2002) Community safety and policing: some implications of the crime and disorder act 1998. In: Hughes, Gordon and McLaughlin, Eugene and Muncie, John, (eds.) Crime prevention and community safety: new directions. London, Sage Publications, pp. 102-122

Newman, J (1996) Shaping Organisational Cultures in local Government. London, Pitman Publishing

Newman, Janet (2011). Public leadership as public-making. *Public Money and Management*, 31(5) pp. 315–322

Newman, Janet and Tonkens, Evelien eds. (2011). *Participation, Responsibility and Choice: Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*. Care and Welfare. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Newman J and Clarke J, (2009) *Publics, Politics and Power, Remaking the Public in public services*, London, Sage Publications

Newman, Oscar (1972) *Defensible space: People and Design in the Violent City*, London, Architectural Press

O'Malley P (1996) Risk and Responsibility. In Barry, Osborne, Rose (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, London, UCL Press, pp 189-207

Oliver, C (2012) Critical Realist Grounded Theory: A New Approach for Social Work Research, *British Journal of Social Work* (2012) 42, 371–387

- Payne, G, (2006) *Social Divisions*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan
- Parker S (2004) *Urban theory and the Urban Experience, Encountering the City*, London, Routledge
- Pierre, J and Peters, G (2012) *Urban Governance in Mossberger, Clarke and John (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Urban Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Pierre, J Peters, G and Stoker G (2008) *Debating Institutionalism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press
- Pollert, A, (1981) *Girls, Wives and Factory Lives*, London, Macmillan
- Pratchett, L. (2004) *Local Autonomy, Local Democracy and the 'New Localism' Political Studies Vol 52 358-375*
- Prior, Stewart and Walsh (1995) *Citizenship, Rights Community and Participation* .London, Pitman
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Quinton P and Morris J (2008) *Neighbourhood policing: the impact of piloting and early national implementation*. HMIC. London. The Stationary Office.
- Rose N (2005) *Learning from Comparative Public Policy*. Oxon, Routledge
- Rosenbaum, D (1994) *The Challenge of Community Policing*. London. Sage.
- Ross N and Pease K, (2008) *Community Policing and Prediction*. In Williamson (eds) *The Handbook of Knowledge-based policing*, Chichester, John Wiley and Sons
- Rowe, M. (2004) *Policing Race and Racism*. Cullompton. Willan Publishing

Rowe, M (2008) Introduction to policing. London. Sage.

Ryan, A, Tahtinen J, Vanharanta, M, Mainela, T (2012) Putting critical realism to work in the study of business relationship processes, *Industrial Marketing Management* 41 300–311

Savage, S. (2007) *Police Reform: Forces for Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Shearing and Stenning (2003) From the Panopticon to Disney World, The Development of Discipline. In McLaughlin, Muncie, Hughes (eds) *Criminological Perspectives, Essential Readings*, London, Sage

Skogan, W (1994) The Impact of Community Policing on Neighbourhood Residents, A Cross-Site Analysis in Rosenbaum D P eds, *The Challenge of Community Policing*, London, Sage

Sherman, L and Neyroud P, (2012) *Offender-Desistance Policing and the Sword of Damocles*, London, Civitas

Silverman, D (2010), 'Interpreting Qualitative Data' London, Sage

Simon, J (2007) *Governing through Crime*, New York, Oxford University Press

Smith, N (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*, London, Routledge

Smith, O (2014) *Contemporary Adulthood and the Night Time Economy*. Basingstoke Palgrave Macmillan

Squires, P (2006) *Community Safety, Critical perspectives on policy and practice*, Bristol, the Polity Press

Stewart J and Stoker G (1989) *The Future of Local Government*. Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan

Stewart, J (2000) *The Nature of British Local Government*. Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan

Stoker G (2004) *Transforming local governance: From Thatcherism to New Labour*.

Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan

Stoker G (1991) *The politics of local government*. Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan

Stoker G and Wilson D (2004) *British local government into the 21st century*. Basingstoke.

Palgrave Macmillan

Stoker, G (1998) *Regime Theory and Urban Politics* In Judge, Stoker and Wolman (eds)

Theories of Urban Politics.

Stone, C (1989) *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*, Kansas, Kansas University

Press

Stone, C (2012) *Power in Mossberger, Clarke and John (eds) The Oxford Handbook of Urban*

Politics, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Sutton, A, (2010) *Taking out the interesting bits, Problem Solving and Crime Prevention* In

Homel (eds) *The politics and practice of situational crime prevention*, London, Lynne Reinner

Publishers

Taylor-Gooby, P and Stoker, G (2011) *The Coalition Programme: A New Vision for Britain*

or Politics as Usual? The Political Quarterly Volume 82, Issue 1, pages 4–15

Taylor M, (2003) *Public Policy in the Community*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Thrift, N (2011) *Lifeworld Inc and what to do about It Environment and Planning D: Society*

and Space volume 29, pages 5- 26

Tilley, N. (2009) *Crime Prevention*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan

Walklate E and Evans K (1999) *Zero tolerance or community tolerance: Managing crime in high crime areas*. Aldershot. Ashgate publishing Ltd

Young J and Lea J (1984) *What is to be Done About Law and Order?: Crisis in the Eighties* London Penguin

Young, J (1999) *The Exclusive Society Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*, London, Sage