



CCI

CUTTING CRIME
IMPACT

Cutting — Crime Impact

www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER



Greater Manchester
POLICE



Contact Us . info@cuttingcrimeimpact.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 787100



CCI
CUTTING CRIME
IMPACT



DELIVERABLE 6.1

Ethical, legal and social issues impacting Crime Prevention through Urban Design & Planning

Deliverable Type

Report

Work Package

WP 6

Dissemination

Public

Month and Date of Delivery

Month 12, September 2019

Leader

RUG

Authors

Dr Oskar J. Gstrein, University of
Groningen
Anno Bunnik, University of
Groningen
Prof Andrej Zwitter, University of
Groningen

Programme

H2020

Contract Number

787100

Duration

36 Months

Start

1 October 2018

CONTRIBUTORS

NAME	ORGANISATION
N/A	

PEER REVIEWS

NAME	ORGANISATION
PROF CAROLINE L DAVEY	UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD
ANDREW B WOOTTON	UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD
PILAR DE LA TORRE	EUROPEAN FORUM FOR URBAN SECURITY
PAUL VAN SOOMEREN	DSP

REVISION HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	REVIEWER	MODIFICATIONS
2	04/10/19	EFUS, DSP, USAL	Minor changes to text

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	5
2	Introduction.....	6
	2.1 <i>Scope</i>	6
	2.2 <i>Approach</i>	7
	2.3 <i>Purpose</i>	7
3	Conceptual investigation of ethical and human rights concerns – based on literature review.....	8
	3.1 <i>Why do ethics and human rights matter for CCI and CP-UDP?</i>	8
	3.2 <i>Proactive networked approaches and the merging of socio-technological activity</i>	8
	3.3 <i>What concepts and theories apply?</i>	10
4	Holistic approach: ethical, legal and social concerns	12
	4.1 <i>Ethical</i>	12
	4.2 <i>Legal</i>	13
	4.3 <i>Social</i>	13
5	Empirical investigation	15
	5.1 <i>State-of-the-art review</i>	15
	5.2 <i>Potential Strengths and weaknesses</i>	16
6	Conclusion and Recommendations	17
7	Bibliography.....	18

1 Executive Summary

- There are various strategies to prevent crime aimed at shaping both the social and physical domain. Crime Prevention through Urban Design and Planning (CP-UDP) is amongst them, seeking to deter criminal behaviour, as well as reduce feelings of insecurity.
- A timely and relevant interpretation of CP-UDP could be to consider it as an investment in proactive approaches that are oriented towards preventing future problems. However, this often involves the development of a network of partners collaborating on a shared mission, instead of using traditional command and control structures.
- CP-UDP needs to be designed in a way that respects the space of the individual and human dignity, even if the measures are deployed in deprived areas which are difficult to control or have high crime rates.
- Ethical concerns related to CP-UDP are the rise of a surveillance society and stigmatisation of areas and groups.
- As we see the emergence of 'smart cities' in Europe and across the world, the distinction between spaces and spheres of influence, as well as the definition of their purpose is influenced by an increasingly wide range of factors, making this process and its results much more fluid and difficult to control.
- To mitigate social issues, smart environments could be designed along the themes of the SHARED principles: Sustainable, Harmonious, Affective, Relevant, Empowerment, Diverse.
- The main strength of CP-UDP, and the case studies presented here, is its strong focus on a proactive problem-solving mentality.
- When it comes to weaknesses one could state that CP-UDP is a primarily a process-driven activity. It is difficult to define (common) substantive themes, objectives and tasks which would allow to clearly understand what needs be achieved and how success could be measured.
- CP-UDP strategies should take into account how the relationship between the individual and society is affected by them avoiding 'technological gentrification'.
- Trends associated with digitalisation such as the emergence of 'smart cities', use of digital technology for surveillance purposes, as well as the increasing dependency on reliable digital infrastructure ought to be integrated in the next generation of CP-UDP strategies.

2 Introduction

Strategies to prevent crime aim at shaping both the social and physical domain. Crime Prevention through Urban Design and Planning (CP-UDP) is among them, seeking to deter criminal behaviour, as well as reduce feelings of insecurity. Through the design of physical space the opportunity for and impact of crime is likely to be reduced. This opens up questions on the role of law enforcement agencies (LEAs) in the domain of urban planning, architecture and design. How far can LEAs go in interfering in 'liberal' societies? And what is the role of other stakeholders, including local authorities, architects and citizens, in this process?

This report is addressing these and associated questions. It is predominantly based on the Cutting Crime Impact (CCI) state-of-the-art review (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019) which provides an overview of CP-UDP approaches in five European countries: Estonia, France, Germany, The Netherlands and the UK. Furthermore, the state-of-the-art review contains a more detailed synopsis of developments in Greater Manchester and Lower-Saxony. Each of these regions have developed their own CP-UDP framework contributing to a diverse landscape of a techniques that is increasingly widespread all over Europe and the world. While aiming at identifying common themes, the authors of this review recognise these differences.

It is submitted that the ethical, legal and social issues of CP-UDP cannot be addressed in a vacuum, but touch upon debates on the root causes of criminal behaviour and the nudging of citizens by the state, such as through surveillance and the emergence of 'smart cities'. The latter is closely linked to an ongoing trend towards digitalisation of LEA activities, as well as the digitalisation of societal life in general (Bayerl and Jacobs 2017, p. 247-248). In this regard, one important aspect is whether current CP-UDP strategies embed this trend enough in their considerations, and whether issues such as network security, information security and data protection ought to be integrated in the next generation of CP-UDP strategies.

2.1 Scope

We base our observations on a literature review plus the state-of-the-art report produced by the CCI consortium (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019). Consequently, this deliverable consists of a conceptual (section 3) and empirical investigation (section 5). We combine these with suggestions for creating a holistic approach consisting of the three lenses—ethical, legal and social concerns (section 4). This setup will enable us to develop our findings from scratch and apply them in an empirical setting based on the observations of the CCI consortium. Finally, conclusions and recommendations seek to improve the development of CP-UDP through the production of toolkits—the intended end-result of CCI.

2.2 Approach

This report deals with the social, ethical and legal implications of CP-UDP and is scheduled for completion in the early stages of the toolkit design process. Hence, the approach of this paper lies between a conceptual and empirical investigation. We begin by exploring questions such as: What is at stake for our police forces, citizens and communities when LEAs start developing and implementing CP-UDP? This is followed by an in-depth analysis of the state-of-the-art report (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019) that underpins the empirical investigation.

2.3 Purpose

This report serves as starting point to inform the participants of the DesignLab, held at the University of Salford in September 2019, and presents salient social, ethical and legal issues relating to CP-UDP. The design process will include LEA officers, LEA staff and crime prevention experts, as well as academics. By including a conceptual and empirical review in the early stages of the design process, the project consortium seeks to 'frontload' ethics in the design of new technologies, systems and toolkits (Van den Hoven 2007). The reason for setting up the process in this way is grounded in literature on human-centred 'design-thinking' and value-sensitive design. Human-centred design thinking as an approach is based on, amongst others, consideration and involvement of the user in the design process (Giacomin 2014). Direct stakeholders (e.g. LEAs) are involved in the design process, whereas the interests of indirect stakeholders (e.g. citizens and communities) are considered in this report. Value-sensitive design is complementary as it is based on the mutually constitutive relationship between humans and/or human values with technologies, which are increasingly part of policing approaches.

3 Conceptual investigation of ethical and human rights concerns – based on literature review

3.1 Why do ethics and human rights matter for CCI and CP-UDP?

In European societies the state has to justify why it interferes with or limits the space of the individual. This can be studied in more detail when considering the development and application of ‘non-absolute’ human rights as enshrined in the European Convention of Human Rights of the Council of Europe which was signed in 1950. This binding international agreement remains one of the most important international human rights treaties in Europe, building its success on enabling individuals to file complaints against states to an international body (Greer 2009, p. 316). The most relevant provisions here are the ‘Right to respect for private and family life’ in Article 8, ‘Freedom of thought, conscience and religion’ in Article 9, ‘Freedom of expression’ in Article 10 as well as the ‘Freedom of assembly and association’ in Article 11. An analysis of paragraph 2 of each of these articles reveals that they only must be limited by states or their institutions if this is done on the basis of a specific law, if it is necessary in a democratic society for one of the purposes specified in the paragraphs, and in a manner that is proportionate taking into account the other rights and liberties that might be affected.

Typically, measures relating to CP-UDP will not directly result in such clear interferences with individual rights. CP-UDP is about designing a landscape in which such limitations might take place, but also has the mission to prevent them from becoming necessary. Hence, it seems important to emphasise this general setup of the human rights system since CP-UDP considerably shapes the preconditions under which these rights can be enjoyed. As we will continue to elaborate throughout this report, the early stage during which CP-UDP is deployed in building projects makes it necessary to keep these end objectives in sight. Since CP-UDP is predominantly process-driven, there is a danger of failing to consider these priorities sufficiently. This would hamper the protection, respect and promotion of human rights through government-assisted design measures, even if their primary focus is on supporting security and fighting crime.

3.2 Proactive networked approaches and the merging of socio-technological activity

CP-UDP in its current shape is heavily influenced by wider developments taking place in recent years, such as the re-definition of the relationship between the individual and society which is catalysed by major trends such as globalisation and digitalisation. To understand these changes and its implications

for the work of institutions working on security better, Hazenberg and Zwitter propose to distinguish three modes of governance:

- Mode 1 governance: traditional command and control structures mostly embedded in the state.
- Mode 2 governance: more horizontal forms of governance that include private actors and can be categorised into (a) public-private governance, (b) non-autonomous self-governance, and (c) autonomous self-governance.
- Mode 3 governance: governance structures outside and governance processes within network structures characterised by changing and multiple roles of actors, and the necessity to identify roles depending on network clusters and policy domains (Hazenberg and Zwitter 2017, p. 184-209).

Hence, from fighting crime to providing health care and across the board, we can identify two relevant patterns:

- The increasing focus by governmental actors on taking proactive measures with the objective of preventing future problems, such as crime
- The rise of networked mode 3 governance in contrast to traditional mode 1 or 2 governance.

Put together, a timely and relevant interpretation of CP-UDP by government agencies could be to consider it as an investment in proactive approaches that are oriented towards preventing future problems. Often, this involves a network of partners collaborating on a shared mission, cooperating predominantly in mode 3 governance, rather than mode 1 or 2. Finding ways to successfully collaborate in mode 3 governance might also aid in improving the broad public acceptance of measures. The attention on investment in proactive policies goes back several decades, such as a critical government report in the UK that called for more proactive law enforcement in the early 1990s (Audit Commission 1993). The trend towards digitalisation, the use of big data, and the opportunities provided through automated decision-making have further increased the opportunities for state agencies to take preventative action based on data-driven insights (Mayer-Schönberger and Cukier 2013). Proactive action is closely linked to networked governance and the availability of large amounts of (personal) data, the velocity of transfer, as well as the increased capabilities of processing and analysis. Hence, networked approaches have gained more traction over traditional bureaucratic governance models in recent years (Castells 2011). Considering CP-UDP in this light, it could become an interesting example of how traditional fields of law enforcement are adapting to challenges and themes of their time, as it brings police, other (public and private) actors and citizens together to co-produce safety and security.

However, the use and assumptions made on the basis of data potentially also limit the opportunities and development options for individuals. Meticulously designed, highly monitored and granularly managed environments might turn out to disproportionately limit the space for development of individuals and communities. Individuals living in 'over designed' spaces might ultimately feel

burdened to ‘fulfil’ the assumptions created by designers and public authorities, even if those have been developed interpreting ‘evidence’ consisting of digital data with different sources, nature, and quality. This potential development towards public spaces that are in their design, use and monitoring overdependent on digital data and digital infrastructure could also be described as ‘technological gentrification’ (Gstrein & Ritsema van Eck 2018, p. 76).

3.3 What concepts and theories apply?

The origins of CP-UDP go back to the Chicago School of Sociology which emphasised the relationship between behaviour (i.e. crime) and places (i.e. neighbourhoods). Scholars such as Shaw and McKay theorised that an erosion of social institutions, such as schools, churches and family, lead to the socialisation of crime producing new generations of criminals (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 7). The state-of-the-art report provides an overview of its foundations, including how the field has evolved since. While it is important to remember these origins of CP-UDP (see Jacobs 1961; Newman 1972; Jeffrey 1999) as well as the resulting experiences, these assumptions themselves might be up for discussion considering the societal changes occurring. Societies are not so much defined by territorial borders as they used to be, and psychological communities and communities of memory gain importance in shaping the daily lives of individuals (Gstrein, Bunnik & Zwitter 2019a, p. 19).

A more recent body of work that is relevant is Latour’s scholarship on the convergence of the social and technological worlds. He makes the case that technological artefacts are not mere things, but instead have agency and are social actors (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 36-37). Similar interpretations of the world and how our perception changes with the development of technology and (networked) mass media can also be found in Marshal McLuhan’s work (1962). Furthermore, we can put such findings in context with conceptualisations of a ‘Panopticon’ of Jeremy Bentham in the 18th and 19th century. Subsequent conceptualisations building on his work on surveillance and society have been developed by Foucault, Deleuze, Lyon (Galič, Timan & Koops 2017, p. 32-34), and most recently Zubnoff (2019) with the proclamation of the age of ‘surveillance capitalism’.

As we see the emergence of ‘smart cities’ in Europe and across the world, the distinction between spaces and spheres of influence, as well as the definition of their purpose is subject to influence from a much wider range of factors (Edwards 2016), making this process and its results much more fluid and difficult to control. Digitalisation of our social and physical world allows urban spaces to be dominated by sensors and autonomous systems, which constantly monitor their surroundings to predict, prevent and nudge human behaviour. A prominent example of this is the city of Eindhoven in the Netherlands, where the main street for nightlife is both packed with people and smart technologies (Naafs 2018). Pilot projects have taken place here to influence people towards prosocial behaviour through changes in the colours of lamps or by spreading the smell of oranges (Omroep Brabant 2018). CP-UDP is in essence about encouraging prosocial behaviour and smart technologies increase the opportunities in the public space to do so—transforming CP-UDP into a form of city management in near-real time. However, it is hard to imagine that such a project can successfully take place in a liberal and free society without a broad public discussion on legitimate purposes and



www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu

objectives of such activities, as well as appropriate transparency and effective oversight during its application.

4 Holistic approach: ethical, legal and social concerns

4.1 Ethical

Preventing crime through better collaboration with city planners and managers, local authorities and architects might seem like an activity few can be against. There are, however, some ethical concerns related to CP-UDP which should be taken into account. Here we discuss the looming threat of transition towards a surveillance society and stigmatisation of community areas which should be taken into account when designing toolkits for CP-UDP.

Surveillance society

One of the primary ethical concerns is that increasing surveillance has an impact on privacy, autonomy and individual agency. It also affects the exercise of other human rights such as freedom of expression, the right to assembly, or the right to access information (Cannataci 2016, p. 8-10). There is the persistent threat that permanently monitored areas transform into what the French philosopher Foucault has described as 'panopticism' (Galič, Timan & Koops 2017, p. 11-15), which makes traditional public spaces disappear since everyone is permanently monitored by default through technologies such as facial recognition and other automated cognition systems making use of a flood of omnipresent sensors. In such a scenario, it does not matter any longer whether an individual is monitored. Rather, one must assume that one is monitored permanently, and that assumptions about one's future behaviour are developed and prepared on an ongoing basis. How people and society might respond to such developments can currently be studied as parts of civil society in the city of Hong Kong carry out protests in a highly monitored and connected environment (Haas 2019). Whereas traditional public space allows for individuals to be mostly anonymous except when they start to interact with others, this predisposition is entirely different in a digitised environment. It seems not impossible that such measures might soon have comparable effects to designing an area to be dominated by 'hard' security measures, such as fencing and barbed wire, which is known to raise feelings of insecurity (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 9).

Stigmatisation of areas

In the CCI deliverable on ethical, legal, and social issues of Predictive Policing (D4.1.) we have already discussed this issue intensely (Gstrein, Bunnik and Zwitter 2019, p. 19). Hence, it should be sufficient to restate that increased LEA activity in certain areas can potentially have stigmatising effects for an area and the individuals living in it. As already outlined, this can be a particular concern if 'traditional stigmas' are increasingly supported by badly selected or prematurely used data sourced from private

or public parties. Additionally, we would like to note that the state-of-the-art report on CP highlighted that stigmatisation of CP was primarily an ethical concern (Davey et al. 2019, p. 49). While it is largely unclear which kind of ethical dimension is alluded to and in which context, we wish to add that the stigmatisation of areas can have very tangible and material consequences for individuals. For example, the houses or businesses they own might decrease in value, or they might not be hired for a job or gain other opportunities for individual development since their existence is tied to a certain address in a deprived area (Gstrein & Ritsema van Eck 2018, p. 75-79).

4.2 Legal

Since CP-UDP is typically used at an early stage of planning affecting the general design of environments and communities, it is difficult to establish direct links to individual rights and duties. Only if the issues outlined in the ethical and social domains are not respected in CP-UDP measures one might consider whether there are any legal implications. However, since it will be difficult to prove direct harm of an individual resulting from CP-UDP—typically individuals will be affected as part of a group—the role of the law to offer concrete safeguards and remedies is limited from the outset.

However, one could at least invoke the importance of respect for second generational human rights which cover the economic, social and cultural domain of an individual. Yet, the exact nature of a ‘right to education’ or ‘to work’ remain vague (Asbjørn 2001, p. 17-22), and the enforcement of such rights has proven complex historically. In conclusion, one might consider whether administrative laws requiring CP-UDP as part of an application to gain a building permit might include the consideration of certain principles, as well as a right for communities to object to certain measures if this is practically feasible.

4.3 Social

The primary social concern is closely related to more recent developments in ‘Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design’ (CPTED) that also seek to improve the quality of life, beyond reducing crime and fear. The state-of-the-art report emphasises that this primarily involves various forms of community engagement: ‘In 2nd generation CPTED, there should be greater attention paid to the social environment. Examples of social interventions include: making passive bystanders more active guardians; encouraging residents to become active; increasing community interest and engagement.’ (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 16). The earlier review of Community Policing (Gstrein, Bunnik & Zwitter 2019) revealed that this is not without risks. This is perhaps most pertinent when it comes to turning ‘passive bystanders’ into ‘active guardians’, effectively bestowing law enforcement duties onto citizens. The relevance and use of open source intelligence for the work of LEAs is also increasingly important in this regard and deserves attention (Hassan & Hijazi 2018, p. 341-345).

With the ongoing pace of digitalisation, CP-UDP is likely to be linked to, or at some point even converge with, smart city activities on sensors and the Internet of Things (IoT). After all, both developments are geared towards improving safety and security in urban environments. And in both

developments technological and social systems are increasingly intertwined to the extent that it is hard to separate the two domains. New developments such as smart doorbells with remotely accessible cameras emphasise this development further (Paul 2019) and keep blurring the line between 'public' and 'private' monitoring of space. While CP-UDP has a track record of engaging citizens for good purposes, a similar strongly value-driven approach is often lacking in developments related to 'smart cities' (Edwards 2016; Keymolen and Voorwinden 2019). Research highlights that citizens are largely excluded in smart city projects financed by the European Union (EU) (Engelbert, van Zoonen & Hirzalla 2019). CP-UDP projects could inform smart cities projects on community engagement, and exchange best practices on the role of citizens, groups and communities in this regard. Furthermore, an overreliance on digital risks excluding certain groups such as the elderly.

The Centre for BOLD cities has developed a set of principles to facilitate citizen engagement on 'smart' developments in an urban context (Centre for BOLD Cities n.d.):

- S for Sustainable: Citizen engagement needs to be invited and organised in a way that it will last longer than just the launch of a project, or the development of a programme.
- H for Harmonious: Citizen engagement needs to be organised in ways that are inclusive and do not contradict existing legislation, social policy and/or standard norms of good citizenship and civil behaviour.
- A for Affective: Citizen engagement needs to include acknowledgement of and respect for different emotional investments and concerns with respect to technology and data.
- R for Relevant: Citizen engagement needs to engage those people who are directly affected by and involved with smart city developments and projects.
- E for Empowering: Citizen engagement needs to be aimed at providing people with a better understanding of what is going on, the intellectual and practical tools to form an opinion and assessment of it, and possibly, but not necessarily, the technical tools to participate in it.
- D for Diverse: Citizen engagement needs to acknowledge and accommodate the various dimensions of diversity in cities, including gender, ethnicity, class, disability, sexuality and religion.

These principles provide a framework to approach the increasing digitalisation of the domain CP-UDP in the near future.

5 Empirical investigation

5.1 State-of-the-art review

The state-of-the-art review by the CCI consortium (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019) provides an overview of CP-UDP in Estonia, France, Germany, The Netherlands and the UK. In addition, the approach in Greater Manchester and Lower-Saxony is described in more detail. Together, this paints a rich picture of diverse approaches instead of a one-size-fit-all model. The comparative analysis of the CP-UDP models recognises this diversity, yet identified three common features that are prominent in all approaches. These three features form the building blocks for the empirical review:

- Process management.
- Language and framing.
- Roles and partnerships.

Process management

The various case studies highlight that CP-UDP is relevant throughout the design and planning process, as well as in city management as the case of Eindhoven elucidated. However, the state-of-the-art report emphasised that police agencies can have most impact by being involved in the early stages of designing and planning, i.e. before building permission is granted. When police are consulted later in the process, changes become more difficult and costly to implement. Furthermore, adaptations of plans in later stages focus primarily on hard security measures, such as locks, bolts and walls. Hence, it is more difficult to achieve 'soft security' and therefore more difficult to create trust.

Language and framing

The review highlighted the importance of language and framing in this field. A prominent example is the use of terms such as 'crime' and 'security' with their many dimensions and meanings. While police officers and staff generally talk about 'crime', those working on development projects talk about 'security'. This insight spurred Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to rebrand the Architectural Liaison Officers as Design for Security Consultants. The state-of-the-art report makes the argument that these consultants are better attuned to engage important stakeholders in the early phases of concept design (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 18). Therefore, it can be concluded from this case study that language matters and, moreover, can improve process management as well as better collaboration with stakeholders. However, it would also be helpful to define the terms more clearly and be aware of the specific context in which they are used. This could facilitate the shaping and management expectations of all involved parties, as well as the development of clear objectives.

Another interesting example worth discussing in this context is the Dutch label ‘Politiekeurmerk Veilig Wonen’ (PKVW). The term ‘veilig’ is positioned somewhere in between safe and secure and hence adds another layer to what has just been elaborated upon. This broad approach facilitates the label to focus on issues such as crime, fire safety and even the design of bicycle lanes to ensure that cyclists are visible to bystanders (PKVW 2015, p. 30-32; Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 18). The broad framing of the label allows for a wide impact on urban design and planning. Yet, while there seems to be little growth in the application of the label within the Netherlands, the question could also be raised if it could work in a non-Dutch context due to its very specific framing.

Multi-agency partnerships

Closely linked to process management and language/framing is the collaboration with stakeholders. Similar to other law enforcement domains, such as Community Policing (CP), CP-UDP is highly dependent on proactive multi-agency partnerships. A good example of the breath of collaboration is the Security Partnership in Urban Planning in Lower Saxony, Germany where police, state councils, planning organisations, professional associations and academics participate in CP-UDP (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 23). However, because of the federal system with high degrees of autonomy the sixteen German states have developed different CP-UDP approaches. Additionally, the case of CP-UDP development in Estonia highlights that getting multi-agency partnerships of the ground is not an easy task and requires strong supporters at the top of governance structures. The unexpected death of a single key individual halted progress for several years (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 26).

5.2 Potential Strengths and weaknesses

The main strength of CP-UDP, and the case studies presented here, is its strong focus on a proactive problem-solving mentality. Despite numerous and diverse challenges, from austerity to terrorism, LEAs are keen to implement projects with and for communities. The co-production of safety and security with local stakeholders is hard to oppose, at least in European societies where inclusion and participation are important values. Furthermore, research links CP-UDP to a measured decrease in crime rates and feelings of insecurity, such as an 80 per cent decrease of risk of burglary in the Netherlands following the introduction of the Police Label Safe and Secure Housing (Van Soomeren, Davey & Wootton 2019, p. 19-20).

When it comes to weaknesses one could state that CP-UDP is primarily a process-driven action. It is sometimes difficult to define common substantive themes, objectives and tasks. As trends such as digitalisation change society it becomes less clear what CP-UDP could or should achieve. In many ways, CP-UDP can be understood as a reservoir of known design practices that seem to reduce crime if implemented at an early stage in the design processes of buildings and public environments. This says little about its substantive meaning and place in society, which gets even more complex considering its predominantly local nature, as well as the vague objectives summarised by terms such as ‘crime’, ‘security’ or their equivalents in other languages such as ‘veiligheid’.

6 Conclusion and Recommendations

CP-UDP is an activity that is deeply rooted in communities with different cultural and local reference points. Considering that the prevention of crime is one of the core activities of LEAs across Europe and the world, it is not surprising to see that cultural context and societal differences are important in its execution. However, its strong focus on process leaves many open questions on its substantive meaning and place in the work of LEAs. Although a European technical reference has been developed (CEN/TR 14383-2, 2007), the example of Germany, with sixteen federal states with their own distinct approaches, highlights that standardisation of CP-UDP in Europe is hard to achieve even within one nation. Nevertheless, we can clearly identify some common themes and principles, notably process management, the importance of language and multi-agency approaches. Police agencies could do well to recognise the importance of these factors and design policies and procedures that connect stakeholders early on in the design and planning phase around a common language that all participating parties understand and trust.

We have identified that the main ethical issues relate to the dangers of CP-UDP becoming one of the key drivers to creating a surveillance society, and the potential stigmatisation of community environments and individuals. When it comes to the social elements it seems crucial to take the changing nature of society with more diversity and other trends into account. As community are being transformed into 'smart cities', the SHARED principles remind us that these places need be sustainable, harmonious, affective, relevant, empowering and diverse. While this is not entirely new as such, a digitised space requires different solutions than the traditional spaces we are used to and in which CP-UDP has been developed over the last decennia.

This report emphasised the need to rethink CP-UDP in order to address the requirements of a rapidly changing society in which digitalisation of private-public interactions is omnipresent. 'Smart technologies' are increasingly present in our public spaces, our streets and in- and outside our homes. The next generation of CP-UDP strategies need to respond to this altered reality and embed digitalisation and relating topics in order to help creating enjoyable public space and at the same time avoid 'technological gentrification'.

7 Bibliography

- Asbjørn E. (2001) "Economic, social, and cultural rights as human rights" In: Rosas, A. Krause, C. Asbjørn M. (eds) *Economic, social, and cultural rights : A textbook*, The Hague: Kluwer.
- Audit Commission (1993) *Helping with enquiries: Tackling crim effectively*. London: HMSO.
- Bayerl, P.S. and Jacobs, G. (2017) "Evaluating the Design and Implementation of CP-Support Technologies: A Participatory Framework", in Bayerl, P. S. et al. [eds] *Community Policing – A European Perspective*, Springer 2017.
- Bunnik, A. (n.d.) *Policing the Future? Assessing the implementation of Big Data by UK Law Enforcement*, PhD Dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Cannataci, J. (2016). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy to the General Assembly*. United Nations report A/HRC/31/64.
- Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society* (Vol. 12). John Wiley & Sons.
- Centre for BOLD Cities (n.d.) *SHARED principles*, no date, available from: <https://www.centre-for-bold-cities.nl/shared-principles> (accessed 20 August 2019)
- Edelenbos J. et al. (2018) "Governing the Complexity of Smart Data Cities: Setting a Research Agenda" In: Rodríguez Bolívar M. (eds) *Smart Technologies for Smart Governments. Public Administration and Information Technology*, Vol 24. Springer, Cham
- Edwards, L. (2016) "Privacy, Security and Data Protection in Smart Cities: A Critical EU Law Perspective". 2 *European Data Protection Law Review*. 28–58.
<https://doi.org/10.21552/EDPL/2016/1/6>
- Engelbert, J., van Zoonen, L., and F. Hirzalla (2019) "Excluding citizens from the European smart city: The discourse practices of pursuing and granting smartness", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 142, Issue May 2019, pp. 347-353.
- Galič, M., Timan, T., & Koops, B.J. (2017). "Bentham, Deleuze and Beyond: An Overview of Surveillance Theories from the Panopticon to Participation". *Philos. Technol*, 2017(30), 9–37. doi: 10.1007/s13347-016-0219-1
- Greer, S. (2006) *The European Convention on Human Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gstrein, O.J., Bunnik, A., Zwitter, A.J. (2019) *Review of ethical, legal, and social issues impacting Predictive Policing*, Cutting Crime Impact, June 2019.

Gstrein, O.J., Bunnik, A., Zwitter, A.J. (2019a) *Review of ethical, legal, and social issues impacting Community Policing*, Cutting Crime Impact, June 2019.

Gstrein O.J., Ritsema van Eck G.J. (2018) "Mobile devices as stigmatizing security sensors: the GDPR and a future of crowdsourced 'broken windows'" *International Data Privacy Law*, Volume 8, Issue 1, February 2018, Pages 69–85, <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1093/idpl/ix024>

Haas, B. (2019) "The new battle in Hong Kong isn't on the streets: it's in the apps". *Wired*, 10 September 2019, <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/614286/the-new-battle-in-hong-kong-isnt-on-the-streets-its-in-the-apps/> retrieved 10 September 2019.

Hassan, N. Hijazi, R. (2018). *Open Source Intelligence Methods and Tools*. New York, NY: Apress.

Hazenbergh, J. L. J., Zwitter, A. (2017). "Network Governance im Big Data- und Cyber-Zeitalter". *Zeitschrift Für Evangelische Ethik*, 61(3), 184–209. <https://doi.org/10.14315/zee-2017-0305>

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House

Jeffrey, C. R. (1999) "CPTED: Past, present and future" Position Paper prepared for the International CPTED Association at the 4th International CPTED Association Conference, Mississauga Ontario, Canada

Keymolen, E. Voorwinden, A. (2019) "Can we negotiate? Trust and the rule of law in the smart city paradigm". *Journal International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2019.1588844>

Mayer-Schönberger, V. and Cukier, K. (2013) *Big Data: A Revolution That Will Transform How We Live, Work, and Think*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

McLuhan, M. (1962) *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1962.

Omroep Brabant (2018) "Stratumseind 2.0: Big Brother kijkt niet alleen mee, maar beïnvloedt je ook", 5 August 2018, <https://www.omroepbrabant.nl/nieuws/2821879/Stratumseind-2-0-Big-Brother-kijkt-niet-alleen-mee-maar-beinvloedt-je-ook> (accessed 20 august 2019)

Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space: Crime prevention through urban design*. New York: Macmillan

Paul, K. (2019) "Amazon's doorbell camera Ring is working with police – and controlling what they say", *The Guardian*, 30 August 2019, available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/aug/29/ring-amazon-police-partnership-social-media-neighbor> (accessed 1 September 2019)

PKVW (2015) *Handboek Politiekeurmerk Veilig Wonen Nieuwbouw 2015*, available from: <https://hetccv.nl/webshop/producten/productdetail/handboek-pkvw-nieuwbouw-2015/> (accessed 20 August 2019)



www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu

Van Soomeren, P., Davey, C. and A. Wootton (2019) *Review of State of the Art: CP-UDP*, Cutting Crime Impact, May 2019

Zubnoff, S. (2019) "Surveillance Capitalism and the Challenge of Collective Action". *New Labor Forum*, Vol. 28(1) 10–29. doi: 10.1177/1095796018819461



CCI
CUTTING CRIME
IMPACT

