

COST Action TU1203:
Crime Prevention through Urban Design & Planning



Situational prevention in Lyon – a pioneering policy in France

From a controversial, taboo subject to an integrated approach in urban design and planning projects.

January 2017

Contents

Contents	i
Table of Figures.....	ii
Foreword	iii
<i>What is COST?</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>About COST TU1203</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>From the Chair and the Core Group.....</i>	<i>iv</i>
Executive Summary	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
<i>Authorship</i>	<i>vii</i>
Introduction.....	9
<i>Case study focus & scope</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Case study methodology.....</i>	<i>9</i>
1. Timeline.....	11
<i>Situational Crime Prevention in France and in Lyon.....</i>	<i>11</i>
2. Action undertaken.....	12
<i>Situational prevention in Lyon – a pioneering policy in France</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>1 - The history of situational prevention in Lyon.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>2- Urban renovation, redevelopment and restructuring: three neighbourhoods, three security consideration strategies.</i>	<i>24</i>
3. Conclusion & recommendations	42
Appendix 1	43
<i>Reference materials.....</i>	<i>43</i>
Appendix 2	46

<i>Key contacts for further information.....</i>	<i>46</i>
--	-----------

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Metropole of Lyon – Google Map.....	13
Figure 2: Extension of the scope of ESSP in 2011.....	21
Figure 3: La Duchère District.....	25
Figure 4: La Duchère District in 2002	26
Figure 5: La Duchère District in 2016 (project) - ©Asylum.....	26
Figure 6: Pictures of La Duchère in 2016 - ©CEREMA.....	27
Figure 7: La Duchère District in 2016 - ©CEREMA	28
Figure 8: Confluence - ©Mission Confluence / Grand Lyon	29
Figure 9: Confluence site visit©HPB.....	30
Figure 10: House of Confluence (to explain the confluence project) and Musée des Confluences ©HPB	31
Figure 11: Confluence District - ©CEREMA	34
Figure 12: Confluence District - ©CEREMA	37
Figure 13: Confluence District - ©CEREMA	38
Figure 14: La Part Dieu District ©Rhône.eelv.fr	38
Figure 15: La Part Dieu Project ©Mission Part Dieu – Grand Lyon.....	39
Figure 16: Site visit of La Part Dieu ©HPB.....	41

Foreword

What is COST?

COST – European Cooperation in Science and Technology is an intergovernmental framework aimed at facilitating the collaboration and networking of scientists and researchers at European level. It was established in 1971 by 19 member countries and currently includes 35 member countries across Europe, and Israel as a cooperating state.

COST funds pan-European, bottom-up networks of scientists and researchers across all science and technology fields. These networks, called 'COST Actions', promote international coordination of nationally-funded research.

By fostering the networking of researchers at an international level, COST enables break-through scientific developments leading to new concepts and products, thereby contributing to strengthening Europe's research and innovation capacities.

COST's mission focuses in particular on:

- ✚ Building capacity by connecting high quality scientific communities throughout Europe and worldwide;
- ✚ Providing networking opportunities for early career investigators;
- ✚ Increasing the impact of research on policy makers, regulatory bodies and national decision makers as well as the private sector.

Through its inclusiveness, COST supports the integration of research communities, leverages national research investments and addresses issues of global relevance. Every year thousands of European scientists benefit from being involved in COST Actions, allowing the pooling of national research funding to achieve common goals.

COST's budget for networking activities has traditionally been provided by successive EU RTD Framework Programmes. COST is currently executed by the European Science Foundation (ESF) through the COST Office on a mandate by the European Commission, and the framework is governed by a Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) representing all its 35 member countries.

More information about COST is available at www.cost.eu

About COST TU1203

The focus of COST Action TU1203 is *Crime Prevention through Urban Design and Planning (CP-UDP)*. The Action is chaired by Professor Clara Cardia of the Polytechnic University of Milan, Italy, and comprises country representatives from European countries and some partnership countries.

The countries presently involved are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, FYR of Macedonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

Its objective is to make a substantial advancement towards the goal of building “safe cities”. Studies have proved that there is a correlation between the structure and organization of urban space and crime: new criminological theory supports this point of view. The Justice and Home Affairs Council of the EU has underlined that crime prevention through design and planning is a successful and effective strategy for crime prevention and needs to be supported. Despite this, new projects are being implemented all over Europe without considering safety criteria, creating urban areas where crime and fear of crime make life difficult.

The Action will develop new knowledge and innovative approaches putting together theoretical thinking and practical experience. Thus the scientific program forecasts to work simultaneously on one hand on the innovative approaches deriving from research and experts, on the other hand on the know-how acquired through best practical experience. It will bring together, value and disseminate the local research and experiences of participating countries, thus contributing to building a body of European expertise in the field of CP-UDP. It will also use its wide network to promote awareness, hoping that at the end of the Action more countries and decision bodies will be aware of the importance of incorporating crime prevention principles in planning decisions and projects.

NOTE: The term crime, in the view of this Action, covers a wide range of behaviours and feelings: proper crime, anti-social behaviours, conflicts, fear of crime and other harmful behaviours, but does not include terrorism.

From the Chair and the Core Group



The activity of COST Action TU1203 is organised along two main courses: producing innovative thinking in CP-UDP on one hand; and consolidating and diffusing existing knowledge on the other.

The Action intends to achieve the first course through working groups and invited experts which will develop new issues of environmental crime prevention, such as theories, private public partnerships, new technologies, new partnerships between police and planners, new implication of local authorities etc.

It will approach the second course mainly through case studies located in different European cities. Each of the case studies will be focused on aspects that are of major importance for the Action, and will be

organized by the hosting city with the support of the Action Core Group.

The dissemination goal is considered of crucial importance and it will be achieved, starting from the first year, by building networks of communication at international as well as the national levels. These networks will be used for diffusing step by step the knowledge acquired by the Action.

In order to make the results of the thematic working groups and the case studies immediately available to the Cost TU 1203 community and to the larger network it has been decided to produce a series of booklets, which develop the approached subject in short and synthetic form and are conceived so s to be easily readable to persons coming from different backgrounds.

In the first year of activity (2013 – 2014), six publications have been produced:

1. Publications on CP-UDP: A European bibliography
2. Review of CEN 14383: The death and life of great European standards and manuals (Development and implementation of the CEN 14383 standards)
3. Cooperation between Police and Planners in Manchester, UK (case study)
3. CP-UDP Academic Research and Training in Cooperation with Local Authorities in Milan, IT (case study)
4. High Rise in trouble: the Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam (case study including an appendix with a comparison Bijlmermeer – Bellvitge)
5. Bellvitge in Barcelona: An Unexpected Success – Against all Odds (case study)
6. Situational prevention in Lyon – a pioneering policy in France (case studies)

See for the most recent information on this COST-action TU 1203: <http://costtu1203.eu/> and http://www.cost.eu/domains_actions/tud/Actions/TU1203

Executive Summary

The meeting of Lyon (France) was organized by the French delegates Michel Le Calloch (Ingeneer of the Urban Safety in Lyon), Gersende Franc and Marie-Aude Corbillé (National Team for Crime prevention by urban planning) together with the support of the COST Action Management Committee.

Under the “Crime Prevention through Urban Design and Planning” COST action, each Member State is required to produce a monograph or case study highlighting its context-specific approach to incorporating security into urban design and planning.

Here, the French team has chosen to showcase Lyon’s situational prevention policy. In this document, we set out the history of the policy and the underlying mechanisms, and provide three urban design and planning project case studies that illustrate this policy.

Lyon’s situational prevention system is a pioneering policy. It is widely recognised as a leading example of its genre, by its innovative, multi-disciplinary nature, its partnership basis and its project-based approach. This policy provided much of the inspiration for the new law introduced in 2007 covering the whole of France.

A series of violent riots happened in France and in the metropole of Lyon in 1980s. There was a new thinking of the crime prevention. The crime prevention policy in France was focused on social crime prevention. The city of Lyon developed a new approach based on situational crime prevention.

In March 2002, a Communal Consultation Committee for Situational Prevention (3CPS) was created by municipal by-law. The commission provided a framework for experimenting with the mechanism set out in the French Security Orientation and Programming Act (LOPS Act) of 1995.

The committee was intended to act as a “project examination framework”. Its purpose was to ensure that urban planning, spatial development and construction projects were designed, implemented and managed with prior knowledge of the project security environment, and to make sure that these considerations were considered at all levels of the project (urban planning, design, construction, management, cleaning and surveillance).

The aim of this initial examination work was to anticipate the potential impact of the project on an existing situation marked by security concerns, as well as its wider impact on its environment.

This approach meant that it was possible to implement suitable risk mitigation measures, based on the specific risks identified.

This committee has performed extremely well since 2002, and some positive changes have taken place. The committee was not originally meaningful as a standalone entity. It was, however, an effective way of ensuring that security considerations gained wider acceptance and were considered more prominently in urban development projects.

Acknowledgements

Authorship

This case study was written by:

Marie-Aude CORBILLÉ, *MC substitute*, Urban Planner, Sociologist, Cities and Neighbourhoods Development project manager and national urban safety and security focal point. Cerema (Centre for Studies on Risks, the Environment, Mobility and Urban Planning).

Gersende FRANC, *MC substitute*, State Architect and planner, and lead national urban safety and security focal point.

Michel LE CALLOCH, *MC member*, security engineer, Local Security and Crime Prevention Council (CLSPD), Department for Security and Prevention, Lyon City Council.

Héloïse PAGNAC-BAUDRY, *Junior Network member*, Dr., Architect and urban planner, UMR 5319 CNRS PASSAGES, National High School of Architecture and Landscape of Bordeaux.

Additional research and compilation was undertaken by:

François WELHOFF

Umberto NICOLINI

The authors would like to thank the following for their contribution to the case study and the COST meeting of Lyon:

CEREMA

Grand Lyon

Municipality of Lyon

Direction Départementale de la Sécurité et de la Prévention du Rhône

Christophe MÉRIGOT, assistant director of the project: « What about security? »

Eliza DOUBET, planner SERL

Matthieu PANCRAZI, Commissaire de Police Lyon 9e arrondissement

Dora CASSAR, representative of Lyon security

Jean-Yves SÉCHERESSE, deputy mayor of Lyon in the security,

Frédéric DUCHENE, Cronos

Anne-Laure RECARTE, Project Leader and Stéphanie SCHEMTOB, leader of the dialogue with the inhabitants,
SPL Lyon Confluence

Frantz DENAT, national coordinator in the Police for urban security (Référent sûreté)

Emilie Petit, EFUS

Introduction

Case study focus & scope

This booklet deals with the French particularity of the application of crime prevention through urban design and planning (CP-UDP) by law. The city of Lyon was pioneering to experiment the French studies of safety (ESSP) between architects and urban planners, the police and the municipality. To illustrate the work of the 3CPS of Lyon, three case studies were selected: La Duchère, La Part Dieu and Confluence.

Case study methodology

COST site visit was from the 2nd to the 4th November 2015 in Lyon (France).

After the working groups, the first day was dedicated to a presentation at the Office of the City Restructuring Project for the case study of La Duchère.

The Design and the implementation of global restructuring projects in La Duchère were presented by Christophe Mériqot, assistant director of the project: « What about security? » and Eliza DOUBET, planner SERL.

The Police organisation in the Security area (Zone de Sécurité Prioritaire, ZSP) of La Duchère and the work with social owners by Matthieu Pancrazi, Commissaire de Police Lyon 9^e arrondissement was discussed.

An urban walk in the district of La Duchère : Place Abbé Pierre – Halle Diagona – square Avéroes – Clôture de l'école des bleuets - Parc du Vallon – was done with Dora CASSAR, representative of Lyon security.

The second day, after the welcome of the deputy mayor of Lyon in the security, Jean-Yves Sécheresse, the specificities of French legislation about crime prevention by urban design was explained by Gersende Franc, architect, urban planner, Director of National Team for Crime prevention for Ministry of Sustainable Development. Then, the Security studies (ESSP) in France were reviewed since 2007 by Marie-Aude Corbillé, urban planner and sociologist, National Team for Crime prevention for Ministry of Sustainable Development.

Michel le Calloch, security engineer City of Lyon presented the crime prevention by urban design in Lyon and its applications. Frédéric Duchene, leader of the project and Security studies for the Part-Dieu renewal project: Engineering firm Cronos explained How to « Take into account in the design phase the future management of the uses of public places » in the Part-Dieu renewal project? Thus, we visited the La Part-Dieu District.

Then, Anne-Laure Recarte, Project Leader and Stéphanie Schemtob, leader of the dialogue with the inhabitants, SPL Lyon Confluence explained the Urban project of Confluence, before the site visit. The role of police for urban security (référénts sûreté) of the *Direction Départementale de la Sécurité et de la Prévention du Rhône* was presented with the participation of Frantz Denat, national coordinator in the Police for urban security (Référént sûreté). To finish, Emilie Petit, EFUS presented the Crime prevention by urban design in French cities. A debate was organized to close the day. The third day was dedicated to the MC.



Figure 1: Case studies ©Ville de Lyon and HPB

1. Timeline

Situational Crime Prevention in France and in Lyon

A series of violent riots happened in France and in the metropole of Lyon. There was a new thinking of the crime prevention. The crime prevention policy in France was focused on social crime prevention. The city of Lyon developed a new approach based on situational crime prevention.

These events are presented at the **National level (France)** and the Local level (City of Lyon):

Date	Item	Ref.
1980-1990	Series of violent riots in the metropole of Lyon.	1
1995	Loi LOPS : the French Security Orientation and Programming Act (LOPS Act).	2
1998	Lyon City Council signed a local security contract (CLS), in which it clearly stated its objective of “securing public spaces and facilities”. In order to achieve this objective, the city council opted to promote an additional prevention mechanism – situational prevention.	3
2002	A Communal Consultation Committee for Situational Prevention (3CPS) was created by municipal by-law. The commission provided a framework for experimenting with the mechanism set out in the French Security Orientation and Programming Act (LOPS Act) of 1995.	3
2007	Application of public safety and security studies (ESSPs). The decree states that development, construction and facility projects aimed at the public must be preceded by an ESSP.	4
2011	Extension of the field of ESSP’s application.	5

2. Action undertaken

Situational prevention in Lyon – a pioneering policy in France

1 - The history of situational prevention in Lyon

There were a series of riots in Lyon's suburbs, especially Vaulx-en-Velin, Villeurbanne and Vénissieux, in the 1980s and 1990s. There had already been several riots as early as 1979, and these episodes were widely covered in the media. There were several high-profile cases in which young people died prior to the late 1990s. On each occasion, these events triggered riots lasting for several days, with violent clashes between the police and residents in sensitive areas.





Figure 2: Lyon in France and Metropole of Lyon – Google Map

These events had a profound impact on the conurbation, and led Greater Lyon (the urban authority) to conduct an in-depth examination of the security situation. Because of this process, the authority began to realise that certain urban planning and design features were making it more difficult for the police to do their work.

Although this document focuses on the situation in Lyon city centre, the surrounding communes such as Vaulx-en-Velin have also adopted a highly-integrated approach to situational prevention.

1-1 A policy begins to emerge

a) An urban sociology approach to situational prevention

“Around 100 different studies were conducted between 1996 and 2006 in neighbourhoods covered by the city council’s urban policy, and in squares in the city centre and the centres of other communes within the wider conurbation.

The initial purpose of these surveys was to assess urban design and planning elements in neighbourhoods covered by the city council's urban policy, which had already been allocated substantial budgets.

The surveys provided an indication of the social geography of these neighbourhoods, revealing highly territorial practices among local residents and changes at different times of the day. They also revealed that certain urban design and planning elements were ineffective at changing the social functions and practices of a particular neighbourhood or space (e.g. the Petit Château shopping centre requalification project in Duchère, where the study gave a largely positive assessment of the urban design and planning elements, but indicated, somewhat problematically, that these had no impact on the observed occupation of space).

These studies also highlighted a certain reluctance among local residents when it came to new urban design and planning elements introduced for security reasons, and revealed that, in many cases, these projects were not suited to the local context and uses (e.g. La Grapinière in Vaulx-en-Velin, where local residents faced the issue of gangs of young people gathering in semi-private spaces).

Other studies were conducted in the La Darnaise neighbourhood in Les Minguettes as part of the residential development project. The aim of this project was to recreate separate private spaces within public spaces, and to address the security of parking spaces by creating on-street parking and a separate, monitored pay-and-display car park.

The issue of local uses was addressed by clearing spaces previously occupied by cars to create frontage gardens.

A separate study considered the social geography of groupings (hot spot for teenage boys, entrance to the neighbourhood for adults, frequency of occupation, etc.).

*These studies revealed the importance of adapting urban design and planning elements to the social context of a location, and to a particular point in time (open spaces must not necessarily be dismissed outright, since they may work in a particular urban and social context, such as the favourable socio-economic context of the 1960s and 1970s)". **Bruno Voisin**, sociologist, Urban Social Development project manager and subsequently Project Officer at the Lyon Conurbation Town Planning Agency (now retired). Interview with Gersende Franc on 28 January 2010.*

The example of Place du Pont:

The example of Place du Pont in Lyon is particularly revealing.

*"This square, also known locally as "Place des Hommes Debouts", had long been occupied by Algerians. It had undergone a series of urban planning and design developments with a view to modifying the function of the space and discouraging groups from forming in the area. Despite these attempts, however, these traditional practices continued to persist." **Bruno Voisin***

This square was a busy thoroughfare and meeting point where groups of men from North Africa gathered (hence the name "*hommes debouts*", which means "standing men"). This square had been a source of fierce debate in the past, with some claiming that this traditional practice should be defended, while others had called for the square to be "cleansed".

It is important that the square should be a space that everyone could use, and that it should not be dominated exclusively by one group.

These examples reveal two separate schools of thought in terms of security issues, and the impact of both of these schools could be seen in the Lyon context.

Lyon City Council subsequently developed a “situational prevention” policy, conducting highly targeted studies relating to the project context, and questioning managers.

b) The 1990s: flagship urban design and planning projects in public spaces

The 1990s saw a raft of flagship enhancement projects conducted throughout Lyon, including various public space development and heritage promotion programmes. This led to questions about how these spaces should be managed.

It was during this period of enhancement that situational prevention studies really came into their own.

During this period, Lyon’s elected officials (Michel Noir, Henry Chabert, etc.) drew their inspiration from Barcelona, a city that was attracting wide attention for its urban development policy. The city began a quest to reclaim its public spaces. The aim was to create a high-quality urban environment throughout the conurbation and, therefore, to help boost the influence of the Lyon conurbation, to generate closer solidarity between residents in the city centre and those on the outskirts of the city, and to develop a stronger sense of belonging to the territory.

In just a few years, this policy had become a benchmark throughout France, and even across Europe. This reputation was based not just on the sheer number of high-quality projects implemented (Rue de la République, Place des Terreaux, Place des Célestins, etc.), but also on the methodology used to achieve these results (creation of the Public Space Department as the contracting authority in 1990, definition of the urban vocabulary in 1994, use of external designers, etc.).

Nevertheless, these requalified spaces posed management problems that were probably not given sufficient attention either prior or even during the project design process.

At Place des Terreaux, for example, the artistic project designed by Daniel Buren and Christian Drevet resulted in a highly-restricted space. No plans had been made to install facilities or street furniture (such as dustbins) to make the space more manageable.

In 1998 the Mayor of Lyon, Raymond Barre, decided to focus on security and management issues and commissioned a series of situational prevention studies for city-centre squares (Place des Terreaux, Place Louis Pradel, Place de la Comédie).

The very first situational prevention study therefore focused on these squares. It was conducted by a consulting firm (Jean Grané, anthropologist and Olivier Pipard), with the aim of determining sociological practices on these three squares. This study resulted in improved management of the spaces (including extensive cleaning between 5 am and 7 am each morning following celebratory events the previous evening), and in closer cooperation with associations (Médecins du Monde) working with marginal groups. The ultimate aim of the redevelopment of the square was to reclaim the space for social uses (opening art galleries, creating a luxury hotel, etc.).

However, as Bruno Voisin indicates, a study conducted by urban sociologist Laurette Wittner shows that this effort to reclaim the space resulted in the disappearance of working-class families from the square, with no consideration given to creating an alternative space for these groups.

These highly detailed studies provided an opportunity to assess and/or evaluate practices and the social impacts of urban design and planning projects. Yet they did not provide sufficient data to inform the project design process, and failed to specifically address security questions. Where they did address these questions, they did so either implicitly, or from a political perspective.

It is therefore clear that while the issues underlying these different types of study appear contradictory they are, in fact, complementary. A broad urban sociology study will address urban programming, political decisions and their sociological impacts. It may cover security matters, but only at a general level (alternative sites for populations no longer able to use enhanced spaces, where spontaneous practices are no longer possible). It will analyse urban policy from an ideological perspective, questioning whether “cosmetic” urban planning and design projects eliminate informal practices that counter the image that the city is attempting to develop.

A situational analysis study, meanwhile, is linked directly to the programme and is conducted once the political decision to implement the programme has been made. This type of study deliberately examines the project from an expert perspective and involves direct questioning of managers. It also seeks to establish mixed use of the space wherever possible, and to ensure that all users are welcome, while avoiding exclusive dominance by one group.

Situational prevention does not dictate the public space programme or urban policy. Instead, it seeks to identify how a space may be occupied by multiple uses, and how these uses may be implemented. Situational prevention must remain a purely technical, apolitical matter, even though it crystallises an ideological debate about security.

These same contradictions were seen in the case of Place du Point (or Place des Hommes Debouts), as seen previously. The occupation practices observed were firmly rooted in the city, yet were the subject of controversy. How could this exclusive dominance by one group be managed? What strategies should be deployed? There were two possible answers to these questions: either question the legitimacy of this occupation or deal with individual situations in a targeted, practical manner without addressing the political issue. Today, this space is managed primarily through mediation, resulting in an alternative approach to occupation of the space. It is therefore clear that there was a need for mediation at this site.

Faced with the need to design attractive, manageable, sustainable and functional public space projects, Lyon City Council opted to create a formal, institutional body to deal specifically with situational prevention issues. One of the aims of this body was to review existing projects from a situational prevention perspective.

1.2- A clear situational prevention policy: The Communal Consultation Committee for Situational Prevention (3CPS)

a) The 3CPS: mindset and operations

On 28 November 1998, Lyon City Council signed a local security contract (CLS), in which it clearly stated its objective of “securing public spaces and facilities”. To achieve this objective, the city council opted to promote an additional prevention mechanism – situational prevention.

In March 2002, a Communal Consultation Committee for Situational Prevention (3CPS) was created by municipal by-law. The commission provided a framework for experimenting with the mechanism set out in the French Security Orientation and Programming Act (LOPS Act) of 1995.

The committee was intended to act as a “project examination framework”. Its purpose was to ensure that urban planning, spatial development and construction projects were designed, implemented and managed with prior knowledge of the project security environment, and to make sure that these considerations were considered at all levels of the project (urban planning, design, construction, management, cleaning and surveillance).

The aim of this initial examination work was to anticipate the potential impact of the project on an existing situation marked by security concerns, as well as its wider impact on its environment.

This approach meant that it was possible to implement suitable risk mitigation measures, based on the specific risks identified.

The city council’s task was then to promote this new “culture”, and to develop a range of new tools to enable contracting authorities and designers to appropriate the principles and techniques of situational prevention. Ultimately, the council had to educate as many people as possible and initiate cross-disciplinary discussions on security issues, with a view to improving:

- the design and management of spaces and buildings, to reduce the number of sites where criminal activities and general security issues might develop;

- municipal service support during project implementation.

The committee is chaired by the Deputy Mayor of Lyon responsible for public peace, and its vice-chair is the Deputy Mayor responsible for urban planning. The other key members are representatives of the Departmental Directorate for Public Security, the Departmental Directorates for Facilities, the Departmental Fire and Emergency Services Department, and urban planning managers from the city council and the Lyon urban community. Depending on the subjects under discussion, various guests are invited to committee meetings. These may include the mayors of the *arrondissements* concerned, the *arrondissement* commissioners, or the managers of departments and services affected by the future facility or space.

Article 1 of the municipal by-law establishing the committee states that the 3CPS is required to “issue an opinion on the measures proposed by builders and developers in their projects, with a view to protecting people and property and facilitating the intervention of the police and emergency services”. Contracting authorities or designers are asked to present their projects at committee meetings, and to highlight the security issues they have identified following a security assessment.

The committee then issues its opinion on the proposed measures, following:

- an examination of the project by experts from a range of different disciplines;
- a constructive discussion between the contracting authority and committee members on the best way to incorporate security objectives into the project;
- participation in the discussions by future managers, providing them with an opportunity to identify the most appropriate construction methods and management procedures (cleaning, human presence).

A “guide for project managers” has been produced, setting out a precise project presentation methodology.

Project managers are first required to conduct a situation analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to assess the current crime and security situation in the project environment, and to establish the types of risk encountered (risks associated with the project environment, risks associated with the type of project, and potential risks arising from the design and/or operation of the project). The project managers then use the results of this analysis to determine the most suitable measures in terms of urban planning, construction and management, and to identify the necessary mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the actions implemented.

Initially, the committee met once a month and the diligence of its members revealed strong interest in this system. Similarly, those contracting authorities prepared to engage in this process also found that the system was particularly beneficial, since the initial environmental analysis enabled them to gain a more holistic overview of the project and ensured that it would operate more effectively in the future.

The committee examined a vast array of different projects, from the construction of schools and community centres, to the redevelopment of public squares and roads, the creation of green spaces and the extension of existing parks.

Other discussions focused on construction, renovation and security enhancement projects on residential properties by public or private landlords, as well as large-scale projects (conference centre, cultural centres and the Lyon-La-Duchère major urban project).

Today, the committee issues a wide range of observations and comments, focusing primarily on the need for improved organisation and public participation to gain a deeper insight into the environmental phenomena surrounding projects, as well as on technical measures in areas such as operations, cleaning or surveillance. These opinions and comments reveal the need for project managers to conduct a holistic assessment of their projects prior to implementation, and point to the vast range of measures they can take to prevent and eliminate criminal and antisocial behaviour.

This system has never been compulsory. The main objective when establishing this committee was to create a viable, long-term mechanism and to ensure that situational prevention became a key consideration in the project development process.

One of the positive aspects of this committee is that it has revealed that all projects, whatever their size, can be adjusted or improved through the consideration of situational prevention aspects, particularly in terms of ownership. In one school construction project, for example, the contracting authority had failed to identify specific problems in advance. However, many of potential issues and conflicts were raised during a discussion meeting on prevention issues. Where this subject is covered during the discussions, it gives stakeholders an opportunity to address potential problems that they would otherwise have overlooked.

Examples include potential minor conflicts between users that cannot be identified in police statistics or are not covered as major risks in crime prevention policies.

Phenomena such as gangs, attempted break-ins and user conflicts are not included in statistics, and it is for this reason that this approach is important.

Prevention does not determine the programme, however. It must adapt to the contours of the programme, or incorporate certain elements (potential closure, for example).

Ultimately, it is the designer's job to assess how prevention will be incorporated into individual projects, before commencing the construction, implementation and management phase. It is important to keep an open mind, and to approach the design phase with a certain level of flexibility, since it is not possible, at this stage, to determine whether certain elements will ultimately be necessary.

b) The controversy surrounding the 3CPS

The committee was widely criticised, particularly by urban stakeholders (public and private contracting authorities, project designers, and even local authority project managers). As stated previously, the committee formally exposed and publicised a previously "hidden", taboo concern, leading to widespread debate.

The main criticisms were that, by analysing practices in this way, the committee tended to focus attention on specific groups that did not pose major security problems. On occasion, the committee was also accused of "stripping" projects of their key components by rejecting any elements that posed a potential security risk.

The ultimate purpose of the system was not called into question. It acted as a discussion forum and allowed urban planners and security stakeholders to openly debate situational prevention matters.

However, given the inherently political nature of the subject matter, there was a very real risk that the committee might step beyond the boundaries of its original remit and become more akin to a tribunal.

Some contracting authorities were disappointed to find their projects criticised and adopted a defensive stance rather than presenting their projects from a prevention perspective. The intention was not to “promote” projects from an advertising point of view, but rather to present projects in terms of urban sociology and spatial considerations, with a view to analysing the underlying risks.

Bilel Benbouzid, a PhD candidate studying urban planning, produced a highly effective analysis of how the committee operated in an instructive article, in which he discussed so-called “professional disputes”.

“In this article, the author examines a dispute surrounding the creation of a Communal Consultation Committee for Situational Prevention – an experimental mechanism introduced in Lyon to provide an expert examination of security (crime prevention) projects in urban spaces. The author uses social conflict theory to analyse this critical moment at which urban planning managers and security managers came to blows over the acceptability and definition of this committee. The challenge is to take each person’s carefully argued and supported position seriously, and to try to determine how they reach an agreement. The evidence points to the fact that situational prevention is a highly contentious issue that triggers significant debates and controversy around the subject of urban development. By creating this experimental system, Lyon City Council has somewhat unintentionally produced a discussion and framework forum for the controversy surrounding situational prevention. This forum provides security and urban planning managers with an opportunity to address a range of political and ethical questions in a manner that places political considerations above technical expertise¹.”

Gradual changes to the way in which the commission operated revealed the trend for greater inclusion of situational prevention in project design. The initially turbulent debates had the positive effect of purging ideological and political positions, and instead placing the emphasis on technical questions, on the content and operation of projects, and on how these projects contributed to life in the city.

1. 3-An integrated, conurbation-wide policy

a) The introduction of statutory public security studies throughout France in 2007.


The LOPS Act of 21 January 1995 laid the foundations for the crime prevention in urban planning and construction. Article 11 of the LOPS Act introduced a compulsory requirement to conduct public security studies prior to the commencement of “development and public facility projects and construction programmes which, due to their scale, location or specific characteristics, may have an impact on the protection of people and property against threats and attacks”. The implementing decrees for these public security studies were not published until 2007, following lengthy discussions between the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Facilities (now the Ministry of Ecology).

¹ **Bilel Benbouzid (2010)**, “Urbanisme et prévention situationnelle : le cas de la dispute des professionnels à Lyon”, *Métropoles*, 8, published online on 17 December 2010. URL: <http://metropoles.revues.org/4391>

Lyon City Council introduced its own mandatory situational prevention study policy in 2002, well before the publication of this decree. Moreover, Lyon's pioneering work in establishing the 3CPS provided much of the inspiration for the subsequent national decree and circular of 2007.

The implementing decree, adopted by the French Council of State on 3 August 2007, sets out a framework for public safety and security studies (ESSPs). The decree states that development, construction and facility projects aimed at the public must be preceded by an ESSP. It also sets out the content of an ESSP and amends section III of decree no. 95-260 concerning the Departmental Consultation Committee for Security and

Figure 3: Extension of the scope of ESSP in 2011 ©CEREMA



Accessibility by creating a new Departmental Sub-committee for Public Security, with responsibility for examining ESSPs.

Meetings of the 3CPS have become much less frequent since 2007, since responsibility for all projects covered by the new act now fall under the remit of the new Departmental Sub-committee for Public Security.

The 3CPS now focuses exclusively on projects not covered by the act, i.e. minor public space development projects (which now, through experience, more naturally incorporate situational prevention issues), as well as larger projects that are not covered by the ESSP requirement since they do not include development procedures (ZACs) or building permits. These include development projects with major security issues, such as the *Berges du Rhône* (banks of the Rhône) project.

b) Greater Lyon-wide projects that incorporate situational prevention and include a forward-thinking approach to management.

Public space programmes such as the *Berges du Rhône* project marked an entirely new chapter in terms of situational prevention and management.

This vast urban planning and design project was initiated in 2002 and was finally completed in 2007. Greater Lyon acted as the sole contracting authority for the project, on behalf of Lyon City Council. The urban authority covered every aspect of the project in the city council's place.

The unique feature of this project was the configuration of the site: an elongated space covering 10 hectares and including 10 bridges. The site stands on a floodplain, with floods only predictable a few hours in advance. It is a highly unique site, located between the river and the city (i.e. between nature and urban development).

The site runs from *Parc de la Tête d'Or* to *Gerland Park*, with a mixture of synthetic and planted spaces designed to accommodate the floods of the Rhône. The banks feature a series of eight different landscaped sections, offering a range of different uses including football, roller-skating, *pétanque*, children's playgrounds, deck chairs and slides. The site consists of two parallel strips: one for environmentally friendly modes of transport, and the other designed for pedestrians and wheelchairs.

The site had become something of a victim of its own success, and was overrun with residents and tourists in both summer and winter. This was particularly notable during the warm season, where people of all types would flock to the site to enjoy a drink or snack.

In terms of situational prevention, a dedicated management team was established at the same time as the design team, with both teams working in parallel. This forward-thinking approach had an impact on certain design choices and technical decisions.

As these management and prevention concerns continued to grow, Greater Lyon established a dedicated contracting authority for this type of large-scale public space project. The urban community introduced a rigorous, cross-disciplinary approach to monitoring this type of operation, under which it involved and consulted multiple technical services and managers. However, like Lyon City Council, Greater Lyon had never previously addressed situational prevention and urban safety matters in great detail, since these issues had fallen under the remit of each separate commune.

A dedicated complex major project management team was therefore appointed for the *Berges du Rhône* project. This team focused on highly technical questions such as who would mow the lawns, what equipment they would use (call for tender procedures), and how the space should be configured to make it easier to manage.

Given the intensive use of the *Berges du Rhône* site since its relaunch in 2007, this dedicated management project proved extremely useful. This project marked the first time that call for tender procedures had contained performance targets rather than resource-based targets. For example, the cleanliness targets no longer stated the number or frequency of bin collection rounds, but rather the maximum bin fill rates. This was critically important at the *Berges du Rhône* site, to ensure that the spaces were properly cleaned following celebratory events and evening festivities.

This approach has now been repeated and fine-tuned for the *Rives de Saône* (banks of the Saône) project. The cleaning costs for the *Berges du Rhône* site turned out to be extremely high (as anticipated by the management team). For the *Rives de Saône* project, Greater Lyon decided to adopt a more rational approach to site management.

The *Rives de Saône* project therefore benefited from the experience acquired under the previous project.

This is reflected in the way in which the contracting authority communicates with the designers, on issues such as how to avoid cyclists using exclusively pedestrian areas. In this case, the designer is required to propose creative solutions in response to the specifications, which do not specifically state the type of response expected. The aim here is to achieve the desired result without laying down any barriers.

In terms of governance, situational prevention is now treated as a separate management service at all stages of the project.

This committee has performed extremely well since 2002, and some positive changes have taken place. According to Michel Le Calloch, the committee was not originally meaningful as a standalone entity. It was, however, an effective way of ensuring that security considerations gained wider acceptance and were considered more prominently in urban development projects.

There is no longer a cross-disciplinary entity responsible for this subject in Greater Lyon. Instead, the topic is handled by a range of different project departments, which naturally cover the theme within their operations. Project managers have now understood and digested the issue, and it forms an integral part of the project process.

In other words, the indented target has now been achieved at the urban community level.

2- Urban renovation, redevelopment and restructuring: three neighbourhoods, three security consideration strategies.

2-1- La Duchère: security in the renovation of a vast social housing neighbourhood

a) A housing development that became a sensitive area

The *La Duchère* district is situated in the west of Lyon, on one of the three hills overlooking the city. The development was built in the 1960s as an overspill estate for residents moved out of unsanitary housing in the workers' neighbourhoods of *Vaise*. It was therefore a direct response to an acute housing crisis in the Lyon conurbation. Around 5,300 homes were built in the space of five years. Mass production techniques were used to build the development quickly and cheaply, using prefabricated parts assembled on site.

The project was overseen by architect François-Régis Cottin. The *Société d'Équipement du Rhône et de Lyon* (SERL) was appointed to purchase the land and develop the site.

The first residents moved into the district between 1962 and 1963. A total of 2,000 homes were occupied in June 1963, rising to 4,000 by December 1964.

Following the Algerian War, the neighbourhood was first used to house people repatriated from North Africa (known as "*Pieds-Noirs*"). It then saw an influx of mostly North African residents.



Figure 4: La Duchère District

In 1975, there were 19,710 people living in the neighbourhood. This figure fell to 17,196 residents in 1982, and then to 13,966 residents in 1990. By 1999, the neighbourhood was home to 12,411 people. This slump may be attributed to a trend for lower population density within each home, with the average number of occupants per household falling from 4 people in 1964 to 2.7 people in 1990. Another factor that contributed to this decline was the ageing population of the neighbourhood, with a substantial reduction in the proportion of residents aged under 20. Moreover, the foreign population rose from 5.5% in 1975 to 17% in 1990. In 1990, the unemployment rate in the neighbourhood stood at 14%.

La Duchère has faced a number of problems since the 1980s/1990s, including isolation, facilities and layout not conducive to modern lifestyles, property devaluation, high concentration of social housing, poor image, and a socially and economically vulnerable population.

La Duchère was included in the city council's policy mechanisms in 1986. Several urban planning and development projects were conducted in the neighbourhood prior to 2000. The area was the scene of a number of incidents that further cemented its difficult reputation, particularly the riots in 1997.

In 2001, all public stakeholders decided to engage in a major urban redevelopment project for the neighbourhood. The Lyon La Duchère Project had an initial estimated budget of €750 million, two thirds of which was provided by a group of 16 public partners, including Lyon City Council, Greater Lyon, the Rhône Departmental Council, the Rhône-Alpes Region, the National Urban Renovation Agency, the National Social Cohesion and Equal Opportunities Agency, the European Union and various other partners. The remaining one third was funded through private investment.

b) Lyon La Duchère: a cross-disciplinary project in which security was just one component

The development zone was created in 2004, three years prior to the publication of the ESSP decree. As such, there was no statutory requirement to conduct this type of study. Nevertheless, the developer understood the importance of addressing security concerns in the interest of public peace from the outset. Thus, security was not treated as a separate matter, but was instead incorporated into the design work along with other considerations (diversifying housing, improving the living environment, developing economic activity, adapting service provision, improving public peace and seeking environmental quality). The La Duchère neighbourhood received the Prix des Écoquartiers (eco-neighbourhood prize) in 2013.

The public space security assessment conducted at the start of the project revealed that the neighbourhood was somewhat isolated from Lyon and the surrounding communes, with no-through-roads, poor links between neighbourhoods, single-use routes and various spaces with no status or purpose.

In terms of the built environment, meanwhile, the size and location of the buildings placed significant restrictions on pedestrian circulation, and the sheer scale of the neighbourhood was incompatible with

management unit procedures. There were various abandoned and unused areas between the public space and houses, and the private/public boundaries were unclear.



Photo aérienne de l'existant, vue aérienne Ouest



Figure 5: La Duchère District in 2002



Perspective du projet, vue aérienne Ouest – image Asylum

Figure 6: La Duchère District in 2016 (project) - ©Asylum

The aim of the project was therefore to provide improved connections with the surrounding communes and Lyon, to build a new prioritised roadway, and to introduce mixed-used roads with mutual visibility between pedestrians and vehicles. The land/property ownership boundaries were clarified, and the blocks were organised in a more “flexible” way to allow for mixed-use functions. The central sections of the blocks were designed with visual openings between public and private spaces. Given the site’s location on a plateau, the altitude and steep gradients were addressed in a manner consistent with the topography.



Figure 7: Pictures of La Duchère in 2016 - ©CEREMA

The specifications for new-build properties now include the following requirements:

- Architectural requirements:
 - transparency and the creation of halls and façades that open out onto the street
 - identified addresses and limited distance between the street and building entrances
- Landscaping requirements:
 - central sections of blocks to constitute used or usable space
 - a clear separation between private/public space, and accessible (collective) and non-accessible private space
 - planted strips between the buildings and the public space.

Urban security issues are covered in the “Local Urban and Social Management” component of the major urban project, which includes technical and territorial monitoring of “living environment problems”, a cleanliness system and a fund for minor work. Residents are invited to several “walking assessments” each year, giving them an opportunity to view and learn more about the projects. This component also includes provisions to make the communal areas of buildings more secure, and to conduct minor improvement works to dwellings, including reintegration contracts for unskilled workers and the long-term unemployed.

A Priority Security Zone was created in 2012, following the example of other neighbourhoods in France. This zone features an enhanced police presence when required, as well as improved coordination between the police and landlords.



Figure 8: La Duchère District in 2016 - ©CEREMA

2-2 La Confluence: security considerations in an urban redevelopment project lasting several decades

a) A mixed and ambitious project in an isolated neighbourhood

As its name suggests, the Confluence area is located at the confluence of the Rhône and Saône rivers. For many years, it was a major hub for shipping, industrial and logistics activities, which constituted something of a blot on the city-centre landscape. Over time, these activities gradually disappeared. The result was a remarkable 150-hectare site, centrally located within the conurbation, that was ripe for reclamation.



Figure 9: Confluence - ©Mission Confluence / Grand Lyon



Figure 10: Confluence site visit©HPB

The aims of the Lyon Confluence project are as follows:

- to create a new city-centre neighbourhood to boost the influence and attractiveness of the Lyon conurbation
- to develop an innovative and attractive range of urban leisure facilities
- to enhance the rivers and the natural landscape of the site
- to reclaim the industrial and logistics brownfield sites
- to improve connections to the south of the “peninsula”, particularly in terms of public transport.

The first phase of the Lyon Confluence project was launched by Greater Lyon in 2003, and has already transformed the layout of the neighbourhood. The coordinated development zone (*zone d’aménagement concertée* – ZAC) covers Place des Archives in the north and a wide strip along the banks of the Saône in the south-west.

The site is dedicated to environmentally modes of transport, and a mixed-use policy has been implemented. The designers have created around 40 hectares of generous public spaces (*Parc de Saône, Place Nautique*, public spaces around Port Rambaud, etc.), major facilities (the leisure and retail park, *Hôtel de Région*, etc.), housing (145,000 m² of floor space) and offices (130,000 m² of floor space).

Efforts to incorporate “situational prevention” into the development project for the new La Confluence neighbourhood began with the programming of the Lyon Confluence Phase 1 ZAC public spaces project in January 2004.

During the initial discussions with the consulting firm responsible for programming the public spaces, all project stakeholders were informed about this innovative approach – an approach that was unique in France and overseen by Lyon City Council’s 3CPS committee.

To address the identified security problems, the public space programme highlighted several specific points that could potentially have an impact on the project, therefore requiring analysis and the development of appropriate measures.

- Emphasis was placed on the following elements:
- Multiple leisure facilities in the centre of the neighbourhood, which could lead to conflicts between users in a mainly residential district.
- The activities and practices associated with the park, the ports, *Place Nautique* and the nearby leisure park and cultural facilities, resulting in mixed users.
- Intense night-time activity in and around the leisure park (drawing in people from across the urban community), further extended by the overlap between the park and the leisure park.
- The open, unenclosed park, which was a problem at the *Montrochet* promenade, with its extended profile and a rail bridge blocking the view.
- The cultural wasteland at *Port Rambaud*.

Moreover, during the Musée des Confluences work, care was taken to consider the site's isolated location between the railways and the river, as well as the presence of a dead-end street.



Figure 11: House of Confluence (to explain the confluence project) and Musée des Confluences ©HPB

b) Security tools and recommendations developed from the outset of the project

The following proposals were issued for phase 1 of the project.

Establishing a substantial police resources:

- Creating a dedicated national police station in the new neighbourhood.
- Establishing an enhanced municipal police presence, potentially including a post in the park (both Parc de Gerland or Parc de la Tête d'Or?). Introducing electric vehicle patrols?

- Close cooperation between the police and the courts.

Using CCTV:

Should CCTV cameras be installed? It is important to remember that this system should not be extended indefinitely. The aim is to avoid an exclusively “technical” approach to security. CCTV systems are simply surveillance tools designed to assist the security services, and are used in specific cases only. Nevertheless, development projects can capitalise on existing CCTV systems. At Place des Archives, for example, there is an existing camera at the exit from the train station. The designer must therefore incorporate this into the planning project.

Designating a single point of contact for the leisure park:

The leisure park must be managed by a single entity, which should establish a suitable set of rules for the park. This entity will be responsible for surveillance of all roads within the leisure park.

Considering natural surveillance:

Due to the high number of users in the area and its layout, natural surveillance is a viable option. This involves relying on local users to act as a crime deterrent and to reassure other users.

- The occupants of the banks of the Saône (boats) are a particularly effective method of enhancing security.
- The dockside car park, managed by a third party, also helps to enhance passive surveillance of the site.

Moreover, security is further enhanced by multiple uses of the site.

Using lighting and landscaping:

- Lighting, street furniture, vegetation and signage all play an important role in enhancing the security of public space.

Maintaining a good state of repair:

All facilities and buildings should be kept in a good state of repair, since poorly maintained spaces can create a sense of insecurity and encourage petty crime.

Keeping visibility considerations in mind always:

First and foremost, it is essential to ensure that people can see and be seen always. This can be achieved by creating a visually open space with no hidden points or blind spots. Recesses should be avoided wherever possible.

Clarifying the status of different spaces:

This recommendation relates to the concept of “belonging”, i.e. users develop a sense of belonging to the space and take ownership of it, thereby enhancing natural surveillance.

- Avoid unauthorised parking.

Finally, remember that the site set-up phase should be treated as a separate project in its own right.

A security study was conducted and presented to the 3CPS committee on 18 May 2005.

This study was performed by a consulting firm commissioned by the Confluence SPL (local public company), between February and May 2005. It comprised two separate phases:

- Phase 1: Public peace/security assessment
- Phase 2: Situational prevention recommendations.

Methodology:

- direct, on-site observations at different times of day (day and night)
- interviews with stakeholders, and with institutional and field partners
- meetings with the urban planner, public space designers and project managers
- use of existing documents (plans, studies, reports, etc.)
- use of crime and security statistics gathered by various services

The recommendations were divided into four sections:

- general objectives
- traffic and parking
- specific recommendations for separate areas
- management

The entire process was conducted voluntarily, with no statutory requirement. The implementing decrees for the 1995 LOPS Act were published in 2007, thereby making it compulsory to perform an ESSP for each major project.



Figure 12: Confluence District - ©CEREMA

c) A robust approach to security under the “statutory” study performed for phase 2

A statutory security study was conducted for phase 2 of the Lyon Confluence ZAC project. The new legal requirement stated that, for ZACs, a set of specifications (or “security framework”) had to be produced by the authority responsible for the ZAC, and subsequently presented to the Departmental Sub-committee for Public Security. This presentation took place in September 2010, and the study itself was then conducted.

The framework document provides an overview of the security assessment in the project environment, then details the “project values” and the “contracting authority’s security approach”.

Next, it sets out the potential security risks facing the project, and the key points that the designers will need to focus on when working on their construction and/or development project within the ZAC.

It also sets out architectural and urban planning recommendations intended for these designers, along with technical, organisational and human recommendations.

Architectural and human recommendations

➤ Ensuring urban continuity:

The existence of excessive natural barriers (railways, boulevards) may make a given site more isolated from other sites.

➤ Promoting mixed uses:

Incorporating mixed uses (offices, housing, shops, public facilities) ensures that the neighbourhood is bustling and busy always, thereby avoiding phenomena such as office districts that are deserted at the weekend, or residential neighbourhoods that become ghost towns during the day. This, in turn, helps to optimise natural surveillance throughout a greater period of the day.

➤ **Ensuring that social and leisure facilities are correctly placed:**

While mixed use helps to keep an area busy and promotes shared occupation, it can also lead to inconvenience, problems and even conflicts between users (noise, unauthorised occupation, unintended usage, etc.). It is therefore important to ensure that these facilities are in the correct location.

➤ **Designing public spaces carefully:**

Public spaces (squares, streets and passages) should be designed in such a way that users are able to take ownership of these spaces and use them for socialisation purposes. By focusing on clarity and legibility over blockages and recesses, designers can ensure that these spaces are conducive to a diverse (although not excessive) range of uses.

These spaces should be highly accessible and cleaned in such a way that users are encouraged to treat them with respect, while ensuring that the emergency services have easy access.

The designers will need to take the following considerations into account.

➤ **Indicating whether spaces are public or private.**

There must be a clear separation between public and private spaces. This will ensure that each space is appropriated by its rightful users, and will prevent trespassing by unauthorised individuals. This will also make these spaces easier to clean.

➤ **Materialising the uses of different spaces.**

Spaces should be materialised either symbolically (lighting, colours, materials) or physically (low hedges, pavements, chicanes, etc.). This will enable users to distinguish between different spaces and therefore limit conflicts between users.

➤ **Creating planted spaces:**

Planting tall trees creates open, airy and attractive spaces and makes it easier for the police to perform their surveillance duties.

- Use a diverse range of materials and street furniture;
- Qualify nocturnal lighting;
- Install appropriate signage;
- Consider maintenance and cleaning requirements from the outset;
- Make it easier for the emergency services to access the area.

➤ **Mechanical and technical recommendations**

- Create shared roads that can be used by car drivers, cyclists and pedestrians
- Anticipate theft risks (burglary, smash-and-grab raids, etc.)
- Install CCTV in line with applicable laws and regulations.

➤ **Organisational and human recommendations**

- Clarify the remits of all stakeholders
- Ensure that work sites are secure
- Comply with the national security alert system (Vigipirate).

d) The phase 2 ESSP presented to the departmental committee in February 2013

This statutory study provided an updated version of the project environment security assessment, and built on the lessons learned from phase 1 over several years of construction and operation.

It set out the ground plans for the intended “neighbourhoods”, the market district and the “field”, detailing the different traffic and circulation methods within these areas, as well as the composition of the blocks.

Emphasis was placed on the following aspects:

- Accessibility for travel and parking
- Clarity of the spaces
- Visibility
- Natural vigilance
- Formal and informal access control
- Ambiance
- Positive appropriation of the spaces
- Designation of a guarantor of the spaces



Figure 13: Confluence District - ©CEREMA

The technical and organisational recommendations were provided for designers to ensure that they incorporated the situational prevention requirements of the La Confluence major urban project into their individual projects, thereby enhancing the sense of community within this new neighbourhood.



Figure 14: Confluence District - ©CEREMA

2-3 Restructuring of the Part Dieu neighbourhood and removal of urban divisions

Part-Dieu is one of the three central districts of Lyon, business district with a rail station and a big shopping center, the first one in Lyon, built in the 1960s but housing too.



Figure 15: La Part Dieu District ©Rhône.eelv.fr

The contracting authorities (Grand Lyon, *SNCF-Gares&Connexions*, RFF and *Vinci Immobilier*) are involved in the following projects: “*Pôle d’Echanges Multimodal Lyon Part-Dieu*” (PEM) and “Two Lyon”. These two projects form part of the “Lyon Part-Dieu” major urban project.

The four contracting authorities have joined forces to commission a single service provider, Cronos, to conduct the public safety and security studies (ESSPs) and to help on associated matters throughout the study process.

The feasibility studies for the PEM and Two Lyon projects are currently being finalised. Once complete, a set of project management studies will be conducted for work scheduled for completion between 2016 and 2021 (PEM phase 1).

This neighbourhood currently has excellent national and international public transport links (metro, trams, SNCF train station). It is also highly attractive in economic and business terms, with offices and the largest

shopping centre in Europe. Locally, however, it is somewhat isolated due to its concrete landscape inherited from the Functionalism era. The neighbourhood also suffers the consequences of major urban divisions, such as high-speed roads and railways. The aim of the urban project is to develop sociable public spaces that are connected with the surrounding urban environment. The main objective is to open up and renovate this ageing neighbourhood through the development of welcoming public spaces and innovative facilities.

The project ownership of the Grand Lyon, SNCF-Gares&Connexions, RFF et Vinci Immobilier are enrolled in projects «Multi modal exchange center Lyon Part-Dieu» and « Two Lyon », linked with the urban project « Lyon Part-Dieu ». Every project have had his security study coordinated by a global study on the district.



Figure 16: La Part Dieu Project ©Mission Part Dieu – Grand Lyon

a) One general ESSP to guide specific ESSPs

The project is innovative in terms of governance, with four separate contracting authorities commissioning a single service provider to conduct the public security study. This represents a truly pioneering approach to the performance of statutory public security studies in France. The local authority and the contracting authorities are committed to the principle of consistency, and have therefore opted to work closely through a coordinated and holistic security assessment.

The 4 projects ownership have given the task to an engineering firm about security, to achieve the crime impact assessment and follow them over the subject during the whole study.

The contracting authorities behind the projects will appear before the sub-committee to outline the key aspects for inclusion in the ESSPs.

The ESSPs included three-stage process:

- social and urban assessment and crime analysis;
- project security analysis;
- recommendations and selected measures.

As required by law (article 14 of the French Act of 5 March 2007, subsequently article L.111-3 of the French Urban Planning Code, implementing decree of 3 August 2007, interpretation circular of 1 October 2007), the aims of the assessment are as follows:

- to understand the social and urban context surrounding the projects;
- to assess public security and crime phenomena: collection of data from the relevant authorities, and analysis of these data;
- to prioritise risks that may impact the projects.

The methodology included:

- interviews with key local stakeholders: national police, Rhône security focal point, Lyon municipal police, local authority technical departments (General Supervision Manager responsible for developing and operating the CCTV system for public spaces), transport provider Keolis, landlords (Dynacité, ICF, SNI), the director of the Part-Dieu shopping centre, the transport police (SUGE) manager, various SNCF contacts (operators, security department), the manager of the Lyon Parc Auto sites located in the Part-Dieu neighbourhood, the manager of the Part-Dieu municipal library, and the manager of the tunnel control centre.
- field survey: site visits, photographs.
- analysis of other studies: INSEE, impact assessment and other studies.
- collection, analysis and processing of crime and security statistics.
- meetings: with partners and security focal points, to establish a joint assessment.



Figure 17: Site visit of La Part Dieu ©HPB

b) Content of the ESSP

The project security analysis content was:

- Identification of potential risks generated by the projects: risks detected in the project environments,
- risks generated by the projects themselves that need to be considered, mitigation measures for these two types of risk (existing risks and generated risks).
- Emergency and security service access and intervention study. Land/property ownership study to clarify the status of the spaces and establish security responsibilities.
- Identification of project vulnerabilities.
- Construction and development recommendations and selected measures: approach to public/private boundaries, urban ambiance, traffic flow security, lighting, landscaping.
- Technical recommendations and selected measures
- For each establishment, open to the public, the recommendations and selected measures will focus on the periphery, boundary and internal area of each project (volume).
- Organisational and human recommendations and selected measures.
- Safety have an important role in the projects scale, for their success, from a social and economic point of view. Security is a critical factor in the success of these projects (from both a social and economic perspective), due to their scale.

3. Conclusion & recommendations

It is essential to treat security matters as central components of the project. These include traffic flow security (pedestrian routes, roads, transport, etc.), the boundaries between private and public spaces, access between high and low spaces, and access for the police and emergency services.

The urban ambiance, in terms of lighting, landscaping and signage, must also be addressed with security in mind.

Careful consideration must be given to the coordination of management tasks and responsibilities between the various local operators.

Mixed use is one of the central principles of the project (transport, offices, shops, etc.).

In the interest of security, it is essential to consider risks from the outset during each phase of the work.

The securing of flows areas (walk sides, roads, transports...), the processing of limiting public and private spaces, the layout of the high and low square bond with the accessibility for police and emergency services should be at the heart of the projects.

The urban sphere linked with lighting's principals, landscape and signal needs to match the safety issues.

The management and responsibility coordination between the different technicians/ operator who are acting on the territory, must be carefully examined.

The functional diversity is a central principal for the project (transport, offices, businesses).

The risks awareness during the different steps in the construction will be a safe guarantee.

The vigilance principal points were the layout of public spaces and the coordination of safety means management and the rail station against terrorism, acquisitive delinquency, and vandalism. Video-surveillance will be installed and cash transport regulation was an important subject too because of diversity of activities (station, shops, hotels, car rental ...).

Appendix 1

Reference materials

A. Timeline references

1. Donzelot J., Mével C. & Wyvekens A. (2003) *Faire société : La Politique de la ville aux Etats-Unis et en France*, Paris: Seuil.
2. <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT000005617582>
3. Benbouzid B. (2010) « Urbanisme et prévention situationnelle : le cas de la dispute des professionnels à Lyon », *Métropoles*, 8.
<http://metropoles.revues.org/4391>.
4.
 - Icade Suretis & Atelier Paul Landauer (2007) *Guide des études de sûreté et de Sécurité publique dans les opérations d'urbanisme, d'aménagement et de construction*, Paris : La documentation française.
 - DGUHC (2007) *Guide des études de sûreté et de sécurité publique dans les opérations d'urbanisme, d'aménagement et de construction : Comment commander, réaliser et une étude de sûreté et de sécurité publique ?*, Paris : La Documentation française.
 - Bauer A. & Freynet F. (2009) *Les Etudes de Sûreté et de Sécurité publique*, Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, Que sais-je ?
5. CEREMA et Club Ville Aménagement (2012) L'ESSP, une démarche intégratrice.
<http://www.centre-est.cerema.fr/l-essp-une-demarche-integratrice-document-elabore-a802.html>

B. Websites

- <http://www.centre-est.cerema.fr/spip.php?page=sommaire>
- <http://www.grandlyon.com/>
- <http://www.lyon-confluence.fr/>

C. Bibliography

- Bauer A. & Freynet F. (2009) *Les Etudes de Sûreté et de Sécurité publique*, Paris : Presses Universitaires de France, Que sais-je ?

Benbouzid B. (2010) « Urbanisme et prévention situationnelle : le cas de la dispute des professionnels à Lyon », *Métropoles*, 8.

<http://metropoles.revues.org/4391>.

Benbouzid B. (2011) *La prévention situationnelle : genèse et développement d'une science pratique*. Thèse de Doctorat. Sciences sociales. Lyon: Université Lumière Lyon 2.

http://theses.univ-lyon2.fr/documents/lyon2/2011/benbouzid_b#p=0&a=top

Billard G., Chevalier J. et Madoré F. (2013) *Ville fermée, ville surveillée. La sécurisation des espaces résidentiels en France et en Amérique du Nord*. Géographie sociale, Presses universitaires de Rennes.

<http://books.openedition.org/pur/1784>

Blanc M. (2007) La « politique de la ville » : une « exception française » ?, *Espaces et sociétés*, n° 128-129, vol. 1, pp. 71-86.

CEREMA et Club Ville Aménagement (2012) L'ESSP, une démarche intégratrice.

<http://www.centre-est.cerema.fr/l-essp-une-demarche-integratrice-document-elabore-a802.html>

Corbillé M.-A., & Franc G. (2012) *Sûreté de l'utilisateur et conception urbaine*, L'Isle d'Abeau : CETE de Lyon.

http://www.cete-lyon.equipement.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/Surete_de_l_usager_et_conception_urbaine_cle764a4c.pdf

DGUHC (2007) *Guide des études de sûreté et de sécurité publique dans les opérations d'urbanisme, d'aménagement et de construction : Comment commander, réaliser et une étude de sûreté et de sécurité publique ?*, Paris : La Documentation française.

Donzelot J., Mével C. & Wyvekens A. (2003) *Faire société : La Politique de la ville aux Etats-Unis et en France*, Paris: Seuil.

Icade Suretis & Atelier Paul Landauer (2007) *Guide des études de sûreté et de Sécurité publique dans les opérations d'urbanisme, d'aménagement et de construction*, Paris : La documentation française.

Jacobs J. (1991) *Déclin et survie des grandes villes américaines*, Coll. Architecture plus recherches, Liège : P. Mardaga,.

LABQUS & IAURIF (2008) *Urbanisme, conception et gestion des espaces pour prévenir la malveillance* (European Commission directorate-General justice, freedom and security), Milan.

Landauer P. (2009) *L'architecte, la ville et la sécurité*, Paris : Presses Universitaires de France.

Loudier-Malgouyres C. & Vallet B. (2010) *L'influence de la sécurité sur la conception urbaine*, Paris : Les Cahiers de l'Institut d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme de la région Ile-de-France, pp.25-28.

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00543844/document>

Pagnac-Baudry H. (2013) *L'intégration de la prévention de la malveillance aux démarches de qualité environnementale de l'espace public*. Thèse de Doctorat. Université de Bordeaux. Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture et de Paysage de Bordeaux.

<http://www.theses.fr/2013BOR14868>

PUCA (2011) *Qualité et sûreté des espaces urbains : programme d'expérimentation*.

<http://www.urbanisme-puca.gouv.fr/qualite-et-surete-des-espaces-urbains-a290.html>

Tievaux S., Hagège C. & Merchat D. (2006) *Qualité globale de l'espace public et sécurité, synthèse*, Institut National des Hautes Etudes de Sécurité, Paris.

Vallet B. (2008) *L'épreuve juridique de la sécurité urbaine*, *Pouvoirs Locaux*, n°78, vol. 3, pp. 61-70.

Wyvekens A. (2006) *Espace public et sécurité*, Paris : la Documentation française.

Appendix 2

Key contacts for further information

CEREMA:

- ✎ Gersende FRANC: Gersende.Franc@cerema.fr
- ✎ Marie-Aude CORBILLE: Marie-Aude.Corbille@cerema.fr

Municipality of Lyon:

- ✎ Michel LE CALLOCH: michel.lecalloch@mairie-lyon.fr