

## Young People and Public Space: Developing inclusive policy and practice

Phil Crane  
School of Human Services  
Queensland University of Technology

### Abstract

Issues about young people's use of public and community spaces are now commonly raised in many countries. As urban space becomes more intensely used and the patterns of use of various types of space changes so a range of tensions have emerged for a range of parties including local government, shopping centre management, youth services and young people themselves. This article is based on a paper delivered at the International Conference on Young People and Social Exclusion, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 10 September 1999.

This article argues for a multidimensional and more integrated approach to public space policy, design and management in respect of young people. It draws on a range of projects undertaken by Brisbane City Council in Australia which have attempted to take an inclusive approach. It concludes that whilst more inclusive policy and practice can be articulated and implemented at the local level with good effect, there remain substantial constraints in developing more inclusive public space environments for young people.

### Introduction

As the urban landscape becomes more colonised, and the delivery of core services and sites for interaction move into spaces which are privately owned or affected by the processes of privatisation, corporatisation and marketisation then problems for young people in using public space which have been present for a very long time are becoming more intense.

This in part is due to changes to the way various types of space which provide amenity and perform commercial and social function have developed. Privately owned shopping centres have increasingly become sites for the delivery of core public services such as bus interchanges, post offices, and libraries. Correspondingly there has been increased involvement of business and the use of corporate models in the development and management of certain public spaces, such as in pedestrian malls onto which shops front, and public recreation areas which are managed by corporatised bodies. For example the previous 1988 World Expo site in Brisbane has been redeveloped as a public facility operated by the Southbank Corporation under special legislation.

The particular importance spaces may have for people is also dynamic and changing. Spaces such as parks, disused blocks and creeks which once may have been seen as having peripheral value are increasingly seen as key social and economic resources to

particular interests. Residents living adjacent to a public park may feel that this is 'their' park, and see benefit worth fighting for in terms of the peace and quiet, the view, and improved property value. The outcome can often be that young people's access to space is made secondary to other interests.

The traditional public-private space legal dichotomy, is thus becoming less adequate as a tool for understanding, planing and managing space. Various types of space categories have been suggested. This paper focuses on two particular types of space, namely state-owned and open public access areas, and 'community space' (White 1996, Heywood and Crane 1998) which is privately owned or leased space to which open public access is invited or necessary. Community spaces include shopping centre entrances, aisles and arcades, and the platforms and circulation spaces of bus and train stations. The term 'mass private property' (France and Wiles 1998) has also been used to describe this type of space.

At the same time there have been significant shifts in how various types of spaces are managed and policed. Patrolling has in many locations been privatised with commercial entities such as banks, shopping malls and centres, and sporting arenas using their own or contracted security forces to protect property and those seen as 'customers'. Other strategies which have become increasingly popular include the development of safety audit and crime opportunity reduction measures in public space design and management, increased reliance on policies that prohibit or condition access to certain spaces (curfews, move on powers, admission charges), and the employment of practices such as repeated questioning of particular 'types' of people and electronic surveillance.

A number of themes emerge from an examination of these shifts. The governance implications of changes in the function and usage of various types of space have not been adequately understood or responded to. Old logics of rights deriving from property ownership have not been revised in the light of the privatisation and corporatisation of core public services. Exclusionary assumptions have tended to underpin responses to the tensions and contests in young people's use of public and community spaces. In the context of public and community space exclusion occurs when people are denied or lack the means for full access to the spaces that are venues for experiencing social, cultural and economic life (based on Reardon 1999). Finally young people, particularly those who already experience other forms of social and economic exclusion, are acutely impacted on by these changes and responses.

The high level of interest in public and community space issues can in part be explained through the framework of 'late modernity', where risk has been increasingly individualised whilst life opportunities are still largely conditioned by a persons social and economic location (Furlong and Cartmel 1997). In relation to what we have termed community space France and Wiles (1998) contend that:

- Feelings of insecurity are increasingly responded to by creating locations of trust and reduced feelings of risk, termed 'security bubbles';
- These 'security bubbles' are often created through the geographical exclusion of

- those who are viewed as potentially threatening;
- Use of exclusion depends on private property rights since these provide a basis for the lawful exclusion of people from private property. This contradicts the previous situation where public law rights applied to people's use of space and where security was provided by universal rights in a shared public domain;
- Security has become one aspect of the contractual bargain between customer and supplier with individuals free to enter whatever such contracts are on offer.

Our work in Brisbane indicates that exclusion from community space (where ownership is not in public hands) is often justified in terms of health and safety, public liability or duty of care obligations. It most frequently occurs not in response to illegal activity but as a response to behaviour that is seen as annoying, 'anti-social', or simply involves people congregating or 'hanging around'. Those most often excluded from such spaces are young people, particularly homeless and Indigenous young people.

*There is a clear danger that as mass private property increases young people, or rather particular groups of young people, will be excluded from many of the locations where the key market lifestyle choices of the new citizenship are being made (France and Wiles 1998, p.69).*

Further they contend that as more public access facilities are provided in private space fewer facilities and lesser quality facilities are available in the public realm, with the result that 'problematic' populations become concentrated and controlled by increasingly assertive policing.

With these shifts, the role of local governments in regulating space assumes an enhanced significance, for it is local government that in many places has primary responsibility for the design and planning processes relating to public and community spaces. In addition it is local government which is often expected along with police to resolve tensions between users of spaces through the regulatory mechanisms of local laws and planning consent.

In the last few years there has emerged in Australia an interest in strategies for responding in a more positive way to issues relating to young people and public and community space. Brisbane City Council has been relatively active in this, commissioning a number of projects during the 1990's which focused on particular sites of tension between young people and authorities or on particular populations of young people (Feral Arts 1995, Richer 1996). There has also been work to bring together insights from the various initiatives across Australia into publications which document 'good practice' (White, Murray, Robins 1996, White 1998). Such efforts reflect an emerging recognition that whilst the critique of young people's use of public spaces is relatively well developed there has been less articulation of the way forward. The alternative approaches which have been documented have tended to address aspects of issues rather than be part of a broader multifaceted strategy. Many have been concerned with the development of consultation processes to gain young people's input, the creative use of existing public spaces, the use of community arts and theatre in raising public

space issues, or on tension reducing strategies for particular spaces such as shopping centres, skate parks, or open parks. The work undertaken by Brisbane City Council represents an effort to move to a more comprehensive response by a local authority.

### **The Brisbane experience**

The population of Brisbane is approximately 1.5 million and the Brisbane City Council is Australia's largest local government authority. In 1996 the Brisbane City Council commissioned a team from the Queensland University of Technology to develop guidelines in respect of young people's use of major urban centres across the city, with funds gained from the Queensland Government. The focus of the investigations was on public and community spaces (defined as privately owned or leased space to which public access is invited such as shopping centres) within major centres. Major centres are defined by Council as the inner city precinct together with eight major regional nodes, characterised by transport interchanges, and concentrations of business, service and retailing activity. They all have one or more large shopping centres at their hub.

The resulting report *Out and About- In or Out: Better Outcomes from Young People's Use of Public and Community Space in the City of Brisbane* (Heywood & Crane 1998), advocated an integrated and inclusive approach for local government. It outlined a range of policy, design, planning and management principles, strategies and tools to assist in achieving this. In essence the report argued that simply responding in any one domain will do little to create and sustain more inclusive public space environments. Broad economic and social forces, various levels of policy, planning processes and decisions, design and management all interact to create the specific conditions which prevail at particular sites. Thus the causes of public and community space issues relating to young people are multiple, both site specific and systemic, and interrelated.

Effective responses from this perspective involve a recognition of the inter-relationship of physical and social planning, community development and capacity building, urban and site management including law enforcement, and service provision to young people. The challenge for various levels of government is to better understand and respond to these in respect of a diversity of young people according to the areas of responsibility for governance they have.

The report has been assessed as detailing the most comprehensive analysis and series of prescriptions on young people and public space issues in Australia (White 1998, p.119). Brisbane City Council responded by initiating a range of localised and across Council projects through the Young People and Major Centres Strategy and a number of strategies related to youth policy, youth participation and city planning and design. Some early examples and insights from these are reported below.

### ***Out and About***

The methods used in the project were derived from its strategic orientation. A central characteristic was the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in the processes of

issue identification and the development of principles and strategies to respond. The project was therefore iterative, and used a variety of mechanisms to involve stakeholders in generating issues and strategic responses. The consultants played an active role in this providing at the outset of the project a widely distributed Discussion Paper which reviewed literature, issues and current practice relating to young people and public space and proposed a set of draft design, planning and management principles.

Interviews were undertaken in three major centres with a diversity of young people, stakeholders and other centre users. A series of group specific and mixed focus groups, informed by these investigations, were conducted involving elected officials, school students, young people who were the targets of 'concern', property developers, local and state government planners, youth services, security and police. This process allowed for the iterative review of the proposed principles, and the development of recommended policies and strategies. The consultants then brought this material together in the final report and supplemented it with specific tools to assist with implementation. These tools included guidelines for developing protocols to deal with 'hot' management issues, guidelines for incorporating access considerations into safety audits/plans, and a competency checklist for security officers operating in community spaces.

The investigations revealed that a range of exclusionary strategies were being employed in one or more of the sampled major centres. These included:

- A shopping centre keeping photographic and written 'grub files' on particular young people;
- Young people being asked to split up if in a group of more than three;
- A shopping centre which had an agreement from the local state high school to not allow young people in during school hours without a note or an appointment with a doctor;
- Conflict and intervention around young people congregating at entrances to premises or around common areas such as telephone booths;
- Exclusion on the basis of appearance eg hairstyle;
- In one shopping centre young people were being asked to leave purely on the grounds of being Indigenous.

There was general support across stakeholders for a more inclusive approach. Rather than there being a high level of disagreement between stakeholders there was a sense that each held part of the information and insight necessary for an effective overall framework. This said there clearly were different interests, priorities and assumptions underpinning views about particular options and not all of these were complimentary.

The framework developed contains three interrelated elements or 'targets'. Broadly these are those of policy in respect of young people and community development, the planning development regime which encourages or prohibits certain spacial features and processes (design), and finally the management approaches used.

### *Key principles*

A key element of the framework is the development of three sets of principles

recommended for adoption and use in Brisbane City Council. These are:

- Principles for strategic and local planning and design
- Principles for centre management relating to young people
- Principles for youth policy development relating to public and community space

A number of themes are reflected across these sets of principles. These are:

- A recognition that local government must take an active interest in how community space is designed and managed to ensure that all people have access to core social and economic resources. Young people, as members of the community, have a fundamental right and need to access public and community spaces.
- Young people as an age segment of the population, are often excluded from or marginalised in design, policy and management processes, and should be allowed, facilitated and resourced to participate in these.
- That this requires recognition of a diversity of interests and perspectives among young people.
- Processes and requirements need to be put in place to make public and community spaces, and the policies that regulate their development and management 'youth friendly'.
- The tensions between various goals for public and community space (such as improved safety, commercial viability and crime prevention) and access for various young people should be explicitly addressed.
- It is essential to engage a broad range of stakeholders in these tasks with the role of government being both regulatory and facilitative.

*Key issues a strategy needs to respond to*

### **Key public space policy issues**

The role of public and community space provision and access in a democratic and inclusive society;

Whether current legislation and regulation promotes the development and maintenance of inclusive public and community spaces;

How tensions between commercial and social objectives are understood;

How the role of shopping centres is understood, generally and in particular cases;

How policy development within and across levels of government is coordinated or integrated;

The public positions of Council regarding young people, as reflected in what policy statements and public comment contain and are silent on;

Whether policy recognises diversity among young people, and various marginalised young people in particular;

Whether young people are seen as having legitimate safety needs;

Whether crime prevention policies improve or diminish young people's access to community resources and spaces.

### **Key strategic and local planning process issues**

Whether and how the impact of developments and redevelopments on young people is appreciated;

Whether and how marginalised people's interests in planning and development processes are acknowledged;

The extent to which planning and development assessment and implementation processes meaningfully involve those sections of government and community concerned with social and community outcomes;

How a diversity of young people are invited and resourced to meaningfully participate in these;

What uses of space are seen as legitimate and incompatible and how this impacts on young people.

### **Key urban design issues**

The recognition of a diversity of young people's usage patterns and purposes in the design adopted;

The cultural traditions, art and symbols reflected in the design;

The relationship of design to conflict, safety and access;

The mix of spaces and design features and the social and sensory experiences they encourage;

The way shopping centres integrate with the built form and social life of surrounding communities eg for young people the articulation of foot, bicycle and public transport routes;

The use of environmental design and activity mix to produce natural surveillance and minimise crime.

### **Key management issues**

The rights and conditions of access, formal and informal applied to various young people;

The assumptions underpinning the management approach utilised;

The approach taken to security provision and by security providers;

The mechanisms for liaison between various managements, police, security, young people, youth and community services;

Mechanisms for dealing with problems, conflicts and multiple or incompatible usages of spaces;

The relationship between management strategies used and accessibility.

Identification of factors which produce management tensions but which arise from design, institutional or systemic sources

A range of specific recommendations were made in the report which attempted to provide mechanisms at the policy and operational levels for these to be responded to. They are best seen as responses to these broader issues tailored to the local context of Brisbane City Council. There is no suggestion that these specific proposals are necessarily transferable to other contexts.



Recommendations for youth and community development policy included recognition and designation of 'community space', the formal recognition in policy of age as an contributor to disadvantage, the development of a consolidated council youth policy and specifically of a 'Young people's participation in civic life policy', establishment of clear liaison with police and security regarding strategies for intervention with young people in community spaces, and liaison and advocacy with other levels of government.

Recommendations for the management largely revolved around the piloting of a management and community relations strategy in the central city and two suburban major centres, designed to explore how a more inclusive approach to management could be developed.

Recommendations for planning and design focused on the systematic use of centre concept plans, youth friendly consultation processes being used in social impact assessments, the interface between shopping centres and their surrounding community, the design of community spaces to reflect active and passive uses, the expansion of youth and community facilities in major urban centres, and the development of an infrastructure charging code

The report also contains a number of 'tools' designed to assist various stakeholders respond to public space issues relating to young people in an inclusive way. The rationale for this is that calls for inclusion can often be little more than a demand on authorities to adopt a particular value framework without considering what information or support is required by stakeholders for such a shift to be realistically chosen. If exclusionary strategies are as embedded as the literature suggests a significant challenge for researchers and advocates is to provide tools which assist more inclusive alternatives be operationalised.

The tools included in *Out and About* are:

- The three sets of principles referred to above.
- Guidance on the development of access and safety plans at both the locality and shopping centre levels. This involves building access impact considerations into the development of safety plans and audits already commonly undertaken for particular localities.
- Aims, role, composition and processes recommended for community and youth advisory committees/forums.
- Guidelines for Centre security provision relating to young people.
- A checklist of training required for security officers working in community spaces.
- A checklist for developing protocols which respond to management issues relating to young people.

### *Implementation to date:*

The process of developing the Out and About framework and recommendations involved a wide range of Council officers, business managers, the youth sector and young people and as well as input from elected Council representatives. This meant that the orientation and much of the broad content was known and owned by a variety of stakeholders. In the period since publication of the report in April 1998, Council has utilised the approach suggested by:

- Co-funding with business the development of a protocol between a large inner city shopping centre, the youth sector and Council as a response to tensions between the centre and young people (Crane and Marsden 1999). Based on inclusive principles this is the first formal ongoing protocol of its kind to be signed in Australia.
- Incorporation of aspects of the report into the draft City Plan where *Out and About* recognised as an important reference for those making development applications;
- Use of the report to inform the redevelopment of the major inner city pedestrian mall, particularly through designing it in such a way that it legitimises 'hanging out'.
- Development of a Council youth policy based on inclusive principles;
- Establishing a Young People and Major Centres Strategy to implement *Out and About* recommendations initially in two localities, and extended to other localities on the basis of successful experiences. This has resulted in a diverse cluster of activities including:

A homeless young people's project to better respond to tensions between retailers and homeless young people and facilitate their voice in youth consultation processes;

A skaters strategy which has facilitated and resourced inner city skaters forming a network with their own ongoing structure and newsletter;

A series of consultation strategies with a diversity of young people culminating in a city centre 'Mass Rave' to speak directly to government. This is part of a broader youth consultation strategy that allows locality specific issues to be brought into a city wide process called 'Visible Ink'.

Facilitation of young people's input to the major redevelopment of a very large disused inner city site.

Installation of an employment information computer terminal for young people within a shopping centre.

Development of new recreation facilities for young people.

Installation of lockers for homeless young people in the inner city.

From this work there is growing recognition that explicit policy and material support from local government combined with local processes which use an inclusive, community resourcing, problem solving and communicative approach, can reduce tensions and produce better outcomes for young people and for other community users of space.

The Queensland Government has renewed its interest in young people and public space and is providing funds to assist other local authorities in the state to make use of these insights and resources. Unfortunately the Queensland Government has also recently passed the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act (2000) which enlarges police powers to move people on from malls and a range of other public and community spaces, providing graphic evidence of way that policies with opposing assumptions can be simultaneously in operation.

### **Working toward more inclusive policy and practice**

Local government has a critical and central role to play in coordinating and resourcing responses to public and community space issues. Indeed it could be said Councils have a duty of care in this respect. In particular there is a need to have the social implications of the changing nature of urban space, how access to core social resources is affected, and the implications for governance discussed and clarified in the contemporary context. This is difficult in a number of respects. There is a reluctance by governments to be involved in service delivery and particularly what might be construed as welfare service delivery.

The challenge is for public and community space issues regarding young people to be understood as fundamentally about the negotiation and regulation of space and not simply in individualist and welfarist terms. The language of inclusiveness and ‘youth friendly’ serves this purpose well as it points not simply to the needs of young people perse but to the relationship between young people and their context.

The experience in Brisbane suggests that with government endorsement and support there can be significant improvements in terms of particular tensions and issues. The character of intervention that improves inclusivity for young people has started to emerge. At its heart it involves working from principles of inclusion for all, including young people, supported by government, in a way which allows the gap between rhetoric and reality about young people to be used as an opportunity for reform.

Whilst specific issues and sites of contest and tension come and go there is a pervasive continuity about the issues that is revealed on close examination. What is needed is an ongoing and sustainable presence supported by government which allows various types of interventions at a number of levels. Short term funding of an arts program for young people or a getting young people involved in a skate park development may be valid as activities but do not constitute a strategy.

Inclusive policy and practice requires viewing young people as members of the community, rather than as separate to it. In operational terms this means emphasising that the goal of an interest in public and community space is to ensure the rights of all members of the community to access core resources is respected. Young people as part of the community warrant consideration.

The staffing and sectorial location of public and community space work is emerging as critical. Whereas activity based strategies can be usefully undertaken by particular agencies located in a particular sector (eg youth services sector, commercial sector) strategies involving the facilitation of cross sectorial communication and problem solving are best undertaken by project workers who are not located in any one sector. Rather they seem to be best located organizationally in such a way that they are seen as independent. At the same time it is critical they have a strong knowledge of the issues facing young people in being dealt with inclusively. Workers who have both a strong track record in youth services provision but have moved to a point where they are committed to cross sectorial communication and problem solving seem ideal for undertaking such facilitative functions. One of the most challenging tasks will be for new mechanisms of communication and collaboration to be established which allow a new level of communication and planning to occur. Unless this happens various key contributors to decision making in local government (eg planners, community development workers) will continue to operate in relative isolation from each other.

Certain aspects of public space work reoccur as difficult across a range of projects. It is common for Council or others decision makers conceptions of what young people need to overwhelm views expressed by young people. Politically young people are simply not powerful enough, rarely able to access processes of influence. This has major implications for the goal of having young people's views influence planning and development processes. Most consultation processes are based on the assumption that rational participatory processes work. Their history is that of themselves they do not.

Another theme has emerged around the reluctance of those in authority, particularly commercial managers and elected representatives, to allow publication or proactive communication regarding the rules applying to, rights and protections afforded young people or good practices to emerge. There is a commonly held fear that being openly communicative about actual situations, policies and practices regarding young people could have potentially negative outcomes for them. This perhaps reflects the extent to which they feel the 'general public' and media hold negative views about young people. In public space policy and practice it appears gains made are not necessarily gains known. How to get information out becomes then a key challenge for practice.

There are continuing and substantial barriers to young people's participation in processes public and community space policy and practice development. These include limitations on the rights of young people under 18 to associate and form their own organisations. There are also problems relating to the establishment of groups of young people to specifically perform a consultation role. One is the relative transience of the inner city youth population. There is an ongoing tension between the convenience of issue specific

short term consultations and supporting longer term youth voice processes which will inevitably display over time the same features of internal power relations as other advocacy groups. Inclusivity at one level it seems, creates challenges of inclusivity at the next level of interaction. In the longer term this however is far more desirable than being limited to adult managed institutionally convenient processes. For meaningful longer term reform it will be necessary to review and modify our notion of a 'minor' who is not able to contract, and therefore not able to accept responsibilities that go with formal organisational participation.

In the current wave of interest on young people and public space there is a danger of it simply being a 'fad' - that after a period of relative attention other issues or target groups will be turned to. This is endemic to the youth area, where much attention has more to do with being seen to be doing something rather than anything in particular. It is critical, therefore, that aspects of inclusive practice and policy become institutionalised so that they cannot simply be discarded when the immediate political pressure to 'do something' has abated.

France and Wiles (1998) rightly argue that possible responses include fighting for the pre-eminence of public law and rights over certain spaces and rightly question how achievable this is when the state is weakened and may not have the will. They argue rightly for the need to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the place of youth work in the political economy of late modernity. Youth advocates increasingly are needing to move into environments where they are communicating with and working alongside the wide range of professions and interests involved in the design, planning and management of public and community spaces.

The goal of inclusivity also involves recognising that little attention has been paid to how young people go about defining, creating and discovering space and the forms of resistance they use as responses to the exclusion they experience and the normalising pressures applied to them (Hil and Bessant 1999). The Brisbane City Council experience suggests that young people do seek to use space from their own perspective, that this can vary greatly between young people according to age, housing status, socio-economic situation, gender, race, ethnicity etc and can have some power in respect of how tensions are resolved. It is also very clear that strategies underpinned by inclusive logic can quickly hit the wall when claims to change or provision conflict with commercial and political objectives and understandings. In advocating more inclusive policy and practice it is important on the one hand to recognise the opportunities to improve how we respond to young people's use of space but also not to underestimate these substantial barriers.

A graphic example is provided by the reaction to homeless people using space in or adjacent to inner city areas. Gaining more inclusive policy and practice is clearly easier when the young people concerned are able to be accepted as legitimate 'customers' or 'consumers'. Negotiations are able to focus on their activity eg skating, and its spacial implications rather than require an acceptance of their rights as people to simply 'be' as is the case of homeless young people.

The approach in Brisbane City Council is to go down the path of attempting to put in place processes for beginning to deal with contestation and learning from these. By committing to this project, the opportunity presents to over time and across many such projects, to understand better what the opportunities and barriers are to the inclusive design and management of space. Strategies can have utility when they target the assumptions and attitudes about young people as problems/ threats, or as unable to contribute. There is inevitably a gap between these assumptions and the reality of situations. When examined in a respectful way that makes these explicit and transparent aspects of these assumptions are often not defensible. Other aspects of these may well be defensible at some level and a communicative project can allow these to be recognised and clarified. The result can be a degree of adjustment to local policy and practice.

The interests of business have often been talked about as operating in a singular fashion. This is not entirely true. The management of shopping centres often become quite nervous when tenant businesses become directly involved in considerations about young people and community space issues. This is because businesses differ dramatically in relation to their customer base. Young people constitute core customers for a significant number of tenants who occupy malls and centres. Processes which engage tenant businesses have the potential to make far more complex and balanced problem solving strategies. Further it is often portrayed or assumed that young people are simply using centres for passive non-commercial purposes. Whilst many young people do utilise centres for passive recreation purposes their overall contribution to commercial activity is substantial and market research can be used to illustrate this. There is growing recognition that an important ingredient of many contemporary public and community spaces is having lots of people there, many of whom are young, giving a space vibrancy and both social and commercial value.

There is a point however where diversity in use is not seen to have commercial and/or political benefit to powerful interests. Communicative strategies do not address basic inequities, and so have least benefit to those most marginalised. To gain greater levels of inclusion and particularly in respect of young people most marginalised will require more than a reliance on market mechanisms and communicative strategies to minimise stereotyping. It will require the use of:

- Contract law assumes great importance in the contemporary market economy. Councils often have services that are being located to private premises and need to pay particular attention to ensuring that access to all people to such facilities is guaranteed in contracts.
- Anti-discrimination legislation also becomes increasingly important. Provisions requiring access to goods and services provisions and their applicability to discrimination on the basis of age provide an opportunity in some jurisdictions to challenge particular exclusionary policies and practices.
- Continued advocacy for legislation and policy that reflects a commitment to civic rights of various marginalised groups (including young people) in their use of various types of spaces will be necessary. Legislation regarding curfews, move on powers will continue to be heavily relied on in many jurisdictions. Rather than simply

opposing exclusion per se the Brisbane work has argued for acceptance of the principle that exclusionary strategies should only be utilised after inclusive strategies have been genuinely and meaningfully put in place.

- Conflict strategies which assert the capacity of people to raise issues regarding exclusion and young people in the public arena.

It is apparent that responsiveness builds over time and can be assisted through:

- Use of independent facilitators with expertise in working with and thinking about youth issues
- The development of tangible tools and products that can allow strategies to move on from issue identification phase
- The development of 'products' that generate interest and support from stakeholders, assist in the meeting of accountability requirements, and allow the frame of people's understanding to move from young people as needing control or welfare support to young people as community members.

The vision of public and community space that is inclusive of young people is an increasingly important one to pursue. The framework offered by *Out and About* sees this task as multi-faceted, requiring a much more integrated approach than has been previously used. There is evidence emerging that governments and a range of community stakeholders can engage in this inclusive project with a degree of optimism. Encouraging governments to identify and take responsibility for the role they have in promoting the development of youth friendly space is critical if access is not to be increasingly narrowed as interests more powerful than young people compete for its use and amenity.

## References

Crane, P. & Marsden G. (1999) *The Myer Centre Youth Protocol: A Summary*, Brisbane City Council: Brisbane.

Egginton, A., Parker, T., & Kaighin, J. (1999) *Young People and the City Centre Project: Final Report*, Unpublished report to Brisbane City Council.

Feral Arts (1995) *Southbank Action Research Project: Young People and Public Space in Inner Brisbane*, Feral Arts: Brisbane.

France, A & Wiles, P. (1998) Dangerous futures: Social exclusion and youth work in late modernity, in C. Finer and M. Nellis (Eds) *Crime and Social Exclusion*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Furlong A. & Cartmel, F. (1997) *Young People and Social Change: Individualisation and risk in late modernity*, Open University Press: Buckingham.

Heywood, P & Crane, P (1998) *Out and About: In or Out? Better Outcomes from Young People's Use of Public and Community Space in the City of Brisbane*, Brisbane City Council.

Hil, R. & Bessant, J. (1999) Spaced Out? Young people's agency, resistance and public space, *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol.17, No.1, pp.41-49.

Reardon, D. (1999) The need for inclusion: the aims, objectives and projects of the Social Exclusion Unit in the UK, *There's No Place Like Home: Proceedings of the 2nd national Conference on Homelessness*, Council to Homeless Persons: Melbourne.

Richter, S. (1996) Girls in Space, *Network News*, Edition 1, pp.20-21.

White, R. (1998) *Public Spaces for Young People: A Guide to Creative Projects and Positive Strategies*, Australian Youth Foundation: East Sydney.

White, R., Murray, G., & Robins, N. (1996) *Negotiating Youth Specific Public Space: A Guide for Youth and Community Workers, Town Planners, and Local Councils*, Department of Training and Education Coordination: Sydney.