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1 Introduction

1.1 Facility siting and effects research programme

This report contributes to social research being undertaken by Taylor Baines & Associates on the siting and effects of various facility types on their host communities. This facility research has been contracted by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology, and is being funded out of the Public Good Science Fund.

The need for research into these effects and impacts is highlighted by the varied but often negative responses from host communities to the siting of certain facilities. Examining siting issues and identifying the social impacts experienced by host communities will provide empirical information that is presently in short supply in New Zealand. This information can be used to:

- improve assessments of effects,
- encourage greater community participation in the siting process,
- support better-informed planning decisions,
- encourage the development of effective relationships between facility operators and host communities, and
- improve ongoing management of facilities.

This in turn will further develop the effects-based approach to resource management and planning embodied in the Resource Management Act 1991.

1.2 Concepts utilised in the research programme

The concept of ‘effects’ or ‘social impacts’ which is used and explored in Taylor Baines’ facility siting research is not intended to refer only to negative effects and social impacts. Rather, the authors use the concept in an unbiased way, acknowledging that both positive and negative effects on host communities may result from a facility siting and its associated activities. This approach is consistent with the definition of ‘effect’ in the Resource Management Act 1991.

The term ‘host community’ employed throughout this research on prison facilities, refers to:

the community resident in the geographic area most clearly associated with the prison. This geographic area may be defined by the prison’s visibility, surrounding roads and access roads, and major topographical features. In addition to these geographic indicators, there may be ‘relationship indicators’ which highlight the prison’s host

---

1 Resource Management Act 1991:

3. Meaning of “effect”-In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the term “effect”... includes-
(a) Any positive or adverse effect; and
(b) Any temporary or permanent effect; and
(c) Any past, present, or future effect; and
(d) Any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects regardless of the scale, intensity, duration, or frequency of the effect, and also includes-
(e) Any effect of high probability; and
(f) Any potential effect of low probability which has a high potential impact.
Previous research in this programme focused on waste management facilities such as landfills, transfer stations and waste water treatment plants. The waste management facilities typically involved relatively few people permanently on site. Indeed, some waste water treatment plants are automated to the point where no personnel are present on site for significant periods of time.

The focus on prisons introduces a new dimension to this social research, by virtue of the fact that prisons are occupied by relatively large numbers of people (inmates and staff) on a permanent basis. People are an integral part of the facility; their presence and activities are closely linked to most of the effects that may be experienced off site by members of the host community.

Thus, research on the off-site effects of prisons and the social impacts which prisons have on their host communities is, in practical terms, an assessment of the relationship between prisons and their host communities. Far more so than in the case of waste management facilities, this is a two-way relationship.

1.3 Research on the social impacts of prisons on their host communities

- The relationship between prisons and their host communities

This report covers the third stage of a three-stage research programme which assesses the social impacts of New Zealand prisons on their host communities. Prisons have been included in Taylor Baines’ facility research as the siting of a prison is often met with resistance and expressions of concern over the impact that it may have on its host community. Rising inmate numbers and a shortage of inmate accommodation nationally also points to a substantial growth in the number of new prisons in the near future. The aim of this research is therefore to assess the social impacts that existing New Zealand prisons have had on their host communities. Such an assessment will assist the Department of Corrections, host communities, territorial authorities, and other professionals involved in the siting of future prisons, and the management of existing and future prisons.

---

2 Although the term ‘host community’ is not a new concept, it was recognised in this research that the nature and definition of a ‘host community’ may vary with different facility types. An effort has therefore been made to identify any special factors that determine the nature of prison facility host communities.

3 Literature identifies this phenomenon as a NIMBY (not in my backyard) reaction to a LULU (locally unwanted land use) (Schichor 1992; Martin 2000).

4 Because many of New Zealand’s prisons were constructed in the late 1800s and early 1900s it would be difficult to access information that would enable an examination of siting issues and an assessment of the social impacts that their host communities have experienced since their construction. This research therefore focuses on changes and social impacts experienced over the last 15 years.
The three stages involved in this prison facility research are:

**Stage 1:** *Sector Review*  
(Morgan & Baines 2001)

- summarises - the Department of Correction’s prisons policy,  
  - New Zealand’s national prison facilities,  
  - the Department of Correction’s prison siting policy, and  
- reviews - national and international prison social impact literature.

**Stage 2:** *Historical Analysis*  
(Morgan & Baines 2001a)

- examines - selected prison facilities and the changes to these over the last 15 years, and  
  - their corresponding host communities and changes to these over the last 15 years.

**Stage 3:** *Case Studies*

- examine - the relationship between selected prisons and their host communities and the actual experiences of these host communities, including the social effects associated with the presence and operation of the prisons.

### 1.4 Prison case studies

The case study reported here, is one of four prison case studies - Rolleston Prison, Rimutaka Prison, Hawkes Bay Prison, and Wanganui Prison.

**Figure 1:** *Location of prison case studies*

In order to assess the social impacts of Rimutaka Prison on its host community, this case study outlines the nature of Rimutaka Prison, the Upper Hutt community, and the relationship between the prison and the community, and explores the community members’ experiences of having a prison located and operating in the vicinity of their community.

There are seven sections in this report. Section 2 describes the methodology and approach adopted in this research. Section 3 provides a history and description of the prison facility and Section 4 provides a history and description of the host community. An assessment of the operational effects of Rimutaka Prison on its host community is reported in Section 5. An assessment of the long term effects is reported in Section 6, while Section 7 summarises the relationship between Rimutaka Prison and its host community.
1.5 Research programme outputs

In addition to the Sector Review, Historical Analysis, and Case Study reports, the results of this research will be disseminated in the form of host community feedback presentations, discussion sessions and conference papers.

The full case study reports are available for the cost of reproduction and postage:

Taylor Baines & Associates
PO Box 8620
Riccarton
Christchurch

www.tba.co.nz

ph/fax: (03) 343 3884

Summary case study reports and conference papers are available free of charge on the Taylor Baines & Associates’ website:

www.tba.co.nz

1.6 The research provider - Taylor Baines & Associates

Taylor Baines & Associates has been a private provider of research, consulting and training services since 1989. The firm specialises in social research and the application of social assessment methods to a wide variety of issues in community development (for more information on the services and work carried out by Taylor Baines & Associates refer to www.tba.co.nz).
2 Methodology

2.1 Research methods

Several research methods were used in this case study based on the theoretical and practical approach to social assessment as described by Taylor, Bryan and Goodrich in *Social Assessment: theory, process & techniques* (1995). These methods include:

- key informant interviews
- structured questionnaires
- secondary data analysis
- feedback meetings.

This combination of methods was used to enable community and stakeholder participation, cross checking, and to ensure a thorough and accurate collection of profile information and reported effects.

Although these methods were appropriate methods for this research, the authors acknowledge their associated limitations. The use of structured questionnaires, for example, can run the risk of constraining the opportunity for the interviewer to access all relevant information and experiences from the interviewee. As with most research methods, there is also the risk that interviewees will refrain from sharing information and experiences or give dishonest answers. In order to address these limitations, the questionnaire was designed to be as comprehensive as possible, and also contained sections for 'comments', giving interviewees the opportunity to add anything that was not addressed in the questionnaire’s detailed questions. Interviewees were also asked for evidence to back up their assertions and interviewers used the multiple research methods listed above to cross check (corroborate) the results wherever possible.

*Key informant interviews:*

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the prison and key informants in the community. The purpose of these interviews was to gather profile information on the prison and the community, and to scope potential effects and issues. As often as possible these interviews were conducted face to face, the remainder were carried out over the telephone. Interviews lasted anywhere between fifteen minutes and one hour.

Prison staff interviewed included:

- Site Manager
- Superintendent
- Custodial Support Unit Manager
- Regional Maori Services Development Advisor

---

5 This may be because an interviewee attempts to predict what is a 'socially acceptable' answer to the interviewer or because of a desire to protect their own interests, for example in this case, local property values.

6 Note that some key informants were not based in the Upper Hutt community, for example the Housing New Zealand representative. Although not based in the community, these key informants have dealings with, or knowledge of the community and/or the issues the research explores.
Key informants in the community included:

- Member of the Orongomai Marae
- Trentham Army Camp Commandant
- Trentham Army Camp Range Warden
- Trentham Golf Course Manager
- Ex Caretaker at the Central Institute of Technology (CIT)
- Ex Academic Registrar at the Central Institute of Technology (CIT)
- Housing New Zealand Representative
- Trentham Primary School Secretary
- Fergusson Intermediate Secretary
- Heretaunga College Secretary
- Upper Hutt College Principal
- Silverstream School Secretary
- Hutt International Boys School Deputy Principal
- Police Dog School Employee (second in charge)
- Prisoner Aid and Rehabilitation Society (PARS) Representative
- Prisoner Fellowship Co-ordinator
- Upper Chatsworth Neighbourhood Support Group Spokesperson
- Blue Mountain Road Progressive Association Secretary
- Detective Sergeant, Intell Section, Upper Hutt Police
- Traffic Police, Upper Hutt
- Summerset Retirement Centre (Trentham) Office Manager
- Trentham Racecourse/Wellington Racing Club Caretaker
- EDS International employee
- Caltex Trentham Petrol Attendant
- Upper Hutt City Council Planning Manager
- Community Probation Service Manager

Structured questionnaires:

In total, 55 neighbours (48 residents and seven business people) were surveyed for this case study.
Questionnaires were completed by the interviewer and took between fifteen minutes and one hour to complete. These explored neighbours’ experience of day to day operational effects of the prison and their perceptions of how the presence of the prison has impacted on them and the longer term development of the host community. The questionnaire was structured so that participants had the opportunity in the first instance to report unprompted, any positive, negative or other effects that they had experienced as a result of the prison’s presence and operation. A ‘prompted’ section that followed contained detailed questions relating to a number of potential effects identified in stage one and two of this research and in consultation with the Department of Corrections. These potential effects included effects resulting from: lighting, visibility, traffic, noise, industrial discharges, inmate escapes, prison visitors, inmate families, inmates working offsite and prison purchases. Information relating to the participants relationship to the prison, and some personal information was also collected.

**Secondary data analysis:**

An analysis of secondary data was also carried out. Census data for example, was used to establish a demographic profile of the Upper Hutt community (see Section 4.2).

**Feedback meetings:**

Separate feedback meetings were held with:
- community members,
- the Rimutaka Prison Site Manager,
- the Wellington Regional Maori Services Development Advisor and the Rimutaka Prison Maori Focus Unit Manager, and
- two representatives from the Upper Hutt City Council.

These feedback meetings summarised the case study’s preliminary findings, and provided participants with an opportunity for comment and feedback.

In general, participants in these meetings endorsed the preliminary findings. A few minor comments have been incorporated into this report.

**2.2 Selection and access to participants**

As discussed earlier, four of New Zealand’s prisons were selected for the case study phase of this research. These four prisons, including Rimutaka Prison, were selected after a review of stage two of the research (Historical Analysis) and after consultation with the Department of Corrections. Rimutaka Prison was selected because of its location on the edge of an urban centre and its significant growth, and because of interest expressed by the Department of Corrections.

Initial access to the four prisons selected was facilitated by the Department of Correction’s head office. Key contacts at each of these prisons then provided the research team with access to relevant participants.

---

7 Note that due to personal time constraints, some interviewees were unable to answer all of the questions in the questionnaire - the analysis in Section 5 is therefore not always based on a 100% response rate (where this is so, it has been indicated).

8 All residents and businesses who had completed a questionnaire and indicated an interest in feedback (25 of the 55 neighbours) were sent a letter of invitation to the community meeting. Two residents, one from the Chatsworth Road area and one from the Somme Road area attended the community meeting.
prison staff who were to participate in key informant interviews. The range of staff involved was determined by the researchers.

The selection of key informants in the community was based on the expectation that they would possess a broad knowledge of some aspect of the community and possible effects and issues due to the nature of their position in the community. Access to these key informants was at times initiated through the prison, but generally the research team contacted potential key informants directly by telephone.

Those residents and businesses who participated in the survey were selected according to their proximity to the prison. This was because the prime focus for the research team was to assess what effects have been experienced and whether or not there is a systematic pattern associated with this experience. Two interviewers in the research team went door to door to access participants.

In order to assist with the analysis in this research, the residents and businesses interviews have been categorised according to their proximity to the prison. These categories reflect distinct areas within the Upper Hutt community, or areas for which it would be expected that ‘groups’ of residents might experience similar effects. The greatest emphasis has been placed on surveying the areas shown below in the map and listed in the table due to their close proximity to the prison. The areas surveyed are not necessarily a complete representation of the ‘host community’ as defined in this research (see Section 4), but were selected because of a desire to identify clearly the operational effects of the prison on its neighbours. The effects on the wider host community have been explored through key informant interviews.

**Figure 2: Survey areas**

![Survey areas](source: TopoMap)

---

9 Obviously there are also time and resource constraints, which make it impossible to survey the entire ‘host community’.
These are approximate distances measured in a direct line from the properties of neighbours surveyed to the nearest prison building at Rimutaka Prison. Note that these measurements do not include the distance from the properties of neighbours surveyed to the boundary of the prison land. Some residential properties (for example: in the Chatsworth Road area and the Blue Mountains Road area) border prison land.

### Table 1: Summary survey information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area description</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Distance to prison boundary</th>
<th>Length of occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Road</td>
<td>East side of Blue Mountains Road; north side of Sierra Way; north side of Katherine Mansfield Drive</td>
<td>11 total 11 residents</td>
<td>residents: 1 km - 1.5 km</td>
<td>≤ 1 year 2-5 years 6-9 years ≥ 10 years 2 missing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth Road</td>
<td>Both sides of Chatsworth Road; west side of Tiniroa Grove; north side of Arundel Grove</td>
<td>14 total 14 residents</td>
<td>residents: 600 - 1 km</td>
<td>≤ 1 year 2-5 years 6-9 years ≥ 10 years 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somme Road</td>
<td>East side of Maadi Road; both sides of Somme Road; both sides of Senio Grove; south side of Gallipoli Road; both sides of Weir Grove; both sides of the south side of Heretaunga Square; south side of Freyberg Road; both sides of Pinehill Crescent</td>
<td>18 total 18 residents</td>
<td>residents: 750 - 1.2 km</td>
<td>≤ 1 year 2-5 years 6-9 years ≥ 10 years 5 2 missing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Street</td>
<td>Both sides of Camp Street; south side of Fergusson Drive; south side of Granville Street</td>
<td>8 total 1 resident 7 businesses</td>
<td>resident: 1.5 km</td>
<td>≤ 1 year 2-5 years 6-9 years ≥ 10 years 2 1 missing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Road</td>
<td>South side of Alexander Road</td>
<td>4 total 4 residents</td>
<td>residents: 2.2 km - 2.6 km</td>
<td>≤ 1 year 2-5 years 6-9 years ≥ 10 years 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Time frame

Key informant interviews and surveys with neighbours were carried out in December 2001.

Feedback meetings were held in Upper Hutt on the 10th and 11th of March 2002.

### 2.4 Analysis

This research aims to identify what effects (social impacts) have been experienced by the Upper Hutt community as a result of the presence and operation of Rimutaka Prison. During the development stage of this case study a number of potential effects were identified from:

- a literature review carried out in stage one of this research,
- the Historical Analysis carried out in stage two of this research,
Methodology

- planning and effects assessment documents commissioned by the Department of Corrections for the siting of a new prison in Northland, and
- discussions with the Department of Corrections.

Other potential effects have also been identified during key informant interviews with prison staff and Upper Hutt community members.

The analysis in this case study is therefore based on determining whether or not these potential effects are ‘actual effects’, and on identifying any other effects not anticipated but evident through observation, key informant interviews, structured questionnaires, or secondary data analysis. The analysis is descriptive and sometimes quantitative, but not statistical in nature.

It is important to differentiate between ‘actual effects’ and ‘perceived effects’. For example, it is likely that residents’ comments about the effect on property values reflect a perceived effect. Investigation and corroboration from other sources would be needed to determine whether it is an actual effect.

However, having noted the difference between perceived and actual effects, this is not to say that perceived effects are without value or significance. The existence of a perceived effect, especially if it is perceived by a number of residents may be in itself the cause of an impact. For example, if a resident believes that an effect is occurring, then this belief may in turn cause stress or anxiety or cause the resident to alter their behaviour or lifestyle choices in some way. A resident may for example avoid a certain area if they believe there is a risk to their personal safety. Also if a perceived effect is prominent enough, it may affect residents from outside the host community who for example may elect not to purchase in the vicinity of the facility.

It is therefore important to report both perceived and actual effects, but to take care in determining whether an effect is perceived or actual, and in noting whether these effects are supported by any other empirical data.

It should be noted, that although the focus of this research is on the effects experienced by the host community as a result of the presence and operation of a prison, it became very clear during this research that significant effects can also be experienced by individuals and communities outside the host community as defined in this research (see Section 1.2). Attempts have also been made therefore to incorporate a description and discussion of these effects.

2.5 Ethics

This research has been developed and carried out in accordance with the ethical requirements of the New Zealand Association for Impact Assessment and the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand.

In keeping with these ethical requirements, participation in the research was voluntary, and informed consent was sought (verbal). An information sheet was provided to residents and businesses who participated in the survey. This information sheet explained the research, assured anonymity, and noted the right of participants to withdraw their participation or any information provided at any time prior to the publication of this report.
3 History and description of the facility

3.1 Location and inmate catchment for Rimutaka Prison

Prison description and location:

Rimutaka Prison, formerly known as Wi Tako Prison, was opened in 1967, and is one of three prisons in the Wellington region. Rimutaka Prison is a medium sized men’s prison accommodating minimum security, medium (low and high medium) security and remand inmates. It is located in the Kuku Valley, approximately 35 kilometres north of Wellington City, and four kilometres southwest of the Upper Hutt City Centre. The prison entrance is located on the Freyberg Road Extension, which is several kilometres east of State Highway 2.

Figure 3: Location of Rimutaka Prison

---

11 Prison management note that the name change was initiated after concern was expressed by local Maori at the inappropriateness of the name Wi Tako.
12 The three Wellington prisons are: Rimutaka Prison, Wellington Prison and Arohata Prison.
13 Note that Taylor Baines classified prisons as either small (under 199 inmates), medium (200-499 inmates), or large (500-899 inmates) in the Historical Analysis (stage two of this research).
Inmate catchment:

A prison’s catchment area is the geographical area from which it takes inmates. The catchment area for Rimutaka Prison is the lower half of the North Island from Paraparaumu and Masterton down to Wellington. Until recently, the catchment area also included Nelson and Blenheim in the South Island. Those areas are now included in the Canterbury Prisons’ catchment area.

For a number of reasons there will usually be a proportion of inmates in a prison who are not from the prison’s catchment area or region. It is difficult to obtain exact figures of inmates from outside the catchment area. It has been estimated however that over 50% of inmates at Rimutaka Prison may originate from outside the prison’s catchment area. There are several units (Maori Focus Unit, the Violent Offenders Unit and the Youth Unit) at Rimutaka Prison which attract inmates from outside the prison’s catchment area (as not all prisons in New Zealand have such units), and therefore factor heavily into the level of such inmates in Rimutaka Prison.

3.2 Rimutaka Prison facilities and development

Prison land:

Rimutaka Prison is sited on 189 hectares of Department of Correction’s land which is designated for prison use. The designation lies on the borders of three underlying zones: ‘Rural Hill Blue Mountains’, ‘Special Activity’, and ‘Rural Lifestyle’. A small portion of the land to the north east of the site is marked as a flood retention band (approximately ten hectares of this band lie beneath the Department of Correction’s designation). This means that this land may flood and therefore cannot be built on. The prison has built close to the boundary of this flood retention band and has permission to encroach onto it in the future with the erection of security fences.

Two recent changes to the land on which Rimutaka Prison is located, were the sale in December 2000 of the portion of land on which the prison staff village was located, and the ‘land swap’ with the Defence Force in early 2001. The prison staff village and its land (five hectares) was sold to Housing New Zealand. The land swap involved land at Rimutaka Prison and several other prisons in the North Island. At Rimutaka Prison, a 14 hectare strip of land east of the prison was given to the Defence Force, partly to assist with the Army’s obligation to meet template conditions on its rifle ranges. The Department of Corrections in return received a seven hectare block of land north of the prison at the prison’s entrance (enabling legal entry to the prison), and a 45 hectare block of Defence Force land south of the prison. This block of land had been used in the past by the Defence Force (Trentham Army Camp) for storage, and had at one stage been leased to local residents so that they could graze their horses. As the only access to this land was through the prison, the prison considered this situation inappropriate for safety reasons.

Prison structures and facilities:

Inmate accommodation is based in eight separate units at Rimutaka Prison. Each of these units is self contained with its own kitchen facilities. Only one of these eight units existed in 1967. The remaining seven have been established over the last twelve years. Currently, a new unit is under construction. Construction of this unit began early in 2001, and is expected to be completed early to mid 2002. This high medium security unit will consist of three units with accommodation for 60 in each (a total of 180 new beds), a control room, and a medical room.
Table 2: Inmate accommodation at Rimutaka Prison, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>Number of beds</th>
<th>Security Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 &amp; Unit 3</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Remand¹⁴ High Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5 / Maori Focus Unit</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9 / Violent Offenders Unit</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Minimum Low Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Unit</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Remand Minimum Low Medium High Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Maori Focus Unit is a 60 bed unit accommodating minimum and low medium security inmates. As at 2001 there are only three other such units in New Zealand (New Plymouth Prison, Hawkes Bay Prison, and Waikeria Prison), inmates accommodated in this unit may originate from outside Rimutaka Prison’s catchment area. To be accommodated in the unit, inmates must want to be in the unit and must agree to participate in all unit programmes, remain alcohol and drug free, and maintain good behaviour. Prison staff also have to want to work within the unit. The unit aims to provide an environment conducive to learning, to foster a ‘family’ atmosphere, and to focus on Maori language and culture. Interviews with the Unit Manager and Regional Advisor emphasised the importance of staff appointments to this Unit requiring people with particular skills. This is because of their function in being good and effective role models for the inmates in their charge.

The Violent Offenders Unit is a 30 bed unit which accommodates inmates who have committed serious violent offences such as grievous bodily harm or murder. Inmates who have been charged with any sort of violent offence against children, are not eligible to enter this unit. Eligibility is also based on the stage at which an inmate is in his sentence. Most of the inmates who enter this unit, enter it in the last year of their sentences, and are usually released from prison after having been in the unit. As this is the only such violent offenders unit in New Zealand, a high percentage of its inmates are from outside the prison’s catchment area. It is estimated that currently, only one or two out of the 27 accommodated in the unit are from within the prison’s catchment area. The unit is based around an eight month therapy course. The first month involves induction and testing, the next six months involve intensive group and individual based therapy, while the last month focuses on summarising the course and preparing inmates for release. The unit has its own psychologist, two therapists and a chaplain. It also has several links to the community (for example through Kaumatua

¹⁴ Note that Rimutaka Prison did not start accommodating Remand inmates until 1994. Until then all Remand inmates were held at Wellington Prison.
and Fresh Start - a re-integrative employment programme), although currently it is in the process of extending these links.

The Youth Unit is a 40 bed unit which accommodates remand, minimum and medium security youth inmates aged 17 and under or between 17 and 19 if considered ‘vulnerable’. At present, the youngest inmate is 14 years old. The courts determine who is placed in the unit and for how long they have to stay. Currently, there are only three other youth units in New Zealand (at Hawkes Bay Prison, Waikeria Prison and Christchurch Prison). It is therefore likely that a number of the youth inmates at Rimutaka Prison will come from outside the prison’s catchment area. The unit operates quite separately from the mainstream prison and has its own chaplain, teachers, and psychologist.

Other facilities and structures onsite include:
- Chapel
- Staff facilities (gym, lounge, kitchen)
- Administration
- Regional Office
- Offices & Stores
- Receiving Office
- Medical facilities
- Programmes facility
- Unit for at risk inmates
- Joinery facility
- Nursery facilities (tunnel houses, garden sheds)
- Maintenance workshop
- Boiler

Until 2000, Rimutaka Prison had a Prison Staff Village. This village was located on Department of Corrections land but accessed off Pinehill Crescent approximately one kilometre away from the prison. The village contained 39 houses and housed approximately 150 people (staff and their families). Village members had access to a village hall located on Freyberg Road\textsuperscript{15}. In 2000 the prison staff village closed. Its closure was a gradual process, initiated by a government decision in 1985 to divest itself of Crown housing. This policy was introduced by the Department of Justice in 1992 and written into staff contracts in December 1992. Only vacant houses were sold until December 1997. At this point a compulsory sale programme was introduced\textsuperscript{16}. The introduction of market rentals in the early 1990s was an added incentive for staff to move out and purchase or rent elsewhere. All but three of the houses (which were purchased by prison staff and moved off site) remain on site. The portion of Department of Corrections land on which these houses were sited and the remaining 36 houses were sold to Housing New Zealand in December 2000. Housing New Zealand has indicated during consultation with neighbours, its intention to redevelop the area as a residual sub-division with approximately 70 sections.

Also sited on Department of Correction’s land is a Prison Staff Training College. This college caters for prison officers from all over New Zealand. Up to 12 five week courses are run each year. Officers generally live on site in Prison Staff College accommodation (11 motel units and a 39 bed hostel),

\textsuperscript{15} This burnt down in 1995.

\textsuperscript{16} Note that although a compulsory sale programme was not introduced until 1997 and the sale was not completed until 2000, most of the houses were empty during this period.
although exceptions are made for officers who live close by. The College has restaurant and conference facilities which are made available to the public (generally through word of mouth, although some advertising is used; for example the facilities are advertised on the Upper Hutt City Council website). The motel units and hostel are also available to the public, although generally these are used by trainees, trainees’ families during graduation, and Department of Correction’s staff who are visiting Rimutaka Prison. The College has seven full-time staff and employs approximately 15 inmates who learn trades while working in the restaurant and around the College.

Utilities:

Rimutaka Prison is connected to the local water and sewage supply network (Upper Hutt City Council).

Prison security:

Currently, there is no boundary fence at Rimutaka Prison. However, each individual prison unit is fully fenced and lit at night with prison security lighting. As there is no boundary fence or entrance gate it is possible for the public to drive into the prison grounds, although this is unlikely to attract unauthorised vehicles since the prison is located at the end of a long access road (Freyberg Extension Road) which prevents it from being visible at the beginning of the access road.

Prison industries:

Inmates may participate in a number of different work activities. These activities for the purpose of this research have been classified as self sufficient activities (activities necessary as part of the day to day operation of the prison and accommodation of inmates), commercial onsite activities (profit or partially profit driven activities based within the prison), commercial offsite activities (profit or partially profit driven activities performed by inmates working offsite), and community service activities (labour or products provided by inmates for the benefit of the community). Self sufficient activities include laundry, garden, kitchen, and cleaning duties. At present there are two commercial onsite industries, a joinery workshop and a nursery. There is also a small farm. Currently, there are no commercial offsite industries. A small amount of community service is carried out by inmates. In the past there was also a piggery (1989-1992), a vegetable garden (1993 - 2000) and a laundry (closed in 1983).

The **joinery workshop** was established in 1993 and provides work for around 12 inmates. Inmates work five days a week, seven and a half hours a day to produce furniture for both internal prison use and external private contracts.

The **nursery** was established in 1995 and provides work for around 15 inmates who work seven hours a day five days a week. Full nursery facilities are located onsite including five tunnel houses. Inmates cultivate plants for community service work and external private contracts.

The **farm** was established along with the original prison in 1968. It has since reduced in size substantially, and will be closed in the near future. The farm consists of sheep and cattle which are tended by around eight inmates. These inmates work five days a week, seven and a half hours a day. Sheep’s wool and sheep and cattle are sold at market.
These work activities are described in greater detail in the following discussions on effects (see Section 5.2).

### 3.3 The people involved in Rimutaka Prison

The nature of a prison dictates that a number of different people will have some sort of involvement with its operation. For the purpose of this section, the following groups are discussed:

- inmates
- prison staff
- inmate visitors
- other prison visitors

**Inmates:**

Rimutaka Prison often runs at or near capacity, meaning that the muster is often at or near 486 inmates. Muster trends show an increase in the number of inmates being accommodated at Rimutaka Prison over the last 12 years. This muster increase coincides with the increase in units and therefore capacity (see Figure 4). The prison has always had the facilities to accommodate minimum and medium security inmates, but it was not until 1994 that Rimutaka Prison started taking remand inmates for the Wellington region, inmates who were traditionally accommodated at Wellington Prison.

**Figure 4: Rimutaka Prison muster, 1985-2001**

![Rimutaka Prison muster, 1985-2001](image)

Source: Department of Corrections 2000, Department of Corrections 2001 & Department of Corrections
In December 2001\textsuperscript{17}, inmates at Rimutaka Prison were serving the following sentence lengths:

**Table 3: Inmate sentence lengths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th>Number of Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to 6 years</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years plus</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prison staff:**

The number of staff employed at Rimutaka Prison has increased over the last 12 years as its capacity to accommodate inmates has increased. Currently\textsuperscript{18}, there are 285 staff employed at Rimutaka Prison. These staff have the following characteristics:

**Table 4: Rimutaka Prison staff characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff category</th>
<th>Full time staff</th>
<th>Part time staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes, Sentence Planners</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site &amp; Unit Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Manager &amp; Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/New Zealand European</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} As at 6/12/01.
\textsuperscript{18} As at December 2001.
Inmate visitors:

At present, inmates may be visited at the following times:

- Monday - Thursday: 12:15 pm - 2:45 pm (Unit 2 Remand inmates)
- Sunday: 9:00 am - 11:00 am (Unit 2 Segregated remand inmates)
- Sunday: 1:15 pm - 3:15 pm (Unit 3 Sentenced inmates)
- Saturday and Sunday: 1:00 pm - 3:30 pm (All other units).

Typically there are approximately 20 visitors a day during the week, approximately 100 on Saturdays and approximately 150 on Sundays. Greater restrictions on visiting times have recently been put in place in order to cope with the large numbers of visitors. Visitor numbers have been fairly static (i.e. only increased in relation to increase in muster), and seemingly unaffected by new security procedures (security checks and approvals) introduced in 2000.

Up to three times a year, individual units may also hold ‘family days’. On these days, usually a Saturday or Sunday (different units hold their family days on different days), around three adults and unlimited numbers of children may be invited by each inmate in the selected unit. Those invited usually visit between 10.00 am and 3.00 pm to participate in various activities such as a barbeque, and to spend time with the inmates.

Family and friends may also visit the prison when an inmate celebrates some special achievement or occasion. For example, an inmate in the Youth Unit or Maori Focus Unit may graduate from a special course and invite their family to view their graduation ceremony.

Other prison visitors:

Other prison visitors include:

- Volunteers (for example: members of church groups who provide church services and bible study sessions)
- Inmate services (for example: lawyers, PARS)
- Prison goods and service providers (for example: goods delivery, maintenance services, health services)
- Police (for example: incident response, court transfers).

These visitors visit on a weekly if not daily basis.

3.4 Links between Rimutaka Prison and its host community

There are numerous links between a prison and its host community as is evident in this section (Section 3), and in the examination of effects in Section 5. In this subsection further links are described.

There are two formal liaison links between Rimutaka Prison and its immediate neighbours. These links take the form of a community warning system and meetings held between the prison and its neighbours. A community warning system was set up in 1995 to warn neighbours in the Chatsworth Road area by telephone when an escape or other emergency occurs at the prison. These neighbours are members of the Upper Chatsworth Neighbourhood Support Group. Over the last twenty years occasional meetings have been held between the prison and its neighbours. These meetings have
been held at the prison and have given neighbours the opportunity to discuss prison and community issues. The last such meeting was held around 1999\textsuperscript{19}. The regularity of these meetings has been determined by the approach of prison management, and community interest.

Other links between Rimutaka Prison and its host community include:

- **Representation on the Safer Community Council**

  For several years now, prison management has been represented on Upper Hutt’s Safer Community Council.

- **Presentations by management to various community organisations and institutions**

  The Site Manager at Rimutaka Prison gives presentations in the community several times a year (may average once a month). These presentations usually provide an insight into the site manager’s job and prison life in general. Community organisations and institutions receiving such presentations include: Rotary, Probus, women’s groups, and schools.

- **Liaison between the prison’s Maori Focus Unit and the Orongomai Marae**

  The Maori Focus Unit has strong formal and informal links to the Orongomai Marae. Links between Rimutaka Prison and the Orongomai Marae pre-date the establishment of the Maori Focus Unit. Currently however, existing links are strongest with the Maori Focus Unit. The Orongomai Marae was involved with the development and establishment of the unit in 1990, and has maintained this link through an advisory committee set up to maintain communication and give advice relating to the unit’s functioning and programmes. Inmates are also directly linked to the marae through community service activities, carving and lessons in the art of speech making.

- **Prison open days.**

  Open days at the prison are usually held when any significant new development such as the opening of a new accommodation unit occurs. These are advertised and open to the public. The youth unit for example held an open day in 2001 to mark its opening, and to give “an opportunity for the public to have a look at one of the Department’s key initiatives to reduce re-offending by youth.”\textsuperscript{20} After advertising regionally, it attracted over 200 members of the public to its open day.

\textsuperscript{19} Most of the neighbours attending such meetings are part of the Upper Chatsworth Neighbourhood Support Group.

\textsuperscript{20} *Upper Hutt Leader* 2001.
4  History and description of the host community

4.1  The ‘host community’

The ‘host community’ of Rimutaka Prison as defined in this research, includes the Upper Hutt suburbs: Heretaunga-Silverstream, Trentham, and Blue Mountains. These suburbs surround the prison and are most likely to contain residents and businesses who view the prison as a ‘neighbour’ (see Figure 2 and Table 1 for a more detailed description of these areas). However, due to the contiguous nature of this host community in relation to Upper Hutt as a whole, this case study gives special attention to the effects experienced by Upper Hutt as a whole as a result of the prison’s presence and operation.

Upper Hutt is situated approximately 35 kilometres north east of Wellington city in the North Island of New Zealand. It is bounded to the south by Lower Hutt, to the north west by the Hutt River, State Highway 2, and the Tararua Range, and to the east by the Rimutaka Range. It is mostly a consolidated urban area, surrounded by bush clad ranges. It is generally seen as one of the lower socio-economic areas within the Wellington region, although it does have several pockets of higher socio-economic areas.

Figure 5: Location of Upper Hutt

Source: TopoMap
4.2 Community demographics

Census data has been used to further profile the host community of Rimutaka Prison. A brief summary is contained in this section, while detailed tables are contained in the appendix. As well as looking at data for Upper Hutt, data for a number of areas in close proximity of the prison were also looked at. These included:

- Pinehaven (west of the prison)
- Heretaunga-Silverstream (north of the prison)
- Trentham-South (the prison and north east of the prison)
- Trentham-North (north east of the prison)
- Blue Mountains-South (south of the prison, on a ridge line overlooking the prison)
- Blue Mountains-South East (south east of the prison, on a ridge line overlooking the prison).

Census data on population levels show no indication of growth in Upper Hutt, especially when compared with the growth experienced in the Wellington region and in New Zealand as a whole. There has been a mixture of decline and growth in population levels in the areas immediately surrounding the prison. The greatest growth has occurred in the Blue Mountains areas (see Appendix Table A.2).

Upper Hutt has slightly higher levels of home ownership (freehold and mortgaged) than in the Wellington region and in New Zealand as a whole. These tenure trends are also evident in most areas surrounding the prison. This is not so in Trentham-South and Trentham-North which have lower levels of home ownership and higher levels of rental properties. In Trentham-South this is due to the high levels of transitory defence staff who reside in the area (see Appendix Table A.3).

The household income of residents in Upper Hutt appears to be fairly representative of those in the Wellington region and in New Zealand as a whole. Surrounding areas are not however so representative. Generally, these areas have greater numbers of households in the higher income categories. Trentham-North is the exception (see Appendix Table A.4).

The representation of different ethnic groups are similar in Upper Hutt as a whole, to the Wellington region and to New Zealand as a whole. However, in the Pinehaven, Heretaunga-Silverstream, and Blue Mountains areas of Upper Hutt there is a greater proportion of European residents (see Appendix Table A.5).

The age of residents in Upper Hutt is representative of the age of residents in the Wellington region and in New Zealand as a whole. This representation is not so consistent in the areas surrounding the prison. In Trentham-South there are low numbers of 0-14 year olds, very high numbers of 15-60 year olds, and very low numbers of residents in the 61 plus category (most probably due to the large number of defence households in this area). In the Blue Mountains areas, there are high numbers of 0-14 year olds and a very low number of 61 plus residents (see Appendix Table A.6).

---

21 The detailed demographic analysis is based on the 1996 Census which was the most recent available at the time the field research was carried out. However, trends in population and dwellings are given for the period 1986-2001.

22 In fact there has been a slight decline in usually resident population.
Unemployment levels in Upper Hutt are representative of those in the Wellington region and in New Zealand as a whole. However, in areas surrounding the prison, these levels are lower in Pinehaven, Heretaunga-Silverstream, and the Blue Mountains, and higher in Trentham-South and Trentham-North (see Appendix Table A.7).

The occupations of residents in Upper Hutt are similar to those in New Zealand as a whole, although it does have slightly more clerks and service/sale workers, and fewer agricultural/fishery workers. Compared with the Wellington region, Upper Hutt has slightly more clerks, service/sale workers and trade/machine/elementary workers and slightly fewer professionals and agricultural/fishery workers. A comparison between Upper Hutt as a whole and the areas surrounding the prison shows that Trentham-North is the only representative area. Pinehaven and Heretaunga-Silverstream have a greater number of professionals and a lower number of trade/machinery/elementary workers. This is also true with the Blue Mountains areas, although they also have a greater number of agricultural/fishery workers. Trentham-South is unrepresentative in all categories with a particularly high number in the service/sale category reflecting the high concentration of defence housing in the area (see Appendix Table A.8).

In summary, Upper Hutt’s demographics are fairly representative of the Wellington region and New Zealand as a whole. This was not always the case for the areas in close proximity to the prison. Generally, census data indicates that the Pinehaven, Heretaunga-South, and Blue Mountains areas are ‘higher-socio economic’ areas evident in higher household income levels, low unemployment levels, and higher numbers of professionals. Trentham South and Trentham North also show differences. The large proportion of defence housing in Trentham South is reflected in its high number of rental properties, its high number of 15-60 year olds, and high number of ‘service’ workers. Census data for Trentham North on the other hand indicates that it is a ‘lower socio-economic’ area, evident in its high number of rental properties, its low household income levels, and its high number of unemployed.

4.3 Land use

Land use in areas neighbouring the prison:

The prison is located in the Kuku Valley, approximately four kilometres southwest of the Upper Hutt city centre. The immediate neighbours of the prison and the focus of the structured surveys as described in Section 2.2, are the residents in the Blue Mountains Road area overlooking the prison, and residents in the Chatsworth Road area, the Somme Road area, the Camp Street area, and the Alexander Road area which are located in the suburbs of Silverstream, Heretaunga, and Trentham.

The Blue Mountains Road area is zoned ‘Rural Hill’ and ‘Rural Lifestyle’, is heavily clad in bush, contains ‘Protected Ridgelines’ and provides a substantial backdrop to Upper Hutt City and the prison. Much of the land west of the prison is Department of Conservation land zoned ‘Open Space’, and looks down onto the prison. The Blue Mountains is an area that began as a retreat from Wellington City with weekend baches being built on large bush clad sections in the hills. Over the years these baches have been altered and extended, and in most cases more substantial homes now

---

23 These ‘Protected Ridgelines’ are areas where the Upper Hutt City Council forbids any building in an attempt to protect the view of the ridgeline.
exist. However, the majority of owners still commute to Wellington City for work. Average house prices fetch between $140,000 to $200,000. According to the real estate representatives in the area, although each of these is distinctive, properties generally are less expensive than those of a similar standard in Wellington City. The nearest shopping centre is in Silverstream.

The Chatsworth Road area in Silverstream is a well established suburban area, zoned ‘Residential Conservation’ and ‘Residential’, and is separated from Rimutaka Prison by a bush clad hill (owned by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Conservation). There are two Chapman-Taylor houses in this area designated as heritage sites, and one Upper Hutt City Council utility. A number of informal/undeveloped walkways traverse the hill which are used by walkers and joggers. Silverstream is considered the most affluent of the suburbs in the area, with the majority of its residents commuting to the city. An average house fetches $300,000. Silverstream School is located in this area.

The Somme Road area contains consolidated suburban housing and also large areas of land used for defence, commerce, and education. There are also two Upper Hutt City Council utilities. Its land use is reflected in its zoning which is a mixture of ‘Residential’ and ‘Special Activity’. The majority of homes in this area are rented to army families. This explains the high number of interviewees in this area who indicated that they have been in the area for less than five years (see Table 1). Part of this area is obscured from the prison by the Blue Mountains. The average house price is around $140,000. East of the Somme Road area located on the north east boundary of the Trentham Racecourse is the Summerset Retirement Centre. Having completed stage one of this centre’s development, there are currently 40 houses, 10 individual apartments, a rest home (with 9 residents at present) and a hospital unit (with 30 residents at present), all serviced by around 50 staff. The centre is continuing to develop, and is about to build a number of outdoor recreational facilities.

Aside from the development of a retirement village there has been little residential development in this area. It has been reported that in the recent past, interest was expressed in developing further retirement accommodation in this area. However, a representative of the Upper Hutt City Council has noted that development in this area is unlikely because of the phenomenon of “reverse sensitivity”. Reverse sensitivity is a concept which refers to the mind set and attitude of those responsible for certain large facilities, that because of their undesirable nature (eg: prison or army camp), are keen to prevent new residential development which may attract residents who subsequently complain about the facility.

The large areas of land used for defence, community services and recreational facilities, commerce, and education in this area contain:

- Trentham Army Camp

The Trentham Army Camp was commissioned in 1915 and was developed during the WW1 period. The Camp occupies 274 hectares around Messines Avenue and Camp Street. It contains a number of structures and facilities including barracks, all of which are surrounded by security fencing, lighting and gates at the entrance. There are a number of historic buildings and structures in the camp, several of which are listed as historic sites, including a clock tower which was built in 1916. The Camp employs around 600 service people and around 400 civilians.
• Police Dog Training School

The Police Dog Training School occupies a one hectare site on Dante Road off Alexander Road and was established in 1956. Onsite there are offices, buildings, accommodation, kennels and eight staff. The school is a national dog training facility for the police, but also trains dogs for customs, aviation security, corrections (including Rimutaka Prison), and occasional international clients. Over 90% of the training takes place off site, including training such as mock drug searches at the prison and the Prison Staff Training College.

• Trentham Golf Club

The Trentham Golf Club occupies 226 hectares of land and caters for around 550 members from the Hutt Valley area. The club was established over thirty years ago, at which time it would have been about one third of its present size (expansion took place prior to 1990). It has a licence to continue operating for another 25 years. The Club has a number of structures on site such as a clubhouse and greenkeepers’ sheds. As it does not have a driving range, most activity occurs during daylight hours. The Club hosts several large events each year, including the Wellington District Junior and Intermediate Stroke Play Events, Men’s and Ladies’ Tournaments, and various Corporate Tournaments.

• Rifle Ranges

There are four ranges located on the corner of Alexander Road and Freyberg Road east of Rimutaka Prison. The Trentham Army Camp uses the Sommerville Range, and leases the other three to various rifle clubs. The Seddon Range is leased to the National Rifle Association, the Collins Range is leased to the Heretaunga Pistol Club, and the Alan Range is leased to the Greater Wellington Musilating Club. These clubs sometimes use the ranges during the week, but more often in the weekends and in the summer months. After data were produced showing safety problems with the ranges in 2001, the ranges were temporarily closed down. The ranges have since been opened again after a land swap with Rimutaka Prison, and new data suggested that the ranges were in fact safe.

• Trentham Racecourse/Wellington Racing Club

The Wellington Racing Club was established in 1904 and had its first meeting in 1906. At present it has 1023 members. The racecourse holds 14 meetings a year, the busiest of which being Cup Week in the first week of January. The venue is also hired out for other events such as conferences and fireworks extravaganzas.

• Davies Field Reserve

This sports field is located on Messines Avenue opposite the Trentham Army Camp.

24 The prison staff village was also used in the past while it was empty prior to its sale to Housing New Zealand.
• EDS International

EDS International, an electronic data service company, has rented what was formerly General Motors on Alexander Road for two years, and employs around 300 people. Note that a portion of the General Motors factory is used for car grooming.

• Central Institute of Technology

The Central Institute of Technology (CIT) closed in 2001. Prior to its closure, the CIT offered technology courses to thousands of students. It employed around 300 staff, two of whom resided on site, and provided accommodation for 500 students. At the time of its closure it was argued that the CIT never really took off, partly because of its location in a suburban area, and evident in low student numbers and a residents hall which was only ever half full. At the end of 2001, it was announced that the CIT would be used as from 2002 as an extension university for a university in Australia.

• Hutt International Boys School

Hutt International Boys School is a private integrated school with a decile 10 rating, and a roll of 580 Year 2 to Year 13 pupils. It has been located on its present site on Granville Street since 1994.

The Camp Street area in Trentham, zoned ‘Residential’ and ‘Business Commercial’, is located off Fergusson Drive north of the prison and the Somme Road area. It is separated from the Somme Road area by the main railway line between the Wairarapa and Wellington. A number of small businesses are situated on Camp Street including a motel, a small supermarket, a postshop, a computer supplier, several vehicle maintenance and repair shops, a bakery, a hairdresser, a veterinary clinic, and a boarding house and restaurant.

There are four residential properties in the Alexander Road area located north east of Rimutaka Prison nestled in an elevated position up against the Blue Mountains. As this area is zoned ‘Business Industrial’ these residents needed resource consents to build/locate in the area. Separating them from the prison is the old General Motors factory, the Police Dog Training School, the Trentham Army Camp, the Trentham Golf Club, and the rifle ranges.
Community development and changes to land use:

Land use in areas neighbouring the prison has not changed a great deal in recent years. This is partly due to existing housing density and capacity problems with local effluent disposal facilities. As mentioned earlier, this lack of development may also be due to the projection of “reverse sensitivity” by certain large facilities in the area\textsuperscript{25}. Changes that have occurred, include:

- development of the Summerset Retirement Centre north east of the prison next to the Trentham Racecourse

\textsuperscript{25} As an example of this ‘reverse sensitivity”, the Upper Hutt City Council noted that the Trentham Army Camp recently raised strong objections to a proposal to locate a rest home for the elderly near to their Camp.
granting of resource consents to build/locate four homes on Alexander Road north east of the prison
• closure of the General Motors factory on Alexander Road
• land swap between the Department of Corrections and the Department of Defence
• purchase of the prison staff village by Housing New Zealand.

Census data reveals that there has been a slight increase in private dwellings in the areas surrounding the prison. Within these areas, the greatest growth has occurred in the Blue Mountains areas (See Appendix).

Land use in Upper Hutt in general has experienced some change. Three areas in particular have been earmarked for, and have experienced residential development in recent years. These three areas are:
• Riverstone Terraces (approximately 800 new sections) - approximately 4.5 km north of Rimutaka Prison, Upper Hutt, and State Highway 2
• Sylvan Way - approximately 2.25 km to the south west of Rimutaka Prison, Upper Hutt, and the suburb of Silverstream
• Mount Marua (approximately 99 new sections) - approximately 8.5 km to the north east of Rimutaka Prison.

These developments have emerged over the last four years and are expected to continue over the next 25 years. These areas, especially Mount Marua are exclusive areas which command higher than average house prices.

Census data reveals that Upper Hutt has experienced some growth in the number of private dwellings, but not as much as that experienced in the Wellington region or in New Zealand as a whole (See Appendix).
5 Operational effects of Rimutaka Prison on the Upper Hutt community

5.1 Employment and expenditure in the local economy

The literature review carried out in stage one of this research discussed the potential for positive and negative effects on community employment and local economy as a result of the presence and operation of a prison facility.

Source of the potential effect:

A positive effect may be experienced through the creation of employment and stimulus to the local economy. The creation of employment may be direct through prison staff employment or indirect through employment in firms which supply the prison with the goods and services it needs. It is this employment (and consequential investment and spending in the community) and possible spending by visitors and inmate families which is said to stimulate the local economy.

A negative effect may be experienced if private businesses in the community have to compete with the use of free or cheap inmate labour in prison industries.

Analysis:

An indication of the likely positive effects has been sought by obtaining prison staff figures and residences, and by determining the extent to which the prison sources its supplies from within Upper Hutt. The 55 structured questionnaires administered to residents and businesses also enquired as to prison employment, dealings with the prison, inmate families and prison purchases. Key informant interviews with prison staff, PARS, Community Probation Services, the police, and local businesses were also used to get an indication of possible visitor and inmate family spending in the community.

An indication of the likely negative effects on employment and the local economy has been sought by exploring the nature and extent of inmate labour in commercial work in key informant interviews with prison staff. Structured questionnaires with neighbours also enquired as to community resentment over possible competition from inmate labour.

A full economic assessment has not been undertaken in this assessment of effects on employment and the local economy in Upper Hutt.

26 Note that not all of the 55 interviewees were asked questions relating to these issues (see Footnote 7).
27 Note that not all of the 55 interviewees were asked questions relating to this issue (see Footnote 7).
28 Due to time and resource constraints.
Actual effects:

Staff employment

As was noted in Section 3.3, Rimutaka Prison currently employs 285 staff, 280 of whom are employed full time. The effect of this employment on the host community is however dependent on the number of staff who reside in the host community, and the proportion of those who were residents prior to gaining employment at the prison. The payroll office at Rimutaka Prison was unable to identify how many staff live in the host community, however it has estimated that approximately 170 of the 285 staff or 60% of the staff at Rimutaka Prison live in Upper Hutt. Assuming one prison staff member per household, in 2001 this corresponded to 1.3% of all Upper Hutt households having a direct association through prison employment. The observation was also made that because Upper Hutt is a well established urban settlement, it is more likely that prison staff will reside within it. It is not known how many of the possible 170 staff residing in Upper Hutt were originally Upper Hutt residents. For those who were Upper Hutt residents, the prison has had a positive effect on community employment. However, there is arguably also a benefit associated with those employees who move into Upper Hutt because of the related purchases and spending by such families.

Real estate agents have confirmed the presence of prison staff in Upper Hutt, having dealt with prison staff looking to purchase in the locality. Although only one resident interviewed during the research worked at Rimutaka Prison, several mentioned friends who lived in Upper Hutt and worked at the prison.

Prison staff and inmate family spending in Upper Hutt was mentioned by several key informants and neighbours. One real estate agent believed that some landlords benefit as a result of staff and inmate families renting their properties. The golf club noted that a number of its members are prison staff, and a local petrol station noted that it maintains and repairs cars, and provides petrol and other goods to prison staff. One neighbour reported that she babysat for prison staff.

It is likely that the benefits linked to this employment in Upper Hutt have increased as additional staff have been hired over the last 12 years to cope with the prison’s increase in capacity and muster.

Provision of goods and services to the prison

Employment may also be created indirectly through the provision of goods and services to the prison. Rimutaka Prison has indicated that approximately one hundred of its goods and service providers are based in Upper Hutt. These vary widely and include:

- Counselling services
- Doctors
- Optometrists
- Chemists
- Inmate support services

---

29 On the other hand, stage two of this research (Historical Analysis) indicated that it is not unusual for residents in the Wellington region to travel considerable distances to work.
Several key informants within the host community also mentioned business generated as a result of the prison’s presence. The Trentham Racecourse for example hires out its venue for staff training when there is no room at the prison, and the Police Dog Training School assists with dog handler selection for the prison. A local dairy receives a substantial benefit through its weekly provision of inmate purchases. This provision can amount to thousands of dollars a week in income.

The provision of health goods and services to Rimutaka Prison and its inmates is an example of a significant demand by Rimutaka Prison for Upper Hutt goods and services. The public prison service has an obligation to meet the health needs of the inmates it accommodates. There are three levels of health service provision within Rimutaka Prison: 1) provision onsite by Public Prison Service health workers (mostly nurses), 2) provision on site by external health providers (eg: general practitioners, dentists, pharmacies, laboratories, osteopaths, hepatitis screening, and forensic services), and 3) provision off site by external providers (eg: Accident and Emergency, various health specialists, optometrists, ear nose and throat services, sexual health, dental, psychiatric/mental health). Within Rimutaka Prison there are seven clinics serviced by a number of health personal.

A Health Services Review of the Public Prisons Service published in January 2001 (Kahui Tautoko Ltd 2001a) gives an indication of the link between prisons and local health services, and therefore Rimutaka Prison and its host community. This review noted that nationally there is an inconsistency of arrangements between prisons and external providers. There is a variety of arrangements, some formal but many informal. Although all the prisons reported positive relationships with local health providers, most prisons did not have good linkages with local iwi and Maori health providers. Although no systematic record of inmate health is kept, the fact that over 27% of New Zealand’s inmate population is on medication gives an idea of the scale of need for external health goods and

---

30 Note that in the past the podiatry unit at the CIT provided podiatry services to inmates as part of its training course.
services. The scale of need is also indicated in the budget for health services (men’s prisons) nationally, which was reported to be $6,061,408 (Ibid, p. 102). The report also notes that the demand for health services has increased in recent years as there has been an increase in youth inmates, average sentence length, psychiatrically unwell inmates, Maori and Pacific Island inmates, and elderly inmates.

Another example of a service provider in Upper Hutt is the Prisoner Aid and Rehabilitation Society (PARS). PARS is a nationwide society (incorporated trust) which was set up to provide support for prison inmates. PARS Upper Hutt’s contract with Rimutaka Prison covers six areas of support and provision for inmates. These areas are: 1) the maintenance of family relationships, 2) suitable accommodation, 3) employment, 4) management of finances and property, 5) the management of relationship issues, and 6) the development of positive community support on release. In fulfilling these contractual duties, PARS acts as an intermediary between inmates and their families, assists inmate families shift, assists visitors who wish to visit inmates, finds and provides accommodation for released inmates, works with employment agencies to find work for released inmates, and facilitates community awareness and support mechanisms.

Of the seven businesses surveyed in the Camp Street area, five (three unprompted, two prompted) were providing, or had at some time provided goods and services to the prison. These goods and services included: vehicle maintenance and repairs, food, computer services, and post shop supplies and services. Some of these goods and services could be provided daily (such as food, post), while others were more irregular. All five businesses reported a positive impact in terms of increased business. Four of the residents surveyed reported having links with, or dealings with the prison on a commercial basis. These dealings included a drainage contract, police business, legal services, and bakery advice.

One resident also mentioned, unprompted, a perceived positive effect on the Upper Hutt community in the form of prison staff employment and prison goods and service provision (for example, the prison hires rooms at the Trentham Racecourse). The resident commented that the large size of the prison institution ensured that a positive effect would be experienced by the Upper Hutt community. This in turn would impact on the resident by improving the community and hence her lifestyle.

Spending by visitors and inmate families

The extent of visitor and inmate family spending in the host community and in Upper Hutt will depend on the extent of their presence in the community. The high level of inmates in Rimutaka Prison who originate from outside the Upper Hutt community (estimated to be over 50 %) suggests that a number of visitors may come from outside Upper Hutt. It is likely that these visitors will spend on route, for example the purchase of petrol or food. A petrol station on Ferguson Drive has indicated that they get quite a few visitors stopping to ask for directions and to purchase supplies. It may be that some visitors even stay overnight or for a period of time, however no evidence of this has been gathered in this research.

The incidence of inmate families relocating to Upper Hutt was investigated in 1999 in a study commissioned by the Department of Corrections (Waldegrave). The study concluded that families of inmates in Rimutaka Prison generally did not relocate to the Upper Hutt community. Only one
resident interviewed in this research knew of an inmate family taking up residence in Upper Hutt\textsuperscript{31}. The prison chaplain, the Upper Hutt police, PARS, and one local school are aware of inmate families relocating to Upper Hutt. There are however no figures or even estimates as to the extent of such relocation. The prison’s Crime Prevention Officer noted that many of the inmate families are from a low socio-economic group and would therefore struggle to afford the costs of relocation. Although some spending by inmate families obviously occurs, it is difficult to determine how much.

**Competition from inmate labour**

The possibility of a negative effect on local business due to competition from inmate labour was investigated during interviews with prison staff, and in structured questionnaires with neighbours. The prison nursery sells some of its plants to retailers in Upper Hutt, including garden centres, landscapers and supermarkets\textsuperscript{32}, and at times the Upper Hutt City Council. The joinery workshop also has a private contract to produce furniture for a furniture retailer in Upper Hutt\textsuperscript{33}. It is difficult to quantify what effect this possible ‘competition’ has on those private businesses in Upper Hutt supplying plants or furniture. However, any effect is most probably lessened by the fact that the prison does not sell its products direct to the public but rather is part of the value added chain of some local firms. Industry managers at Rimutaka Prison report that in seeking or considering private contracts, the prison is sensitive to concerns relating to unfair competition and is careful to ensure that they are not competing with existing business, but instead filling a gap in the market. They also point out that most of their contracts are obtained through word of mouth and that generally these contracts have existed for many years. Of the 24 neighbours asked if they had ever encountered resentment in the community that inmate labour is taking jobs away from other people, all answered that they had not.

**Summary evaluation:**

Even without a comprehensive economic assessment on the effects of the prison on employment and the local economy, it is evident that the prison has a significant positive impact on employment opportunities locally and on the local economy of Upper Hutt. Approximately sixty percent of the prison’s staff live in Upper Hutt and approximately 100 local firms supply goods and services to the prison. The fact that prison enterprises (plant nursery and furniture) supply to local retailers rather than direct to the public suggests that the role of such prison enterprises in the local economy is complementary rather than competitive. This is reinforced when consideration is given to the size of the prison industries involved, the limited number of private contracts being serviced, and the policy of prison management to avoid being in competition.

5.2 **Goods and service contributions from the prison to the community**

Stage two of this prison research (Historical Analysis) indicated that communities may benefit from prison and inmate goods and service contributions.

\textsuperscript{31} One of the 46 responses received to this question.

\textsuperscript{32} Supply to retailers in Upper Hutt is only a small proportion of the business done with retailers in the wider Wellington region.

\textsuperscript{33} The joinery workshop has similar contracts to provide furniture to a furniture shop in Petone and a furniture shop in Porirua.
Source of the potential effect:

The source of this effect is the offering of free or discounted goods, or inmate labour to the prison’s host community and its members.

Analysis:

In order to determine the extent of Rimutaka Prison’s goods and service contributions to the host community and the Upper Hutt community, the results of key informant interviews with prison staff, the Orongomai Marae, local schools, the Trentham Army Camp, the Trentham Golf Course, the Trentham Racing Club, and the Upper Hutt City Council have been examined. The structured questionnaires also asked interviewees about inmates working off site.

Actual effects:

There are no current goods and service contributions from the prison to its immediate host community. However, in the recent past the following goods and services have been provided:

- Sheep grazing on the rifle ranges

At the end of 2001, Rimutaka Prison stopped grazing its sheep on adjacent rifle ranges because of a drop in sheep numbers.

- Maintenance of the Trentham Golf Club course

Up until 2001, approximately eight supervised inmates worked on the nearby Trentham Golf Club every day maintaining the course. This community service was discontinued by the prison management for security reasons. There had been a number of incidents involving the dropping off of contraband for inmates in the work gang to pick up. The Golf Club has expressed its disappointment that this service has been stopped.

- Maintenance of rifle ranges

Up until 2000, a gang of eight inmates worked 9.00 am to 3.00 pm five days a week on the five rifle ranges located east of the prison. The inmates performed general maintenance duties such as gorse clearance, drainage, and rubbish removal. A number of problems with the work gang led to the prison withdrawing its services in 2000. The range warden has stated these problems included a failure by inmates to keep clear of restricted areas putting their safety at risk, unwanted visitors in defence areas, inappropriate behaviour and use of tools, and intrusions by inmates in the farm work gang.

- Work at the Trentham Racecourse during cup week

Inmates from Rimutaka Prison were used once during cup week January 2001 to move runners off the racecourse. However, this proved to be unsuccessful, resulting in the racecourse’s decision to not use inmate labour again.
Some of the goods and services currently provided by Rimutaka Prison to the wider Upper Hutt community include:

- **Plants for fundraising**

  The prison nursery, established in 1995, provides plants to community institutions and organisations in Upper Hutt (and the wider Wellington region) at a discounted price for the purpose of fundraising.\(^{34}\) As the nursery has developed and community awareness has grown, there has been an enormous increase (estimated 800% increase) in these activities, especially over the last 3 years.

- **Work at the Orongomai Marae**

  The Orongomai Marae has a well established and strong relationship with Rimutaka Prison and the prison’s Maori Focus Unit. Inmates work on the marae at least once a month (refer to Section 5.4 for further detail).

- **General maintenance at the Riding for the Disabled School in Silverstream**

  Approximately six inmates carry out general maintenance, such as fence repairs, at the Silverstream riding school for the disabled several times a year. A prison staff member initiated the work around five years ago, but now leaves it up to the riding school to request help.

- **Stormwater drain clearing for the Upper Hutt City Council**

  For approximately 12 years, the Upper Hutt City Council has used a work gang of approximately eight inmates to clear stormwater drains in Upper Hutt. This may occur up to once a month and is free to the Council in return for the Council providing transport, petrol, tools, and lunch for the inmates.

- **Forestry work for the Wellington Regional Council**

  For many years, inmates from Rimutaka Prison have been involved in various work activities such as forestry work in the Upper Hutt region for the Wellington Regional Council.

- **Cultivation and planting of trees in Upper Hutt**

  In partnership with the Upper Hutt City Council, Forest and Bird, and local schools, Rimutaka inmates are involved in various planting programmes.

A number of trends in prison development were highlighted in stage two of this research programme (*Historical Analysis*), including a reduction in the level of prison goods and service contributions to communities over the last three to five years. This reduction was attributed to an initiative around

\(^{34}\) Such institutions and organisations include: St Patricks College, Trentham Kindergartens, Hutt International Boys School, Silverstream Kindergarten, Silverstream School, Busy Beez Child Care, Rimutaka Gym Club, Silverstream Christian School, Fraser Crescent School, St Brendans School, Heretaunga College, Upper Hutt School, Totara Park School, St Joseph’s Home of Compassion, Cottle Kindergarten, St Francis School, Victim Support, and Brown Owl Kindergarten.
the same time to commercialise prison activities (especially under Corrlands which took control of most prison industries in 2001). This trend was also evident at Rimutaka Prison. A number of services performed in the past have recently ceased. These include:

- Planting and maintaining the Upper Hutt City Council’s pine plantation

The Upper Hutt City Council used to use a work gang to plant and maintain its pine plantation. The prison terminated this arrangement around 1997. The Upper Hutt City Council’s Park Manager claims that the inmates were unreliable anyway and it took four years to do a job which would take anyone else one year.

- Donation of excess vegetables to community organisations

In the past (1993-2000), any excess vegetables from the prison’s gardens were donated to various community organisations. This ceased when the prison’s vegetable garden ceased operating.

Although one resident had knowledge of the plants grown by inmates for the purpose of community fundraising, none of the neighbours interviewed had been involved at any time in a community organisation or event which has used free inmate labour.

Summary evaluation:

A number of goods and services are provided by Rimutaka Prison to the Upper Hutt community. The extent of this contribution has reduced over the last three years, due partly to a policy shift to commercialise inmate labour. For the most part, these contributions appear to be greatly appreciated by the community, evident in expressions of disappointment when they have been withdrawn. However, there were also a few situations where such activities posed security risks for the prison or inmates.

5.3 Community involvement with the prison

The second stage of this prison research (Historical Analysis) indicated that individuals and groups involved with prisons may experience personal and organisational development and fulfilment.

Source of the potential effect:

The nature of a prison dictates that aside from the need for prison staff and prison goods and service provision, there will be other needs (which may not be catered for officially) and ways in which a community will become involved in the operation of a prison facility. Often this involvement is volunteer-based work which provides support for and caters for inmate needs.

Analysis:

The analysis of this effect is based on interviews with prison staff (including the Prison Chaplain), Prisoner Fellowship, the Orongomai Marae, and on structured questionnaires with residents. Of the

35 Note only 23 neighbours were asked this question.
48 residents interviewed in this case study, 38 were asked if they had any dealings with the prison in any capacity.

**Actual effects:**

The Upper Hutt community has a significant involvement with Rimutaka Prison through Christian based groups and individuals who volunteer their time and resources to help inmates. It was not possible to determine how many, if any of these groups’ members live within the host community. There are 24 Christian based groups from all over the Wellington region who, under the Prison Chaplaincy Service, work with Rimutaka Prison inmates. Nine of these 24 groups are based in, have a branch in, or have members who live in Upper Hutt. These groups are:

1) Christian Film Unit
2) Salvation Army
3) Upper Hutt Hosanna Fellowship
4) Upper Hutt Samoan Assembly of God
5) Our Lady of Grace Heretaunga
6) Prisoner Fellowship
7) Kia Hiwa-ra
8) First Samoan Full Gospel Church
9) International Catholic Programmes of Evangelisation

These groups and individuals provide for inmates in a number of ways, including:

- taking church services and bible studies
- playing sport
- running programmes
- offering counselling
- taking inmates on church or day parole
- writing to inmates
- visiting inmates
- providing transport to the prison, for inmate visitors
- helping inmates or inmate families shift house
- helping inmates’ partners with pregnancy needs
- helping adopted inmates trace birth mothers
- establishing links and contacts between inmates and the community on release
- assisting with settling in the community on release (for example: take inmate or inmate’s family to look at furniture, help find accommodation and employment).

The groups are rostered so that church services and bible studies are held in each unit every week (some units have up to three services a week). Some groups visit on a weekly basis, others on a fortnightly or monthly basis. As up to five people will take a church service, there may be up to 40 people visiting Rimutaka Prison every Sunday to take services.

Members of these groups and other groups and members of the community also get involved with the prison through the donations they make. Prisoner Fellowship, for example, organises ‘angel trees’ to be placed in churches every year. An angel tree is a Christmas tree which has cut out angels with the names of inmates’ children hung on them. Church members will then select an angel and purchase a Christmas gift for that child. The gift is then sent on to the family on behalf of the parent.
in prison. The chaplaincy actively seeks donations and resources, such as clothes, books, and money, not only from individuals but other groups, organisations, and businesses.

Local Maori, especially the Orongomai Marae, have significant involvement with Rimutaka Prison and its Maori Focus Unit. This involvement includes advisory functions and cultural programmes and activities (see Section 5.4).

Of the 38 residents asked if they had any dealings with the prison, one mentioned involvement along the lines discussed above. This resident was involved with kapahaka at the Maori Focus Unit.

**Summary evaluation:**

A significant number of Upper Hutt community members are involved on a voluntary basis with Rimutaka Prison and its inmates. This involvement occurs on a weekly basis and over the years has increased as the prison’s muster has increased. Thus, there is a substantial basis of local community involvement.

### 5.4 Relationship with the local Maori community

The local tangata whenua of the Upper Hutt area are Te Ati Awa. The land, sea, fish and water are their responsibility. However, the majority of Maori living in Upper Hutt are not tangata whenua. The Orongomai Marae, which is an urban marae in Upper Hutt, provides for the interests of Maori from all iwi. Orongomai Marae has been given the mandate to look after the social well being of the area which includes the inmates of Rimutaka Prison with which it has a close association. “The marae has never viewed the prison as a place that we could not interact with” according to one member. This special association dates back to the early 1970’s when a local resident had the vision to establish carving classes and a kapahaka group at the prison for inmates. The kaumatua for the prison is from Orongamai Marae.

In December 2001 there were 203 New Zealand Maori being accommodated at Rimutaka Prison. At the time this amounted to over 46% of the total prison population. A large proportion of these Maori inmates are not local iwi. The fact that a large proportion are not local iwi can put a strain on the resources of the local marae and makes it more difficult to provide support and contribute to their well being.

Whilst there was always an active liaison between local Maori and the prison it has broadened substantially with the opening of the Maori Focus Unit at Rimutaka Prison in 1999. Local Maori were involved with its establishment and their involvement is of ongoing importance in terms of the overall philosophy or tikanga taught to the inmates as well as the management and programmes within the unit. “We consider ourselves guardians to the men within the unit and want to be involved at all levels.”

Work parties from the unit help out at other prisons in the Wellington region as well as other maraes. The closest association is with the Orongamai Marae in Upper Hutt. In exchange for work the inmates from the Maori Focus Unit gain knowledge and experience the ways of other Maori which is considered an essential part of their prison programme.
A kapahaka group from within the prison visits the Orongomai Marae regularly, as do other tutors. Inmates and officers travel as far afield as Rotorua to extend their knowledge of Maori carving. Members of the Orongomai Marae visit inmates who are both family and non family.

Family whanau days are held at the Unit when food and activities are shared. Special visiting days are initiated for the unveiling of carvings. Sometimes huis and sleep overs take place. “The atmosphere within the unit is quite unique” according to several key informants. Maori language classes in speech making are now offered to inmates and taught by local Maori. A recent initiative is the enrolling of Maori inmates for a diploma at the University of Otaki in the year 2002 which will enable the men to gain a qualification whilst within the prison. This course is fully funded by the Maori Focus Unit and is available to both inmates and staff.

The Maori Focus Unit now has a Maori Advisory Committee which has improved communication between the Unit and local Maori. Informal and formal consultation, especially over programmes, occurs weekly. Maori therapeutic and alcohol and anger management programmes are offered to inmates. Because there has been a longstanding relationship between local Maori and the prison, consultation between the two has never been an “afterthought”.

The Upper Hutt Police have appointed a liaison person whose primary focus is the nurturing of the relationship between the Maori Focus Unit and the local community.

In April 2001 a Maori cultural advisor was appointed to the Wellington Region and is based at Rimutaka Prison. The role of the advisor is to “keep a positive communication with iwi groups, tribal, Maori staff, leaders and government ministers”. Networking with other iwi is an essential part of the advisors role, as there are inmates from other parts of New Zealand in the Maori Focus Unit.

The cultural advisor at Rimutaka Prison works very closely with the manager of the Maori Focus Unit. Together they make staff appointments. Staff are given training specific to the requirements of the unit to ensure that they “have the knowledge and the cultural sensitivity and are also aware of the cultural identity of the area”. Officers in the Unit are both Maori and non Maori.

Whilst the Maori Focus Unit caters to 60 men, many more Maori are within the mainstream prison. Entering the Maori Focus Unit is considered a privilege which has to be earned. Strict rules have to be followed and if broken, the men return to the mainstream prison. A criminogenic programme (which is a programme which is directly related to the needs of the inmate) is offered within the mainstream which encourages Maori men to want to awaken their sense of identity and encourage them to want to enter the Maori Focus Unit.

Summary evaluation

There is a strong and growing commitment by the local Maori community to provide practical support for the Maori inmates. This is based largely around the relationship between Orongomai Marae and the Maori Focus Unit within the Rimutaka Prison.
5.5 Nuisance: lighting & noise

The second stage of this prison research (Historical Analysis), and assessment reports commissioned in preparation for the siting of the new Northland prison, indicate that lighting and noise emanating from a prison have the potential to create a nuisance for prison neighbours.

Source of the potential effect:

The source of this effect is prison security lighting and noise associated with the everyday operation of the prison. Rimutaka Prison has eight units for accommodating inmates. Each of these units has its own lighting structures. Rimutaka Prison is a medium sized prison with over 480 inmates, over 280 staff, daily traffic, and several industries capable of generating noise.

Analysis:

In order to determine whether or not lighting and noise causes a nuisance to prison neighbours in Upper Hutt, interviews were conducted with prison staff and a representative of the Upper Hutt City Council. Structured questionnaires which investigated the effect of lighting and noise were also conducted with 55 prison neighbours.

Actual effects:

Security lighting

Nine of the 55 neighbours (48 residents and seven businesses) interviewed could see prison security lighting from their properties (two unprompted, seven prompted). These nine neighbours (all residents) were from the Blue Mountains Road area (4), the Somme Road area (2), and the Alexander Road area (3) (see Figure 8). Of the five areas surveyed, these three areas are closest to the prison. Two of these were elevated and therefore more exposed to the lighting (Blue Mountains Road area and the Alexander Road area). There were no residents or businesses in the Chatsworth Road area or Camp Street area who could see lighting from their properties. These areas are the two most removed areas, either by distance or topographical features such as hills, and would therefore be unlikely to be affected by prison security lighting. It is acknowledged however that lighting is unlikely to be an issue for the seven businesses surveyed as their hours of operation would generally prevent them from being on their properties when the security lighting is on.

As all but one of the eight units at Rimutaka Prison have been built over the last 12 years, and it is on the units that security lighting is erected, it is fair to say that prison security lighting has increased significantly over the last 12 years in conjunction with the construction of these new units. Five of those who reported being able to see the lighting said that there had been no change to the intensity of this lighting over time. However, three of these had only lived on their property for less than four years and are therefore unlikely to have been in residence during the time when the most significant additions to lighting were being made. The remaining four reported an increase. Increases were noted in all three areas where lighting was noticed.

36 Altogether, thirty three people were interviewed in these particular areas.
Of the nine residents who reported being able to see the prison security lighting, only one reported being impacted by this. This resident from the Blue Mountains Road area described this impact as an increased sense of insecurity as the lights acted as a reminder of the prison’s presence.

The Upper Hutt City Council did not have any specific system to log complaints from community members. On enquiry however, the staff member who usually dealt with complaints could not recall any complaints relating to prison security lighting. Prison management also could not recall any such complaints.

Aside from the nine residents who reported being able to see the prison security lighting, an additional two out of the 55 mentioned that they could see the lights when they were driving near the prison. One noted that “at night it’s lit up like a Christmas tree” or looks like “a white bright suburb”. Neither reported any resulting impact.

Noise

Of the 55 neighbours (48 residents and seven businesses) interviewed, five reported being able to hear noise from the prison (one unprompted, four prompted). All five of these residents were from the Blue Mountains Road area. One additional resident from the Somme Road area noted that he could hear noise from the prison on walks in the Blue Mountains above the prison.

When asked what noise they hear, all five of the residents mentioned voices, three mentioned music, two mentioned construction noises, and two mentioned the noise of a chainsaw. When asked what is the likely source of these noises, the voices were attributed to loud speaker announcements (three residents), inmates playing sport (three residents), and a riot (one resident). The music was attributed to family days (one resident)\(^{37}\), and inmate entertainment (one resident), while the construction noises were linked to prison expansion (one resident). All noted that the noise could be heard from outside, or inside if windows were left open, and that generally the noise was heard during the daytime. The frequency of this occurrence varied. Announcements and inmates playing sport could apparently be heard everyday to several times a week, as was the case for construction noise when construction activities were going on. Music was reportedly heard a few times a year, while noise from riots was heard once or twice. All five of the residents reported an increase in noise, four of whom felt it was due to prison expansion.

While three of the five reported no resulting impact, two did claim an impact, noting that the noise acted as a reminder and that this resulted in an increased sense of insecurity.

As already noted, the Upper Hutt City Council did not have any specific system to log community members’ complaints regarding Rimutaka Prison. On enquiry however, the staff member who usually dealt with complaints could not recall any complaints relating to noise emanating from the prison. Prison management also could not recall any such complaints.

\(^{37}\) Prison management noted that bands are sometimes used on family days.
Summary evaluation:

In summary, although only a small percentage of those interviewed reported being able to see prison security lighting or hear noise from the prison, these reports have helped identify those areas which have the potential to be affected. A very small proportion of near neighbours reported any negative impacts at all, with three referring to the impact of lighting and noise as being a constant reminder of the presence of the prison nearby.

5.6 Personal Safety

Literature has indicated that there is a fear that host community members will be subjected to an increased risk to their personal safety (as a result of a prison’s presence). Personal safety may also be at risk from traffic.

Source of the potential effect:

The primary source of this fear for personal safety is the potential for inmate escapes and any consequential risk of assault, damage or loss. Rimutaka Prison has the capacity to accommodate over 480 inmates at any one time. If an inmate escapes, their escape is classified as a ‘breakout’, a ‘walkaway’ (for example, from prison grounds or work parties), a ‘non-return from temporary release’, or an ‘other escape’ (for example, escape from escort). Any fear for personal safety is borne mainly out of a fear of breakouts or walkaways. These two types of escapes were investigated in this research.

Concerns relating to increased traffic were also investigated. Any large operational facility creates a demand for traffic. Rimutaka prison has 285 employees and over 480 inmates who need to be transported to and from prison on arrival and departure, and for a variety of temporary releases. Many of these inmates also receive visitors each week. The prison also has hundreds of different goods and service providers. There have been several extensions to the prison which have necessitated the use of construction vehicles on site for several months at a time. Thus the prison creates a large amount of traffic and corresponding issues relating to traffic and personal safety.

Analysis:

In order to ascertain the effect of Rimutaka Prison on a person’s safety, interviews were conducted with a number of key informants, namely the Upper Hutt Police, the Crime Prevention Officer at Rimutaka Prison, the prison manager, various other prison staff, a criminal lawyer, and resident group co-ordinators.

Structured interviews (using structured questionnaires) were also conducted with 55 members of the host community in which they were asked if they had experienced any effect from the operation or presence of the prison. If respondents did not identify fear from an escape as an effect, the interviewer prompted them. Inmate escape issues received more responses than any other effect addressed in the questionnaire. All five residential areas surveyed gained responses from interviewees on the effect of inmate escapes. Thirty four respondents out of the total fifty five discussed this issue (50% of whom were unprompted).
The questionnaire also addressed prison-related traffic. Of the 55 neighbours surveyed, 18 commented on prison related traffic.

**Actual effects:**

**Inmate escapes**

Twenty four neighbours worried about inmates escaping. It is noteworthy however that for some of these neighbours their fear was not always constant but heightened when an inmate had actually escaped. This fear of inmate escapes had a varying impact on these residents, who described “a real anxiety”, a “cold feeling when we learn of an escape”, and being “anxious when at home alone”. Some also described taking measures to counteract the fear such as “never showering with the door unlocked” and “locking all the doors and windows at night”. Some residents had also taken extra security measures such as installing security locks, lights and alarms. Two residents in the Chatsworth Road area who had bushtracks traversing their properties did not feel safe walking these alone. Another resident in this area allowed her children to play in the bush on their property only whilst within hearing distance of her voice. The police acknowledged that fear of escapes would be a “very real issue for some residents” as a recent escape had resulted in two inmates entering an unoccupied home in the area.

There are a number of factors which seem to affect the degree to which neighbours fear for their personal safety. Generally, neighbours in the vicinity of the prison felt that if an inmate was to escape, they would be most likely to take a route through the Blue Mountains south of the prison, due to the cover that it would provide. This concern was reflected in the number of residents in the Blue Mountains Road area and Chatsworth Road area who reported a fear of inmate escapes. The numbers in these areas was significantly higher than in the other three areas covered in the research. However, neighbours also frequently mentioned the belief that if an inmate escaped they would leave the area as quickly as possible. To a small extent this belief abated their fears. Details of four recent escapes obtained from Upper Hutt Police appear to support this belief. All four of these escapees seemed to have left the area promptly, and all four were caught outside Upper Hutt, one as far away as Auckland.

There are certain effects associated with the presence and operation of the prison which can act as reminders of the prison’s presence, and hence the risk of inmate escapes. This reminder can therefore factor into the fear experienced by neighbours. In this case study, such effects include the visibility of prison security lighting at night, noise heard from the prison, and prison traffic. Several of the neighbours who could see lighting or hear noise noted that it acted as a reminder and increased their anxiety. Although several residents noted that the presence of police cars in their street (Blue Mountains Road and Chatsworth Road area) acted as reminders of an escape and therefore evoked a sense of fear, one resident noted that it was “reassuring to know that the police are in the neighbourhood”.

None of the neighbours surveyed reported ever encountering an inmate during the course of an escape, or having an escaped inmate arrive at their home or business. Nevertheless, Department of Corrections’ records show that over the last 17 years, a total of 95 inmates have escaped from Rimutaka Prison. This is an average of just fewer than six escapes per year, with a maximum of 13 (1994) and a minimum of one (1998). The number of escapes each year over this period appears to have reduced slightly. A closer examination of the different types of escapes reveals a slight
reduction in the number of breakouts and non-returns from temporary release each year. The overall reduction in the number of escapes over this period has greater significance if viewed in relation to the increase in muster over this same period (see Figure 7).

Figure 7: Inmate escapes from Rimutaka Prison as a percentage of muster, 1985-2001

Twenty five of the 34 neighbours who discussed inmate escapes, were able to determine the year in which the last inmate escaped. When asked the number of escapes in the last five years, only three people attempted to answer.

As a result of inmate escapes, one resident surveyed has had property stolen, several residents had experienced prison officers on their property searching for escaped inmates, ten had experienced road blocks due to an escape, two had their vehicles searched whilst on route to their homes, and two had left their homes to stay with family elsewhere until the escaped inmate was caught. It is worth noting that although no neighbours reported having an escaped inmate arrive at their home or business, two residents in the Blue Mountains Road area did mention having inmates arrive at their homes for ‘other’ reasons. One resident encountered two inmates on her property who claimed they had permission from the prison to be out looking for lost cattle. The other resident encountered inmates who claimed to be lost. Both reported being “very frightened”. As prison staff have stated that no inmates would be allowed to roam the Blue Mountains to look for cattle unsupervised, it would seem that these inmates may have been escaped inmates. However, the resident who reported this incident also noted that there was no announcement of escaped inmates in the media at the time of the incident.

In order to help address neighbours’ fears, a phone warning system has been set up in the Chatsworth Road area. This system aims to ensure that the Chatsworth Road residents group is rung by the prison if an escape occurs. The setting up of this system was initiated by the group’s coordinator. All seventeen households in the group also have personal alarms for use if an escape

38 Corroborated by the Upper Hutt Police.
occurs. Although escapes have occurred in the last ten years, there has been no need for the use of these personal alarms. Although this system is a comfort for residents, the coordinator was concerned that she was not always telephoned when an escapee had been caught, and described fielding phone calls from anxious neighbours awaiting news. Two other neighbourhood group coordinators indicated that they would like to have a phone warning system in place. Seven respondents out of the total 44 interviewed in all areas were keen for the prison to initiate a warning system. Several of these were spouses/partners of defence personnel (in the Somme Road area) who felt particularly vulnerable when their spouses/partners were off base for long periods of time. The police and prison management were also keen to initiate some warning system for these other neighbourhood groups.

In addition to breakouts and walkaways from the prison, walkaways from work parties\(^{39}\) that are working off site also have the potential to evoke a fear for personal safety. Twenty three residents out of the 55 interviewed noticed inmates working off site in the community. However only five worried as “the most likely escape was a breakaway” according to one interviewee. One resident noticed the work parties but did not feel concern because “only the low security inmates get to work out side of the prison”. Prison management has noted that fewer than ten percent of its inmates work around prison grounds, while approximately ten inmates work off site at any time.

There are a number of other instances when inmates may need to be off site. These include court appearances, health needs and education activities. It was noted by key informants who had worked at the CIT that inmates had attended courses at the CIT during the 1990s. These inmates were classified as minimum security and had not caused any problems. The number of inmates attending courses had dropped significantly over the years and ceased altogether after 1999. At times inmates may also participate in release to work. Release to work enables suitable inmates at the end of their sentence to work in the community. The inmate usually works normal hours and receives payment from which he must pay board to the prison. Inmates need to find their own way to their place of employment. Currently, there are only one or two inmates on release to work at Rimutaka Prison. Several research participants noted seeing inmates walking to work or to catch the train to work. One resident in the Somme Road area noted seeing inmates walking down his street, and the subsequent concern he had for his children’s safety.

Although there is obviously some concern for neighbours/school children walking or carrying out activities in close proximity to the prison, it was also agreed upon during the feedback meeting with neighbours, that there is a duty on neighbours as well as prison management to deal with such concerns. It was suggested for example, that schools should notify the prison if pupils will be in the area and would prefer if inmates were not working off site at that time.

Several residents interviewed in the Somme Road area noted that they were concerned for their safety when the prison staff village fell into disrepair prior to its sale to Housing New Zealand. When the village was left empty, it attracted vandals and quickly deteriorated. One resident would not walk in the vicinity of the village during this time.

---

\(^{39}\) For example, two inmates escaped from a work party near Blue Mountains Road near Pinehaven in September 2001 (Williams 2001).
Traffic-related risks

The Somme Road area being on route to the prison received the greatest mention by residents. One resident reported seeing prison vehicles at “8 am every morning”. Residents expressed concern for the safety of their children as some prison officers drove at speed. Much of this concern was felt by families with young children in defence housing. Some of these residents had approached the Army to request speed bumps, which as yet have not been installed. Five residents were concerned with the apparent increase in traffic which they believed to be due to the increase in the size of Rimutaka Prison.

Residents in the Chatsworth Road area and Blue Mountains Road area only noticed prison traffic in their street when there was a search, and although six had encountered police vehicles they were not considered a problem.

Several residents noted the presence of police vehicles on Freyberg Road during a recent prison officers strike, however their presence did not affect them.

Summary evaluation:

The fear of inmates escaping is by far the most frequently reported off-site effect. Sixty percent of all those interviewed discussed inmate escapes, while just over 40% of all those interviewed reported experiencing fear of some sort. The effect is most apparent for residents closer to the prison. Although none had ever actually encountered an escapee, all were fearful when escapes occurred. Whilst the fear was “not enough to make us sell up and move”, it caused anxiety and made many residents take extra measures as a result.

Despite the size of the prison and its regular demand for goods and services including inmate transporting and staff movements, there was very little impact from prison related traffic experienced by neighbours. The main impact was an increase in volume of traffic and related speed in Somme Road.

5.7 Crime

Literature has indicated that potential and current host communities often fear that a prison’s presence and operation in a community will result in an increase in crime. Existing research into whether or not this fear is realised has had mixed results.

Source of the potential effect:

The source of this potential effect is the belief that inmate families, visitors and an increased ‘criminal element’ will commit crime in the community.

Analysis:

In order to investigate this potential effect, interviews were carried out with the prison’s crime prevention officer, the prison chaplain, community probation, PARS and the police. Crime rates in Upper Hutt have also been compared to three other demographically similar areas in New Zealand.
The structured questionnaires also addressed issues relating to inmate families and visitors.

Actual effects:

Two of the eleven residents who discussed issues to do with inmate families noted that they were fearful that crime would increase as a result of inmate families moving into the area.

As discussed in Section 5.1, it is evident that visitors from outside Upper Hutt do visit Rimutaka Prison and that there are some inmate families who relocate to the area. However, investigations in this research have revealed no evidence that these visitors or inmate families commit crime in Upper Hutt. The police had some anecdotal recollections of the occasional spouse or partner of an inmate shoplifting food or Christmas presents, and the need for monthly vehicle checks around the prison due to drug drop offs. However, the police emphasised that there was no evidence that crime was a special problem in Upper Hutt attributable to the prison’s presence. In assessing the effect of the prison on crime, it is also important to remember that it would be erroneous to automatically assume that inmate families must be involved in crime. It should also be remembered that of the inmate families who are located in Upper Hutt, many will have always been Upper Hutt residents, not new members who have relocated to be close to a relative in prison.

Some concern was expressed that the presence of the prison may have encouraged the establishment of gangs in Upper Hutt. After discussing this concern with several key informants it appears that this concern is unsubstantiated. It was noted that gang members are not approved prison visitors and that in fact there are other areas in the region with worse gang problems than Upper Hutt.

In order to further assess the effect of the prison on crime in Upper Hutt, crime rates in Upper Hutt have been compared with three other urban centres in New Zealand which do not have prisons in them. To ensure that this comparison was valid, attempts were made to select urban centres that were as similar as possible demographically to Upper Hutt (see Table 5).
Table 5: Demographic comparison between Upper Hutt and urban centres without prisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Hutt</th>
<th>Paraparaumu</th>
<th>Blenheim</th>
<th>Masterton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>36717</td>
<td>31023</td>
<td>30693</td>
<td>22758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental properties</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14 yrs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0-14 yrs</td>
<td>0-14 yrs</td>
<td>0-14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-60 yrs</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15-60 yrs</td>
<td>15-60 yrs</td>
<td>15-60 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+ yrs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>61+ yrs</td>
<td>61+ yrs</td>
<td>61+ yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$50,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$20,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$20,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$20,000-$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$100,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$50,001-$100,000</td>
<td>$50,001-$100,000</td>
<td>$50,001-$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>$100,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1996 Census data (Supermap).

Table 6: Recorded offences for the 1999, 2000, 2001 calendar years for Upper Hutt, Paraparaumu, Blenheim, and Masterton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Upper Hutt</th>
<th>Paraparaumu</th>
<th>Blenheim</th>
<th>Masterton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3026</td>
<td>2996</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>3883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>3753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3659</td>
<td>3156</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>3505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2002 NZ Police.

The recorded offences for 2001 in Upper Hutt appear to be slightly higher than those in Paraparaumu, Blenheim, and Masterton. However, if compared per capita it is evident that the number of recorded offences in Upper Hutt is similar to those in Paraparaumu and slightly lower than those in Blenheim and Masterton. For example, while there is one recorded offence for every 10

---

40 Note that these demographics are from the area units and mesh block units which most closely represent the areas covered by the police districts for which the crime rates in Table 6 were collected.

41 Note that the crime rates represented in this table are crime rates for police districts. These districts often cover large areas. The police district for Upper Hutt for example, covers an area beyond the Upper Hutt urban centre (host community) as described in this report. Much of this area however is unpopulated and should still provide some indication of the effect of the prison on crime rates.
people in Upper Hutt, there is one recorded offence for every 8.8 people in Blenheim\textsuperscript{42} and every 6.5 people in Masterton\textsuperscript{43}. This data would seem to indicate that the prison has not had a significant affect on crime in Upper Hutt.

Three of the four centres compared, including Upper Hutt, experienced an increase in recorded offences between 1999 and 2001.

\textit{Summary evaluation:}

Although there is no data available on crime committed by prison visitors or relocated inmate families, discussions with key informants and a review of crime rates seems to indicate that the prison has not had a significant adverse affect on crime in Upper Hutt.

\subsection*{5.8 Community services and resources}

Literature examined in stage one of this prison research (\textit{Sector Review}) stated that there is the potential for the presence and operation of a prison to put a strain on community services and resources. Conversely, it is argued that there is the possibility that the increased demand for community services and resources brought about by the presence and operation of a prison will lead to an improvement in the availability and delivery of these services and resources locally.

\textit{Source of the potential effect:}

It is argued that this strain on, or improvement to community services and resources may be caused by an influx of prison staff and inmate families into the community.

\textit{Analysis:}

This argument was explored during the course of interviews with prison staff, local schools and the police.

\textit{Actual effects:}

As discussed in Section 5.1, it is clear that some staff and inmate families do relocate to Upper Hutt. Obviously these people will need and use community resources and services.

The extent of this demand depends on the number of people who relocate. It has been estimated that approximately 60\% of the staff (170 people) at Rimutaka Prison live in Upper Hutt. It is difficult to ascertain the number of inmate families who have relocated. Nevertheless, it would seem that the total number is relatively low, especially when compared with the Upper Hutt population of around 36,000. It is therefore unlikely that the number of staff, or inmate families who do relocate to Upper Hutt put a significant strain on community resources and services.

\textsuperscript{42} Using 1996 population figures.
\textsuperscript{43} Using 1996 population figures.
Of the six schools interviewed in the course of this research, only one had knowledge of an inmate family, and none mentioned any problems or issues associated with the presence of inmate families in Upper Hutt.

During the course of this research it also became clear that the prison itself used a number of community resources and services.

The use of, and possible strain on, community policing resources and services was evident in discussions with the Upper Hutt Police. Police resources and services are used at the prison\(^{44}\), and in the community when dealing with some inmate families\(^ {45}\). As a result of ongoing concern over the provision of these resources and services, the Upper Hutt Police have recently started a record of police resources and services used by the prison. It has been calculated that 1.5 police persons are required per year to deal with the prison\(^ {46}\).

In addition to the police resources and services noted above, the Upper Hutt police have also noted that the prison has over the years used the police jail to accommodate ‘overflow’ from the prison. Payment received from the prison for this service usually failed to meet police costs. Recent adjustments made to implement a “more realistic cost recovery programme” have resulted in less use of the police jail by the prison.

Prison staff mentioned several social agencies which are used to help inmates re-integrate into the community. Work and Income New Zealand and Housing New Zealand, for example, will at times visit the prison to provide inmates with information regarding their services and post-release procedures.

*Summary evaluation:*

Although local police note the use of their resources and services by Rimutaka Prison, it appears that generally, the comparatively low number of prison staff and inmate families in Upper Hutt prevents any significant strain or improvement to community resources and services in Upper Hutt.

### 5.9 Local environment

Effects assessments commissioned by the Department of Corrections and research carried out in stage two of this research (*Historical Analysis*) indicate there is the potential for negative and positive effects on the environment as a result of a prison’s operation.

---

\(^{44}\) Police resources and services are needed for vehicle checkpoints, assaults on prison officers or inmates, DNA tests, suicides, investigations on request, perimeter checks during strikes, remand escorts, riots, crime committed within the prison, and escapes (these are the responsibility of the police once an inmate leaves prison property).

\(^{45}\) Note that there has been absolutely no suggestion that all inmate families or ex-inmates have dealings with the police. It would seem that the police’s dealings with some relocated inmate families and ex-inmates are relatively minor in relation to all police dealings in Upper Hutt.

\(^{46}\) Note that no such calculation has been made in regards to inmate families and ex-inmates, although as noted earlier the Upper Hutt police emphasised that there was no evidence that inmate families or ex-inmates were a particular problem in relation to crime in Upper Hutt.
Source of the potential effect:

A negative effect on the environment may result from the use of boilers and sewage treatment plants, the existence of various prison industries, and the necessity for prison traffic.

However, a positive effect on the local environment may result from contributions made by inmates performing community service.

Analysis:

A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment of the prison’s effect on the local environment has not been carried out in this social assessment. However, interviews were conducted with prison staff, and local and regional authority staff. Structured questionnaires also addressed this issue. Of the 55 residents surveyed, 46 were asked if they had ever noticed any industrial discharges from the prison.

Actual effects:

Rimutaka Prison is connected to local utilities and therefore, unlike some prisons in New Zealand, does not have its own sewage and water treatment systems on site.

There are several on-site industries at Rimutaka Prison (nursery, joinery, farm), none of which currently require resource consents to operate. Of the 46 neighbours asked to comment on industrial discharges (for example, smoke or other discharge) from the prison, 45 had not noticed or been affected by any sort of discharge from the prison. One resident in the Somme Road area believed that the occasional large amounts of stormwater in a stream which ran through his backyard could come from the prison. However, prison staff talked to believed that the prison was not responsible for this stormwater.

Of the 18 neighbours who discussed traffic issues, none mentioned traffic pollution or its effect on the environment.

As discussed above, there are a number of ways in which the prison and its inmates contribute to the Upper Hutt community. Several of these have the potential to provide a positive benefit for the local environment. For example:

• Stormwater drain clearing for the Upper Hutt City Council

For approximately 12 years, the Upper Hutt City Council has used a work gang of around 7-8 inmates to clear stormwater drains all over Upper Hutt.
• Forestry work for the Wellington Regional Council

For many years, inmates from Rimutaka Prison have been involved in various work activities such as forestry work in the Upper Hutt region for the Wellington Regional Council.

• Cultivation and planting of trees in Trentham Park, Upper Hutt College

In partnership with the Upper Hutt City Council, Forest and Bird and local schools, Rimutaka inmates are involved in various planting programmes.

Note that there are instances when Rimutaka prison work parties are involved in community work (which benefits the environment) outside Upper Hutt.

**Summary evaluation:**

It appears that negative impacts on local environment quality have not been experienced in the vicinity of Rimutaka Prison. Immediate neighbours especially were adamant that industrial discharges were not at all an issue. When discussing traffic issues, the effect on the environment caused no concerns.
6 The long term effects of Rimutaka Prison on the Upper Hutt community

6.1 Residential settlement and business development

The long-term effects of Rimutaka Prison on the Upper Hutt community have been investigated through questionnaires with neighbours of the prison, interviews with key informants in the community, and secondary data analysis.

The perceived impact of Rimutaka Prison on the Upper Hutt community has been explored in the structured questionnaires with residents and businesses in the areas surrounding the prison. Of the 37 residents asked to comment on whether or not they believed the presence of the prison has had a negative impact on business/community/rural development options in the locality, 25 said ‘no’, seven said they were ‘not sure’, while five said ‘yes’. The four businesses asked to comment, all said ‘no’. Figure 8 illustrates the combined responses of residents and businesses.

![Figure 8: Perceived negative impact on business / community / rural development options in the locality](image)

Of the 38 residents asked to comment on whether or not they believed the presence of the prison has had a positive impact on business/community/rural development options in the locality, 22 said ‘no’, eight said they were ‘not sure’, while eight said ‘yes’. Of the four businesses asked to comment, two said ‘no’ and two said ‘yes’. Figure 9 illustrates the combined responses of residents and businesses.
In summary, the majority of neighbours believed that the prison has not had a negative impact on business/community/rural development options in the locality. Neighbours were more divided as to whether or not the prison had a positive impact in the locality. Although just over half felt that it had not, approximately 19% felt that it had, while approximately 24% were unsure.

There has been some development in areas close to the prison and in Upper Hutt. The level of development has not been as great however as that in the Wellington region as a whole or as in New Zealand as a whole.

The main developments in close proximity to the prison include:
• the development of the Summerset Retirement Centre north east of the prison next to the Trentham Racecourse, and
• the granting of resource consents to build/locate four homes on Alexander Road north east of the prison.

The most significant change to business in these areas was the closing down of the General Motors factory. It is noteworthy however, that the General Motors facilities have not been left empty, but are now occupied by other businesses.

The limited development in these areas is also evident in census data which highlights only slight increases in private dwellings in areas surrounding the prison (see Appendix Table A.9).

This limited development in areas close to the prison may be due to:
• existing housing density - there is not much room surrounding the prison for further development,
• capacity problems with local effluent disposal facilities - these facilities would need significant upgrades to cope with future residential development, and
• the projection of “reverse sensitivity” by certain large facilities in the area - it has been noted that arguably ‘undesirable’ facilities such as the prison and the army camp are reluctant to see
an influx of new neighbours who may then turn around and complain about the presence and operation of their facilities.

Despite the limited development in areas close to the prison it should be noted that census data (reviewed in Section 4.2) indicates that several of these areas are higher socio-economic areas. Pinehaven, Heretaunga-South, and the Blue Mountains have higher household income levels, low unemployment levels, and higher numbers of professionals.

There has been an increase in the number of private dwellings in Upper Hutt as a whole, although this increase is not as high as the increase experienced in the Wellington region or in New Zealand as a whole (see Appendix Table A.9).

Of the growth that has occurred, three areas in particular have been earmarked for, and have experienced residential development in recent years. These three areas are:

- Riverstone Terraces (approximately 800 new sections) - approximately 4.5 km north of Rimutaka Prison, Upper Hutt and the State Highway 2
- Sylvan Way - approximately 2.25 km to the south west of Rimutaka Prison, Upper Hutt and the suburb of Silverstream
- Mount Marua (approximately 99 new sections) - approximately 8.5 km to the north east of Rimutaka Prison.

These developments have emerged over the last four years and are expected to continue over the next 25 years. These areas, especially Mount Marua are exclusive areas which command higher than average house prices.

In order to investigate further the impact of Rimutaka Prison on the long term development of Upper Hutt, attempts were made to determine whether or not it is common for inmates from outside the region to settle in Upper Hutt upon release. During the course of our key informant interviews, the prison chaplain, PARS and the police all reported knowledge of inmates settling in Upper Hutt after release. However, as with the relocation of inmate families, there are no figures or estimates available. The Community Probation Service in Upper Hutt noted that there are probably more “ex-inmates” in Upper Hutt than in other localities which do not have prisons, although this observation could not be corroborated. Waldegrave’s (1999) study also investigated the incidence of inmates settling in the Upper Hutt community after release. The study concluded that inmates from outside the region usually did not decide to stay in the host community after release.

In summary, there is little evidence that Rimutaka Prison has had any significant positive or negative effect on the longer term development of residential and business sectors in the Upper Hutt community as a result of its presence and operation.

### 6.2 Property values

A full assessment of the effect of the prison on local property values has not been undertaken in this social assessment\(^\text{49}\). Interviews were conducted however with several real estate agents in the area,

\(^{49}\) Due to time and resource constraints.
and structured questionnaires contained several questions aimed at addressing the issue of stigma and its possible effect on local property values.

Real estate agents interviewed in the course of this research did not believe the prison has had a significant effect on local property values, partly because the prison was isolated and set back in a valley out of sight. This sentiment has also been expressed in a local newspaper which notes that “the value of Upper Hutt’s residential sector has increased by an average 14.6 per cent over the past three years” (Upper Hutt Leader 2001).

Although these real estate agents mentioned the isolated nature of the prison, it is clear that there are still a number of residents in neighbouring areas who can see the prison. The visibility of the prison to others in the area (for example: commuters using Alexander Road as a bypass, and golf patrons) has also increased in recent years, as trees have been removed and new accommodation units built. Of the 55 neighbours interviewed, seven could see the prison or parts of the prison from their property. These residents were in the Alexander Road area, the Somme Road area and the Blue Mountains Road area.

In order to explore the possibility that the presence of the prison placed a stigma on Upper Hutt which in turn affected Upper Hutt’s development and property values, neighbours were asked if they knew there was a prison in Upper Hutt before moving there. Over 80% of those asked this question stated that they knew there was a prison in Upper Hutt before purchasing in the area. Neighbours were also asked if they had ever heard Upper Hutt referred to as a prison town or any other negative link made between the prison and Upper Hutt. Eighty four percent of those asked this question answered that they had never heard any sort of negative link being made between the prison and the community.

These responses, in addition to the observations made by real estate agents, and the relative isolation of the prison suggests that there may not be a significant impact on property values as a result of the presence and operation of Rimutaka Prison. This would seem to be corroborated by the fact that several of the immediate areas surrounding the prison contain relatively high income households compared with Upper Hutt, Wellington and New Zealand as a whole (see Section 4.2).

6.3 Other land use

There is a high concentration of ‘other land uses’ such as defence and educational uses in close proximity to the prison. There has been little change to this use in recent years. The main changes include the continued growth of the Trentham Army Camp and the announcement of the closure of the Central Institute of Technology in 2001. Note however, early in 2002 it was confirmed that the CIT facilities will remain and now be used by an Australian University.
7 Conclusions

This research set out to establish what effects have been experienced by the Upper Hutt community as a result of the presence and operation of Rimutaka Prison, and what relationship exists between the prison and the community.

A significant effect of having a prison in the Upper Hutt community has been the establishment of a mutual relationship, which is based on well developed links between the prison and the local community. This relationship is evident in:

- the number and proportion of staff living locally,
- the number of local firms providing goods and services to the prison,
- the level of involvement by community groups in support of prison inmates,
- the level of involvement and commitment of the local Maori community,
- the goods and service contributions made by inmates for the local community, and
- the level of community liaison by prison management in terms of involvement in the Safer Community Council, in addressing meetings of local groups, and in establishing a community warning system for escape events.

Generally, this relationship has developed and extended over the last twelve years as Rimutaka Prison’s capacity to accommodate inmates has increased. One aspect of the relationship which has seen a noticeable decline over the past several years is the level of inmate contributions of goods and labour to the local community. From the community side, these links and the development of this relationship are supported by the neighbours’ desire to have communication with prison management, and by the views expressed that inmates should be giving back and contributing to society, for example through community services. From the prison perspective, a pro-active and supportive approach by management is critical to the development of the different elements of this relationship with the community.

There was some uncertainty amongst neighbours interviewed as to whether or not they want to know more about the prison, as was evident in their reference to the notion of “out of sight, out of mind”. Formal groups in the community such as residents groups, were more likely to express interest in more regular contact and notification of escapes.

For host community members who live in close proximity to the prison, there is also the potential to experience certain off-site effects due to the prison’s presence and operation.

Off-site effects such as the visibility of prison lights, and noise, are noticed by relatively few neighbours, and the only impacts from these are in terms of these being a regular reminder of the prison’s presence. The likelihood of experiencing these effects, and also the concerns for personal safety, are dependent on proximity to the prison, and the topography separating them.

Of all the off-site effects reported, concern for personal safety for near neighbours stands out. These concerns have apparently not resulted in residents exiting. However, there is concern amongst residents neighbouring the prison about the possibility of the prison accepting higher-security inmates in the future, and also about the possibility of future expansion on site. The general impression gained was that “we are OK with the prison as it is at the moment, but not if it expands further”. If the prison were to expand, some of these effects may become more prominent issues.

There were no indications during this research that Rimutaka Prison has had any significant impacts on the long term development of Upper Hutt. This appears largely due to the size of Upper Hutt, which has enabled it to absorb any resulting impacts from the presence and operation of the prison.
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Appendix

Table A.1: Rimutaka Prison’s muster, 1985-2001

Source: Department of Corrections 2000, Department of Corrections 2001, & Department of Corrections 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (July average based on weekly averages)</th>
<th>Number of inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2: Changes in the usually resident population, 1986-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Pinehaven</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream</th>
<th>Trentham-South</th>
<th>Trentham-North</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3243</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3285</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.2: Changes in the usually resident population, 1986-2001 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204)</th>
<th>Upper Hutt</th>
<th>Wellington Region</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>No. of Persons</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36756</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-28.6</td>
<td>36882</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>36717</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>36369</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.3: Tenure, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Pinehaven</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream</th>
<th>Trentham-South</th>
<th>Trentham-North</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204) (%)</th>
<th>Upper Hutt (%)</th>
<th>Wellington Region (%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgaged</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Free</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May not add up to 100% as rounded to one decimal place.

### Table A.4: Household income, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Pinehaven</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream</th>
<th>Trentham-South</th>
<th>Trentham-North</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204) (%)</th>
<th>Upper Hutt (%)</th>
<th>Wellington Region (%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 &amp; under</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$50,000</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$100,000</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 &amp; over</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May not add up to 100% as rounded to one decimal place.
### Table A.5: Ethnicity, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Pinehaven (%)</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-South (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-North (%)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204) (%)</th>
<th>Wellington Region (%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May not add up to 100% as rounded to one decimal place.

### Table A.6: Age, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pinehaven (%)</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-South (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-North (%)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204) (%)</th>
<th>Wellington Region (%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14yrs</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-60yrs</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61yrs+</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May not add up to 100% as rounded to one decimal place.
### Table A.7: Employment Status, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Pinehaven (%)</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-South (%)</th>
<th>Trentham-North (%)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202) (%)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204) (%)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB) (%)</th>
<th>Upper Hutt (%)</th>
<th>Wellington Region (%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wage/salary</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self employed</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpaid worker in family</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: may not add up to 100% because of rounding to one decimal place.

### Table A.8: Occupation, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Pinehaven</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream</th>
<th>Trentham-South</th>
<th>Trentham-North</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB)</th>
<th>Upper Hutt</th>
<th>Wellington Region</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>administrators/managers</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals &amp; technicians</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Sale workers</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishery workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trades workers/ machine operators/ elementary occupations</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May not add up to 100% as rounded to one decimal place.
### Table A.9: Private dwellings in areas neighbouring Rimutaka Prison, 1986-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>Pinehaven</th>
<th>Heretaunga-Silverstream</th>
<th>Trentham South</th>
<th>Trentham North</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South East (MB 1915202)</th>
<th>Blue Mountains South (MB 1915204)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.10: Escapes from Rimutaka Prison, 1985-2001

**Source:** Department of Corrections 2001, Department of Corrections 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Breakouts (breach of security)</th>
<th>Walkaways (by low security inmates)</th>
<th>Non-returns from temporary release</th>
<th>Other (eg: escape from escorts)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>