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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 Fund¹.

The need for research into 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 or 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’s operation. This approach is consistent with the definition of ‘effect’² in the Resource Management Act 1991.

---

¹ Contract TBAX0002.
² 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.
The term ‘host community’ employed throughout this prison facility research, refers to:

“the community resident in the geographic area most clearly associated with the prison facility. 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 community. Such relationship indicators may include community meetings with prison management or community warning systems. The prison’s name may also indicate its host community.”

Previous research in this programme focussed 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

This report provides an overview of the four case studies conducted as part of Stage Three of this research programme which assessed the social impacts of New Zealand prison facilities on their host communities. Prison facilities were included in Taylor Baines’ facility research as the siting of a prison often encounters 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 and have had on their host communities. Such an assessment will assist host communities, the Department of Corrections, territorial authorities, and other professionals involved in the siting of future prison facilities, and the management of existing and future prison facilities.

3 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.

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

5 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 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.
This prison facility research involved three stages:

Stage 1: A *Sector Review* (Morgan & Baines 2001) which 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: An *Historical Analysis* (Morgan & Baines 2001a) which 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: Four *Case Studies* which examine the relationship between selected prisons and their host communities and the actual experiences of selected host communities, including the social effects associated with the presence and operation of the prisons.

This report focusses its discussion on Stage Three of the research. Section 2 introduces and summarises the case studies, Section 3 reports the research findings, and Section 4 discusses possible implications of these findings.

1.4 **Research programme outputs**

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

The *Case studies* and *Overview* report are available for the cost of reproduction and postage:

Taylor Baines & Associates  www.tba.co.nz
PO Box 8620  ph/fax: (03) 343 3884
Riccarton
Christchurch

*Summary case study* reports are available free of charge on the Taylor Baines & Associates’ website.

1.5 **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 The Case Studies

2.1 Introduction

Case Study Selection

During stage three of this research, four case studies were carried out at Rolleston Prison, Rimutaka Prison, Hawkes Bay Prison, and Wanganui Prison (see Figure 1).

Selection of these four prisons was made from the nine ‘peri-urban’ prisons examined in stage two of the research (Historical Analysis). This focus on peri-urban prisons was favoured due to the likelihood that future prisons will be sited in peri-urban locations (especially with the underlying influence of the Regional Prisons Policy). This focus also enabled a thorough exploration of the effects and impacts of these type of prisons. Nevertheless, other factors considered during selection, such as:

- Rolleston Prison’s minimum security status
- Rimutaka Prison’s close proximity to a large urban centre,
- Hawkes Bay Prison’s local Maori settlements and
- Wanganui Prison’s diverse on-site industries,

have highlighted some significant differences and points of interest.

Analysis

In order to assess the social impacts of these prisons on their host communities, each of these case studies outlined the nature of the prison, the host community, and the relationship between the prison and the community, and explored the community members’ experiences of having a prison located and operating nearby.

Case Study Methodology

Several research methods were used in each case study, based on the theoretical and practical approach to social assessment as described by Taylor, Bryan and Goodrich (1995). These methods include:

- 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. Each interview lasted fifteen minutes to one hour.

Between the four case studies over 60 Department of Corrections’ staff and over 90 community members have been interviewed as key informants.

- structured questionnaires

Two levels of survey were used - full questionnaires and rapid interviews.

Full questionnaires were completed by the interviewer and took between fifteen minutes to one hour to complete. The questionnaire explored neighbours’ experiences of day to day operational effects of the prison and their perceptions of how the presence of the prison had impacted on themselves 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. Information relating to the participants relationship to the prison and some personal information was also collected.

The rapid interviews contained a selected number of questions from the original full questionnaire, and were used to extend the area of survey coverage and determine the spatial extent of effects and impacts. During each case study’s fieldwork the interviewers determined at which point rapid interviews are needed by noting at what point certain effects are consistently unreported.

Between the four case studies, 275 prison neighbours were interviewed using structured questionnaires and rapid interviews.

- secondary data analysis

An analysis of secondary data was also carried out. Census data, for example, was used to establish demographic profiles of the host communities.

- feedback meetings

Feedback meetings with host community members and prison management were held in each case study. These meetings provided participants with an opportunity to learn of the case study results and offer comment, and provided Taylor Baines with an opportunity to check the validity of the results and conclusions.

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

The four case studies are summarised below under the following headings:

- Case study timing
- Prison description, location, and inmate catchment
- Prison land
- Prison security
- Prison structures, facilities, and utilities
- Prison industries
- Inmates, staff, and visitors
- Links between the prison and its host community
- The host community
- Coverage of consultation and interviews
- Operational and long term effects of the prison on neighbours and settlement patterns and development in the locality

2.2 Rolleston Prison

Case study timing

Key informant interviews with prison staff and community members were carried out in October and November 2001 and January 2002. Feedback meetings were held in May 2002.

Prison description, location and inmate catchment

Rolleston Prison was opened in 1962\(^6\), and is one of three prisons in the Canterbury region. It is a medium sized men’s prison accommodating minimum and low medium security inmates, and is located on the Canterbury Plains, approximately 15 kilometres south of Christchurch and three kilometres south of the township of Rolleston (see Figure 2).

---

\(^6\) Rolleston Prison has existed in some form or another for many years. This date most closely represents the establishment of Rolleston Prison as it is today.
Inmates generally come from within Rolleston Prison’s court catchment area which is the South Island north of Timaru. It is estimated that approximately 15% of the inmates in Rolleston Prison come from outside its catchment area. There are several factors which contribute to the level of inmates at Rolleston Prison who are from outside its catchment area, including the presence of a sex offenders unit and drug and alcohol unit (as not all prisons have such units). As Rolleston Prison gets most of its inmates from Christchurch Prison, the number of inmates in Christchurch Prison from outside the region also has an influence on Rolleston Prison.

**Prison land**

Rolleston Prison is sited on 63 hectares of Department of Correction’s land designated for prison use. The land’s underlying zone is rural.

The only alteration to this land has been an exchange of land in 1994/1995 with the neighbouring quarry owned by the Selwyn District Council.

**Prison security**

Although there is only a light boundary deer fence, each of the five individual prison units are wire fenced with internal security beams\(^7\). Security lighting is located on each of the units’ fences.

\(^7\) Although Tawa, the oldest unit, does not have the same level of fencing as the four newest units.
Prison structures, facilities and utilities

There are five separate units at Rolleston Prison which accommodate minimum and at times low medium security inmates. Together, these units provide 320 beds. Four of these units are currently in use, providing a capacity of 260 beds. Of these five units, four have been established in the last ten years. A forty bed unit located on the southern side of the prison property near Runners Road was demolished in 2000. Prior to the construction of the Tawa unit in 1985, this was the only accommodation unit at Rolleston Prison. Currently, Rolleston Prison has two special units, a sex offenders unit and a drug and alcohol unit.

Alongside the unit on Runners Road which was demolished in 2000, there used to be a prison staff village on site. This village, which was accessed off Runners Road, contained 23 prison houses and housed approximately 100 staff and their families. In 1998, the prison staff village closed. All of the staff village houses were sold privately and moved off site.

Rolleston Prison has its own sewage treatment plant (including irrigation paddocks) on site. It also has its own water supply on site.

Prison industries

There are a number of on-site industries in which inmates may be employed, including: a tailor shop (established pre-1985), vegetable gardens (established pre-1985), and a nursery (established in 1990). In the past there has also been a dry cleaning shop (1980-2000), a garage (1975-2000), and a carpentry shop (1975-2000). Note that there are some off-site employment opportunities in which inmates may take part, including seasonal squash picking (in the summer of 2000), fruit picking (since 1998), forestry (since 2000), and manure collection (since 1992).

Inmates, staff and visitors

Rolleston Prison has the capacity to accommodate 320 inmates. The current inmate muster is around 260. The muster at Rolleston Prison has increased significantly over the last 15 years.

Generally, there has been an increase in prison staff over the last ten years as additional units have been constructed and the muster has increased. This trend has reversed in recent years as the Tawa unit has closed, and management and administration staff have relocated to Christchurch Prison as part of the regionalisation of Canterbury Prisons. Currently, staff numbers at Rolleston Prison stand at 93.

Visitors may visit sentenced inmates on Saturday. Segregated inmates may be visited on Wednesdays by appointment. Typically there are approximately 120 visitors in total on a Saturday, and up to ten on a Wednesday. Until recently, sentenced inmates could be visited on Saturday and Sunday. Visitor numbers have been fairly static (increases related to increase in muster), and unaffected by new security procedures (security checks and approvals) introduced just over a year ago.
Other prison visitors include:
- volunteers (for example: church groups who provide 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 may visit on a weekly and at times daily basis.

**Links between the prison and its host community**

There are no formal links such as a liaison person, liaison committee, or regular meetings between Rolleston Prison and the Rolleston community. There is an annual meeting organised by Christchurch Prison which provides local residents the opportunity to find out about prison developments, ask questions, or discuss concerns. As this meeting is advertised in a regional paper and is addressed to residents in the locality of Canterbury Prison’s, Rolleston residents could attend if they wished.

There is also some form of community warning system which is supposed to ensure that neighbours are warned when an inmate has escaped. Currently, this system appears to be inconsistent in its operation, both in terms of neighbours who are on the list, and neighbours who are rung when an escape occurs.

Other links between Rolleston Prison and the Rolleston community include prison open days.

It may be that the links between Rolleston Prison and its host community have changed with the regionalisation of Canterbury Prisons in recent years. This regionalisation has seen most of Rolleston Prison’s management and administration staff relocate to Christchurch Prison (near Templeton, Christchurch). Most management and administrative matters and decisions are therefore made from the Christchurch Prison site rather than the Rolleston Prison site.

**The host community**

The host community referred to as the Rolleston community in this research is located approximately 15 kilometres south of Christchurch in the South Island of New Zealand. It is characterised by a large proportion of residents who commute to work elsewhere (the majority of whom probably work in Christchurch).

Rolleston has experienced considerable residential growth over the last five to seven years. This new development has been accompanied by a vision that Rolleston will become a “satellite city of Christchurch”. The residential development in Rolleston has facilitated the development of a more ‘self contained’ community which has greater access to commercial and community services.

**Coverage of consultation and interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the prison and key informants in the community. In total, structured interviews were conducted with 87 residents and 10 businesses. Separate feedback meetings were held with community members and prison management. These
feedback meetings summarised the case study’s findings, and provided participants with an opportunity for comment and feedback.

Operational and long term effects of the prison on neighbours and settlement patterns and development in the locality

An effect of having a prison in the Rolleston community has been the establishment of a mutual relationship, albeit a very low key relationship, based on a small number of links it has with the local community. This relationship is evident in:

- the small number of prison staff who live locally,
- the small number of local firms providing goods and services to the prison,
- several local community members who provide support to prison inmates,
- some voluntary contributions from inmates to provide goods and services to the local community,
- attempts by the prison to warn near neighbours when an escape occurs.

The limited extent of Rolleston Prison’s relationship with the Rolleston community is a reflection of the small size of the nearby community and the small number of commercial and community goods and service providers within it. More recently, it probably also reflects the fact that Rolleston Prison is managed from another site - Christchurch Mens Prison in Templeton.

This relationship has changed over the last ten years as Rolleston Prison’s capacity to accommodate inmates has increased. From the community side, these links are supported by the neighbours’ desire to have communication with prison management (especially in regards to inmate escapes), and by the views expressed that inmates should be giving back and contributing to society, for example through community service. From the prison perspective, the nature of, and approach by management is an important factor in this relationship. As noted earlier, with the regionalisation of the Canterbury Prisons, most Rolleston Prison management and administration staff have now relocated to Christchurch Prison in Templeton. This transfer of staff and decision making activities dislocates the prison from its neighbours, both in distance and accessibility. This may affect the relationship between the prison and its neighbours, and influence the neighbours’ experience of effects. Several neighbours noted that they were unsure of who to ring to discuss issues and concerns.

For individual residents there was some uncertainty as to whether or not they want to know more about the prison, evident in their frequent reference to the notion of “out of sight, out of mind”.

Off-site effects were of greatest concern to those neighbours who lived in close proximity to the prison. Of those neighbours in close proximity, there were at least four on Two Chain Road and Walkers Road who lived within 100 metres of the prison.

Of all the off-site effects reported, concern for personal safety for near neighbours stands out. Approximately 20% of all those surveyed worried about inmate escapes, although many emphasised that this fear was not constant but heightened with the knowledge of an inmate escape. It should be noted that this level of response is considerably lower than was the case for several other prison host communities studied in this research.
Despite this concern, there seemed to be a general acceptance of the prison as it is in its present state. The fact that it is a minimum security prison with a smaller capacity for inmates was an important factor influencing their experience of effects. If the prison were to expand or take higher security inmates, then their experience of effects may change.

There were no indications during this research that Rolleston Prison has had any significant impacts on the long term development of the Rolleston community. In fact Rolleston has experienced significant residential growth which has facilitated the development of a more ‘self contained’ community which has greater access to commercial and community services. It appears that factors contributing to the prison’s lack of impact include: its separation and isolation from the township, its size, and its security level.

2.3 Rimutaka Prison

Case study timing

Key informant interviews and interviews with neighbours were carried out in December 2001. Feedback meetings were held in Upper Hutt in March 2002.

Prison description, location and inmate catchment

Rimutaka Prison, formerly known as Wi Tako Prison, was opened in 1967. It 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 (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Location of Rimutaka Prison

Source: TopoMap
The catchment area for Rimutaka Prison is the lower half of the North Island from Paraparaumu and Masterton down to Wellington. It has been estimated however that over 50% of inmates at Rimutaka Prison may originate from outside the prison’s catchment area. The Maori Focus Unit, Violent Offenders Unit and the Youth Unit at Rimutaka Prison 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.

**Prison land**

Rimutaka Prison is sited on 189 hectares of Department of Correction’s land designated for prison use. The designation lies on the borders of three underlying zones: ‘Rural Hill Blue Mountains’, ‘Special Activity’, and ‘Rural Lifestyle’.

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.

**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.

**Prison structures, facilities and utilities**

Inmate accommodation is based in eight separate units at Rimutaka Prison. 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. Rimutaka Prison has several special units including a Maori Focus Unit, a Violent Offenders Unit, and a Youth Unit.

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). In 2000 the prison staff village closed. 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 are sited and the remaining 36 houses were sold to Housing New Zealand in December 2000.

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. The College has restaurant and conference facilities which are made available to the public. 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.

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

At present there are two commercial onsite industries, a joinery workshop (opened in 1993) and a nursery (opened in 1995). There is also a small farm (established when the prison opened). 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).

Inmates, staff and visitors

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.

The number of staff employed at Rimutaka Prison has increased over the last 12 years as its capacity to accommodate inmates has increased. Currently\(^\text{10}\), there are 285 staff employed at Rimutaka Prison.

At present\(^\text{11}\), inmate visiting occurs on any day other than Friday, depending on the prison units they are in. 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 large numbers of visitors. Visitor numbers have been fairly static (increased relational to increase in muster), and seemingly unaffected by new security procedures (security checks and approvals) introduced in 2000.

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.

Links between the prison and its host community

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. 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.

\(^{10}\) As at December 2001.
\(^{11}\) As at December 2001.
Other links between Rimutaka Prison and its host community and wider Upper Hutt community include, representation on the Safer Community Council, presentations by management to various community organisations and institutions, liaison between the prison’s Maori Focus Unit and the Orongomai Marae, and prison open days.

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’. 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 of Rimutaka Prison.

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.

Coverage of consultation and interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the prison and key informants in the community. In total, structured interviews were conducted with 48 neighbouring residents and 7 local businesses. 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.

Operational and long term effects of the prison on neighbours and settlement patterns and development in the locality

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. The close proximity to Upper Hutt City has also been a factor. 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.

### 2.4 Hawkes Bay Prison

**Case study timing**

Key informant interviews with prison staff and community members and interviews with prison neighbours were carried out in March 2002. Feedback meetings were held in July 2002.

**Prison description, location and inmate catchment**

Hawkes Bay Prison, formerly known as Mangaroa Prison, was opened in 1989, and is located in the Hawkes Bay Region approximately three kilometres south west of Hastings (see Figure 4). It is one
of New Zealand’s larger men’s prisons accommodating minimum, medium, and remand security inmates.

**Figure 4: Location of Hawkes Bay Prison**

Hawkes Bay Prison’s catchment area is the East Coast of the North Island as far south as Waipukurau. Approximately 35% of the total inmates in Hawkes Bay Prison come from outside its catchment area. There are several factors which contribute to the level of inmates in Hawkes Bay Prison who are from outside its catchment area, including the presence of a Maori Focus Unit and Youth Unit. Hawkes Bay Prison’s capacity and proximity to Auckland also means that it is often used to cater for its muster overflows.

**Prison land**

Hawkes Bay Prison was originally sited on 26 hectares of land designated for prison use. Over the last five years the Department of Corrections has acquired an additional 45 hectares of land bordering the original site. The Department of Corrections is in the process of applying to have this additional land designated for prison use. The underlying zone in this area is a ‘Plains Zone’.

**Prison security**

There is no gatehouse or security fencing (only a farm fence) around the boundaries of Hawkes Bay Prison. A deer fence was being constructed around the perimeter of the market garden on Pakipaki and Mangaroa Roads at the time of this research. Individual units are securely fenced (single fence around two units, double fences around six units) and lit at night.
Prison structures, facilities and utilities

There are eight separate units at Hawkes Bay Prison which accommodate minimum, medium and remand security inmates. Together, these units provide 568 beds. Only one of these units existed in 1989 when Hawkes Bay Prison was opened. Hawkes Bay Prison has several special units including a Maori Focus Unit, a Youth Unit, and Self Care Units.

Although Hawkes Bay Prison has not had a prison staff village as other prisons have, it has in the past owned three houses in Hastings to house staff. These were sold in 1998.

Hawkes Bay Prison is connected to local sewage and water utilities.

Prison industries

There are a number of on-site industries in which inmates may be employed, including: joinery/timber (established in 1998), horticulture (established in 1997) and farming (established in 1989 when the prison opened). Inmates may also partake in catering and laundry work or off-site forestry work.

Inmates, staff and visitors

Hawkes Bay Prison has the capacity to accommodate 568 minimum, medium and remand security inmates. The current inmate muster is around 554\(^{13}\). The muster at Hawkes Bay Prison has increased significantly since its opening in 1989.

Currently\(^{14}\), staff numbers at Hawkes Bay Prison stand at 290.

At present, inmate visits may occur on any day except Tuesday, depending on the prison unit they are in. Typical visitor numbers were not readily available during the case study’s fieldwork period in March 2001. However, research carried out in February 2001 for the second stage of the research programme (Historical Analysis) indicated that approximately 300 visitors could visit inmates in Hawkes Bay Prison per week. There were also indications at this time that new security checks initiated in 2000 had not had any long-term affect on visitor numbers.

Other prison visitors include:

- volunteers (for example: church groups who provide 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, DNA testing)

These visitors visit on a weekly if not daily basis.

\(^{13}\) As at March 2001.

\(^{14}\) As at July 2002.
Links between the prison and its host community

Hawkes Bay Prison has well established links with its host community through its appointed cultural advisor. Although not in the last three years, the prison has met with the community by way of community meetings and barbeques in the past. There is also a community warning system.

Other links between Hawkes Bay Prison and the Mangaroa community include, prison open days and presentations by prison staff to various community organisations and institutions.

The host community

The host community of Hawkes Bay Prison is defined in this research to include:

- roads surrounding the prison, including Mangaroa Road, Pakipaki Road, Maraeakaho Road, Rosser Road, Ru Collin Road, Longlands Road (West), and Stock Road,
- the Bridge Pa settlement, and
- the Pakipaki settlement.

Together these areas cover an approximate radius of three kilometres around the prison.

This host community referred to as the Mangaroa community in this research, is located approximately three\textsuperscript{15} kilometres south west of Hastings in the North Island of New Zealand.

The Mangaroa community is a well established community on the outskirts of Hastings, in a region known for its favourable climate and plentiful fruit. Land use in Mangaroa is characterised by its lifestyle blocks, ‘residential/business’ properties, orchards, and Maori communities. Since 1997 there has also been huge vineyard developments slightly west of Mangaroa.

Other than the development of these vineyards there has not been any significant developments, partly due to the large parts of land in the locality classified as ‘confined aquifer’ in the Proposed District Plan (which prevents it from being developed intensively in order to preserve its favoured agricultural/horticultural uses), new rules that require that land is not subdivided down to less than 12 hectares (rather than the previous six hectares), and a strategic policy which has encouraged development in Havelock North.

Coverage of consultation and interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the prison and key informants in the community. In total, structured interviews were conducted with 70 neighbouring residents and eight local businesses. Feedback meetings were held with community members, prison management, and the Regional Advisor for the Maori Service Department.

\textsuperscript{15} Measured in a direct line.
Operational and long term effects of the prison on neighbours and settlement patterns and development in the locality

An effect of having a prison in the Mangaroa community has been the establishment of a mutual relationship, based on a small number of links it has with the local community. This relationship is evident in:

- the small number of prison staff who live locally,
- the small number of local firms providing goods and services to the prison,
- the level of involvement and commitment of the local Maori community,
- some voluntary contributions from inmates to provide goods and services to the local community,
- attempts by the prison to warn near neighbours when an escape occurs.

The limited extent of Hawkes Bay Prison’s relationship with the Mangaroa community is a reflection of the size of the nearby community and number of commercial and community goods and service providers within it.

This relationship has changed over the last 12 years as Hawkes Bay Prison’s capacity to accommodate inmates has increased. From the community side, these links are supported by the neighbours’ desire to have communication with prison management (especially in regards to inmate escapes), and by the views expressed that inmates should be giving back and contributing to society, for example through community service. From the prison perspective, the nature of, and approach by prison management is an important factor in this relationship.

Off-site effects were of greatest concern to those neighbours who lived in close proximity to the prison. This was especially the case for lighting, noise, and dust effects. While significant numbers of neighbours could see lighting or hear noise, the relatively few who reported resulting impacts mostly mentioned their ‘reminder’ and ‘nuisance’ factor. For the very few who noticed dust, it was a significant issue.

Of all the off-site effects reported, concern for personal safety for near neighbours stands out. Approximately 45% of all those interviewed worried about inmate escapes. Although many emphasised that this fear was not constant but heightened with the knowledge of an inmate escape, the fear has transplanted in to some real impacts in terms of changed behaviour and periods of anxiety.

There were no indications during this research that Hawkes Bay Prison has had any significant impacts on the long term development of the Mangaroa community. However, significant recent expansion at Hawkes Bay Prison has already had an influence on some neighbours’ experience of effects, and caused some concern over future effects and development of the community. If significant expansion was to continue then operational and long term effects may become more prominent issues.
2.5 Wanganui Prison

Case study timing

Key informant interviews with prison staff and community members, and interviews with prison neighbours were carried out in July 2002. Feedback meetings were held in Kaitoke on the 10th of October 2002.

Prison description, location and inmate catchment

Wanganui Prison was opened in 1978, and is located on the west coast of the North Island approximately six kilometres\(^{16}\) south east of Wanganui city (see Figure 5). It is one of New Zealand’s medium sized men’s prisons accommodating minimum, medium, and remand security inmates; and is part of a wider North Island region which includes New Plymouth Prison, Manawatu Prison, and Hawkes Bay Prison.

Figure 5: Location of Wanganui Prison

Wanganui Prison’s catchment area extends from Waverley and includes Wanganui to Marton and Ohakune/Taihape District Courts. For a number of reasons there will often be a proportion of inmates in a prison who are not from the prison’s catchment area or region. Approximately 72% of the total inmates in Wanganui Prison come from outside its catchment area. There are several factors which contribute to the level of inmates in Wanganui Prison who are from outside its catchment area, including the presence of a National Police Protection Unit, an At Risk Unit, Self Care Units, and a Maori Focus Unit.

\(^{16}\) Measured in a direct line.
Prison land

Wanganui Prison is sited on 49 hectares of land designated for prison use. Up until 1999, the prison also managed 805 hectares of pine forest located south of the prison. In 1999 the Department of Corrections sold this forest to the Treasury for possible Treaty claims. The underlying zone in this area is a ‘Rural Zone’.

Prison security

There is no gatehouse or security fencing (only a deer fence) around the boundaries of Wanganui Prison. Individual units are however securely fenced and lit with security lighting at night.

Prison structures, facilities and utilities

There are four separate units/complexes at Wanganui Prison, providing 370 beds. There is provision for nine at risk inmates. Only one unit existed in 1978 when Wanganui Prison was opened.

Until 1999, Wanganui Prison had a prison staff village on site which provided accommodation for prison staff and their families. This village comprised 30 houses and single quarters which accommodated approximately 120 people. In 1999, the prison staff village closed. All of the staff village houses were sold privately and moved off site.

Wanganui Prison has its own water bores and a sewage treatment plant.

Prison industries

There are a number of on-site industries in which inmates may be employed, including: joinery and timber processing (established 1978), concrete manufacturing (established 1996), engineering workshop (established in 1978), and horticulture (established in 1978). There are other industries which have recently ceased to operate, including forestry and shoe manufacturing.

Inmates, staff and visitors

Wanganui Prison has the capacity to accommodate 370 minimum, medium and remand security inmates. The current inmate muster is around 330\(^{17}\).

Currently\(^{18}\), there are just over 200 staff employed at Wanganui Prison.

It has been estimated, based on one week’s visitor records in July 2002, that approximately 130 people can visit inmates in Wanganui Prison any given week. Note that this figure is based on calculating each visit made by each individual. Some individuals make several visits each week.
Links between the prison and its host community

There are at present very limited links with the Kaitoke community, mostly due to its small size and composition. There are more links with the wider Wanganui community.

When there was a staff village at Wanganui Prison, from 1978 until the mid-1990s, a strong social link existed between the prison and its host community. The prison village hall was a focus of social activity for many in the neighbourhood, hosting a happy hour on Friday nights. Children of prison staff attended the local Kaitoke primary school. There was regular social contact between staff and neighbours and long time neighbours reported that they were relatively well informed of activities at the prison. Because of this close association, Wanganui Prison has not had any other formal liaison with its host community. No such liaison appears to have emerged since the prison village closed.

There is however a community warning system by way of a “telephone tree”. In the event of an escape the prison control room phones police and local neighbourhood co-ordinators who in turn ring their neighbours. There appears to be some uncertainty amongst some neighbours as to the efficiency of the system and whether or not they are on it, while others expressed a desire to be on it. This seems to be partly due to the fact that there have not been many escapes since a rash of escapes in the late 1980s and early 1990s and local coordinators have moved out of the area without new coordinators being appointed.

The host community

The host community of Wanganui Prison is defined in this research to include:

- roads surrounding the prison, including Pauri Road, Kaitoke Road, Marangai Road, and State Highway 3 (between Marybank and Whangaehu), and
- nearby settlements, including Kaitoke, Marybank, and Whangaehu.

This host community is referred to as the Kaitoke community in this research, the border of which is located approximately two\textsuperscript{19} kilometres south east of Wanganui in the North Island of New Zealand. Although residents of Marangai Road, Whangaehu and Marybank do not live in the “Kaitoke community”, they have been included as participants in this field research as they live in an area which borders Kaitoke and where operational off-site effects are likely to be experienced.

The Kaitoke community as referred to in this research is a well established community, which contains a number of scattered rural dwellings and several small settlements. Land use in Kaitoke is characterised by its farming properties, lifestyle blocks, and small residential communities. There has not been any significant rural, residential, commercial, or community development in these areas in recent years.

Coverage of consultation and interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the prison and key informants in the community. In total, 45 neighbouring residents and businesses were interviewed for this case

\textsuperscript{19} Measured in a direct line.
study, using two levels of survey. Separate feedback meetings were held with community members, the Wanganui Prison superintendent, and the community development manager for the Wanganui District Council.

Operational and long term effects of the prison on neighbours and settlement patterns and development in the locality

An effect of having a prison in the Kaitoke community has been the establishment of a mutual relationship, based on a very small number of links it has with the local community. This relationship is evident in:

- the small number of prison staff who live locally,
- the level of involvement and commitment of the local Maori community,
- attempts by the prison to warn near neighbours when an escape occurs.

The very limited extent of Wanganui Prison’s relationship with the Kaitoke community is a reflection of the size and composition of the nearby community.

From the community side, these links are supported by the neighbours’ desire to have communication with prison management (especially in regards to inmate escapes). From the prison perspective, the approach by prison management is an important factor in this relationship.

This relationship has developed and changed over the last 15 years. Not only has it been affected by the increase in Wanganui Prison’s capacity to accommodate inmates, it has been significantly affected by the closure of the prison staff village in 1999. Many neighbours noted that they benefited from the presence of prison staff village through the increased roll at the local school and social contact. This social contact was quite substantial, and for some its loss affected their sense of community.

Relatively few neighbours were affected by off-site effects such as lighting and noise due to the topographical setting of the prison. Of all the off-site effects reported, concern for personal safety stands out. Although 64% of neighbours worried about inmate escapes, most noted that this concern was not always on their minds and for some only present when an inmate had actually escaped, mostly because there had not been many escapes in recent years. The high percentage of neighbours who were concerned is partly accounted for by the rash of escapes in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the violent nature of events associated with two of them.

There were no strong indications during this research that Wanganui Prison has had any significant negative impacts on the long term development of the Kaitoke community.
3 Research Findings

Although the focus of this research is on the effects experienced by the immediate host community as a result of the presence and operation of a prison, it became clear during the research that significant effects can also be experienced by individuals and communities (‘the wider host community’) outside the host community as defined in this research (see Section 1.2). The effects on this wider host community are therefore also acknowledged in the following report of host community effects in the four case studies.

3.1 Prison Employment

Staffing levels varied according to inmate muster levels and ranged from 93 at Rolleston Prison, which had a muster of 260, to 290 at Hawkes Bay Prison, which had a muster of 554.

An examination of staff residences indicated that generally no more than 10% of prison staff live in the prison’s host community. The remaining 90% live in the wider community. This pattern of residence is largely due to the limited housing options in peri-urban host communities (i.e. predominantly rural). It should be noted that prior to the closure of prison staff villages (located in host communities) this pattern would have been quite different. Indications are that in most instances, the majority of prison staff resided within the prison staff villages prior to the closure programme implemented in the mid-1990s.

Of the four prisons studied, Rolleston Prison has one of the higher levels of staff living in the host community. Indications are that this is due partly to the significant residential and community development that has occurred in Rolleston in recent years, increasing local housing options and ‘rural lifestyle’ opportunities.

3.2 Goods and Service Providers

From a prison perspective, host community businesses provide only a small proportion of the total goods and services required by a prison. From a host community perspective however, this provision can involve around 50% of local businesses. This high percentage is partly due to efforts by prison purchasers to source local suppliers. However, they are often restricted by the limited range and number of local businesses versus the diverse needs of the prison. It is worth noting however that in several of the case studies, a significantly higher number of businesses in the wider community were involved as providers.

3.3 Spending by Inmate Families

There is little if any spending by inmate families in the prisons’ host communities, as few if any families of inmates tend to relocate to the host communities. This is largely due to limited cheap accommodation options, limited work opportunities, limited means to meet moving costs, and uncertainty over inmate placement. There tended to be more inmate families in the wider community, but still a relatively low incidence of re-location.
3.4 Spending by Prison Visitors

Visitor expenditure was limited in the host communities by a lack of opportunities to spend locally. Nevertheless there were local businesses in each case study that reported some expenditure by visitors.

3.5 Unfair Business Competition

Although all of the prisons in the case studies operated commercial industries, there was limited opportunity for unfair business competition with the host communities due to the lack of competing businesses locally. Generally, there was greater potential for unfair competition in the wider community.

Community members’ perceptions of unfair competition varied between the host communities. While very few neighbours of Rolleston Prison and Rimutaka Prison had encountered resentment over the perception that inmates may be taking jobs away from community members, a significant number of Hawkes Bay Prison and Wanganui Prison neighbours had encountered such resentment (29% and 42% respectively).

There are several differences between the prison facilities/host communities which may explain this difference. Hawkes Bay Prison stands out as the only prison which has prison industries which could potentially compete with similar industries in its host community, and the greatest number of inmates involved in release-to-work activities, especially in nearby orchards. Hawkes Bay Prison has also experienced considerable property expansion for industrial use in close proximity to neighbours in recent years, alongside the introduction of a strong focus on profit and the commercialisation of its industries. For at least one of the industries the prison potentially competes with, unfair competition was not an issue as the prison had developed a mutual and positive working relationship.

Although Wanganui Prison does not have any competing industries in its host community, it does stand out as having the greatest number of on-site prison industries, especially if the very recently closed shoe factory is considered. The shoe factory and concrete factory in particular have received significant media, local council, and wider community attention since their inception. The size of the wider Wanganui community and its somewhat contiguous nature with the host community may explain the high response rate despite the fact there are no competing industries in the host community.

3.6 Prison Contributions to the Community

All of the prisons contributed to the host communities and the wider communities by way of free or cheap goods and services, often with the use of inmate labour. Although the wider community often benefited to a greater extent because of the greater range of opportunities, for host community members who lived in close proximity to the prison, the often mutual exchange of goods and services was seen as an important part of being a good neighbour.

Prison policy has had a significant impact on the level of contributions in recent years as there has been a move away from community service work to a focus on profit-driven industries. All communities expressed an appreciation of the contributions made and some members noted disappointment in loss of these contributions.
3.7 Host Community Involvement

There is minimal involvement by host community members with the prisons, largely due to the small size of the host communities. This is compared with the wider community from which come most of the community members involved with providing inmate support. Most of these belong to inmate support organisations such as PILLARS, PARS, and Prisoner Fellowship, which are organised in the major centres.

3.8 Relationship with Local Maori

Three of the four prisons had strong relationships and levels of commitment with local Maori, based around the presence of Maori Focus Units. The fourth, Rolleston Prison, did not have a strong or well established relationship, due to absence of any strongly Maori-focused programmes and the distance between the prison and its nearest marae.

Generally, where Maori Focus Units have been established, very high levels of commitment evolve for all parties involved. This reflects an ethic and set of attitudes associated with the concept of restorative justice for inmates, in contrast to the ‘out of sight, out of mind’ attitude to inmates prevalent in much of the Pakeha community. However, such high levels of commitment have their cost in terms of human effort and need for resources (see further discussion in Section 4.3 under Allocation of Resources).

3.9 Risks to Personal Safety - Inmate Escapes

Although fear by host community members of inmate escapes was the most reported effect in the case studies, the number of community members reporting this fear varied between the case studies. The following percentage of neighbours reported a fear of inmate escapes:

Table 1: Fear of inmate escapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison facility</th>
<th>Neighbours reporting fear of inmate escapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston Prison</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimutaka Prison</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay Prison</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui Prison</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be emphasised however, that in all of the case studies, many of those who reported experiencing concern over the possibility of inmate escapes noted that this was not a constant fear or a fear that affected their everyday life. For many, this fear was most evident when they had knowledge of an escape.

It became evident that the level of fear experienced by neighbours depended on several factors, including perceptions of inmate security levels, escape routes, visibility of buildings and inmates, and past experience of escapes.

Neighbours reported a wide range of impacts, including temporary heightened anxiety when notified of an escape, modifications to regular behaviour (such as household arrangements, school transport
arrangements and recreational activities), loss of property through theft, and long lasting trauma from personal violation.

Two host communities reported significantly different levels of fear than the other two host communities. Only 20% of Rolleston Prison neighbours reported experiencing fear of inmate escapes as compared to 40% and 45% of Rimutaka Prison and Hawkes Bay Prison respectively. Comments from neighbours who did not report experiencing fear indicate that the perceived minimum security status of inmates at Rolleston Prison is an important factor determining level of fear for personal safety in Rolleston. It is also noteworthy that Rolleston Prison has the smallest capacity compared with the other three prisons, and that there were no reports of serious incidents as a result of inmate escapes. Wanganui Prison had the highest response rate with 64% of neighbours reporting experiencing fear. Explanations from neighbours indicate that the high percentage of neighbours experiencing fear is due to a spate of escapes in the late 1980s and early 1990s, two of which resulted in personal violations of a violent nature.

3.10 Risks to Personal Safety - Prison Traffic

In some case studies, concerns about prison-related traffic on access roads were expressed, including concerns about traffic volumes at particular times (e.g. staff shift changes), and driver behaviour (e.g. excessive speed). No accidents were reported in any of the case studies.

3.11 Prison-induced Crime Locally

While there may be a public perception that inmate families relocating to a host community might be a source of criminal activity, this research found no basis in fact for such a perception. There was no evidence in any of the case studies that the prisons were significant contributors to crime in the host communities or wider communities. Furthermore, other research (Waldegrave, 1999) confirms that inmate families do not tend to relocate to the host communities and relatively few into the wider communities. There has been no systematic collection of data on crime committed by visitors and inmate families by local police.

In the Rolleston Prison and Rimutaka Prison case studies, an effort was made to compare crime rates in the host communities with crime rates in communities which did not host prisons. Data indicates that crime rates were not higher in the host communities.

3.12 Changes in the Levels of Community Services and Resources

There was no evidence of any significant strain on or improvement to community resources and services in the host communities in these case studies. This is largely due to the fact that the host communities have very few community resources and services, and that prison staff and inmate families do not tend to live in the host communities.

The biggest demands were for services and resources in the wider community including policing, health services, and Maori programme providers. There is also some demand for social services such as Housing New Zealand, and Work and Income New Zealand services.
3.13 Off-site Environmental Effects

*Prison Security Lighting*

The following number of neighbours noticed prison security lighting from their properties and reported resulting impacts:

**Table 2: Prison security lighting impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison facility</th>
<th>Noticed lighting</th>
<th>Reported impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston Prison</td>
<td>30 of 97 (40%)</td>
<td>7 of 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimutaka Prison</td>
<td>9 of 55 (16%)</td>
<td>1 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay Prison</td>
<td>40 of 59 (68%)</td>
<td>4 of 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui Prison</td>
<td>13 of 45 (29%)</td>
<td>2 of 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of the case studies, neighbours were more likely to report a “glow” from prison security lighting rather than “bright” prison security lighting.

The number of neighbours who noticed prison security lighting and reported resulting impacts depended on proximity and topography. The closer the neighbours were to a prison and the flatter the local terrain, the more likely that they will notice prison security lighting (for example, Hawkes Bay Prison).

Irrespective of the number of neighbours who noticed prison security lighting, very few neighbours in any of the host communities felt that they were impacted as a result. For the few that were impacted, there were some similar responses such as the fact prison security lighting acted as a “reminder” of the prison’s presence. However, it also appears that there could be some differences. In the Rolleston and Wanganui case studies, impacts relating to interference with the rural character of the neighbourhood were mentioned. In other words, impacts are likely to be related to the interference with or conflict with individual values and community characteristics which are important to prison neighbours. Also in the Rolleston Prison case study there were some positive responses from several immediate neighbours who reported benefitting from improved lighting of their properties at night.

*Prison Noise*

The following number of neighbours had heard prison noise from their properties and reported resulting impacts:

**Table 3: Noise from the prisons and reported impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison facility</th>
<th>Heard noise</th>
<th>Reported impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston Prison</td>
<td>28 of 97 (29%)</td>
<td>8 of 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimutaka Prison</td>
<td>5 of 55 (9%)</td>
<td>2 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay Prison</td>
<td>35 of 59 (59%)</td>
<td>4 of 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui Prison</td>
<td>7 of 45 (16%)</td>
<td>2 of 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of neighbours who heard noise from the prisons was dependent on proximity and topography. The closer the neighbours were to a prison and the flatter the local terrain, the more likely that they will hear noise from the prison (for example, Hawkes Bay Prison).

Irrespective of the number of neighbours who could hear noise, very few neighbours in any of the host communities felt that they were impacted as a result. For the few that were impacted there were some similar responses such as the noise acting as a “reminder” of the prison’s presence. Generally, impacts also related to the interference with or conflict with individual values and community characteristics which are important to prison neighbours (such as a rural environment).

Dust from Horticulture

Dust was noticed by a group of neighbours in the Hawkes Bay Prison case study. It was determined that this dust was from horticulture activities in prison gardens located in close proximity to the neighbours. Some of these neighbours argued that it was due to inappropriate gardening practices. For all five of these neighbours this experience had a significant impact on them, including property soiling and reduced visibility.

Other Off-site Environmental Effects

There was no evidence of any other persistent environmental effects. Although several councils noted minor one-off problems with sewage or storm water system maintenance or upgrade in the past, only one neighbour reported a past problem with storm water overflow.

3.14 Long Term Effects on Local Community and Community Development

In all of the case studies there was greater consensus amongst neighbours as to any potential negative impact (i.e. the majority agreed that there was no negative impact), than to any perceived positive impact (i.e. more division as to whether or not there had been any positive impact).

Although there was little evidence of any significant host community development in the Rimutaka Prison, Hawkes Bay Prison, and Wanganui Prison case studies, this was often explained by zoning restrictions in rural areas, or the little room for development as was the case in the Rimutaka Prison case study. In the Rolleston Prison case study, there was no evidence that the prison had an adverse impact on community, in light of the significant residential and community development in recent years.

There were also no indications from the real estate agents interviewed that there was any significant adverse impact on property sales or values in the host communities.

3.15 Summary of Effects

A review of the above effects highlights the potential for host communities to experience more negative effects, and the wider community to experience more of the positive effects (see Table 4). The main focus of improved management and mitigation efforts should therefore be in relation to the localised effects and impacts of a prison’s presence and operation.
### Table 4: Summary of effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Negative Effects</th>
<th>Host Community</th>
<th>Wider Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuisances (Lighting, Noise, Dust)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate Family Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Positive Effects</th>
<th>Host Community</th>
<th>Wider Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providers to Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prison Goods &amp; Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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4 Implications of the Research

As described in Section 1.3, this social research on prison facilities began with a prison Sector Review which summarised information on all the country’s prisons, and an Historical Analysis which examined changes over the past 15 years for all prisons in peri-urban locations. The four case studies involved site and location-specific research for individual prisons. From these four case studies, it is possible to draw some more general conclusions which will be of assistance to a range of people who are involved in the siting of future prisons, the planning of future prisons, and the management of existing and future prisons. These implications of the research are set out briefly in the following sections.

4.1 Siting Future Prisons

A Balance Between Proximity and Visibility

The proximity of a prison to its neighbours will be less of an issue if visibility (of inmates and buildings) and potential physical nuisances (lighting, noise, dust) are well managed, on the assumption that members of the host community have confidence in the prison’s security arrangements (fencing, escapes).

Visibility can be managed by considering separation distance, topography and screening during the siting process. The preferences for and location of screen planting should be discussed with immediate neighbours so that both prison and neighbours interests are understood before a decision is taken.

Confidence in security arrangements is linked to the physical provisions for inmate containment and supervision, the way in which information to neighbours is managed, and the prison’s track record of escapes. Neighbours should have an understanding of the security provisions, and also be kept well informed whenever escapes do occur (see Section 4.3 for further comment on community phone warning systems).

Access to Public Transport for Prison Visitors

It is important that during the siting process, consideration is given to the question of access to public transport. There are many visitors who do not have access to a car, and currently not all prisons can be accessed by way of public transport. Even with public transport, it can be a long way for visitors to walk, especially visitors with children. This can result in pressure being put on PARS and prison chaplains who have to resort to using their already stretched time and resources and the help of volunteers to meet demand. Alternatives, such as taxis are usually too expensive for the visitors, and other alternatives such as hitch hiking are not appropriate. Even though the use of public transport will usually take a more direct route to the prison, precluding local expenditure (which is low anyway), the cost of public transport is such that this would appear to be the best option for many visitors.
Proximity to Marae

Consideration should be given to where support of Maori inmates is to come from. This is especially so if a prison has a Maori Focus Unit. This is not necessarily an argument in favour of locating near to a marae, but should be a key focus for consultation. The case studies revealed that much of the success of the Maori Focus Units was based on the strong commitment by local Maori and marae to support the units and care for the inmates.

Future Prison Expansion

The possibility of future expansion also needs to be considered during the siting process, as this may change the effects experienced by neighbours. In reducing the separation distance to neighbours and possibly increasing visibility of the prison facility, neighbours may be more likely to experience proximity-related effects, fear of inmate escapes, and off-site environmental effects (lighting, noise, and effects associated with additional pressure put on prison utilities).

It is important that a prison’s special status under the Resource Management Act 1991 as a designated activity does not preclude consultation with neighbours over these issues.

Where are the benefits and costs distributed?

Identifying where the benefits and costs (for example, Section 3.15) associated with a prison’s presence and operation are distributed, should assist site selection. Indications are that peri-urban sites are the most likely sites for the future siting of prisons.

Some of the wider community considerations include:
• where are staff likely to live?
• where will goods and services come from?
• where will community support (Maori community, PARS, church-based groups) come from?
• how will visitors travel to the prison?

Some of the host community considerations include:
• access routes,
• separation distances to nearest neighbours (not just the prison accommodation, but also the inmate work areas),
• visibility of built structures, inmate activities and servicing activities,
• ultimate site capacity, and
• the scope to provide benefits to local businesses and residents.

4.2 Planning Future Prisons

Planting and Screening

It is preferable that the visibility of prison facilities and inmates to neighbours is limited due to the ‘constant reminder factor’ and aesthetics. In planning for this, consultation with neighbours is essential. It is wrong to assume that everyone’s approach to what is the most appropriate screening will be the same.
Signage

In signposting a prison’s location, consideration should be given to its impact on the community. Signs that are too visible, may for the neighbours act as a reminder of the prison’s presence and/or increase the association between the prison and the host community. On the other hand, if signage is too discrete visitors may find it difficult to find the prison, resorting to asking local residents for directions. Indeed, this had occurred in each of the case studies, and was often an uncomfortable experience for the residents. This problem could be partly addressed by providing maps and directions in visitor documentation.

Visitor Facilities

In addition to visitors asking for directions, neighbours were also concerned about visitors who parked on road sides when waiting for visiting times, often littering in the process. This occurrence may decrease if prisons were to provide visitor facilities, such as parking, picnic areas and indoor waiting areas.

Subsequent Prison Developments

As discussed above, it is important that neighbours are consulted about new prison activities or developments, in order to mitigate any potential adverse effects. Many on-site industrial activities established to provide inmate employment (e.g. joinery, piggery) have the potential to conflict with a variety of amenity values, particularly in peri-urban or rural locations. Odour, noise and dust effects can often be addressed by choice of location. There have been examples where inappropriate locations have been used, largely due to the fact that prison designations have been taken to override normal RMA processes.

4.3 Management of Existing and Future Prisons

Allocation of Resources

The case studies highlighted significant involvement by some community groups and individuals in providing various inmate support services. For some in particular, this support is time consuming and puts a strain on already tight resources.

This was an issue of concern for local Maori of Rimutaka Prison, Hawkes Bay Prison, and Wanganui Prison. The relationship local Maori have with the prisons and their Maori Focus Units, tends to be richly diverse and involve high levels of commitment, through cultural advisors, inmate visiting, inmate education through formal programmes in the Maori Focus Units (whakapapa, cultural knowledge, artisan skills, etc.), accommodating inmate families when they visit, and providing opportunities for inmates to do community service. This relationship is very important to the success of the Maori Focus Units and a positive dimension of external relations. However, it is also time consuming, demanding of resources, and places significant demand on kuia and kaumatua. These demands are accentuated by the need to support Maori inmates who come from all over the country. To ensure that this essential relationship is a positive relationship that continues to develop, consideration should be given to the allocation of resources in support of the relationship.
The Relationship with the Host Community - Being Pro-Active on Both Sides

With the demise of prison staff villages and the commercialisation of inmate employment, prisons now offer their host communities far fewer benefits than they used to.

They can still, however, offer a positive reciprocal relationship with the host community in order to generate confidence and trust. In particular it is important to keep in touch with the host community, to provide information on new activities and developments, and to share good news. This information sharing contributes towards reducing perceptions of risk to personal safety.

Locals should also be encouraged to take some responsibility for communications, the most effective way often being an active liaison mechanism such as residents' liaison group. Any community organisation (for example a local school or pony club) which makes intermittent or regular use of land in the vicinity of a prison, should be encouraged to take responsibility for communicating with prison management if events are likely to give rise to unanticipated encounters with inmates.

Attitudes and Leadership

The attitude and approach of senior management is critical to the relationship between a prison and its host community. Although this takes time out of an already tight time budget and it is difficult to keep external relations as a priority, the attitude and approach of senior management is a critical factor determining the form of any relationship. Aside from senior management, other prison staff also contribute to good relations, especially with close neighbours. It should be noted that a change of manager can disrupt previous relations with the host community, and that it is therefore important to have a handover that encourages continuity and builds commitment on the part of the incoming manager.

This raises two specific issues for Dept of Corrections Head Office personnel. The first relates to the kind of briefing and training provided to new prison managers, particularly as it relates to external relationships with the community. The second relates to protocols for Head Office personnel who may have responsibilities unrelated to day-to-day prison management, such as those to do with future prison developments (e.g. new industries on site, land acquisition, etc.). In their dealings with prison neighbours, it is important that they work through local prison site managers to preserve the integrity of host community relationships. The same issue may arise for regional management personnel.

The Community Phone Warning System is Valued and Vital

Fear of inmate escapes is the most significant negative impact for most host community residents. The community phone warning system is an important mechanism to help mitigate this fear. Invariably it was found not to work as well as neighbours would like. The main issues consistently mentioned by neighbours were: the need to keep the system up-to-date, and the need to notify residents once escapees were caught; this is just as important as notifying them of an escape.
Specific Suggestions for Building Host Community Relationships

- Regular meetings between prison management and neighbours - perhaps annually - keep neighbours informed on issues or good news;
- Open days for neighbours and the public - occasionally, but not too occasionally - attack ignorance and speculation; educate;
- Newsletters - perhaps every six months; possibly a way to update on departures and new arrivals in the neighbourhood by requesting feedback from neighbours;
- Community phone warning system - keep it updated, and notify re-captures as well as escapes;
- Exchanges of goods and services with neighbours - there is still the chance to be good neighbours.
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