

Triple Bottom Line and UAM: Where do Compliance, Social Capital and the New UAM Fit in?

Virginia Jackson and Ian Henderson

Triple bottom line theory has been a dominant management buzzword for the last decade. But what is it and why is it relevant to UAM?

This paper will explore the links between triple bottom line theory, social capital, compliance and the new UAM. It will look at the latest research and discuss its application (both actual and potential) in the City of Port Phillip in Melbourne. The paper will be of interest to those with a general interest in TBL as well as those interested in where UAM fits into these new management approaches.

Introduction

The triple bottom line (TBL) concept emerged in the late 1990s. In a nutshell, TBL theory asks us to assess a corporation's performance according to 3 bottom lines: the financial bottom line, the environmental bottom line and the social bottom line.

Public and private sector corporations around the world have embraced TBL. It has been particularly popular with Australian local authorities and the TBL language now permeates all parts of the planning and decision making frameworks. TBL might be a passing fad but we believe its principles are here to stay.

In this paper we look at TBL as it relates to pet ownership. In particular, we explore the concept of one of these bottom lines (social capital) as it relates to pet ownership.

There are a number of reasons why we believe this paper is important to UAM:

1. Because if we talk in the current lexicon we are more likely to be seen as part of the mainstream of local government. This means being recognised and valued for the important work we do.
2. Because if we focus on the social benefits or capital arising from people's relationship with their pets, it might result in improved compliance with UAM laws and codes of behaviour. In this paper we show you clear links between social capital and responsible pet ownership.
3. Because we should. There are many benefits from owning pets. We've been talking about them since UAM began - but mostly with a view to passing these insights on to the relevant Council department to implement (whether that be town planning, social planning, open space planning etc).

However in Virginia's presentation to this conference last year, she argued that getting other disciplines or council departments to think seriously about the benefits of pet ownership is harder than drawing teeth. She argued that UAM needs to be broadened from a focus on compliance alone to one that actively fosters responsible pet ownership. She said UAM needs to become the champion of pet ownership.

In this paper we use the case study of the City of Port Phillip in Melbourne where Ian has worked for the last 20 years and where we believe social capital is alive and barking amongst its dog owning community. By doing this we hope to move beyond the theoretical to show you concrete examples of how social capital could become one of the cornerstones of the new UAM.

One point before we begin. It is not our intention to quantify the social capital we describe. Doing so is notoriously difficult and there are philosophical differences amongst researchers about different methodologies. We are not qualified accountants, nor are we experts on social capital. Whilst we may be criticised for not quantifying our findings, we believe that it is the principle behind TBL that is most important (ie that the economy, the environment and the social are assessed on an equal footing), not the actual numbers.

A Few Words About the Case Study

Port Phillip is an old inner suburban municipality of Melbourne. It comprises 20sqkm and is located just 3km from the CBD. It encompasses the suburbs of Port Melbourne, South Melbourne, Albert Park, Middle Park, St Kilda, St Kilda Road, East St Kilda, Ripponlea and Elwood.

Port Phillip developed as a group of middle and working class suburbs. It declined in population and socio-economic status during the middle of the 20th century but was heavily gentrified (yuppies moving in) over the last 40 years. More recently, rising property values and changing housing choice has seen the construction of many apartment buildings throughout the municipality. Many of these apartment dwellers own pets and present council with new challenges especially given the combined impact of very limited availability of public open space.

Today Port Phillip is a densely developed, highly desirable place to live and visit. Its population in 2001 was 80,157, up from 70,557 in 1991. It has enormous cultural and socio-economic diversity and an array of social malaise common to the inner areas of most Australian cities including homelessness, unemployment, drug abuse and prostitution. It is the quintessential melting pot!

From the density of development and lack of open space, it is probably reasonable to say Port Phillip is not an ideal place for pet ownership. However this community has shown that it wants pet ownership and is willing to make it work in otherwise trying circumstances. It is our thesis that the social capital elements of pet ownership in Port Phillip are a significant reason for this success.

Triple Bottom Line Theory

The TBL concept first appeared in 1997 in John Elkington's work *Cannibals with Forks: The triple bottom line of 21st Century Business*. The sentiments expressed and many of the driving forces however date back to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 where the growing need for Corporations to account for their economic and social performance was publicly expressed.

Elkington defines the TBL as:

Sustainable: development involves the simultaneous pursuit of economic prosperity, environmental quality and social equity. Companies aiming for sustainability need to perform not against a single financial bottom line but against a triple bottom line.

The TBL focuses corporations not just on the economic value they add, but also on the environmental and social value they add – and destroy.

In the typical worldview, the economy is the primary source of wealth and the key to the improved standard of living for

all. In this interpretation, GDP is the primary indicator of community well being.

In the broader worldview, economic, environmental and social sustainability are inter-connected contributors to the health, well-being and functionality of the community. This gives rise to triple bottom line accounting where social, environmental and economic factors are given equal weighting.

The takeup rate around the world has been promising. Many large corporations are now producing TBL reports dealing with:

- Human resources issues (employee satisfaction and turnover, female/male salary ratio, non work aspects of career management).
 - Changes to internal processes and products that produce more environmentally sustainable outcomes.
 - Improving accessibility for the disabled.
 - Screening of suppliers for social and environmental performance.
- It has also become prevalent in the public sector with examples of local authorities:
- Adopting sustainability as an overarching corporate goal.
 - Increasing the focus on transparent decision making.
 - Producing directories that list businesses in their area offering sustainable products and services.
 - Moving to gas powered waste collection trucks.
 - Encouraging car pooling amongst their staff.

These are just a few isolated examples. Most of you would recognise TBL approaches in your municipality.

At Port Phillip, the TBL concept has been wholeheartedly embraced but adapted to include four pillars of sustainability: economic viability, environmental responsibility, cultural vitality and social equity.

Council's 4 year plan for 2004/05-2008/9 explains:

Its economic viability pillar seeks:

To promote effective stewardship of the city's resources and promote positive economic development within Port Phillip that supports the council's social, cultural and environmental goals.

Its environmental responsibility pillar seeks:

To place a minimal and balanced load on our environmental while recognising that the city is highly complex, urbanised and altered.

Its cultural vitality pillar seeks:

To support the conditions that allow all communities within Port Phillip to experience and enjoy diversity of values, beliefs and aspirations.

Its social equity pillar seeks:

To develop resilient and fair communities by ensuring residents are effectively and appropriately supported in accessing services and resources in the city.

Under each pillar are the initiatives Council wishes to pursue for the coming year. These are specific tasks the organisation plans to take in addition to the services that the council normally provides.

In the current Council Plan there are no obvious links between TBL and UAM – other than one of the objectives under the environmental responsibility pillar which seeks to:

Minimise litter contamination and improve water quality within the Elwood Canal/Elsternwick Creek catchment.

The impacts of unretrieved dog poo would fit into this objective.

There are also initiatives relating to noise control, managing parks for everyone which no doubt match traditional UAM responsibilities.

However on delving deeper into Council's affairs it is clear the emphasis on community building or social capital is driving many of the approaches to UAM that Council has undertaken in recent years. We will discuss this later. First, we need to explain what we mean by social capital.

Social Capital Theory

Social capital is all about people making connections with other people. Putnam¹ was the first to coin the phrase. He defined social capital as connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. Putnam highlights that these connections can be embodied in organisations – churches, bowling clubs, voluntary groups – or in less structured exchanges such as chit-chat around the water cooler at work or among parents in the school yard after school.

Contemporary research suggests that an abundance of social capital makes it easier for an individual to find a job, resist illness, cope with stress and possibly lead a more satisfying life. According to Brunner – socially isolated people die at two to three times the rate of people with a network of social relationships and sources of emotional support².

It has also been identified that communities and regions rich in social capital suffer less crime, educate their children better, have more smoothly functioning economies and better governance due to the opportunities created by engaging and empowering the community. If these claims are true (and there are many people establishing clear links) then its importance to public policy cannot be underestimated.

To explain further, social capital can be examined along two dimensions 1) weak and strong links between people and groups and 2) bonding and bridging capital.

Weak links are those that exist between acquaintances, such as those who gather around the photocopier at work, parents waiting on the school yard to pick up kids, members of book clubs, sporting clubs, neighbours, social friends, work mates etc.

Strong links are those that are formed among family members, intimates, bounded tight-knit teams, close workmates and teams, street gangs, organised crime syndicates etc. Strong links may be a private good but are rarely a public good. At the extreme social engagement beyond the group is truncated and the society as a whole becomes tribalised.

Bridging capital essentially means weak ties between numerous people whilst bonding capital mean strong ties within small groups.

Although strong links are bonding and make the resources of the group available to its members, weak links are

bridging and provide access to new resources not available to the bonded group.

A contemporary example of the advantage of weak links, seen in many workplaces, are those that operate between smokers, who gather together frequently often bridging departments, work-teams and levels of seniority and who often enjoy a relative advantage in the pursuit of office politics as a result.

We need to be careful however because social capital can produce negative outcomes. Some social networks inspire enormous trust between insiders on the grounds of a common intolerance to outsiders. Urban gangs are a common example. These groups develop social capital amongst themselves, which they then turn in a destructive way against others. Putnam says it is the combination of internal trust and external tolerance that produces positive benefits for the wider society.

Effective networks and effective networkers simultaneously bond along one dimension and bridge along another.

When a community is well networked, important informational resources are shared around. Information about where to get a job, where to catch a fish, best buys, what the weather is doing, what the government is doing, how to respond to your teenager etc. Well networked communities also tend to be self-regulating. People are brought into line, brought into the fold, more likely to participate and conform.

By contrast in an untrusting society people are frightened of one another, spend time and money protecting themselves against social risks and hazards and economic development is stunted or distorted.

Town planners have become very interested in how the stock of social capital is influenced by the built environment. The profession now talks of creating open spaces where people can look and play and be part of the community. They also talk about serendipity – creating opportunities for chance encounters, to allow people to run into people they know slightly, people they know well. This is social capital.

Open space planners are interested too. A 'no no' these days is to design facilities for just one group; that other people would not be interested in using. Multi-purpose facilities might have their origins in economic rationalism but their increased popularity is also central to the notion of community building.

Social capital recently caught our Treasurer's attention. In his address to the Sydney Institute in July 2003³, Peter Costello talked about social capital in the context of the re-building of Iraq. Notwithstanding your own views on the war, it is his comments on social capital that are most compelling.

He argued that if you were re-building a county from the ground up after a totalitarian state you would have to start re-building trust amongst its citizens. You would need to build a culture of tolerance between citizen and citizen, which would allow expression and association within the context of trust. He went on to argue that trust facilitates compliance. Trust enhances efficiency. It reduces transaction costs. Trust in the legal system underpins the willingness to invest. He went on to say engagement in voluntary or leisure groups produces a direct outcome –

it raises funds, people enjoy the activity. But it also produces by-products. By-products like friendship, belonging, tolerance and trust and forms the basis for relationships, which can be extended to other worthwhile causes.

The concept of the "third place"

Sociologists have coined the term "third place" which we believe has particular relevance to this discussion.

The first two places in our lives are our homes and our workplaces. The third places are the coffee shops, bars, hair salons and parks where we meet others and develop a sense of community. The classic example is the bar in the old TV series Cheers. Paths cross, information is exchanged, relationships are established and problems are solved.

There are 10 reasons why third places are thought to be important to individuals and communities:

1. They unify communities. People get to know each other.
2. They are ports of entry. Visitors and newcomers can get information, get acquainted and learn how the neighbourhood works.
3. They are sorting areas where people with similar interests can find each other.
4. They bring youth and adults into contact.
5. They help care for the neighbourhood.
6. They foster political debate.
7. They reduce the cost of living. Neighbours who know one another and care about the neighbourhood are more likely to do things for each other, offer ideas that save time and money.
8. They provide a constant source of entertainment and advice.
9. They offer friendship on an informal, neutral ground.
10. They keep retired people in touch with others and involved in community life.

One writer⁴ pondering the relationship between third places and social capital wrote:

Every neighbourhood needs an ice-cream shop, a bookstore and a place that welcomes dogs. An ice cream shop because it attracts both kids and adults and gives us a reason to wander around the neighbourhood as we enjoy our cones. A bookstore because it gives us a destination to spend some time and talk to people. And a place that welcomes dogs (the bookstore has a water bowl and a jar of treats by the door) because it acknowledges that we have families and lives and loved ones, some of whom are our pets.

I was heading back to my car when I fell into step with a guy with a Great Dane the size of a Shetland pony that sends a message: Don't mess with me. But his owner eagerly explained that his dog is sweet tempered, a big friendly baby. The owner gets the best of both worlds: a pet that discourages bad guys but encourages attention.

As we passed a sidewalk café, people put down their cell phones and longneck beers to gather around the guy and the dog, fussing over the Great Dane and chatting with his owners. That's a third place at work right there.

¹ Brunner, E Stress and the biology of inequality, *British Medical Journal*, 1997

³ Costello, P Building Social Capital, Address to the Sydney Institute, Parliament House, Sydney, 16th July, 2203.

⁴ Stark, J A Place to live or a place for living?, *St Petersburg Times*, May 15, 2004.

And, we would say it is also an example of people accessing social capital through their pets.

What are the Links Between Social Capital and Pet Ownership?

From the preceding discussion, we'd suggest that the links between social capital and pet ownership are obvious. Dogs in particular encourage people to get out and engage with the community. This brings private benefit to individuals but it also gives rise to significant public benefits through the building of social capital.

Very little work has been done on this. One exception is Wood's⁵ exploratory work on pets and social capital where she suggests that pets:

1. Act as lubricants for social contact and interaction both with other pet owners, neighbours and with the broader local community.
2. Provide additional opportunities or motivation for participation in community events.
3. Facilitate the exchange of favours between neighbours, which contributes to the reciprocity and network dimensions of social capital.
4. Are associated with higher levels of self reported general health, lower levels of doctor identified mental conditions and lower levels of loneliness.
5. Where the pet is a dog, increased perceptions of safety within the home and out in the community. Personal experiences of some types of crime are also lower for dog owners.
6. Where the pet is a dog, motivate owners to walk, making use of streets, parks and open space and increasing owner opportunities for physical activity.

Her study, which involved a literature review and telephone interviews (n=235) also identified that pet owners had elevated perceptions of community friendliness and sense of community, were more likely to be involved in a range of civic activities and were more likely to be interested and empowered regarding local issues. She went on to conclude that social capital theory also suggests that the increased visible presence of dogs being walked and the accompanying social exchanges facilitated by such walks, contribute to increased feelings of collective safety and perceptions of sense of community.

All of these elements of social capital are present in Port Phillip.

Social Capital and Pets in Port Phillip

The City of Port Phillip has wholeheartedly embraced the notion of social capital. Its commitment to building social capital is clearly evident from the myriad policy documents and corporate plans.

Council also recognises the benefits of pet ownership as a source of social capital. In 2000, Council's community and health development department undertook a detailed review of the literature relating to the benefits of owning pets. As far as we know, that's a first for local government. It followed feedback from residents in the late 1990s as part of the leash laws review that suggested Port Phillip residents received significant benefits from owning pets. Council went on to survey its residents to find out more

about these benefits as they exist locally.

However there is another just as interesting element to this discussion. Council also believes there are clear links between social capital and UAM compliance, which if handled well, can be mutually reinforcing.

In other words, the approach now is to use the social capital that's there to boost compliance with UAM laws. And as a by-product you might in turn reinvigorate the social capital that's already there. This principle now permeates Council's first approach to any UAM problem. Enforcement is there to be used but only as a last resort.

Lets look at some examples.

Off Leash Parks in Port Phillip

As we said earlier, Port Phillip is a cultural melting pot. It is densely populated. Many people don't have a backyard and there is very little public open space. That's not exactly conducive to successful pet ownership.

For its paucity of public space, Port Phillip has a large number of areas available for off-leash dogs – four beaches and 17 reserves. Like many Victorian councils, it went through a fairly painful process of consultation during the late 1990s to move from a situation of largely off-leash to just a few off-leash areas.

However since putting the first leash laws in place in the late 1990s, Council has gone in the opposite direction from many other local authorities. It has actually increased the number of off-leash opportunities available in the municipality. Partly this is a recognition by Council of the important social capital associated with dog walking. However it is also an example of the beneficial outcomes that can result from communities demonstrating strong social capital. The links and social connections people make in these parks and their importance to people's lives has made it relatively easy for council to connect with dog owners, to educate them in responsible pet ownership and to look for meaningful ways to solve the problems of the melting pot. To put it bluntly, Council has said to the dog owners: make it work and we'll give you more, fail to make it work and we may take your space away.

Lets look in to it more closely.

Gasworks Arts Park is an unlikely place for a thriving off-leash park but it is one of Port Phillip's strongest.

Operating formerly as a gasworks foundry from 1873 until its closure in 1957, it became an inner urban park in the 1970s, hence the name. Many original features of the foundry remain as historic elements in the park to this day. These include the 6m high boundary wall and several unrenovated industrial buildings.

Used as an arts precinct, facilities include a 240 set theatre, a rehearsal studio/performance space, community access tuition space, a darkroom, sculpture studio, painting studios, ceramics studios and a gallery. The precinct also has 15 studio artist tenants.

The park is owned by the City of Port Phillip and is leased by Gasworks Arts Inc, a community based non-profit organisation, which presents an annual program of festivals, events, exhibitions and performances. When not being used for the Gasworks program, facilities are available for hire.

The parkland itself comprises a large, open lawn area and although not remnant, it boasts 60 native plant species, with a native woodland theme. As an open space with native Australian plants, Gasworks Park play an important role in the lives of many residents living adjacent in newly developed high rise apartments.

The Park is a leash free dog exercise area and includes a children's playground, picnic tables and barbeques. The dog owners group is thriving – up to 100 dog owners use and value the park regularly. The group is not formalised but it is very easy to identify the stakeholders and contact the spokesperson.

The dog owning population in the vicinity of Gasworks Park love their park and as we now know well – when the same people go to the same park at the same time every day they start to get to know one another, make friends and in the case of one couple at Alma Park in East St Kilda meet and fall in love (more on that later).

To give you a few specific examples of the social capital we uncovered at Gasworks Park:

1. An elderly lady did not bring her dog to the park one morning as usual, so a couple of park regulars went over to her house to check on her. They found her collapsed on the floor and called an ambulance.
2. Someone noticed the old lady did not have a television and bought her one, concocting a story about winning the television in a raffle and not having room for it.
3. Another lady broke her foot and couldn't walk, so a park friend took her dog to the park every night for 6 weeks.
4. Another lady's son fell at school. The school didn't ring her, but a park friend, walking his dog past the school, saw the boy covered with blood and called her on his mobile.

The list goes on and is repeated in other parks around the world - people having barbeques at the park, breakfasts in the park, dog walking groups, progressive dinners, birthday parties for dogs. We've even heard of rosters being made to ensure a dog is walked whilst its owner is laid up.

The interesting thing about Gasworks Park and the social capital it has developed is the diversity of connections made within the melting pot. To use the jargon, people are bonding with other dog owners and bridging with other groups using the park. Its not always entirely harmonious but everyone has a vested interest in making it work. Even with the dog owning group there is amazing diversity with people from all walk of socio-economic and socio-cultural groups meeting – the one commonality being their dog.

Alma Park, in East St Kilda is another manicured, highly valued park that also hosts a diversity of stakeholders and a strong dog owning community. The park comprises significant picnic furniture and seating, an oval, significant avenues of trees, a colourful central shrub walk, a bike path, a children's playground, gazebo, sports area, toilets, BBQ, artists playground including a tree-house, dragon, pond and play sculptures.

Alma Dogs, the group that meets there is a formally organised group with office bearers and its own website. Alma Dogs is most famous for the Mornington Peninsula couple Ros and Peter who fell in love and later married after walking their dogs at Alma Park, 10 years ago. Ros says dog owners instantly had a common interest and it was pets, not the dog owners that took centre stage. She says you find out the name of the dog long before you find out the names of the people.

We've read a lot about social capital in the last year or so and believe UAM has every right to claim this as extremely strong social capital. People are **connecting** through their pets and their pets are in many cases **transforming** their lives. There is also evidence of **reciprocity**, (people giving without any expectation of receiving something directly in return). These 3 key elements of social capital are alive and well in Port Phillip. Even weak social connections, like the person who stops to pat your dog, will enrich the community's stock of social capital.

Because there are such strong dog owners groups at Gasworks and Alma Parks and because these groups value their park so highly, it has been relatively easy for Council to connect with them to **improve responsible pet ownership**. Each park has a spokesperson and the dog owners meet with Council regularly. If Council organises a meeting in the park – 50-100 people will turn up. This way Council can talk about practical issues, push the self enforcement message, look for ways to improve facilities and services and generally keep an ear to the ground. And, the interesting thing is that bringing the people together to discuss problems has actually been found to reinforce the social capital that's there already.

Why does it work? We believe it is first and foremost because the people value the stock of social capital present in the parks, second because they know that in this inner city melting pot, they have to make it work and third because a very good partnership has developed with council based on trust and mutual respect. Sure there are differences, sure Council can't deliver everything they might want and sure there are some people who'd be unhappy no matter what Council does, but on the whole the partnership is fruitful and mutually beneficial.

Council is now moving on to some of its smaller parks. Whether it works as successfully remains to be seen. These smaller parks don't have the same stock of social capital amongst dog owners but council is nevertheless adopting the same approach – sometime bringing different user groups together, sometimes meeting a particular group on its own. It's a matter of identifying the stakeholders - dog owners and other groups - and working through practical solutions to ensure each group gets as much out of the park as they can. And again, by bringing the groups together Council is not only helping to solve some of its problems its also helping to build social capital.

Gaworks Arts Park Dog Day

Council held 4 of these until 2002. They were a two day festival for dogs and their owners. The media release called it a festival that involves and celebrates canines.

VicHealth was a major sponsor of the day and promoted its Active for Life health message over the two days, encouraging all Victorians and their dogs to take up just 30 minutes of light exercise a day. Activities included face painting to look like your dog, jack russel races, bitzer competitions, dog wedding, dog astrology, and many more games, prizes and presentations.

We know many Councils or groups of Council now hold their own Dog Days. They are a great way for Councils to encourage get people out and about, connect with their communities and get the responsible pet ownership message across. However as pet ownership reaches across all stratum of society they are a great way to build the stock of social capital available to the community and should be recognised and valued as such.

⁵ Wood L "Social capital, sense of community, health and the environments in which people live – exploration of the pet factor", Report prepared for the Petcare Information and Advisory Service, 2003.

Petlinks

A lot has been written about Petlinks. In the event you have not heard of it, it is a program that connects frail elderly pet owners with volunteers who help with walking, bathing, taking to the vet and so on. It is run jointly by the Department of Health and Community Services and the City of Port Phillip. At present, there are currently 65 clients and 75 volunteers.

The program has direct benefits: the frail and elderly can continue to keep their companions. However it also a way that the elderly can stay connected with the community. There is the social contact, the comfort in knowing someone will make arrangements for their pet in the event of their death or a stay in hospital. It's also a way for the community to keep in touch with its frail population and make sure they are OK.

This is a very good example of social capital.

Blessing of the Animals Day (4th October)

These ceremonies have been held in Port Phillip for the last 4 years. The ceremony itself dates back to the time of St Francis of Assisi, the 13th century Italian monk who was concerned for all forms of life including animals.

The Blessing of the Animals ceremony was an initiative of the Kilbride Ecumenical Centre for Spirituality and Personal Development. The staff at Kilbride have sought to involve the community in this celebration of animals as an important and valuable part of our lives. They joined forces with the City of Port Phillip and Petlinks to organise this event for the community.

From Council's point of view, this is an ideal opportunity to promote the power of pets in improving residents' health and well being. The Mayor's speech to the 1993 ceremony went further when it said:

Modern lifestyles can create loneliness, isolation and a sense of vulnerability. This is particularly the case in Port Phillip. According to the 2001 census, 43% of people in Port Phillip live alone, compared to 24% Australia wide. So, in Port Phillip, pets are even more crucial in providing necessary companionship to many people than in other municipalities.

After the ceremony everyone was invited back to the Kilbride Centre for refreshments. This is surely another example of social capital: people staying connected through their relationship with pets.

Conclusion

We have found it particularly insightful to write this paper. Many of the arguments about the benefits of pet ownership and their links to responsible pet ownership have been circulating in UAM for many years but sometimes it takes the discipline of an appropriate theoretical framework to put the ideas in order and give them relevance.

We started with the position that UAM needs to broaden its focus and become the champion of pet ownership. If we don't do this, no one else will and pet ownership could seriously become a thing of the past in the next generation or two.

We then looked at the concepts of TBL and social capital and found they are now central to the planning and decision making frameworks of many local authorities, not least the City of Port Phillip.

The TBL construct has obvious relevance to pets in the form of traditional UAM responsibilities of noise and faeces

control and availability of parks for everyone. However it is the benefits to social capital outlined in this paper that we found the most intriguing. The connections and relationships that are made through both formal and informal activities are true examples of strong social capital. Don't let anyone trivialise them. And in Port Phillip's case this has gone one step further with a clear link between social capital and compliance that has been achieved through a focus on using the capital that is there to help Council achieve its own ends.

Virginia Jackson

Virginia Jackson is a Director of Harlock Jackson Pty Ltd. She is an urban policy analyst and town planner who has specialised in animal management for over a decade. Her work on pet friendly architecture and design of public open space have been world firsts. She has also researched extensively issues of compliance in UAM. Clients include community groups and state and local governments around Australia.

Ian Henderson

Ian Henderson oversees the City of Port Phillip's Animal Management Team. His other functions include the development of policy in relation to local laws and animals in public open space including off leash areas. Ian was responsible for the development of the specification for Animal Management service as part of the CCT process and following the appointment of the Lost Dogs Home as the service provider, acted as Contract Manager during the 5 year contract period. The service returned internally in December 2001. Ian has 30 years experience in local government and his background is in Environmental Health where he was involved in an advisory committee working group role at both state and commonwealth government levels.