

As edited 21/01/01

SAFER SPACES & PLACES: REDUCING CRIME BY URBAN DESIGN

Dr John Parker

Chartered Architect/Town Planner

Greater London Consultants

E-mail: glc@btinternet.com

COUNCIL OF EUROPE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PHYSICAL URBAN ENVIRONMENT AND
CRIME PATTERNS.

SZCZECIN, POLAND

19 - 21 OCTOBER 2000

INTRODUCTION

“Anxieties about personal safety lead individuals to control where they go and when they go to places, and/or to control the activities of others for whom they have responsibility. Research consistently shows a strong link between fear of crime and spatial behaviour. If individuals are frightened, they adjust their behaviour to reduce the level of risk.” (Harrison et al (1995)).

This report is primarily concerned with physical design related to the safety and security of people in the public realm – the spaces and places of our towns and cities. It does not deal with crime related to buildings and their contents, though the two are closely connected. The report focuses primarily on streets, arcades, squares, parks, amenity areas, river and canal walkways, and the small lanes and alleys that together make up the public realm. The difference between an urban space and a place is that a space is an empty architectural creation until people and activities animate it, then it becomes a place.

In the nineteenth century John Ruskin said that the measure of a civilisation was the quality of its public spaces; he was right then and even more today.

I speak from a British perspective and can say that most of our towns and cities are still pleasant to live in. They serve stable communities and are generally perceived by our citizens as relatively safe. The exceptions are the blighted inner areas of our larger cities. Reducing crime, and improving public order, nevertheless comes close to the top of most people’s priorities when asked to list their primary social concerns. During daytime hours, when going about the normal activities of shopping, employment, leisure and casual meeting, people generally feel secure. At night it is a different situation due to an alarming increase in criminal incidents, especially vandalism, theft, and drink and drug related activities. This reflects what is happening elsewhere in our society and has led to a considerable increase in fear of being a victim, especially among women and the elderly – even though most incidents of crime are against young men. Everyone studying the subject agrees that: **a place made safer for women will be safer for everyone.**

In an article on social exclusion Anne Power (2000) points out that: *“The success of cities depends on successful neighbourhoods – physical areas within which people organise their lives Neighbourhoods have three interlocking aspects; the home and its immediate surroundings; services such as shops and schools.....; the*

environment, which gives a powerful sign of who we are and how we should behave. They offer a sense of familiarity and security, countering fear of the unknown even when the neighbourhood is poor, run-down or unpopular.” She goes on to say that if these elements are disrupted then security disintegrates and the neighbourhood breaks down. Also that “..... *there is little doubt that areas affect people as well as people affecting areas.*” Among her social and physical solutions she believes that people will be lured back into city centres by cleaner livelier streets, restored buildings and glamorous new ones which will revive and upgrade our cities. This is an apt assessment of the ways and means of reducing crime explored in this report.

It is well recognised that social interaction and community spirit are probably more important than the physical quality of the environment. Nevertheless, people usually feel deep affection for the familiar, and large-scale environmental change can be disturbing and divisive. Too much development in the recent past has been utilitarian, cheaply constructed, ill maintained and unrelated to its surroundings. Users feel alienated, unable to express their individuality and oppressed by impersonal structures. This destroys pride in the places where they live and work and leads to more serious problems. It is notable that, in contrast to public spaces which are the responsibility of ‘other people’, love and care is often lavished on the private garden or balcony.

The aim of all urban designers should be to create pleasant surroundings, harmonising the new with the old. The most likeable urban environments consist of attractive blends of buildings, trees, roads and spaces, especially when busy with people. These places create a pleasurable ambience by night and day and in all weathers. Conservation of familiar and cherished features and activities of a place give “character”. This is an elusive quality, difficult to create but easy to spoil or lose. It consists of those characteristics that make a place memorable and different from anywhere else.

In designing our surroundings, particular attention must be given to scale, form, colour, views, landscaping, materials, lighting and maintenance. The last is too often forgotten.

Urban planners and designers cannot do much about the causes of crime: unemployment, poverty, rights v duties, family breakdowns, drugs, violent role models in television and films, the car, increased opportunities, shortage of police and civic guardians. The fact that even design itself has been accused of causing

crime does indicate however that designers must ensure their schemes minimise opportunities and situations for crime to occur.

Political discussion on law and order is now common in the media. Combating crime has engaged the attention of all levels of national and local government, in partnership with the police force. Many of the current ideas and practices for doing this through the planning and design of our cities seem to have originated in the USA. They arose from two seminal books on the subject: Jane Jacobs' *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961); and Oscar Newman's *Defensible Space* (1972).

In recent years, the social policies of 'zero tolerance' and 'reclaiming the streets' have been inherited from the New York Police Department. These policies form a strong attack on petty crime and offences such as graffiti, unlicensed street trading, prostitution, and aggressive begging and roadside "services". It has been found that not only has the quality of civic life improved but that major crime has significantly reduced. Although civil liberty pressure groups object to these policies, they have received overwhelming support from the public. This is because in the real world, the link between petty crime and major crime is instinctively appreciated - what is known as the 'broken window syndrome' or 'litter creates litter'. These have a widespread influence on the way our public spaces are used and appreciated.

In Britain local authorities are at the forefront of reducing crime, and they have a duty to prepare community safety plans. Policies from these safety plans are being incorporated into the statutory local development plan for their areas. These development plans should already contain policies on designing out crime, and development proposals can be refused if they do not comply. This requirement arose from Government guidance by our Department of Environment (DOE) in *Planning out Crime* (DOE 1994). The author contributed to this guidance and it contains a great deal of his experience up to that time. The guidance covers all of the matters considered in this report: designing to deter crime, development plan policies, landscaping, roads, footpaths and subways, security shutters, bollards, car parking, closed circuit television, security lighting and managing public spaces. Six years later it is still an influential document and underpins initiatives between local authorities, their professional staff, the local police force, and private architects, planners and engineers. Local authority initiatives in this area are usually described in publications, which are easily obtainable on application. The above guidance has

since been reinforced by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, where Section 17 requires all local authorities, as a statutory duty, to consider crime and disorder reduction whilst exercising their powers, and to consider partnership schemes with the local police and businesses.

The British police now have trained specialists known as Architectural Liaison Officers (ALO'S) or, in London, as Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA's). An insight into their role and skills can be found in a training manual produced by the Home Office (1997). Copies are obtainable from the Crime Reduction College in York. In the manual the police acknowledge that the physical environment can have a significant influence on criminal behaviour, because the criminal relies on opportunity, anonymity, easy access and quick escape routes.

The current approach of the police is based on the concept of "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" (CPTED), which has already been covered by Paul van Soomeren in his report. Therefore only a few points on the techniques of CPTED will be mentioned. The concept is founded on the belief that the built environment can influence behaviour for good or ill. The terms used in applying its techniques: 'defensible space', 'access control', 'territoriality', 'target hardening' and 'natural surveillance', are now in common parlance.

An attempt to test CPTED through the perceptions of the criminals who may be influenced by its techniques, and the planners who are partly responsible for ensuring its incorporation into new developments, was made by Cozens et al (2000). They concluded that there are significant differences between the perceptions of criminals and planners with regard to residential space, but that the theory appears to be supported by the results of their study. For criminals and planners, the general condition and standard of maintenance in housing design was highlighted as an important determinant in forming an image and perception of potential for committing crime.

It would be valuable to have such an analysis applied to the whole public realm. This might be achieved through 'space syntax' – a computer based multi-dimensional framework to identify, assess and communicate the complex interrelation of factors involved. University College London (see Hillier 1999) is the leading research body for this and has applied its findings to a number of major projects. Space syntax can

be used to identify precise layout factors, which produce greater or lesser vulnerability to crime, by mapping and analysing crime statistics in the public realm.

A major police initiative aimed at actively encouraging the adoption of better security measures is 'Secured by Design'. Developments, which have followed police guidance, can receive approval and gain entitlement to use an official logo as an accolade and for promotion in sales literature. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) has recently validated this initiative. Individual logos are available for: residential estates and house refurbishment's, car parks, commercial schemes (shops, hotels, industrial estates, offices, business parks and public buildings). It should not be long before the scheme is extended to the public realm.

These events indicate the seriousness of the situation and emphasise the need for all those concerned with producing the physical environment, both private practitioners and local government officers, to become involved. It is clear that well thought-out planning and design solutions can help to make people less fearful by reducing the opportunities for crime to occur. Despite numerous publications generated by governmental and quasi-governmental bodies, aimed at improving the urban environment, few of them address the ubiquitous problem of crime reduction. It was, for example, virtually ignored in an important review of national development, *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (DETR 1999).

PUBLIC REALM

The phrase 'public realm' covers all those places and spaces between buildings to which everyone has a free right of access. It consists of both the physical space and the activities occurring there, it is a neutral territory no matter what your class, age, race or gender.

The patterns of public space are changing especially in large cities according to Cybriwsky (1999). He identifies the following common trends: increasing privatisation of spaces that were once more in the public realm; necessary surveillance and control of access to the public realm; and increasing design intervention that employs 'theme park' simulations that break connections with local history and geography. He relates this specifically to Tokyo and New York, but it can be seen elsewhere including London and Paris. Cybriwsky sees this trend as related to feelings of lack

of security and safety. He and other commentators are of the opinion that 'Disneyland' has had a significant impact on urban design ideas.

Unlike housing estates and other single use activities, the public realm of cities serves multiple land uses, numerous independent enterprises and thousands of different people – most of them strangers to each other. Coping with such diverse interests is what makes public safety and security so difficult. In addition, many parts of our towns are changing from mainly shopping and administrative centres to places for leisure, tourism and pleasure. This has led to the growth of covered shopping malls, pubs, clubs, restaurants and entertainment centres. The success of mixed use policies in city centres, the emerging 24 hour city, and growth in the size of restaurants, pubs and wine bars, means that large numbers of people are leaving premises late at night, with resulting anti-social behaviour (mainly by young men), usually drink related. Unfortunately this is leading to older people and women retreating into private realms and the public realm fragmenting into safe and unsafe areas. This is especially so after businesses and shops close in the evening.

Aesthetic considerations are vital components in one's sense of quality of life. More attention must therefore be given to the wishes of local communities in this respect. Traditional materials and forms are now used with more colour, richer textures, attractive surfaces, and appropriately robust constructional details. Historic and familiar buildings and spaces, which are unique to the character of many towns, must continue to be conserved. Many of our most successful schemes have a combination of modern design and restoration of existing buildings. This has produced some exciting and stimulating developments set in pleasurable landscapes, producing towns that are not only attractive, but safe, easy to maintain and salubrious. What we must avoid is the 'fortress mentality'; epitomised by metal shutters, because this discourages civic activities that help to control petty crime.

When undertaking an urban security audit of the public realm the author uses a checklist of over a hundred factors, that he has compiled over the last ten years or so. It has previously been distributed at Council of Europe meetings and copies are available on request. The list can be used to ask the following questions about the public realm:

- (i) Are pedestrian areas and routes subjected to good natural surveillance?
- (ii) Is there an absence of venues that attract large numbers of adolescents?

- (iii) Are there good definitions between public and private ownership of spaces?
- (iv) Is artificial lighting adequate at night?
- (v) Are the public spaces busy with people throughout the day and evening?
- (vi) Is there a good public transport service?
- (vii) Are acceptable standards of maintenance and cleanliness in evidence?

If the answer to all of these questions is yes, then the locality is probably safe and secure in planning and design terms.

A newer development on the above is 'Placecheck', a quasi-governmental initiative by the Urban Design Alliance (UDA). The UDA consists of a grouping of some of the major professional institutions involved in the urban environment. Placecheck is a method of investigating how a place can be changed for the better. It assesses a place's qualities, with a range of different people, and shows what improvements are needed. It developed from the approach described in the book *The Connected City* published by Urban Initiatives in 1997. Details of web-site and e-mail contacts are listed in this report.

The public realm has wide differences in its function and use. A shopping high street, a pedestrian precinct, a covered mall, a historic lane, a town park and a riverbank could link through to local housing or a multi-storey car park. Each of these has different security needs, which must be co-ordinated, so that people can move from one to the other in safety. Although people will be very safe in a crowded high-tech mall, once they have reached the quiet riverbank, or the isolated walkway to the multi-storey car park, they could be vulnerable because of the absence of other people and poor lighting.

In preparing this report the author was surprised to find, in a search of the literature since 1985, inadequate coverage of the many CLRAE reports on the subject. In view of the vital importance of the issues involved this situation should be remedied. This report indicates, through its list of Internet web sites and e-mail addresses, one way of doing this.

TOWN CENTRES

Town centres are usually the most memorable parts of a town. The appearance and atmosphere of central areas can often give a clear environmental clue as to whether

a town as a whole is safe or unsafe. A busy friendly centre, well-lit and attractive, appeals to visitors and customers who perceive that the place is under control. It makes people feel safe, cared for and visible. Studies have shown that vacant premises, ugly surroundings, steel shutters, graffiti and litter, all warn of danger and personal vulnerability, and indicate that the rest of the town will probably be even worse. A well cared for place, thronged with people and a bustling atmosphere, has the opposite effect.

Of particular importance is the presence of residents, especially those living above shops. They have a sense of propriety and their passive surveillance does much to maintain civic responsibility. In Britain a proponent of this, over many years, has been Ann Petherick, who has written extensively on the subject (see web site and e-mail address list). She has shown that vacant spaces over shops, especially in shopping centres, have contributed to crime and vandalism.

Metal shutters are now notorious for creating dark frontages. The insidious spread of these, especially in small local centres, is creating an alien environment. In a study the author's firm did in 1989 in south London (Balham and Tooting) on the A24 road, over a third of the 5km (3 mile) shopping frontage was occupied by shutters. Not only did the shutters prevent window shopping in the evening and loss of light; it also attracted graffiti daubing. Because there were fewer people on the street this increases fear. Laminated and toughened glass and internal grilles, or some of the elegant external shutters that one sees in southern Europe are all better than the solid shutter. In some places the experience has been so bad, that the local authorities provide grants to remove the shutters. There have also been numerous examples of fires breaking out which have been unseen because of shutters.

One of the major influences on behaviour is the transparency and permeability of a shopping centre. This is the ability for people to look into and 'through' shops, and for shop staff to look out at passers by – a mutual surveillance. Artificial lighting from the shop also makes a major contribution to the environmental ambience.

Often there is a breakdown between private security staff and the police, and similarly, there may be no contact between local residents, businesses and retailers. Early closure of shops or major venues can quickly lead to a town's public realm being deserted, which reduces surveillance and encourages crime. These observations also apply to the outlying smaller neighbourhood centres.

HIGHWAYS

When planning traffic and parking schemes, road safety is carefully considered but personal safety is often forgotten. Attention is usually given to emergency services but not, for example, to the isolated servicing areas where vehicles are parked; these are often poorly lit, bereft of activity and people, and not overlooked by the windows of adjacent buildings. Of vital importance are the location of bus routes and stops as these can prove an important factor in terms of public surveillance and passenger safety at bus stops.

The level of permeability of the town's fabric and the route pedestrians can take between parking and their destination is often a weak link. For example, in town centres people can arrive at a high quality car park, but once they are outside they may encounter threatening and ill-maintained spaces and no alternative routes. One should bear in mind that car parks are also often in peripheral locations.

Large volumes of pedestrians cause road crossing points to be congested and provide opportunities for pick pocketing and handbag snatching. Bus stops are often used by offenders to loiter with anonymity, whilst watching potential victims. Thought must also be given to the way cars and other vehicles are used in robberies, for example, in 'ram-raiding'. Bollards are often an effective deterrent, although they would not always be acceptable in heritage areas and in front of historic buildings.

OPEN SPACES

In the conservation and creation of natural spaces in urban areas, local authorities must ensure safety through design and management. This will allow such areas to be places where individuals feel that they are in control rather than feeling that they are vulnerable to unprovoked attack. A sense of 'communal ownership' will be fostered where this control is felt. Whether such control is felt will depend on the physical form and configuration of the space in question, and also upon its social use.

In determining whether an open space is safe or not, people will look to both its size and natural character. As elsewhere, the key determinant, as to whether or not individuals feel comfortable and in control of an open space, is the presence of other people.

Woodland areas are perceived as risky. In terms of size and natural character, woodlands will be distinguished by a sense of enclosure, reduced natural light and restricted views. This leads to the fear that potential aggressors may be lurking and that entrapment and isolation from assistance may occur. Ongoing research has demonstrated that it is familiarity that allows the exercise of choice in the use of these natural spaces, when they might otherwise be considered risky environments. It is thus apparent that **urban residents are reading natural landscapes and places as if they were features of the built environment**. This tendency can be alleviated by certain design measures, notably the improvement of sight lines, views and permeability of natural areas. Reduction of hiding and entrapment spots along with improved lighting and high levels of maintenance, to ensure that incivilities are kept at bay, are other methods of making people feel safer and more in control.

Sensitive design and management of well-used natural spaces will encourage the perception that they are safe, especially where they lie on routes that generate free and frequent pedestrian flow. Apart from thinning out undergrowth, planting prickly shrubs, opening up views and improving lighting, not a lot more can be done to open spaces in design terms, without spoiling them. Certainly CCTV (closed circuit television) is an unwanted intrusion, except at access points and vulnerable areas e.g. children's playgrounds. Better management and security staff (see below), are the main ways to reduce crime in natural open spaces. The introduction of communal events and activities, e.g.: jogging, skating, angling, concerts, tai chi, cycle paths, football and other games, will all help to make a natural open space popular.

An example of how criminal activity can quickly flourish can be found at the new 'London Eye' on London's South Bank. Imaginatively designed, this Ferris wheel, erected for the Millennium celebrations, has attracted vast numbers of visitors (especially tourists), but also high numbers of unscrupulous, unlicensed street traders (vendors, tattooists, trinket sellers, ticket touts) and also pickpockets. This has led to "turf wars" between rival gangs, which has blighted the site. Although the police regularly patrol the area, they are powerless to act against the illegal trading because, although owned by the local authority, the area is classed as private land. All the police can do is prevent the obstruction, intimidation and fracas that arise. This is a good example of where good design cannot function without a supporting legal framework.

Parks and open spaces in the UK were traditionally patrolled by 'keepers' (which literally meant 'keep off' – the grass, flowers or bandstand); they kept public order and protected the surroundings from vandalism. Many keepers were formerly in the police or armed services. To save money keepers were largely disbanded a generation ago. But without figures of authority people felt unsafe, therefore security staffs are now making a comeback in the form of 'wardens' or 'rangers' (a friendlier and less negative name).

The Royal Parks in London also have their own police force. At the presentation, examples of practices for reducing crime in Hyde Park/Kensington Gardens will be given. This is of special interest as it is a very large area (253 hectares), in the heart of central London and was, until recently, accessible at all hours. Being adjacent to many tourist attractions and the major hotels, it has always suffered from being an area frequented for prostitution and associated activities. It is of interest that at the famous 'Speaker's Corner', where people air views on any subject, the emphasis has moved from politics to religion which has generated far more intolerance and violence.

During the past thirty years, the author has taken a special interest in London's Canal. This is an internal waterway which encircles most of inner London north of the River Thames, and part of West London (see appended map). Until about 1980 this stretch of canal was a backwater, relatively unknown to passers-by, hidden by hoardings, warehouses and factories. From the early 1980's it was opened up to public access for leisure uses, largely due to a scheme, 'Canal Way Parks', which was conceived by the author when he was Planning Architect for Central London, at the former Greater London Council (GLC). Since the opening of the towpath, use of the canal has increased considerably, for boating, fishing, cycling and walking. Indeed it is a traffic free pedestrian route across London. Unfortunately there has also been an increase in crime, which was evident from the start – especially vandalism of property and boats, burglary via the towpath, and graffiti. More recently there have been muggings and some horrific rapes. Other crimes include arson, illegal tipping, threatening behaviour and indecent exposure. This illustrates the problem that, whilst the presence of people in large numbers can reduce crime, attraction of small numbers of people can be fraught with danger. How to overcome this without destroying the character and ambience of the canal presents a dilemma similar to that for parks and other open spaces.

The British Waterways Board (BWB), which owns the canal, has tried to come to grips with the problem in collaboration with the Metropolitan Police (MP). This is examined in publication, BWB/MP (2000), that specifically deals with reducing crime by design related to the waterside in London. (An extract from the publication was appended at the Conference). The BWB/MP have recognised that the intrinsic nature of waterways, particularly canals, which have a limited number of access points, segregate them from their surroundings and thereby increase the opportunities for criminal activities. The guide is to advise local authorities, developers and their design teams of measures that should be incorporated into briefs and development. The purpose is to *“..... create safe, attractive and accessible waterside developments which conserve and enhance the waterside character”* and to *“..... reconcile the visual quality of a development with the need for crime prevention to create sustainable development.”*

Many new initiatives are taking place, including safety and crime audits, with recommendations for designing out hidden corners and introduction of ‘windows’ onto the waterway plus the removal of graffiti. The last item is very important because it gives an impression to visitors that the place is not cared for, and that anti-social activity is taking place unhindered. Unemployed young people are also receiving skill-training programmes on canal improvements, to instil a more responsible attitude.

The BWB/MP tables list problems encountered on canals and possible solutions. The guide provides excellent examples of good and bad practices, many of which could be used elsewhere in the public realm. These will be illustrated and described at the presentation of this report. The guide is very comprehensive, and its specialised bibliography is an excellent indicator of how much more there is to digest on the subject. It should however be remembered that a successful solution must be used with a degree of caution for it may not even be suitable along an adjacent stretch of waterway. Every site has unique qualities which safety and security measures must be tailored to meet.

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION

CCTV is now extremely popular in Britain and is often quoted as ‘the solution’. Security cameras are playing an ever-increasing role in the fight against crime, and are now routinely used in the private realm, and also the semi-public, e.g. railway stations, schools and hospitals. Assaults on staff, graffiti and littering, have dropped

dramatically where CCTV is installed; it has frequently been utilised in prominent cases of football hooliganism and abduction of children. In Britain it has been estimated that there are over one million CCTV cameras in use, about one camera for every 50 people, more than anywhere else does in the world.

European Union and recent British Human Rights legislation can place considerable strictures regarding privacy on the use of CCTV. Local authorities and other users therefore need to have proper codes of practice and procedures in place. One of our larger authorities, Westminster City Council, has a well-developed procedure manual that may be obtained on application (e-mail: lwoods@westminster.gov.uk)

New buildings, and their related public and semi-public spaces, are incorporating CCTV systems, monitoring who enters and leaves. It seems to be a defining characteristic of post-modern urban life and design. Undoubtedly, together with the zero tolerance policy, it has rejuvenated downtown New York, with a dramatic reduction in crime. Crowds have returned to once abandoned areas, e.g. Times Square, although urban design has played only a small part in this renaissance.

The use of CCTV is only as good as its operators and requires adequate lighting to ensure that offenders are identifiable. The more sophisticated systems can, however, also 'see' during the hours of darkness. CCTV is by no means the panacea; **it must be used as just one of a series of effective crime prevention measures.** These include visible policing on the ground; high standards of street maintenance and cleansing; clear street signing; minimal street clutter by extraneous items like advertising, bollards and guard railing; and responsible management by the occupiers of businesses along street frontages.

The author has earlier mentioned concerns over the privatisation of the public realm that may, eventually, dictate how this is designed and used. This is particularly relevant to CCTV, which is here to stay as one of the more effective crime reduction measures. Urban designers must therefore become familiar with its technical requirements; for example the dreaded phrase 'sight-lines', familiar to those working with highway engineers, will be a factor that could shape our surroundings in the same way as it does our highway junctions. Trees, street furniture, signs, planting, changes of level and direction, even temporary events involving staging can all block the line of sight of cameras. The technology, cabling and junction boxes all need to

be built into or onto the fabric, with implications for listed buildings and heritage areas.

CCTV engineers are well aware that their equipment can be vandalised and put out of operation by offenders and are taking precautions to prevent this. The fact that cameras are now being miniaturised makes them less intrusive aesthetically as well as less noticeable to offenders. The latter is not necessarily a good thing, because knowledge of the presence of CCTV can control behaviour. On the other hand criminals are known to wait until cameras are pointing away from their 'victim'. Clearly we are at a crucial stage in CCTV development, where it is almost becoming another public utility, like drainage, gas, water, telephone and electricity services. Designers need to be involved in this development.

ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING

Lighting is an important factor in controlling crime. As another report will focus on the subject only a few relevant points will be mentioned.

The quality of public lighting has surprisingly only recently been officially acknowledged, although its role in crime prevention has been clear since time immemorial. The author recalls that when he attempted to obtain research funding from the British Government in the early 1980s, to validate a fairly self-evident situation, he was told *"There is no indication that the quality of lighting affects crime levels"*! A news item last year in the magazine *Building Design*, with the title *"Home Office sees the Light"* indicates that this mindset has at last changed thanks to a review by our Institution of Lighting Engineers (ILE).

Two separate reports (ILE 1999) have now been prepared, by two criminologists: Dr Kate Painter and Prof. Ken Pease. Dr Painter commented in a press release: *"If it wasn't for architects designing-in crime I'd be out of a job"*. Pease concluded that *"Precisely targeted increases in street lighting generally have crime reduction effects..... street lighting improvements can reduce daytime crime as well as night-time crime, inviting speculation that lighting increases community pride, sense of ownership and surveillance; and the effects of lighting are more pronounced in chronically victimised areas"*.

The previous reluctance of the British Government to support research seems to have been motivated by the cost involved, although five years ago Painter found that

for each year for every £1 spent on lighting there was over £4 saved through crime reduction.

The author has found that in urban areas, white light is best because it shows the surroundings in their daylight colours and clearly illuminates the faces of other people. Light spillage from adjoining shops and other activities is of particular importance; metal shutters are notorious for creating dark fortress mentality frontages. Over-lighting should, however, be avoided as it can create a frightening effect. Subtle amenity lighting, and reflected light from the floodlights on buildings and trees, is of great value. A particular challenge for lighting is how it should be used to enhance safety without spoiling the attractiveness of a city (including blotting out the stars). Good management is again a vital issue.

MAINTENANCE

The importance of regular maintenance and cleanliness has been mentioned throughout this report, because it cannot be emphasised enough. It must be coordinated and continuous. Litter and graffiti must be removed quickly and repairs carried out to match the original materials. The presentation will include examples of good and bad situations in the public realm throughout the UK, together with a few examples from other countries. It is vital that the public realm does not lose its character through neglect, alienate citizens and visitors, and give encouragement to potential offenders because they feel no one cares.

The cleanliness of a place and its state of repair affect our attitudes and feelings. There is evidence that, by raising the quality and speed of maintenance, less wilful damage and neglect will occur.

CONCLUSIONS

There are no universal formulas or easy answers for making our surroundings safer. However design and management measures can be taken to reduce the opportunities for crime to occur. These measures must be tailored to local customs and culture and to social and situational controls. The curbing of anti-social behaviour and conduct by education is an essential concomitant; this applies especially to adolescents, particularly young men, who are responsible for most criminal incidents.

Information about research and practical experience is vital. Issues related to the physical urban environment and crime patterns need to be better co-ordinated and communicated. The use of the Internet for this purpose is clearly a valuable. The author has therefore introduced the innovation of a list of web sites and e-mail addresses as an extension to the conventional bibliography of references.

The emphasis in this report is that design and planning should improve natural surveillance, and increase the presence of people in the public realm. This seems to be the best way to improve communal safety and retain the civilised dignity and quality of towns. The ability to walk without fear, to see and be seen, and know you have been seen, is the key.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

British Waterways Board / Metropolitan Police (2000), *Under Lock and Quay: Reducing Criminal Opportunity by Design: Reducing Criminal Opportunities by Design*.

A guide to Waterside Development and improvement in London

Cowan, R., (1997), *The Connected City* Urban Initiatives. London

Cozens, P., Hillier, D., Prescott, G., (2000), *A Tale of Two Cities? Town and Country Planning* (March). London.

Cybriwsky, R., (1999), *changing patterns of urban public space: observations and assessments from the Tokyo and New York Metropolitan areas*.

Cities, Vol. 16 No. 4 August pp223 – 231. Pergamon. Great Britain.

DOE, (1994), *Planning out Crime* Circular 5/94. HMSO London.

DETR, (1999), *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. Final Report of the Urban Task Force.

Harrison, C., Burgess, J., Millward, A., Dawe, G., (1995), *Accessible natural greenspace in towns and cities: a review of appropriate size and distance criteria*.

English Nature Research Report No. 153.

Hillier, W., (1999), *Space is the Machine*. Cambridge University Press.

Home Office, (1997), *Police Architectural Liaison Manual of Guidance*.

Crime Reduction College, York.

ILE, (1999), *Guide for crime and Disorder Reduction through a Public Lighting Strategy* (Author – K Painter); and *Lighting and Crime* (Author - K Pease).

Warwickshire.

London Borough of Sutton, (1996), *Towards a Safer Sutton?* UK.

Newman, O., (1972), *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention through Urban Design*. USA

Oc, T., & Tiesdell, S., (editors) (1997), *Safer City Centres: Reviving the Public Realm*.

Paul Chapman Publishing. London.

Parker, J., (1992), *Shopping and Pedestrianisation*

Planning and Design for Security Seminar – Metropolitan Police and London Borough of Croydon. (April). London.

Parker, J., (1997). *Safe Cities 3: Relationships between Crime, Urban Insecurity and the Built Environment*. Council of Europe International Conference – Crime and Urban Insecurity in Europe: The Role and Responsibilities of Local and regional Authorities.

Erfurt, Germany. (February).

Parker, J., (1997), *Urban Environment and Crime: Some Pointers Towards Policies and Action*. Council of Europe, Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe. Strasbourg, France. (June).

Parker, J., (1998), *Design against crime : Journal of the London Branch of the Royal Town Planning Institute*. (Report on a talk given in October 1996) (March).

Petherick, A., Fraser, R., (1992), *Handbook for Practitioners*. LOTS. UK.

Power, A., (2000), *Social Exclusion*. Royal Society of Arts Journal No 5493 pp 46-51. London.

WEB SITES & E-MAIL CONTACTS

British Waterways Board. UK	http://www.britishwaterways.co.uk heather.clarke@britishwaterways.co.uk
Community Safety Group. UK	http://www.neighbourhoodwatch.org
Crime Reduction College. UK	http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk crc@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
Greater London Consultants. UK	glc@btinternet.com
Institution of Lighting Engineers. UK	http://www.ile.co.uk info@ile.co.uk
International CPTED Association. Canada	http://www.cpted.net/ ica@cpted.net
Living Over The Shop (LOTS). UK	ann.lots@ukonline.co.uk
National Crime Prevention Institution. USA	http://www.cpted-watch.com
University of Maryland. USA	http://www.preventingcrime.org
Urban Design Alliance. UK	http://www.placecheck.co.uk info@placecheck.com