



LOWER TAYLOR CREEK RESTORATION PROJECT

ANALYSIS REPORTS

- A. Taylor Creek Project Area Public Safety Analysis (Seattle Police Department, 2013)

TAYLOR CREEK PROJECT AREA PUBLIC SAFETY ANALYSIS



July 2013

Early community discussions about the Lower Taylor Creek Restoration project brought to light many concerns and issues in the project area, including the potential for the public access at the site to result in negative neighborhood impacts. Concerns included increased crime, safety of children and other pedestrians on the private drive, and reduced property values.

This assessment was conducted to assess the potential public safety impacts of the Taylor Creek project related to crime, disorder, negative behaviors and police response. This assessment looks at the probability of certain criminal activity or negative behaviors occurring at the Taylor Creek project site. *This assessment is not intended to address vehicular or pedestrian traffic or traffic safety concerns.*

This assessment was prepared by Mark Solomon, Crime Prevention Coordinator, Seattle Police Department. Mr. Solomon has been a Crime Prevention Coordinator with the Seattle Police Department since 1990. He is a recognized expert in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). Additionally, Mr. Solomon served as an analyst with the United States Air Force for 26 years.

Other projects for which Mr. Solomon has provided CPTED assessment and evaluation include:

- Adams Street Boat Ramp
- Beacon Food Forest
- Beacon Hill Playground
- Beer Sheva Park/Atlantic City Boat Launch
- Benefit Park
- Bradner Gardens Park
- Charles Richey SR Overlook
- Cheasty Greenbelt trail project from 27th Ave S and Angeline Street - S Alaska Pl
- Cormorant Cove
- Emma Schmitz Memorial Overlook
- Hitt's Hill Park
- Hutchinson Field renovation
- Jefferson Park redesign
- Lewis Park
- Martha Washington park
- Pritchard Island Beach & Natural area
- Rainier Beach Community Center redesign
- Rainier Beach Urban Farm & Wetland

Assessment Methodology

This assessment used the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design - or CPTED- and examined SPD data to evaluate the likelihood of undesirable activities occurring.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

CPTED principles can be applied easily and inexpensively and have been implemented in communities across the nation.

"The proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime, and an improvement of the quality of life." CPTED as defined by the National Crime Prevention Institute.

There are four overlapping CPTED strategies:

1. Natural Surveillance

A design concept directed primarily at keeping intruders easily observable. Promoted by features that maximize visibility of people, parking areas and building entrances: doors and windows that look out on to streets and parking areas; pedestrian-friendly sidewalks and streets; front porches; adequate nighttime lighting.

2. Territorial Reinforcement

Physical design can create or extend a sphere of influence. Users then develop a sense of territorial control while potential offenders, perceiving this control, are discouraged. Promoted by features that define property lines and distinguish private spaces from public spaces using landscape plantings, pavement designs, gateway treatments, and 'CPTED' fences.

3. Natural Access Control

A design concept directed primarily at decreasing crime opportunity by denying access to crime targets and creating in offenders a perception of risk. Gained by designing streets, sidewalks, building entrances and neighborhood gateways to clearly indicate public routes and discouraging access to private areas with structural elements.

4. Target Hardening

Accomplished by features that prohibit entry or access: window locks, dead bolts for doors, interior door hinges.

Presented along with each of these CPTED strategies are guidelines which a homeowner, builder, or remodeler can apply to reduce the fear and incidence of crime and improve the quality of life (see Attachment 1).

Property Maintenance

In addition to the strategies above, property care and maintenance allows for the continued use of a space for its intended purpose. Deterioration and blight indicate less concern and control by the intended users of a site and indicate a greater tolerance of disorder. Proper maintenance protects the public health, safety and welfare in all existing structures, residential and nonresidential, and on all existing premises by establishing minimum requirements and acceptable standards. Maintenance is the responsibility of the owners, operators and occupants.

SPD Data

This assessment took into consideration 911 calls for service to the immediate area from January 2012 through July 2013. Specifically the study area included the 9800 – 10300 Blocks of Rainier, the 10000 - 10100 Blocks of 68th Ave S, and Holyoke WY S, Lakeridge Park/Playfield and Deadhorse Canyon.

Further, the assessment is based on 911 calls for service and anecdotal reporting/observations from area residents regarding crime, disorder and negative behaviors at other public spaces/parks areas in the South Precinct area and the immediate adjoining areas. These other green space park areas that were examined include:

- Adams Street Boat Ramp
- Beer Sheva Park/Atlantic City Boat Launch
- Benefit Park
- Cheasty Greenbelt Trail
- Ferdinand Street Boat Launch
- Genesee Park
- John C. Little Park
- Kubota Gardens
- Lake Washington Blvd Park
- Martha Washington Park
- Mt Baker Beach
- Othello Park
- Pritchard Island Beach
- Rainier Beach Urban Farm & Wetland
- Seward Park
- Stan Sayers Memorial Park

Public Access Options Evaluated

- No Public Access
- Viewpoint Only
- Scheduled Public Access
- Limited Public Access
- Open Public Access

Given CPTED principles, behaviors at the site are going to be driven primarily by design elements and user groups. To that end, the site design should consider the following:

- The intended users of the site.
- Activities encouraged at the site.
- What will physically be at the site (shelter, comfort station, tables, seating, picnic area, vehicle parking, walking trails, etc.).
- Access control of site (gates, fencing, hours of operation, enforcement of access control).
- Territorial reinforcement at the site; Fencing (type), vegetation (shrubbery, hedges, plantings).
- Natural surveillance of the site: good lines of sight from the adjoining residential properties; good visibility for users.
- Site maintenance.

Evaluating Neighborhood Concerns

Numerous concerns were raised by neighbors immediately adjacent to the Taylor Creek Project area regarding public safety impacts at the Taylor Creek Project site. These concerns, plus other undesirable behaviors that SPD encounters, are evaluated in the following sections and include:

- Drug dealing and drug use
- Prostitution
- Urban camping
- Nuisance activities (such as loud music, large group gatherings, fireworks, littering, and public drinking)
- Graffiti
- Property crime, including vandalism (other than graffiti), burglaries, and car prowls
- Concern: Person-to-person crime (includes various forms of assault that can result in injuries and death)
- Illegal dumping

Concern: Drug dealing and drug use

Contributing factors:

- Vehicle access and flow-through site
- Parking on-site
- Reputation (i.e. site known for availability and/or use of drugs)
- Convenient location
- Places to sit (e.g., benches)
- Absence of positive user groups
- Seclusion/low visibility

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to none. There is greater likelihood with Limited Access and Open Access options because more people are using the area, however, more people also deter the activity.

Rationale: SPD experience shows that drug usage and drug dealing at Seattle's public spaces, particularly in the southeast Seattle area, most commonly occurs when there is good vehicle access, parking, and the ability to exchange and use drugs in or near the privacy of a vehicle. Drug use occurs most often when there are places to sit (often in the vehicle) and there is low visibility of the usage, either because of park/green space configuration and/or dense understory of vegetation to conceal the activity.

The number of people using the area also significantly affects the incidence of illicit activity in public spaces. Substantial research has shown that criminals avoid well-used residential areas where their activities might be easily observed (Wolf, 2010).

The likelihood of drug dealing or drug usage occurring at Taylor Creek is low to none because:

- There will be no parking or vehicle access to the site.

- Park benches will not be installed at the site to protect habitat improvements and reduce maintenance needs.
- The site is not conveniently located and does not have a reputation for being a place to get or use drugs.
- The close proximity to homes and the private drive overlooking the site will have a discouraging effect since people will be easily seen.

Concern: Prostitution

Contributing factors:

- Vehicle access and flow-through site
- Parking on-site
- Proximity to major arterials
- Reputation
- Absence of positive user groups
- Seclusion/low visibility

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to none.

Rationale: Prostitution activity in primarily residential areas occurs most often in vehicles. The activity is influenced by privacy of a vehicle to conceal the activity and seclusion of the area in which the vehicle can be without being clearly observed. Prostitution is also influenced by the amount of people moving through the area. For example, well used areas like major arterials may have more visible street solicitation for prostitution, but the act itself may occur on a side residential street where there is less likelihood of being seen. Reputation of the area also plays a role. Some areas have been known to be spots where solicitation occurs, while others display evidence of where the acts have occurred, debris such as used condom, condom wrappers.

Similar to having a low likelihood of drug dealing and use, there is a low likelihood of prostitution occurring at Taylor Creek because:

- The Taylor Creek area and the surrounding neighborhood have no reported instances of Prostitution activity.
- The site does not have a reputation for prostitution
- There will be no parking or vehicle access to the site
- The close proximity to homes and the private drive overlooking the site, and the lines of sight into the project area will have a discouraging effect since people attempting to engage in acts of prostitution will most likely be seen.

Concern: Urban camping

Contributing factors:

- Proximity to buses/transit
- Proximity to social services, treatment (drug, alcohol) resources
- Proximity to businesses, food

- Absence of people
- Seclusion

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low. Greater likelihood with the No Access and Viewpoint options as there would be more seclusion at the site.

Rationale: Public spaces in Seattle that are attractive to urban campers and transients offer easy access to public support systems. These include, but are not limited to social service organizations, health clinics, even drug rehabilitation or drug assistance programs (methadone clinics). Further, urban campers need to access businesses and public facilities to access food and use the facilities. Urban camping occurs throughout Seattle, whether it's under an overpass in downtown Seattle or in a green space along I-5. According to the Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness 2013 One Night Count, on any given night, there are nearly 2000 men, women and children that are without shelter in Seattle. Of that number, the vast majority sleep in vehicles, in structures or under roadways. Only 3-4% were found to be within City parks or sleeping in bushes/undergrowth¹.

In the Taylor Creek Project area, Deadhorse Canyon would be a more likely environment for urban camping due to the large area and dense vegetation that would provide seclusion from surrounding homes and people that use the canyon trails. There was one anecdotal report of urban camping in Dead Horse Canyon from several years ago; however that was not able to be verified.

The likelihood of urban camping occurring at Taylor Creek is low because:

- The site is small and narrow, with homes in close proximity. In addition, the private drive overlooks the site. Further, the design elements would not provide for significant vegetation that would obstruct lines of sight. All of these elements increase visibility and removes the opportunity for seclusion.
- While there is a restaurant in the immediate area and a comfort station at Lakeridge Park, the site is not conveniently located to social services or a major business core to allow access to food or other facilities. Bus service also is no longer provided in the area.

Unlike other concerns where public access might increase incidents of unwanted behavior, fencing the site and not allowing public access could increase the possibility of urban camping. With the No Access and Viewpoint options, there would be less people visiting the site and the vegetation would be more densely planted, both of which offer greater seclusion. However, there is no current evidence to indicate that urban camping is a current concern in this area at large.

Concern: Nuisance activities

Nuisance activities are unwanted behaviors that reduce the enjoyment of the space for others users, but are not considered major crimes (although they may be illegal). Examples of nuisance activities include loud music, gatherings of large groups, fireworks, littering, and public drinking.

¹ http://www.homelessinfo.org/what_we_do/one_night_count/2013_results.php.

Contributing factors:

- Parking on-site
- Large open spaces such as grassy areas or pavement for people to gather
- Park facilities such as bathrooms, swimming beaches, trail networks, and picnic sites
- User Groups

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to moderate. Greater likelihood with Limited Access and Open Access options because more people are using the area, however, more people also deters the activity.

Rationale: Seattle’s public parks that offer amenities, like bathrooms, parking, seating and picnic areas draw larger crowds than natural areas. Large open spaces for groups to congregate can lead to disorderly behavior and reduce the enjoyment of the space for other users or for surrounding neighbors. Parking is a key factor for enabling nuisance behavior as people want to have BBQs and music equipment with them. Seward Park, Lincoln Park and Matthews Beach are examples of parks that experience nuisance activities more frequently than other, smaller City parks or natural areas. We can even look at the activity at Lakeridge Playfield and John C. Little Parks as areas that have frequent group gatherings. As a result, we have 911 calls for service and anecdotal reporting from neighbors of nuisance activities such as fireworks being set off, fight disturbances, loud amplified music, and public drinking. Neighbors to the lower Taylor Creek project site have observed nuisance behavior at nearby Lakeridge Playfield, which has parking, large open grassy areas, and Park amenities (picnic area and comfort station).

The likelihood of nuisance activities occurring at Taylor Creek is low to moderate because:

- There will be no parking or vehicle access to the site.
- There will be no park facilities so as to protect habitat improvements.
- The site, if open to the public, would be used for passive recreation only.
- Local, nearby neighbors are expected to be the majority of users. Without park amenities, the site will not draw visitors from the larger region.
- Open access will bring more users to the Taylor Creek site, but the type of activity that occurs at the site will be driven more by what space is available and the amenities for people to use.

Concern: Graffiti

Contributing factors:

- Open, non-landscaped spaces
- Solid walls or structures
- Visibility to large number of people

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to moderate. Greater likelihood with the Viewpoint, Limited Access and Open Access options because there are more people to see the graffiti.

Rationale: Among minor crimes, studies show that there is less graffiti, vandalism, and littering in outdoor spaces with natural landscape than in comparable plant-less spaces (Wolf, 2010). A study completed in a California community found that among 31 urban sites, 90% of the incidents of vandalism or graffiti occurred in areas without plantings compared to 10% in landscaped areas (Brunson,

1999). Additionally, SPD's experience has shown that graffiti is likely to occur in areas where number of people can see the artist's/tagger's work.

There was one report of graffiti having occurred in the immediate area (along 68th Ave S), most notably on a fence that bordered Lakeridge Playfield. The solid fencing and visibility to park users likely made the fence an attractive site for the graffiti. Graffiti could occur at the project site and on surrounding properties, particularly on open, blank spaces that can be well seen. Since most graffiti occurs overnight when there are less people likely to see the graffiti in progress, the number of visitors to a site does not necessarily discourage graffiti from happening; more visitors may encourage it.

The likelihood of graffiti occurring at the Taylor Creek site or the surrounding neighborhood is low to moderate because:

- The location and natural setting of the site does not promote visibility for graffiti.
- Large numbers of people are not expected at the project site if public access is allowed. The restoration and natural area plan is not expected to create a regional draw, meaning fewer eyes to see the graffiti.
- The site fences and signs could create a canvas for graffiti, especially if there are highly visible and solid surfaces. To deter graffiti, the project should use open fences and carefully consider if and how signage is used. Site vegetation should also reduce visibility of any solid surfaces.
- There is increased risk to the surrounding properties, especially if there is public access that brings more people into the area. Properties adjacent to the project site will have the greatest increase in risk for graffiti, especially if they have fences and other structures that are highly visible and provide a blank canvas. There are a number of measures that can reduce graffiti and other vandalism, including using vegetation as a barrier, using coatings that are easy to clean, and lighting at-risk areas.

Concern: Property crime

Property crimes are activities that damage private property, including vandalism (other than graffiti), burglaries, and car prowls.

Contributing factors:

- Level of engagement and vigilance among neighbors
- Maintenance of private property
- Visibility and lines of sight
- Amount of foot and vehicle access

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to moderate. Greater likelihood with the Viewpoint, Limited Access and Open Access options because there are more people aware of the area, however, more people can also increase observation and deter potential crimes.

Rationale: Property crimes such as car prowling and burglary are most likely to occur when a perpetrator can go unnoticed. Conditions that allow perpetrators to go unnoticed include: an absence of people to observe the area; neighbors who are unengaged, do not communicate with each other and are not vigilant to happenings in their area, and; by visual barriers and obstructions. Visual barriers can be created by fences, structures, and vegetation. However, vegetation and the presence of green spaces

adjacent to residential areas has been shown to create neighborhoods with fewer violent and property crimes (Brunson, 1999).

Review of SPD incident reports and calls to 911 indicate that residential burglaries are most likely to happen during daylight hours when the home occupants are most likely away at work. Conversely, car prowls in residential areas are most likely to happen in the late night hours when it is dark. At locations such as Seward Park, Lincoln Park, and Green Lake, car prowls are most likely to happen during daylight hours when there are a number of unattended vehicles in parking areas that have visible items of value in the vehicle.

Car prowls are the most likely property-related crime to occur in this area, as they currently are in any area of Seattle. Car prowls in residential areas or along major arterials such as Rainier Ave S, can be reduced by keeping cars free of valuables and other items that may draw attention, and parking cars in an enclosed garage (most secure option), or in a driveway or car port off the street.

The immediate neighbors of the site already have a strong presence on the private drive, communicate with each other, and are very observant. Reported incidents of property crime in the immediate area are low (relative to Seattle data), with one reported car prowls and one reported burglary along the private drive in the period January 2012 – July 2013. There were also reports of one vehicle theft and one burglary during that same time period along the 10000 Block of 68th Ave S, while at the restaurant (Pizzeria Pulcinella) there were three reported car prowls.

Property crimes can be further discouraged by property maintenance. A well-cared for property signals to potential criminals that the home is more effectively secured and policed by its owners (Wolf, 2010).

The likelihood of property crime occurring at the Taylor Creek site is medium to low because:

- While an increase in users to the site could increase the possibility that a visitor could be a potential perpetrator, we have no evidence to show that increases in visitation to a public park or green space has resulted in an increase of property crime to the immediate adjacent residences. That said, more people present at the site also mean more crime observers/reporters in the area.
- Car prowls should be deterred by the lack of parking at the project site, the availability of driveway parking for residents on the private drive and vigilance of the neighbors.
- The potential for vandalism and burglaries is reduced by neighborhood vigilance and the good condition of the homes and properties on the private drive. Similar to discouraging practices for graffiti, property crimes can be deterred with well placed lighting, open visibility to prevent areas of cover and concealment to try to gain access to a home or vehicle without being seen, by neighbor vigilance and communication with each other, and by immediate reporting of any criminal and/or suspicious activity.

Concern: Person-to-person crime

Person-to-person crime includes various forms of assault (including sexual assault) that can result in injuries and/or death.

Contributing factors:

- Most person-to-person crimes occur between people who know one another

- Drug/alcohol use
- Number of users at the site
- Seclusion/low visibility

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to none.

Rationale: The vast majority of person-to-person crime occurs between people that know one another. Often there is a domestic, familial, dating or friendship/acquaintance relationship. Often when a person-to-person assault occurs, the influence of alcohol or other substance is a contributing factor.

Person-to-person crimes between strangers are rare. In those instances where there have been stranger-on-stranger assaults (sexual/attempted sexual) in park spaces, they often take place in areas of seclusion where there is minimal foot or vehicular traffic.

Seclusion can be offered by vegetation that is visually obstructive and offers a place for perpetrators to hide. In urban settings, dense, low-lying vegetation and densely wooded areas are consistently associated with fear of crime and perceived safety risks (Wood, 2010).

The likelihood of stranger-on-stranger person-to-person crime occurring at Taylor Creek is low to none because:

- Seclusion should be minimal. If the site is publically accessible, vegetation will be planted to maintain sight lines through the site (no areas for concealment) and visitors will increase observation of the area. The close proximity to homes and the private drive overlooking the site also reduces seclusion and increases eyes on the site. Further, the more positive users at the site, the less chance for a perpetrator to commit an assault without being witnessed and reported.

Concern: Illegal dumping

Contributing factors:

- Vehicle access
- Seclusion/low visibility

Likelihood at/surrounding lower Taylor Creek: Low to none

Rationale: Illegal dumping most often occurs in areas where there is easy vehicle access and few people around to witness illegal dumping activity. An example where these conditions exist and illegal dumping has been reported is at the Deadhorse Canyon trailhead where 68th Ave S & Holyoke Way S meet.

The likelihood of illegal dumping occurring at Taylor Creek is low to none because:

- There will be no parking or easy vehicle access to the site.
- The close proximity to homes, the nearby arterial of Rainier Ave S, and traffic on the private drive creates a very visible space and does not provide seclusion for the illegal dumping to occur.

Neighborhood Impacts Conclusion and Recommendations

In general, many of the factors that lead to crime and nuisance activities in a public space and the adjacent community will not be created at Taylor Creek due to its small size, the nearby residents that overlook the site, the lack of a reputation for illicit behaviors, and the lack of vehicle access, park amenities and parking.

However, public access to the site, especially with Limited Access and Open Access may enable greater likelihood of unwanted behaviors simply because more people are using the area. Specifically, there could be an increased likelihood of nuisance behaviors, graffiti, and property crime if public access is allowed. The first and best way to deter illicit and nuisance behaviors is to have neighbors and nearby residents actively use and monitor the area and interact with those using the site. A basic principle of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design is that when public open spaces are activated with positive user groups and family friendly activities (empowered neighbors, families, educational organizations, faith-based and neighborhood groups), negative user group behavior is discouraged. In Seattle we've seen this play out with the activation of positive user groups and family friendly activities at Othello Park being crucial in dissipating negative behaviors. This was accomplished through collaborative effort between community groups, local faith-based organizations, Seattle Parks, Seattle Police and the immediate park neighbors.

If public access is allowed, SPU and Parks should investigate partnerships for site stewardship and educational opportunities with nearby neighbors, community groups, and schools so a positive presence is established at the site. The immediate neighbors already have a strong presence on the private drive, however, SPU and Parks should also encourage their vigilance of the project site and their surrounding neighborhood (e.g., a Block Watch program), as these efforts have been shown to be an effective deterrent of crime at the neighborhood level in other parts of Seattle.

Regardless of the public access option allowed at the project site, there are design elements and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles that should be employed, including:

- Increase visibility and reduce seclusion at the site. It will be important to create open sightlines through the site, particularly between three and six feet off the ground. Plant type and location will be well-planned and plants will be selectively pruned to maintain an open sight corridor. Care should also be taken to avoid creating hiding spots behind structures or creating view blockages.
- Make it easy for the police to monitor and respond at the site. In addition to maintaining sight lines, this could include building a vehicle turnaround at the entrance to the site to allow patrol cars to easily access and observe the site.
- Do not create areas for graffiti. Open style fences, like chain link or wrought iron, should be used for project site boundaries. Open view fences avoid presenting an open, blank surface that is a draw for graffiti, and also maintain sight lines into the area. Signs should also be considered as a canvas for graffiti and designed accordingly.
- Consider installing a trash can. While a trash can creates a maintenance need, it may be less staff time than that needed to pick up trash from around the site, which can also blow into the stream and lake. There are examples of "pack it in, pack it out" park sites in Seattle as well. During design, installing trash cans should be explored with Parks.
- Work in partnership with the adjacent neighbors. SPU and Parks should work proactively with the neighbors to monitor the site, discuss how the site is being used, and adapt management of the site and surrounding area as needed. Perhaps developing a neighborhood task force to assist in the

project design, implementation and maintenance would be a good way to establish a productive working relationship at the start of the project and set the stage for a successful habitat restoration site into the future that not only benefits Seattle's environment, but adds to the quality of life for the immediate neighborhood and perhaps the larger community.

RESOURCES

- The Trust for Public Land. 2011. The Economic Benefits of Seattle's Park and Recreation System (www.recpro.org/assets/Library/Economic_Impact/economic_benefits_seattles_parksrec_system_2011.pdf).
- Wolf, K.L. 2010. Crime and Fear - A Literature Review. In: Green Cities: Good Health (www.greenhealth.washington.edu). College of the Environment, University of Washington.
- Brunson, L. 1999. Resident Appropriation of Defensible Space in Public Housing: Implications for Safety and Community. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, IL.
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Human-Environment Research Laboratory. 2003. City Parks Forum Briefing Paper – How cities use parks to create safer neighborhoods. American Planning Association.
- Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness 2013 One Night Count, http://www.homelessinfo.org/what_we_do/one_night_count/2013_results.php
- 911 calls for service to the Sam 3 patrol area, January 2012 – July 2013
- SAFE SPACES; DESIGNING FOR SECURITY AND CIVIC VALUES, ASLA Security Design Symposium Abstracts, July 2004, Chicago, IL
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, General Guidelines For Designing Safer Communities, January 20, 2000, City of Virginia Beach, Virginia
- Public Safety, Park Watch; Copyright © 2002-2013 City of Palmdale, California, 38300 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550

Attachment 1: CPTED Evaluation Guidelines, Section VII. PARKS OR OPEN SPACES

National Institute of Crime Prevention, 3/31/2006

This guideline covers the factors to consider in the planning and design of a wide variety of public park areas and open spaces ranging from the small, compact park in a commercial area through the vast regional parks. The park layouts may range from highly structured and very formalized usages, e.g. tennis courts, baseball diamonds, shuffleboard courts, etc., to less formal areas for picnics, nature trails and just open expanses.

The crime potential for these areas can range across the entire spectrum of anti-social behavior, from petty vandalism through grievous assaults and mass disturbances. Physical planners and law enforcement personnel should be involved in the early stages of planning and design to introduce suggestions for physical features which might serve to prevent the commission of crimes and/or increase the ability of law enforcement agencies to respond in the event of a crime.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

The following list considers six major components of a public park or open space in which physical features might make a significant contribution to the prevention or deterrence of crime. The questions are designed to illuminate the crime prevention possibilities.

A. Street Patterns and Park Layout

1. Are adjoining streets planned to permit observation of park areas by regular police units or special park patrols?
2. Can an access street be provided through the park without destroying the character of the park? If full access for all types of vehicular traffic would be destructive, is it possible to provide for occasional patrol and emergency vehicles?
3. Does the proposed park require the closing of a major street with potential problems for other patrol activities?
4. Can the high volume park activities be located close to the patrol observation points?
5. Can buildings be located close to access roads to permit maximum observation?
6. Can access roads be provided to reservoirs and similar "targets" to permit maximum patrol observations?
7. Can access, or patrol roads, be laid out to permit efficient patrol and maximum observation of major park activities, buildings, equipment storage areas, reservoirs and other possible crime "targets?"

B. Parking

1. Can off-street parking be situated so that it can be readily observed from patrol and so that it does not obscure patrol observation of other park areas?
2. Is parking provided in a secure, well-lighted area? Is the parking for night activities located adjacent to the activity centers to reduce isolation? Is there adequate lighting of these areas?

3. Are parking stalls laid out to improve, not hinder, patrol observations?

C. Buildings

1. Are buildings located near regularly patrolled streets and in areas of high activity? Is the number of entrances kept to a minimum? Are entrances observable from patrol points? Are there means of gaining access to the roof? Can windows be reduced to a minimum without impairing park-like qualities? Are buildings well lighted?
2. Are restrooms located on the perimeter of the park or adjacent to patrolled streets? Can entrances be seen from the street? Are entrances unobstructed without blind walls and small access ways? Are restrooms well lighted inside and out? Are lighting fixtures tamper-proof?

D. Storage Areas

1. Are storage areas located on perimeters and close to patrolled roads to permit maximum observation by regular patrol units?
2. Is parking provided for equipment away from buildings and fueling facilities so that unauthorized vehicles can be readily observed by patrol units?
3. Is area well lighted?
4. Does landscaping permit places of concealment from patrol units?
5. Can chain link fencing be used instead of block walls?

E. Walkways

1. Are they wide enough to permit clear observation?
2. Are they adequately lighted if to be used at night?
3. Does adjacent landscaping provide concealment opportunities?
4. Can walkways be routed through areas where there are usually some people to reduce isolation?

F. Recreational Equipment

1. Can recreational equipment be located close to other activity centers to reduce isolation?
2. Can it be located close to patrolled roads?
3. Can it be secured at night?
4. Can the area be lighted at night?