



Prevention of crime — Urban planning and building design

Part 2: Urban planning

Vorbeugende Kriminalitätsbekämpfung — Stadt- und Gebäudeplanung — Teil 2:
Stadtplanung

Prévention de la malveillance — Urbanisme et conception des bâtiments —
Partie 2: Urbanisme

Publisher and printing

ON Österreichisches Normungsinstitut
Austrian Standards Institute
Heinestraße 38, 1020 Wien

Copyright © ON – 2008. All rights reserved!

No part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means – electronic, mechanical, photocopying or any other data carries without prior permission from ON!
E-Mail: copyright@on-norm.at

Sale and distribution of national and foreign standards and technical regulations via
ON Österreichisches Normungsinstitut
Austrian Standards Institute
Heinestraße 38, 1020 Wien
E-Mail: sales@on-norm.at
Internet: www.on-norm.at/shop
Fax: +43 1 213 00-818
Tel.: +43 1 213 00-805

ICS 13.310; 91.020

Identical (IDT) with CEN/TR 14383-2:2007-10

Supersedes ÖNORM ENV 14383-2:2004-04 (PRESTANDARD)

responsible ON-Committee ON-K 011
Hochbau-Allgemeines

National Foreword

This Austrian Standard has been published as Prestandard, since the European development in this subject field is still in a state of flux and further practical experience has to be gained. The users are kindly requested to send relevant experiences and suggestions in writing to the Austrian Standards Institute.

Therefore, PRESTANDARD ÖNORM CEN/TR 14383-2 has been already implemented in Austria and made available to all users of the standard.

English Version

Prevention of crime - Urban planning and building design - Part 2: Urban planning

Prévention de la malveillance - Urbanisme et conception
des bâtiments - Partie 2 : Urbanisme

Vorbeugende Kriminalitätsbekämpfung - Stadt- und
Gebäudeplanung - Teil 2: Stadtplanung

This Technical Report was approved by CEN on 21 July 2007. It has been drawn up by the Technical Committee CEN/TC 325.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

Management Centre: rue de Stassart, 36 B-1050 Brussels

Contents

Page

Foreword.....	4
Introduction	5
1 Scope	9
2 Normative references	9
3 Terms and definitions	9
4 Preliminary questions: the area, its crime problems and the stakeholders.....	9
5 Urban Planning and Design Guidelines	18
6 Process to prevent and reduce crime and fear of crime by urban planning and management.....	22
Annex A (informative) Crime Assessment – Examples of elements to take into account	29
A.1 Introduction	29
A.2 Risk assessment: three general aspects	29
A.3 Specific risk assessment factors for six types of crime and for fear of crime	30
Annex B (informative) Crime review - Problem identification in an existing area.....	34
Annex C (informative) Fear of crime.....	36
C.1 Introduction	36
C.2 Factors which characterise an "unsafe location":	36
C.2.1 Fear generating activities	36
C.2.2 Vandalism and bad maintenance	36
C.3 Problematic urban design.....	37
C.3.1 Lack of control	37
C.3.2 Isolation - lack of visibility by others.....	37
C.3.3 Lack of orientation and alternative routes	37
Annex D (informative) Safety audit framework of an urban project.....	38
D.1 The basic principles	38
D.2 Urban planning strategies	39
D.2.1 Taking into account the existing social and physical structures.....	39
D.2.2 Guaranteeing accessibility and avoiding enclaves.....	39
D.2.3 Creating vitality (blending functions and attractive layout).....	40
D.2.4 Providing mixed status (blending socio-economic groups, avoiding isolation and segregation)	40
D.2.5 Creating adequate urban density to allow vitality and natural surveillance	40
D.2.6 Avoiding physical barriers (due to infrastructures etc.) and waste land.....	40
D.3 Urban design strategies.....	41
D.3.1 Layout (continuity of urban fabric and pedestrian and bicycle routes).....	41
D.3.2 Specific location of activities	41
D.3.3 Time schedules coordination to guarantee continuous natural surveillance.....	41
D.3.4 Visibility (overview, sight lines between e.g. dwellings and public space, lighting, etc.)	41
D.3.5 Accessibility (orientation, space to move, alternatives routes, limiting access for non-authorized people)	42
D.3.6 Territoriality (human scale, clear public/private zoning, compartmentalization)	42
D.3.7 Attractiveness (colour, material, lighting, noise, smell, street furniture)	43
D.3.8 Robustness (materials e.g. street furniture, fences).....	43
D.4 Management strategies	43
D.4.1 Target hardening/removal.....	43
D.4.2 Maintenance	43

D.4.3	Surveillance (patrolling, camera monitoring)	44
D.4.4	Rules (for conduct of the public in public spaces)	44
D.4.5	Providing infrastructures for particular groups	44
D.4.6	Communication (of preventive messages and rules of conduct for the public)	45
Bibliography		46

Foreword

This document (CEN/TR 14383-2:2007) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN/TC 325 “Prevention of crime by urban planning and building design”, the secretariat of which is held by SNV.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN [and/or CENELEC] shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

This document supersedes ENV 14383-2:2003.

The status of Technical Report (CEN/TR) was proposed to give all countries the opportunity to compare experiences and to harmonise procedures.

This Technical Report is one of a series for the “Prevention of crime - Urban planning and building design”, that consists of the following Parts:

- Part 1: *Definition of specific terms*
- Part 2: *Urban planning*
- Part 3: *Dwellings*
- Part 4: *Shops and offices*

Introduction

Preliminary declaration

This Technical Report is based on the principles contained in the following statement:

We should contribute to an interdependent urban development and not generate privilege yet isolated areas, which by way of consequence could become exclusion area. The buildings should be integrated in the city and urban fabric.

We should ban any approach that take into account the security of property and not of persons, because this approach tends to generate security to the profit of groups and not of the population as a whole.

Indeed, solutions based on the development of safer areas within and opposed to the outer world perceived as a source of insecurity will lead to exclusion and enclosure. Social life, respect for public freedom, exchange and friendliness are not taken into account. These solutions most of the time involve discrimination through money and through investment and operation costs that are not accessible to everybody.

Crime and fear of crime as major problems

The European Urban Charter asserts the basic right for citizens of European towns to "a secure and safe town free, as far as possible, from crime, delinquency and aggression". This basic right to a safe community has been enshrined into many national and local crime reduction programs all over Europe.

The final declaration of an International Conference¹⁾ organised by the Council of Europe's Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE; Erfurt 26.-28. February 1997) stated: "that crime, fear of crime and urban insecurity in Europe are major problems affecting the public and that finding satisfactory solutions for them is one of the main keys to civic peace and stability".

The first recommendation from this conference was that local and regional authorities in Europe develop integrated crime reduction action plans, with continuing public involvement, in which crime reduction is included as a policy in all aspects of the responsibilities of local authorities. Such a plan should define the nature and type of crime to be tackled, objectives, timetable, proposals for action and be based on a wide ranging up-to-date survey of statistics and diagnosis of crime.

In this respect the CLRAE conference in Erfurt also stressed the importance to promote collaboration between the police and professional designers and ensure that police officers are specially trained to advise on the relationship between crime and the built environment.

1) Crime and Urban insecurity: the role and responsibilities of local and regional authorities.

Crime prevention and fear reduction by urban planning and building design

The Justice and Home Affairs council of the European Union (meeting 15-03-2001) agreed politically on the conclusion of the EU experts Conference "Towards a knowledge-based strategy to prevent crime" (Sundsvall, Sweden, 21.-23. February 2001). This conference concluded that "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), or Designing out Crime (DOC), has proven to be a useful, effective, very concrete and feasible strategy to prevent crime and feelings of insecurity, integrated in a multidisciplinary approach. Best practices regarding CPTED/DOC should be collected, evaluated and made accessible for stakeholders. This process should utilise a common framework of concepts and processes, and transferable principles should be identified".

This conference also underlined "as regards prevention of the fear of crime, that the fear of crime should be viewed and treated as a social problem in its own right".

Statements and recommendations about the collaboration between environmental design/planning specialists and crime experts are becoming more and more common nowadays in European countries. These statements and recommendations are based on assumptions regarding the inter-relationships between the physical environment and human behaviour. It is obvious that the results of urban planning and architecture do influence the choice of conduct and choice of routes of all people (young/old, woman/man, potential offender/potential victim).

Hence urban planning also has an impact on crime and fear of crime by influencing the conduct and attitudes of e.g.:

- offenders;
- formal guardians such as police;
- informal guardians such as residents surveying an environment;
- potential victims (and/or targets) of crime or victims of fear of crime.

A great number of experiments have shown that particular types of crime can be reduced by modifying the opportunity for crime in the built environment. Moving the night-time tavern crowd away from vacant storefronts after closing time will inevitably reduce the number of burglaries and vandalism incidents to the stores. Controlling the access into, and natural sightlines through, underground parking areas will increase the opportunity for offenders to be seen and caught. This in turn will reduce the number of assaults and car crimes in those parking areas. The list of successful opportunity reduction examples goes on. In Canada and the USA this has come to be known as "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" (CPTED, pronounced septed)²⁾.

In Europe the concept is also known as 'the reduction of crime and fear of crime by urban planning and architectural design'. In short, "Designing Out Crime"(DOC)³⁾.

²⁾ The concept of CPTED is also used in the world wide association of researchers, specialists and practitioners in this field: the International CPTED Association (ICA; see: <http://cpted.net/>).

³⁾ See also the European Designing Out Crime Association: <http://www.e-doca.net/> and the European Crime Prevention Network (Brussels): http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/eucpn/home.html.

There are numerous examples of housing projects where bad design has contributed to the general decay and decline of urban areas. Badly designed housing estates have been rebuilt with thought and consideration to diminish criminal opportunity. In many cases after the refurbishment residents have wished to return to the estates where before they had left as they feared for their safety. New estates and housing projects are now incorporating good crime prevention features at the design stage.

Shopping centres are another building category that is benefiting from good planning ideas. The siting of the centre, car parks and transport infrastructure are all being incorporated at design stage to accommodate good design features. Supermarkets are also adopting designing out crime measures to reduce both internal theft as well as crime committed by customers.

Researchers have identified reductions in crime following, for example, the introduction of design changes in large municipal housing estates. There is also overwhelming evidence concerning fear and the built environment, e.g. pedestrian subways, lack of surveillance, and particularly the level of lighting and dark streets. Similar parallels can be drawn with regard to vandalism. When questioned, offenders (and victims) of burglary, car theft and rape/assault, have all mentioned environmental/design factors. The research findings show that the feelings of insecurity of victims are clearly related to the very same features of the place that attract offenders to commit a crime.

No wonder more and more local and regional authorities in Europe are now insisting on planning applications showing proof that the principles of crime prevention and fear reduction by urban planning and building design have been adopted.

Conclusion

The conclusion from the literature, research and project – or policy evaluations can be summarised as follows:

- 1) urban planning has an impact on the different types of crime and fear of crime by influencing the conduct, attitudes, choices and feelings of e.g. offenders, victims, residents, police;
- 2) crime can be subdivided in specific types (burglary, vandalism etc.);
- 3) crime and fear of crime are different phenomena;
- 4) fear of crime is an important issue but it has to be separated from a much broader set of feelings people have about the whole of their living space and about the degree to which they feel deprived of a good social and physical environment to live in;
- 5) a securer and safer city or neighbourhood is the result of a safety policy aiming at the physical and social environment;
- 6) policymakers and practitioners should never focus on planning and design only. Every newly built neighbourhood, public space or building needs good maintenance. Planning/design and maintenance are thus two sides of the same coin.

This Technical Report combines 'contents' and 'process'.

- **Contents** refers to the question: which strategies and measures may⁴⁾ be implemented to prevent and reduce crime problems in a given environment.
- **Process** refers to the question: how to follow an effective and efficient procedure in which stakeholders should choose the strategies and measures most effective and feasible to prevent and reduce the crime problems as defined by the stakeholders.

4) Note the word 'may' (and not shall or should) is used deliberately here because the actual choice for certain strategies and measures can only be made by the stakeholders, and in the end by a responsible body.

The process is described in Clause 6 (for a summary see Figure 1). In step 3 of this process the stakeholders choose strategies and measures. To help stakeholders make this choice they may use the strategies and measures as presented in Clause 5 and Annex D.

Hence by adopting this Technical Report the process described in Clause 6 is adopted while the definitive choice of strategies and measures (see Clause 5 and Annex D) is left to the stakeholders and in the end to a responsible body (most often local and regional authorities issuing rules for urban planning, building/planning codes and permits) involved in a concrete plan for building, reconstruction or the management of an area.

Before the contents (see Clause 5) and process (see Clause 6) are presented, a preliminary set of questions is elaborated upon in Clause 4:

- the identification of the area (**where**);
- the crime problem (**what**) and;
- the stakeholders (**who**).