CPTED: Past, Present, and Future

Opening Comments at the 4th Annual ICA Conference, Mississauga, Canada, Sept 20, 1999

Professor C. Ray Jeffery

These brief comments will introduce my analysis of CPTED as it developed, as it is currently viewed, and as it may develop in the future. It is my opinion that a coherent theoretical model of CPTED never existed. When I published the book *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* in 1971 it was a plea to study crime in terms of the science of ecology and a call for interdisciplinary research. Immediately after publication of this book other versions of crime prevention emerged. Newman’s *Defensible Space* was published in 1972, based on architecture and without criminology, ecology, or urban planning. The major concepts in Newman’s approach were territoriality, surveillance, image, and safe zones.

These ideas were picked up in the 1970’s by the U.S. federal government, private corporations such as the Westinghouse Corporation, and by academics. However, these efforts at crime prevention were based upon Newman’s concepts and not mine. Basic concepts of territoriality, surveillance, and access control came from Newman. There is no CPTED in the federal programs, in the training programs established by the National Institute for Crime Prevention, or in the efforts to prevent crime through environmental design. The exceptions are the few individuals who have emerged with urban design training, such as Patricia Brantingham, Sherry Carter, Gregory Saville, Richard Gardiner, and Paul von Soomeren with academic connections to ecology and urban design.

A CPTED model would be based on ecology, including biological ecology, social ecology, urban geography, psychological learning theory, urban planning, and criminology. It would be based on an Individual-Brain-Environmental model where individuals interact with the physical environment by means of the brain. The brain is the organ of behavior; all behavior is controlled by the brain, and the brain is created by the interaction of the individual with the environment. We cannot study the individual separate from the environment, or the environment separate from the individual. All crime prevention currently being carried out limits the problem of crime prevention to the physical environment.
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CPTED: Past, Present, and Future

Behavior is the focus of crime prevention. What is needed is a basic theory of behavior as found in psychological learning theory. Because all behavior involves the brain and is a product of genetic and environment interaction, input from the environment changes the structure of the brain which in turn controls behavior. Basic learning theory, called classical and operant conditioning, involves the association of a stimulus (environment) with a response (behavior). The two controlling principles are pleasure and pain, or reinforcement and punishment as they are identified in learning theory. A child learns that food or warmth are pleasurable, and that a spanking or falling on one’s head is painful. The basic message of learning theory is that pleasure shapes and controls behavior, whereas punishment does not.

A person will respond to gain pleasure, and behavior can be shaped in this way, whereas punishment creates escape and avoidance responses, aggressive responses, and learned helplessness. A person who is punished will become aggressive or will not learn new adaptive responses to the environment. Punishment must be immediate and certain. In the criminal justice system it is neither swift nor certain, and less than 10% of the crimes are punished.

Most of the principles of crime prevention are based on the punitive-revenge-deterrence approach found in the criminal law. We use surveillance to deter criminals since they have a fear of punishment; we use territoriality to say this property is defended and is defensible space. We put out signs such as “protected by a Sentry System”, or “protected by a .44”. We are not reinforcing a lawful response, but a punishing an illegal one. Punishment does not work, even a rat can learn to avoid a shock and to gain food (look at the picture of Azrin’s rat!)

As planners for crime prevention we must reinforce desirable behavior rather than punishing undesirable behavior. We must create environments that are healthy for the development of the infant, that stimulate brain growth, that provide a healthy diet and not toxic poisoning or stress, and that provide opportunities for education, family support, and adequate medical care in places of high infant mortality and child abuse. Greg Saville has described to me what he considers to be an excellent example of such positive reinforcement in the work of Gerry Cleveland, principal with the Toronto School Board. Cleveland’s work combines the physical aspects of CPTED in troubled schools, with what he calls the “affective” (emotional) environment, or how students with delinquency problems think about themselves, and how they interact with others. He even has them talking to the police about the causes of why they relate so poorly to the police, and why the police relate so poorly to them. In this way positive reinforcement can be obtained and pro-social behaviors can be created.

Urban planning must eliminate urban sprawl, poor housing, and crowded slum areas. This does not mean that the basic ideas now found in crime prevention cannot be applied, such as surveillance or access control – but they must be done within the framework of total urban planning. It does little good to target harden a convenience store located in a major urban area, while ignoring the development of a major highway a block away, or a large low cost housing development several blocks from the store. We must be aware of the role of the automobile in urban development, and the changes in ecological patterns from the pre-automobile city to the modern city dominated by major highways linking the central city to sprawling suburbs. Ideas like the new urbanism must be used to plan urban growth in a more ecological way, and to guide urban policy for the future, including crime as a major urban problem, something now neglected by urban planners.

[C. Ray Jeffery is professor emeritus in criminoology at Florida State University. He is the founder of the term CPTED and has served as president of the American Society of Criminology. He has published extensively and lectured around the world. He can be contacted at the School of Criminology & Criminal Justice, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, 32306]
A Review of Creating Defensible Space


A book reviewed by:
Gregory Saville, Henry C. Lee Institute of Forensic Science, University of New Haven,
Wendy Sarkissian, Sarkissian Associates Planners, Brisbane, Australia


Reading Oscar Newman is an exercise in tolerance – one must tolerate his individualistic approach and writing style to reach his substance. However, for those unfamiliar with his original 1972 book Defensible Space, this latest book is an excellent summary of the principles and tactics of an idea he created 24 years ago. Newman provides three engaging examples of how he has applied the concept in the field... From this perspective, Creating Defensible Space is a necessary addition to any planning and development library.

Newman uses the following 13 specific design strategies on three projects to create the “defensible space” described in this book:

1. designing out nebulous public grounds so that gangs cannot congregate;
2. defining semiprivate property by means of territorial markings, garden areas, and landscaping;
3. carefully selecting and training residents in public housing;
4. ensuring that older people and children seldom mix in public housing sites;
5. properly maintaining all public areas;
6. creating areas to reduce conflicts among different user groups (e.g., by dividing urban parks into sections for older people, children, and adolescents);
7. closing streets to create hammerhead cul-de-sacs;
8. clustering buildings into mini-neighborhoods;
9. establishing a minimum of 40 percent of permanent homeowners in a neighborhood to enhance local ownership of territory;
10. providing quality schools and local institutions in mini neighborhoods;
11. enhancing streetscaping, such as decorative lighting fixtures and benches, in semipublic areas of row housing to introduce a positive milieu;
12. reassigning public grounds in public housing to adjacent single-family properties to encourage residents to maintain these areas, and;
13. scattering 200 public housing units over seven sites, rather than concentrating them together.

Without question, all of these approaches are helpful for the designer or planner wishing to create defensible space. There is nothing particularly new about these strategies. Most have become commonplace in jurisdictions where Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is incorporated into the planning process, such as in Florida, British Columbia, Canada, and the Netherlands. However, CPTED is still not an accepted part of planning in many places. Thus, Newman’s book provides a good introduction to the defensible space component of the CPTED model (actually, Newman considers CPTED to be a component of the defensible space model, but one gets the impression that this is merely semantics).

Newman, however, falls into many of the same traps that he did in his original work – physical determinism, working in isolation from criminological research, and occasionally working in isolation from the community residents living the conditions he is attempting to improve. His latest work reads as though he has never even glimpsed at some of the latest research in the very field he helped create, although he claims he has. Thus, the early sections of the book appear to be more of a response to his critics than the articulation of anything really new.

“...In theory, there is no difference between theory and practise. But, in practise, there is.”

Jan L.A. van de Snepscheut
He claims “many social science professionals are quick to label my ideas physical determinism without having taken the time to think the matter through or to familiarize themselves with the origin of the term...I am troubled by my failure to communicate my ideas clearly.”

The consequence of this failure, he argues, has been that “a whole cult has sprung up around these misunderstandings, with its own pseudo-language, misbegotten concepts, and rituals”. The reader is left wondering who constitutes this “cult” and what these rituals are all about. One suspects he is referring to those (other than Newman himself) who have actually practiced and researched contemporary CPTED over the past decade. This leads to some vexing problems.

It is undoubtedly true some critics have misunderstood defensible space. But Newman doesn’t make it easy for himself. He continually asserts that defensible space concerns simply reassigning space so it is clearly demarcated as belonging to legitimate users. Here he lapses into determinism. For example, he claims that “…the influence of building height and number of units per entry…predicted the crime rate. Regardless of the social characteristics of inhabitants, the physical form of housing was shown to play an important role in reducing crimes and assisting residents in controlling behavior.”

This statement raises two issues. First, current research demonstrates that the influence of building height and units per entry does not always predict the crime rate. In some cases, such as in Vancouver, research in building size and crime (Bernard-Butcher, 1991) found the opposite to be true. Second, if the physical form of housing does play an important role, then this is a form of physical determinism. Which brings us back to two interesting questions about Newman himself. Why does he not include alternative perspectives from the field? And why is he loathe to call his work deterministic if, in fact, that is precisely what it is?

...Further, Newman does not clarify what he means by “crime”, other than broad statements about “robbery rates” and “felony crimes”. There is now a vast body of research about the impact of different types of crime on physical opportunities for them (Brantingham and Brantingham 1991; Clarke and Mayhew 1980; Clarke and Hope 1984; Clarke 1992). All of this research is directly related to contemporary defensible space, none of which is cited by Newman. Perhaps they are part of Newman’s “cult”?

Instead, Newman provides three case studies of his work: the Five Oaks community project on a two-family home subdivision in Dayton, Ohio (in 1991); the Clason Point, New York project on public row housing in the South Bronx (in the early 1970s); and the Yonkers, New York project on a dispersed, high-density public housing project (late 1980s). Each project used a unique set of design tactics to create defensible space. Together they do, in fact, provide some compelling evidence supporting the defensible space strategy...

All three projects saw reductions in crime and social problems, although it wasn’t entirely clear what the long-term effects were. Newman’s “evaluation” of the Yonkers project (101-107) amounts to a discussion with the police chief and the housing director. Even in the outdated Clason Point example, more recent data were not included. This makes the reader wonder whether Newman bothers at all with post-occupancy evaluations, as suggested by Marcus and Sarkissian (1986).

Compounding these issues are questions regarding implementation problems emerging in some of these projects...Newman reports that during public meetings in the Yonkers project, his recommendations were so controversial that “the vociferous elements in the city made it a practice to come and disrupt every such community meeting. In some instances, the police had to escort me out for my own protection. I stopped holding them (88).” As most planners are aware, adversarial groups frequently emerge in large planning projects. But a wide range of participatory planning and design strategies has emerged to help. Newman discusses none of...
Creating Defensible Space Review continued

these strategies, such as search conferences (Emery 1993, 1997; Emery and Purser 1996). Community building has much more to it than physical design modifications. This has long been documented in the planning literature on action research. Other practitioners have had great success with these strategies (Sarkissian and Walsh 1994; Sarkissian, Cook, and Walsh 1997; Sarkissian and Perlgu 1994; Saville 1995). Unfortunately, Newman does not city any of this literature. It is perhaps not surprising that Newman himself became a potential target for the very violence he was attempting to prevent.

Creating Defensible Space is a restatement of Newman’s 1972 book with three case studies. It is well written, at time very interesting, but sadly outdated. It stands alone as a summary of Newman’s personal work and should be read as such. That it stands alone is unfortunate. Despite his calls for resident cooperation and collaboration, Newman fails to practice what he preaches. His book is a product more of his highly individualistic style than of substance or research.

References:

ICA CONFERENCE 2000

Creating Safer Communities for our Youth . . . for our Future!

ICA members will head west to the beautiful Bay Area of Northern California in December for the annual conference. This will mark the first time in ICA’s history that the conference will be hosted on the West Coast.

The theme for this year’s conference, Creating Safer Communities for our Youth . . . for our Future, promises to offer engaging speakers and con-

structive workshops as we all continue to struggle with the challenge of creating and maintaining safer environments. While no one prevention alternative could have stopped the horrible school and workplace shootings and violence that have plagued our recent past in North America, organizations continue to grasp for new ideas and strategies that can prevent such tragedies. CPTED concepts and principles should certainly play a role in this international discussion and this year’s conference will undoubtedly bring attention to the issue.

In the interest of planning ahead for travel, the conference schedule is shaping up to look like this:

Wednesday, December 6
Registration/Check-in

Thursday, December 7
Morning - Local Site Visits
Afternoon - Opening Session & Workshops
Evening - Welcome Reception

Friday, December 8
Workshops
Evening - Optional Trip to New Science Center & Observatory

Saturday, December 9
Workshops & Closing Session
Conference concludes at 12:00 noon

The conference will take place at the Oakland Marriott City Center from December 6 through December 9, 2000. Oakland is located in the heart of the East Bay slightly east of San Francisco and sits at the northern tip of the Silicon Valley. When you are not conferencing, you can sneak away for quick trips to the renowned Napa and Sonoma wine country, first class shopping in San Francisco, as well as enjoy art and science destinations in Oakland – all the makings of a great opportunity to bring your significant other along! The typical average daytime temperature in December doesn’t get below 60 degrees and seldom dips below 40 in the evening.

The host hotel has guaranteed a special rate of $129 per night for conference attendees. Arrangements are most easily made by calling Marriott reservations at (800) 228-9290. When making your reservation, please reference ICA/CPTED 2000 to secure the special rate. Conference brochures will be mailed out in April. For general conference information, contact the City of Oakland at (510) 238-3301. To submit workshop papers and ideas, please contact Sandra Sanders-West at (510) 238-2922.
CPTED and Hotel Security in the U.S.A.

By Ray Wood, ICA director

One of the commercial building areas that is routinely overlooked for safety by architects is the medium income hotel property. While some corporations such as Marriott, Baymount, and Holiday Inn look on the property with an eye toward crime prevention we find others who are not concerned about safety but the aesthetics of a property. Perhaps that is why properties designed for weekly stays in the low and medium markets still place doors to rooms accessible from parking lots and in at least one company still use hard steel keys instead of plastic computerized entries.

Hotels have a duty to protect their guests. The design of a property will go a long way in deterring the average thief when confronted by a hotel that has the best interest of the guests in mind. These include interior hall entrances with one-way entry after darkness. These entryways should be visible to the front desk and other in house employees. Today’s market demands that employees are trained in crime prevention and at least a passing acquaintance with CPTED should be required (someone has to report that lights are out).

Card keys should be the norm and not the exception. The idea of this being too expensive is laughable in today’s marketplace. The liability of hotels that do not have card key systems in the United States is indeed well known but some owners just don’t “get it” and are the first to complain loudly and officiously when civil liability rears its ugly head after a guest or employee is the victim of their negligence.

Three points must be remembered in regards to hotel security. First, security is a part of design and must be viewed by all the stakeholders. Second, training is paramount for employees for their protection as well as their guests. The third is to pay attention to the obvious and profitability will result from guest satisfaction and security.

Publications


Designing Safer Communities, National Crime Prevention Council, 1700 K Street, NW, Second Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006-3817. $19.95 per copy + shipping and handling. (Website ncpc.org)


Notes from the Chair

The cyber revolution and CPTED

by Greg Saville, ICA International Chair

In daily life, it is easy to gloss over the importance of the new cyber reality of the internet. This is especially true for activities in the ICA.

When we created the ICA 5 years ago most of the planning had already occurred on email long before many of us ever met in person at the 1st Calgary conference. Today this tradition continues. The board of the ICA has begun a series of netmeetings, there is a healthy and vigorous debate about CPTED accreditation on our website, and ICA member Josh Brown has agreed to survey a CPTED panel on an internet listserv about whether standards can be established for training or accreditation.

At our most recent netmeeting, we welcomed Rick Draper, from the newly formed Asia/Pacific chapter of the ICA onto the board as an observer representative. Rick has already agreed to work with our executive director on enhancing the look and feel of a new ICA website. As well, the board discussed putting all upcoming newsletters into electronic form for cyber-mailout rather than regular mail, except for one issue of a compiled annual ICA "journal/magazine" which will be professionally printed.

Indeed, the internet has expanded our capacity to do many things. In my own work, for example, we have been developing on-line certificates and university degree courses in areas such as CPTED. Clearly the internet has changed many things about how we do business!

But the truth of CPTED is that it begins as an activity of the physical world, not the cyber world (though I have heard conversations recently how the two might be brought together to help prevent crime). It is unclear how the new cyber reality affects crime, and thereby our activities in prevention. It has been said the internet is a place of chaos. Thank goodness for that! Personally, I believe that a little bit of chaos can be a healthy and creative thing. It's like what makes a bohemian neighborhood so interesting as Jane Jacobs described in New York's Greenwich Village, or what Vancouver's Commercial Drive is today. But such chaos can also have an ugly side. Some of the recent school violence in the U.S. and Canada may also have an ugly side. Some of the recent school violence in the U.S. and Canada may well have been influenced by violent media images, much of which emanates from the internet.

Is it possible that we can bring a little order to the chaos on the internet the same way we try to in the physical world of CPTED - through territoriality and ownership? Healthy CPTED is that which not only helps reinforce the defensible space and territoriality of a physical area, but also provides incentives and opportunities for people to work together to prevent crime (without which, of course, there is no territoriality). It is no different on the internet. Web communities and chat neighborhoods can offer a similar kind of ownership over emerging problems in a cyber environment. Some of the tools to allow this to happen already exist; firewalls, passwords, and hostbot monitors. Rules of civility can be applied there as they can in physical neighborhoods. And there are many other possibilities.

The upcoming ICA conference in Oakland offer us the chance to discuss some of these possibilities. This year's conference has been shaping up to be a fascinating event. So set aside a few days in December to join us in the beautiful bay area in California to discuss this issue, and many others.

Brochures will be available from ICA headquarters, and the ICA website also has information. Get the word out. See you in December.
Planning for Prevention: Sarasota, Florida’s Approach to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Florida Criminal Justice Executive Training Institute, P.O. Box 1489, Tallahassee, Florida 32302. $2.25 per copy shipping and handling.


Safer Communities Edition, Planning Commissioners Journal, Timothy Crowe, Sherry and Stan Carter, Otis White and Anne Lust, Fall 1994 edition. ($10 per copy via website plannersweb.com)


Design Guidelines

A Working Guide for Planning and Designing Safer Urban Environments, Safe City Committee, City of Toronto Planning and Development Department, 20th Floor, East Tower, City Hall, Toronto, M5H 2N2. Approx $ 20 per copy shipping and handling.

Design for Public Safety - Saint Paul, City of Saint Paul Planning and Economic Development Department, 1400 City Hall Annex, ST. Paul, Minnesota 55102, Margot Fehrenbacher, Chief of Design, 612-266-6660.

Safescape, Dean Brennan, AICP and Al Zelinka, AICP, APA Planners Press, due out April, 2000. (Website safescape.net)

VIDEOS


Did You know . . .

⇒ The ICA website receives an average of 125 visits per week.
⇒ Today the ICA has over 300 members in more than 30 countries!
⇒ The ICA Board holds on-line board meetings.
⇒ The ICA headquarters operates on a budget of less than $1500 per year. This covers the cost of our website, postage, supplies, phones, etc.
⇒ The office receives in excess of 50 emails per week. (This explains why some of you get responses at 2 am)
⇒ Of the original 63 members that originally joined the ICA in 1996, more than 45 are still involved.
⇒ 100% of articles or letters sent in for publication in the newsletter are used. (Maybe you should send in yours?)
⇒ This year’s conference in Oakland will also see a number of new directors and a new International Chairperson being elected.
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Return by mail no later than May 26, 2000 to:

Sandra Sanders-West
Oakland Police Department
455 7th Street
Oakland, California, 94607

Speaker Names & Titles: ____________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
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Subject Matter: ___________________________________________________

Summary of Session (50-60 words):

Biographical Sketch of Each Speaker (150-175 words):
Speakers Form (Cont.)
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1.
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3.

Description of Presentation (200-300 words).
(Please attach)

Audio/Visual Equipment Request

Each room will have a minimum of (1) screen, (1) lavaliere microphone (1) table microphone and (1) head table. Rooms will be theatre-style (rows of chairs facing the front of the room).

Check additional equipment needed:

____35 mm slide projector(s)

____Overheard projector

____Additional screen

____LCD Panel

____VCR Monitor

____Other ___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Name of Speaker: __________________________________________________________________

Return with Speakers Form to:

Sandra Sanders-West
Oakland Police Department
455 7th Street
Past, Present, Future or Past, Present and Future may refer to: Islam: Past, Present and Future, a book by Hans Küng. Past, Present and Future, a book series by Nat Schachner. Past, Present and Future (1987), a book by Isaac Asimov. Past, Present, Future (Morgana Lefay album), 1995. Past, Present, Future (Tiki Taane album), 2007. Past:Present:Future (Chipz EPs), 2006, two-part extended play series. Past, Present and Future (Al Stewart album), 1973. Past, Present & Future (Rob Zombie album), 2003. Present Continuous Tense: This tense indicates the continuous nature of an act or event in the present and has not been completed. The activity has begun in the past and will be completed in the future. Example: She is preparing chicken sandwiches for breakfast. Present Perfect Tense: This tense is used to describe an action that had begun in the past, continues into the present and has just been completed. The time of occurrence of the action is generally not mentioned. This tense is also used to describe an action happened in the past before another action took place. Example: I have just co