



City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

MINUTES

1
2
3
4 **Regular Meeting**

March 10, 2016

5
6 **Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

7 1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at
8 3:06 p.m. in Conference Room #3.

9
10 2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Member Nicholson, Hawkes, Chair Liden

11
12 **Absent:** Member Thayer, Morrow

13
14 **Staff Present:** Kevin Thompson, Principal Planner
15 Nancy Sawyer, Ukiah Police Department
16 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

17
18 **Others present:** Susan Knopf

19
20 3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

21
22 4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the September 17, 2015 and September
23 24, 2015 meetings will be available for review and approval at the March 10, 2016
24 meeting.

25
26 **M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** to approve the September 17, 2016 and September 24, 2015 meeting
27 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (3-0) with Members Thayer and Morrow absent.

28
29 5. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

30
31 The DRB is required by the City Code to review and make a recommendation on all Site
32 Development Permit applications.

33
34 6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

35 **6B. City of Ukiah Zoning Code Amendment** revision discussion:

- 36 a. Revise parking lot tree shade requirement to reflect 15 years instead of 10 years;
37 b. Revise maximum fence height in the R-1 zone from 6 feet to 7 feet for consistency with
38 the building code.

39
40 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 41 • Staff is proposing a Zoning Code Amendment to the Planning Commission and City
42 Council to:
43 1) Change the parking lot tree shading requirement from 10 years to 15 years in the
44 R-2, R-3, C-N, C-2, PD, P-F zoning districts and AIP Ordinance; and,
45 2) Change the maximum fence height in the R-1 zone from 6 feet to 7 feet. This change
46 would make certain the Zoning Code corresponds with the recent changes to the
47 California Building Code. The California Building Code now allows 7-foot tall fences
48 without building permits. 7-foot tall fences are allowed in the backyard. A 3-foot fence
49 height is required for the front yard. All fences must comply with front, side and
50 backyard setback requirements and provided for in the UMC.
51 • The reason for the proposed code amendment change of 50% shade coverage in 15
52 years for parking lots is that the expected canopy cover of 50% in a 10 year period the

- 1 City has been requiring for projects is impossible and unrealistic. The 50% shade canopy
2 coverage in 15 years is the standard the City of Davis uses for projects. The City of Ukiah
3 has been applying the City of Davis shade coverage standard to projects.
- 4 • Requiring 50% canopy coverage in 15 years for new projects is not typically a problem.
5 However, projects with existing parking lots often have a problem meeting the 50% tree
6 shading requirement for parking lots and typically seek an exception where based on the
7 design of the parking lot, a reduced number of trees may be approved through the
8 discretionary review process.
 - 9 • It may be the shade requirement of 50% coverage is inappropriate for projects with
10 existing parking lots in that it may be too burdensome. Because 50% canopy coverage is
11 difficult for applicants to do for projects with existing parking they seek exceptions from
12 the zoning code requirement in this regard. Cited the new World Gym where the former
13 Ukiah Daily Journal operated as an example of a project with an existing parking lot that
14 could not meet the 50% shade coverage requirement for the parking lot and therefore, an
15 exception was requested. In order to comply with the 50% shade coverage requirement,
16 the applicant would have had to tear up his parking lot and this would have been
17 burdensome and not cost effective.
 - 18 • Asked the DRB if there is support for having a different standard for projects with existing
19 parking lots. Finds it important, however, that applicant be able to provide for some level
20 of landscaping for projects with existing parking lots even though he/she cannot meet the
21 zoning code requirements.
 - 22 • It may be necessary to look more closely at projects with existing parking lots that cannot
23 meet the 50% shade coverage requirement due to the design of the parking lot and/or
24 parcel constraint to determine how such projects should be treated with regard to
25 compliance with the City's parking lot shade requirement. Should we continue to allow
26 exceptions or should we develop separate standards for projects with existing parking
27 lots.
 - 28 • As it is now, a request for an exception to the 50% shade coverage requirement can
29 actually act as a tool giving the City some leverage to ask for as much landscaping/trees
30 as possible for a particular project even though the project cannot meet the standard.
 - 31 • Recommends further review of how projects should be looked at that have existing
32 parking lots. Should we continue to allow exceptions and ask for more landscaping where
33 feasible on a case-by-case basis or establish standards that are more realistic for
34 projects with existing parking lots?
35

36 **Susan Knopf:**

- 37 • Would conformance with the parking standards mean less parking or is it the rules
38 require more landscaping than they use to?
39

40 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 41 • The parking requirement would remain the same. It is just the 50% landscaping coverage
42 for projects with existing parking lots cannot be met in all cases without modification to
43 the parking lot. Parking lots with 12 or more parking stalls are required to have a tree
44 placed between every 4 parking stalls within a continuous linear planting unless clearly
45 infeasible. If clearly infeasible, the applicant typically asks for relief from the requirement
46 where the Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission has the discretion to reduce the
47 number of trees required.
48

49 **Member Nicholson:**

- 50 • Without some sort of a shade coverage requirement applicants could say that compliance
51 is 'just too much trouble' and infeasible. While it may be impractical for the Zoning
52 Administrator or Planning Commission to possibly reduce the number of trees required
53 via an exception having a standard does provide for a tool to get some landscaping for a
54 project.
55

1 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 2 • Agrees with the aforementioned statement where the idea is to possibly consider having
3 a different standard for projects with existing parking lots. What typically occurs is the
4 applicant cannot meet the standard and asks for an exception. The question is should we
5 continue with this process or establish set standards for projects with existing parking
6 lots.
7 • It may be we should continue to allow for exceptions and ask for as much landscaping as
8 possible for a particular project.
9

10 There was DRB/staff discussion concerning changing the parking lot tree shading requirement
11 from 10 years to 15 years and what is the best approach to take for projects with existing parking
12 lots where exceptions to the 50% standard is what typically occurs.
13

14 **Member Nicholson:**

- 15 • New developments may have an issue with having to do something different than
16 what existing developments have to do for parking lots.
17

18 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 19 • Acknowledged there is a difference between new development versus existing
20 development where the same rules may not really apply because the project type/project
21 characteristics are different.
22

23 **DRB:**

- 24 • Is fine with changing the maximum fence height in the R-1 zone from 6 feet to 7 feet.
25 • Is fine with the 50% shade coverage over all paved areas within 15 years standard but it
26 may be important to have a discussion and provide more information about the
27 application of the 50% shade coverage requirement for projects with existing parking lots
28 to either continue to allow exceptions or establish set standards.
29

30 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 31 • It may be more discussion is necessary concerning parking lot shading for projects
32 with existing parking lots and will look further into the matter.
33

34 **6A. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)** presentation from Nancy
35 Sawyer Community Services Officer Ukiah Police Department.
36

37 **Nancy Sawyer, Community Service Officer, UPD:**

- 38 • Is a certified international crime prevention specialists.
39 • Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a methodology that relates
40 to planning and design in that it directly addresses the relationship between the physical
41 environment and the incidence of crime.
42 • Advocates of CPTED see this concept as a way to improve safety in a community by
43 providing a physical environment that promotes positive behavior and deters criminal
44 activity.
45 • While interpretation and implementation vary, the rise of community policing efforts
46 solidify CPTED's role in planning and community development.
47 • Provided an overview about her experience in applying the methodology of CPTED in the
48 community and her role in the process thereof and cited examples of businesses that
49 participated in the effort to deter criminal activity and what measures were taken.
50 • CPTED recommends having a design and plan review processes in place.
51 • CPTED has design recommendations for residential, commercial and other facility types.
52 • CPTED provides for landscaping recommendations that suggest planting and selection of
53 landscape materials be included such that sight lines remain open and clear and places
54 of concealment are not fostered/encouraged. Keep shrubs trimmed to three feet or at

1 least below window sills, particularly if safety is an issue. Prune the lower branches of
2 trees to at least seven feet off the ground. If graffiti is a problem, consider thorny
3 landscape plants as a natural barrier to deter unwanted entry. Use of vines or planted
4 wall coverings help to deter graffiti. Important to note that blank walls may be an invitation
5 to graffiti vandals. Provide for landscaping/fencing that do not create hiding places.
6 Provide for attractive and durable fencing materials where feasible.
7

8 The following attachments are included in the minutes:

- 9 1. Email from Alan Nicholson, dated February 21, 2016, Attachment 1;
- 10 2. Letter from Pinky Kushner, dated March 5, 2016, Attachment 2.
- 11 3. Email from Lynda Myers, dated February 4, 2016, Attachment 3.
- 12 4. Small Retail Business Security Survey Assessment Form, Attachment 4. (This form is
13 used to help small business assess how they operate in the event they are interested
14 in suggestive and corrective measures to help prevent crime through environmental
15 design efforts)
- 16 5. Handout, What is CPTED?, Attachment 5.

17
18 **DRB:**

- 19 • The DRB looks at projects from a design and aesthetics perspective.
- 20 • Finds that while CPTED has merit where the objective is to provide outreach to the
21 community as an educational program to control crime through the use of strategies
22 pertinent to natural surveillance, natural access control, territorial reinforcement and
23 maintenance (attachment 1 of the staff report - General Guidelines for Designing Safer
24 Communities), does nothing really to prompt and enhance the aesthetics of the community
25 as it relates primarily to landscaping and corresponding landscaping features.

26
27 **Member Nicholson:**

- 28 • Read an excerpt from his email to staff, dated February 21, 2016:
29 'It is understandable that law enforcement is concerned with 'natural surveillance'
30 concepts for keeping intruders under observation. In support of law enforcement, it is
31 important to continue their outstanding outreach and educational initiatives. A one-page
32 handout placed in City Hall next to the approved tree list briefing those interested in the
33 highlights of this program would seem appropriate, not legislating a confusion design
34 policy that the City would be hard pressed to implement'

35
36 **Nancy Sawyer:**

- 37 • Acknowledged maintaining aesthetics is very important particularly if a business, such as
38 the World Gym project, is thinking of applying CPTED landscaping design standards.
- 39 • Important for the community to understand CPTED is a concept that may be helpful if
40 certain methodologies are considered and/or applied.

41
42 **Chair Liden:**

- 43 • Has experienced vandalism to his business and finds this to be an issue in the
44 community.

45
46 **Susan Knopf:**

- 47 • Finds that lighting in the community is too bright and cited some examples.
- 48 • Would like to see that lighting fixtures/systems be shielded and downcast so as not to
49 spill out onto adjacent properties.
- 50 • The NWP Rail Trail is too brightly lit.
- 51 • Sees the value in applying environmental design concepts to deter crime.

52
53 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 1 • Related to lighting, we ask that all lighting for projects be shielded and downcast in
2 conformance with the International Dark Sky Association standards.
3

4 **Nancy Sawyers:**

- 5 • CPTED recommends pathways be clear and to highlight entryways without creating
6 harsh effects or shadowy hiding places.
7 • Related to lighting systems, such systems should provide night time vision for motorists
8 to increase the visibility of pedestrians, other vehicles and objects that should be seen
9 and avoided. Important to design lighting systems for pedestrians, homeowners and
10 business people to make certain pedestrians see one another and the ability to see
11 clearly when walking at night. Design lighting systems which will enhance the ability for
12 surveillance and observation and provide lighting systems that minimize glare, shadow,
13 light pollution and light trespass. Lighting can be used in landscaping for security and
14 aesthetics.
15

16 **Principle Planner Thompson:**

- 17 • No action is necessary from the DRB concerning the aforementioned presentation.
18

19 **DRB:**

- 20 • Supports the importance of providing for a safer community and with taking security
21 precautionary measures such that the information introduced by Nancy Sawyer is
22 valuable.
23 • It may be more discussion concerning ways to look at crime prevention though
24 environmental design would be useful.
25

26 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

27
28 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

29
30 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

31 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, April 14, 2016.
32

33 Staff inquired whether the DRB would be interested in attending a special meeting Thursday,
34 March 17, 2016 for review of the Mutt Hut accessory building project.
35

36 DRB would be amenable to attending the March 17, 2016 special meeting.
37

38 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

39 The meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.
40
41

42 _____
43 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Michelle Johnson

From: Alan Nicholson <alan@andesignstudio.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2016 8:30 PM
To: Michelle Johnson
Cc: Kevin Thompson
Subject: Letter to DRB for 2-25-16 meeting
Attachments: Notes on Environmental Crime Prevention.pdf

Hi Michelle,

Thank you for getting out the review materials for this week's Design Review Board. I am looking forward to the presentation with Nancy Sawyer in Community Services, and the other items on the agenda.

I am not clear about what the end objectives are for the Community Surveillance design initiative, and my comments attached may be irrelevant, but after reading through the Guidelines, I found some responses that I felt a need to express. I hope this may become part of the ongoing dialog.

Anyway, I look forward to the meeting, and thanks again,

Alan

alan nicholson Design Studio
PO Box 577
3201 Mill Creek Road
Talmage CA 95481
p. 707 972 8879
f. 707 462 1045
e. alan@anDesignStudio.com

Some thoughts on a proposal for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

Design Review Board Meeting, Feb. 25, 2016

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is based on idea that the proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the incidence and fear of crime, and an improvement in the quality of life.

In the United States, and the rest of the world, the most desirable communities to live in have not advanced because a fear of crime was the driving component. Quality of life is typically rated based on many elements; unemployment, crime, the economy, and income growth, the cost of living, as well as well as recreational and cultural opportunities. A vibrant downtown and a walkable, pedestrian friendly city have been cited at community design charrettes for decades as being near the top of priorities for the citizens of Ukiah. This current proposal is simplistic and lacks any sense of comprehensive inquiry into principles enhancing a positive quality of life in this community.

Rather than frame the discussion in terms of "Natural Surveillance", the discussion is really about encouraging and bringing the public into the community. Security is in creating places where people are comfortable and do gather, as it is well documented that the safest public places are where more people are, rather than how well-lit or open the visibility is. The new Rail Trail is an example of decreasing the attractiveness of this area for homeless camping.

Any tour of Ukiah will illustrate how impractical and incongruous a civic regulation concerning limitations in height and shape of plant material or night lighting would be. Most planners and design professionals will speak of scale, proportion, color, texture, and form when addressing the relationship of landscaping and buildings, that is to say, aesthetics. Security is but one design element of many and is not exclusively or necessarily at the top of the list. Community planning, building design and landscaping are relative to the context in which it is intended and designed for.

Making safe spaces that draw the public into them takes experience, expertise, intuition and creativity. Every illustration promoting safe design in the proposed guidelines is a lonely, bleak landscape that discourages community communication and celebrating public interaction. If you look at the photos the message is about curating surveillance security, not building people friendly community spaces.

There are many different types of urban spaces. There are civic spaces such as City Hall, parks, schools. There are retail and dining destinations, service business', hospitality functions, residential neighborhoods, etc. There are many different street types with different scale buildings and different automobile and pedestrian functions. In short, a one design solution is inadequate for planning for the diverse conditions of our city.

It is understandable that law enforcement is concerned with "natural surveillance" concepts for keeping intruders under observation. In support of law enforcement, it is important to continue their outstanding outreach and education initiatives. A one-page handout placed in City Hall next to the approved tree list, and briefing those interested in the highlights of this program would seem appropriate, not legislating a confusing design policy that the City would be hard pressed to implement.

Respectfully,

Alan Nicholson

March 5, 2016

TO: The Design Review Board
FROM: Pinky Kushner

RE:

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, a document for consideration of approval by the Design Review Board

COMMENTS:

The source for this document is Virginia Beach, which is described in Wikipedia---

"Virginia Beach is an independent city located in the U.S. state of Virginia. As of the 2010 census, the population was 437,994.[3] In 2013, the population was estimated to be 448,479.[4] Although mostly suburban in character, it is the most populous city in Virginia, having grown larger than the more urban neighboring city of Norfolk, and is the 39th most populous city in the United States."

There is a huge difference between Ukiah, California 'Gateway to the Redwoods' and Virginia Beach. Recommendations for Virginia Beach, VA, a beach community and a big weekend party destination, are antithetical to the small community of Ukiah. Safety in a community like Ukiah is best improved by knowing and interacting with one's neighbors and police force.

Particularly revealing in the document are the illustrations, featuring a car, in front of a house or a school, and no people at all. Many people walk in Ukiah and leave their cars at home. If one were walking along a street, for instance, any street, my street in Ukiah, Oak St., I know that the best protection I have from crime is knowing and befriending my neighbors. Moreover, Ukiah's new community out-reach efforts by the Police Department into the neighborhoods encourage interactions with the Police and, importantly, neighbor to neighbor. This is the sort of 'crime prevention' tactic that works here in Ukiah.

Some specific points for discussion:

1. The document does not take into account the weather in Ukiah, the mild winters and the very hot summers. Without vegetation, especially trees near the sidewalk, the neighborhoods become sterile, unpleasant routes for walking, biking, and getting to know your neighbors.
2. The document also does not take into account the proximity of nature to even the center of town in Ukiah. We have all seen bluebirds on School Street. What provisions does the document have to accommodate birds and bugs (for instance, butterflies)?

3. Especially disturbing is the section in the document on lighting. Lighting for security is a double-edged sword. Lights can be blinding at night and decrease visibility---think about a car with bright headlights on, moving toward you. Or think about walking on a dim street and suddenly having a motion-sensitive bright 'security light' go on. In that situation, one's eyes have accommodated to the night and then suddenly are blinded, and one cannot see for some time/distance afterwards.

Night lighting that is not downward shielded removes the possibility of seeing stars at night. Disrupting circadian rhythms with night lighting increases the incidence of diseases such as cancer.

Ukiah is presently having a real night-lighting problem. The newly opened rail trail is lighted by lights that are downward directed but not *sidewise* shielded. These new lights, presumably expensive ones, send out blinding lateral light scatter at night to users of the trail. A big mistake. Moreover, I know of one new LED light that was installed on Todd Road near Todd Grove Park, that caused such problems that the home-owner was blinded with such lateral light scatter that she could not see her front stairs, even with her own porch light on. To modify the problem, it took two city workers to shield and re-direct the new light so that it was acceptable. Even now, however, the light is still dangerously bright.

Outdoor lighting should be downward shielded and laterally restricted. For more on the topic of lighting, see <http://www.flagstaffdarkskies.org>. The Planning Department has been very careful to demand fully shielded lighting on new construction. The Electric Department has yet to accept fully shielded lighting as beneficial to community safety.

In summary, crime-prevention is worthwhile. Moving forward with crime prevention *only* as the goal is not appropriate and can cause other problems. For the most part, crime comes from people at the bottom of our community. These needy persons need to be helped, but not by making the Ukiah community look like a prison yard.

Sincerely,

Pinky Kushner
504 N. Oak St.
Ukiah, CA
510 459-8289

Nancy Sawyer

From: Lynda Myers <lmyers@pacific.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Nancy Sawyer
Subject: Business Watch - interest @168 Washington Ave.

Dear Officer Sawyer,

I would like to thank you for your advice about trimming back some of the bushes, and other changes, at 168 Washington Ave. to discourage vandalism, theft, and trash left by transients. Since the bushes were trimmed, and the other changes made, we have had no more evidence of transients sleeping in the area, no more thefts, and less trash thrown on the property. The trash we still have seems to be tossed by people walking by, and we would like any additional advice you have for us on that issue.

I saw information about a Business Watch program on the Ukiah Police Dept. website, after reading Chief Dewey's article in yesterday's Ukiah newspaper. While I am the owner of the building at 168 Washington Ave., I do not have a business there. I have six tenants, and I would like each of them to receive information about the Business Watch program, if you think that is appropriate. The tenants do look out for each other now, to some extent, but the varying work hours keep some of them from seeing each other on a regular basis. For example, one tenant only works in the evenings (she is a marriage and family counselor, who also has a day job), and one tenant, an artist, often works on weekends.

Another reason I would like to encourage them to join the Business Watch, is to partner with other businesses in the area. If it is possible, I would also be interested in partnering with the owner(s) of the apartments across the street, as well as the owner(s) of the empty lot and the abandoned building and home rental just East of my property, as well as other business owners in the area, to work on ways to keep our sites cleaner, more attractive, and safer. If possible, I would like to include the residents of the homes North of my property in the discussion, as well, since I can see that they also deal with graffiti and trash.

Thank you for your help and guidance.

Sincerely,

Lynda Myers
lmyers@pacific.net
(707) 462-7192

- Keep as little cash as possible in the ATM and remove the cash when the business is unattended.
- Do the following if the ATM is located outside the business: use a bolt-down kit in addition to ground bolts, keep the surrounding area well lighted at night, install firmly-cemented bollards around the ATM to prevent a vehicle from hitting it, and install a motion-activated alarms and cameras.

SMALL RETAIL BUSINESS SECURITY SURVEY ASSESSMENT FORM

Business name _____

Owner's or manager's name, phone number, and e-mail address _____

Address _____

Check items that need attention and suggest corrective measures in the space below or on a separate page.

1. DOORS

- a. Single entry doors
- b. Double entry doors
- c. Deadbolt locks
- d. Hardware (sensors, locks, latch guards, etc.)
- e. Visibility (doors clear of signs)
- f. Height marks next to egress doors
- g. Bollards

2. WINDOWS AND OTHER OPENINGS

- a. Locking means (primary and secondary)
- b. Glass strength
- c. Visibility (panes clear of signs)
- d. Other openings and roof access secured
- e. No access through common walls and attic

3. LIGHTING

- a. Exterior
- b. Interior

4. UTILITIES

- a. Electric power
- b. Telephone lines

5. LANDSCAPING

- a. Bushes trimmed to less than 3 ft.
- b. Tree canopies trimmed to at least 8 ft.
- c. Not blocking lights or cameras
- d. Backflow preventers
- e. Decorative rocks

6. SIGNS

- a. No loitering or trespassing
- b. Towing unauthorized vehicles
- c. Alcoholic beverage sales
- d. Code of conduct
- e. Surveillance camera warning
- f. Minimal cash and employee safe access
- g. No hats, hoods, or sunglasses
- h. No scavenging

7. PROPERTY CONDITION

- a. Address numbers at least 12-in. high and visible from the street and alley
- b. No graffiti, trash, junk, etc.
- c. Outside refuse and recyclable material containers, dumpsters, and container enclosures locked
- d. Property defined by fences and walls
- e. Secure gates
- f. Secure outdoor storage

8. SECURITY MEASURES

- a. Entry and exit control
- b. Burglar and panic alarms
- c. Watch dogs
- d. Security personnel
- e. Employee badges
- f. Cameras
- g. Mirrors and office windows
- h. Secure office equipment
- i. Security gates and shutters for windows and doors
- j. Property identification and inventory
- k. Company vehicle parking
- l. Key control
- m. Cash handling and control
- n. Safes
- o. Letter of Agency
- p. Cashier protection
- q. Drive-through windows
- r. Back- and side-door peepholes or cameras
- s. ATM installation

What is CPTED?

CPTED (Pronounced 'sep-ted') is the acronym for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

"CPTED is the proper design and effective use of the built environment which may lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime, and an improvement of the quality of life."
National Crime Prevention Institute

Applying this philosophy during the design phase, before the building or neighborhood is actually built, is the best time, however this can also be successfully applied later. After the building phase is completed, CPTED can be somewhat limited.

The Four Strategies of CPTED

- Natural Surveillance**—Allows people maximum visibility to easily see entrances, parking areas, streets and sidewalks with clear sight lines and adequate nighttime lighting. This limits the opportunity for crime, but also increases the opportunity for positive social interaction for residents.
- Territorial Reinforcement**—Defines property lines to distinguish private spaces from public spaces using landscaping, pavement designs, art, gate areas, and "CPTED" recommended fences. This promotes a sense of ownership for residents.
- Natural Access Control**—A design concept using streets, sidewalks, building entrances, gate areas, etc. to clearly show public routes and discourage access to private areas. Creates a risk perception in criminals by denying access to their targets, limiting their crime opportunity.
- Maintenance & Management**—Once the proper image is created, it must be kept up in order to show a pride in ownership. The more pride in ownership that is projected, the less likely the area is to attract criminal activities and vandalism. If not kept up, those activities appear to be acceptable there.

How is CPTED Applied?

CPTED is applied through the use of the 3-D approach which assesses the space for design and use.

- Designation**—What was the space originally intended for and what is it's designated purpose now? Can it support it's current or intended use?
- Definition**—How is the space defined and does it clearly show who owns it and where the borders are? Are there any signs? Are there any legal, social, or cultural definitions as to it's use?
- Design**—Does the physical design support the intended function of the space as well as the desired behaviors? Is there any conflict of the use of the space and intended human activity because of the physical design?

What are Design Features of CPTED?

- Clear Sight Lines**—Reduce isolated areas, hidden spaces and blind corners. Keep trees trimmed up to 7' from the ground and bushes no taller than 3' high and far enough away from doors to reduce hiding areas. Keep business windows clear of signage around cashier area.
- Adequate Lighting**—Use of adequate lighting for areas to be used at night and less lighting to discourage use of certain areas.
- Minimize Concealed Routes, Isolation, & Areas of Entrapment**—Offer alternative routes to use during nighttime or less favorable use times of the day when there is less pedestrian traffic. Place windows in strategic places such as bank lobbies used at night. Avoid entrapment areas such as recessed doors and travel routes shielded on three sides by bushes or walls.
- Activity Generators**—Adding a restaurant into an office building or increasing activities at a park.

Just to name a few!
CPTED has many more design features!

Can CPTED Be Applied After a Structure is Built?

Definitely! CPTED principles can also be applied to a business, home, or neighborhood that is already in existence. Sometimes at a very low cost. Just by trimming landscaping or adding additional lighting fixtures such as porch lights and yard lights or moving them to more strategic locations, you are applying CPTED. Additional ideas include:

- ~ Adding a timer to your porch and yard lights.
- ~ Trimming trees up to 7' above the ground level.
- ~ Pruning bushes down to 3' tall.
- ~ Adding short thorny bushes under windows.
- ~ Keeping sidewalks clear, defined, and well lit.
- ~ Keeping landscaping well maintained.
- ~ Working with neighbors to keep common areas clean, litter and graffiti free, and well maintained.

It's never too late to apply CPTED!

How Does CPTED Benefit You?

Remember the old saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," that you heard as a child? CPTED is that ounce of prevention used in the design phase of a project to avoid needing a pound of cure after crime hits.

Most people name their number one priority as their family and keeping them safe and out of harms way. When you go home at night, you want to relax and not have to worry about any of them becoming a victim. In addition, you invest a lot of time and hard earned money in your homes, businesses and communities and want them to be in safe areas. CPTED can create that sense of security by planning or transforming entire communities into being crime resistant. More importantly, it allows you to become involved in reducing the presence of criminals and therefore criminal behavior in your own businesses, neighborhoods and communities.