

**North Central Crime Prevention through Environmental Design
(CPTED)
Final Report**

(Draft FINAL - February 15, 2004)

Table of Contents:

- 1) Executive Summary**
- 2) Background**
 - a. What is CPTED?**
 - b. The North Central Neighbourhood: A Profile**
 - c. Document Review**
 - d. Methodology**
- 3) Findings**
 - a. Streets**
 - b. Alleys**
 - c. Parks**
- 4) Residents Priorities**
- 5) Appendixes**
 - a. Streets/Alleys audit tool**
 - b. Parks audit**
 - c. North Central maps #1 and #2**
 - d. Parks Maintenance Classes**
 - e. Statistics – Alleys, Streets, Parks**
 - f. Bibliography**

Executive Summary

The North Central Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) project is a partnership with the City of Regina, the North Central Community Society, the Public School Board, Regina Police Service, and North Central residents. The project funding is provided by the City, with volunteer services and in-kind services from the partners, and overseen by a steering committee. Prairie Sky Consulting coordinated the safety audits with volunteers, entered and analyzed the data, and compiled this report.

CPTED – pronounced \sep-ted\ – is a tool that deals with the design, planning and structure of cities and neighbourhoods. CPTED brings together local residents to examine how an area’s physical features, such as lighting, trees and roadways, can influence crime and the opportunities for committing crime. It has been successfully applied in a number of Canadian cities and contexts.

North Central, located northwest of the city’s downtown, is home to 6% of Regina’s population. Overall, the population tends to be younger than the rest of Regina. It is ethnically diverse, with 35% aboriginal. The housing consists of older homes, most built in the first half of the 20th century. Property values are the lowest in the city. About half the residents are renters. Although the area is sometimes singled for crime and social problems, residents feel it is unfairly stigmatized. Many speak with pride about the neighbourhood they call home.

The project collected data in two ways. Safety audits, designed much like surveys, provided quantitative data for streets, parks and alleys. These were completed by about 40 residents – a thorough mix by age, gender and ethnicity – who volunteered for the CPTED process. Additional data was included from focus group discussions with the auditors, data on service calls to the city, and City of Regina police statistics on “hot spots” in the area.

Findings

There are blocks and areas where residents did not feel safe because of aspects of the built environment. Poor lighting, overgrown vegetation and areas with litter, graffiti and poor maintenance match those blocks where auditors said they felt uneasy. Areas of concern are scattered throughout North Central, but patterns are clear in three areas. These include a large rectangular area from Angus west to Athol, in between Dewdney and 3rd Avenue, the 600 blocks between Pasqua and MacTavish and a corridor along Dewdney, especially to the north (See Maps 1 and 2 in the Appendix).

Some key areas for action were highlighted in the audits and confirmed in focus group discussions with the residents. These findings are consistent with police hot spots (???) and service calls to the city.

Streets

1. **Trim trees and bushes.** Overgrown trees and bushes were cited in many of the street audits. They obstruct house numbers, street signs, and sightlines, provide

hiding and entrapment sites, and create darkness by blocking streelights. This contributes to a sense of insecurity.

2. **Clean up streets and yards.** The auditors found problems with litter, graffiti and vandalism in some blocks, on vacant lots and around convenience stores. Poor maintenance of houses – broken windows and steps – gives an air of neglect that made auditors feel uneasy.
3. **Improve lighting.** Improvements to lighting were needed in one-quarter of the streets. Cutting back trees and bushes is the main solution.
4. **Improvements to signage.** House numbers need to be more visible and readable, especially for emergency vehicles. Trees can be trimmed around street signs. More signs directing people to emergency assistance would be helpful.

Alleys:

1. **Continue efforts to light the alleys of North Central.** Auditors strongly recommended back alley lighting. Care would have to be given to install lights that could not easily be vandalized and that would not create shadows.
2. **Trim trees and bushes.** Overgrown bushes and trees need cutting back to open up alleys, improve sightlines and reduce the number of hiding sites.
3. **Clean up the alleys and yards.** Maintenance issues to be addressed include cleaning up litter and graffiti in certain blocks.

Parks:

1. **Update parks and provide more activities.** While the auditors felt that, overall, the parks were good, they wanted more attractions, especially updated play equipment, and activities for youth. This would attract more people, decreasing the sense of isolation and increasing the number of legitimate users.
2. **Improve maintenance.** Maintenance was described as mostly satisfactory. Overgrown bushes and trees need trimming, especially in Confederation, Parkdale and Dewdney Pool Parks, around buildings and along parkways. The equipment in some parks needs to be fixed, and gang tags, graffiti and litter cleaned up.
3. **Improve lighting.** Electrical lighting could be brighter, especially in Albert Scott and Kinsmen North parks.

Detailed lists of problem areas identified by auditors have been provided to the City of Regina and the North Central Community Society.

Background

A. What is CPTED?

CPTED as a prevention strategy emerged in the 1970s in the United States after a series of studies on how the physical environment impacts crime¹. CPTED's basic premise is that the proper design and effective use of the physical or built environment can help reduce the incidence and fear of crime, thereby improving the quality of life. The built environment includes parks, buildings, alleys, streets and landscape, and can refer to a single location, one street or an entire neighbourhood.

CPTED works to deter crime through direct and indirect methods. Directly, access to property is restricted and public visibility is increased, deterring criminal activities. Indirectly, CPTED includes the concept of "defensible space" (Newman 1972). Public space is subdivided and assigned to legitimate users. The intended result is to make an area feel safer, as residents are collectively responsible for and control their own public environment.

Since the 1970's, when the concept was introduced in Canada, police officers, city planners, and community associations have utilized CPTED principles in their planning. Vancouver, Toronto, Calgary, and Edmonton have all applied CPTED to crime problems in the context of community and problem-area policing. CPTED has overwhelmingly been applied reactively to existing structures, usually as a result of a high crime rate in a particular area or a particular building, such as a school (Schneider 1998: 1). To a lesser extent, CPTED principles have been applied in the design of a public complex or new neighbourhood.

The CPTED approach means encouraging neighbours, business people and community groups to work together to prevent crime by taking ownership, or territoriality, of their shared places. Therefore, a key aspect of any CPTED project is community consultation.

The components of CPTED are organized into two generations. The 1st Generation focuses on aspects of physical design, including territoriality, natural surveillance, access control and image. Second Generation CPTED is more holistic and emphasizes the social aspects of the neighbourhood. Although the North Central project refers specifically to 1st Generation CPTED, the basics of 2nd Generation CPTED are included here because they are interrelated. In the audits and group discussions of the North Central CPTED project, residents referred to aspects from both generations.

A summary of the 1st Generation CPTED components is provided below:

Territoriality: This refers to people's sense of ownership of an area. Defining who uses a territory or place is a major aspect of reducing opportunities for crime and helping render criminals ineffective. Actual or perceived boundaries, including fences, hedges, pavement stones, lit front yards and signs, can create symbolic control of places. This is

¹ Some of the early pioneers of CPTED include C. Ray Jeffery's *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* (1971), Oscar Newman's *Defensible Space* (1972) and Jane Jacobs' *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961).

turn fosters people's vigilance and ownership over their homes, public areas and neighbourhood as a whole. Physical spaces are clearly delineated as private, semi-private or public, in what is known as a hierarchy of space.

Natural Surveillance: This refers to "eyes on the street", whereby legitimate users are aware of what is going on and can spot suspicious people or activities. Improving surveillance can mean designing or altering landscapes to allow unobstructed views, improving visibility with lighting and avoiding the creation of entrapment and hiding areas. Designs that enhance the possibility that offenders will be seen or will think they will be seen can deter the opportunity for crime.

Access Control: This is controlling who goes into or out of a neighbourhood, building, park, etc. through landscaping, fencing and other means. Entrances that are clearly defined and well lit, and have been designed to prevent quick and easy entrance and exit, will deter offenders.

Target Hardening: This refers to the use of security devices and hardware to lessen the vulnerability of potential targets for criminal activities. Locks, house alarms and fortified door frames are among the measures. Target hardening is an aspect of Access Control.

Image: This CPTED principle is based on the premise, often called the broken window theory, that people will feel unsafe in a location that appears neglected and uncared for. A clean and well-maintained location will instill pride in residents, promoting community ownership and territoriality. On a practical level, this means revitalization and cleanup, and eliminating litter and graffiti.

Movement Predictors. These are routes or paths that offer few or no choices to their users. For example, enclosed pathways, staircases, pedestrian bridges, or paths through parks, are of concern. Such routes can leave users vulnerable, especially if the routes are isolated or coincide with entrapment sites or hiding places.

Activity Support. This refers to the appropriate use of areas and buildings. For example, sports, barbecues and other activities would reinforce the legitimate uses of a park. Underused areas can become trouble spots.

Land Usage. Mixed-use neighbourhoods help create a sense of community, as opposed to areas used only for a single purpose i.e. where people sleep or work only. However, potential conflicts between user groups must be avoided. Some examples are a seniors' complex beside a bar, a school near a busy factory, or a day care near an adult video store.

Second Generation CPTED incorporates a wide range of social crime prevention programs for a more holistic approach to reduce crime. After issues like access and surveillance have been addressed, public events, meetings, youth curfews other activities can be initiated. Second Generation CPTED is best described by four concepts, including:

Neighbourhood Cohesion. This refers to the type and level of neighbourhood participation and responsibility through initiatives such as neighbourhood watch or agreements like a youth curfew.

Extensive Outside Connections. These include community partnerships and coordination with other government agencies.

Neighbourhood Threshold Capacity. This concept refers to the human scale of the neighbourhood, in both size and density, and the common facilities available, such as youth clubs, meeting places, community gardens, etc.

Community Culture: Broadly, this is the sense of place and shared history within a neighbourhood.

B. The North Central Neighbourhood: A Profile

The North Central neighbourhood is home to 10,100 of Regina's 178,225 residents. Located northwest of Regina's downtown, the North Central area borders Lewvan Drive to the west, Albert Street to the east, McKinley Avenue to the north and Saskatchewan Drive to the south.² The neighbourhood covers 3.76 square kilometers.

North Central has six schools and eight public parks. It is home to major public facilities such as the Agridome and the Exhibition Grounds, the Regina Fieldhouse and Leisure Centre, and Taylor Field. There is one hospital, the Pasqua, as well as a fire station on Pasqua Street and a police post on Athol Street. The Territorial Building and the Albert Scott Library are heritage buildings. There is an outdoor public pool at the Dewdney Pool Park. Many services are centred around the area's major high school, Scott Collegiate. Scott is home to the Albert Scott Community Centre, the North Central Community Society, several community services, and a police post. This cluster of buildings served as the base for the CPTED project.

North Central is overwhelmingly a residential neighbourhood, with businesses located along Dewdney Avenue, Albert Street and scattered throughout the area. Many single detached houses sit on wider lots (35'), especially east of Elphinstone Street, between 4th and 7th Avenue and in the three crescents to the west. Of 2,178 lots in North Central, 196 were vacant in April 2002. There are heavy traffic flows along Dewdney and 4th Avenue.

Census 2001 Data

Of Regina's 178,225 residents, 10,097 live in North Central. This is a 4% drop in population from the 1996 Census, which recorded 10,470 people living in North Central.

² This general background information is derived from two sources: city and neighbourhood data from the 2001 Census by Statistics Canada, and from the "Regina North Central Neighbourhood Detailed Profile", compiled by the City of Regina Urban Planning Division in November 2002.

The population of North Central is young. As **Table 1.1** indicates, 43.3% of North Central is under 24 years, compared to 35.4% for the city. North Central has a lower percentage of seniors – 8.9% - who are 65 years and older, compared to 12.8% who constitute the seniors

Table 1.1: Population by age groups

	NC	Regina
Total population	10,100	178,225
Under 5	10.2%	5.9%
6 to 15 years	16.3%	13.7%
15 to 24 years	16.8%	15.8%
25 to 44 years	30.5%	29.7%
45 to 64 years	16.4%	22.1%
65 to 74 years	4.2%	6.5%
Over 75 years	4.7%	6.3%

population in the city as a whole. The average age for the city is 36.8 years while for North Central it is 31.3 years.

The North Central area is the most mixed in the city in terms of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal identity. Thirty-five percent of residents identify themselves as Aboriginal, compared to 8.7% for the city as a whole. Some 12.6% of North Central residents said they were visible minorities or immigrants, a number lower than the 13.2% in these categories for the city overall.

In both the city and North Central, there are an average of 2.4 persons per household. In North Central the percentage of lone parents is nearly double that of the city as a whole. The percentage of families, with or without children, is lower in North Central (**Table 1.2**).

Table 1.2: Household characteristics

	NC	Regina
Total population in private households	10,050	175,270
Living alone	13%	12%
Living with others	9%	6%
Families with children	34%	45%
Families without children	27%	36%
Lone parents	39%	20%

Table 1.3: Dwellings characteristics

	NC	Regina
Number in private dwellings	4,135	71,720
Single detached	87%	69%
Rented	50%	33%
Need major repairs	18%	8%
Built before 1946	39%	11%
Built after 1990	0%	6%
Average market value	\$45,600	\$105,400

A greater percentage of people in North Central live in single detached dwellings, compared to the rest of the city. However, in North Central, half those dwellings are rented, compared to 33% for all of Regina. As **Table 1.3** indicates, the houses in

North Central are older and a greater percentage is in need of major repairs. The average market value – \$45,600 – is less than half the city average of \$105,400. Residents of North Central reported a higher level of mobility. Thirty-one percent said they had moved in the last year, compared to 17% for all of Regina. Forty percent in North Central said they didn't moved, compared to 57% for Regina.

The employment levels in North Central are lower than the city averages, but are not the lowest in the city. As **Table 1.4** indicates, the youth employment level is particularly low when compared to the city average.

Table 1.4: Employment

	NC	Regina
Number of adults	7,365	140,625
Percentage employed: both sexes	49%	66%
Men	54%	69%
Women	43%	62%
Youth	38%	63%

Regarding education, 38% of 15 to 24 year-olds in North Central had attended school in 2000/2001. This is considerably lower than the 60% in the same category for the city as a whole. Sixty percent of adults said they had a high school diploma, while 30% had a post-secondary degree or diploma. In the city overall, 74% had completed high school and 48% had obtained a post-secondary qualification.

Overall, income levels are lower in North Central and a greater proportion of residents depend on government transfer payments (**Table 1.5**). As a result, the percentage of residents living below the low-income poverty cut off (LICO) is 48%. This is three times the city average of 16%.

Table 1.5: Income characteristics

	NC	Regina
Average annual: individual	\$18,269	\$29,640
Family	\$33,289	\$66,170
Household	\$30,262	\$55,860
Source of income		
Employment	65%	26%
Government transfers*	77%	11%
Percentage of persons below the low-income cut off (LICO)	48%	16%

* Includes Old Age Security, CPP, Child Tax Credit, GST Credit, Social Assistance, EI, Worker's Compensation, etc.

Finally, residents provided some of their own descriptions of the neighbourhood during the focus group discussions. Some long-time residents who grew up in North Central fondly recalled activities in the parks and community, but said many of these activities are no longer offered. North Central, many felt, has a negative image that it does not deserve.

- *Crime happens all over the city but North Central gets bad press.*
- *This is a fairly well kept community, with a few noticeable exceptions.*
- *It's a moral panic that people create. It's not that bad here. If it was that bad, none of us would be here. There's good and there's bad...*

They also stressed that the CPTED process attracted much interest from residents out in their yards and on the streets when audit teams visited their blocks. They hoped the interest and commitment from resident volunteers would lead to positive changes in their neighbourhood.

CPTED is a good vehicle for community involvement and discussion. We need to do something now – there's an expectation that something will happen.

C. Document Review

Regina Development Plan, Park K, North Central Neighbourhood Plan, Urban Planning Department 1988, was created to be a part of the City of Regina's Development Plan. This review of the North Central Neighbourhood Plan engaged the community to develop policies and strategies for enhancement, while reflecting the overall City goals. This review presents almost 30 recommendations, including justifications with corresponding documentation. City Council approved the Plan in 1988, but included 4 more recommendations.

The 1988 Urban Planning Department's North Central Neighbourhood Plan prioritized the need to have community consultations in utilizing the land base as a means for community improvement.

The Neighbourhood Plan presented recommendations in several categories, including Property and Building Maintenance, Personal Security and Safety, Parks and Recreation, Bylaw Enforcement, and Land Use and Zoning. The City Council's additional recommendations focused on infrastructure considerations and partnerships in Education and Business. Several recommendations were made that reflects CPTED principles. They include:

- “The City recognize North Central as a neighbourhood which could benefit appreciably from a lane lighting program.”
- “The City actively enforces and administers its bylaws dealing with building maintenance and untidy properties.”
- “The City considers the upgrading of existing open space, particularly school sites, a priority over creation of new sites, and plans for upgrading open space be prepared in consultation with the community. Upgrading plans should emphasize lighting and winter use in the design.”
- A review and update of these recommendations should be included in any future plans.

Focusing on People, A social and demographic profile of the Regina Community, 2000 Edition, is the third report compiled from the 1996 Statistics Canada Census and other sources. The “first social and demographic profile”, was published in 1992 and the

subsequent in 1994. The report is broken down into topics, with some of the topics then further subdivided into neighbourhoods and/or trends using previous years as a measure. These topics range from profiles of the overall population of Regina, Family Structures, Education and Schooling, Employment, Housing, Births and Deaths, Culture, Language and Ethnicity, Income and Poverty, and specifically Community profile.

The Community Profile section contains a statistical profile of the communities. This includes: Population and Households; Demographic and Living arrangements, Culture, Ethnicity, and Language; Dwelling Types and Mobility; Education Attainment and Educational Activity; Labour Force and Employment; and Income. The report's demographic sections for the North Central community paint a disturbing picture. Most alarming is the data that addresses income measures.

Released in May 2003, the North Central Community Partnership, Report on the Community Vision and Action Plan, is a revitalization plan for North Central based on a collection of community consultations, through surveys, and public community meetings, a review of past rehabilitative initiatives; and an interpretation of demographics of North Central.

The North Central vision statement was defined from a comprehensive series of community consultations using the following as values: caring, community pride, cultural diversity, community working together, premium placed on the value of family seniors, children and youth, confidence in the future, and forward looking.

The Report has several goals for North Central such as greater safety, a good physical environment, a healthy community and good human services, a high proportion of home ownership, a high level of employment and business development, extensive community participation, quality education, and the ease of access to facilities and services both within and outside of the community. Action Plan Pillars were formulated to include Housing and Infrastructure, Crime and Safety, Business and Economic Development, Health and Human Services, Education, and Community Development.

The Report identifies crime and housing conditions as the two major concerns for residents. Suggestions offered by the residents to deter crime were more policing in North Central and developing programs for youth. The residents want to make landlords more accountable by licensing them and penalizing them for not maintaining housing standards. They also want home ownership programs available for North Central residents and a review of the city bylaws enforcement process to ensure standards are being enforced. A CPTED audit of the North Central neighbourhood is also recommended.

Each one of these reports has different perspectives. The Regina Development Plan examines housing and infrastructure; Focusing on People, looks at the human profiles of communities; and the Report on the Community Vision and Action Plan provides an analysis of housing and infrastructure; human profiles; and community consultations into its methodology.

Service Calls to the City

Between January and November 2003, the residents of North Central made 3,631 service calls to the City. Of these, almost half related to topics covered by CPTED. Some are included in **Table 1.6**.

Litter, untidy property, garbage collection and trees are among the most common reasons residents made service-related calls to the City.

Table 1.6:

CPTED-related service calls to the city: Jan. to Nov. 2003	Number
Alley litter	400
Noxious weeds	266
Untidy and unsightly property	206
Back alley garbage collection	205
Unmaintained structure	123
Trees: inspection, city	77
Container maintenance	64
Junked vehicles	55
Sidewalk repair	35
Trees: pruning	31
Trees: obstruction	29
Street depressions	28
Abandoned vehicle	25
Trees: inspection, private	24
Road repair	22
Trees: maintenance	17
Trees: pruning low branches	17
Trees: removal	13
Litter on public property	12
Traffic signs	11
Debris pickup: streets	7
Sightline restriction	6
New traffic sign	5
New traffic light	5
Total:	1683

Police Hot Spots

Hot Spots are existing locations of high crime and/or violence, as recorded by police statistics. They may change based on the time of day, day of the week, type of crime and land use patterns. Some hot spots may be obvious; others are more invisible. Overall, hot spots areas those where crime concentrates, offering ample opportunities for criminals to take over, thereby increasing the fear of law-abiding residents and preventing them from controlling and owning their own neighbourhood.

Some North Central hot spots are:

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Clearly some residents of North Central are putting into place their own application of CPTED principles, at a household level. For example, houses with alarms, guard dog signs and burglar bars on windows are a fairly common sight. Homes surrounded by high chain-link or wooden fences project a strong sense of territoriality.

At a household level these measures may enhance security or the sense of security for residents who may have experienced crime directly themselves. Unfortunately they can have the opposite effect on a block or neighbourhood level. The presence of many “gated households” on a block suggests people do not feel safe, do not trust each other and have all but retreated behind their gates. There is clearly a sense, in some areas of North Central, that residents do not feel they “own” the neighbourhood.

D. Methodology

The CPTED project began as a partnership with the City of Regina, the North Central Community Society, the Public School Board and the Regina Police Service in 2002. The City funds the project, with volunteer and in-kind services from the partners. A Steering Committee, composed of City employees from various department and divisions, North Central residents and police officers from the North Central police post, was established to supervise and direct the project. In April 2003, the committee hired Prairie Sky Consulting to coordinate safety audits with volunteers, data-entry the information and complete a final report.

This report includes a review of existing documents and background information, including CPTED information, current demographics, crime statistics, and municipal government publications. The City of Regina provided maps of North Central, in both large scale, full-color and electronic versions.

The project utilized two types of data collection. Safety audits, designed much like surveys, provided quantitative data for streets, parks and alleys in North Central. This information was fleshed out with qualitative data collected during focus group discussions and informal discussions with community members, and meetings with the Steering Committee. Additional data was included on service calls to the City from North Central, and police statistics on “hot spots” in the neighbourhood.

The safety audit tools for North Central were derived from similar CPTED tools used in other Canadian cities and reworked for North Central. The streets/alleys audit tool consisted of a 10-page form that included open and closed questions (Appendix A). The 5-page parks tool included many of the same questions (Appendix B).

The North Central Community Society contacted volunteers from the neighbourhood to complete the audits. Two CPTED training sessions were delivered to 33 volunteers in May and June 2003. The training consisted of half-day of instruction on CPTED principles and several hours of demonstration audits on nearby streets. The high turnout of volunteers proved crucial to the success of the project as the vast majority of those trained audited at least a few blocks. Some completed as many as twenty.

The trained volunteers worked together with team leaders and Steering Committee members who had received more extensive CPTED training. Together, they headed out in teams of two or more and completed audits for 150 streets, 152 alleys and 8 parks. The audit typically took 15 to 30 minutes each. Most audits were completed during the summer of 2003, usually during daylight hours. Some streets were audited after dark. Most parks were audited twice; during daylight and after dark. A large map from the city’s urban planning department, posted in the North Central Community Centre, allowed coordinators and volunteers to keep track of audited streets and alleys.

The completed audits were entered into a data analysis program, EPI Info 2002, in October and November 2003.³ Separate files were created for the streets, parks and alleys. Check files were created for each file to reduce the possibility of data entry errors. A detailed listing of the statistical frequencies for each question is included as Appendix E.

³ EPI Info 2002 is a user-friendly data entry program developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta, GA. Though used mainly by medical professionals, EPI Info is useful for analyzing community-based research. It can be downloaded free of charge from www.cdc.gov/epiinfo.

Findings

a. Streets

There are 393 street audits completed on 150 blocks in North Central. This represents an average of 2.6 audits completed per block. The blocks range from the 1600 to the 600 block, between 10th Avenue and McKinley. East to west, they encompass 17 streets between Albert Street and the Lewvan Drive. Two blocks, both on Edward Street, were not audited.

Data Collection and Analysis

The 10-page audit tool, consisting of 91 questions, was to be self-administered by volunteers trained in the CPTED methodology and process. They worked together in teams, usually supported by a team leader.

Ninety-nine percent of audits were completed between July 3 and September 30, 2003. Most are done in daylight; one quarter of them in the morning, before noon. About 11% were completed after 9 p.m.

Overall, the street audits were thoroughly filled out. Where gaps appear in the data, this is mostly due to auditors inadvertently missing questions or entire pages. Sometimes questions did not pertain to their specific circumstances (i.e. electrical lighting if audit was being done in the daylight). Some chose to leave blank questions asking for personal details.

Response rates vary depending on the type of question and its placement within the questionnaire. Questions at the start of a section, or those that required auditors to circle a choice were completed at rates between 94 and 100%. Open-ended questions that required a written out answer had lower response rates. For example, 83% responded to the question “How safe does the area feel?” The comments question at the end of each section, probing for additional comments and information, prompted response rates of between 7% and 23%. Overall, the intersections section, completed by about 70% of respondents, had the lowest overall response rate⁴.

A few questions presupposed a degree of familiarity with a given street, even though only 2.1% of auditors said they lived on the street they were auditing. For example, questions about whether an area was patrolled, or how often garnered lower response rates. Some auditors wrote question marks, indicating they were not sure. The questions with the lowest response rate 56) “From your experience, how long do repairs generally take?” tended to confuse people. Either they didn’t know, because they lived elsewhere, or were

⁴ This section might have been easier if respondents had been asked to audit just one intersection, rather than having to do two intersections and generalize the results.

unclear who was supposed to do the repairs – residents, landlords or the city. Just 17% of auditors filled out this question.

Some auditors answered questions briefly; others wrote considerable detail in the space provided or in the margins. Some, when offered a choice of “Yes” or “No”, wrote in “Maybe” or “Sometimes”. Where required, a third category was created in data analysis to capture these wider responses.

Although the audit process is understood to be an objective one, the influence of outside factors on the auditors is clear. Some filled out their first audits most thoroughly, then began to abbreviate answers as heat and fatigue set in. The auditor’s own priorities and experiences were sometimes reflected i.e. a mother might record details relevant to children or their safety; an auditor with construction experience pointed out a homemade fence. The team approach to the auditing process also influenced results. Some audit teams discussed what they saw on a block and wrote down almost identical answers. Others audited streets together but separately, and recorded quite different observations on their audit sheets.

The result is a data set full of detail and richness. The questions that asked for additional comments are recorded here not as statistics but as quotations or directions where specific repairs or attention are called for.

Demographics:

There is a good representation of auditors by age, sex and identify. At least 25 different auditors participated in the street audits. Forty-nine percent identified themselves by name.

Auditors were almost evenly divided between male and female (**Table 2.1**) and aboriginal and non-aboriginal (**Table 2.2**). Some auditors were family member, representing different generations.

The age of the auditors ranged from under 18 years to 60 plus (**Table 2.3**)

Not many people lived on the street they audited – only 2.1% (**Table 2.4**).

Table 2.1: Sex of auditor

Sex of auditor	#	Percent
Female	188	48.5%
Male	200	51.5%
Total	388	100.0%

Table 2.2: Identity

Identity?	# Audits	Percent
Aboriginal	152	46.2%
Non-aboriginal	177	53.8%
Total	329	100.0%

Table 2.3: Age of auditors

Age group	# Audits	Percent
18 and under	29	8.2%
19 to 29	122	31.9%
30 to 39	81	21.1%
40 to 49	72	18.8%
50 to 59	65	17.0%
60 plus	14	3.7%
Total	383	100.0%

Table 2.4:

Live on street?	#	Percent
Yes	8	2.1%
No	382	97.9%
Total	390	100.0%

Safety

How safe does the area feel?

This question was open-ended. The answers were coded into three categories – safe, somewhat safe and unsafe.

Table 2.5:

How safe does the area feel?	#	Percent
Safe	228	69.7%
Somewhat safe	61	18.7%
Unsafe	38	11.6%
Total	327	100%

Almost 70% said the area they were auditing felt safe. Close to 12% said unsafe, and the remainder (18.7%) said somewhat safe (**Table 2.5**). The blocks where auditors said they would not feel safe if alone tended to be fairly scattered throughout North Central, though there are clear clusters along Dewdney and near Kinsmen North Park (See Map I)

Specific aspects of the block affected how safe or unsafe auditors felt. For example, auditors wrote that a block felt:

Not safe, because no one cares about how they live or how they look

Not very safe. Lots of garbage around...there are bars on the windows . Area is not well kept.

Overall a few aspects made auditors feel unsafe or only somewhat safe:

- Unkept and untrimmed yards and general signs of neglect, including graffiti and garbage.
- Obvious security measures – grates or bar on windows, secure fences and guard dogs.
- The absence of people, especially children, or the reaction of people who were around. Were they friendly and relaxed?
- A high volume of traffic. Some traffic was tied to illegal activities i.e. the stroll. Fast moving traffic created a sense of isolation.

Where an area felt safe, auditors reported seeing people around, facilities like schools and parks nearby and a high percentage of privately owned homes. Some qualified their answers – one part of a block felt better than another or if they felt safe in the daytime they might not feel safe at night.

- *It felt lived in and secure.*
- *Pretty safe. Traffic going by is not so rushed, and people are strolling.*

In comparison, auditors said they would feel slightly less safe if alone (**Table 2.6**).

They said they would feel slightly safer if with children, and less safe if they were elderly, a person with a disability, or a newcomer.

Table 2.6:

Safe if alone?	#Percent	
Yes	254	65.1%
No	49	12.6%
Maybe/Somewhat	87	22.3%
Total	390	100%
Safe if with children?	#Percent	
Yes	256	65.6%
No	48	12.3%
Maybe/Somewhat	86	22.1%
Total	390	100%
Safe with elderly?	#Percent	
Yes	239	61.3%
No	71	18.2%
Maybe/Somewhat	80	20.5%
Total	390	100%
Safe if a newcomer?	#Percent	
Yes	232	59.5%
No	63	16.2%
Maybe/Somewhat	95	24.4%
Total	390	100%
Safe if minority?	#Percent	
Yes	248	64.2%
No	54	14.0%
Maybe/Somewhat	84	21.8%
Total	386	100%
Safe if had a disability?	#Percent	
Yes	221	56.8%
No	82	21.1%
Maybe/Somewhat	86	22.1%
Total	389	100%
Safe if walking?	#Percent	
Yes	263	67.4%
No	50	12.8%
Maybe/Somewhat	77	19.7%
Total	390	100%

Lighting

Lighting is an important CPTED tool because improvements to lighting can reduce crime and the fear of crime. Lighting can:

- Improve discrimination of visual details at night.
- Provide greater time to respond to dangerous situations.
- Create an environment that makes it riskier to commit crime.
- Influence patterns of safe movement through a variety of environments.

Some aspects of lighting that must be considered include illuminance and luminance (adequate detection and recognition), uniformity (allowing people to see at a distance) and glare (from a direct source such as a naked bulb, or a reflected off another surface, which can reduce visibility).

Also to be considered is the reflectance factor, which may either reflect light or seem to swallow it up. For example, a light grey sidewalk will reflect more light than a dark green hedge, making the area appear brighter.

Finally, the quality of lighting is just as important as the quantity of light. Bright lights can create areas of high contrast and large brightness ratios. In other words, one area may be well lit, leaving another in dark shadows.

The safety audit included nine questions on lighting. However most of the audits were completed during daylight hours. Only twelve per cent said the streetlight was on at the time of the audit. However, more than half of the auditors – 56.1% – said they had been down the street with the lights on (**Table 2.7**)

Table 2.7:

Is the street light on?	#	Percent
Yes	39	12.4%
No	276	87.6%
Total	315	100%

Been on street with light on?	#	Percent
Yes	147	56.1%
No	115	43.9%
Total	262	100%

Overall, about one-third of auditors felt lighting to be inadequate in some way (**Table 2.8**). Twenty-seven percent said the lighting at night was poor or very poor. Almost 40% said the light was not even along the block. 32% said lighting illumination on sidewalks was poor or very poor.

Some 3.3% of auditors said the streetlights were burnt or broken. This is a fairly low number, possibly because many of the audits were completed in daylight.

Thirty-five percent of the auditors said that overgrown bushes and trees blocked the streetlights, thereby reducing the amount of light.

In the comments section, the auditors offered the following suggestions to improve the lighting:

- Cut back the bushes and trees that block streetlights.
- Add another set of streetlights in the darker blocks.
- Turn lights on earlier in the evening.
- Change light bulbs from the current orange ones to the older white light style, which some thought was brighter.

Isolation

Twenty percent said the block they were auditing felt isolated or somewhat isolated (**Table 2.9**). Though those areas tended to be scattered around North Central, there are some patterns. While many are on streets with houses on both sides, others are near streets busy with vehicular traffic

Table 2.8: Lighting

How is lighting at night?	#	Percent
Satisfactory	108	73.0%
Poor	32	21.6%
Very poor	8	5.4%
Total	148	100%

Brightness even along block?	#	Percent
Yes	87	62.1%
No	53	37.9%
Total	140	100%

Lighting illuminate sidewalk?	#	Percent
Satisfactory	94	68.1%
Poor	35	25.4%
Very poor	9	6.5%
Total	138	100%

Streetlights burnt or broken?	#	Percent
Yes	5	3.3%
No	147	96.7%
Total	152	100%

Streetlights blocked?	#	Percent
Yes	69	35.4%
No	126	64.6%
Total	195	100%

Table 2.9:

Does the area feel isolated?	#	Percent
Yes	73	19.0%
No	307	79.7%
Somewhat	5	1.3%
Total	385	100%

Table 2.10:

Predict when pipo around?	#	Percent
Yes	119	31.6%
No	258	68.4%
Total	377	100%

like Dewdney and Pasqua. Others bordered on parks or were half streets, such several blocks of Angus (See Map 2 in the Appendix)

The auditors' feeling of isolated is likely compounded by not being sure if and when other people would be present on the block. Sixty-eight per cent said they could not predict when people would be around (Table 2.10).

Table 2.11:

How many likely to be around: morning?	#	Percent
None	29	7.8%
A few	283	76.1%
Several	52	14.0%
Many	8	2.2%
Total	372	100%
How many likely to be around: day?	#	Percent
None	10	2.7%
A few	229	60.7%
Several	100	26.5%
Many	38	10.1%
Total	377	100%

Generally, auditors expected fewer people around in the daytime and late in the evening (Table 2.11).

How many likely to be around: evening?	#	Percent
None	17	5%
A few	235	63%
Several	102	27%
Many	21	6%
Total	375	100%

How many likely to be around: late night?	#	Percent
None	72	20%
A few	235	65%
Several	43	12%
Many	14	4%
Total	364	100%

Questions about patrols and their frequency and predictability tended to garner a lower rate of response. Some auditors wrote only question marks, indicating they did not know about patrols or were not familiar with a specific block.

Among those who answered, however, 54 % said the area was patrolled, while 46 % said the area was not (**Table 2.12**). However, auditors were fairly uncertain of this as 91 % said it was not easy to predict patrolling.

Table 2.12:		
Is the area patrolled?	#	Percent
Yes	170	54.3%
No	143	45.7%
Total	313	100%

Easy to predict patrolling?	#	Percent
Yes	31	8.9%
No	319	91.1%
Total	350	100%

Place to call/get help?	#	Percent
Yes	188	49.7%
No	190	50.3%
Total	378	100%

When asked how frequently, few auditors could say with any certainty. Seventy-two percent said they didn't know. Others suggested daily, all the time, occasionally and once a day. A handful felt police patrols were around only during crises.

Half the auditors said there was nowhere to call or get help on a particular block. How auditors answered this last question reflected their comfort level with the block. If they felt safe then they usually said they would ask for help at a nearby house. Others spoke only of going to a local business, a school or church, or the police or fire station.

- *I would not go up to most of the houses to call for help*
- *The street seemed a place that if you yelled for help there would be an answer.*
- *This block could have more people appearing. Everyone stays inside and keeps to themselves.*
- *I would feel safe going to houses for help.*

Signage

Six questions asked about the visibility and usefulness of street signs, house numbers and directions to emergency assistance.

Table 2.13:

Are the street signs visible?	#Percent	
Yes	300	83.6%
No	59	16.4%
Total	359	100%

Sixteen percent of auditors said street signs were not clearly visible (**Table 2.13**). Although not specifically asked why, some noted that trees and bushes blocked streets signs and yield and stop signs.

Can an emergency vehicle

easily find the house?	#Percent	
Yes	221	57.6%
No	163	42.4%
Total	384	100%

Some 42% of auditors said emergency vehicles could not find easily find houses. Most often bushes and trees obscured signs (**Table 2.14**). Auditors also found the numbers were generally small, missing or poorly illuminated. Generally, they felt the visibility of signs could be improved. Specifically, they documented house numbers on 76 blocks

Table 2.14: What could be done to help to find the houses?		
	#Percent	
Trim yard	56	21.7%
Make numbers bigger	51	19.8%
Illuminate numbers	34	13.2%
Other (all or some of the above)	117	45.3%
Total	258	100%

See signs/phones for assistance?	#Percent	
Yes	35	9.6%
No	329	90.4%
Total	364	100%

Signs to add?	#Percent	
Traffic - yield, school, dead end, etc.	18	35.3%
Emergency assistance	13	25.5%
Bigger street signs or house numbers	8	15.7%
Facilities - centre, police	2	3.9%
Neighborhood watch	10	19.6%
Total	51	100%

where foliage needed to be cut back, signs had to be made bigger or moved, and missing numbers needed replacing.

In just less than 10% of audits, auditors could see telephones or signs directing them to assistance.

Auditors suggested different signs to be erected on a block - particularly yield signs, dead end signs and school zones. One quarter recommended emergency assistance signs that would direct people to the nearest telephone or police station. Others requested neighbourhood watch signs.

Possible assault sites

Seventy-three percent said there were places someone could be hiding on the block they audited (**Table 2.15**). Most of these places were behind trees and bushes. A few were parking lots and alleys.

About 13% of auditors said there are areas that should be locked or fenced. Some of these areas were the storage site near the hospital, parking lots, and beside the railway track. In private yards, some auditors felt houses needed fences around them for security. Others recommended fences between the backs of house and alleys, to prevent people from cutting through yards or hiding in them. A few suggested trimming at specific addresses, especially where hedges were overgrown.

Table 2.15:

Hiding places for someone?	#	Percent
Yes	277	72.9%
No	103	27.1%
Total	380	100%

Where hiding?	#	Percent
Other	120	46.2%
Bushes/trees	114	43.8%
Parking lots	16	6.2%
Alley	9	3.5%
Garages/sheds	1	0.4%
Total	260	100%

Areas to lock, fence or barricade?	#	Percent
Yes	46	13.2%
No	302	86.8%
Total	348	100%

Sightlines

Table 2.16:

Can you see clearly ahead?	#	Percent
Yes	335	86.1%
No	54	13.9%
Total	389	100%

Almost 14% of auditors said they could not see clearly ahead. Problems with sightlines were almost always due to bushes and trees. A few auditors said fences blocked their sightlines (**Table 2.16**).

Problem with sightlines?	#	Percent
Bushes	41	73.4%
Other	9	16.1%
Trees	5	8.9%
Fences	1	1.8%
Total	56	100%

Animals

Over all, domestic animals did not appear to be a major issue. Animals were cited in 35% of the audits. Of these animals, 85% were fenced in (**Table 2.17**).

In 11% of audits, there were reported to be houses that had guard dogs but no signs warning of the guard dogs. Ten per cent of auditors said there were animals running freely but almost all of these were cats.

Table 2.173:

Domestic animals in area?	#	Percent
Yes	138	35.5%
No	251	65.4%
Total	389	100%

If so, are animals fenced in?	#	Percent
Yes	111	85.4%
No	19	14.6%
Total	130	100%

Any dog warning signs?	#	Percent
Yes	155	52.7%
No	139	47.3%
Total	294	100%

Houses without dog signs?	#	Percent
Yes	27	10.5%
No	231	89.5%
Total	258	100%

Free run animals?	#	Percent
Yes	37	10.0%
No	332	90.0%
Total	369	100%

Maintenance and litter

Table 2.18:

Impression of maintenance?	#	Percent
Good	80	20.8%
Satisfactory	224	58.3%
Poor	55	14.3%
Very poor	25	6.5%
Total	384	100%

Report maintenance to....?	#	Percent
Yes	196	52.5%
No	177	47.5%
Total	373	100%

Just more than 79% of auditors said maintenance on the block was good or satisfactory. Twenty percent rated maintenance as poor or very poor (**Table 2.18**).

Just over half – 53% – said they knew to whom they should report maintenance concerns.

Litter was reported in 38% of the audits (**Table 2.19**). About two-thirds of the audits had details about the kind of litter. Most of the litter came from food or drink – candy wrappers, fast food containers and soft drinks. About 12% of auditors mentioned bigger garbage like discarded furniture, carpets or junked vehicles. Five or six noted condoms, condom wrappers and empty syringes.

Table 2.19:

Is there litter around?	#	Percent
Yes	142	38.2%
No	230	61.8%
Total	372	100%

What kind of litter?	#	Percent
Glass/paper/fast food	59	41.5%
Not specified	39	27.5%
Furniture/cars	17	12.0%
Building and yard debris	12	8.4%
All kinds	10	7.0%
Condoms and needles	5	3.5%
Total	142	100%

Where is the litter?	#	Percent
Streets	59	41.5%
Yards	47	33.1%
Vacant lots	12	8.5%
Everywhere	10	7.0%
Part of the block	8	5.6%
Stores, parks, schools	6	4.3%
Total	142	100%

Most of the litter, 41.5%, was found on streets. Litter in yards accounted for one-third of the litter. Auditors also noted litter in vacant lots and around convenience stores and parks. Sometimes specific sections of a block were more littered than others.

Only 17% of auditors responded to the question on how long repairs take. Those who answered said repairs took anywhere from “20 minutes” to “forever”.

The auditors offered comments for maintenance on 37 blocks. These included the need for yard maintenance and trimming, street and sidewalk repair, garbage removal, and repairs to eaves, stairs and windows.

Factors which Make This Place More Human

Table 2.20:

How do you feel walking in this area?	#	Percent
Safe	221	72.9%
Somewhat safe	50	16.4%
Unsafe	33	10.8%
Total	304	100%

Auditors were asked how they felt walking in the area. Their answers were graded on a scale of 1 to 3, with one being safe, 2 being somewhat safe and 3 being not safe.

Seventy-three percent said they felt safe, while 16% did not feel entirely safe and almost 11 % did not feel safe at all (**Table 2.20**). These findings match those from an earlier question in the audit – “How safe does the area feel? In response to that question, almost 70% said the area they were auditing felt safe; 12% said unsafe, and the remainder, 18.7%, said somewhat safe.

The audit asked for people’s impressions of a block in terms of care, if it felt abandoned, whether there was graffiti or vandalism.

Table 2.21:		
Is the place cared for?	#	Percent
Yes	295	76.6%
No	69	17.9%
Somewhat/sort of	21	5.5%
Total	385	100%

Seventy-seven percent the area felt cared for, while 18% said it didn't and 6% said somewhat/sort of (Table 2.21).

Place feel abandoned?	#	Percent
Yes	46	12.0%
No	332	86.5%
Somewhat/sort of	6	1.6%
Total	384	100%

Twelve percent said a given block felt abandoned.

Less than 10% of the audits recorded graffiti or vandalism.

Graffiti on walls?	#	Percent
Yes	31	8.2%
No	349	91.8%
Total	380	100%

Just over 8 % of auditors said there was graffiti and 2% felt that graffiti was offensive.

Bad slogans/signs/images?	#	Percent
Yes	8	2.1%
No	368	97.9%
Total	376	100%

Nine per cent of auditors reported signs of vandalism.

Vandalism signs?	#	Percent
Yes	34	8.9%
No	349	91.1%
Total	383	100%

Less than 6% of audits indicated there were benches for people to sit on. It is not clear if those benches noted were in parks or at bus stops.

Benches for people?	#	Percent
Yes	21	5.5%
No	362	94.5%
Total	383	100%

Table 2.22:

What would improve sense of safety?	#	Percent
General clean up, including graffiti and vandalism	31	23.3%
Trim hedges and bushes	28	21.1%
Yard and property maintenance	26	19.5%
More police patrols	13	9.8%
More people and more activities	8	6.0%
Other	7	5.3%
Improve lighting	6	4.5%
Slow down traffic	5	3.8%
Work with landlords to improve rental properties	5	3.8%
Street maintenance	4	3.0%
Total	133	100%

In an open-ended question, auditors were asked what would improve their sense of safety (**Table 2.22**). Their answers overwhelmingly indicate that clean up and maintenance of yards and streets would make them feel safer. Sixty-nine percent of responses referred to cleaning up graffiti and vandalism, trimming trees and bushes and generally maintaining streets and yards. Some suggested aspects of 2nd Generation CPTED, such as having more people around and more activities offered. Some suggested improvements to lighting and slowing down traffic.

Intersections

The section on intersections asked auditors to consider the intersections both north and south of the streets they audited.

Intersections and pedestrians

Almost six per cent said there is not enough time to cross intersections, and 23% said not enough time for people in wheelchairs and walkers to cross the intersections (Table 2.23).

There were bells or buzzers in 10% of intersections. 14% of pedestrian signs were not clearly visible. Intersection lighting was mostly good or satisfactory, except in a few locations, about 5%.

About one-third of auditors - 35% - said they would feel somewhat or very unsafe crossing the intersection. The rest felt safe. Their feelings of safety are influenced by the time of day, with 40% of auditors saying the time of day would change their feelings.

Auditors raised concerns about pedestrians and traffic on 46 blocks. Of particular concern for pedestrians was the heavy traffic flow on 4th Ave and speeding vehicles on 1st Ave. Though most of the audits were completed in daylight, some auditors pointed out traffic risks for pedestrians – speeding, increased numbers of car and possible drunk drivers – would be greater after dark.

Table 2.23:

Enough time to cross inter.?	#	Percent
Yes	273	94.5%
No	16	5.5%
Total	289	100%

Enuf cross time for wheelchairs?	#	Percent
Yes	222	77.4%
No	65	22.6%
Total	287	100%

Bells/buzzers in intersections?	#	Percent
Yes	21	9.7%
No	195	90.3%
Total	216	100%

Pedestrian signs visible?	#	Percent
Yes	237	85.9%
No	39	14.1%
Total	276	100%

Intersection lighting quality?	#	Percent
Good	99	50.5%
Satisfactory	88	44.9%
Very poor	9	4.6%
Total	196	100%

Feel safe crossing?	#	Percent
Very safe	33	11.8%
Safe	155	55.4%
Somewhat safe	90	32.1%
Very unsafe	2	0.7%
Total	280	100%

Time of day change feelings?	#	Percent
Yes	98	36.3%
No	172	63.7%
Total	270	100%

Intersections and vehicles

The audit asked similar questions about vehicles as for pedestrians. However, since auditors were on foot, they would have completed this section from the perspective of a pedestrian or from their own recollection of driving through the intersection on another occasion.

Overall, the visibility for a driver approaching intersection was mostly good. Only 12% said there was not good visibility for oncoming traffic (**Table 2.24**).

The auditors also indicated a few visibility problems. Ten percent felt there was not a good line of sight for pedestrians. Twelve percent said the signs and lights were not so visible.

Less than 8% said there was not enough stopping distance. Thirty-eight percent of auditors said they felt safe driving through the intersection, while the rest were somewhat safe or not at all. Thirty-six per cent said the time of day would change their feelings.

Auditors noted vehicle traffic concerns on 34 blocks, many of them the same busy streets as in the pedestrian comments. Traffic was described as fast and busy at 4th Ave and Rae, and 4th and Angus. A few wrote that the parked cars along Dewdney reduced visibility. On 1st Ave, around the 600 block, auditors noted speeding at Wascana and Queen and the need for traffic calming around Pasqua.

Table 2.24:

Enough time to cross inter.?	#	Percent
Yes	273	94.5%
No	16	5.5%
Total	289	100%

Enuf cross time for wheelchairs	#	Percent
Yes	222	77.4%
No	65	22.6%
Total	287	100%

Bells/buzzers in intersections	#	Percent
Yes	21	9.7%
No	195	90.3%
Total	216	100%

Pedestrian signs visible?	#	Percent
Yes	237	85.9%
No	39	14.1%
Total	276	100%

Intersection lighting quality?	#	Percent
Good	99	50.5%
Satisfactory	88	44.9%
Very poor	9	4.6%
Total	196	100%

Feel safe crossing?	#	Percent
Very safe	33	11.8
Safe	155	55.4%
Somewhat safe	90	32.1%
Very unsafe	2	0.7%
Total	280	100%

Time of day change feelings?	#	Percent
Yes	98	36.3%
No	172	63.7%
Total	270	100%

In the streets, the main CPTED issues centered on natural surveillance and image.

1. **Trim trees and bushes.** Overgrown trees and bushes were cited in many of the street audits. They create darkness by blocking streetlights, obstruct house numbers, street signs, and sightlines, and can provide hiding and entrapment sites. All of this contributes to a sense of insecurity.
2. **Clean up streets and yards.** The auditors found problems with litter, graffiti and vandalism in some blocks. Litter was cited in yards and vacant lots, as well as around convenience stores. Poor maintenance of houses – broken windows and steps – also contributed to a sense of an area being neglected and therefore, not safe. Maintenance on some streets and sidewalks could also be improved.
3. **Improve lighting.** Overall, about one-third of auditors felt lighting to be inadequate in some way. Although cutting back trees and bushes would improve lighting, auditors offered other suggestions. Some thought changing light bulbs from the current orange ones to the older white light style would brighten blocks. Others said streetlights could be turned on earlier in the evening, or that an additional set of streetlights could be installed in the darker blocks.
4. **Improvements to signage.** Auditors suggested improvements to make house numbers more visible and readable, especially for emergency vehicles. A number also suggested the installation of signs directing people to emergency assistance.

b. Alleys

Participants

The audit team for the alleys comprised 6 to 8 youths participating in a Rainbow Youth Project. They were primarily Aboriginal, both male and female and between the ages of 19 to 29 years, with two non-Aboriginal supervisors.

Findings

During the summer months of 2003, 430 audits were completed for the alleys in North Central. The same street audit form was used for the alley audit.

All of the alley audits were completed during daylight hours, generally mid-morning between 8:00 and 12:00 p.m. Teams of two or three auditors with a supervisor walked through the alleys, completing individual audits in 15 to 20 minutes. Many did not include names and the comment most given during the self-identification section was in reference to a question that asked whether the auditor was aboriginal or non-aboriginal. “Why does it matter?” was the common response to the question. The comment is included but yet, over 50% of the auditors mentioned that a sense of safety may be different for ethnic groups.

All of the auditors were participants in a local youth program; the number and selection of male and female participants were dependent on their participation in the program. Forty-four percent of the audits were completed by women and 54 percent by men (**Table 3.1**). None of the auditors lived in the neighbourhood.

The majority of the audits were completed by Aboriginal auditors. However, 40.5% of the audits left the question unanswered. Only 6% of the audits were completed by non-Aboriginal auditors.

Table 3.1: Sex	#	Percent
Females	192	44.7%
Males	232	54.0%
UK	6	1.4%
Total	430	

Table 2

Identity	#	Percent
Aboriginal	230	53.5%
Non-Aboriginal	26	6.0%
UK	174	40.5%
Total	430	

Personal Safety

Thirty-seven percent of the audits said they felt safe while walking in the alleys during the day (**Table 3.2**). Depending on the alleyway, auditors' levels of safety increased or decreased. Most felt safer in alleyways with busy streets, open areas and when they were in the company of others.

Table 3.2: How Safe does the Area Feel?	#	Percent
Very Safe	28	6.5%
Safe	161	37.4%
Okay	75	17.4%
Isolated	13	3.0%
Not Safe	55	12.8%

- *I feel more comfortable in the alley in a group; however, I would walk down this alley and feel fairly secure.*
- *I feel safe cause there's lots of open areas.*
- *I think a lot of people would feel safe because of the busy street.*

A couple of comments made by auditors said they felt safer in alleys where businesses were on the block.

- *Nothing to be scared of, lots of businesses.*
- *Safe, lots of movement, carwash, and businesses lots of movement.*
- *Lots of businesses, many people to lookout for you.*
- *A lot of open spaces to get help, or run from danger.*

Generally, any negative comments around alley safety were made because an alleyway had not been taken maintained. For, example “graffiti all over. It scares me.”

Over half of the audits mentioned that maybe/sometimes they would feel safe if they were alone. If children accompanied them, the sense of safety drops to 22% while 29% said they would not feel safe with children. If the auditor was an elderly person the sense of safety drops to 23% with 32% stating unsafe for elderly persons. Twenty-four percent are relatively equal for safety concerns when questioned about newcomers.

The percentage is considerably higher when questioned about racial minorities, almost 52% of the auditors said they felt racial minorities would not feel safe. One auditor commented:

If you are a racial minority it changes. If you're Caucasian, technically you are a racial minority within North Central, whose population is predominantly aboriginal.

Lighting

All of the alley audits were completed during daylight hours. The coordinator drove through some of the alleys in the evening, and found them to be poorly light with most illumination coming from floodlights purchased by individual homeowners for their property. In conversations with community residents, most said the alleys were dark and not a safe place to be walking after sundown.

Isolation

Sixty percent of the audits found the alleys not to be isolated while only 30% found alleys isolated. Many answered that only a few people could be seen walking in the area during the morning, day and evening hours or late at night.

Table 3.3: Does area feel isolated?	#	Percent
Yes	132	30.7%
No	270	62.8%
Somewhat/sort of	11	2.6%
UK	17	4.0%
Total	430	

Signage

The majority indicated that the street signs were not visible or easily identifiable. Almost 49% thought that emergency vehicles would have a problem finding the house from the alley. At that time, the alleys were surveyed a program provided by North Central Community Association and Regina Realtors had only partially completed placing alley addresses in North Central. It is estimated by the summer of 2004 the entire North Central will have back alley numbering.

When asked what suggestions would help emergency vehicles find addresses easier the most given response by the auditors was to trim the yards of overgrown bushes. The second response was to illuminate the house numbers. The third response was to increase the size of house numbers. A full 87% of auditors did not find any signs to emergency phones or emergency assistance.

Table 3.4: House Sign Problems	#	Percent
Yes	152	35.3%
No	177	41.2%
UK	101	23.5%
Total	430	

Emergency Vehicle find houses?	#	Percent
Yes	197	45.8%
No	209	48.6%
UK	24	5.6%
Total	430	

What could be done to help emergency vehicles find houses?

	#	Percent
Illuminate house numbers	23	5.3%
size of house numbers	88	20.5%
Trim Yards	156	36.3%

Other	23	5.3%
UK	140	32.6%
Total	430	

Visible Phones to call for Emergency

	#	Percent
No	376	87.4%
Yes	31	7.2%
UK	23	5.3%
Total	430	

Entrapment Sites

Ninety-five percent found possible assault sites where perpetrators could maybe hiding. Most mentioned between garbage bins, or in unlocked garages or utility sheds. 54% identified isolated lots as being a problem for possible assault sites.

Table 3.5: Are there places to hide?

	#	Percent
Yes	409	95.1%
No	14	3.3%
UK	7	1.6%
Total	430	

Auditors made similar comments several times regarding their overall sense of safety and what would contribute to it. For example, three auditors commented that open spaces or lots increased their sense of safety.

- *I feel safe cause there's lots of open areas.*
- *I would feel safe allot of open spaces.*
- *A lot of open spaces to get help or run from danger.*

Sightlines

Ninety percent thought sightlines were clear, however 9% mentioned sightlines were not clear and that fences, bushes, and trees were blocking sight.

Table 3.6: Can see clearly what's ahead?

	#	Percent
Yes	391	90.9%
No	26	6.0%
UK	13	3.0%
Total	430	

if no why not?

*	#	Percent
Bushes	7	17.9%
Trees	7	17.9%
Fences	8	20.5%
Telephone	5	12.8%
Company Signs	6	15.4%
Other	1	2.6%
UK	5	12.8%
Total	39	

Animals

Most of the alleys did not have domestic animals running freely, yet a full 90% said that there were domestic animals in the area. Only 26% found signs warning of dogs.

Table 3.7: Any domestic animals in area?

	#	Percent
Yes	391	90.9%
No	26	6.0%
UK	13	3.0%
Total	430	

Maintenance

Overall, 70% of the audit stated the maintenance area was satisfactory. 53% found litter to be a problem, and 44% identified graffiti of which 46% did not contain racist attitudes.

Table 3.8: General impression of maintenance?

	#	Percent
Good	61	15.1%
Satisfactory	284	70.5%
Poor	49	12.2%
Very Poor	9	2.2%
Total	403	

Despite the majority satisfactory rating, comments from the auditors revealed some alleys with major problems regarding garbage disposal, junked cars, and furniture, etc.

- *boards, junked car, garbage*
- *graffiti junked van*
- *couches beside fenced-in area*
- *mattress behind garbage*
- *very dirty*

Seven comments made regarding couches and mattresses left in the alley. Why are they left outside? One researcher who had previous discussions with community residents found they were concerned about the number of sleeping places in the alleys. One mentioned seeing children sleeping on the mattresses outside the house.

Vandalism

Almost 73% found no signs of vandalism with 10% positive that vandalism was present and 16% unsure.

Table 3.9: Vandalism?

	#	Percent
Yes	42	9.8%
No	317	73.7%
UK	71	16.5%
Total	430	

Graffiti

Forty-four percent of the audits found graffiti on the walls but were divided on whether or not the graffiti was racist. 51% said not racist or sexist while 46% said the graffiti was either one or the other. One auditor acknowledged that graffiti contributed to their level of safety.

Graffiti all over. It scares me.

Table 3.10: Graffiti on walls?

	#	Percent
Yes	189	44.0%
No	233	54.2%
UK	8	1.9%
Total	430	

Racist or sexist, slogans/signs/images?

	#	Percent
Yes	199	46.3%
No	223	51.9%
UK	8	1.9%
Total	430	

When asked for their overall assessment of the care and attention given to the alleys. The majority stated the alleys felt cared for and not abandoned. General comments ranged from “ I like this area” and “ this area looks clean and looked after, also no guard dogs back here” other comments included “ dirty alley”, or just “dirty”.

Table 3.11: Does place feel cared for?

	#	Percent
Yes	251	58.4%
No	130	30.2%
Sometimes	40	9.3%
UK	9	2.1%
Total	430	

Does this place feel abandoned?

	#	Percent
Yes	62	14.4%
No	352	81.9%
Sometimes	7	1.6%
UK	9	2.1%
Total	430	

Conclusion

The key CPTED issues in the alleys are natural surveillance and a sense of territoriality. The auditors did not feel safe in about 20% of alleys, even during day light hours. Like the streets, the alleys are public spaces. However, auditors felt considerably less safe in the alleys than on the streets. Overall, they are somewhat unsure of who will be there and what they will be doing. Overgrown trees and bushes that create hiding and entrapment sites, and blocked sightlines increase their feelings insecurity and uneasiness. As well, alleys tend to be more isolated from people, with fewer open spaces and more structures to hide behind. The rates of graffiti and litter, particularly furniture and vehicles, are higher in the alleys than the streets. Clear and well lit house numbers would likely increase safety by allowing emergency vehicles to find houses more easily and making homes appear more friendly and less anonymous.

c. Parks

This section of the report will include overall statistics for the parks, and specific findings and statistics for each park

A total of 65 audits were completed on eight public parks in North Central between July 2 and August 9, 2003. These parks are:

- 1) Albert Scott Park

- 2) Confederation Park
- 3) Dewdney Park
- 4) Grassick Park
- 5) Kinsmen North Park
- 6) Parkdale Park
- 7) Pasqua and 7th Avenue Park
- 8) Patty Cake Play Park

The park audit form was a five-page, self-administered CPTED checklist that inquired about lighting, sightlines, isolation, hiding spots, escape routes, maintenance, overall design and suggestions for improvement (See Appendix B). In total there were 54 questions that required auditors to answer yes or not, rate aspects of the park or provide written details.

Table 4.1 shows the numbers of completed audits for each park.

Most audits were completed between 8:00 and 10:30 p.m., with a few done in the afternoon. Each park was audited in daylight, usually around 8 p.m. and again after dark, between 10 and 10:30 p.m. Only one park, Patty Cake Play Park, was audited in one time period, around 9:30 p.m.

Typically, each audit took somewhere between 15 and 30 minutes to complete.

Each park was audited by a team of three to five people, pulled from a larger team of eight. All the auditors, except one, were between the ages of 30 and 39. One auditor was between 50 and 59 years of age. Half were City of Regina employees; half were North Central residents.

The team included three women and five men. Thirty-one percent of the audits were done by women and 69% by men (**Table 4.2**).

Table 4.1:

Park	# Audits	Percent
Confederation	10	15.4%
Kinsmen North	10	15.4%
Pasqua and 7th Ave	10	15.4%
Albert Scott	8	12.3%
Dewdney Park	8	12.3%
Parkdale	8	12.3%
Grassick	7	10.8%
Patty Cake Play	4	6.2%
Total	65	100.0%

Sex of Auditor	#	Percent
Female	20	30.8%
Male	45	69.2%
Total	65	100.0%

Almost half said they had visited the park they were auditing in the previous year (**Table 4.3**).

Table 4.3:

Visited park in last year?	#	Percent
Yes	28	47.5%
No	31	52.5%
Total	59	100.0%

Lighting

In a series of 17 questions, the audits inquired about the quality and evenness of both the natural and the electrical lighting. Some auditors did not complete the lighting section and in some cases, it appears the section on natural lighting was filled in during audits done after dark.

Natural Lighting

Most of the auditors – 79% – rated the quality of the natural lighting as satisfactory, good or very good. Only 21% said they found the natural lighting poor (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4:

Quality of natural lighting?	#	Percent
Very poor	0	0
Poor	11	20.8%
Satisfactory	12	22.6%
Good	15	28.3%
Very good	15	28.3%
Too dark	0	0.0%
Total	53	100%

Table 4.5:

Natural lighting even?	#	Percent
Yes	37	68.5%
No	17	31.5%
Total	54	100%

Where is lighting not even?	#	Percent
Near trees and bushes	6	37.5%
At centre of park	4	25.0%
Specific spots/corners	4	25.0%
Near buildings and play equip.	2	12.5%
Everywhere	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Total	16	100%

Identify face at 25 yards?	#	Percent
Yes	36	64.3%
No	20	35.7%
Total	56	100%

A slightly lower number – just fewer than 69% – found the natural lighting even (**Table 4.5**). Asked where the lighting was uneven, respondents most commonly said it was near trees and bushes, at the centre of the park and in specific spots or corners. Some 64% of auditors said they could identify a face at 25 metres, while 36% said they could not.

Table 4.6:

How does lighting illuminate the park?	#	Percent
Very poorly	0	0
Poorly	10	21.3%
Satisfactory	15	31.9%
Well	11	23.4%
Very well	11	23.4%
Total	47	100%

A final question, which asked how well the lighting illuminated the park, also highlighted some concerns with lighting. Twenty-one percent of auditors said the lighting only poorly illuminated the park (**Table 4.6**).

Electrical lighting

The section on electrical lighting was completed only for three parks – Albert Scott, Confederation and Dewdney Pool Park. The results are based on fewer than 15 audits and should be treated with caution. They do suggest declining visibility at night and an increase in auditors’ feelings of uneasiness and discomfort.

Of the 13 audits where the section on electrical lighting was completed, slightly under half the auditors found the quality of lighting poor or very poor. Some 54% described the quality of lighting as satisfactory or good (Table 4.7). When asked how well the lighting illuminated the park, only one auditor said well. The other felt the lighting illuminated the park only satisfactorily, poorly or very poorly.

Several noted that electrical lighting or spotlights in the park were not turned on, and that street lights and nearby buildings at least partially illuminated the park.

Almost 70% said they found the electrical lighting uneven, (Table 4.8), specifically:

- Between lights (meaning the lighting did not reach far enough)
- In fields
- Around play structures and rinks.
- Away from the pathways and the pool.

Amenity lighting or a combination of amenity and pathway lighting was the most common form of lighting in the park (Table 4.9). Some auditors noted that street lighting provided an additional and important source of light in the parks.

Finally, only three out of 10 auditors reported they could identify a face at 25 yards by the electrical lighting (Table 4.10). This is a drop in visibility of almost half when compared to the natural lighting.

Table 4.7:

Quality of electrical lighting?	#	Percent
Very poor	1	7.7%
Poor	5	38.5%
Satisfactory	6	46.2%
Good	1	7.7%
Very good	0	0.0%
Too dark	0	0.0%
Total	13	100%

Table 4.8:

Electrical lighting even?	#	Percent
Yes	4	30.8%
No	9	69.2%
Total	13	100%

Table 4.9:

Is the park lit from?	#	Percent
Amenity lighting	4	28.6%
Pathway lighting	2	14.3%
Both	5	35.7%
Street lights	3	21.4%
Total	14	100%

Table 4.10:

Identify face at 25 yards?	#	Percent
Yes	3	30%
No	7	70%
Total	10	100%

Sightlines

Six questions and one general comments sections recorded auditors' observations about sightlines.

Sixty-eight percent said they could see clearly ahead, while 32% said they could not (**Table 4.11**). Bushes were the most common obstacle that blocked peoples' sightlines.

Some 77% reported there were places to hide in the park. The vast majority of these hiding places were behind or around bushes, shrubs and trees (71%). The other category of hiding places related to structures such as rinks, schools and park buildings.

Table 4.11:

See clearly what's ahead?	#	Percent
Yes	44	67.7%
No	21	32.3%
Total	65	100%

If not, why?	#	Percent
Bushes	17	81.0%
Hill	1	4.8%
Other	3	14.3%
Total	21	100%

Are there places for hiding?	#	Percent
Yes	50	77%
No	15	23%
Total	65	100%

Where are hiding places?	#	Percent
Bushes, shrubs, trees	39	70.9%
Buildings: rinks, school, etc.	16	29.1%
Total	55	100%

Since greenery was cited as the most common hiding place, it is unsurprising that auditors suggested that trimming or thinning bushes (65.2%) and trimming trees (17.4%) would improve the sightlines (**Table 4.12**). Others suggested improvements to lighting, though one auditor thought turning off the lighting around the park would improve the

Table 4.12:

What would improve sightlines?	#	Percent
Trim or thin bushes and shrubs	30	65.2%
Trim trees (i.e. the low branches)	8	17.4%
Adjust lighting	6	13.0%
Other	2	4.4%
Total	46	100%

lighting by cutting down on shadows. Another said the wooden sides of the outdoor skating rink should be removed during the summer months.

Finally, auditors offered a few more suggestions about sightlines:

- A lighting audit to look at the context of use is needed.
- Could lights be changed to metal halide lights?
- Bright lights on exterior cause shadows.
- Lowering berms would be a shame since it adds a lot to the character of the park
- Shrubs are spaced out so as not to provide a full enclosed hiding space.

- There are some clumps of bushes but they have been thinned enough to see a person’s silhouette through them.

In regards to lighting in each park, the auditors’ perceptions and answers varied widely. Overall, most parks were rated good or satisfactory for lighting. The most concerns were raised about Confederation Park, Parkdale Park and Dewdney Park Pool after dark, particularly in regard to a lack of even light as auditors mentioned shadows, dark spots and corners, and darkness in the centre.

Isolation

Eye Distance

When asked about isolation in regards to eye distance, 32.8% of the auditors said the area felt isolated (**Table 4.13**). This varied from park to park. All the auditors described Confederation Park as isolated, while about half felt isolated in Dewdney Park Pool and Albert Scott. In the other parks, the question of isolation brought only a few or no affirmative answers.

Table 4.13:

Eye: does the area feel isolated?	#	Percent
Yes	21	32.8%
No	43	67.2%
Total	64	100%

Table 4.14:

How many people likely to be around?	#	Percent
None	16	25.0%
A few	30	46.9%
Several	16	25.0%
Many	2	3.1%
Total	18	100%

Overall, 72% of auditors felt there would be few or several people around (**Table 4.14**). One-quarter said there was likely to be nobody around. The auditors felt people were more likely to be around Kinsmen North, and less likely to be in Confederation Park.

Table 4.15:

How many people likely to be around in the day?	#	Percent
None	0	0.0%
A few	9	30.0%
Several	16	53.3%
Many	5	16.7%
Total	30	100%

How many people likely to be around in the evening?	#	Percent
None	4	9.1%
A few	22	50.0%
Several	13	29.5%
Many	5	11.4%
Total	44	100%

How many people likely to be around late at night?	#	Percent
None	16	40%
A few	24	60%
Several	0	0%
Many	0	0%
Total	40	100%

Easy to predict when people are around?	#	Percent
Yes	37	60.7%
No	24	39.3%
Total	61	100%

The time of day considerably influenced when auditors thought people would be around (Table 4.15). During the day, they felt there would be several, a few or many people around. None of the auditors felt the parks would have nobody in them.

By evening, the auditors felt the number people in the park would thin out. The percentage of “many” decreases while the percentage of “none” increases, in comparison to the daytime.

When asked about late at night, 40% of auditors thought there would be nobody around, while 60% thought there might be a few. Clearly the number and density of people decreases into the evening, thereby creating an expectation of isolation. Auditors were not entirely confident of this – only 61% said it was easy to predict when people would be around.

Isolation – Ear Distance

When asked about isolation in regard to sound and ear distance, 32.3% of auditors said the area felt isolated (Table 4.16). This is the same percentage that reported isolation in regard to sight and eye distance.

Table 4.16:

Ear: does the area feel isolated?	#	Percent
Yes	21	32.3%
No	44	67.7%
Total	65	100%

One-quarter of auditors said they could hear the sounds of children at the time of the audit. Just over 40% reported traffic noises. Only 8% reported hearing adults (**Table 4.17**)

Table 4.17:

What do you hear?	#	Percent
Traffic	47	42.4%
Children	27	24.3%
General din: trains, alarms, etc.	11	9.9%
Birds and nature	10	9.0%
People	9	8.1%
Pets	7	6.3%
Total	111	100%

Overall, 72% of auditors felt there would be few or several people around. Twenty-one percent said there was likely to be nobody around (**Table 4.18**). The auditors felt especially isolated in Confederation Park and somewhat isolated in Parkdale and Albert Scott Parks.

Table 4.18:

How many people likely to be around?	#	Percent
None	13	20.6%
A few	35	55.6%
Several	13	20.6%
Many	2	3.2%
Total	63	100%

As with the visual section of questions on isolation, the time of day considerably influences when auditors thought people would be around (Table 4.19). During the day, they felt there would be several, a few or many people around. Again, none of the auditors felt the parks would be entirely empty of people.

By evening, the auditors thought the people in the park would thin out. The percentage of “many” decreases while the percentage of “none” increases compared to the daytime.

Table 4.19:

How many people likely to be around in the day?	#	Percent
None	0	0.0%
A few	11	37.9%
Several	14	48.3%
Many	4	13.8%
Total	29	100%
How many people likely to be around in the evening?	#	Percent
None	4	9.1%
A few	18	40.9%
Several	18	40.9%
Many	4	9.1%
Total	44	100%

How many people likely to be around late at night?	#	Percent
None	17	41.5%
A few	24	58.5%
Several	0	0.0%
Many	0	0.0%
Total	41	100%

When asked about late at night, 41.5% of auditors thought there would be nobody around, while 58.5% thought there might be a few. Clearly the number and density of people again decreases into the evening and creates an expectation of isolation. In this portion of the checklist, the auditors were even less confident about knowing when people would be in the parks. Only 65% said they felt it was easy to predict when people would be around (Table 4.20).

Table 4.20:

Ear: easy to predict when people are around?	#	Percent
Yes	41	65.1%
No	22	34.9%
Total	63	100%

Movement Predictors

Six questions in this section of the audit inquired about pathways through the park, places to hide and what destinations people used the pathways to get to.

Some 26.2% of the auditors said they could not predict a pathway through the park (**Table 4.21**), particularly in Kinsmen North. They were divided predicting a pathway on Grassick, Dewdney Park Pool and Albert Scott. In the other parks, the majority said they could predict a pathway through the park.

Table 4.21:

Can you predict pathway through the park?	#	Percent
Yes	48	73.8%
No	17	26.2%
Don't know	0	0.0%
Total	65	100%

When asked if they would take the pathway, 34% said no or that they didn't know (**Table 4.22**). They were most comfortable with taking the pathway through Parkdale, Pasqua and 7th Ave and Patty Cake Play Park. Responses to the other parks varied except in Kinsmen North, where many said they could not predict a pathway, and therefore would not take it.

Table 4.22:

Would you take the pathway?	#	Percent
Yes	39	66.1%
No	8	13.6%
Don't know	12	20.3%
Total	59	100%

Manmade pathways accounted for 39% of the pathways, while natural ones were just over 16%. Thirty-six percent of pathways were a combination of both (**Table 4.23**).

Table 4.23:

Are the pathways...?	#	Percent
Manmade	24	39.3%
Natural	10	16.4%
Both	22	36.1%
Don't know	5	8.2%
Total	61	100%

Table 4.24:

Are there places to hide along the pathway?	#	Percent
Yes	23	39%
No	36	61%
Don't know	0	0%
Total	59	100%

Manmade pathways are found in Patty Cake, Pasqua and 7th Ave and Confederation Parks. Albert Scott has predominately natural pathways. The remainder of the parks have a combination of the two. In Kinsmen North, auditors mostly left the question blank or said they didn't know.

Thirty-nine percent of auditors felt there were places to hide along the pathways (**Table 4.24**). Most of the affirmative answers to this question were in Confederation, Dewdney Pool and Parkdale Parks. In Confederation, auditors mentioned hedges, shrubs and large trees as possible hiding places. At Dewdney Park Pool, in and around the pool building, overgrown shrubs, particularly along the pathway and behind large evergreen trees were cited as hiding places. In Parkdale Park, one auditor wrote "I would walk wide around the playground to determine if anyone was there". Trees, shrubs, a large clump of caraganas and around the play set were flagged as potential hiding places in Parkdale.

People used pathways through the parks to get to a wide range of locations and services – stores, schools, the exhibition grounds, local bars, churches and residences. Detailed answers to this question are included in findings for each park.

Possible Entrapment Sites and Escape Routes

Some 42% of auditors felt the parks had areas where they could feel trapped (**Table 4.25**). In three parks – Albert Scott, Pasqua and 7th Ave and Patty Cake – auditors did not feel there were entrapment sites.

Table 4.25:

Are there areas where you would feel trapped?	#	Percent
Yes	27	42.2%
No	37	57.8%
Total	64	100%

Table 4.26:

Are there areas of no escape?	#	Percent
Yes	24	37.5%
No	40	62.5%
Total	64	100%

In a corresponding question about escape routes, slightly fewer auditors – 37.5% - identified what they thought were areas of no escape (**Table 4.26**). All auditors felt Albert Scott and Pasqua and 7th Avenue

Parks did not have areas they would be unable to escape from.

The entrapment sites and areas of no escape are described in the findings for each park.

Maintenance

Auditors were asked two questions about maintenance⁵ – what was their general impression of park maintenance and why they were unsatisfied. Answers to the first question put into one of three categories (**Table 4.27**). Just over half thought park maintenance was good, while 27% found it fair or acceptable. Just fewer than 20% found park maintenance poor. Specific responses to park maintenance are included in the findings for each park.

Table 4.27:

Maintenance impression?	#	Percent
Good	32	54.2%
Fair	16	27.1%
Poor	11	18.7%
Total	59	100%

Factors That Affect Your Impression of the Park

In this section, auditors were asked four questions about graffiti and one question about what factors would make the park more enjoyable. This last question will be included in the next section, on overall design, where it more logically fits.

Table 4.28:

Graffiti in the park?	#	Percent
Yes	36	62.1%
No	21	36.2%
Can't tell	1	1.7%
Total	58	100%

The first question about graffiti actually includes two questions – is there graffiti, and if so, what kind is it? This question has been analyzed in three parts:

- Is there graffiti?
- What type of graffiti?
- Who did the graffiti?

Auditors said they saw graffiti in 62% of the park audits (**Table 4.28**). One respondent could not tell if there was any.

What type of graffiti?	#	Percent
Painting or writing	12	32.4%
Carving or scratching	5	13.5%
Other	1	2.7%
Unspecified	19	51.3%
Total	37	100%

In same question, 32.4% of auditors described the graffiti as painting or writing, while 13.5% said it was carving or scratching. One respondent described the graffiti as a label that had been torn off. Just over half did not specify the type of graffiti.

Who did it?	#	Percent
Gangs	9	26.4%
Kids	7	20.5%
Unspecified	18	52.9%
Total	34	100%

⁵ The level of maintenance within a given park is determined by the city according to one of four classes. Within North Central, all parks are rated Class B, except Kinsmen North, which is rated Class A. A full description of the Parks Maintenance Classes is included as Appendix B.

About half the auditors described who they thought had done the graffiti. Some 26.4% said it appeared to be graffiti by children or adolescents, while 26.4% said it was gang-related.

Table 4.29:

Any gang-related tags?	#	Percent
Yes	8	14.8%
No	46	85.2%
Total	54	100%

A similar number of auditors answered yes to the next question. This is about the same number of auditors who said there was gang-related tags on the nearby property (**Table 4.29**). They accounted for almost 15% of the

responses to this question.

Table 4.30

Graffiti on nearby property?	#	Percent
Yes	9	16.6%
No	42	77.7%
Don't know	3	5.6%
Total	54	100%

When asked about the surrounding property, 16.6% of the auditors said they saw graffiti there (**Table 4.30**). In comparison, there would appear to be much more graffiti in the parks than on the surrounding property. The difference in the responses may in part

due to the auditor's perspective from inside the park. There, they are likely have a closer and clearer view of graffiti than any that appears farther away, on the nearby property.

In two parks – Albert Scott and Patty Cake Play Park – auditors did not report any graffiti. Grassick and Parkdale Parks had limited graffiti, mostly small writing and spray paint on the play structures and the rink boards. At Kinsmen North, auditors noted kids writing and painting on the shack and the fences, as well as some carving on the benches. The heaviest graffiti seems to be in three parks: Pasqua and 7th Ave, Dewdney Park Pool and Confederation Park. At Pasqua and 7th there is kids writing, plus gang tags carved into benches. At Confederation Park, the auditors noted spray painting and writing on planter boxes and on the fountain and small gang tags. Dewdney Park Pool appears to be the most heavily graffiti. There, auditors recorded spray painting and carving on the benches, both by kids and gangs. Several noted the gang tag of CRIPS.

Albert Scott Park

Description

Auditors were fairly critical of this park, located north of Scott Collegiate. A few noted it was clean and quiet. Mostly their descriptions were negative. They described it as boring, plain, flat, uninviting, desolate, bland and no fun. Some said there seemed to be few children or users around. One woman wrote: “Yuck! You can see across the park but it still looks too dark to be safe.”

Lighting

Overall, auditors rated the natural lighting of this park as good. There were a few points of concern, particularly dark spots in the centre. Just over half thought they could identify a face at 25 yards.

This park was rated only satisfactory for electrical lighting. It is lit from both amenity lighting and streetlights. One auditor thought the lighting was uneven, with the central field dark. None of the auditors thought they could identify a face at 25 yards.

Sightlines

Auditors noted sightlines were clear, with the only possible hiding places in and around the nearby school. One suggested fencing in niches behind the building.

Isolation

Just under half the auditors felt this park was isolated, with only a few people around mornings, days, evenings and late at night. Half thought they could predict when people would be around. When asked what they could hear, auditors mostly said cars and traffic, plus some children and dogs.

Movement Predictors

The auditors mostly said they could predict a pathway through the park and that they would feel comfortable taking it. The pathways were natural and people used them to get

to schools, homes, stores, churches and streets, including Athol, southwest to northeast and northwest to southeast.

Entrapment and Escape

Auditors did not feel there were areas of entrapment or no escape in this park. One person suggested he might feel trapped right behind the school.

Nearby Land Uses

Around this park auditors described seeing homes, rental properties, two schools, a church, a police station, busy streets and lots of pedestrians. Homes were “a mixture of cared for and not”, with some reasonably maintained and others somewhat neglected. One auditor thought the houses were dark. A nearby busy street with no barrier was a concern. Also cited was prostitution, leading one auditor to comment that it was “not an area I’d want to be in after dark”.

Maintenance and Impression

Overall, the auditors were positive about this park, noting it was fairly clean and the grass was mowed. A few called the maintenance poor, pointing to a bent post in the ball diamond, a hole in the tennis fence and poles from the parking lot lying in the field. “This gives an air of neglect”. Two suggested the park needs garbage cans. There was no graffiti or gang-related tags reported in this park or on the nearby property.

Design and Improvements

Auditors described this park as good but plain and in need of updating. On the whole, they thought it lacked a sense of purpose and suggested more amenities – play lands for kids, basketball hoops, or volleyball – to draw more people to the space. “The park has no sense of purpose...very flat...safe for me but still I would not use.” Several suggested better landscaping and the planting of trees to green up the space. One auditor had concerns about problems with sightlines and entrapments areas just behind the school, on the south side of the park.

Confederation Park

Description

Located in the Exhibition Grounds, this is a 14,204- square metre park. It is particularly busy in the summer time, as meeting place and rest space for people attending events on the Exhibition Grounds. Surrounding the park are multiple buildings – a casino, the Agridome, the grandstand and large warehouse-style structures – as well as many parking lots. Further away, to the east, is the Lawson Sportsplex.

Auditors described this park as treed, beautiful, stately, majestic, turn of the century and historic. Some appreciated its large shady trees.

However, they noted that the park felt isolated and abandoned, and tended to be used only during summer events, such as Buffalo Days. They described it as listless, eerie,

scary and uneasy. “It’s pretty but lonesome” and “it reminds me of a cemetery” is how some auditors described Confederation Park.

Lighting

Auditors rated the natural lighting as good or poor, with half of them noting it was uneven and one-third felt the park was poorly illuminated. Trees and buildings were said to cause shading, so that only half the auditors thought they could identify a face at 25 yards.

The electrical lighting was felt to be poor and uneven. Some noted the spotlights were not turned on. Lighting from the nearby buildings lit up parts of the park but created shady spots in some areas.

Sightlines

Auditors were split on how well they could see ahead - half said that bushes blocked their line of sight. All noted hiding places, including the bushes, behind the fountain and around a small house and trailer in the park, as well as around buildings just outside the park and generally, in shadowed areas.

Isolation

All felt this park was isolated in both eye distance and ear distance. Only half could predict when people might be around, and mostly said during the day or evening. When asked what they could hear, they said only distant traffic and birds.

Movement Predictors

The pathways in this park are predictable and auditors were mostly comfortable with taking them. About half noticed places to hide along the pathways, behind hedges and large tree trunks. People might use the pathways in this park to get to facilities at the Exhibition Grounds – the Casino, Agridome, and a bingo palace. To the east and south, they could travel through the park to the Lawson Sportsplex or to other neighbourhoods, such as Cathedral.

Entrapment and Escape

About half the auditors said they could feel trapped around buildings, particularly in the northwest corner and between the house and trailer in the park. The same areas were also ones they felt they could not escape from.

Nearby Land Uses

The auditors’ impression of the nearby properties was of parking lots and large windowless buildings, some of them run down. They felt the nearby property to be desolate, abandoned and very empty at night.

Maintenance

Confederation Park received mixed marks in the maintenance department, ranging from pretty good to forgotten. “The park is clean but could use some TLC”, wrote one auditor. While the grass was mowed, some noted the bushes and trees needed trimming and the

fountain and pathways are in disrepair. This park seems to be “maintained to a minimum level”, one auditor suggested.

Impression

There was little graffiti in this park or on the nearby property, apart from some writing and spray painting on planter boxes. Some noticed very small gang tags in the park.

Design and Improvements

Auditors liked the “historic town square” feel to this park, which they regarded as classic, quiet, and a welcome resting place for people attending events at the Exhibition Grounds. They regarded it as hidden and unadvertised, therefore somewhat wasted. Possible improvements could include more benches and picnic tables, improved plantings, more garbage cans and a working fountain. Some felt a destination amenity, i.e. a spray pad or a dog park, might attract other users. A sign in the Exhibition Grounds would help the park be better known. Entrance and exit lighting, better pathways, and trees planted for the future would also help. The house on the property needs to be fixed or moved. Overall, some general sprucing and planning, they felt, would make this a more attractive and inviting park. “This is a very historic park with beautiful trees and fountain. It just needs some TLC to restore it and a reason to come visit”.

Dewdney Pool Park

Dewdney Pool Park, at 3355 8th Ave, covers 13,050 square metres. At the northwest corner is a public swimming pool; the northeast is a lawned and treed area with a children’s playground. At the south end of the block, bordering Dewdney Avenue, is the historic Territories Building, dating back to 1883, when Regina was capital of the NorthWest Territories. Open lawn and a parking lot divide the pool and park area and the building.

Overall, auditors described this park as “nice” or “quite nice”. Some appreciated the trees and landscaping and found the park “green”, “visually appealing” and “handsome”. Some, however, must have felt somewhat uneasy, for they also described the park as spooky, ominous, dark and having places to hide. One noted the park was misused and somewhat littered.

Lighting

Only a few auditors completed the section on natural lighting. Overall, they found it good, though the trees tended to create shadows.

The electrical lighting was found to be satisfactory, or poor, and mostly uneven. Shadows and dark areas were recorded, with the best light along the pathway and near the pool. The lighting, according to some auditors, did not reach far enough. Half felt the lighting poorly illuminated the park at night.

Sightlines

Three-quarters of the auditors found that bushes blocked their sightlines, and created areas for hiding. They suggested pruning shrubs and trimming evergreens up, to allow people to see under the tree branches.

Isolation

About half the auditors felt this park was isolated by sight, and could not easily predict when people would be around.

Fewer felt the area was isolated by ear distance and said they could hear children in the park and in the neighbourhood, plus traffic on nearby Dewdney Avenue. They were more confident that people were around, and that they could predict when they would be there.

Movement Predictors

Just over half the auditors could predict a pathway through Dewdney Pool Park, but only a few said they would feel comfortable taking that path. Pathways were both natural and man made. All noted places to hide along the pathways, including shrubs, trees and shadows, and the area around the pool building.

The pathways, auditors felt, would be used by people to get to schools, stores, churches and the laundry facility on Dewdney Avenue. People would also use the paths enroute to the pool itself or the Territories Building.

Entrapment and Escape

About half the auditors noted places of entrapment and areas of no escape at Dewdney Pool Park. The bushes at 5th Ave and Montague and 8th Ave and Montague, together with the pool fence, were cited as areas of entrapment. Bushes in the park and the high pool fence were viewed as areas of no escape. One auditor wrote of “a small tunnel (path) at 8th and Montague between bushes (that) could be used by aggressors”.

Nearby Land Uses

This park is surrounded mostly by residential properties and to the south, busy Dewdney Avenue. Further away are a church and some businesses. The auditors noted that the houses are a mixture of rentals and owner-occupied, “some moderately well cared for, others in the beginning stages of decay”. They were described as older, “quiet and nice”. Some thought they were fairly well lit; another auditor noted many were without front lights.

Maintenance

The maintenance in this park was described as quite good overall. Some auditors pointed to specific areas to improve – clean up the litter, fix the holes beneath the fence, trim the bushes and trees and eliminate the graffiti on benches and walkways. There is also need, they said, to fix the playground equipment and provide more garbage bins, especially near the pathways and play area.

Impression

Graffiti in this park included writing, scratching and carving on benches. Several auditors noted gang tags.

Design and Improvements

Overall, auditors liked the design of this park, appreciating the attractive pathways. They suggested more and better play equipment and additional benches for parents, especially along the pathways and by the play area. More activities in the park, such as a basketball court for youth, one said, might invite positive use of the park and reduce the number of “negative users” in the evening. (Some auditors said children find needles around the ring of benches and drunks sleeping on benches and in the bushes.) Some felt the park needed lighting upgrades, more garbage cans and trimmed hedges, particularly near the pool.

Grassick Playground Park

Grassick Playground Park, at 901 Garnet St., covers an entire city block. It encompasses 53,652 square metres, making it the largest park in North Central. The park contains a children’s playground, plenty of open space, and an outdoor boarded skating rink.

Overall, auditors were neither glowing nor very negative in their reaction to this park. Most described it as “fairly nice”, clean, open and functional. Some noted that the park was empty, dark and lacked benches to sit on. As one auditor wrote, “(it’s) not too bad, I’d probably walk through it at night but only with someone”.

Lighting

The natural lighting was described as mostly good, and evenly illuminated. However, one auditor found the centre of the park to be dark, and only three in seven said they could identify a face at 25 yards. The section on electrical lighting was not completed.

Sightlines

Half the auditors said they could not clearly see what was ahead, because of a small hill in the park. All pointed to the wooden boards, of the skating rink, left up in the summer months, as a possible hiding place.

Isolation

Overall, auditors did not feel this park was isolated, either in eye distance or ear distance. They were fairly confident they could predict when people would be around, especially in the daytime and evening, when there would be several or many people. Asked what they could hear, auditors said cars, children, music, voices and birds.

Movement Predictors

The pathways in Grassick Park are a combination of natural and manmade. Mostly auditors could predict a pathway through the park and said they would take that pathway. The area around the rink was the only place flagged as a possible hiding spot.

People might use the park, auditors noted, to get to nearby residences and the Buddhist Temple, as well as facilities in the park itself, such as the play structure and the rink.

Entrapment and Escape

Just over half the auditors pointed to the inside of the rink as a possibly place of entrapment and no escape. Wrote one “In the boarded rink, because the exits are on the same side. I would not go in there at night.” Another said the high fencing would not allow an easy escape and that “common sense would tell you not to be in there at night”.

Nearby Land Uses

The auditors described quiet residential streets to the east and west of this park, with “lots of traffic” on the major streets to the north and south of the park. Some auditors felt they were fairly well kept, others noted that some houses had high front faces that were not inviting or in poor shape. One pointed out that some of the 25’ lots were empty. A few said the homes needed to be better lit.

Maintenance

Grassick Park is clean and well maintained. Auditors said the trees are kept trimmed and the grass is cut regularly.

Impression

The only graffiti noted in the park or the nearby property was some children’s writing on the rink boards. No gang tags were noted.

Design and Improvements

The design of this park was seen as good, open and safe, though simple, somewhat bland and a bit cold. Pathways would create more definable space, as would better use of the empty 4th quadrant. More benches and better use of the facilities by community groups – the baseball diamond and the rink – would improve park usage. Auditors also thought the ball diamond could be better maintained and the rink boards removed in the summer.

Kinsmen North Park

Kinsmen North Park is located in the northwest corner of North Central. To the west and east are Lewvan Drive and Pasqua Street; north and south are 1st Ave and 3rd Ave. This park is 47,530 square metres. Immediately south are baseball diamonds and a school; to the north is a church.

Auditors had positive statements about this park, particularly about the green space and the trees, and described it as lush. Others felt it was happy, sunny and fun for kids. One wrote that it was a “very nice, visually appealing park with mature trees and defined areas”: another stated that it was a “green flowing space”. Auditors appreciated the openness of the park.

The more negative comments centred on the park having a somewhat indifferent feel to it. One auditor wrote it was non-descript and cookie-cutter, but had some potential.

Lighting

Most of the auditors described the natural lighting as good or very good. Overall it is even, apart from some shading from the trees. Most of the auditors said they could identify a face at 25 metres. A few felt the park was poorly illuminated. The section on electrical lighting was not completed.

Sightlines

About three-quarters of the auditors said they could see clearly ahead. Bushes blocked the sightlines of a few. All indicated possibly places to hiding, including behind bushes, shacks and the rink fence. One auditor noted “there are shrubs throughout the park, but I don’t think they need to be cut down, just thinned out.” Others also suggested cleaning out the underbrush and trimming the lower portions of bushes.

Isolation

Only one of the auditors thought the park was isolated. Overall, they felt there would always be people around, except possibly late at night, and they could mostly predict when people would be there. In regards to ear distance, the auditors did not consider the park isolated, and said they could hear cars, children, some nearby adults and people working on their yards or houses. The only time some auditors felt they could not predict people would be around was late at night.

Movement Predictors

There does not seem to be clear pathways in Kinsmen North. Most of the auditors could not predict a pathway and didn’t know if they could take it. Half did not know if the pathways were natural or manmade.

The park might be used by people to get to school, church, local bars, a strip mall and Lewvan Drive, or to facilities within the park – picnic areas and spray pad. However, the movement through this park is somewhat limited because it is fenced on three sides and the west side borders Lewvan Drive.

Entrapment and Escape

About half the auditors said they could feel trapped against the fence on the west side of the park, especially in the northwest corner. The fence is six-feet high and there is no exit.

Nearby Land Uses

Around this park are residences, a church, a school and ball diamonds. To the west is Lewvan Drive. Auditors were mostly positive about the nearby property, although one referred to “drugs”. Generally, they felt the homes were mostly owner-occupied and well kept, described as “fine” and “generally good”.

Maintenance

The auditors rated maintenance in this park as not bad to excellent. Areas for improvement include removing stones in the spray pool, repairing broken boards on the bench, cutting the grass and adding pea gravel. One auditor noted used condoms under the bushes.

Impression

Graffiti within the park was described as children's painting on the shack and on the rink fence, and some carving on benches. Auditors noted some graffiti on a nearby garage. No gang tags were recorded.

Design and Improvements

Auditors envisioned many possibilities for this park, described as good and "plain but functional", somewhat old-fashioned and "cookie cutter". Some thought there is need for definable spaces in this park: "a pathway system would accomplish that; entrance and exit would also help." Another auditor wrote, "From a CPTED perspective, this park requires better routes, image and definable space." They suggested the addition of more play equipment and picnic areas, plus benches for parents, as well a volleyball area or a dog park section. Additional landscaping and colourful shrub beds would brighten the park. A particular concern is the isolation of the north end, which is said to attract illegal activities. Some thought trimming the bushes there and closing the gate at the north end would discourage these.

Parkdale Park

Parkdale Park, at 901 Princess Street, covers 12,539 square metres. It is mostly open space, with some playground equipment and a ball diamond.

Auditors did not write much about this park. Generally the comments are positive, describing it as a "pleasant space, reasonably well used." One wrote that it "generally looks nice, well maintained, (and) turf in good shape". Another thought it was spacious, landscaped and child-oriented.

A few pointed out that the park was passive and indifferent and had litter and beer bottles around. They said it was used day and night, which might account for the litter.

Lighting

Auditors gave this park average marks for natural lighting – some found it very good and others poor. Mostly, they termed it satisfactory. Half felt the lighting was uneven, and thought the centre of the park and bush areas were dark. Only half could identify a face at 25 yards. Auditors also varied in how well they thought the lighting illuminated the park. The section on electrical lighting was not completed.

Sightlines

A few auditors felt they could not clearly see ahead because bushes blocked their sightlines. All thought the bushes and tress in this park provided potential hiding places and needed to be trimmed and thinned. One suggested "Remove bottom branches from

piners. Thin out caraganas, single row and spaces. Cut down to 40” maximum”. Another hiding place suggested was around the play set.

Isolation

Mostly auditors did not find this park isolated, though half said they could not predict when people would be around. However, throughout the day, evening and night, they thought at least a few people would be in the park. Soundwise, they could hear cars, children, people walking and talking, birds, dogs and a distant train. Again, the auditors felt there would always be a few people around, though they could not always predict when.

Movement Predictors

This park has both natural and manmade path. Auditors could predict pathways through the park and said they would feel comfortable using them. However, they noted places to hide along those paths – behind spruce trees and shrubs. One wrote “At the play area, bushes are approximately 4.5 feet high. I would walk wide around the playground to determine if anyone was there.” People use the park to get to the Rainbow Youth Centre, garage, church, bus stop and residences.

Entrapment and Escape

More than half the auditors thought they would feel trapped and unable to escape between the fence and the softball backstop, and against the backstop itself. One auditor did not name specific areas of no escape but said “I’m iffy about the play area after dark. Too many areas that someone could hide. But (there is) still space to run if surprised.”

Nearby Land Uses

The nearby land uses for this park are residences, the Rainbow Youth Centre, a main road and the Green Garage. Auditors noted the area was fairly quiet, a mixture of owned homes and rentals, with some in good shape and others poorly maintained. A few of the homes were not well lit. One said the nearby roads were reasonably well maintained.

Maintenance

This park got high marks for maintenance, ranging from good to very good. A few auditors suggested cleaning up the shrub beds, which contained some litter.

Impression

The only graffiti noted was a bit of writing and spray painting on the bench and swing set of the play structure.

Design and Improvements

Modern and nice, but lacking creativity and vision was how auditors described this park. They suggested trimming and removing some bushes, straightening the line of caraganas, trimming branches from pines, and adding lights, particularly at 4th and Princess St.

Improved benches, possibly metal ones, and better and more creative play structures, would attract more usage.

Pasqua and 7th Ave Park

This park, located at 1301 Pasqua Street, covers 4,433 square metres. It occupies the northern third of the block between Wascana and Pasqua Streets. Seventh Avenue marks the park's northern boundary.

This park was described as nice, open, clean, busy and sunny. Some auditors felt it to be a useable children's park. Others noted that it was plain, cookie cutter and an "afterthought" One auditor felt it was quite well lit, while others wrote that this park was empty, dark and quiet. However, residents who live near this park said in a focus group discussion that the park is used for illegal activities after 11 p.m. and that they would not feel safe going there.

Lighting

Auditors were evenly split in describing the natural lighting of this park, with a few in each category – very good, good, satisfactory or poor. Mostly they found the light even, except at 5th Avenue, and mostly they felt they could identify a face at 25 metres. Only one auditor completed the section on electrical lighting. It was rated as even, but poor. One auditor said the streetlights adjacent to the park blinked on and off and were partly blocked by trees.

Sightlines

A majority of auditors said they could clearly see what was ahead. Bushes blocked the sightlines of a few of the auditors. Six said the park had places for hiding in the bushes and shrubs along Wascana Street. They suggested pruning bushes and improving lighting.

Isolation

Overall, the auditors did not find the park isolated. They could mostly predict when people would be around and thought there would always be someone in the park except, perhaps, late at night. The nearby sounds included cars and traffic, voices, children playing and birds. Again, the auditors felt they could mostly predict when people would be around, within hearing distance.

Movement Predictors

Pathways in this park were both natural and manmade. Auditors said they could predict the pathway and would feel comfortable taking it. They did not see any places to hide along the pathway.

People might pass through this park on their way to Pasqua Hospital, the strip mall and local stores, bars and residences.

Entrapment and Escape

The auditors did not see any areas of possible entrapment or no escape.

Nearby Land Uses

Surrounding this park are residential homes to the east, west and south, a busy street to the north and two bars located two blocks from the park. Auditors pointed out a mix of housing and low-income residences, both “unkept and run down”.

Maintenance

Overall, the auditor felt this smaller park was clean and quite well maintained. Two suggested trimming and shaping the bushes, and possibly planting more.

Impression

Graffiti was noted on benches in the park, both kids’ writing and gang tags. The auditors also found graffiti on nearby garages and garbage bins.

Design and Improvements

The auditors felt this park was basic and somewhat boring, “very afterthoughty”. They suggested upgrading or adding play structures for children and removing or burying the low overhead lines that crisscross the centre of the park and block ball activity. More lighting would brighten the park, pathways would add definition, trimming the bushes would clean it up and additional trees would be welcome. One person suggested reconfiguring the space. Another offered the idea of renaming it to Blakeney Park.

Patty Cake Play Park

At 581 square metres, this is the smallest park in North Central. Unlike the other, general use parks, Patty Cake Play Park is specifically for young children. It is located just north of Taylor Field, on the south end of the block, between Retallack and Rae Streets.

While auditors noted it was small and good for young children, many felt this park was too small, boring, lacking in imagination and poorly maintained. One auditor pointed out that the trees in this park are dying.

Lighting

The natural lighting in this park was described as satisfactory or very good. All auditors said the lighting was even, and that they could identify a face at 25 yards. There were no results for the section on electrical lighting.

Sightlines

Auditors did not record any concerns with sightlines or places to hide.

Isolation

One of four auditors felt the park was isolated. All, however, said it was easy to predict when people would be around. One auditor also noted the park was isolated for ear distance. The only reported sound was distant traffic.

Movement Predictors

Pathways in this park were manmade and therefore predictable. All auditors said they would feel comfortable taking them. There were no places to hide. People might go through the park to get to Taylor Field or the Rainbow Youth Centre, though the park is small and a destination in itself.

Entrapment and Escape

One auditor flagged the northeast fence corner of Patty Cake Play Park as an area of no escape because the fence has no opening there

Nearby Land Uses

This small park sits in the midst of residences and near to Taylor Field and the youth centre. It was described as “fairly calm”, with well-kept, older homes nearby.

Maintenance

Maintenance in this children’s play park was described as acceptable, not great or very poor. Auditors noticed a weedy pathway and sign decals ripped off. One suggested painting the swings, recoating the benches and replanting the trees.

Impression

No graffiti or gang tags were noted. A sign decal was ripped off.

Design and Improvements

Auditors’ impressions of the park were that it is simple and very plain. “For a play park, it is very isolated and almost all pea gravel”. They suggested improved maintenance and more imaginative design, as well as the addition of more benches, better play structures, grass, and trees to make the park more inviting. One auditor would like to see it become “a place to dream”.

Conclusion

Overall, auditors were fairly positive about the parks of North Central. Some concerns about maintenance were raised, in regards to trimming trees and bushes and cleaning up litter and graffiti. In some places, lighting could be improved.

A key finding in relation to CPTED is about activity support and community culture. There is need, some felt, to attract legitimate users by offering more activities and updating play equipment. The parks looked nice but auditors wanted more of a reason to visit them.

Residents Priorities

The findings from the audits highlighted some key areas for action. Residents confirmed these findings during the focus group discussions. They are fairly consistent with the service calls made to the city by North Central residents, and with police hot spots. Detailed lists and addresses of locations that need attention have been provided to the City of Regina and the North Central Community Association.

Streets

In the streets, the main CPTED issues centered on natural surveillance and image. Numbering

5. **Trim trees and bushes.** Overgrown trees and bushes were cited in many of the street audits. They create darkness by blocking streetlights, obstruct house numbers, street signs, and sightlines, and can provide hiding and entrapment sites. All of this contributes to a sense of insecurity.
6. **Clean up streets and yards.** The auditors found problems with litter, graffiti and vandalism in some blocks. Litter was cited in yards and vacant lots, as well as around convenience stores. Poor maintenance of houses – broken windows and steps – also contributed to a sense of an area being neglected and therefore, not safe. Maintenance on some streets and sidewalks could also be improved.
7. **Improve lighting.** Overall, about one-third of auditors felt lighting to be inadequate in some way. Although cutting back trees and bushes would improve lighting, auditors offered other suggestions. Some thought changing light bulbs from the current orange ones to the older white light style would brighten blocks. Others said streetlights could be turned on earlier in the evening, or that an additional set of streetlights could be installed in the darker blocks.
8. **Improvements to signage.** Auditors suggested improvements to make house numbers more visible and readable, especially for emergency vehicles. A number also suggested the installation of signs directing people to emergency assistance.

Alleys:

Many of the findings for the alleys echoed those of the streets, with a few differences.

1. **Add lighting to the alleys.** The audits were completed during day, but a good proportion of auditors felt the alleys to be isolated or felt unsafe. This would increase during the night, when alleys are mostly dark, lit only randomly by residents' own backyard and garage lighting. Care would have to be given to install lights that could not easily be vandalized and that would not create shadows.
2. **Trim trees and bushes.** Trim overgrown bushes and trees to open up alleys, improve sightlines and reduce the number of hiding sites.

3. **Clean up the alleys and yards.** Maintenance issues to be addressed include cleaning up litter and graffiti in certain blocks.

Parks:

The audits for the parks were fairly positive, but some areas for action were identified.

1. **Improve maintenance.** Maintenance was described as satisfactory, with areas for positive improvement. Overgrown bushes and trees need to be trimmed, especially in Confederation, Parkdale and Dewdney Pool Parks, around buildings and along parkways. The equipment in some parks needs to be fixed or clean up. Gang tags, needles and litter obviously give a sense of unfriendliness. Some parks have blocked sightlines. Kinsmen North Park would benefit from clearer pathways.
2. **Improve lighting.** Electrical lighting could be brighter, especially in Albert Scott and Kinsmen North parks.
3. **Update parks and provide more activities.** While the auditors felt that, overall, the parks were good, they wanted more attractions, especially updated play equipment, and activities for youth. This would attract more people, decreasing isolation and increasing the number of legitimate users. Albert Scott was described as plain and uninviting; Grassick was seen as bland and a bit cold. Confederation, admired as green and beautiful, was isolated and used only during Buffalo Days in July-August.

Appendix A: Street/Alleys audit tool

SAFETY AUDIT

**CITY OF REGINA
NORTH CENTRAL NEIGHBOURHOOD**

AUDIT NUMBER: _____

AREA BEING AUDITED

1) STREET NAME: _____

2) BLOCK NUMBERS: _____

3) DATE: _____

4) TIME: _____ DAY or NIGHT? _____

AUDITED BY:

5) NAME: _____
(optional)

6) IDENTITY: Aboriginal _____ Non-Aboriginal _____
(optional)

7) SEX: MALE: _____ FEMALE: _____

8) AGE GROUP:

18 and under _____	19 to 29 _____	30 to 39 _____
40 to 49 _____	50 to 59 _____	60 plus _____

9) DO YOU LIVE ON THE STREET THAT YOU ARE AUDITING?

YES _____ NO _____

General Impressions

10) How safe does the area feel?

11) Would I feel safe here if:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|----------------|
| a) I was alone? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| b) I was with children? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| c) I was an elderly person? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| d) I was a newcomer? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| e) I was of a minority? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| f) I had disability? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |
| g) I was walking? | Yes | No | Maybe/Sometime |

12) Comments:

Signage

30) Are the street signs visible and easily identifiable? Yes No

31) Could an emergency vehicle find the houses on this block rapidly? Yes No

32) What could be done to help emergency vehicles find the houses?

- a) Increase size or location of house numbers _____
- b) Trim overgrown front yards blocking numbers _____
- c) Illuminate the house numbers _____
- d) Other _____

33) Can I see telephones or signs directing me to emergency assistance? Yes No

34) What signs should be added or removed in this block? _____

35) Comments:

Possible Assault Sites

36) Are there places someone could be hiding? Yes No

37) If yes, where?

- a) _____ Between garbage bins
- b) _____ Unlocked garages or utility sheds
- c) _____ Alley or lane-way
- d) _____ Isolated parking lots
- e) _____ Other

38) Are there areas that should be locked, fenced or barricaded? Yes No

39) Comments:

Sightlines

40) Can you clearly see what's ahead? Yes No

41) If no, why not?

- a) _____ Bushes
- b) _____ Trees
- c) _____ Fences
- d) _____ Telephone poles
- e) _____ Company signs
- f) _____ Other

42) Comments:

Animals

43) Are there any domestic animals in the area? Yes No

44) If so, are dogs secured or fenced in? Yes No

45) Are there signs warning you of the dogs? Yes No

46) On this street, are there yards without signs that have guard dogs? Yes No

47) If so, what is the house number? _____

48) Are there dogs or cats running freely on this block that you are auditing now?

Yes No

49) Comments:

Maintenance

50) What is your impression of maintenance?

Very Poor Poor Satisfactory Good

51) Do you know whom maintenance concerns should be reported to? Yes No

52) Is there litter lying around? Yes No

53) If so, where? _____

54) What kind? _____

55) If yes, what is the house number? _____

56) From your experience, how long do repairs generally take?

57) Comments:

Factors Which Make This Place More Human

58) How do you feel walking in this area?

59) Does the place feel cared for? Yes No

60) Does the place feel abandoned? Yes No

61) Is there graffiti on walls? Yes No

62) In your opinion, are there racist or sexist slogans, signs or images? Yes No

63) Are there signs of vandalism? Yes No

64) Are there benches where people can sit, read, chat, etc? Yes No

65) What would improve your sense of safety?

Intersections

Vehicles and pedestrians:

- 66) Is there sufficient time for everybody to cross the intersection? Yes No
- 67) Are the sidewalks and median easily crossed by wheel chairs and walkers?
Yes No
- 68) Do the walking signals have bells and buzzers for the visually impaired?
Yes No
- 69) Are signs clearly visible? Yes No
- 70) How is the quality of lighting? Very good Good Satisfactory Very Poor
- 71) How safe do you feel crossing the intersection?
Very safe Safe Somewhat safe Very Unsafe
- 72) Would the time of day change your feelings? Yes No

73) **Comments on vehicles and pedestrians:**

Vehicles (to be completed from the perspective of a driver)

- 74) How is the visibility approaching this intersection?
Very good Good Satisfactory Very Poor
- 75) Is there good visibility of oncoming traffic from all directions? Yes No
- 76) Do you have a good line of sight of pedestrians at all times? Yes No
- 77) Are stop signs and traffic lights easily visible? Yes No
- 78) Do you feel there is sufficient stopping distance for the unexpected? Yes No
- 79) Do you feel safe and comfortable driving through this intersection?

Very Somewhat Not at all

80) Would the time of day change how you feel?

Yes

No

81) Comments on vehicles and intersections:

Thank you for taking your time to complete this safety audit. If there are any other comments or concerns that you would like to make, please add them below:

Appendix B: Parks Audit tool:

Appendix C: Findings Maps of North Central: #1 and #2

Appendix D: Parks Maintenance Classes

Maintenance service levels or maintenance classes have been established in context of the hierarchy of open space types. The classes acknowledge that maintenance requirements for open spaces are determined primarily by the use or function of the open space. Maintenance service levels are, therefore, tailored to meet the needs of the open space use.

The park spaces managed by the City range from high quality, high use parks such as Kiwanis Park and Victoria Park to lower use neighbourhood parks such as Lucy Eley Park. To ensure that maintenance is provided in a fair and equitable manner, suitable to the type of open space and the use the area receives, each park is characterized as belonging to a particular class. The maintenance schedules for that park are then developed based on the guidelines for that class of open space. The Parks List, identifies parks by class, along with their location.

Maintenance guidelines are organized into four maintenance classes. Each class represents a different quality or intensity of maintenance.

- Class A** This class of maintenance is characterized by an intensive level of attention. Turf is maintained at a 3" height of cut, receiving 1½" of water per week. Types of open space maintained at this classification may have annual flower beds and planter boxes as well as perennial beds, which are maintained in a relatively weed-free condition. During the summer season (approximately April through September) these spaces are inspected and litter is picked up seven days per week. During the off-season, litter pick up occurs daily during the regular work week (ie: 5 days per week).
- Class B** This class is maintained in a somewhat less intensive manner than a Class A area. The turf is still maintained at a 3" height of cut, but is cut half as frequently, and receives only 1" of water per week. Some Class B areas may have perennial flower beds, but do not have annual beds or planter boxes. This class of open space receives litter pick up once per week during the summer season (May through September).
- Class C** Open space maintained at this classification is unirrigated, and receives a significantly lower intensity of maintenance. The turf is maintained at a 5 inch height of cut and receives no sweeping or aerating. Class C open space types have no flower beds or planter boxes. During the summer season, this class receives litter pick-up once every 2 weeks.
- Class D** This class is maintained as coarse grass turf in a naturalized state throughout the growing season, receiving only one cut in mid-summer. A mow strip is maintained adjacent to residential properties. This strip is maintained at a level roughly corresponding to a Class C. Litter pick-up in this area is also once every 2 weeks.

Note: New tree plantings receive a relatively high level of maintenance for the first three years, regardless of the class of the surrounding open space.

Accessed at:

http://www.cityregina.com/content/parks_and_rec/park_maintenance/parks_classifications.shtml

Appendix E: Statistics

Alleys
 Streets
 Parks
 Service Calls

Table 5.1: Service calls by category

By category: CPTED-related service calls to the city: Jan. to Nov. 2003		Number
Alleys:		
Alley litter		400
Back alley garbage collection		205
Litter and debris		
Junked vehicles		55
Abandoned vehicle		25
Litter on public property		12
Debris pickup: streets		7
Graffiti and vandalism		0
Maintenance		
Noxious weeds		266
Untidy and unsightly property		206
Unmaintained structure		123
Container maintenance		64
Sidewalk repair		35
Road repair		22
Light repair/replacement		1
Sightline restriction		6
Traffic lights and signs		
General signs		1
Traffic signs		11
New traffic sign		5
Traffic signals/lights		1
New traffic light		5
Street signs		2
Trees		
Trees: inspection, city		77
Trees: pruning		31
Trees: obstruction		29
Trees: inspection, private		24
Trees: maintenance		17
Trees: pruning low branches		17
Trees: removal		13
Trees: pruning dead wood		2

Parks	
Park: amenity	3
Park: turf maintenance	1
Park: shrub bed	1
Park: play equipment maintenance	1
Park: debris pickup	1
Park: misuse	0
Park: lighting	0
Park: litter	0
Park maintenance	0
Park: pathway/roadway	0

Bibliography

Jeffery, C. R., 1971. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Newman, O. 1972. *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. New York: Macmillan.

Jacobs, J. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.

Urban Planning Division, 2002. "Regina North Central Neighbourhood Detailed Profile", City of Regina.

Schneider, S. 1998. "Best Practices in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Canadian Case Studies".