7.0 Custodianship

7.1 Personal Safety – Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

Concerns about personal safety in the public realm, whether real or only perceived are important in the extent to which spaces are utilised and valued. Although CPTED is essentially a design feature that requires more detail and is best addressed at time of subdivision, some CPTED principles and qualities are able to be identified as part of the structure plan. In part this is to improve the ability to implement CPTED, and in part to put in place a framework or mechanism that requires personal safety to be addressed.

This section briefly identifies CPTED principles and qualities, and how the structure makes some preliminary provision for those to be achieved.

CPTED Principles and Qualities

The Four Overlapping CPTED Principles

- **Surveillance** – present are present and can see
- **Access Management** – attract people to some places, restrict from others
- **Territorial Reinforcement** – clear boundaries give 'ownership'
- **Quality Environments** – attract people and support surveillance

The Seven Qualities of Safer Places

- **Access** – Safe movement and connections
- **Surveillance and sightlines**: See and be seen
- **Layout**: Clear and logical orientation
- **Activity mix**: Eyes on the street
- **Sense of Ownership**: Showing a space is cared for
- **Quality environments**: Well designed, managed, and maintained environments
- **Physical protection**: Using active security measures

7.2 Surveillance and sightlines

Maintaining surveillance and sightlines of public areas such as roads from passing traffic and from houses can assist in making those areas safer. Streets in Carterton are typically long and straight and provide for long sightlines.

South End Park (see photo 1 overleaf) on Brooklyn Road provides an excellent example of visual permeability into a park area, with an extensive frontage, no visual barriers from the street, and significant overlooking from an adjacent social housing. Visual lines of sight can be maintained even where street trees are in place, (see photo 2 overleaf).

High visual permeability between dwellings in new subdivisions and the public realm (street) are particularly common, (see photos 3 and 4 overleaf). This is a general result of fewer and smaller vegetation and an absence of visually impermeable front boundary treatments (solid walls, fences and the like). This allows significant passive surveillance opportunities and a greater sense of 'ownership' of these spaces by local residents.

These features can be retained through the structure plan by encouraging new developments to minimise or avoid visually impermeable front fencing, and ensuring that areas of public open space have as great and as open road frontage as possible.

The draft structure plan has identified three locations for new recreation open space in the form of small parks. All three have full road frontage, with the two between High Street and Lincoln Road also being on corners. Future park design should seek to maximise this opportunity by maintaining highly visually permeable boundary treatments such as at South End Park.

1

2

3

4

Maintaining clear sightlines of public space from adjacent activities, particular residential properties and habitable rooms/spaces within those properties can make a significant positive contribution to safety.

7.3 Access and Layout

Pedestrian movement is generally well catered for by formed footpaths throughout the study area. However, in the southern end of the study area and in new subdivisions the relative lack of connections to adjacent areas does compromise easy and legible connections. For an outsider not familiar with the local area the lack of connection and loss of the legible grid-pattern street alignment to cul-de-sacs makes the area less understandable. As has been identified in the 'Legibility' section of this report, the draft structure plan will provide a more legible layout or assistance to visitors.

For this project the application of CPTED principles to movement corridors is particularly important. The identification of movement corridors is a desired outcome of the structure plan, and the perceived safety and attractiveness of the

routes will be important to their success. Particular aspects of the nature of movement corridors, especially those for walking and cycling mean they are more susceptible to personal safety issues and concerns. For example the use of these routes by pedestrians and cyclist can potentially make these users vulnerable.

By their very nature pedestrian/cycleways are movement predictors (it is clear which route the user will take) and careful consideration and design can minimise real or perceived risk through eliminating entrapment points, loitering opportunities, and concealment opportunities. Although design solutions for these issues are generally too detailed for this project, consideration of logical and legible routes, good lines-of-sight and encouraging adjacent activity (see activity mix below) and custodianship (see sense of ownership below) and minimising dead or remote areas on the route can (and has) be considered as part of the development of the structure plan.

7.4 Activity Mix

Carterton South is very predominantly residential in nature with little other uses present, the primary exception being grazing of stock. However in respect to the benefits of a mixture of diverse activities providing 'eyes' on the street' and passive surveillance, similar opportunities are provided by residential development – which is a use-type often occupied across most parts of the day and night. Where public spaces such as local parks are present, adjacent residential activity provides a significant use giving passive surveillance.

7.5 Sense of Ownership and Quality Well-Maintained Environments

As an example South End Park on Brooklyn Road is well-maintained and features a bollard boundary treatment that while not presenting any barrier to legitimate activities, clearly signals that the space is cared for and that unacceptable activities (for example vehicles) will not be tolerated. This is reinforced by the general good maintenance of the areas – with children's play facilities and other features in good condition. Care and thus ownership are clearly evident.

The newer subdivision areas in the northern parts of Carterton through their lack of boundary treatment do make it difficult to determine the boundary between public and private space. In one sense this does mean that on occasion straying, particularly at corners may occur by pedestrians onto private property, however significant benefits are also present as it appears that the street itself although public space is very much a part of the local neighbourhood and almost 'owned' by the surrounding residential properties. It is significant that for these dwellings the relationship with the street is often from habitable rooms such as kitchens and lounges, rather than as is often the case in smaller lot size urban subdivisions – from garages. This further reinforces the relationship implying that the local residents do have a relationship with the street.


(Left) Where is the front boundary? The house to the rear clearly exhibits a degree of 'ownership' over this stretch of public footpath, and clearly consider it safe for a young child's play. Would this scooter be seen on the footpath if a high boundary fence/wall was in place? (Right) Although the side fences are a little unattractive, the openness of this linkage decreases entrapment opportunity and enhances feelings of safety – again it is perceived as safe enough to play in.

As outlined above with respect to sightlines, the structure plan locates areas of significant open space in positions where they are likely to be well overlooked by other activities, particularly neighbouring or facing residential properties. Minimising front boundary treatment on new lots will increase the relationship between the new dwellings in the structure plan area and the street – and thus increase the extent of ''my-street' ownership from residents who are more likely to take an interest in what is happening outside their front gate.

7.6 Physical protection

Physical protection is principally a design tool best left to specific subdivision or park developments. However it is recommended that the use of physical protection be minimised. Often used features of physical protection are high fences and barriers, both of which send a 'lack of ownership' and 'lack of safety' signal and could be counter productive. Less obtrusive measures should be used where necessary, such as bollards to prevent vehicles entering the park (used at South End Park).


Traditional (Left) versus a more open approach (Right). The draft structure plan encourages wider pedestrian/cycle links to reduce entrapment and concealment opportunities. The example on the right also feels more safe and is more attractive as a result of being less confining and being more overlooked from adjacent areas. In this instance location is irrelevant as these walkways are directly opposite one another. They link Papamoa to the Papamoa beach-front. Note that although solid side fences exist on the example on the right, these were required to be lowered near the front of the properties, again to reduce concealment opportunities.