Introduction

Chapter 1
The Urban Fabric of Crime and Fear

Vania Ceccato

1.1 Introduction

Cities are places of social interaction. Some social interactions – such as being a victim of crime[1] – are unpleasant experiences. Even if there is no such thing as a place free of crime, many would argue that a liveable city should aim to control the risk or fear of crime[2], where a feeling of security[3] underpins a sense of place attachment and the social cohesion of its residents. Security includes individuals' risk of being a victim of crime as well as their perceived safety. Some would argue that, although security is necessary for urban quality of life, prioritising it may restrict social interaction, exclude certain groups of individuals and stigmatise others. Cities cannot aim at being socially sustainable without considering their citizens' security concerns seriously. However, the determination to ensure security must follow policies and practices which have a wide sense of inclusion and fairness. The objective of this book is to provide a theoretical and empirical discussion of security issues in the urban context based on different research traditions. From an academic point of view, the book shows examples of

---

[1] 'Crime is fundamentally defined as an antisocial act that violates a law and for which a punishment can be imposed by the state or in the state's name' (UNHSP 2007: 50).

[2] Fear of crime refers to the fear of being a victim of crime as opposed to the actual probability of being a victim of crime (Hale 1996; Farrall et al. 2007). Fear of crime includes 'a variety of emotional states, attitudes, or perceptions' (Warr 2000: 453).

[3] Security as a concept is complex and problematic; its use makes sense only when it is attached to a context, a group or a specific discipline. The definition of security in this book is limited to urban crime and fear of crime, their geography and links to urban fabric. As such, security is a social construct which is produced and reproduced by individuals, their actions and interventions in everyday life.

V. Ceccato (✉)
School of Architecture and the Built Environment, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH),
Drottning Kristinas väg 30, 10044 Stockholm, Sweden
e-mail: vania.ceccato@abe.kth.se

potentialities and limitations within different research disciplines when dealing with urban crime and fear of crime. From a practical point of view, the book has the potential to help practitioners and planners to set out a more realistic agenda for what can be planned and achieved when the issues are crime and fear of crime.

We live in a world where security concerns are part of our everyday life. Although crime and fear of crime are multifaceted and multi-scale phenomena, there is a need to discuss crime, fear of crime and the processes underlying them on an urban scale. First, the urban scale is important because it is at the local level that both crime and fear take shape and form. According to UNHSP (2007), it is at the local level that crime and fear is most felt since it is often individuals and households that are targeted. Second, although many security problems cannot be solved at the local level, it is at this spatial scale that the impact of planning decisions is experienced and it is at this level that planning solutions are offered. Many crime causes can be addressed at the local level through policies, by direct involvement of municipalities, police, community groups and local actors. It is at this level that previously excluded voices can be heard (e.g. through participatory schemes). Given such importance, Part I, *Placing Fear on the Urban Scale*, is devoted to security concerns at the level of neighbourhoods.

Since fear relates to the risk of being a victim of crime, Part II, *Micro-urban Environments of Crime and Fear*, focuses on the vulnerability of urban micro-spaces to crime and fear. Attention is given to small-scale features of the urban environment: types of buildings, facades, alleys, streets, bus stops and the types of human activities that they generate. Some of the explanations of differentiated levels of crime and fear are better associated with ecological characteristics of places, such as neighbourhoods, or qualities that can be aggregated, for instance, by census tracts. Linking aggregated data of different types has brought benefits to academics but also to analysts in the police service and other agents tackling crime and perceived safety. In Part III, *Crime, Fear of Crime in Neighbourhoods and Their Effects*, the ecological nature of crime and fear is discussed from examples in the UK and in Sweden. It is important to stress that the examples shown here are not a 'one-size-fits-all' solution to the demands and challenges of urban crime and fear to other cities in the world. On the contrary, they constitute an illustration of what has been recently done in the area from different research disciplines. The content of Parts II and III relies on twentieth-century theories of urban planning (e.g. defensive spaces, Jane Jacob's Eyes on the street, Safescape) and criminology (e.g. social disorganisation theory, routine activity). Although these theories have been criticised on different grounds (see Bottom and Wiles 2002, for a review), they still constitute the theoretical pillars for those interested in understanding local causes of crime and fear.

In order to provide examples of the complexity faced by other types of urban areas, Part IV, *The Context of Crime and Fear in Cities of Global South*, illustrates the case of South African cities as well as a metropolis of the Global South, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The part shows how problems related to crime and fear are magnified by socio-economic inequality, availability of weapons on the streets (through organised crime), police corruption and a culture of violence. These two

cases show how certain security problems cannot be improved by local action only but rather need to be tackled on a much broader scale (sometimes beyond national borders, such as responses to drug trafficking) and on a long-term basis. In the cases of Rio de Janeiro and South African cities, a relevant question is always: can security be attained by all? Socio-economic inequalities determine the quality of housing commodities in the market, including security. In these countries, cities have turned into a patchwork of differentiated experiences of levels of security, characterised by those who can afford it and those who cannot.

When actions and interventions to improve security are put into practice, the outcomes are not always the expected ones. Part V, *Actions for Safe Urban Environments*, presents examples of actions promoting urban security at national and local levels. One of the examples shows how, for instance, practices may operate in ways that unintentionally heighten relative inequalities in community levels of crime, whilst at the same time producing overall reductions in the volume of crime; in other words, crime may be affecting one group but not others. This unbalanced victimisation may partially explain inequalities in declared perceived safety between groups in society. Two articles are devoted to interventions at the local level. The first one is about the challenges of building a new residential area taking into consideration some of the basic ideas of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). The final article shows the variety of ways that gender considerations influence planning practices when the goal is to tackle gendered victimisation and fear of crime.

In the section that follows, we provide an introduction to the main themes of the book. The intention is to review some of the most important theories of crime and fear of crime in the city context that have emerged since the early twentieth century and place each contribution to this book in its widest context. The article starts with a brief discussion of the concept of urban fabric in relation to crime and fear as adopted by the contributors themselves.

There are a number of questions to be addressed in this book. Whilst not all the questions will be properly answered, we nevertheless hope that these articles will provide some leads. We know, for instance, that the risk of being a victim of crime is not equally or randomly distributed over space; neither is the fear of being a victim of crime. How does the city's urban fabric relate to geographies of crime and fear? How are young marginalised groups perceived by others, and how do these young people express their fears? When individuals evaluate their personal risk of becoming a victim of crime, how far do they consider the wider social and physical environment that extends beyond their own neighbourhood's boundaries? Does the urban environment affect one's decision to commit an offence? How do crime and fear interrelate to inequality, segregation and drugs in cities of developing countries? What are the challenges to planning cities which are both safe and sustainable when some of these goals are in conflict? What does it mean to have a gender perspective on safety issues at the municipal level? This book searches for answers to these questions in the context of the city, particularly in the social interactions that take place in urban space, which are distinctively framed by different land use and people's activities. In other words, the book deals with the urban fabric of crime and fear.

1.1.1   The 'Urban Fabric' in This Book

In this book, the term urban fabric goes beyond the materiality of the city, reflecting the multidisciplinary approach adopted by those studying crime and fear on the urban scale and who are contributors to the book. Sometimes, urban fabric refers to the ecological texture of neighbourhoods, either represented by census tracts or perceived as entities of imagined and experienced fear. In other cases, urban fabric includes the social aspects of the city (people, networks, interconnectivity) as well as the symbolic and subjective meanings attached to the city environment. Certainly, the urban fabric has an impact on crime and fear, influencing its non-randomness in space, by including some and excluding others, by defining land uses and social interactions that are both space and time bound and may have different meanings for different groups. Urban fabric relates to the physical structure in the strict sense too, its grain, density and urban structure and how they relate to human activities. What is then the urban fabric in this book?

According to the architect Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris:

> Urban fabric is composed of the material and physical aspects of the built environment in cities – the buildings, streets and alleyways, sidewalks, open spaces, and other micro-environments that represent the settings of everyday life. The *urban fabric is the container of social activity*; its layout and design can encourage or discourage certain types of behaviour. Some aspects of the urban fabric can be manipulated, redesigned, and reshaped to decrease fear and opportunities for crime.

Bo Grönlund, also an architect, is particularly interested in the continuous/discontinuous effect the urban fabric has on safety and on how cities are built. The architect adopts some of the CEN principles in urban planning and EU's land cover typologies to define urban fabric as:

> . . .the specific way a city or a part of a city is shaped by its buildings, building arrangements, the layout of streets, roads and pedestrian/bicycle routes and the size and location of non-built areas. The urban fabric affects the distribution of functions and social networks. A continuous urban fabric normally is a more integrated and vital urban system which often produces safer environments. From a crime prevention and perceived safety point of view, new building complexes should avoid physical isolation from their surroundings, for instance, by isolated car-parks or no-man's-lands.

Bill Hillier found that he could not easily answer the question (what is urban fabric?) since his approach is focused on defining the urban/built fabric in a particular way – as spatial configuration. The architect adds that:

> The central idea is that if one takes the elements of the urban fabric to be streets, they are all pretty similar to each other. So how do they become functionally differentiated? If one tries to apply intrinsic measures such as size and shape, one cannot explain much in the way of functional differentiation. Too many elements are too similar to each other. But if one applies extrinsic measures of how each space relates to all others at different scales, the elements become spatially differentiated and it is these differences that relate to function. Beginning with movement: how many people pass along a street is first and foremost a

function of how the street is connected to the larger-scale system rather than of its intrinsic properties. The differences then become stronger as land use follows movement, in other words, one puts the shops where the configuration has put the people. This is why in self-organised cities everything seems to be in the right place!

In the definition by the social psychologist Jonathan Jackson and the criminologist Ian Brunton-Smith, urban fabric embeds the construct *neighbourhood*. According to the approach taken in their article:

> Urban fabric captures the complex interplay between the physical and social structures of local areas, and the individual definitions of *neighbourhood* that give meaning to these environmental cues. In more densely populated *urban* areas, definitions of neighbourhood are particularly fluid, with clear evidence from our study that residents are drawing on cues from surrounding areas in addition to the immediate area when forming perceptions of their risk of crime. Urban fabric is the contingent nature of neighbourhoods, and the role that the broader environment has on individual perceptions.

Urban fabric, as defined according to the geographer Robert Haining's article, refers to:

> ...geographically defined ecological areas that partition the urban space. The identification of such internal differentiation may be the product of formal processes of analysis such as factorial ecology or social area analysis applied to census data, yielding lines of demarcation. However, internal differentiation may also be a product of the local imagination of area residents and the social meaning they attach to particular places and which, necessarily, are less sharply defined. Viewing the urban fabric in these terms is meaningful to the police in an operational sense. In the UK, as in many other parts of the world, police forces operate territorially and at a range of spatial scales, and the initiatives they take to reduce crime are sometimes targeted at particular places. Viewing the urban fabric as a mosaic of ecological environments is also important for our understanding of criminogenic processes where area land use, built form and population composition (including their social, economic, ethnic and demographic characteristics) provide the context within which criminogenic interactions take place between motivated offenders and suitable targets. Ecological ideas, both the construction of such areas and their ecological properties (e.g., area deprivation, neighbourhood social disorganisation and more recently collective efficacy), continue to play a key role in helping us to make sense of the spatial and space-time variability in levels of crime in urban areas and in helping to define society's response.

A similar definition is suggested by the criminologist Per Olof Wikström:

> Urban fabric is the social and physical differentiation of urban space and its related social processes.

The economist Mats Wilhelmsson and the geographer Vania Ceccato suggest that:

> Urban fabric has tangible and intangible dimensions. The tangible dimension of the urban fabric refers to the environmental attributes and other neighbourhood qualities that exist in different parts of the city and are differently valued in the housing market. Sometimes it refers to rough grain structures in space, such as roads and railway lines with electric wires, but also smooth features, such as a lake. The intangible dimension is determined by the individual's perception of the immediate surrounding areas of a residence – their neighbourhood and perhaps beyond. The urban fabric therefore has an intangible dimension, which is composed of symbolic features attributed to that urban space – a type of mental map of the city's qualities, which guides individuals to differentiate a pleasant from an unpleasant place.

The materiality of the concept of urban fabric (either as micro-spaces or as ecological areas) is left behind by the way urban fabric is defined by social geographers Catherine Alexander and Rachel Pain in their article. For them:

> Urban fabric is a term that describes the lifeblood of a city – the networks and the connections that actively interweave and stitch together different members of a community. We envision urban fabric as a patchwork quilt, linking and meshing the layers of community together, into the living materialisation of diversity and difference. Fear then, is that intangible, elusive and ever more difficult to grasp *loose thread*, which can work to loosen, unravel and undo feelings of security and safety. As such, patterns of fear – and the resistance of fear – work to change the shape and substance of the urban fabric of an area, creating new designs and patterns. The jagged and often raw edges where fear is at its sharpest, can in this way be folded under and sewn up, to create a more hopeful – and socially just – utopia in its place.

In cities of the Global South, urban fabric takes another dimension in the eyes of the anthropologist Alba Zaluar. She suggests that:

> Urban fabric is the social fabric inside a city, that is, the symbolic, economic, social and political relationships between people who live or act inside it, linked through networks of several kinds. It is therefore never simply material, for one should include the subjective meanings that urban services have for the people who use them. Violence and crime are material phenomena when one considers physical violence, especially that arising from armed conflicts between drug lords. They are also symbolic, economic and political processes that have been going on in Rio de Janeiro for the past 30 years. Organised crime may also be analyzed as a social network that links allies and excludes enemies. The violent interaction between drug lords commandos or militia is better understood, however, when one projects the territories they rule geographically. Then one can understand how and why homicides and other crimes are denser in certain areas of the city than in others, despite their similar social-economic features.

The architect Karina Landman incorporates the dynamic dimension of the urban fabric by illustrating how crime and fear of crime imposes changes in its structure. She suggests that:

> ...crime and fear significantly changes the nature of the built environment in South Africa. Fortification influenced the materiality of the city in two ways, namely changing the form and structure of cities from a fine-grained pattern to a coarse grain through the increase of fortified enclaves and through the new aesthetic of fear symbolized by physical elements such as burglar bars, boom gates and electric fences. These changes in the urban fabric also change the way people use and experience space and adapt their lifestyles to avoid public open space. A new social order is thus facilitated through the establishment of a new spatial order in the urban landscape. Given these relationships between crime, urban fortification and the modification of and interaction with the urban fabric, one cannot look at urban fortification in isolation, but must also consider the causes and consequences from a systemic viewpoint.

For the criminologist Nick Tilley, the urban fabric is *the urban land use pattern*. He argues that:

> The urban fabric is important for understanding crime patterns, but is difficult to modify in the short term to accommodate safety interventions. In his paper, he is concerned with patterns of domestic burglary and security measures used to reduce burglary, using data from the British Crime Survey. Rates of burglary have fallen but inequalities remain, with the poorer continuing to suffer higher rates than the better off. The continuing differences in levels of domestic burglary raise important questions of distributive justice. One measure to

address this issue could be to target security improvements on the most needy. Other sources of variation in levels of burglary relating, for example, to the land use patterns in cities are in practice very difficult to address in the short term.

In the article *An international perspective of the gender dimension in planning for urban safety*, urban fabric was conceptualised by the spatial planner Christian Dymén as follows:

> Urban fabric is seen and experienced from the eyes and bodies of women and men, boys and girls, with different backgrounds and life experiences. The urban fabric is created and designed in the interface of shared actions of urban planners, architects and citizens – such as buildings, roads, green areas, light and dark – in different shapes. Depending on who is planning the urban environment, who is building it and who is experiencing it, the urban fabric will be perceived in different ways as, for instance, fearful, emancipating, accessible or welcoming.

In the existent literature, urban fabric is rarely defined as a concept in itself; often it builds upon other constructs. More often, *fabric* is commonly defined by various dictionaries as *the underlying structure, the framework* (of a city). In Knox and Pinch (2006: 5), fabric *is a place with many interwoven elements (that can be tattered and torn)*. Some would expressly confine its definition to a city's physical environment. For instance, *fabric is the physical aspect of urbanism, emphasising building types, thoroughfares, open spaces, frontages and streetscapes, and functional, economic and sociocultural aspects* (Wiktionary 2011).

An operational definition of urban fabric is provided by EU CORINE[4] (2001) and is merely *a typology of land cover types*. This definition is perhaps too crude to support the analysis of crime and fear in urban areas since urban fabric is considered here as a passive backcloth to social interactions in space.

Marshall (1998), taking a different line of thought, suggests that clues to the nature of urban fabric can be found in the use of language in the various terms used to describe it. The habitual use of the singular – *the* urban fabric – implies that there is *only one* per urban area. He adds however that the urban fabric, like urban structures and spaces, also embodies the concept of *continuity*, in contrast to the built form which could easily be regarded as being a collection of free-standing objects. Two aspects of Marshall's definition of urban fabric are relevant here: first, its *uniqueness,* and second, its *continuity*. Urban areas may share many commonalities with each other, but each of them has a specific urban fabric (*the* urban fabric) that affects particular dynamics of crime and fear as well as their underlying processes. The uniqueness of a city's urban fabric implies, for example, that interventions aiming at improving its quality of life have to account for its particular generating nature. Simply put, this *uniqueness* aspect of the urban fabric is regarded in this book by the careful selection of studies drawing upon evidence from cities in

---

[4] Urban fabric can be continuous (most of the land is covered by buildings, and roads and artificially surfaced areas cover almost all the ground. Non-linear areas of vegetation and bare soil are exceptional) or discontinuous (most of the land is covered by structures, but vegetated areas and bare soil occupy discontinuous but significant surfaces).

Europe, the USA, South Africa and Brazil. However, identifying what is particular from different areas may not be enough. Marshall (1998) also reminds us that the urban fabric embodies the concept of *continuity*, which leads us to think about cities and each part of them, belonging to a wider system – a system in which a number of qualities (e.g. being safe) and problems (e.g. being victimised) are shared amongst them. If this is true, lessons can be learned from the commonalities amongst these parts just because they may struggle with problems that are generated by similar underlying dynamics.

We shall return to this subject in the final section, after discussing briefly the more orthodox theories and facts that relate to crime and fear in the city. The following sections are intended to provide a theoretical framework to the book in Parts I–VI by summarising briefly the existing literature in the field. To facilitate the reading, these sections adopt the same titles as the book parts.

1.2   Placing Fear on the Urban Scale

> ...*perceptions and feelings of personal safety are prerequisites*
> *for a vital and viable city*
> (Oc and Tiesdell 1999: 265)

There is a general consensus that fear of crime is more than a function of risk of crime and is not always correlated to experiences of victimisation (Warr 2000; Addington 2009; Ceccato and Lukyte 2011). Sandercock (2005) argues that expressions of fear of crime are actually expressions of fear of difference (fear of others). The current literature also shows that fear can also be explained by a number of other factors that operate at several levels often simultaneously (Skogan and Maxfield 1981; Hale 1996; Will and Mcgrath 1995; Pain 2009; Day 2009). According to Gerber et al. (2010: 9) fear operates at three levels: individual, neighbourhood and social macro. At the individual level, fear of crime is largely the result of personal experience of crime, whilst at the neighbourhood level, fear is a function of what people experience where they live. At the macro level, fear is understood both as a social phenomenon shaped by media (Gerbner 1970) and as part of a generalised and diffused anxiety generated by current global and social changes. Regarding the media effect on fear of crime, UNHSP (2007) shows that in the UK, readers of national *tabloids* were twice as likely to be worried about violent crime, burglary and car crime as people who read other newspapers. In the UK and the USA, crime is amongst the top concerns that people have in everyday life. In Latin America, for instance, the media play a key role in constructing images of fear given to the sensational coverage of youth gangs.

Beyond the media, fear may be understood as a symbol of global and social change. The effect of macro-level changes on crime and overall anxieties were studied early on by Durkheim (1897). He argued that rapid social change creates

anomie, which can have a negative impact on society and may lead to crime and a sense of *normlessness*. This anomic situation translates into a lack of or weakening of social controls[5] which are fundamental for the functioning of social institutions and therefore may be associated with changes in crime levels and anxieties. Messner and Rosenfeld (1994, 1997) suggest that in a dominant capitalist society, social institutions tend to be devalued in comparison to economic institutions (what has been called *institutional anomie*) and lose their power to affect security concerns and crime levels positively. Anomie can, for instance, be triggered by the effects of macro changes imposed by the shift from modernity to late modernity, or postmodernism. Loader and Sparks (2002) summarise these changes as the (1) transformations in capitalist production and exchange, (2) changes in family structure and the ecology of cities, (3) proliferation of the mass media and (4) democratisation of everyday life; more blurred definition of authorities and identities (see also Giddens 1991; Garland 2001; Young 1999). These transformations, according to Bottoms and Wiles (2002), have an effect on crime and fear. At this point, to be aware of these changes facilitates our understanding of the nature of the fear of crime as a phenomenon affected by multi-scale factors (e.g. Los 2002; Wyant 2008; Day 2009), some are local and tangible, whilst others may be global, and although they may be more difficult to assess at the urban scale, they do affect individuals' anxieties at local level. This multidimensional nature of fear was already suggested by Garofalo and Laub (1979: 242). The study shows ambiguous links between victimisation and fear of crime which, they add, calls for a wider perspective on studies of fear of crime, 'encompassing the entire social fabric, particularly urban life'. More than 30 years later, the article by Jonathan Jackson and Ian Brunton-Smith in this book makes a contribution to the way fear of crime is assessed at the intra-urban level, taking the neighbourhood structure into account.

Fear is often related in the literature to factors such as gender (women more fearful than men), age (young people less fearful), race (minorities tend to express more fear), neighbourhood cohesion (less cohesive and deprived neighbourhoods show higher levels of fear), confidence in the police (less confidence in society's institutions goes hand in hand with higher levels of fear), levels of local incivility (more disorder brings more fear), experience of victimisation (victims tends to be

---

[5] Loosely defined, social controls are composed of mechanisms that regulate individual and group behaviour, leading to compliance to the rules of a given place or group. They can be informal or formal. According to Conklin (2007), informal social control, or the reactions of individuals and groups that bring about conformity to norms and laws, includes peer and community pressure, bystander intervention in a crime and collective responses such as citizen patrol groups. Formal social control is, according to Poore (2007), expressed through law as statutes, rules and regulations against deviant behaviour. It is imposed by government and organisations using law enforcement mechanisms and other formal sanctions such as fines and imprisonment. These concepts provided the basis for social control theory; for details, see, for instance, Hirschi (1969, 2002).

more fearful), perception of risk and assessment of offence seriousness (individuals tend to declare do be more fearful about being a victim of violence than about theft, for instance) (Box et al. 1988).

Of particular importance in the study of fear of crime is its gender dimension, which has quickly evolved into a research area in itself in the last two decades. Whilst most recent studies of fear of crime recognise that 'gender is the most consistent factor' in explaining who fears crime (Grabosky 1995: 2), there is a broadly divergent set of explanations as to why women are more likely than men to fear crime. The author suggests that women's fear about sexual assault in public space and about sexual and physical violence in private space explains partially why women tend to declare being more fearful than men. Valentine (1992) indicates that women's fear of violent crime is related to the social construction of space within a patriarchal society. Thus, crime and fear of crime may be seen as another way in which a group in society is able to dominate space. Another argument made by Stanko (1990) and Pain (2000, 2001) is that it is not gender per se, but economic and social powerlessness and exclusion that is the defining factor behind fear of crime. In this book, Catherine Alexander and Rachel Pain provide an example of how young people living in a marginalised area in the UK express and feel fear. In the next section, our attention is turned to the physical space of cities at the micro-scale and how they become vulnerable to crime or generate fear.

1.3 Micro-urban Environments of Crime and Fear

> *The urban settings that create crime and fear are human constructions. . . . . .home, parks, factories, transport systems . . .the ways in which we assemble these large building blocks of routine activity into the urban cloth can have an enormous impact on our fear levels and on the quantities, types and timing of crimes we suffer.*
>
> (Brantingham and Brantingham 1995: 3)

Crime tends to be concentrated in cities,[6] but not in a homogenous way. Some places are more risky than others. City centres, areas with mixed land use and transport nodes are often more criminogenic places than residential areas (Sherman et al. 1989; Wikström 1991; Loukaitou-Sideris et al. 2002; Bromley and Nelson 2002; Ceccato et al. 2002; Smith 2003; Andresen 2006; Ceccato 2009). Even within city centres, crime occurrence differs over space and time. For instance, areas close to bars and premises selling alcohol tend to be more vulnerable than other areas, particularly in the evenings and at weekends (Roncek and Maier 1991; Newton and

---

[6] There is a clear link between city size and crime (Christie et al. 1965; Glaeser and Sacerdote 1999). More social interaction in a single place leads to high rates of crimes against persons (Mayhew and Levinger 1976); in particular, robbery and residential burglary are heavily concentrated in larger cities (Skogan 1978) since larger urban areas offer greater opportunities for crime (Wikström 1991), higher benefits (variety of targets), lower probabilities of arrest and a lower probability of recognition (Glaeser and Sacerdote 1999).

Hirschfield 2009), but again, not all bars and surrounding areas are equally criminogenic (Briscoe and Donnelly 2001; Madensen and Eck 2008).

The literature in urban criminology has for decades put forward evidence on how different types of land use relates to crime distribution (for reviews, see Herbert 1982; Evans and Herbert 1989 but also Ceccato 2009; Andresen et al. 2009). What this evidence has in common is that the risk of crime in a place varies as a function of the place's location, the characteristics of its built environment and the human activities that the place generates at a particular time (the social-demographic content) – all this together determines different opportunities for crime. There is a large number of theories about how such opportunities arise. They all fail to provide a full explanation for why certain areas are more criminogenic than others, but they do provide good attempts to better understand urban crime patterns. Some of them will be discussed below, whilst others will be covered in the following section.

One of the best-known theories is routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson 1979). This theory states that for a crime to occur at any place or at any time, there needs to be a convergence in space and time between three elements: a suitable target, a motivated offender and the absence of capable guardians against crime. It also suggests that an individual's activities and daily habits are rhythmic and consist of patterns that are constantly repeated. This is the basis of explanations of the mechanisms behind temporal variations in crime levels. During periods when people are more often outdoors, there is a greater risk of victimisation for theft, for instance. This is because individuals' whereabouts affect their chances of coming in contact with offenders. In defining the concept of opportunity space, Brantingham and Brantingham (1984: 362) suggest that potential crime victims/targets are not distributed uniformly in space. It will be 'the interaction of the location of potential targets and the criminal's awareness or activity space that (will) culminate in particular patterns of crime occurrence'. They suggest that offenders learn through experience or social transmission clues that are associated with 'good' victims or places where they can act. Crimes occur where and when the immediate environment makes the offender feel familiar and safe to act at the same time when victims are unfamiliar with the risks they face, for instance, when they are travelling.

Modern transport systems generate areas of social convergence that are more prone to crime. Moving between places means being exposed to unfamiliar environments. An individual might be at higher risk, or at least feel so, because he or she is moving beyond familiar jurisdictions into unknown territory (e.g. different neighbourhoods) (Smith and Cornish 2006). A number of studies have examined the manifestation of crime and disorder on public transport systems (Sloan-Howitt and Kelling 1997; Easteal and Wilson 1991; Clarke 1996; Loukaitou-Sideris 1999; La Vigne 1997; Church et al. 2000; Loukaitou-Sideris et al. 2001). Newton (2004) suggests that a transport system is a multifaceted arena, with a complex interaction of settings (buses, trains and trams), facilities (stops, stations and interchanges) and users (staff and passengers). The design of these facilities, and the internal and external environments, may influence the level of crime (or perceived safety)

experienced on the system. According to Smith and Clarke (2000), the targets of crime also vary and could include the system itself (vandalism, fare evasion), employees (assaults on ticket collectors) and passengers (pickpocketing, assault). In Stockholm, Sweden, Ceccato et al. (2010) suggest that the design and environmental characteristics of underground stations influence the rates of crime and public disorder. From an offender's point of view, a train station can provide a proper environment for committing crime. Assuming that the offender acts rationally (Becker 1968), he or she would assess the likelihood of escaping without being detected after committing the offence (Felson and Clarke 1998). Thus, the presence of hiding places, dark corners, insufficient illumination and lack of social control contribute to an offender's decision to commit an offence.

Transport nodes not only concentrate more crime than surrounding areas but also trigger feelings that make passengers feel concern for their safety. Findings from a UK survey showed that 18% of respondents in London were dissuaded by fear of crime from using buses; for trains, the figures were 15% (DfT 2004). Passengers often report high levels of fear when waiting for and travelling on public transport even when levels of recorded crime on the system are relatively low. According to Smith and Cornish (2006), women and ethnic minorities are particularly concerned about their personal safety on public transport, and these feelings of insecurity typically increase with age. Not surprisingly, Brown (1998) found that women more often reported being afraid at car parks, waiting at the bus station and travelling on buses. Also, women's fear was not much affected by the presence of closed-circuit television (CCTV). Passengers often report that their fear intensifies after dark (Smith and Cornish 2006). This might be because more crimes happen in the evening and at night at transport nodes. Findings in Stockholm underground stations, for instance, show that more events of crime and disorder happen in the evenings, weekends and holidays (Ceccato et al. 2010), when more unstructured activities, such as leisure, tend to occur. A safety survey of Stockholm's transit public system shows that most travellers declared feeling safe at the stations, but more than half of respondents felt unsafe in areas close to the stations, that is, on their way to/from these transport nodes (SL 2007). In the USA, Loukaitou-Sideris (1999) and Loukaitou-Sideris et al. (2001) suggested that the surrounding environment where a transport node is located is of high importance in determining the safety experienced by travellers (actual or perceived). In these two studies, stations located in deprived areas tended to be more exposed to crime and disorder, and passengers perceived them as less safe than other stations. In Part II of this book, Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris deals specifically with individuals' safety on the move. Transit crime is a rather persistent but underreported crime that intimidates riders in many cities – particularly women.

Crime opportunities are also influenced by the type and distribution of micro-spaces, regardless of the city and the contexts in which they are embedded. Micro-spaces refer to the types of facades, height and density of buildings, number and types of streets and entrances, whether windows are facing the streets, the connection of backyards with the main streets, alleys, parking spaces, garages, storages, physical barriers between buildings and public places (fences and rear

yards), but also to modern features of the physical environment that directly affect surveillance opportunities (e.g. security cameras). It is important how these features relate to the whole city, supporting accessibility and feelings of territoriality and social control. These micro-spaces are vital for the urban quality. For instance, according to Németh and Schmidt (2007), vibrant public spaces are an integral part of the urban physical fabric, connecting disparate neighbourhoods and encouraging interaction amongst otherwise disparate parts of the city. On the other hand, Hirschfield (2008) reminds that areas that are highly accessible (served by arterial roads, railways, bus routes) can be more susceptible to crime by travelling offenders than by those living in neighbourhoods with poor communications and fewer escape routes. The influence of interstitial spaces, including streets and parks, depends on many contextual factors that are not always easy to predict (see Hillier 2004).

Theories developed between the 1960s and 1980s highlight the importance of micro-spaces and their relationship to the whole in creating opportunities/barriers for social interaction and human activity, including crime (Jacobs 1961; Barker 1968; Thomlinson 1969; Sommer 1972; Newman 1972; Coleman 1985). Although some of these theories have been controversial and attracted a great deal of criticism (e.g. Pain 2001; Sweet and Escalante 2010), their value resides in trying to gain a better understanding of the effect of micro-environments on individuals' behaviour. Also, they all felt the need to evaluate (and react against) the design in post-Second World War housing developments, which were low-density environments.

Jacobs (1961) coined the term *eyes on the street*, stressing that the design of neighbourhoods has a role to play in defining opportunities for surveillance. Barker (1968) and Thomlinson (1969) were particularly interested in how individuals shape and settle into space and how they are affected by it; whilst Sommer (1972) was more focused on the importance of individuals' engagement in (use and maintenance of) spaces as indicators of their quality and social control of the area. Coming from the same line of thought but directly focused on crime occurrence, Newman (1972) developed a theory based on the interaction between the individuals and their environment, which he referred to as *defensible space*. Newman stated, for instance, that the type of building influences what occurs on the streets surrounding them – that the housing design can actually make individuals feel safe. A fundamental concept of this theory is that of natural surveillance: the 'capacity of physical design to provide surveillance opportunities for residents and their agents' (Newman 1972: 78). Whilst Jacobs was interested in the block and neighbourhood as a unit, Newman focused on the building and its immediate surroundings. Both agreed, however, that neighbourhoods with adequate surveillance, clear separation of public and private space and territorial control over personal spaces, and the proximity to well-used institutions led to stronger resident-based informal control of their areas; such informal control should lead to less delinquency, less fear and less victimisation (Taylor and Harrell 1996). Ten years later, Coleman (1985) tested some of Newman's ideas of how poor urban design could affect crime and communities. Despite methodological limitations, Coleman found that regardless of the housing design of an area, some residents behave inappropriately, but poor design seemed to increase the odds of vandalism

and criminal activity. Five key design factors created faster social breakdown: number of dwellings per entrance, dwellings per block (as block size increased, so did the types of incivilities), number of storeys, overhead walkways and spatial organisation (Coleman 1985). Since then, numerous studies have further tested whether and how micro-spaces can generate opportunities for crime (e.g. Bassanese 1999; Grohe 2006), and there have been further theoretical developments, such as in Zelinka and Brennan (2001), Hillier (2004) and Johnson and Bowers (2010). In Part II, Bill Hillier explores links between the micro-urban environment and crime in a London borough, UK. Such vulnerability depends not only on particular types of streets, buildings or facades but also on (or in combination with) individuals' interactions and socio-economic contexts of their daily activities. In the next section, we turn our attention to ecological theories that attempt to explain the interplay between demographic, cultural and socio-economic characteristics of neighbourhoods and crime and fear of crime.

1.4   Crime, Fear of Crime in Neighbourhoods and Its Effects

> *Although the geographical concentration of violence and its connection*
> *with neighbourhood composition are well established, the question remains: why?*
> (Sampson et al. 1997: 918)

What is an unsafe area? If one takes two high-crime neighbourhoods, one located in London, UK, and the other in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, do they have anything in common? Let us compare these two hypothetical areas. The distinctive features of high-crime communities in British cities are described by Hancock (2001) and typically include a neglected built environment manifested by poorly designed and poorly maintained housing, the lack of natural surveillance, an abundance of empty properties, a lack of public facilities and environmental hazards such as litter, dog faeces and dumped goods. As suggested by Hirschfield (2008: 5), they also often 'bear hallmarks of antisocial behaviour in the form of graffiti, abandoned and burnt out vehicles, damaged street furniture and discarded needles'. But it is not the physical environment only; there may be visible signs of gang activity, drug dealing, truancy and young people hanging around the streets with little in the way of purposeful activities. Some of these features are also found in a high-crime area of any city of the Global South, but they tend to be magnified by social inequality, drugs trafficking and use, organised crime and poor governance (see, e.g. Caldeira 2000). In Rio de Janeiro (Carneiro 1999; Chevigny 1999; Zaluar 2000; Silva 2010), high-crime areas are characterised by open violence, daily sounds of gun shots, slum settlements with lack of basic urban infrastructure and maintenance, poor services, low youth education attainment, extensive connections between everyday crime, drug dealing and illegal weapons, repressive police and corruption and vulnerability to natural hazards and pollution.

These high-crime neighbourhoods in London and Rio de Janeiro share some common characteristics. In addition to institutional neglect and environmental injustices (Schlosberg 2007), these areas suffer from lack of social control associated with conditions of long-term deprivation. Many would argue that poverty and poor social control are insufficient to explain why certain areas are less safe than others. The truth is that it is still unknown whether neighbourhood social processes operate in a similar way across different neighbourhoods or countries, but environmental criminology has since the early twentieth century made attempts to interpret the links between social and economic conditions, disorder, crime and fear of crime. Some of the most important theories on the ecology of crime will be summarised below and should provide a background for reading Parts III and IV.

One of the best-known urban criminology theories is social disorganisation theory. Shaw and McKay (1942) in their seminal work on Chicago argue that low economic status, ethnic heterogeneity and residential instability led to community disorganisation. This lack of social organisation results, they argued, in a culture of violence and high rates of delinquency. According to Morenoff et al. (2001), not until the 1970s and 1980s was the theory explicitly conceptualised by Kornhauser (1978) and Bursik (1988) as 'the inability of a community structure to realise the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls'.[7] Despite criticisms (for a review, see Bottom and Wiles 2002; Wikström 2005, 2006), the concept of social disorganisation remains alive in contemporary environmental criminology. Social disorganisation theory links many forms of crime with the presence of weak informal social controls, often present in high-crime areas, regardless of where they are located (for recent examples, see Andresen 2006; Ceccato 2009; Bellair and Browning 2010).

Since the 1990s, new theoretical constructs have been introduced into social disorganisation theory. These new ideas, whilst recognising neighbourhood conditions as important, link them to the city as a system, a scale which had been largely ignored by traditional social disorganisation theory. Bursik and Grasmick (1993) suggest an expanded version of social disorganisation theory, integrating the ideas of formal and informal social control. They argue for the importance of the networks amongst residents and with local institutions and the networks amongst local representatives of the neighbourhood and external actors, institutions and agencies. Social networks reduce crime indirectly by stimulating informal social control. A second important idea is that of social cohesion at the neighbourhood level, in other words, high levels of social trust and co-operation between citizens for mutual benefit; civic engagement would lead to less criminogenic conditions

---

[7] Deriving from neighbourhood clues of disorder, Wilson and Kelling (1982) suggested that unrepaired damage to property encourages further vandalism and other types of crimes, the so-called *broken window syndrome*.

(Kennedy et al. 1998; Hirschfield and Bowers 1997; Rosenfeld et al. 2001). A third new idea devotes even more attention to individual agency. Collective efficacy is the group-level term used by Sampson et al. (1997) to refer to the situation where there are shared expectations within the group and a willingness to engage in processes of social control for the common good. Sampson et al. (1997) suggest that action to restrict crime does not necessarily require strong local social ties or associations. Collective action may take place where personal ties and social networks are weak. What is important is a willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good, for instance, by looking after for public property or engaging in activities that improve overall safety of the neighbourhood.

Most traditional ecological theories of urban criminology have so far concentrated either on the neighbourhood conditions of crime location or on where offenders live, missing a great deal of information on people's whereabouts over time in the city. There have been some attempts to empirically explore the location of offences and offenders' residence (for a review, see Wiles and Costello 2000) as well as hypothetical models of intersection of criminal opportunities with offenders' cognitive awareness space[8] (Brantingham and Brantingham 1981). Wikström (2005) declares that this missing information is vital for understanding why an individual decides to commit a crime. He suggests that the urban environment does not affect individuals equally. He argues for the need of empirical studies that go beyond this myopic perspective of crime location and offenders' residence, suggesting an integrated theory called situational action theory (SAT). In Wikström et al. (2010), the interaction between individuals' crime propensity and their exposure to criminogenic environments was empirically tested using a group of young people in Peterborough, UK. Findings show that they move around extensively in urban space and that their activity fields normally stretch far beyond their neighbourhood and expose them to a range of different environments. Those who spend more time in criminogenic environments (e.g. being unsupervised with peers in neighbourhoods with a poor collective efficacy) tend to be more frequently involved in acts of crime. Wikström et al. (2010: 81) notes, however, that 'this relationship depends on the young person's crime propensity. Having a crime averse morality and strong ability to exercise self-control appears to make young people situationally immune to influences from criminogenic settings, while having a crime prone morality and poor ability to exercise self-control appears to make young people situationally vulnerable to influences from criminogenic settings'. Wikström's situational action theory and the previous ecological theories discussed in this section play a key role in helping us to make sense of the spatial and time variability of crime and fear in urban areas. Indirectly, they also provide theoretical frameworks to define society's response to these problems.

---

[8] Whilst the empirical testing of Brantingham and Brantingham's model has not been extensive, evidence tends to support it (Bottoms and Wiles 2002).

The effect of city environments on social life and crime is the main focus in the article by Vania Ceccato and Per Olof Wikström in Part III of this book. Situational action theory is used as guidance for testing spatial methodologies to visualise and track individuals over space and time. The space-time dimension of individual movement patterns is placed against the city's urban fabric as an ecological context. The whole third part of the book focuses on the effect of urban environments on crime and fear as discussed above. Robert Haining reviews the background to, and nature of, ecological analysis in crime and disorder research. He shows examples of such analysis in studies of the geography of offences, offending and area profiling. The article also reviews some of the current challenges and future prospects for small-area ecological analysis and concludes with comments on the value of this form of analysis in crime prevention. Following the same analytical approach, the study by Vania Ceccato and Mats Wilhelmsson assesses whether and how crime and fear impact on neighbourhoods, particularly the effect of acts of vandalism together with fear of places in neighbourhoods on apartment prices. The research stems from the idea that crime and security concerns result in neighbourhood decline. As UNHSP (2007) shows, crime leads to stigmatisation of neighbourhoods or even entire sections of a city. These areas become *no-go* areas and eventually lose out on investments, provision of infrastructure and basic services. At the individual level, apart from injury and death, victims of crime suffer long-lasting trauma and may live with the fear of victimisation.

Whether in Rio or London, crime and fear of crime have an impact on the social life of communities. Taylor (1995) suggests that crime has a wide range of behavioural, psychological, social and economic consequences: lower house values, weaker attachment of residents to and satisfaction with their neighbourhood and desire to move. For people in these communities, some of the consequences include limited physical activities, avoidance of 'dangerous places', less participation in the local community and less willingness to co-operate. People living outside the neighbourhood may be less willing to move into or buy a house there because of security concerns. Evidence from the literature shows that crime affects housing prices (e.g. Thaler 1978; Bowes and Ihlanfeldt 2001; Gibbons 2004; Tita et al. 2006; Troy and Grove 2008; Ceccato and Wilhelmsson 2011), but there are other conditions that might conceivably contribute, together with crime, to lowering property prices (Cohen 1990). Particularly in cities of the Global South, neighbourhoods with high crime may also experience fewer environmental amenities (absence of nearby parks, lakes, playgrounds, good schools, etc.) and suffer from isolation (poor accessibility) as well as noise and air pollution (too close to major highways and transport nodes). They may be close to industrial or commercial/entertainment areas (e.g. close to bars, restaurants, pubs) and show signs of vandalism and abandonment. The focus of the next section is on the specificities of landscapes of crime and fear in cities of the Global South. Some of the theories so far presented are challenged by the scale of crime, violence and complexity of security problems experienced by people living in cities in Brazil and South Africa.

1.5   The Context of Crime and Fear in Cities of Global South

Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody,
only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.
(Jacobs 1961: 238)

We are accustomed to thinking that crime is a rare event – and perhaps it is, if we think about the chances of being a victim of violent crime in a European city. However, such an assumption must be rethought in relation to crime levels and rates in large cities of the Global South. The incidence of homicides, for instance, varies nowadays between five and seven a day in cities such as Rio and São Paulo,[9] Brazil or in Cape Town, South Africa (SSP 2010; SAPS 2008). In Brazil, homicide is influenced by age, gender and ethnicity: non-white, young males are overrepresented amongst both offenders and victims.[10] Within cities, homicide rates range from district to district, but the reasons for such variations are subject to much debate, some attributed to differences in local drugs markets, policing strategies and contextual community cultural and social values (UNHSP 2007). Most large cities mirror the socio-economic inequalities that exist within society and suggest social disorganisation risk factors as determinants of high homicide rates (Camara et al. 2001; Carneiro 1998; Ceccato et al. 2007). High violence rates also seem to relate to the absence of social control, to competition for scarce resources and to bureaucratic neglect (Cardia et al. 2003).

A recent study has shown that 70% of urban dwellers in Africa and Latin America have been victims of crime. In Latin America, where 80% of the population is urban, the metropolitan areas of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Mexico City and Caracas account for over half of the violent crimes in their respective countries. The homicide rate in Rio de Janeiro has tripled since the 1970s, whilst in São Paulo it has quadrupled. In cities like Rio de Janeiro, violence is interwoven into the fabric of daily life and has become the norm for many slum dwellers. In Africa, it is not much different. Cities such as Cape Town, Johannesburg and Nairobi account for a large proportion of these respective countries' crime. Also, victimisation rates for robbery are much higher in Latin America and Africa than in other regions of the world (UNHSP 2007).

Contrary to what happens in Europe (Hale 1996; Vanderveen 2006), in Latin America and in African nations, fear of crime tends to correlate with police-recorded crime and victimisation surveys. According to Nuttall et al. (2002), the

---

[9] There were 13 homicides recorded per day between 1999 and 2003 (Ceccato et al. 2007). Lethal violence is decreasing in the last decade.

[10] In many cities, a Brazilian pattern of higher male youth homicide rates is clear. Of murder victims from 14 to 30 years old, 94.5% were men and 5.5% women. Amongst the young population, between 15 and 24 years old, the rate for blacks and mixed race was 74% higher than that for whites (15) (Monteiro and Zaluar 2009).

highest levels of fear reported were in Brazil followed by South Africa, where 70% and 65% of respondents respectively felt unsafe walking home at night (the percentage for Western European nations is around 20%). In practice, interventions to ensure safety have used approaches that differ from area to area but which are often exclusionary and repressive. These range from army control and police practices that are tough on crime in poor and slum areas to gating, private security controls, neighbourhood watch schemes and related measures; these developments are all designed to create *bubbles of security* for the better off. In African and Latin American countries, gated communities are seen as a rational reaction to the increased risk of victimisation and fear of crime. Despite the fact that the causes of these housing developments differ between Latin American and South African cities (where apartheid forms part of the historical baggage), these types of community are seen as a visible consequence of deepening socio-economic disparities (Coy 2006) and the creation of spatial fragmentation. Gated communities of different types and dimensions have become a common feature in almost all Latin American and African cities, nowadays not only for the rich. In extreme cases, projects have constant armed guards and video surveillance. Devices in the road bed may puncture the tyres of vehicles trying to crash through the gates. Homes have private alarms tied in to central security services (Grant and Mittelsteadt 2004). In Part IV, Karina Landman presents examples of gated communities in South Africa and explores the implications of crime and urban fortification for socio-spatial order and integration.

According to Gilbert (1998), gated communities are only one element in the complex patchwork of the fragmented cities of the Global South. The author adds that the dichotomy of islands of wealth in oceans of poverty describes the overall structural character of this urban patchwork. According to Bate (2002), in Rio de Janeiro, for instance, nearly one million people occupy approximately 600 *favelas*.[11] The more troubled *favelas* have problems with drugs, crime and a mob-like control over the territory that calls for intervention beyond the local sphere, although less repressive than what is currently in place (such as having the army patrol the *favelas*). Part IV includes the article by the anthropologist Alba Zaluar, who presents, with her long experience in the field, the dynamics of social life in the poorest areas of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, where the interaction between youth violence, guns and drug trafficking are part of daily life.

The next section provides a background to the last part of the book on interventions and actions towards safer urban environments. Although limited, the part illustrates – with examples drawn from criminology, urban planning and architecture – how crime and safety are dealt with in practice in different European cities.

---

[11] *Favela* is the Portuguese word for shanty towns or irregular, subnormal dwellings.

1.6 Actions for Safe Urban Environments

> *A city is the characteristic physical and social unit of civilization.*
> *It possesses size, density, grain, outline and pattern. The people*
> *who live in it shape these properties and are shaped by them.*
>
> (Lynch 1954: 54)

Cities can be called liveable places only when they can ensure quality environments fit for all to live in, and this quality also includes security. How can we plan for safer urban environments? First, as researchers, planners or practitioners, we have to believe that our actions are intended to have a positive effect on the environment, making them safer. Second, we cannot doubt the importance of the urban fabric in creating opportunities for both crime and perceived safety. Third, our actions aiming at urban safe environments must be based on knowledge of what does and does not work. Fourth, we must be aware that security measures may impose restrictions on space that will be perceived, at least by some, as discriminatory. Fifth, we should be aware that planning for safe environments may mean that only certain groups (whose voices are legitimised and turned into policy responses) will be the beneficiaries of that action (other unheard groups may be silenced or marginalised). Finally, and most importantly, we must strive to work towards actions that are inclusive and fair[12] so that urban environments can turn into liveable places also from a safety perspective. These assumptions are far from being unproblematic. They just illustrate the difficulties in tackling crime and perceived safety on the urban scale.

These practical difficulties are magnified by structural changes that characterise our time. For instance, challenges of ensuring security have increased since causes of crime and fear require solutions that may go beyond the urban sphere. This goes hand in hand with a safety discourse that follows the perceptions of escalated crime levels, something that makes public opinion think that crime is a serious problem that must be targeted, regardless of what official statistics may say. Moreover, security is no longer a matter of the police but of a diverse set of actors (Loader and Sparks 2002). In the past, the state was the only chief custodian of criminal justice, and the police were the most visible (and only) arm of it in urban environments. Security has changed through privatisation. Enclosed and sealed shopping malls or gated communities are part of the commodified security of the contemporary urban landscape. At the same time, commercial firms offer a range of security hardware of different types through the market: fences, padlocks, dogs, alarms, guards, security electronic devices and closed-circuit television (CCTV). Nick Tilley in his article illustrates the links between levels of investment in security goods – such as alarms and window bars/grilles – and levels of residential burglary in the UK.

---

[12] There is a vast literature that dismisses the idea that we really can create cities in which justice is possible for everyone; see, for example, Fainstein (2010).

In new housing developments, particularly in Europe, security concerns have been taken seriously from the initial sketches to final details of the projects. In the UK, for instance, security and safety are part of urban sustainability goals (see, e.g. Armitage and Monchuk 2008), a quality that can be traded as any other amenity in the housing market. Some of these new developments take into account the *European standard* for the reduction of crime and fear of crime through urban planning and building design. This document suggests key propositions based on examples of good practice across Europe based on CPTED and situational crime prevention (CEN 2003). One of the key recommendations is that crime and fear of crime should be seen as different but related phenomena. Some of these recommendations in the *European standard* have, however, generated controversy (Schneider and Kitchen 2007). In the article by Bo Grönlund, Hammarby Sjöstad is presented as an example of a newly built residential area in Stockholm, Sweden, that to some extent incorporated some of these security principles in the construction and planning of the area.

A parallel but overlapping development is the implementation of a range of initiatives that make citizens responsible for their own security. Security now incorporates voluntarism (people working without paying) through governance.[13] The engagement of actors other than traditional planners and politicians in the planning process has often followed open frameworks of participation and action (for a review, see Listerborn 2007). The article presented by Catherine Alexander and Rachel Pain in Part I provides an example of how research can lead to knowledge about groups that are rarely heard in more traditional planning set-ups and can provide a more nuanced view of community safety.

Crime prevention measures and planning practices are sometimes seen with suspicious eyes. Some suggest that urban planning must be done consciously. Listerborn (2007: 74) suggests that 'if the planners have poor knowledge about, or are prejudiced towards, the people they plan for, the result of the planning processes will illustrate just that'. Even in participatory frameworks, planning solutions may not fit the needs of all. If interventions are guided by a local dominant group or elite, there is a risk that what is achieved at the end reaches only the needs of that specific group. For instance, the literature on the use of public places has suggested that focus on security measures has restricted social interaction, constrained individual liberties, militarised space and excluded certain groups (Graham and Marvin 2001; Kohn 2004). However, according to Németh and Schmidt (2007: 42), few studies have empirically tested such assertions or documented actual methods and approaches used to secure such spaces.

In 1996, the UN-Habitat launched the Safer Cities programme that tackles security problems as an issue of good governance. The programme has focused mostly on cities in Africa and Latin America, where problems of crime and

---

[13] As suggested by Rhodes (1997: 67), governance blurs the distinction between the state and civil society. The state becomes a collection of inter-organisational networks made up of governmental and societal actors with no sovereign actors able to steer or regulate.

safety are considered most urgent. Since then, countries have been in the process of reforming police and criminal systems with greater appreciation of the urban environment and the recognition of the value of local actors in the development of community-wide planning strategies for addressing security problems (UNHSP 2007).

Participatory frameworks have been popular in the last decade particularly when the goal was improvements in women's safety. Examples are the engagement of women in safety audits[14] to improve environments at various scales (for a review, see Whitzman et al. 2009). Even though research shows that planning departments tend to ignore questions of gender equality (Beebeejaun 2009; Burgess 2008; Sen and Kelly 2007), urban planning has not only become more sensitive to the different needs of women and men but also engaged both as active participants in planning-related activities (e.g. Beall 1996; Sweet and Escalante 2010). These initiatives have had the support of supranational gender policies at the European Union (EU) level. For instance, one of the main objectives of the EU is to eliminate inequalities and to promote gender equality throughout the European member states. However, how gender is understood and put into practice by each member state differs. In the last article of the book, Dymén and Ceccato make an attempt to illustrate how gender is incorporated into urban planning projects and practices when urban safety is the main goal. The authors rely on case studies in four different countries: Austria, Finland, Sweden and the UK and finalise the article suggesting an agenda for action.

1.7   Concluding and Looking Ahead

We identify future research fields by reflecting upon the current research reviewed in this section but also taking into account the contributors' conclusions and recommendations.

Traditional theories of urban criminology, such as social disorganisation, routine activity and others, still constitute the pillars for research of urban crime. New developments in research have also highlighted the importance not only of environment on crime causation but also people's agency in improving the collective efficacy and their own safety in neighbourhoods. Empirical research driven by these theories has made valuable contributions to the understanding of the way environments shape human behaviour, social interactions that sometimes lead to crime. More empirical evidence is needed in this field even though these new developments have already shown encouraging results. Future developments

---

[14] Women's safety audits have been defined as 'a process which brings individuals together to walk through a physical environment, evaluate how safe it feels to them, identify ways to make the space safer and organize to bring about these changes' (Women's Action Centre Against Violence Ottawa-Carleton 1995:1).

should consider the links between these theories with the current transformations in society, as suggested by Bottoms and Wiles (2002). It is surprising that little has been done to investigate how today's mobility patterns affect local (urban) and regional patterns of crime and whether these ecological theories are adequate to interpret such dynamics. Also, there is a lack of knowledge on how crime trends vary over space and time (monitoring) and how they might relate to inequality in victimisation in the long run in different parts of the city (prediction). Nick Tilley's article shows that, although overall victimisation is decreasing, the poor still tend to be overrepresented amongst victims of burglary. This calls for new areas of research related to (1) whether (and how) patterns of consumption of security commodities relate to patterns of crime and perceived safety in urban environments and (2) whether socio-economic inequality and differences in victimisation relate to other types of social injustices more than crime (e.g. pollution, diseases) at intra-urban levels.

Another area of development is the methodology in ecological research. At the research frontier are methods of prediction of crime concentration and offenders' movement and those that include the city dynamics (population at risk over time and space). Of great potential are spatial methodologies (mapping and spatial techniques) that allow fine detailed analysis of crime in space and time. Of particular importance is the need to consider the role of ecological analysis in crime prevention and the limitations and advantages this framework of analysis may impose, as suggested in this book. The potentiality of tracking individuals over time and space and measuring the environment impact on individuals' behaviour, as exemplified by Ceccato and Wikström's article, constitutes certainly a new frontier in research. Although we have now both more appropriate theories as well as methods to assess the role of environment in crime causation, more evidence is needed to better understand the interaction between individual and ecological effects on human behaviour.

As proposed in the article by Ceccato and Wilhelmsson, future studies should deal with changes in crime rates or fear of crime in the neighbourhoods. It may be that such changes, particularly the rapid ones, are more likely to affect communities than the actual levels of crime or fear of crime (this effect should be assessed differently for different types of offences). More research is also needed on the effect of fear of crime in the wider geographical urban area. Jackson and Brunton-Smith found that attributes of adjacent localities shape fear of crime just as much as immediate social and physical conditions. It is believed that tackling crime and disorder hot spots can reduce the fear of crime not only in a particular locality but also in neighbouring areas. They suggest the use of more precise methodologies to measure public insecurities about crime.

Micro-spaces are believed to affect spatial behaviour, social interactions and, ultimately, the geography of crime and fear. Of relevance are the principles proposed by Jane Jacob's *eyes on the streets*, defensible spaces as set out by Newman and also the *new urbanist* position as suggested by Zelinka and Brennan in their 2001 book *Safescape*. Bill Hillier demonstrates in his article the need for further evidence on how street networks and other aspects of physical design of buildings relate to crime. His findings, however, show amongst other things that

higher residential populations linked to spaces – that is, to street segments – are pervasively associated with lower rates of both residential burglary and street robbery. His results contribute to corroborate both *defensible space* and *Safescape* principles. He suggests that these results urgently call for more investigation. As Bo Grönlund notes, evidence from Hammarby Sjöstad in Sweden seems to point in the same direction. He concludes that the traditional way of building cities with streets and blocks seems to enhance security and feeling of safety. The challenge, however, is to ensure security in the existent housing developments found in many Scandinavian large cities. The most problematic ones are based on the CIAM type of large, mono-functional, modernistic principles that create spatially segregated areas, often where groups that face more socio-economic challenges tend to reside.

Cities are dynamic places where a significant part of our time is spent moving around and going from place to place, using either automobiles or public transit systems. Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris in her article suggests the need for an integrated understanding of security during the whole trip (in her words, adopting a *whole journey approach*) since the risks and perception of crime may vary along the trip. She also points out to the need for better knowledge on how different interventions may work in different places since different groups have different needs as well as different levels of fear and vulnerability. Some of this new knowledge may be based on particular groups living in a specific area. Alexander and Pain suggest, for example, that new understandings are required to move us towards innovative and more spatially nuanced ways of thinking about security and securitisation, which impose a considerable challenge both to the theorisations and the politics of urban security.

Still, a remaining issue both in research and practice, as shown by Dymén and Ceccato, is the difficulty of dealing with women's fear of crime and victimisation. The fact that women's victimisation belongs to private space (home) whilst women's fear is redirected to the public sphere (fear of public places) imposes a number of challenges not easily resolved. Planning interventions might be focusing on the *wrong spaces* and *wrong targets* if actions are restricted only to public spaces, where the minority of cases of serious crimes against women occur. Interventions are often guided by the dichotomy of actions between private versus public spaces. Improving women's safety requires an integrated framework of actions that engage physical planning (which deals with safety of outdoor environments) with other sectorial interventions, for instance, social care and organisations that deal with domestic violence. The integration of risks in both private and public spaces must also happen at research level. Women have the right to feel safe at all times and environments. The use of space-time budgets[15] might

---

[15] Space-time budgets comprise detailed hourly information about individuals' whereabouts and doings. They cover a time period (e.g. a day, a week), including the subject's geographic location, the place (e.g. home, school, street), who the subject was with (e.g. family, friends) and his or her main activity (e.g. socialising, sleeping). For more details, see Wikström et al. (2010).

be useful for tracking individuals in different spatial arenas, to check what they are doing and with whom. Future studies dealing with safety should take into account individuals' movement patterns and how vulnerable they are (or might feel) both indoors and outdoors.

The cases of South Africa here, presented by Karina Landman, and Brazil, illustrated by the case of Rio de Janeiro by Alba Zaluar, show the challenges faced by urban areas in the Global South. The difference in nature and magnitude of security problems faced by cities of developing countries demands a consideration of whether the planning and criminological theories, some previously discussed in the book, are adequate for interpreting problems in cities like Rio, Bogota or Cape Town. They may not be, but they have been used for decades as theoretical benchmarking to tackle problems of cities in the Global South. For instance, defensible space ideals can surely be applied to many neighbourhoods in cities of the Global South, but we wonder what Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) means for those living in residential areas where walls are made of cardboard and streets lack asphalt and illumination? The same difficulty is found when we think about what is private and public space in favelas and how they affect women's pattern of risk and fear. Moreover, in cities like Rio, the source of violence is not only organised crime but, in some cases, it is the local ruler and service provider simply because the state is not there or the police are repressive and corrupt. What is social control in such areas? Better to say, control for whom? In some areas, social protection and safety are built on the basis of fear of mafia-like social networks; thus are social disorganisation principles of any use in these settings? Challenges are not minor when routine activity principles are applied to extremely segmented urban spaces, such as post-apartheid cities in South Africa or gated Latin American fortresses. For those who can afford, social interactions in the so-called bubbles of security may lead to lower risk of victimisation. When human interactions are limited to certain areas, such as protected shopping malls and private leisure clubs, does it make sense to think about principles of routine activity as a way to predict the risk of crime for all? Although some of the examples we draw upon might sound extreme, they are used here to highlight the need to rethink the importance of context of different *urban fabrics* when dealing with urban security using existent theories of urban criminology.

Practices in crime prevention and planning presented in this book should not be considered as a *one-size-fits-all* solution for urban crime and fear in other cities. There is a need to consider the context of actions to achieve the desired goals. For this to happen, planners and practitioners must be aware of their role and the challenges involved when working with security issues. They should strive to work towards practices that are inclusive and fair (different target groups but also based on a coalition of different actors) and, as much as possible, to work on participatory frameworks. If well thought out, security interventions and urban planning actions can also serve to engage local communities, empower participants and help facilitate public participation in the production of a safe and liveable built environment. And this is our task!

References

Addington, L. A. (2009). Fear of crime and perceived risk. *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. doi:10.1093/obo/9780195396607-0051.

Andresen, M. A. (2006). Crime measures and the spatial analysis of criminal activity. *British Journal of Criminology, 46*(2), 258–285.

Andresen, M., Brantingham, P. J., & Kinney, B. (2009). *Classics in environmental criminology*. Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis.

Armitage, R., & Monchuk, L. (2008). Reconciling security with sustainability: The challenge for eco-homes. *Built Environment, 35*(3), 308–327.

Barker, R. (1968). *Ecological psychology concepts and methods for studying the environment of human behaviour*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bassanese, S. (1999). *Property crime in townhouse developments: An assessment of physical design and crime rates*. PhD thesis, The University of Guelph, Otawa.

Bate, P. (2002). *From raze to rebuild*. IDB America. Parts 1 – 3. http://www.iadb.org/idbamerica/index.cfm?&thisid=1429&articlepreview=0&. Accessed 05 Apr 2010.

Beall, J. (1996). *Urban governance: Why gender matters*. http://www.gdrc.org/u-gov/doc-whygendermatters.html#Gender. Equity in urban partnerships. Assessed 22 Dec 2010.

Becker, G. (1968). Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy, 76*(2), 169–217.

Beebeejaun, Y. (2009). Making safer places: Gender and the right to the city. *Security Journal, 22*(3), 219–229.

Bellair, P. E., & Browning, C. R. (2010). Contemporary disorganization research: An assessment and further test of the systemic model of neighborhood crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 47*(4), 496–521.

Bottoms, A. E., & Wiles, P. (2002). Environmental criminology. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of criminology* (pp. 620–656). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowes, D., & Ihlanfeldt, D. (2001). Identifying the effects of rail stations on residential property values. *Journal of Urban Economics, 50*(1), 1–25.

Box, S., Hale, C., & Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology, 28*(3), 340–356.

Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P. L. (1981). *Environmental criminology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P. L. (1984). *Patterns in crime*. New York: Macmillan.

Brantingham, P. J., & Brantingham, P. L. (1995). Criminality of place: Crime generators and crime attractors. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 3*(3), 5–26.

Briscoe, S., & Donnelly, N. (2001). *Assaults on licensed premises in inner-urban areas, Sydney*. Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

Bromley, R. D. F., & Nelson, A. L. (2002). Alcohol related crime and disorder across urban space and time: Evidence from a British city. *Geoforum, 33*(2), 239–254.

Brown, S. (1998). What's the problem, girls? CCTV and the gendering of public space. In C. Norris, J. Morgan, & G. Armstrong (Eds.), *Surveillance, closed circuit television and social control* (pp. 207–220). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Burgess, G. (2008). Planning and gender equality duty – Why does gender matter? *People Place & Policy Online, 2*(3), 112–121.

Bursik, R. J. (1988). Social disorganisation and theories of crime delinquency: Problems and prospects. *Criminology, 26*(4), 519–551.

Bursik, R. J. J. R., & Grasmick, H. G. (1993). *Neighbourhoods and crime*. New York: Lexington.

Caldeira, T. P. R. (2000). *City of walls: Crime, segregation and citizenship in São Paulo*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Camara, G., Monteiro, A. M., Ramos, F. R., Sposati, A., & Roga, D. (2001). *Mapping social exclusion/inclusion in developing countries*. http://www.dpi.inpe.br/gilberto/papers/saopaulo_csiss.pdf. Assessed 20 Feb 2011.

Cardia, N., Adorno, S., & Poleto, F. Z. (2003). Homicide rates and human rights violations in São Paulo, Brazil: 1990 to 2002. *Health and Human Rights, 6*(2), 15–33.

Carneiro, L. P. (1998). Firearms in Rio de Janeiro: Culture, prevalence and control. In: K. Ghougassian & L. P. Carneiro (Eds.), *Connecting weapons with violence: The South American experience*. Monograph 25. http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/Monographs/No25/Contents.html. Assessed 20 Feb 2011.

Carneiro, L. P. (1999). *Determinantes do crime na America Latina: Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo research report*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.

Ceccato, V. (2009). Crime in a city in transition: the case of Tallinn, Estonia. *Urban Studies, 46*(8), 1611–1638.

Ceccato, V., & Lukyte, N. (2011). Safety and sustainability in a city in transition: The case of Vilnius, Lithuania. *Cities, 28*(1), 83–94.

Ceccato, V., & Wilhelmsson, M. (2011). The impact of crime on apartment prices: Evidence from Stockholm, Sweden. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, 93*(1), 81–103.

Ceccato, V., Haining, R., & Signoretta, P. (2002). Exploring crime statistics in Stockholm using spatial analysis tools. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 92*(1), 29–51.

Ceccato, V., Haining, R., & Kahn, T. (2007). The geography of homicide in São Paulo, Brazil. *Environment and Planning A, 39*(7), 1632–1653.

Ceccato, V., Uittenbogaard, A. C., & Bamzar, R. (2010, November). *Safety in underground stations: The importance of environmental attributes*. Stockholm, Preliminary report.

CEN (Comite Europeen du Normailisation). (2003). *Prevention of crime – Urban planning and design – Part 2*. Urban planning, ENV 14383–2, CEN, management centre, Brussels, Belgium.

Chevigny, P. (1999). Defining the role of the police in Latina America. In J. Mendez, G. O'Donell, & P. S. Pinheiro (Eds.), *The (un)rule of law and the underprivileged in Latin America* (pp. 49–70). Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

Christie, N., Andenaes, J., & Skirkbeckk, S. (1965). A study of self-reported crime. In *Scandinavian studies in criminology* (Vol. 1). London: Tavistock.

Church, A., Frost, M., & Sullivan, K. (2000). Transport and social exclusion in London. *Transport Policy, 7*(3), 195–205.

Clarke, R. (1996). *Preventing mass transit crime* (Crime prevention studies). New York: Willow Tree Press.

Cohen, M. A. (1990). A note on the cost of crime to victims. *Urban Studies, 27*(1), 139–146.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(August), 588–608.

Coleman, A. (1985). *Utopia on trail vision and reality in planned housing*. London: Hillary Shipman Limited.

Conklin, J. (2007). *Criminology*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Coy, M. (2006). Gated communities and urban fragmentation in Latin America: The Brazilian experience. *GeoJournal, 66*(1–2), 121–132.

Day, K. (2009). Being feared: Masculinity and race in public space. In M. Lee & S. Farral (Eds.), *Fear of crime: Critical voices in an age of anxiety* (pp. 82–107). New York: Routledge-Cavendish.

DfT – Department of Transport. (2004). *A bulletin of transport statistics: Great Britain, 2004 edition*. SN (04) 34. www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transats/downloadable/dft_transats_032974.pdf. Assessed 20 Feb 2011.

Durkheim, E. (1897). *Suicide: A study in sociology*. New York: Free Press.

Easteal, P., & Wilson, P. (1991). *Preventing crime on transport*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

EU CORINE Land Cover. (2001). *Definition of urban fabric*. Available at http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/COR0-landcover. Assessed 14 Feb 2011.

Evans, D. J., & Herbert, D. T. (1989). *The geography of crime*. London: Routledge.

Fainstein, S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Farrall, S., Jackson, J., & Gray, E. (2007). Theorising the fear of crime: The cultural and social significance of feelings of insecurity. Published on the *Social Science Research Network*. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1012393. Assessed 20 Feb 2011.

Felson, M., & Clarke, R. V. (1998). *Opportunity makes the thief practical theory for crime prevention*. London: Home Office.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: Clarendom.

Garofalo, J., & Laub, J. (1979). Fear of crime – Broadening our perspective. *Victimology, 3*(3–4), 242–253.

Gerber, M., Hirtenlehner, H., & Jackson, J. (2010). Insecurities about crime in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. *European Journal of Criminology, 7*(2), 141–157.

Gerbner, C. (1970). Cultural indicators: The case of violence and television drama. *Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science, 388*(1), 69–81.

Gibbons, S. (2004). The costs of urban property crime. *The Economic Journal, 114*(499), F441–F463.

Giddens, A. (1991). Structuration theory: Past, present and future. In G. A. Bryant & D. Jary (Eds.), *Giddens' theory of structuration: A critical appreciation*. London: Routledge.

Gilbert, A. (1998). *The Latin American city*. London: Latin American Bureau.

Glaeser, E. L., & Sacerdote, B. (1999). Why is there more crime in cities? *Journal of Political Economy, 107*(6), 225–258.

Grabosky, P. (1995). *Fear of crime and fear reduction strategies* (Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice, 44). Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Graham, S., & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering urbanism: Networked infrastructures, technological mobilities and the urban condition*. London: Routledge.

Grant, J., & Mittelsteadt, L. (2004). Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B. Planning and Design, 31*(6), 913–930.

Grohe, B. R. (2006). *Perceptions of crime, fear of crime, and defensible space in Fort Worth Neighbourhoods*. Thesis, The University of Texas, Arlington.

Hale, C. (1996). Fear of crime: A review of the literature. *International Review of Victimology, 4*, 79–150.

Hancock, L. (2001). *Community crime and disorder: Safety and regeneration in urban neighbourhoods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Press.

Herbert, D. T. (1982). *The geography of urban crime*. New York: Longman.

Hillier, B. (2004). Can streets be made safe? *Urban Design International, 9*, 31–45.

Hirschfield, A. (2008). The multi-faceted nature of crime. *Built Environment, 34*(1), 5–20.

Hirschfield, A., & Bowers, K. J. (1997). The effect of social cohesion on levels of recorded crime in disadvantaged areas. *Urban Studies, 34*(8), 1275–1295.

Hirschi, T. (1969, 2002). *Causes of delinquency*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers (Originally published by University of California Press, 1969).

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Vintage Books.

Johnson, S., & Bowers, K. (2010). Permeability and burglary risk: Are Cul-de-Sacs Safer? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*(1), 89–111.

Kennedy, B. P. I., Kawachi, D., Prothrowstith, K. L., & Gupta, V. (1998). Social capital, income inequality, and firearm violent crime. *Social Science & Medicine, 47*(1), 7–17.

Knox, P., & Pinch, S. (2006). *Urban social geography: An introduction*. Harlow: Peason Prentice Hall.

Kohn, M. (2004). *Brave new neighborhoods: The privatization of public space*. New York: Routledge.

Kornhauser, R. (1978). *Social sources of delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

La Vigne, N. G. (1997). *Visibility and vigilance: Metro's situational approach to preventing subway crime* (NIJ research in brief). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Listerborn, C. (2007). Who speaks? and who listens? The relationship between planners and women's participation in local planning in a multi-cultural urban environment. *GeoJournal, 70*(1), 61–74.

Loader, I., & Sparks, R. (2002). Contemporary landscapes of crime, order and control: Governance, globalization and risk. In M. Maguire, R. Morgan, & R. Reiner (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Los, M. (2002). Post-communist fear of crime and the commercialisation of security. *Theoretical Criminology, 6*(2), 165–188.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (1999). Hot spots of bus stop crime: The importance of environmental attributes. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 65*(4), 395–411.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Liggett, R., Iseki, H., & Thurlow, W. (2001). Measuring the effects of built environment on bus stop crime. *Environment and Planning B, 28*(2), 255–280.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., Liggett, R., & Iseki, H. (2002). The geography of transit crime: Documentation and evaluation of crime incidence on and around green line stations in Los Angeles. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 22*(2), 135–151.

Lynch, K. (1954). The form of cities. *Scientific America, 190*(4), 54–63.

Madensen, T. D., & Eck, J. E. (2008). Violence in bars: Exploring the impact of place manager decision-making. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety, 10*(2), 111–125.

Marshall, S. (1998) *Defining the dimensions of urban design*. Originally appeared in the Planning Factory. http://www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/research/marshall/publication2.htm. Assessed 10 Feb 2011.

Mayhew, B. H., & Levinger, R. (1976). Size and density of interaction in human aggregates. *The American Journal of Sociology, 82*(1), 86–110.

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (1994). *Crime and the American dream*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (1997). Political restraint of the market and levels of criminal homicide: A cross national application of institutional anomie theory. *Social Forces, 75*(4), 1393–1416.

Monteiro, M. F. G., & Zaluar, A. M. (2009). Desigualdades regionais do risco de mortalidade de jovens por grupos étnicos. Presented in the IX Congresso Brasileiro de Saúde Coletiva, Recife, Brazil.

Morenoff, J., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. (2001). Neighbourhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of homicide. *Criminology, 39*(3), 517–560.

Németh, J., & Schmidt, S. (2007). Toward a methodology for measuring the security of publicly accessible spaces. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 73*(3), 283–297.

Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space*. New York: Macmillan.

Newton, A. D. (2004). Crime on public transport: 'Static' and 'non-static' (moving) crime events. *Western Criminology Review, 5*(3), 25–42.

Newton, A., & Hirschfield, A. (2009). Measuring violence in and around licensed premises: The need for a better evidence base. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety, 11*(3), 171–188.

Nuttal, C., DeCourcey, E., & Rudder, I. (2002) *The Barbados crime survey: International comparisons*. Barbados Statistical Department. http://barbados.gov.bb/Doc/AG-barbadoscrimesurvey2002.pdf. Assessed Mar 2005.

Oc, T., & Tiesdell, S. (1999). The fortress, the panoptic, the regulatory and the animated: Planning and urban design approaches to safer city centers. *Landscape Research, 24*(3), 265–286.

Pain, R. (2000). Place, social relations and the fear of crime: A review. *Progress in Human Geography, 24*(3), 365–388.

Pain, R. (2001). Gender, race, age and fear in the city. *Urban Studies, 38*(5–6), 899–913.

Pain, R. (2009). Globalized fear? Towards an emotional geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography, 33*(4), 466–486.

Poore, S. (2007). *Overview of social control theories*. http://www.hewett.norfolk.sch.uk/curric/soc/crime/s_contro.htm. The Hewett School. Retrieved 2 Sept 2007.

Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexibility and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Roncek, D. W., & Maier, P. A. (1991). Bars, blocks and crimes revisited: Linking the theory of routine activities to the empiricisms of 'Hot Spots'. *Criminology, 29*(4), 725–753.

Rosenfeld, R., Messner, S. F., & Baumer, E. P. (2001). Social capital and homicide. *Social Forces, 80*(1), 283–309.

Sampson, R. J., Raundenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918–924.

Sandercock, L. (2005). Difference, fear and habitus, a political economy of urban fear. In J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 219–233). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements, and nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schneider, R. H., & Kitchen, T. (2007). *Crime prevention and the built environment*. London: Routledge.

Sen, P., & Kelly, L. (2007). *Shadow thematic report for the Committee on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)*. Thematic shadow report on violence against women in the UK.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sherman, L. W., Gartin, P. R., & Buerger, M. E. (1989). Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. *Criminology, 27*(1), 27–56.

Silva, L. A. M. (2010). Violência urbana, segurança pública e favelas: o caso do Rio de Janeiro atual. *Caderno CRH, 23*, 283–300.

Skogan, W. G. (1978). The changing distribution of big-city crime. *Urban Affairs Quarterly, 13*(1), 33–47.

Skogan, W., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with crime: Individual and neighbourhood reactions*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

SL – Stockholm Lokaltrafik. (2007). Trygghetsstatisk, Stockholm, SL. (unpublished).

Sloan-Howitt, M., & Kelling, G. L. (1997). Subway graffiti in New York city: "Gettin' up" vs. "meanin' it and cleanin' it.". In *Situational crime prevention: Successful case studies*. Monsey: Criminal Justice Press.

Smith, J. (2003). *The nature of personal robbery* (Research Study No. 254). London: Home Office.

Smith, M. J., & Clarke, R. V. (2000). Crime and public transport. *Crime and Justice, 27*, 169–233.

Smith, M. J., & Cornish, D. B. (2006). *Secure and tranquil travel: Preventing crime and disorder on public transport*. London: Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science.

Sommer, R. (1972). *Design awareness*. Corte Madera: Reinhart Press.

SSP – Secretaria de Segurança Pública de São Paulo. (2010). Estatistica de homicidios. http://www.ssp.sp.gov.br. Assessed 15 Jan 2011.

Stanko, E. (1990). *Everyday violence: Women's and men's experience of personal danger*. London: Pandora.

SAPS – Strategic Information, Strategic Development Information and GIS Department. (2008) *Incidence of murder*. http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/stats/Documents/Incidence%20of%20murder.htm. Assessed 9 Feb 2011.

Sweet, E. L., & Escalante, S. O. (2010). Planning responds to gender violence: Evidence from Spain, Mexico and the United States. *Urban Studies, 47*(10), 2129–2147.

Taylor, R. B. (1995). The impact of crime on communities. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 539*(1), 28–45.

Taylor, R. B., & Harrell, A. V. (1996). *Physical environment and crime*. National Institute of Justice Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Thaler, R. (1978). A note on the value of crime control: Evidence from the property market. *Journal of Urban Economics, 5*(1), 137–145.

Thomlinson, R. (1969). *Urban structure the social and spatial character of cities*. Toronto: Random House Publishing.

Tita, G. E., Petras, T. L., & Grembaum, R. T. (2006). Crime and residential choice: A neighbor-hood level analysis of the impact of crime on housing prices. *Journal of Quantitative Crimi-nology, 22*(4), 299–317.

Troy, A., & Grove, J. M. (2008). Property values, parks, and crime: A hedonic analysis in Baltimore, MD. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 87*(3), 233–245.

UNHSP – United Nations Human Settlements Programme. (2007). *Enhancing urban safety and security: Global report on human settlements*. London: UN-HABITAT.

Valentine, G. (1992). Images of danger: Women's sources of information about the spatial distribution of male violence. *Area, 24*(1), 22–29.

Vanderveen, G. (2006). *Interpreting fear, crime, risk and unsafety*. Devon: Willan.

Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for research and policy. *Criminal Justice, 4*, 451–489.

Whitzman, C., Shaw, M., Andrew, C., & Travers, K. (2009). The effectiveness of women's safety audits. *Security Journal, 22*, 205–218.

Wikström, P. O. (1991). *Urban crime, criminals, and victims: The Swedish experience in an Anglo-American comparative perspective*. Stockholm: Springer.

Wikström, P. O. (2005). The social origins of pathways in crime: Towards a developmental ecological action theory of crime involvement and its changes. In d Farrington (Ed.), *Integrated developmental and life-course theories of offending* (pp. 211–246). New Brunswick: Transactions Publishers.

Wikström, P. O. H. (2006). Individuals, settings and acts of crime: Situational mechanisms and the explanation of crime. In P. O. Wikström & R. J. Sampson (Eds.), *The explanation of crime: Context, mechanisms and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wikström, P. O. H., Ceccato, V., Hardie, B., & Treiber, K. (2010). Activity fields and the dynamics of crime advancing knowledge about the role of the environment in crime causation. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*(1), 55–87.

Wiktionary. (2011). *Urban fabric*. http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/urban_fabric. Assessed 20 Feb 2011.

Wiles, P., & Costello, A. (2000). *The 'road to nowhere': The evidence for travelling criminals* (Home office research study, 207). London: Home Office.

Will, J. A., & Mcgrath, J. H. (1995). Crime, neighbourhood perceptions and the underclass: The relationship between fear of crime and class position. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 23*(2), 163–176.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly, 249*(3), 29–38.

Women's Action Centre Against Violence Ottawa-Carleton. (1995). *Safety audit tools and housing: The state of the art and implications for CMHC*. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Association.

Wyant, B. R. (2008). Multilevel impacts of perceived incivilities and perceptions of crime risk on fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45*(1), 39–64.

Young, J. (1999). *The exclusive society: Social exclusion, crime and difference in late modernity*. London: Sage.

Zaluar, A. M. (2000). Perverse integration: Drug trafficking and youth in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro. *Journal of International Affairs, 53*(169), 654–671.

Zelinka, A., & Brennan, D. (2001). *SafeScape: Creating safer, more liveable communities through planning and design*. Washington, DC: Planners Press.