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ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and its relationship to a sense of place in terms of the current planning and design initiatives to assist in the prevention of crime within the built environment.

A non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Kilner Park and Queenswood is utilised as a study area.

From national and international authors, it was found that crime and fear of crime have an influence, firstly on the built environment, and secondly on a sense of community. The following schools of thought, relevant to this particular study, were identified as planning initiatives focused on crime prevention within the built environment:

- The Broken Windows Theory
- The Defensible Space Theory
- Situational Crime Prevention Theory
- Crime Prevention through Environment Design (CPTED) Theory.

The research design of this study is based on a case study approach, addressing social and spatial elements. A mix-used research approach was followed, consisting of qualitative and quantitative analysis components. The qualitative analysis consists of interviews conducted with local law enforcement and related parties. Additionally, focus groups were conducted with community members. The quantitative data consists of statistical data obtained from the Villieria Police Precinct.

It is evident from the study that the main crime generators are the physical structuring elements - freeways, railway line, open space systems and main movement network - as these elements serve as escape routes. It is noted that a sense of community and community participation play a significant role in crime prevention. Crime and fear of crime has not
influenced the communities’ sense of place, although community members are more vigilant and selective in the utilisation of the built environment.

The physical changes within the built environment have to some degree restricted communication, although not negatively influencing the overall sense of place experienced by community members. Planning and design should take cognisance of these findings, and in conjunction with law enforcement, structure future planning accordingly. Planning theory should take into account that physical crime prevention mechanism is not the answer to crime prevention alone. It is a tool to deter criminal activity, even displace crime, but not to prevent crime. In most instances, physical crime prevention mechanisms hinder crime prevention initiatives. Stronger emphasis should be placed on community integration and participation in crime prevention, as social control of neighbourhoods (ownership) creates symbolic barriers which deter criminal activity.

**Key words:** Crime and fear of crime / sense of community / built environment
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CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

South Africa is characterised by significantly high crime rates which over several decades have escalated to a point where the built environment has reacted in terms of physical interventions to try and curb crime. Moving through any neighbourhood in South Africa one is confronted with high walls, burglar bars, electric fencing, guard dogs and private security firm signs. Crime and the fear of crime have resulted in the fact that many people do not feel safe in their own homes any more. The establishment of gated communities, enclosed neighbourhoods and security villages are the order of the day. Crime and fear of crime have led to physical intervention in the built environment by means of the fortification of private residences and public facilities alike. These physical interventions have social implications, as they have led to the creation of a sense of non-belonging, due to social exclusion and alienation. Crime and the fear of crime in South Africa have a direct effect on how we perceive and utilise the current built environment (Holtmann & Domingo-Swarts, 2008:115; Kruger, 2005:1; Landman, 2009:214).

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996, No 108) clearly state that all citizens have the right to “freedom and security of the person, which includes to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources”. The National Development Plan (2011:349) states that “safety and security are directly related to socio-economic development and equality”. The National Outcomes Approach (2010:1) directly speaks to crime prevention; Outcome 3 entails that “all people in South Africa (is) protected and feel safe”. The aforementioned policies and plans acknowledge that personal safety is a necessary condition for quality of life, development and productivity.

Numerous theories / schools of thought on crime prevention, through built environment interventions, have been developed over the past several decades. The most relevant theories include Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, the Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Coles, 1997), Defensible Space Theory (Newman, 1996) and Situational Crime Prevention (Clarke, 1997). All four theories are based on physical intervention in the built environment which to some extent can contribute to crime prevention. The South African town planning, urban design and architectural fields are currently utilizing the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Theory (as described by the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research [CSIR]) as a point of departure in terms of addressing crime and fear of crime in the built environment.

According to Zinn (2010) and Cartwright et al (2012), South Africa has moved beyond the rational paradigm of addressing crime and fear of crime through environmental design. Zinn advocates the implementation of individualized crime prevention mechanisms focused primarily on target hardening (high walls and fences, private security firms, alarm systems, guard dogs etc.). These target hardening mechanisms alienate people as they remove them from the public domain and trap them in their fortified
homes. This leads to a sterile and perceived, unsafe built environment, that fosters neither integration, nor a sense of belonging / sense of community.

In this context it is important to understand the influence of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place. It is vital to acknowledge that crime and fear of crime is primarily experienced due to social and physical disorder within the built environment. Disorder within the built environment (associated with the possibility of victimization) leads to communities retreating into fortified homes, limiting social interaction and in turn weakening the social fabric of a community (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1; Ceccato, 2012:17).

Crime prevention initiatives within the built environment are to some degree reliant on the prevalence of a sense of community within neighbourhoods to optimise the effectiveness of crime prevention initiatives. Communities that experience a strong sense of belonging, express a form of territoriality whereby a community feels a strong sense of ownership or having proprietorship over a given space or neighbourhood. Communities that experience a sense of ownership take control of their neighbourhood and fulfil an order-maintenance function with the neighbourhood. Within such communities, it is found that through informal social control mechanisms, it is not the police or local authorities that safeguard the communities (regulating disorder), rather it is residents, local families, an influential local gang, a large local company etc. who protect residents and the broader community (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:19, Pain, 2000:380).

The study will focus on the inter-relationship that exists between the built environment, crime and fear of crime and a sense of place.

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM / QUESTION AND SUB-PROBLEMS/QUESTIONS (RESEARCH OBJECTIVES)

Research problem:

In reaction to high crime rates, planning and design frameworks, legislation and policies were formulated by the South African Government for the built environment to assist with the fight against crime by means of creating “safe places”. In the process of policy implementation, the research observed that the current policy directive contributes to the development of “pockets” of safe environments, but as an unintended cause results in target-hardening, alienation and exclusion, which does not foster a sense of belonging. On the other hand environments that foster a sense of place are conducive to social-, community-, personal-development and growth and free movement in crime free areas. This gives rise to the following research question and sub-questions to guide the study as indicated in Figure 1.1.
Goal of the Study

The goal of the study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship that exists between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place in terms of the current planning and design initiatives implemented to assist in the prevention of crime within the built environment in a non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Kilner Park and Queenswood.

Research Objectives

In order to achieve the aforementioned goal, the following research objectives are defined:

(i) Determine the current state of a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood in respect to the built environment. 
(ii) Determine the current state of crime and fear of crime within Kilner Park / Queenswood and the influence thereof on the built environment. 
(iii) Determine the relationship between crime and fear of crime (and implementation of crime prevention mechanisms) on a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood.

1.3 RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN, TOOLS AND METHODS

Following is a brief description of the research approach, design, tools and methods to be utilised within this study.

1.3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

When conducting research, first and foremost, it is necessary to determine which approach to follow as scientific inquiry in practice, typically involves alternating between deduction and induction research. Both methods involve interplay of logic and observation; and are therefore alternatives to the construction of social theories (Babbie, 2010:53).
The main distinction between inductive and deductive research approaches relates to the existence of hypotheses within the research. Adopting a research approach based on a range of hypotheses the research aims to explore, the approach can then be classified as a deductive research approach. On the other hand, if hypotheses are absent at the start of the research, the approach can then be classified as an inductive research approach (Singh & Bajpai, 2008:11).

According to Saunders et al, (2007:314) inductive research seeks to understand the meaning humans attach to events. Inductive research is furthermore described as a more flexible type of research as it deals mostly with qualitative data. Although, this particular research study is based on a deductive research approach as the study is based on a series of research questions (qualitative approach) crafted to seek clarity on the views of community members understanding of the influence of crime and fear of crime on the built environment and a sense of place.

In addition quantitative data was utilised; therefore a mix method research approach was used, to determine by means of triangulation, if there is any correlation between the quantitative and qualitative data.

1.3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design of this study is based on a case study approach, addressing social and spatial elements.

In terms of identifying a relevant study area, it came to light that there is a gap in the literature in terms of information available on crime and fear of crime and the influence thereof on the built environment and a sense of place within non-gated communities in South Africa. The chosen study area is therefore a non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Queenswood and Kilner Park. Queenswood and Kilner Park have numerous legibility elements which add to a sense of place. Local law enforcement and private security firms are operational within the area and can thereof shed some light on the current effect of crime and fear of crime within the built environment.

1.3.3 RESEARCH METHODS AND TOOLS

Method: A mix method approach using quantitative and qualitative data was embarked on. Police data on criminal incidents was used in a statistical analysis to determine if there is any correlation between the statistical information (quantitative) and the various interviews and focus groups (qualitative) conducted with local law enforcement and related parties and with local community members. (Yin, 2014:67).

Tools: An interview schedule was utilised to guide questions to gather data / opinions of local law enforcement and related parties. For the focus

---

1 Note: Kilner Park and Queenswood are two neighbourhoods located next to each other with a similar profile and character and will therefore be analyses as one geographic entity. The combined geographic areas will therefore form the case study for analysis and referred to as the Study Area.
groups a non-directive set of questions (focus group schedule) was used to steer the groups and to ensure a standardized outcome in each focus group for data comparison reasons. For the geostatistical analysis of the SAPS statistical data, a GIS programme (PlanetGIS & QGIS) was used.

1.4 CHAPTER OUTLINE

The chapter outline of this study follows together with a brief description of the content of each chapter.

Chapter 1: Orientation
Chapter 1 consists of the background and rationale to the study, indicating the research problem that gave rise to the study. Following the research question the objective of the study is briefly indicated, as well as the research design and methods utilised within the study. Chapter 1 concludes with a chapter outline of the study.

Chapter 2: The Relationship between Crime and Fear of Crime, a Sense of Place and the Built Environment
The theoretical relationship that exists between crime and fear of crime and the built environment and a sense of place will be unpacked in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3: Planning Framework and Design Principles in Addressing Crime and Fear of Crime within the Built Environment and on a Sense of Place

In Chapter 3 the focus will be on the crime prevention within the built environment schools of thought, highlighting the effect of the planning and design elements on a sense of place. The current state of the built environment within South Africa due to crime and fear of crime is described next. Understanding of the current state of the built environment within South Africa, following a brief overview of the South African Police Service mandate, is provided as background to the role and function of the police and how and where the community can actively participate in crime prevention initiatives.

Chapter 4: Methodology
This Chapter comprises the research methodology used in this study, highlighting that a mix used method was followed, comprised of qualitative and quantitative analysis. Additionally within this chapter, the process followed in terms of data collection, interpretation and representation of the findings is indicated.

Chapter 5: The Study Area
Chapter 5 consists of a thorough contextual analysis of the study area within the South African context. The chapter commences with a brief context analysis of South Africa as a country and the current state of crime nationally. Secondly, the Gauteng Province is described and a corresponding state of crime analysis is provided. Moving to a Metropolitan level, the City of Tshwane context is sketched, with an analysis of the state of crime for the metro. At a local level, 10 police precincts (including the Villieria Police precinct within which the study area
is located) are contextualized and a state of crime of the 10 precincts analysed. Chapter 5 concludes with a detailed contextual analysis of the study area, highlighting the structure, form and function of the study area. Additionally a detailed state of crime analysis is described for the study area.

Chapter 6: Research Findings
Chapter 6 comprises the findings of the interviews with local law enforcement and related parties and the focus groups conducted with community members residing within the study area. Additionally, reference is made to specific crime statistical data as obtained from the Villieria Police precinct for the time period April 2015 to March 2015 (correlating with the research timeframe) to support or contradict the findings of the interviews and focus-groups. Throughout this chapter, where applicable, reference is made to the literature discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

Chapter 7: Implications of the Study and Conclusions
Chapter 7 Firstly this chapter indicates the objective which the study sets out to achieve and how this was done. Secondly the chapter highlights the implications the study has for theory, planning and for the SAPS. Thirdly, some limitations to the study are highlighted. This chapter concludes by identifying areas for future research and overall concluding remarks.
CHAPTER 2: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME, A SENSE OF PLACE AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objective of this chapter is to analyse and establish the theoretical relationship and influence that exists between:

- Crime and fear of crime and the built environment
- The built environment and a sense of place and/or a sense of belonging
- The influence of crime and a fear of crime on a sense of place and or a sense of belonging.

As early as 1200’s cities were designed as fortresses, with large brick walls and iron gates surrounding the city, to protect the king and its inhabitants from outsiders. During 1285, King Edward I recognized the connection extending beyond the city walls that existed between overgrown paths (highways) and robberies, He therefore ordered farm owners to clear all vegetation occurring on highways to ensure robbers had no place to hide close to “highways” (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:4, Kostof, 1991:32).

The awareness of the influence of the natural and built environment on crime has been prevalent throughout time. A shift in awareness of crime and fear of crime became prevalent during the 18th and 19th century, where the “fear about those within rather than those outside the cities were of principle concern” (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:810). The first noted urban intervention in addressing crime and fear of crime was in the early 18th century when Paris and London introduced street lighting in their cities to increase safety and reduce crime in the streets. Paris is cited as the city with the most significant and radical historic (19th century) urban redevelopment / renewal of its inner city to eradicate epicentres of crime. Interventions in post-modern cities to address crime and fear of crime within the urban setting, has led to the creation of fortified cells or pockets of safety (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:4, Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:810).

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1960’s the intricate relationship between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place have been studied extensively. Some of the earliest studies include the work of Jane Jacobs (The Death and Life of Great American Cities) where she acknowledged the relationship that exists between street layouts, different combinations of land uses and crime. Jacobs (1961:31) immediately recognizes that “the bedrock attribute of a successful city district is that a person must feel personally safe and secure on the street”. During 1972 Oscar Newman (1996:9), from an architectural point of view, attempted to reduce crime in public housing schemes through the application of practical architectural planning and design principles. Newman’s ‘Defensible Space Theory’ is based on changes within the built environment to ensure residents take...
ownership of the space (ensuring a sense of place) which in turn reduces the opportunity for crime to occur (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:807).

During the late 1970’s, C Ray Jeffery developed the “Crime Prevention through Environmental Design” (CPTED) approach. The CPTED approach is based on the rationale that through effective use of the built environment and proper design, incidents of crime and fear of crime can be reduced within the built environment and improve the quality of life of citizens. Kelling and Coles (1997:12) developed the “Broken Windows Theory” in 1982, whereby they hypothesise that social disorder and physical neglect leads to crime and fear of crime within the built environment.

The aforementioned authors acknowledge that there is a definite connection between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of belonging. Figure 2.1 schematically indicates the interconnectedness of the three concepts.

Following is a discussion of each of the interconnected elements.

2.2 THE INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON BUILT ENVIRONMENT (AND VICE VERSA)

In distinguishing between crime and fear of crime, fear of crime poses a bigger problem than crime itself, although the actual risk of victimization may be low. According to Garofalo (1981:840) fear of crime can be described as “an emotional reaction characterised by a sense of danger and anxiety produced by [although not limited to] the threat of physical harm”. A fear of crime is triggered by cues within the environment that relate to aspects of crime for the individual. In some instances, fear of crime can be so overpowering that it leads to psychological distress, depression and increased levels of anxiety, weakened health and wellbeing and distrust amongst others. It is noted that women and the elderly are more fearful of victimization, than men are. Fear of crime is situational as certain people, activities, events and environments can generate this fear by individuals and communities. People therefore move through varying degrees of fear on a day to day basis. Actual and perceived features of individuals’ social environments have an influence

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, fear can be described as: “The emotion of pain or uneasiness caused by the sense of impending danger, and as a state of anxiety derived from the concern for the safety of a person or thing”.
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Fear of crime is highlighted as a significant social problem and impinges upon the quality of life and well-being of a substantial proportion of the population, and it in turn reduces the willingness and desire of people to partake in social encounters. Fear of crime can thus be viewed as a significant urban stressor which leads to harmful psychological effects due to decline in social integration and increased isolation. Communities are confined to their homes, whilst combined with added security measures, alarms, burglar bars, security locks, reinforced doors, fence walls, etc., the fear of crime is heightened (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:808, Abdullah, et al. 2015:1, Zhao, et al. 2015:20, San-Juan, et al. 2012:656, Franghanel, 2014:344).

As indicated by Garofalo (1981:840) the main factor initiating fear of crime is the risk of physical harm, to the individual and / or loved ones. Property loss may in some instances also bring about a fear of crime, for instances such as for a very poor family whose resources are limited. In addition to physical harm being the main source of fear of crime, according to Loader et al (2001:891), elements such as drugs, social disorder, urban decay and neglect bring about a fear of crime.

It is noted, that within the built environment, fear of crime thus has a direct influence on the activity patterns of individuals' daily lives in terms of how they perceive and utilise (underutilise) the urban space and the meaning it holds. Crime and fear of crime within the urban setting, has a direct influence on the economic, social and political fabric of a city. The vital essence of a city, celebrating difference, is drained by crime and fear of crime, damaging the city's fabric (San-Juan, et al. 2012:656, Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:809, Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:807).

In some instances fear of crime is so overwhelming; citizens become prisoners in their own homes and especially avoid public spaces. Fear of crime thus extends far greater than the private dwelling as most people are afraid to walk alone outside (especially after dark), even in their immediate area / neighbourhood (Lorencet al, 2012:762; Plain 2000:367; Scarbrough et al, 2010:820, Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:809).

Fear of crime therefore leads to two distinct approaches towards the built environment, the first being avoidance of the built environment (public spaces) and the second fortification of one’s home (Yavuz, & Welch, 2010:2491, San-Juan, et al. 2012:656; Loader et al, 2001:886).

According to Brantingham & Brantingham, (1993:6) “criminal behaviour is highly patterned and frequently localized”, subject to a number of economic and psychological factors, but always influenced by and
influencing both the *situation* (occurrences within the built environment) and the *site* (physical built environment). The “choice of crime and target is not random, but is shaped by the physical layout of a city, the transport modes and the daily activity rhythms dictated by the physical environment” (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:12).

To better understand the nature of fear of crime and the link to the built environment, one needs to look at the ‘triggers’ that generate a fear of crime. According to Scarbrough *et al* (2010:820), Nasar & Fisher (1993:189) and Abdullah, *et al.* (2015:1) the two main factors influencing fear of crime are social perspectives (*psychological* elements) and neighbourhood structure (*physical* elements). Figure 2.2 indicates the constructs of fear of crime within the built environment and related elements to be discussed.

**Figure 2.2: Constructs of Fear of Crime within the Built Environment**

2.2.1 PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS (PERCEPTIONS OF FEAR OF CRIME)

In terms of the *psychological* elements influencing fear of crime within the built environment, elements related to the conflicting demographic characteristics of a neighbourhood, incidence of rowdiness, previous incidences of violence, gang-related activities, presence of homeless individuals, prostitution and drug trafficking (to name but a few) generate a fear of crime. The aforementioned elements can be described as *social disorder within the built environment* - the *situation* within the built environment at a local level (as it is households and individuals who are targets of crime which generate fear of crime). There is a direct link between the perception of crime / fear of crime and social disorder. In the context of a practical example, individuals residing in low income areas may experience heightened levels of fear of crime due to the neighbourhood context, as these neighbourhoods are characterized by actual and perceived social disorder and crime (Ceccato, 2012:17; Kelling & Coles, 1997:15; Nasar & Fisher: 1993:195; Pitner *et al.*, 2012:43; Scarbrough *et al.*, 2010:820).

Following is a discussion regarding social disorder within the built environment.
Social Disorder within the Built Environment

The city, the streets and public spaces are perceived arenas to learn and experience diversity. However, due to images of an urban setting of unsettling, unruly and disorderly places, the city streets and public spaces are avoided. The social disorder within the built environment is thus seen as dangerous and overwhelming, and consequently something to fear. Visual clues of social disorder lead to community withdrawal and diminish informal control and cohesion between community members. (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1, Zhao, et al. 2015:21). The breakdown of social control and community deterioration, being mediated by the urban environment, has a direct consequence in fostering the fear of victimization. According to the social control thesis, people are fearful due to their inability to “prevent or cope with the consequences of victimization” (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:809).

Likewise, minority groups have significantly higher victimization rates due to different racial or ethnic background (fear of others). In some instances, certain areas are associated with a dominant racial group, be it actual or perceived dominance, outsiders are clearly unwelcome. Social exclusion and victimization is thus prevalent (Pain, 2000:377, Zhao, et al. 2015:23, San-Juan, et al. 2012:656).

The fear of crime in particular spaces generated by actual and / or perceived clues of social disorder inevitably has social meaning within a particular space. The main elements of social disorder, linked to the creation of crime and fear of crime, are thus the breakdown of social cohesion and social control (Pain, 2000:372, Yavuz & Welch, 2010:2495).

2.2.2 PHYSICAL ELEMENTS (FUNCTION AND FORM OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT)

In terms of the physical elements (which have more permanence than psychological elements), certain physical characteristics / features within the built environment influence fear of crime. The physical characteristics / features within the built environment relate to the physical structure and form of the built environment. Whilst the function of the built environment quality of life of older people. Woman, children and the elderly have become “prisoners of space” (Pain, 2000:375, Zhao, et al. 2015:23, San-Juan, et al. 2012:656).
refers to the actual use / activities taking place within the built environment.

According to the Broken Windows Theory, visual cues of functional disorder within the built environment such as garbage on the streets, graffiti on walls, vandalism, overgrown landscaping, public intoxication, abandoned and illegally parked cars, indicate to criminals that residents are unresponsive to what happens in their neighbourhood and a lack of social cohesion is prevalent. Physical disorder in terms of function, the disorderly utilization of the built environment, is therefore seen as a precursor to crime which heightens the levels of fear of crime (Kelling & Coles, 1997:12; Scarbrough et al, 2010:821; Nasar & Fisher, 1993:189, San-Juan, et al. 2012:663).

In addition to visual cues of functional disorder (activities taking place) within the built environment, the built environment form and structure (nature of the built environment) can add to the creation of fear of crime, for instance “places of concealment might suggest the possibility of someone hiding” and therefore the possibility of victimization (Nasar & Fisher, 1993:190). Physical structures such as types and layouts of buildings, enclosed facades, hidden alleys, poorly designed street network and isolated public transport stops, just to name a few, can be fear of crime generators. It is noted, that individuals are more fearful of crime after dark, within the built environment, due to limited sight - as one cannot identify a possible attacker hiding in the dark. The aforementioned physical features can to some degree be controlled through planning and design elements. Appropriate street lighting for instance, can have a significant effect on reducing fear of crime within the built environment (Painter, 1996:200; Marzbali et al, 2012:78; Nasar & Fisher, 1993:190; Ceccato 2012:4).

A discussion regarding the physical disorder within the built environment and the physical structure of the built environment follows.

**Physical Disorder within the Built Environment**

The built environment provides visual clues of the probability of criminal activity within an urban setting. Urban decay, neglect and the resulting degradation of an area leads to the perception that an area is unsafe and fosters a fear of victimisation / crime within these areas (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:809, Kruger & Landman, 2003:7, Iqbal & Ceccato, 2015:3).

Bannister & Fyfe, (2001:809) states that “people effectively read the environment as a barometer of risk and protective factors”, neighbourhoods with “unpleasant appearances created by signs of incivilities” therefore fosters higher levels of possible victimisation and thus fear of crime (Abdullah, et al. 2015:3)

The main elements related to physical disorder within the built environment that generate a sense of fear can be ascribed to (Abdullah, et al. 2015:5, Yavuz & Welch, 2010:2494; Iqbal & Ceccato, 2015:1):
- Vacant and unkempt gardens and lawns
• Unkempt houses and fences – signs of neglect
• Neglect of open spaces and children play areas
• Poor / non-functioning street lights
• Graffiti and vandalism of public properties
• Condition of roads, sidewalks and road signs
• Littering and dumping in public areas / open spaces

The aforementioned physical disorder elements are cues that lead to avoidance of space, due to the negative image of the space and the uncontrollable and unpredictable fear it might hold.

Physical Structure of the Built Environment

The physical structure and arrangement of the built environment has a direct effect on crime and fear of crime. Lonely, dark, unattractive or uncared-for places are particular environments that heighten fear of crime. Poorly designed urban environments create the opportunity for crime and decrease communities’ territoriality and willingness to utilise and defend their space (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1, Pain, 2000:369, Yavuz & Welch, 2010:2494).

Crime needs a place to occur, a setting, which predominantly is within the built environment. Criminals react to and “see” the physical environment differently; they identify and utilise the physical environment to their benefit for criminal activities (Pain, 2000:369, Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:7).

The following elements are identified as main structural elements within the physical built environment that influence crime and generate fear of crime: (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:5; Yavuz & Welch, 2010:2494)

• Physical infrastructure of buildings
• Movement network (roads, rail, bridges, highways, pedestrian walkways)
• Transit system (predominantly public transport)
• Land use (e.g. node configuration)
• Design and architecture

According to Brantingham & Brantingham (993:11) a grid street pattern is the most attractive city form for criminals as the grid provides for undisturbed target identification (mainly corner properties) and easy escape routes. Cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets are not preferred targets due to limited escape routes. Poorly designed public transport stations and waiting areas are significant crime and fear of crime generators. Bus stops specifically provide cover to criminals awaiting their next potential victim (Yavuz & Welch, 2010:2494; Loukaitous-Sideris, et al. 2001:255).

In terms of land use, the physical clustering of certain land uses can also attract crime. For instance near a bar or alcohol outlet, criminal activities are common. In contract, residential nodes / neighbourhoods with limited activity during the day, with adults at work and children at school are attractive criminal hot spots for burglaries during the day time (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:17).
2.2.3 TO SUMMARISE: THE INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (AND VICE VERSA)

Deduced from the discussion above, a definite relationship exists between fear of crime and the built environment. Fear of crime is influenced / generated by psychological and physical elements within the built environment and has a direct influence on individuals' behaviour within the urban context. The primary effect of fear of crime within the built environment is the overall avoidance of place and the related psychological influences thereof (isolation / decreased quality of life etc.) and the physical fortification of the home and the related effects thereof.

2.3 THE INFLUENCE OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT ON A SENSE OF PLACE (AND VICE VERSA)

The relationship between people and place is vested in the experience of the place. Experiences of place translate into latent images in the mind, which in turn inform mental perceptions of a space. Judgements regarding the perceptual comfort, security, symbolism and expected experience is therefore based on the mental perceptions of space. The perception of space gives meaning to a place, and in turn fosters a sense of place and belonging (Zendehdelanet al, 2013:1013, Francis et al, 2012:401).

In other words, all people, even those who commit crimes develop a sense of place and a sense of belonging within the built environment. A sense of place within the built environment is established through the meaning one attaches to the specific place within the built environment. Mental perceptions of place are linked to individuals’ feelings and perceptions which influence place experience and the establishment of sense of place. The feelings influencing a sense of place of individuals are their senses informing them “whether a place feels safe, vibrant, comfortable, quiet or threatening”. Additionally, people learn pathways, forming cognitive maps, which represent their surroundings that influence their behaviour within and their experience of the physical built environment, influencing their perception (understanding) of the built environment and the sense of place they experience. Francis et al, 2012:401; Kyle & Chick, 2007:212; Zendehdelanet al, 2013:1012; Cozens, 2002:132; Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:11; Montgomery 1998:95).

As indicated by Montgomery (1998:101) the three main Principles of Place Making, which are essential for a positive sense of place include: activity, form and image.

- **Activity** relates to the vitality and diversity of a place.
- **Form** relates to the five urban design qualities of places as identified by Kevin Lynch (1981) including buildings, spaces, sense, fit, access and control.

According to Zendehdelanet al, (2013:1012), “a sense of place is the mental perception connected to the inner relationship with the environment in order to link feelings and perceptions of a person to the background and meaning of the environment”.
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• **Image** entails the impressions and feelings a place fosters. Image in terms of the fostering of a sense of place relates to the psychological access, receptivity and knowledgeability of a place.

From the above three main *Principles of Place Making*, Figure 2.3 indicates the principles graphically identified by Montgomery (1998:98) as necessary for the creation of a sense of place within the built environment.

![Figure 2.3: Elements to Foster Urban Sense of Place (Place Making)](image)

The aforementioned elements pertain to the physical environment which fosters a sense of place. In addition to the physical elements, there are physiological / social elements which fosters a sense of place.

As highlighted by Puren et al (2007:43) “place identity, based on emotional investment and association with location, is seen as part of self-identity and regarded as the most important contributor to sense of place”. Place-identity is “seated in power relations and formed by feelings, meanings, experiences, memories and actions which are filtered through social structures and fostered through socialisation” (Puren et al, 2007:43).

The relationships between people and place are always at ends to maintain equilibrium, with assumed positive and negative values, meanings and elements attached to the creation of a sense of place within the built environment (physical and physiological). People who commit crimes experience a similar sense of place and place belonging to a certain neighbourhood as the resident community. Criminals develop their own sense of place within the built environment, called an *awareness space*. Similarly, criminals’ awareness space is infused with meaning and they are comfortable within and familiar with the space, and therefore usually pick a target from within their awareness space. Community members feel a sense of belonging and the security it offers within a neighbourhood, whilst criminals are familiar with their awareness space and the vulnerability it offers within the same neighbourhood. Bower et al (2014:552) emphasises the fact, indicating that additional to criminals’ awareness space (that related to a specific place), criminals are also
attuned to the criminal opportunities a specific space presents and “their associated risks and potential rewards”. Criminals tend to target an area of familiarity based on a preferential crime incident (Zendehdelan et al., 2013:1013, Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:10, Bower et al., 2014:552).

From the brief discussion above, it is noted that communities and criminals identify with the same area in terms of sense of place and awareness space. Figure 2.4 indicates the relationship between the built environment and a sense of place / awareness space, for both local communities and criminals.

2.3.1 COMMUNITY SENSE OF PLACE / BELONGING

A sense of place binds communities to a place which is infused with meaning. Over time, emotional and social bonds are established between the built environment and a community utilizing the space, sense of ownership of the built environment is established and therefore a sense of belonging / attachment to a certain space is consequently fostered (Francis et al., 2012:401; Kyle & Chick, 2007:212; Zendehdelan et al., 2013:1012; Cozens, 2002:132, Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:11).

According to Zendehdelan et al., (2013:1013) a sense of belonging / attachment to place is more powerful than a sense of place alone. A sense of belonging, binds individuals to the built environment through feelings and emotions, as the built environment is infused with meaning. It is noted, the meaning of place is directly linked to positive and negative experiences of place. Positive experience of place leads to a sense of place and sense of belonging (these spaces influence individuals spatial perceptions, identity and meaning), whereas negative experiences lead to avoidance of place (Kyle & Chick, 2007:212).

Communities with a strong sense of belonging, express a form of territoriality, whereby a community feels a strong sense of ownership or having proprietorship over a given space or neighbourhood. Within such communities, as mentioned before, it is found that it is not the police or local authorities that safeguard the communities; it is residents, local families, an influential local gang, a large local company etc. protecting...
residents and the broader community through informal social control mechanisms (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:19, Pain, 2000:380).

2.3.2 CRIMINAL SENSE OF PLACE / BELONGING

According to Brantingham & Brantingham (1993:4) crime occurrence has a strong connection with the criminals’ perception and knowledge base of their surrounding environment which in addition is shaped by criminal motivations and opportunities. Criminals tend to commit crimes within their routine activity space(s) as they are mostly familiar with these areas. Identifying an “ideal” place for a crime, criminals acquaint themselves with the target neighbourhood, the local community members, their daily routines etc., thereby fostering a sense of belonging to a place. They blend in, forming “a mental image of the right place and the right victim for the crime” (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:7, Bower et al, 2014:552)

2.3.3 TO SUMMARISE: THE INFLUENCE OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT ON A SENSE OF PLACE (AND VICE VERSA)

From the above brief discussion, it is evident that the built environment serves as a platform for the creation of a sense of place and a sense of belonging. The built environment is infused with meaning and influences individuals’ perceptions and utilization of the built environment. Communities who actively utilise the built environment, are familiar with their surroundings and foster a sense of territoriality, strengthening sense of belonging. On the other hand, people who commit crimes, experience a similar sense of place and connection to the built environment and / or a specific neighbourhood. The criminal awareness space is known largely from legitimate, routine activities, whereby they seem to restrict most of their criminal behaviour to these known areas.

2.4 THE INFLUENCE OF A SENSE OF PLACE ON CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME (AND VICE VERSA)

Pain (2000:372) alludes to the connection between the fears of crime in particular spaces and their social associations (meaning). A particular space can foster a sense of place (belonging), but due to elements of crime and fear of crime occurring within the particular space, a sense of non-belonging will manifest over time. Physical and social disorder in neighbourhoods leads to the weakening of the social fabric of a community and in turn leads to a sense of non-belonging. Crime and fear of crime can thus create a condition of non-belonging and diminishing a sense of place (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1).

As crime and fear of crime take root within a neighbourhood, individuals display avoidance behaviour in terms of limiting movement outside of their homes and ‘bunker mentality’ sets in. Avoidance behaviour leads to limited social interaction, diminishing social cohesion and limit physical activities within the neighbourhood context, individuals are thus alienated from their neighbours, kids don’t play in the streets and parks and public spaces are not utilised. Hence, due to crime and fear of crime, sense of community

**Figure 2.5** schematically illustrates the influence crime and fear of crime has on a sense of place and a sense of belonging.

**Figure 2.5: Influence of Crime and Fear of Crime on a Sense of Place and a Sense of Belonging**

On the other hand, Francis et al (2012:401) states that “a strong sense of community is associated with increased feelings of safety and security”. Opposing the ‘bunker mentality’, communities which actively participate in shaping their neighbourhoods, foster a sense of place attachment / place belonging. Communities take pride in their area and take ownership of the built environment; territoriality is thus established. Communities displaying a sense of territoriality are more likely to take action to protect their neighbourhood and are likely to have less concerns regarding neighbourhood safety (Cozens, 2002:133; Pitner et al, 2010:47; Schweitzer, 1999:9).

**Figure 2.6** schematically illustrates the influence a positive sense of place and a sense of belonging have on reducing crime and fear of crime.

**Figure 2.6: Influence of a Strong Sense of Place / Sense of Belonging on Crime and Fear of Crime**

Following is a discussion on the interrelationship that exists between crime and fear of crime and a sense of place and belonging.

**2.4.1 NEGATIVE EFFECT OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON A SENSE OF PLACE**

Fear of crime has a direct effect on how, when and where people utilise or non-utilise the built environment. In most instances fear of crime restricts people participating in activities within their neighbourhood, and therefore increases the overall dissatisfaction with the area, and reduces the overall
quality of life of residents. Active participation within a neighbourhood by community members is needed to ensure a sense of place. Crime and fear of crime therefore leads to the fragmentation of social cohesion, whereby a lack of ownership and neighbourhood attachment of space sets in. The withdrawal of communities and lack of active utilization for the space leads to an increase in incivilities within the particular space. An increase in incivilities in most cases, leads to elements of crime, which in turn heightens fear of crime. Therefore, due to the diminishing of a sense of place, a sense of non-belonging sets in and crime and fear of crime can establish in a particular space (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1, Francis et al, 2012:407; Pitner et al, 2010:43). Bannister & Fyfe (2001:809) reiterate this argument, stating that “fear of crime is correlated with, or caused by some kind of community deterioration”.

Figure 2.7 schematically illustrates the effect of a demising sense of place on incivilities / crime and fear of crime.

The inverse is noted; neighbourhoods which experience constant flux, for example transitional communities with limited social cohesion and community participation (limited sense of place) are more prone to incivilities and crime whereby residents experience higher levels of fear of crime (Abdullah, et al. 2015:1).

2.4.2 POSITIVE EFFECT OF A SENSE OF PLACE ON REDUCING CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME

According to Pain (2000:370), “social relationships operating in particular spaces and places are more integral to [reducing] fear of crime than the physical character of particular environment” itself. Social cohesion and mutual trust within communities lead to an increased sense of place encouraging a sense of territoriality that seems to reduce the perceived fear of crime and the sense of personal risk. With social cohesion informal social control is established within a neighbourhood with the shared expectation that community members will intervene in addressing issues, for example elements of social disorder within a neighbourhood that lead to crime and fear of crime. The strong sense of place and community cohesion therefore has a direct effect on reducing communities’ fear of crime (Abdullah, et al. 2015:8, Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:19, Zhao, et al. 2015:24, Taylor, 2002:774).
2.4.4 TO SUMMARISE: THE INFLUENCE OF A SENSE OF PLACE ON CRIME AND A FEAR OF CRIME (AND VICE VERSA)

From the brief discussion above it is evident that crime and fear of crime have a direct effect on a sense of place and sense of belonging within the built environment. Crime and fear of crime diminishes the social fabric of a community and leads to a sense of non-belonging. On the other hand, a strong sense of place and social cohesion can add to the reduction of fear of crime.

2.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the literature review it is apparent that crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place have direct and indirect effects on each other. Fear of crime has a physical and physiological effect on the built environment, whilst the built environment can foster a sense of place for communities, or enlighten a criminal. In turn a sense of place can be positively or negatively influenced by fear of crime.

Moving forward, the main elements to be highlighted from the analysis with regards to the interconnectedness of the three (3) constructs described above, is the recurring theme that crime and fear of crime, influencing a demising sense of place, lead to the avoidance of the built environment and the fortification of the home and the related physical and physiological effects thereof.
CHAPTER 3: PLANNING FRAMEWORK AND DESIGN PRINCIPLES IN ADDRESSING CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME WITHIN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND A SENSE OF PLACE

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objectives of this chapter are to:

- Indicate the built environment related planning initiatives (schools of thought) in addressing crime and fear of crime within the urban landscape.
- Highlight the effect of these planning and design initiatives on a sense of place.
- Describe the current state of the built environment within South Africa due to crime and fear of crime.
- Highlight the crime prevention mandate of the South African Police Service.
- Highlight local crime prevention initiatives to reduce crime and fear of crime.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As mentioned within Chapter (1.1), South Africa faces numerous challenges within the built environment due to crime and fear of crime. In reaction to crime and fear of crime, most citizens have responded by means of fortification (e.g. through high walls and fences around their premises) and / or the avoidance of the public space. Both approaches directly influence a sense of community (Holtmann & Domingo-Swarts, 2008:115; Kruger, 2005:1; Landman, 2009:214; Zinn, 2010:12).

Due to the effect of crime and fear of crime on the built environment, numerous theories / schools of thought on crime prevention through built environment interventions have emerged. For the purpose of this study, the Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Coles, 1997), Defensible Space Theory (Newman, 1996), Situational Crime Prevention (Clarke, 1997) and Crime prevention through Environment Design (Kruger & Landman, 2003) planning theories will be unpacked in this chapter. Additionally the influence of the aforementioned planning theories on a sense of place will briefly be highlighted.

With a better understanding of the theories relevant to crime prevention within the built environment and the influences thereof on a sense of place, the current state of the built environment within South Africa due to crime and fear of crime is then discussed. Following this, the role and function of the South African Police Service is briefly explained, as the crime prevention mechanisms within the built environment have to work in conjunction with local law enforcement and local communities. This chapter concludes by highlighting the role of communities in local crime prevention.
Following is a brief overview of the main schools of thought in terms of built environment crime prevention initiatives (internationally and within the South African Context).

3.2 BUILT ENVIRONMENT RELATED CRIME PREVENTION INITIATIVES

As stated before, due to crime and fear of crime, several theories / schools of thought based on physical intervention in the built environment have developed over the past few decades, which contribute in crime prevention. For the purpose of this study, four main built environment related schools of thought, contributing in the prevention of crime, will be highlighted. The four schools of thought include:

- The Broken Windows Theory
- The Defensible Space Theory
- Situational Crime Prevention Theory
- Crime Prevention Through Environment Design (CPTED) Theory

3.2.1 BROKEN WINDOWS THEORY

According to Wilson & Kelling (1982:1), the primary approach of the Broken Windows Theory is order-maintenance – formal and informal social control. If one window is left broken, a sense of “no-one caring” is fostered within a given area and crime sets in. As Muniz (2011:333) indicates, one small act of ‘disorder’ (one broken window) left unattended “creates an environment conducive to serious crime like robbery or assault”. This statement is supported by Gau & Pratt (2010:758) who are of the opinion that disorderly conditions can “spark a wave of serious crime”. Disorder fosters a general feeling of unsafety, (a sense of fear of crime) amongst local residents and causes law-abiding community members to retreat into their homes and gated estates, reinforcing the sense of “no-one caring” and a downward spiral of crime sets in (Kelling & Coles, 1997:49; Muniz, 2011:333).

Disorder, as identified by Wilson & Kelling (1982:6), primarily relates to the physical disorder within the built environment and social disorder within the built environment. Physical Disorder within the built environment entails: litter lying around, graffiti against walls, broken windows, urban decay, poorly lit streets, unkempt sidewalks, etc. Whilst Social Disorder within the built environment entails: homeless people, drunks, vagrants, prostitutes, youth gangs, etc. (Muniz, 2011:333). Both physical disorder and social disorder within the built environment are fear of crime generators.

Following on the theoretical background, during the mid-1970’s, a “Safe and Clean Neighbourhood Program” was initiated by the state of New Jersey based on the Broken Windows order-maintenance approach. Part of the program included the removal of policemen from their patrol cars, and assigning them to foot patrols. During the foot patrols, the police officers were responsible for the order-maintenance as determined by the local communities they patrolled. The foot patrols had a positive effect on reducing community members’ fear of crime and increasing communities’
sense of security. Visible policing had a direct and to some extent an indirect effect on containing / preventing physical and social disorder within the built environment. The actual crime occurrences / incidences did not decline; although the visible policing had a strong psychological effect on the local community they patrolled (Wilson & Kelling, 1982:1; Muniz, 2011:334).

It is noted that during the late 1970 beginning 1980’s, the police mandate of order-maintenance changed to fighting crime due to several political, financial and human rights issues (Wilson & Kelling, 1982:4).

### 3.2.2 DEFENSIBLE SPACE THEORY

According to the Defensible Space Theory (developed by Oscar Newman) “the physical design and urban living environments” within the built environment are the main contributing elements as to why some places are perceived to be more vulnerable to crime compared to others (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:26). The theory, Defensible Space is therefore based on three main principles, namely territoriality, natural surveillance and image / milieu (Moran & Dolphin, 1986:397). The three elements work in conjunction to create a platform for crime prevention though the fostering of community control over their neighbourhood (Newman, 1996:9).

**Territoriality**, defined by Newman (Newman, 1972:51) entails the “capacity of the physical environment to create perceived zones of territorial influences”. In layman’s terms, territoriality entails a sense of control displaced by community members over their surroundings, including their homes and extending to the streets and grounds located within their neighbourhood. The control exercised can be in the form of physical barriers of / and symbolic barriers. Physical barriers include fencing, locks, burglar-bars, gateways etc. Whilst the symbolic barriers (landscaping, planters, territorial markers etc.) psychologically convey a message of control that strangers are not welcome, according to Newman’s (Newman, 1972) theory, both the physical and symbolic barriers, add in the reduction of crime and fear of crime (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:28).

**Natural surveillance** defined by Newman (Newman, 1972:78) entails “the capacity of physical design to provide surveillance opportunities for residents and their agents”. The physical Newman alludes to, necessitates the layout of houses and buildings in such a manner that they face each other and over public spaces (e.g. parks). This layout form allows for residents to observe (intentional or unintentional) activity within the street and adjacent properties. The natural surveillance adds to a sense of security and the utilization of open spaces (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:29).

**Image / milieu** defined by Newman (Newman, 1972:102) entails “the capacity of design to influence the perception of a project’s uniqueness, isolation and stigma”. The physical appearance of a neighbourhood conveys a message of the lifestyle of residents and the control they have over a given area. A neighbourhood perceived to be dilapidated, isolated and neglected becomes a target for criminal activity as no signs of control
and care are visible, whilst a well-kept neighbourhood which conveys a message of being cared for and controlled, deters criminal activity (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:30)

It is acknowledged that the three elements work in conjunction to create a defensible space, the one cannot function without the other. It is therefore important to ensure all three elements are present within a neighbourhood to truly create a defensible space.

3.2.3 SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION THEORY

Situational Crime Prevention entails primarily the analysis of the circumstances from which crime emanates and accordingly introducing discreet environmental changes to reduce the opportunity for crime. Situational Crime Prevention is thus “focused on the settings for crime, rather than upon those committing criminal acts” (Clarke, 1997:2).

As stated by Clarke (1997:4) Situational Crime Prevention consists of opportunity-reducing measures, which are:

- “Directed at highly specific forms of crime,
- Involve the management, design or manipulation of the immediate environment in a systematic and permanent way as possible, and
- Make crime more difficult and risky, or less rewarding and excusable as judged by a wide range of offenders”.

Clarke (1997:16) identifies sixteen opportunity-reducing techniques as informed by the opportunity-reducing measures as listed above. The following table is a summary of the 16 identified techniques according to each opportunity-reducing measure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing Perceived Effort</th>
<th>Increasing Perceived Risks</th>
<th>Reducing Anticipated Rewards</th>
<th>Removing Excuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: Clarke (1997:16)

The opportunity-reducing techniques inform and support each other to ensure a holistic approach to crime prevention within the built environment.

3.2.4 CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

Crime Prevention through Environment Design (CPTED) to a large degree is informed by the Defensible Space Theory (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:27)
and Situational Crime Prevention Theory (Clarke, 1997:9). CPTED can be defined as planning initiatives “aiming to reduce the causes of, and opportunity for, criminal event and addressing the fear of crime by applying sound planning, design and management principles to the built environment (Kruger & Landman, 2003:1).

CPTED consist of a first, second and third generation of theories. Following is a brief overview of the CPTED theories.

**First Generation CPTED**

Informed by international literature, the first generation CPTED consist of five principles, which are identified to determine how the physical environment can add to the reduction or increase in crime opportunities (Kruger et al, 2001:33). The principles include:

- Surveillance and visibility;
- Territoriality and defensible space;
- Access and escape routes;
- Image and aesthetics; and
- Target hardening.

Following is a brief description of each principle.

**SURVEILLANCE AND VISIBILITY:** Defined by Kruger (2005:4), “surveillance and visibility maximize opportunity for observation of public and private areas either by users or residents during the course of their normal activities (passive surveillance) or by the police or other security personnel (active surveillance). [Additionally] ensure that environments are made visible though effective lighting and uninterrupted lines of sight”. Passive surveillance is also referred to as “eyes on the street”. The design of building in terms of window and door placement plays an integral role in natural surveillance. Allowing windows and doors to front onto the street, home owners observe activities taking place within the street more casually (be it intentional or unintentional). Visibility is primarily influenced by road designs, placement of street lighting and hidden entrances (Kruger et al, 2001:33).

**TERRITORIALITY:** Defined by Kruger (2005:5), territoriality "encourages a sense of ownership of and responsibility for a space by employing mechanisms that will allow residents to identify with the space and experience it a legible”. Territoriality elements contributing to the identity of an area can include elements such as landmarks reflecting the local community’s cultural values, clear signs orientating the user and a comprehensive layout, which all contribute to the ownership / control communities exercise over a given area. Through elements of territoriality (ownership / control) a space can foster a welcoming feeling to wanted users, or an unwelcoming feeling to undesired users (Kruger et al, 2001:34).
ACCESS AND ESCAPE ROUTES: Defined by Kruger (2005:5), access and escape routes entail “limiting opportunities for offenders to utilise access and escape routes such as vacant land. Enhance the level of ease which potential victims could find and access escape routes”. Access and escape routes can be viewed as a double edge sword. On the one hand vacant land, alleyways, through routes between properties etc. can become easy access and escape routes to criminals. Household located next to a vacant tract of land can become an easy target. On the other hand, clear signage on streets, buildings and subways indicating exit routes are vitally important for possible victims to easily find a way out (Kruger et al, 2001:35).

IMAGE AND AESTHETICS: Defined by Kruger (2005:5), image and aesthetics “ensure that the physical appearance of an environment creates a positive image and instils feelings of safety in users”. Urban decay, neglect and un-kept neighbourhoods foster a sense of unsafety; in turn community members utilise the space less often, creating an opportunity for criminal elements to move in. It is therefore important to ensure a neighbourhood is well-kept, vacant land and unoccupied buildings are maintained and that the overall visible appearance of the neighbourhood reflects community attention and control (Kruger et al, 2001:35).

TARGET HARDENING: Defined by Kruger (2005:6), through target hardening “the attractiveness or vulnerability of potential targets [are reduced] by, for instance, physically strengthening it or installing mechanisms that will increase the effort required to commit an offence”. Target hardening elements primarily consist of the inclusion of physical interventions such as high walls and burglar-bars on properties (Kruger et al, 2001:36).

Within the South African context, the CPTED principles need to guide development through the incorporating of the CPTED principles in planning, design and management of the urban environment. Following is a description what each element entails (Kruger & Landman, 2008:84):

- **Planning** - physical urban planning approaches used at a strategic level, including the promotion of mixed land use, the reduction of vacant land, etc.
- **Design** - the detailed design of the different urban elements, such as the movement system and the roads, the public open space system, and individual buildings on their separate sites.
- **Management** - the management of the entire urban system and the different elements and precincts that make up the urban area. This includes infrastructure maintenance, the enforcement of by-laws, etc.” (Kruger et al, 2001:5).

The White Paper on Safety and Security of South Africa (1998:23) is informed by the CPTED principles acknowledging that through situational crime prevention strategies, the opportunities for crime can be reduced “by modifying the situations in which offending occurs. This encompasses crime prevention through environmental design; focusing on making the built environment less conducive to crime” (South Africa, 1998:23).
The first generation CPTED received several critics regarding the lack of a social / cultural dimension and other situational factors (Letch et al, 2011:38; Gibson & Johnson, 2013:12; Saville & Cleveland, 2013:91). Thus the development of a second and third generation of CPTED theories originated. Following is a brief summary of the second and third generation CPTED theories.

### Second Generation CPTED

The second generation CPTED can be defined as an addition to the first generation CPTED, with specific focus on “social and cultural dynamics in each individual neighbourhood” (Letch et al, 2011:38). Second generation CPTED includes four new strategies – the four C’s which entails the following (Saville & Cleveland, 2013:93):

- “Social cohesion (participation in local events, self-directed community problem-solving, friendship networks)
- Connectivity (transport facilities, networks with outside agencies)
- Community culture (gender and minority equality strategies, special places, festivals)
- Threshold capacity (human scale, land use density, maximum diversity)”.

### Third Generation CPTED

According to United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (2011:23) the third generation of CPTED is focused on the “reprogramming of the urban space through digital means on one hand, and green technologies on the other”. However, it still incorporates the principle of surveillance and control from the first generation CPTED, and effective physical design and socio-cultural diversity from the second generation CPTED.

### 3.3 THE INFLUENCE OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT RELATED CRIME PREVENTION INITIATIVES ON A SENSE OF PLACE

According to the *Broken Windows* theory, disorder within the built environment (physical and social disorder), leads to community members retreating into their homes to avoid the disorderly situation. Therefore having a direct influence on a sense of place, as community members retreat, less interaction occurs and community networks / cohesion breaks down (Gau & Pratt; 2010:763).
In line with the order-maintenance principle of the Broken Windows theory, it is important for communities to take control/ownership of their community (in conjunction with local law enforcement) and ensure disorderly conduct (broken windows) is addressed as soon as possible. Order fosters a sense of security and lead to the utilization of the built environment which in turn strengthens a sense of place (Wilson & Kelling; 1982:1).

In terms of the Defensible Space theory, a strong sense of community is necessary to establish formal and informal community structures of control within a neighbourhood, thereby conveying elements of territoriality (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:26).

The CPTED principles rely first and foremost on proper planning design and layout of urban spaces, limiting opportunity for criminal activity. However the community still needs to take ownership of an area to ensure a sense of community and reduce fear of crime (Kruger et al, 2001:36).

Overall, all three built environment related crime prevention theories strongly rely on the presence of a sense of community within a given neighbourhood. Control of neighbourhoods (be it physical or symbolic) exhibited by communities is important. Through a sense of community, by means of informal control mechanisms, communities to some degree, regulate disorder themselves.

3.4 CURRENT STATE OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT WITHIN SOUTH AFRICA DUE TO CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME

Within the South African context, it is evident that two main forms of crime prevention initiative have taken route within the built environment. On the one hand, we find that some communities have reacted to crime and fear of crime by means of barricading themselves within pockets of perceived safety, for example within gated communities, security villages and enclosed neighbourhoods. Whilst on the other hand, we find non-gated communities who primarily rely on personal property crime prevention precautionary measures including locks, electrical fencing, alarms systems, walls, burglar-bars etc. (Breitzke et al, 2014:124; Kruger & Landman, 2003:1).

Understanding the current state of crime and the built environment reaction to crime and fear of crime, it is important to acknowledge the challenges faced by South Africa (Kruger & Landman, 2008:79):

- “The crime situation within South Africa is exceptional,”
- The extreme levels of violent crime,
- Severe levels of poverty and inequality,
- The urban form and spatial characteristics of the South African landscape,
- Levels and effectiveness of policing vary,
- An effectively functioning local government is essential, and
- The willingness to intervene is affected by current conditions.”
With the abovementioned challenges as background, following is a brief discussion on the two built environment crime prevention initiatives visible within the South African urban landscape: gated vs non-gated communities.

3.4.1 GATED COMMUNITIES, SECURITY VILLAGES AND ENCLOSED NEIGHBOURHOODS

The development of gated communities, such as security estates/villages and enclosed neighbourhoods, are viewed as a direct response to the current state of crime and fear of crime within South Africa. This form of fortification can be viewed as a process of target hardening and to some degree the displacement of crime. In some instances it was found that the physical interventions had a significant effect on crime, the actual crime rate declined, and even more so, reduced the perceived fear of crime amongst community members. On the other hand, non-gated/non-enclosed communities adjacent to gated communities experienced an increase in crime and fear of crime, due to the displacement of crime brought about by target hardening especially in enclosed neighbourhoods since they had been open before (Breetzke et al., 2014:125; Kruger & Landman, 2003:1; Landman, 2012:240).

It is noted that community members view gated communities and related development as crime preventative developments. Research, however, conducted by Breetzke et al., (2014:134) indicates that the high walls of gated communities and related development merely create a false sense of security/safety for the residents it encloses. Residents become less vigilant and alert due to the false sense of safety and therefore in turn actually increase their risk of falling victim to criminal activities. Gated communities and related development “does not deter criminal activities, but in fact attracts it” (Breetzke et al, 2014:134).

The long term urban structural and functional influence of these extreme interventions related to gated communities and related developments within the broader urban context, includes “urban fragmentation and segregation, the privatization of public space through access control”, obstructed emergency response and urban maintenance restrictions, to name a few. Gated communities are therefore not sustainable in the long term (Kruger & Landman, 2003:17; Kruger & Landman, 2008:82; Bénit-Gbaffou, 2008:1935; Landman, 2007:15).

3.4.2 NON-GATED COMMUNITIES

With specific focus on households located within non-gated communities, Zinn (2010:155) advocates the usage of ‘multiple layers’ of security. He therefore listed the following physical interventions to one’s individual property as a necessity in personal safety precautionary measures:

- “An alarm system linked to an armed response unit
- A high steel palisade security fence around the yard
- An electrical fence (liked to a separate alarm system) on top of the palisade fence
• An alarm system that serves as a pre-warning system surrounding the house (beams in the garden)
• Security lights automatically controlled by motion sensors around the house and garden and especially above bedroom widows
• Burglar bars of good quality on all the windows
• Security gates in front of all the outside doors of the house, including sliding doors
• CCTV cameras outside of the house
• Dogs that are kept inside the house”.

At a minimum, households should have fences / walls, an alarm system, and burglar-bars in front of windows and doors (Breetzke et al, 2014:124; Zinn 2010:155). The main aim of all the fortification elements is to provide a home owner with enough time to call for help (police, private security companies, community policing forums) before criminals gain access to the house.

3.4.3 OVERALL BUILT ENVIRONMENT CRIME PREVENTION DILEMMA

The number of gated communities and enclosed neighbourhoods are on the rise within South Africa, justified by the high crime rates. From the above discussion it is evident that the built environment has reacted to crime and the fear of crime by means of physical interventions in the form of primarily target hardening. Some of the most common target hardening elements include high walls / fences surrounding houses, alarm systems, electrical fencing and burglar bars on doors and windows (Kruger & Landman, 2003:8, Zinn, 2010:155).

3.5 CRIME PREVENTION MANDATE OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Constitution (South Africa, 1996) states that all citizens have the right to “freedom and security of the person, which includes being free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources”. To achieve the Constitutional obligation of government, the South African Police Service (SAPS) is mandated to serve and protect all citizens. Following is a summary of the crime prevention mandate of South Africa, highlighting the framework within which the SAPS operate.

The national mandate of the SAPS is derived from Section 205 of the Constitution of the Republic of South African (1996). The objections as indicated within the Constitution (Chapter 11) stipulate that the South African Police Service has a responsibility to:
• Prevent, combat and investigate crime;
• Maintain public order;
• Protect and secure the inhabitants of the Republic and their property; and
• Uphold and enforce the law.
• Create a safe and secure environment for all people in South Africa.
• Prevent anything that may threaten the safety or security of any community
Investigate any crimes that threaten the safety or security of any community

- Ensure criminals are brought to justice; and
- Participation in efforts to address the causes of crime.

The Constitution of the Republic of South African (1996) is viewed as the highest authority and therefore a national guiding document. The following key legislation, informed by the Constitution, forms the legislative mandate of SAPS:

- Protection of Constitutional Democracy Against Terrorist and Related Activities Act, 2004 (Act no. 33 of 2004)
- Firearms Control Act, 200 (Act no. 60 of 2000)
- Explosive Act, 1956 (Act no. 26 of 1956)
- Dangerous Weapons Act, 2013 (Act no. 15 of 2013)
- Control of Access to Public Premises and Vehicles Act, 1985 (Act no. 53 of 1985)
- Intimidation Act, 1982 (Act no. 72 of 1982)
- Second Goods Act, 2009 (Act no. 6 of 2009)
- The Private Security Industry Regulations Act, 2001 (Act no. 56 of 2001)

With the Constitutional Mandate and the key legislative mandate as guiding policies, it is acknowledged that SAPS derives its powers and functions from the following key Acts:

- The Criminal Procedure Act, 1977 (Act no 51 of 19777)
- The Sexual Offences Act, 2007 (Act 32 of 2007)
- Children’s Act, 2005 (Act no 38 of 2005)
- Criminal Law (Forensic Procedure) Act, 2010 (Act 6 of 2010)

The SAPS thus operate and are measured against the above mentioned legislative framework.

3.6 WORKING TOGETHER IN ADDRESSING CRIME WITHIN SOUTH AFRICA

Within the South African context, reducing crime cannot be the responsibility of the police alone, due to the nature and extent of crime, creating safe communities requires the “committed involvement of communities, various government departments, local authorities, the private sector etc.” (Kruger, 2005:1) to ensure that a comprehensive and integrated community based crime prevention strategy prevails (Kruger & Landman, 2003:18).
The above statement is further unpacked by Kruger & Landman, (2008:86) and Ceccato (2012:4) indicating that crime occurs on a local level and therefore needs policy responses, context-specific, based on local level initiatives to ensure municipalities, local police, community groups, private security firms and local actors work together in addressing local crime problems. Through a localized approach “previously excluded voices can be heard” (Ceccato, 2012:4).

As stated above, community and private security firms’ involvement in crime prevention is crucial. Following are some police partnering initiatives within the South African context.

### 3.6.1 PRIVATE SECURITY COMPANY POLICING

Within the context of South Africa, private security firms are on the increase. As indicated in a news article by Victoria Eastwood, published on CNN in 2013, the private security force in South Africa was already larger in relative numbers in 2013, than that compared to the South African Police Force and Army combined. It is therefore only logical to utilise the vast numbers of the private security firms in combined efforts to prevent crime.

### 3.6.2 COMMUNITY BASED POLICING INITIATIVES

Community members are the eyes and ears of the police, and in some instances in organized forums, crime prevention partners. As Ceccato (2012:18) indicates, community participation in crime prevention is motivated by the “shared expectations within a group and a willingness to engage in processes of social control for the common good” of all within the community.

Community members can actively participate in crime prevention initiatives within the following structures as identified for community involvement in policing:

- Reservists (SAPS)
- Community Policing Forums (SAPS Act)
- Community Patrol Groups
- Street Watches
- Street Committees
- Neighbourhood Watches
- Business Watches

Several of the above listed involvement options form part / are guided and regulated to some degree through an inclusive participatory approach - Community Policing Forums.

Within the South African context, Community Policing Forums are regulated by Section 18 of the South African Police Act, 1995 (Act No 68...
of 1995). Police precincts are divided into manageable sectors whereby community members residing within the specific police precinct / sector can participate accordingly. Following is a brief overview of the role, function and “limitations” of a community policing forum in terms of sector policing initiative.

### Community Sector Policing

Sector Policing means policing that focuses on small manageable sectors of a police station area. Sector Policing is a tool to implement Community Policing. The role of the various groups and stakeholders are briefly outlined below (Villieria Community Policing Forum, 2015):

#### Purpose of Sector Policing
- Perform targeted visible police patrols
- Ensure a rapid response to complaints
- Address crime generators
- Investigate reported cases
- Provide a localized policing service to the community in accordance with their respective needs

#### The role of the Sector Commander
- To mobilize and organize the community in the sector to take action against local crime together with the police.
- To act as liaison between the community of the sector and the local police station.
- To act as a crime prevention officer, which involves being responsible for all plans and projects to address crime in the sector

### The Role of the Community
- Attend the Community Police Sub Forum meetings to discuss action plans with the sector commander in order to deal with crime in the sector.
- Participate in neighbourhood initiatives to safeguard the area in which they live, work and play. For example through community patrols, street watches or neighbourhood watches.
- To take ownership of community policing and support the SAPS in the enforcement of the law.

### Limitations on the Powers of the Community Safety Structures
- No promoting of political agendas/ interests
- No promoting, marketing or selling of security equipment/ services
- Cannot request or enforce registration/ membership fees
- Cannot act as a police official
- Cannot participate in crime prevention operations with the SAPS (e.g. "Stop and search", roadblocks, etc.)
- Cannot wear or use the SAPS insignia in any way on a person or private vehicle

---

1. The Community Sector Policing section information was abstracted from the Villieria Community Policing Forum’s (CPF) Code of Conduct document (COC).
• May not use any rotating/reflecting light of any colour on a private vehicle for the purpose of visibility during patrols
• A community police forum, sub-forum or board has no power of command and control over the Service or any member thereof:
  • No member of such a forum or board may:
    o Wear any insignia or identification mark in respect of any political party, organization, movement or body while attending a meeting of a CPF, sub-forum or board
    o Utilise his or her membership of a CPF, sub-forum or board for political interests
• Not entitled to have access to police registers or files without approval
• May only use property belonging to or under the control of the Service with the prior written approval
• The Service is not obliged to provide office accommodation
• No equipment or SAPS store items may be issued to a member of a Community Police Forum, Sub-Forum or Board
• No such member may be allowed to utilise a police vehicle

3.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the Broken Windows Theory it is evident that physical and social disorder within the built environment leads to crime and fear of crime. The Defensible Space Theory emphasises that physical design and urban living environments influence how the built environment is perceived and how crime and fear of crime can set in. Territoriality, natural surveillance and image / milieu are the three elements identified by the Defensible Space Theory to be utilised as crime prevention mechanisms.

Similarly, the Situational Crime Prevention theory focuses on the settings for crime, rather than those committing criminal acts. Situational Crime Prevention thus aims in preventing crimes by means of controlling the setting (urban environment) through proper design and planning. Crime Prevention through Environment Design (CPTED) which is primarily informed by the Defensible Space Theory, focuses on physical crime prevention elements (surveillance and visibility; territoriality and defensible space; access and escape routes; image and aesthetics; and target hardening) and social crime prevention elements (socio-cultural elements).

In addition, the built environment crime prevention analysis clearly highlights the importance of community control and participation to successfully implement built environment related crime prevention principles. A multi-pronged approach is therefore needed in combating crime, involving law enforcement, social prevention and situational prevention mechanisms.

Within the South African context, the rise in gated communities is a form of larger scale fortification of an entire neighbourhood within the built environment. The fortification of individual dwellings, as advised by Zinn, leads to communities retreating into their fortified homes, isolation sets in and the broader built environment is observed as unutilised and neglected. Next, criminal elements move in.
Overall, as identified by the crime prevention theories, a sense of community (ownership / control) is essential in any crime prevention strategy within the built environment.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objective of this chapter is to:

- Indicate the research methodology informing the study – the research problem, goal, objectives and questions.
- Indicate the research approach, design, methods and tools applied.
- Indicate the research process followed in terms of data collection, interpretation and representation.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters (2 and 3) the interconnectedness of crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place was established. It is evident that crime and fear of crime, occurring within the built environment, diminishes a sense of place and sense of belonging, which leads to avoidance of space, or fortification of place. In addition, the current state of crime and fear of crime within the South African context has been identified and the built environment reaction thereon, in terms of formal planning frameworks and individual fortification measures. Throughout the analysis it became clear that most crime and fear of crime research within the South African context of the built environment tends to focus on various types of gated communities.

There has been a plethora of studies on various types of gated communities (for example, Landman, 2004; Lemanski, 2006; Dirsuweit & Wafer, 2006 and Bénit-Gbaffou, 2008.). Some of these studies have started to address the effect of gating and neighbourhood closures on a sense of community. Landman (2004:26) briefly indicated that estate residents experience a sense of community with residents residing within the gated community due to shared “activities and facilities offered within the estate”. It is noted that few have looked at the effect of a sense of place and sense of community in relation to gating. Therefore, the questions remain about the influence of crime and fear of crime in gated and non-gated communities.

Therefore, the research conducted within this particular study is focused on a non-gated community, with specific reference to the neighbourhoods of Queenswood and Kilner Park, located within the broader Moot area, within Pretoria (South Africa).

4.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following section indicates the methodology informing this research study.
4.2.1 RESEARCH PROBLEM / QUESTION AND SUB-PROBLEMS/QUESTIONS (RESEARCH OBJECTIVES)

Research Problem

In reaction to high crime rates, planning and design frameworks, legislation and policies were formulated by the South African Government for the built environment to assist with the fight against crime by means of creating “safe places”. In the process of policy implementation an observation was made that the policy directive contributes to the development of “pockets” of safe environments, but as an unintended cause results in target-hardening, alienation and exclusion, which does not foster a sense of belonging, while environments that foster a sense of place are conducive for social-, community-, personal- development and growth and free movement in crime free areas.

Research Goal

As mentioned before, the goal of the study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship that exists between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and its influence on a sense of place in terms of the current planning and design initiatives implemented to assist in the prevention of crime within the built environment within a non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Kilner Park and Queenswood, South Africa.

Research Objectives

In order to achieve the aforementioned goal, the following research objectives are defined:

(iv) Determine the current state of a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood in respect to the built environment.

(v) Determine the current state of crime and fear of crime within Kilner Park / Queenswood and the influence thereof on the built environment.

(vi) Determine the relationship between crime and fear of crime (and implementation of crime prevention mechanisms) on a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood.

Research Questions

The following questions (as indicated in Figure 4.1) are drafted to assist with the qualitative and quantitative exploration of the research problem.

4.2.2 RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN, TOOLS, METHODS AND ETHICAL ASPECTS

Research Approach

A research approach describes the procedures and plans that need to be in place to implement a research design. The research approach of this
**Research Question and Sub-Questions**

What is the effect of crime and fear of crime on the built environment and sense of place in Kilner Park / Queenswood (South Africa)?

What is the current state of a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood in respect to the built environment?

What is the current state of crime and fear of crime within Kilner Park / Queenswood and the influence thereof on the built environment?

How does crime and fear of crime (and implementation of crime prevention mechanisms) influence a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood?

**Research Objectives**

Determine the current state of a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood in respect to the built environment.

Determine the current state of crime and fear of crime within Kilner Park / Queenswood in respect to the built environment.

Determine the influence of crime and fear of crime (and the implications of crime prevention mechanisms) on a sense of place within Kilner Park / Queenswood.

**Information / Data**

Focus Groups

Interviews

Statistical data

**Description**

Community Members

Police / CPF / Local Security Firms, etc.

Study area analysis – legibility principles / demographic profile, etc.
study will be a mixed method approach, including qualitative and quantitative data. The purpose for this form of research is that both qualitative and quantitative research, in combination, provide a better understanding and/ or completeness of a research problem or issue than either research approach alone (Bryman, 2008:637&Creswell, 2009:204).

In most cases, qualitative research focus on natural settings, whereby a certain phenomenon is observed and secondly a study of those phenomena is conducted (Leedy & Omrod, 2005:133). In the study at hand, the observed role of crime and fear of crime within the built environment and the effect thereof on a sense of place as the phenomenon will be analysed. In addition, qualitative data analysis can be defined as “the non-numerical examination and interpretation of observations for the purpose of discovery underlying meanings, and patterns of relationships” (Babbie, 2005:387). With regards to this study, the qualitative data to be utilised will consist of focus groups (with community members) and interviews (with relevant law enforcement entities e.g. local police, CPF, private security firms operating within the study area etc.) to determine the underlying influence of crime and fear of crime within the built environment and on a sense of place within the study area.

Quantitative data analysis on the other hand can be described as the “numerical representation and manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect” (Babbie, 2005:414). The quantitative data to be utilised within this study will be based on two data sets, the first pertaining to the National Crime Statistics as published by the National Police Service for the time period March 2004 to April 2014 and the second, statistical data set obtained from the Villieria Police Precinct, for the time period March 2014 to April 2015.

One of the biggest advantages of mixed methods is that it enables the researcher to expand the research question to explore a multi facet research area (Yin, 2014:67). In support of the argument is the idea of triangulation whereby the results of one research strategy (qualitative) are cross checked by the strategy of the other (quantitative) (Bryman, 2008:635) In this study, a sequential exploratory strategy will be followed whereby qualitative data will be collected firstly, followed by a second phase which comprises of quantitative data collection and analysis which builds on the results of the first phase. The biggest weight will be on the qualitative data, which will be supported by the quantitative data. The triangulation outcome of the two sets of data will assist with the exploration of the subject being studied in this case study (Creswell, 2009:211).

**Research Design**

The research design of this study is based on a case study approach, addressing social and spatial elements. The appropriateness of a case study approach as the design for the study can be supported by the view of Yin (2014:5) who argues that there is no formula that justifies your choice to use a case study method, “but your choice depends in large part..."
on your research questions. The more your questions seek to explain some present circumstance (e.g., “how” and “why” some social phenomenon works,) the more case study research will be relevant.

Each case study is unique, as the different elements surrounding it, will differ from case to case. As such, it is important to craft the research questions in such a way, that they will unlock all possible variables that might have an influence on the case study at hand. Crucially, each case should have a pre-defined boundary which clarifies the nature and time period covered by the case study (i.e. its scope, beginning and end), the relevant social group, organisation or geographical area of interest to the investigator, the types of evidence to be collected, and the priorities for data collection and analysis (Yin 2014:11).

Yin (2014:9) points out, in comparing the case study with other research methods in the social sciences, one needs to examine upfront if it is the most appropriate choice, instead of a survey, an experiment, historic overviews, analysis of archival records, or statistic modelling methods, as each choice represents different research methods, different data gathering strategies and analysis.

In deciding when to use which method, the proposal of Yin (2014:9) as summarized in Table 4.1, can be used as a guideline:

Yin (2014:10) explains the use of the different type of research questions within the different research methods as follows: “What” questions, focus more on exploratory studies, while “how” questions, focus more on inquiries, while “how and why” questions, in combination, are more explanatory and likely to be used to guide in case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Form of Research Question</th>
<th>Requires Control of Behavioural Events?</th>
<th>Focus on Contemporary Events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how, many, how much?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how, many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A case study approach therefore entails an in depth study of a particular phenomenon, program or community. Leedy and Omrod (2005:135) describe the case study method as a process whereby “the researcher collects extensive data on the individual(s), program(s), or event(s) on which the investigation is focused”. The data gathering can take on the form of interviews, studying Meta data and/or conducting focus groups (Leedy&Ormrod, 2005:146).

Different types of case studies can be conducted - namely a single case study or a multiple case study. A single case study design focuses on the dynamics of one single setting, searching to understand a specific phenomenon, while a multiple case study design includes two or more observations from the same phenomenon (Yin 2014:18).

Flyvberg (2011:314) in Denzin and Lincoln is of the view that the strength of case studies can be found in the depth of the study, understanding the context and process, understanding what causes a phenomenon linking causes and outcomes.

In terms of identifying a relevant study area, it comes to light that there is a gap in the literature in terms of information available on crime and fear of crime and the influence thereof on the built environment and a sense of place within non-gated communities in South Africa. The chosen study area is therefore a non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Queenswood and Kilner Park. The chosen study area is appropriate as several community forums and community actions are active within the area, against which a sense of community can be tested. Local law enforcement and private security firms are operational within the area and can therefor shed some light on the current effect of crime and fear of crime within the built environment.

In summarising the above views, it seems appropriate to use a case study approach in the current study as a particular phenomenon is being analysed, within a given community. The “how and why” questions will assist in the finding of explanations of why and how the current state of crime, influence sense of place, and how does the built environment respond to the two different variables.

Research Methods and Tools

The research methods utilised within this study are interviews and focus groups. A focus group can be defined as “a group of subjects interviewed together, prompting a discussion (Babbie, 2005:483).

Focus groups were conducted with local community members to gain a better understanding of the following:

- The sense of place that community members experience within the study area with respect to the built environment.
- Community members’ views on the current state of crime and fear of crime within the study area and the role of the built environment with regards to the crime and fear of crime.
The community members’ views with regards to the influence of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place they experience within the study area.

*Interviews* were conducted with local law enforcement, the community policing forum (CPF), and private security firms / armed response units operating within the area to gain a better understanding of the current state of crime and fear of crime within the study area.

The research tools to be used for each method are focus group and interview *schedules*. The use of semi-structured interview schedules help in reaching the objectives of the study, as the questions are crafted in such a way that they relate to the objectives of the study (Saunders *et al*, 2007:314).

*Figure 4.2* and *Figure 4.3* respectfully represent the focus group and interview schedules:

**Ethical Aspects and Trustworthiness**

The most important elements pertaining to the ethical aspects and trustworthiness of qualitative analysis entail (Babbie, 2005: 61; Halai, 2006:5):

- Voluntary participation
- No harm to the participants
- Anonymity and confidentiality

- Informed consent

Following is a brief description of the ethical aspects and trustworthiness elements as identified by Babbie (2005) and Halai (2006):

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION** – It is very important for participant to partake voluntary as the research is some instances require the participants to reveal personal information (Babbie, 2005: 62).

**NO HARM TO THE PARTICIPANTS** – social research should never injure the individuals participating in the study. Information revealed should never embarrass subjects or endanger their lives, homes, families, friendships, jobs etc. (Babbie, 2005: 63; Halai, 2006:6).

**ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY** – anonymity ensures that no connection can be made between a given response and a given responded, thus protecting a participants identity. Whereas confidentiality entails that only the researcher can identify a given person's responses but promise not to do so publically (Babbie, 2005: 65; Halai, 2006:6).

**INFORMED CONSENT** - entail all participant voluntary participate in a given research projects on a full understanding of the possible risks involved (Babbie, 2005: 64; Halai, 2006:5).
The purpose of this session is to gain a better understanding of:

- The sense of place that community members experience within the study area with respect to the built environment.
- Community member’s views on the current state of crime and fear of crime within the study area and the role of the built environment with regards to the crime and fear of crime.
- The community member’s views with regards to the influence of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place they experience within the study area.

The goal of the study is to gain a better understanding of the influence of crime and fear of crime on the built environment and on a sense of place, within a non-gated community within Pretoria.

Briefly orientate the focus group members on the following elements within the context of this study:
- A sense of place
- Crime and fear of crime
- Built environment

Ask the focus group members to share their view on the following three elements:
- The role and function of sense of place / sense of community within the study area
- The state of crime and fear of crime within the study area (when, where, how)
- The state of the built environment

As the focus group members to discus their views on the following:
- The effect of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place
- The effect of crime and fear of crime on the built environment
- The effect of a sense of place and the built environment

Ask the focus group members to share their perspective on the following:
- Personal safety – precautionary measures?
- Built environment that foster a sense of place

Ask the members of the focus group to give a short interpretive summary of the discussion of the key elements.
The goal of the study is to gain a better understanding of the influence of crime and fear of crime on the built environment and on a sense of place, within a non-gated community within Pretoria. Briefly orientate the interviewee on the following elements within the context of this study:

- Crime and fear of crime
- The built environment

**Introduction**

In your opinion, are community members informed /aware as to the state of crime within the neighborhood?

- In your opinion, are community members fearful of crime?
- If yes, is this fear of crime justified?

**Purpose of the Session**

The purpose of this interview is to gain a better understanding of the views of local law enforcement on the current state of crime and fear of crime within the study area and the influence thereof on the built environment.

**Current State of Crime within Study Area**

- How would you describe the current state of crime within the study area?
- What are the predominant crimes occurring within the study area?
- Are there “hot-spots” of crime within the study area?
- If yes, where are these “hot-spots”?
- Are there specific crimes linked to these “hot-spots”?

**Community Awareness of Crime**

- In your opinion, are community members informed /aware as to the state of crime within the neighborhood?
- If yes, is this fear of crime justified?

**Built Environment and Crime**

- In your opinion, does the crime and fear of crime influence how community members utilize the built environment?
- In your opinion, which physical interventions within the built environment contribute to the prevention of crime?
- In your opinion, what additional physical intervention within the built environment should be explored in the prevention of crime within study area?

**Crime Statistics**

In studying crime incidence reports from the study area, what conclusions do you draw from the reports?

Note: Interviewees will not be asked regarding sense of place, as most interviewees do not reside within the study area and cannot relate to the study area in terms of a sense of place.
TRUSTWORTHINESS – participants promise to provide information that is relevant, accurate and true as part of a research study. In addition the researcher promises to reflect all the given information as accurate and true (Babbie, 2005: 69).

4.3 RESEARCH PROCESS - DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND REPRESENTATION

This section indicates the process followed, parameters used and the representation rationale of the data collected, analysed and the representation thereof.

4.3.1 INTERVIEWS

A discussion follows of the process followed with reference to the interviews conducted within the study area. Annexure A includes the signed Informed Consent Forms of each interviewee.

Sampling

To ensure a representative sample, four main crime prevention bodies / entities operational within the study area were identified and approached for interviews. The crime prevention bodies / entities interviewed are as follows:

- Villieria SAPS
- Private Security Firms located and operational within the study area
- Community Policing Forum Members
- Community Policing Liaison Members

The Villieria SAPS members were very accommodating and participated openly and honestly. The members interviewed consisted of the Station Commander, the Sector 2 commander and a station adjutant who is specifically tasked with crime prevention and crime awareness amongst the youth. Throughout the study duration, the Station Commander had an open door policy providing assistance as needed. A total number of three (3) Villieria SAPS members were interviewed.

Two private security firms (Kilner Park Security and MCS Security) are located within the study area, with the broader Villieria and Moot CPF sectors as their focus area for protection. The directors of both Kilner Park Security and MCS Security were interviewed. Additional patrol members (Romeo’s) of Kilner Park Security were interviewed as they are active daily within the study area providing immediate protection and response. A total number of five (5) private security members were interviewed.

Initially only two of the Community Policing Forum management members were available for interviews, but, during the course of the study, a new management directorate was elected. The new CPF management members are very forthcoming and participated in additional / follow-up interviews. A total of three (3) interviews (and 1 follow-up interview) were conducted with the CPF members.
Throughout the course of the study, it became clear that the local SAPS, the private security companies and the CPF are not the only crime prevention and related activities agents within the study area. Therefore interviews were conducted with the Mon Ami Trauma Troops, who assist victims of crime, family violence, child abuse, etc. A total number of three (3) Trauma Troop members were interviewed.

Advised by the Villieria Station Commander and the initial CPF Madam chair, additional interviews were conducted with community members, who are not part of any of the formal crime prevention bodies / entities, or the Trauma Troops. They do however play a significant role in crime prevention within the study area, and are referred to as the Community Policing Liaison Members. A total number of four (4) Community Policing Liaison members were interviewed.

Overall, a total number of 18 interviews were conducted with individuals tasked with crime prevention within the study area throughout the course of the study.

**Process Followed**

The interviews were structured according to five main themes (as set out in the Interview Schedule – **Figure 4.3**); of which the first theme entailed a brief discussion regarding the background to the study. The interview concluded with the last theme as an open ended question, asking the interviewees if they had any statistical data that could be of value to the study. The following three middle themes were then discussed:

- The Current State of Crime Within the Study Area
- Community Awareness of Crime
- Built Environment and Crime

Following is a brief indication of the questions asked per theme.

➢ **Theme 2: The Current State Of Crime Within The Study Area**

The first question covers the current state of crime within the study area. To unpack this variable the following five sub-questions were asked:

- How would you describe the current state of crime within the study area?
- What are the predominant crimes occurring within the study area?
- Are there “hot-spots” of crime within the study area?
- If yes, where are these “hot-spots”?
- Are there specific crimes linked to these “hot-spots”? 
Theme 3: Community Awareness Of Crime

The second group of questions deals with the “awareness of crime by members of the community”. The questions are divided into three sub-questions namely:

- In your opinion, are community members informed /aware as to the state of crime within the neighbourhood (study area)?
- In your opinion, are community members fearful of crime?
- If yes, is this fear of crime justified?

Theme 4: Built Environment And Crime

The third group of questions deals with “built environment and crime”. To derive an understanding of the elements related to the built environment and crime within the study area, the following three sub-questions were asked:

- In your opinion, does the crime and fear of crime influence how community members utilise the built environment?
- In your opinion, which physical interventions within the built environment contribute to the prevention of crime?
- In your opinion, what additional physical intervention within the built environment should be explored in the prevention of crime within study area?

Data Capturing and Interpretation

None of the interviewed parties allowed for digital recordings of the interviews. Therefore detailed notes of the interviews were made. The interviews were transcribed and summarized in a table format (See Annexure B).

The interviews were interpreted by means of trend analysis whereby the researcher highlight / identified reoccurring themes discussed / mentioned by the interviewees. Conclusions was then draw form the identified trends.

Ethical Aspects and Trustworthiness

It should be noted that all of the interviewees participated out of free will, no harm can to any of the interviewees and all interviewees’ identities and opinions are confidential. In addition all interviewees signed an informed consent form (attached as Annexure A) whereby confirming they understand the nature of the study, agree to partake, assure that their inputs will be true and accurate, and acknowledge their identity and inputs will be kept confidential.

4.3.2 FOCUS GROUPS

Following is the process followed with reference to the focus groups conducted within the study area. Annexure C includes the signed Informed Consent Forms of each of the focus group participants.
Sampling

Due to the sensitive nature of this particular study, no personal information of the community members participating in this particular study was recorded, as per request of the Ethical Committee of the University of Pretoria. As observed and confirmed by the researcher, the focus groups were age, race and gender representative.

Owing to the complexity and sensitive nature of the study, it was difficult to gain community members trust and participation in the focus groups. Two approaches were followed to gain community participation in the structured focus groups:

- Firstly **social media** was utilised: community members located within Sector 2 were informed via a mailing list and via WhatsApp groups throughout the study area. The mailing list was overseen by the Sector 2 Chairman, as the mailing list was confidential and was not made available to the researcher.

- Secondly a **direct approach** was utilised: managerial Sector 2 CPF members were approached on an individual basis, and encouraged to discuss the research with their neighbours and other community members located within the study area on a one-to-one basis.

In term of the **social media** approach, limited response was received. Some community members indicated that they were interested in participation in the focus groups, although the scheduled sessions did not suit them, whilst some preferred individual interviews for anonymity.

The **direct approach** was more successful. It was noted that community members experienced a sense of inclusion and self-imprinted responsibility in participating in the study so as to ensure that their voices were heard in identifying crime elements within their area and contributing in the fight against crime in their own small way. This was primarily due to the fact that they could relate to the individual asking them to participate. Community members invited to participate via the direct approach, then invited additional members via the social media approach.

The focus groups were therefore set up by means of a combination of the social media and direct approach and representative of the study area. A total of five focus groups was held with a total number of 21 participants.

It was noted that most of the participants had been residing within the area for an average of 21 years. This was very valuable to the study, as the participants indicated the changes they had observed and experienced within the study area and specifically the built environment due to crime and fear of crime over the past two / three decades.
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**Process Followed**

A research expert, Dr AG Moore (2004), attended all of the focus groups to oversee the process / methodology followed and anonymity of participants and data accuracy.

The focus groups were structured according to five main themes (as set out in the Focus Group Schedule – Figure 4.2); of which the first theme entailed a brief discussion regarding the background to the study. The focus groups concluded with an open ended question, asking the participants if they had any additional comment / remarks they wished to add pertaining to the study. The following three middle themes were then discussed:

- Opening questions
- Transfer questions
- Supportive questions

Following is a brief indication of the questions asked per theme.

**Theme 2: Opening Questions**

The focus group participants were asked to share their views on the following three statements in order to gain a better understanding of their opinions regarding the importance / non-importance of community awareness and community involvement; if the members are informed of crime, and of fear of crime, within the study area and the influence on their lives, and lastly, the physical interventions they deemed appropriate in crime prevention:

- The role and function of sense of place / sense of community within the study area
- The state of crime and fear of crime within the study area
- The state of the built environments

**Theme 3: Transfer Questions**

The focus group participants were asked to discuss their views on the following elements in order to gain a better understanding whether the participants are of the opinion that crime and fear of crime has an influence on a sense of community (community awareness / involvement); if crime and fear of crime influences how, when and where the community utilises the built environments; and lastly to determine if the crime prevention precaution within the built environment influences a sense of place (community awareness / involvement):

- The effect of crime and fear of crime on a sense of community
- The effect of crime and fear of crime on the built environment
- The effect of the built environment on a sense of place
Theme 4: Supportive Questions

The focus group participants were asked to share their views on the following elements in order to gain a better understanding whether participants were of the opinion that any additional personal safety precautionary measures are necessary in crime prevention or that through the active utilization of the built environment and community participation a better sense of place would be fostered thereby limiting crime and fear of crime.

- Personal safety precautionary measures
- Built environment that fosters a sense of place

Data Capturing and Interpretation

The focus group discussions were digitally recorded. The discussions were transcribed and summarized in a table format per theme, sub-question and responses (See Annexure D).

The focus group discussions were interpreted by means of trend analysis whereby the researcher highlight / identified reoccurring themes discussed / mentioned by the focus group participants. Conclusions was then draw form the identified trends.

Ethical Aspects and Trustworthiness

It should be noted that all of the focus group participants participated out of free will, no harm can to any of the participants and all participants' identities and opinions are confidential. In addition all participants signed an informed consent form (attached as Annexure C) whereby confirming they understand the nature of the study, agree to partake, assure that their inputs will be true and accurate, and acknowledge their identity and inputs will be kept confidential.

4.3.3 CRIME STATISTICAL DATA

For the purpose of this study, two sets of statistical data pertaining to crime were analysed. The first data set analysed, represents the national criminal data, as published by the South African Police Service – September 2014. The specific data utilised is time series data from March 2004 to April 2014.

The second set of statistical data analysed, is data obtained from the Villieria SAPS Precinct for the time period April 2014 to March 2015. This is followed by the process used with reference to the Villieria SAPS data “clean up” and the overall analysis thereof.
Statistical Data Obtained

For the purpose of this study, SAPS Villieria made available the Villieria Police Precinct formal crime data for the time period April 2014 to March 2015. The crime incidence reports were received in a "raw" format indicating all crime incidences per week. As prerequisite for making the data available, SAPS Villieria had to oversee the final analysis and interpretation of the data as included / reflected within this study. The GIS database is based on the statistical data.

Confidentiality Agreement

Due to the nature of the crime data, a formal confidentiality agreement was signed between Villieria SAPS, the Researcher and the GIS consultant (who was responsible for the spatial capturing of the statistical data). Annexure E.1 is a copy of the confidentiality agreement between Villieria SAPS and the Researcher. As part of the confidentiality agreement, SAPS Villieria had to sign off on the final document to ensure accurate interpretation of the data and anonymous graphical representation of the data. Refer to Annexure E.2 for the letter of approval form SAPS Villieria.

Interpretation

National Statistical Data

The National Data was analysed and interpreted holistically within the context of South Africa, the Gauteng Province and the City of Tshwane Metropolitan area. On a local level, 10 police precincts were identified (including the Villieria Police Precinct) and the data compiled accordingly from the National Data for the 10 precincts for interpretation.

The national data within the context of South Africa, the Gauteng Province and the City of Tshwane Metropolitan area is analysed in terms of the total number of crime incidents and as a ratio (1: 100 000 people). Additionally the total number of crime incidents data is graphically represented as choropleth maps.

For the purpose of expressing the crime incidents as a ratio (1: 1000 000 people) for the identified 10 police precincts, the following process was followed to determine the total population per precinct and the corresponding crime incident ratio:

- The Gauteng 25-years Integrated Transport Master Plan (GITMP, 2013) traffic zone system was utilised to calculate the total population per police precincts, as the GITMP traffic zones aligned closely with the police precincts.

3 The population per police precinct was calculated by the researched due to the SAPS boundaries differing from the Census population count boundaries.
As basis, the GITMP utilised the Census 2011 data which was then updated to 2014 by means of statistical interpolation and the examination of 2014 Google images by the custodian (Nel, 2015) of the GITMP data.

Some of the GITMP zones overlapped between police precincts; therefore some interpretation was applied to calculate the population per police precinct. The interpretation was overseen by Nel (2015), the custodian of the GITMP data.

The calculation below indicates the method used in calculation of the crime statistics per police precinct - verified by Nel (2015).

### Table 4.1 (see overleaf) is a summary of the Gauteng and 10 Police precincts actual crime incidents and corresponding incident ratio (1:100 000).

#### Villiera Statistical Data
The statistical data was used to compare the actual crime incidents with the interviewees and focus group participants’ perceptions of crime and fear of crime. To assist in the data interpretation, SAPS provided five time categories according to which they analyse crime occurrences. The time categories are as follow:

- Time Category 1: 06:00 – 10:00
- Time Category 2: 10:00 – 14:00
- Time Category 3: 14:00 – 18:00
- Time Category 4: 18:00 – 22:00
- Time Category 5: 22:00 – 06:00

In addition, SAPS indicated their day / night split is from 06:00 – 18:00 (day) and 18:00 - 06:00 (night).
Table 4.1: Crime Incidents vs Incident Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>GITMP 2014 Total Pop</th>
<th>National Data 2013-2014 Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Crime Rate Per 100 000 of the Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Pop</td>
<td>Total Crime</td>
<td>Contact Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>12,728,400</td>
<td>650,519</td>
<td>162,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>74,563</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>32,069</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>21,953</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>69,937</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>1,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>28,492</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>114,960</td>
<td>5,191</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>74,109</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>85,905</td>
<td>10,258</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villieria</td>
<td>59,653</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>23,459</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Precinct Total</td>
<td>585,100</td>
<td>43687</td>
<td>6895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The national crime categories utilised within the study for both of the data sets are listed in Table 4.2 below, indicating the main categories and related sub-categories.
Buffer areas related to crime incidents, occurring in close proximity to structural elements within the built environment and some nodes, were determined during discussions between the researcher, SAPS, CPF and Community Liaison members.

The buffers were defined as following:
- N1 – 500m
- Railway line - 500m
- Main movement roads – 250m
- Open space and parks – 150m
- Shopping nodes – 300m

Data Representation

The National and Precinct statistical data was analysed according to three main data categories. The categories are as follow:
- All crime incidents
- Contact crime
- Property-related crime.
The statistical data is mainly represented by a number of graphs. The data was then translated to be spatially represented. The national crime data was translated to be graphically representative of the 1140 police precincts located within South Africa. The Villieria police precinct statistical data was translated to be graphically represented within the precinct boundary and more focused study area (Sector 2).

4.3.4 LOAD SHEDDING STATISTICAL DATA

During the interview discussions, it was brought to the attention of the researcher that crime incident increased during times of load shedding.

**Load Shedding:** "Load shedding is a measure of last resort to prevent the collapse of the power system country-wide [due to the demand being in excess of the generator supply]. Scheduled load shedding is controlled by way of sharing the available electricity among all its customers" (Eskom, 2015)

A formal description by Eskom of Load Shedding is included in Annexure F.

**Statistical Data Obtained**

To test the interviewees’ observation, the load shedding times were obtained from the City of Tshwane. The statistical data obtained was only for the time period February 2015 to May 2015. Unfortunately only the data for February and March could be utilised, as the SAPS Crime Statistical Data is available only up until March 2015.

**Interpretation**

The study area (Queenswood and Kilner Park) forms part of Group 8 in terms of the load shedding schedule for the City of Tshwane. The days and times of load shedding was overlaid with the Villieria Police Precinct Data and compared to the same time period for days with no load shedding to establish any trends.

**Data Representation**

Due to the limited data available, no graphs / spatial representation of the data was possible.

4.3.5 GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

For the purpose of this study, a Geographic Information System (GIS) was utilised for the graphical representation of the crime statistical data. Through GIS application, mere statistical data is transformed in geostatistics, whereby the locational value of the data can be extracted, analysed and spatially represented (Ferreira, 2012:36)
Following is a brief overview of the process used with reference to the spatial capturing and representation of the Villieria Precinct crime data on a Geographic Information System.

**Data Preparation**

The statistical data obtained from the Villieria Police Precinct was firstly combined into one data set, including all crime incidents from April 2014 to March 2015 in one database. The data was then “cleaned up” to remove any duplicates entries, crime incidents that occurred outside of the time period analysed (April 2014 to March 2015) and to remove all crime incidents that occurred outside of the Villieria precinct boundary. Additional information deductions were added to standardize all crime incidents according to the national crime categories.

**Confidentiality Agreement**

As part of the confidentiality agreement, it was agreed upon between Villieria SAPS and the Researcher that the actual crime location may be captured spatially, although the incident should be graphically represented by an approximate 150m buffed “zone”. The locations of the victims are therefore protected. In addition, as per request within the confidentiality agreement, the GIS database will be provided to SAPS with the completion of the study.

**Data Capturing**

For the purpose of this study, PlanetGIS and QGIS were utilised as GIS platforms for the spatial representation of the crime data. A GIS Consultant, A Atkinson, assisted in the convergence of the statistical data into geostatistic and the corresponding spatial representation of the crime data. All crime incidents for the time period April 2014 to March 2015 were spatially captured according to the actual crime location as recorded within the SAPS data.

**Data Representation**

All the crime incidents are represented by an approximate 150m buffer “zone”. Queries were conducted to indicate the following type of incidents graphically:

- Crime classifications
- Time of day
- Time category
- Per Month
- Day of the week
- Etc.

Additionally, choropleth and heat maps were utilised. The choropleth maps were used to indicate the intensity of crime incidents per police precinct according to the national crime data. According to the ESRI online GIS
dictionary (2015), a choropleth map can be defined as follows: “A thematic map in which areas are distinctly coloured or shaded to represent classed values of a particular phenomenon”.

Heat-maps were used to identify statistical hot spots of crime with the Villieria Precinct, based on the statistical data which Villieria SAPS made available. According to the QGIS definitions (2015), a heat-map can be described as following: “Heat-maps allow easy identification of “hotspots” and clustering of points, [as] the density is calculated based on the number of points in a location, with larger numbers of clustered points resulting in larger values”.

4.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the above discussion it is evident that the study is based on a case study approach, utilizing a mixed-method approach, analysis qualitative and quantitative data. The process for data capturing, interpretation and graphical representation varies slightly between the qualitative and quantitative data. The spatial representation of the statistical data adds enormous value to the study.
CHAPTER 5: THE STUDY AREA - KILNER PARK AND QUEENSWOOD (PRETORIA, SA)

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objective of this chapter is to:

- Provide a broad overview of the study area within a National, Provincial, and Municipal context and the related State of Crime (National, Provincial, and Municipal)
- Provide detailed background information with regards to the study area within a local context by means of a spatial and demographic analysis of the area. Additional the State of Crime within the study area is described.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Moving forward from the research methodology, the locational context of the study area is discussed. The Study Area is located within South Africa, within the Gauteng Province. In total there are nine provinces in the country. Within Gauteng the study area is located within the Tshwane Metropolitan municipality and locally within the broader Moot area. The locational context of the study area will therefore be discussed according to a National, Provincial, Municipal and Local (Study Area) context. The corresponding state of crime will be analysed and briefly discussed.

Furthermore South Africa is divided into a total number of 1140 police precincts (SAPS, 2015), each with a police station serving the local community (the Study Area is located within the Villieria Police Precinct). Choropleth maps are used to indicate the total number of crime incidences per 100 000 people according to the police precincts for the time period April 2013 to March 2014. The main categories analysed are as follow:

- All main crime categories (providing a holistic overview of all crime)
- Contact Crimes (representing the main fear of crime generator as it entail crime against the person - primarily violent)
- Property-related Crimes (as this form of crime directly speaks to the built environment).

The sources of the crime statistics / data utilised within the section refer to (the applicable source is indicated on the corresponding Figure page):

- South African Police Service: Crime Situation in South Africa (Released 19 Sept 2014)

5.2 NATIONAL CONTEXT – SOUTH AFRICA

Following is a brief discussion of the South African context and a brief summary of the state of crime nationally.
5.2.1 SOUTH AFRICA IN A NUTSHELL

The Study Area is located within South Africa. South Africa is located on the most southern tip of the African continent as indicated in Figure 5.1. According to the 2011 Census (StatsSA, 2015), the population of South Africa was 51 770 560 in 2011. South Africa is divided into nine administrative provinces.

As stated within the National Development Plan (2011:235) South Africa’s spatial structure is reasonably balanced. The main economic activity of the country is “distributed across four metropolitan regions and a network of cities, large towns and service centres, all linked by established networks of connecting infrastructure”. Due to the apartheid legacy and the spatial distortions of the past, numerous people still live in poverty, mainly within the former homelands. The country is vast in land area, making infrastructure and the movement of people and goods costly.

The study area is located within the Gauteng Province, within South Africa.

5.2.2 THE STATE OF CRIME WITHIN SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa has experienced a significant increase in crime in the past two decades, with a slight decline over the past few years. Due to the current state of crime, fuelled by the media, fear of crime is at an all-time high. Emphasizing the point, Breetzke et al., (2014:124) highlights that the “current murder rate in South Africa is 37.3 murders per 100 000 people, nearly five times the global murder rate of 7.6 murders per 100 000”. Violent crime, which is the main fear of crime generator, as it entails primarily crime against the person, causes particular concern, as approximately one third of all recorded crimes within South Africa are classified as violent crime (Breetzke et al., 2014:124). As indicated by Kruger & Landman (2008:75) housebreaking, after murder, is the main crime type most feared by respondents (National Victims of Crime Survey conducted by the Institute of Security Studies in 2003). Following is a statistical overview of the current state of crime within South Africa based on the 2014 crime data of the South African Police Service.

As indicated in Figure 5.2, representing all crime categories for the time period April 2004 to March 2014, most of the main crime categories declined over the indicated time period, with crime detected as result of police action, increasing annually. Looking at a cross section of crime for the final year of published information, April 2013 to March 2014, contact crimes (crimes against the person) are the main fear of crime generators, representing 27.9% of the total crime profile nationally. Following this is property–related crimes, representing 25.3% and other serious crimes, representing 23.3% (SAPS, 2014). With reference to the nine provinces, it is evident that the Gauteng province still has the highest incidents of crime over the total time period (April 2004 to March 2014) compared to the other provinces. For the book year April 2013 to March 2014 Gauteng contributed 28.9% towards national crime figures. Figure 5.3 is a graphical representation of all crime incidents per police precincts nationally (April 2013 to March 2014).
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Looking at the breakdown of contact crime, as indicated in Figure 5.4, it is evident that over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, the number of contact crimes stayed relatively unfluctuating throughout, with a slight increase in common robbery over the past few years. For the cross section, April 2013 to March 2014, assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm represented 29.5% of all contact crimes, followed by common assault, representing 26.9%. In terms of the provincial distribution, Gauteng has the most contact crime incidents nationally, representing 26.3% nationally. Figure 5.5 is a graphical representation of the contact crime incidents per police precincts nationally (April 2013 to March 2014).

Property related crime experienced some changes over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, as indicated in Figure 5.6. Burglary at non-residential premises started to increase steadily from 2006/2007 and plateaued from 2011/2012. Theft out of, or from, motor vehicles declined slightly around 2008/2009 and then increased again. Theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles declined annually from 2007/2008, whilst burglary at residential premises stayed mainly constant over the entire time period with minor fluctuations. Looking at the cross section, for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, burglary at residential premises represented 46.3% of all property-related crimes, followed by theft out of, or from, motor vehicles, representing 25.5%. Gauteng experienced a slight decline in property-related crimes over the time period April 2004 to March 2014. For the time period April 2013 to March 2014, Gauteng had the highest incidents of property-related crimes, representing 27.7%. Figure 5.7 is a graphical representation of the property-related crime incidents per police precincts nationally (April 2013 to March 2014).

From the above national statistical analysis, contact crime (crime against the person) is of great concern, and it declined only slightly over the entire time period (April 2004 to March 2014). Gauteng, compared to the other provinces, has by far the greatest number of crime incidents for all crime categories for the entire time period (April 2004 to March 2014).

5.3 PROVINCIAL CONTEXT – GAUTENG PROVINCE

Following is a brief discussion of Gauteng in the context of South Africa, followed by a summary of the state of crime within Gauteng.

5.3.1 GAUTENG IN A NUTSHELL

The Gauteng Province is located within the heart of South Africa as indicated in Figure 5.8. Gauteng consists of three metropolitan municipalities (City of Tshwane, City of Johannesburg and City of Ekurhuleni) and two district municipalities (West Rand and Sedibeng). As indicated within the Gauteng Spatial Development Framework (2011:5), Gauteng is noted for its economic dominance and large population concentration. Gauteng has experienced significant urbanization as most of the job opportunities are located within the urban centres of Gauteng. The Gauteng province is besieged by gated communities (such as
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PROVINCIAL CONTEXT - GAUTENG PROVINCE

Figure 5.8
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enclosed neighbourhoods and security villages) in response to the high crime rates within the province.

The study area is located within the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality, within the Gauteng Province.

5.2.2 THE STATE OF CRIME WITHIN GAUTENG

The large population concentration within Gauteng, adds to the higher crime rates within Gauteng, compared to the other provinces. As indicated in Figure 5.9, most of the main crime categories stayed fairly constant over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, with crime deterred as a result of police action, increasing sharply from 2009/2010. In contrast contact crime steadily decreased from 2007/2008. It is noted from the cross section that contact crime and other serious crimes are the most significant; both representing 25% of the total crime incidents for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, following property-related crime representing 23.9%.

Figure 5.10 is a graphical representation of all crime incidents per police precincts for Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014).

In terms of contact crime (Figure 5.9) most of the sub-categories showed little change throughout the time period April 2004 to March 2014. Common assault showed some fluctuation, decreasing up to 2006/2007 and then increasing again and peaking in 2011/2012, while afterwards declining steadily again. Robbery with aggravated circumstances mirrored common assault, increasing up to 2006/2007 and then declining steadily till 2011/2012, after which it increased again. The cross section of the time period April 2013 to March 2014 indicates that common assault represented 27.5% of all contact crime incidents, followed by robbery with aggravated circumstances representing 26.2% and assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm representing 25.5%. Figure 5.11 is a graphical representation of the contact crime incidents per police precincts for Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014).

Most of the property-related crime sub-categories experienced some change over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, as indicated in Figure 5.12. Burglary at residential premises decreased slightly until 2007/2008 and then increased again, whilst theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles peaked in 2006/2007 and then declined steadily. Theft out of, or from a motor vehicle declined up to 2008/2009 and then gradually increased again. Looking at the cross section, it is evident that burglary at residential premises represented 43.8% of all property-related crime for the time period April 2013 to March 2014. Following, theft out of, or from motor vehicles represented 27.4% and theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles represented 17.6%. Figure 5.13 is a graphical representation of the property-related crime incidents per police precincts for Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014).

The dominant crime categories nationally are echoed by the dominant crime categories within Gauteng. Contact crime within Gauteng is of great concern, followed by property-related crimes.
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5.4 MUNICIPAL CONTEXT – CITY OF TSHWANE METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY

Following is a brief discussion of the City of Tshwane in the context of Gauteng, followed by a summary of the state of crime within the City of Tshwane.

5.4.1 THE CITY OF TSHWANE IN A NUTSHELL

The City of Tshwane forms part of the Global City Region of the Gauteng Province. Tshwane is located on the northern border of Gauteng as indicated in Figure 5.14. The City of Tshwane, also known as the Capital City, is home to the Union Buildings and the Presidency. As indicated within the Tshwane Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework (2012:30), the City of Tshwane is the administrative Capital of South Africa with numerous seats of government spheres / departments located within Tshwane.

The City of Tshwane is home to numerous gated communities such as Silver Lakes, Woodhill, Mooikloof, Silver Stream, to name but a few. It is noted in terms of land area however, that gated areas represent merely ±14.4% of the total land area of Tshwane, as graphically illustrated in Figure 5.15 (Nel & Landman, 2015:16).

The Study Area is located within the Moot area of Pretoria, within the city of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality.

5.4.2 THE STATE OF CRIME WITHIN THE CITY OF TSHWANE

The main crime categories as representative of the City of Tshwane, experience little change over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, as indicated in Figure 5.16. Contact crime declined significantly from 2009/2010, with a slight increase again from 2012/2013. Crime detected as a result of police action increased drastically from 2010/2011. The cross section indicates that other serious crime represented 27.9% of all crime incidents for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, followed by property-related crime representing 26.1% and contact crime representing 22.7%. It is positive to note that within Tshwane, contact crime is not the highest crime occurrence. Figure 5.17 is a graphical representation of all crime incidents per police precincts for the City of Tshwane (April 2013 to March 2014).

As indicated in Figure 5.16, the contact crime sub-categories experienced some fluctuation over the time period April 2004 to March 2014. Common assault decreased till 2006/2007 and plateaued for a few years, starting to increase again from 2010/2011. Robbery with aggravated circumstances declined from 2006/2007 annually, but increased from 2011/2012. The cross section indicates that for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, common assault represented 27.1% of all contact crime incidents, followed by robbery with aggravated circumstances representing 26.6% and assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm representing 24.0%. Figure 5.18 is a graphical representation of the contact crime incidents per police precincts for the City of Tshwane (April 2013 to March 2014).
Figure 5.17

Figure 5.18

Property-related crimes changed significantly over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, as indicated in Figure 5.19. Theft out of motor vehicles decreased drastically up to 2007/2008, then increased again. Theft out of, or from motor vehicles increased up to 2007/2008, afterwards decreasing gradually. Burglary at non-residential premises increased from 2005/006 up to 2008/2009 and then plateaued. Looking at the cross section, it is evident that for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, burglary at residential premises represented 43.2% of all property-related crime incidents, followed by theft out of, or from motor vehicles representing 30.2%. Figure 5.20 is a graphical representation of the property-related crime incidents per police precincts for the City of Tshwane (April 2013 to March 2014).

From the above analysis it is evident that property-related crime is emerging as a significant crime occurrence within the Metropolitan area. Notable however is the fact that contact crime is the third highest ranked crime occurrence within the City of Tshwane compared to that of Gauteng Province and South Africa nationally.

5.5 LOCAL CONTEXT – VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING POLICE PRECINCTS

Following is a brief discussion of the Villieria and surrounding police precincts in the context of City of Tshwane.

5.5.1 VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING POLICE PRECINCTS in a nutshell

The Study Area is located within the Villieria Police Precinct, within the Moot area of Pretoria, forming part of Region 3 of the Tshwane administrative regions (TSDF, 2012:30). The Moot strip is cradled within the Magaliesberg hills. Figure 5.21 indicates the context of the Villieria and surrounding police precincts. The police precincts located within the Moot strip, adjacent to the Villieria Police Precinct consist of the Wonderboompoort and Pretoria Moot precincts to the west; and the Eersterust and Mamelodi police precincts to the west. To the north, the Villieria precinct is bordered by the Sinoville and Kameeldrift precincts. To the west, the Villieria precinct is bordered by the Sunnyside, Brooklyn and Silverton precinct. Figure 5.22 indicates the Villieria and surrounding police precincts to be discussed within this section.

5.4.2 THE STATE OF CRIME WITHIN VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING POLICE PRECINCTS

As indicated in Figure 5.23, for the time period April 2004 to March 2014, all crime categories stayed relatively stable, with the exception of the Mamelodi Precinct, which experienced a significant decline in crime incidents up to 2007/2008, after which it stabilized. The Sunnyside police precinct experienced an increase from 2007/2008 till 2010/2011, after which it declined slightly. Looking at the cross section, the Sunnyside (23.5%) and Brooklyn (21.3%) precinct had the most crime incidents for
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the time period April 2013 to March 2014, compared to the other precincts. The Villieria precinct represented 8.1\% of all the crime incidents compared to the other precincts. **Figure 5.24** is a graphical representation of all crime incidents per police precincts for the Villieria and surrounding police precinct, whilst **Figure 4.25** represent the Villieria precinct in relation to the surrounding precinct in terms of all crime incidents (April 2013 to March 2014). From Figure 25 it is apparent that all crime incidents recorded within the ten police precincts represents a mere 7\% of all crime incidents recorded for the rest of Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014). In terms of the total number of incidents, the Villieria police precinct has the fifth lowest number of recorded incidents.

**Figure 5.26** indicates the total number of all crime incidents as a ratio (1: 100 000 people). From the analysis it is evident that the current rate of all crime incidents for the Villieria Police Precinct represents 5 901 crime incidents per 100 000 people, nearly in line with the Gauteng crime incident rate of 5 111 incidents per 100 000 people (April 2013 to March 2014).

Contact crime displayed a similar time series profile compared to the all crime categories time series analysis (**Figure 5.23**) for the time period April 2004 to March 2014. The Mamelodi Precinct experienced a significant decline in contact crime incidents up to 2007/2008, after which it stabilized. Sunnyside had some fluctuation, peaking at 2006/2007, 2010/2011 and 2013/2014. From the cross section it is evident that the Sunnyside precinct had the highest number of contact crime incidents compared to the other precincts, representing 72.5\% for the time period April 2013 to March 2014. Villieria precinct represented 6.3\% of all contact crimes. **Figure 5.27** is a graphical representation of the contact crime incidents per police precincts for the Villieria and surrounding police precinct, whilst **Figure 4.28** represent the Villieria precinct in relation to the surrounding precinct in terms of contact crime incidents (April 2013 to March 2014). As indicated in Figure 28, contact crime incidents recorded within the ten police precincts represents a mere 4\% of all contact crime incidents recorded for the rest of Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014). In terms of the total number of contact crime incidents, the Villieria police precinct has the fifth lowest number of recorded incidents.

**Figure 4.29** indicates the total number of contact crime incidents as a ratio (1: 100 000 people). From the analysis, the current rate of all crime incidents for the Villieria Police Precinct, represents 723 contact crime incidents per 100 000 people, nearly half that of the Gauteng contact crime incident rate of 1 280 incidents per 100 000 people (April 2013 to March 2014).

Property-related crime, as indicated in **Figure 5.30** for the time period April 2004 to March 2014, clearly indicates some fluctuation of the sub-categories over time. The Brooklyn police station experienced a decline from 2005/2006, plateauing from 2007/2008 to 2010/2011 and then declining rapidly again, whilst the Sunnyside precinct experienced a steady increase from 2006/2007. Looking at the cross section the Sunnyside (22.2\%) and Brooklyn (21.3\%) precincts represented most of
Figure 5.24
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### Villiera and Surrounding Precincts – All Crime Incidents Comparison 2013 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>650,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>9,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>1,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>3,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>5,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>3,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>10,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiera</td>
<td>3,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>1,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Precinct Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,687</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gauteng All Crime Incidents**

Study area as % of Gauteng

- Study Area: 7%
- Other: 93%

**Source:** Atkinson, A. 2015, ex South African Police Service: Crime Situation in South Africa (Released 19 Sept 2014)
### GAUTENG ALL CRIME RATIO
**1: 100 000 PEOPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Crime Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>5,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>12,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>5,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>6,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>5,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>9,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>4,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>5,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>11,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villieria</td>
<td>5,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>8,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Precinct Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,467</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING PRECINCTS – CONTACT CRIME INCIDENTS 2013 - 2014

Legend
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Source: Atkinson, A. 2015, ex South African Police Service: 
Crime Situation in South Africa (Released 19 Sept 2014)
VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING PRECINCTS – CONTACT CRIME INCIDENTS COMPARISON 2013 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Contact Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>162,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>1,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villieria</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Precinct Total</td>
<td>6,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gauteng Contact Crime Incidents

Study area as % of Gauteng

4% Study Area
96% Other

VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING PRECINCTS – CONTACT CRIME INCIDENTS COMPARISON 2013 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Contact Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>1,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>2,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villieria</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Precinct Total</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the property-related crime occurrences for the time period April 2013 to March 2014. The Villieria precinct represented 10.2% for the same period. **Figure 5.31** is a graphical representation of the property-related crime incidents per police precincts for the Villieria and surrounding police precinct, whilst **Figure 4.32** represents the Villieria precinct in relation to the surrounding precinct in terms of property-related crime incidents (April 2013 to March 2014). Figure 32 indicated that property-related crime incidents recorded within the ten police precincts represent a mere 8% of all property-related incidents recorded for the rest of Gauteng (April 2013 to March 2014). In terms of the total number of property-related crime incidents, the Villieria police precinct has the fourth highest number of recorded incidents.

**Figure 4.33** indicates the total number of contact crime incidents as a ratio (1: 100 000 people). From the analysis it is evident that the current rate of all crime incidents for the Villieria Police Precinct represents 2 246 property-related crime incidents per 100 000 people, nearly two-thirds of the Gauteng property-related crime incident rate of 3 774 incidents per 100 000 people (April 2013 to March 2014).

From the above analysis, it is evident that compared to the surrounding police precinct, the Villieria precinct had fewer crime incidents over the total time period, especially in terms of contact crimes.

5.6 THE STUDY AREA – SECTOR 2 OF THE VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT

The study area (Kilner Park and Queenswood) is located within the Villieria Police Precinct. The Villieria Station consists of 128 members, together with the public service act members. The Station has 27 vehicles which includes 3 motor cycles. VISPOL is responsible to provide a 24 hour Client Service and response service, with each relief consisting of approximately 11 members. The station has four focus areas / components in terms of crime prevention namely:

- Visible policing,
- Crime Investigation,
- Support Services and
- Information Management.

Additional services provided by the station include a Firearm Registration Centre and Second hand Goods and Liquor premises inspections units.

The precinct is divided into three patrolling sectors, of which the study area is located within Sector 2. Colonel Alberts indicated that a patrol vehicle per CPF sector is allocated for all day patrols. **Figure 5.34** graphically illustrates the broader Villieria CPF area and the respective Sectors, whilst **Figure 5.35** graphically illustrates the study area within Sector 2. Following is a brief analysis of the study area (Kilner Park and Queenswood) within the context of Villieria Police Precinct.
Figure 5.31: Villieria and surrounding precincts – Property-related crime incidents 2013-2014

## Pretoria North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Property Crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>155,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>2,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>1,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiera</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Precinct Total</td>
<td>13,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Area as % of Gauteng

- **Study Area**: 8%
- **Other**: 92%

VILLIERIA AND SURROUNDING PRECINCTS – PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME INCIDENTS RATIO COMPARISON 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Precinct</th>
<th>Property Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>3,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersterust</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameeldrift</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamelodi</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria Moot</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvertown</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinoville</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>3,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villieria</td>
<td>2,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderboompoort</td>
<td>2,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Precinct Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GAUTENG PROPERTY CRIME RATIO (1: 100 000 PEOPLE)

Figure 5.33

CPF SECTORS OF VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT

Figure 5.34

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015
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THE STUDY AREA WITHIN SECTOR 2

Sector 1

Sector 2

Sector 3

LEGEND
- Sector 2 Boundary
- Study Area
- Railway Station
- Railway
- Roads
- Police Stations

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015
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5.6.1 LOCATIONAL OVERVIEW

The chosen study area is a non-gated, non-enclosed community; Kilner Park and Queenswood, located within the east of Pretoria. The study area forms part of the active Community Policing Forum (CPF) of Villieria Police Precinct, including several private security companies operational within the area and active local law enforcement involvement.

In terms of the physical built environment, the study area includes numerous legibility elements which define the area. The study area is diverse in its role and function, and includes the following uses (see Figure 5.36 – the numbers indicated within the bullets below relate to the numbers indicated on the Figure 5.36).

- Two primary schools within Queenswood - Laerskool Queenswood\(^1\) and Laerskool Nellie Swart\(^2\)
- One combination primary and secondary school within Queenswood – Eduplex\(^3\) (a private school)
- Four shopping nodes
  - The primary nodes consisting of Queens Corner\(^4\) located within Queenswood, and the Kilner Park Spar Complex\(^5\), located in Kilner Park
  - The secondary nodes are comprised of the Queens Galleries\(^6\) node located within Queenswood
- Three old age homes,
  - Huis Herfsblaar\(^7\), located within Queenswood, which is relatively large, accommodating the elderly in a frail care section, residents in individual flats and in townhouses,
  - Susan Strijdom Home\(^8\), located within Queenswood, caring for the elderly and disabled,
  - Ebenhaeser\(^9\), located within Kilner Park, accommodating the elderly in a frail care section, residents in individual flats and in townhouses
- Higher density residential units (apartment blocks) within both Kilner Park and Queenswood,
- Open space areas, of which 3 formal parks with playground equipment are located within Queenswood, with additional open space, with a memorial site\(^10\), in Kilner Park along the stream area. ,
- Four medical centres / facilities,
  - A medical day care center\(^11\), located within Kilner Park with general practitioners, dentists, a day clinic etc.
  - The Ear Institute\(^12\) in Queenswood,
  - The Eye Institute\(^13\) in Queenswood
  - The Bloodbank\(^14\)
- A nursery\(^15\), located on the border of Kilner Park

Figure 5.37 is a visual collage of the main legibility elements as identified within the study area.
Figure 5.37

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015

THE STUDY AREA (KILNER PARK & QUEENSWOOD) - VISUAL COLLAGE

- Wikkies Pompe Complex (Queenswood)
- Spar Complex (Kilnerpark)
- Huis Herfsblaar Old Age Home
- Queens Corner
- Queens Gallaries
- Medical Day Care Facility
- Stream and Open Space
- Kinerpark Old Age Home
- Open Space and Apartments
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In addition, the following main physical structuring elements define the study area and add to the legibility of the area (see Figure 5.38 – the numbers indicated within the bullets below relate to the numbers indicated on the Figure 5.38).

- The N1 freeway\(^1\) passing through the area in a north-south direction, dividing Kilner Park into an eastern and western section,
- The Metro Rail\(^2\) line passes through the area in an east-west direction, dividing Queenswood and Kilner Park into northern and southern sections,
- The Moreleta stream\(^3\) and wetlands area runs through the area in a north-south direction, further dividing Kilner Park into an eastern and western section,
- The main movement spines within the area are:
  - Stormvoël Road\(^4\), which becomes Nico Smith Street, providing movement in an east-west direction, bordering the study area to the north,
  - CR Swart Drive\(^5\), providing movement in a north-south direction, forming the divide between the suburbs of Queenswood (to the west) and Kilner Park (to the east),
  - Soutpansberg Road\(^6\), providing movement in an east-west direction,
  - Stead Avenue\(^7\), providing movement in a north-south direction, bordering the study area to the west.

5.6.2 DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

Understanding the physical built environment that influences how and when people utilise the study area, and the influence it has on crime and fear of crime, is only one component of the equation. The other part consists of the people that utilise the built environment and who are affected by crime and fear of crime. It is therefore important to gain a better understanding of the demographic profile of the people who reside within the study area. The demographic summary is informed by the 2011 Census (StatsSA, 2015) information and graphically represented in Figure 5.39.

Population and Age Profile

The study area (Kilner Park and Queenswood) consists of approximately 12 879 people and 4 558 dwellings which translates into approximately 2.8 people per household. The age profile of an area is a good indication of the role and function of an area. From the age profile, it is evident that 16% of the total resident population is aged 5 to 19, school going age. The dominant age category comprises residents aged 20 to 24 (12.2%), representing youths attending tertiary education and / or entering the workforce. The total economically active aged segments (aged 15 to 64) represents 70.2% of the total resident population. The elderly / retired population aged 65 and up, represents 15.4% of the study area. From the above, it can be deduced that the study area is mainly comprised of
DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY - STUDY AREA (KILNER PARK & QUEENSWOOD)

Source: Snyders, E. 2015 ex Census 2011 (StatsSA, 2015)

Figure 5.39

### Age Profile, 2011

- Ages: 85+ 1.8%
- Ages: 80-84 2.8%
- Ages: 75-79 2.9%
- Ages: 70-74 3.5%
- Ages: 65-69 4.3%
- Ages: 60-64 4.9%
- Ages: 55-59 5.4%
- Ages: 50-54 5.6%
- Ages: 45-49 6.1%
- Ages: 40-44 8.0%
- Ages: 35-39 6.9%
- Ages: 30-34 6.2%
- Ages: 25-29 8.4%
- Ages: 20-24 12.2%
- Ages: 15-19 6.5%
- Ages: 10-14 5.1%
- Ages: 05-09 4.4%
- Ages: 00-04 4.9%

### Racial Profile, 2011

- Black African 19.4%
- Coloured 3.7%
- Indian or Asian 2.0%
- White 74.8%

### Gender Profile, 2011

- Male 45.9%
- Female 54.1%

### Education Profile, 2011

- Not Specified 13.0%
- Higher 35.9%
- Secondary (Grade 8-12) 41.6%
- Primary (Grade 1-7) 7.8%
- Grade 0 1.8%

### Employment Profile, 2011

- Employed 93.4%
- Unemployed 6.6%

### Income Profile, 2011

- R 0 - R 400 0.4%
- R 401 - R 800 0.8%
- R 801 - R 1 600 1.8%
- R 1 601 - R 3 200 7.8%
- R 3 201 - R 6 400 16.2%
- R 6 401 - R 12 800 16.1%
- R 12 801 - R 25 600 10.7%
- R 25 601 - R 51 200 6.9%
- R 51 201 - R 102 400 4.9%
- R 102 401 - R 204 800 1.1%
- R 204 801 or more 1.2%
- No income 32.0%
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younger working aged adults with children, and a fairly strong retired / elderly element.

The study area is located in close proximity to the University of Pretoria (6km), the Hatfield Gautrain stations and numerous primary and secondary schools, which makes the area very attractive for young adults and young families in which to reside. Two large old aged homes are located within the study area, contributing to the elderly population segment.

**Gender and Racial Profile**

From the racial profile, it is evident that the White population group is dominant within the study area, representing 74.8% of the total population. The African Black population represents 19.4% of the population, followed by the Coloured population group (3.7%) and the Indian / Asian population group (2.0%). It is noted that the study area is fairly evenly represented in terms of gender, although the female population is slightly higher (54.1%) than the male population (45.9%) within the area.

The racial profile is primarily due to the fact that the study area falls within the broader Moot area, which was previously a former “white area”. The area is characterized by residents having resided within the area for a number of years, and only with the change of ownership, have other racial groups gained access to the study area and surrounds.

**Education / Employment and Income Profile**

Levels of education, employment and income are inter-connected. Education is a good indication of the literacy levels of a study area. The study area clearly has high levels of secondary education (41.6%) and higher education (35.9%). In terms of employment, 52.2% of the population is economically active, (which corresponds closely with the economically active population segment by age). Of the 52.2% of the economically active population, 93.4% is employed. High employment levels are a good indication of lower dependency levels within the study area.

From the study area monthly income profile, it is noted that 32.0% of individuals have no income. This correlates with the high number of children and elderly (approximately 40%) within the study, who have no monthly income. The study area can be classified as middle to higher income area, with 32.3% of individuals earning a monthly income of between R6 041 and R25 600. An additional 10.8% of individuals earn a monthly income of R25 601 and higher.

From the above, it is evident that the study area is characterized by high employment levels, which translates into middle to higher income households, as they are well-educated individuals.
5.6.3 STATE OF CRIME WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

The current state of crime analysis for the study area consists of two sections. The first highlights the historic crime incident data as indicated within the South African Police Service: Crime Situation in South Africa (similar to the national, provincial, metropolitan and precinct context) for the time period April 2004 to March 2014. The second analysis consists of the crime data provided by the Villieria Police Precinct for the time period April 2014 to March 2015.

Historic Overview – April 2004 to March 2014

From the time series data, as indicated in Figure 5.40, the Villieria Police Precinct experienced some fluctuation over the time period April 2004 to March 2014 for all crime categories. Other serious crime increased from 2005/2006, peaking at 2009/2010 and declining again until 2012/2013. Property-related crime declined from 2005/2006 with a slight increase at 2010/2011. Crime detected as result of police action increased significantly from 2010/2011. The cross section indicates the property-related crimes are the most significant, representing 38.1% of all crime incidents for the time period April 2014 to March 2014, followed by other serious crimes representing 28.7%.

Notably two (2) of the contact crime sub-categories experienced some fluctuation over the time period April 2004 to March 2014, as indicated in Figure 5.40. Common assault declined until 2007/2008 and increased slightly until 2009/2010, after which it increased drastically until 2011/2012. Assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm decreased steadily from 2007/2008. Looking at the cross section, for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, common assault was the most significant contact crime sub-category, representing 43.4%, followed by robbery with aggravating circumstances representing 23.9%.

Property-related crime, for the time period April 2004 to March 2014 fluctuated substantially, as indicated in Figure 5.41. Burglary at residential premises decreased up to 2007/2008 and then increased and peaked during 2009/2010, followed by a steady decline up to 2012/2013. Theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles peaked in 2007/2008 and again in 2012/2013. Theft out of, or from motor vehicles decreased till 2007/2008, afterwards increasing steadily until 2012/2013. From the cross section, burglary at residential premises represented 42.5% of all property-related crime incidents for the time period April 2013 to March 2014, followed by theft of motor vehicles and motorcycles, representing 27.3%.

From the above analysis it is evident that property-related crimes, in terms of burglary at residential premises, are the most active crime occurrences within the Villieria precinct.

Current Crime Overview – April 2014 to March 2015

The current crime stats are discussed according to two sections. The first section indicates the overall crime incidents for the entire Villieria Policy
VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME CATEGORIES

- Contact Crimes (Crimes Against The Person)
- Contact-Related Crimes
- Property-Related Crimes
- Crime Detected As A Result Of Police Action
- Other Serious Crimes
- Subcategories Of Aggravated Robbery
- Other Crime Categories

VILLIERIA PRECINCT - ALL CRIME CATEGORIES
April 2013 to March 2014

- Other Crime Categories: 0.9%
- Subcategories Of Aggravated Robbery: 1.5%
- Other Serious Crimes: 28.7%
- Crime Detected As A Result Of Police Action: 14.1%
- Property-Related Crimes: 38.1%
- Contact-Related Crimes: 4.4%
- Other Crime Categories: 12.2%
- Contact Crimes (Crimes Against The Person): 0.0%

CONTACT CRIME INCIDENTS – VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT COMPARISON 2004 - 2014

- Murder
- Total Sexual Crimes
- Attempted murder
- Assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm
- Common assault
- Common robbery
- Robbery with aggravating circumstances

VILLIERIA PRECINCT - CONTACT CRIME
April 2013 to March 2014

- Robbery with aggravating circumstances: 23.9%
- Common robbery: 14.4%
- Common assault: 43.4%
- Assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm: 6.5%
- Attempted murder: 2.3%
- Total Sexual Crimes: 8.6%
- Murder: 0.9%
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Precinct, while the second section focuses on the crime incidents per sector, highlighting **Sector 2** representing the study area.

- **Villiera Precinct**

Turning to the previous year’s crime incidents as indicated in Figure 5.42, April 2014 to March 2015, the type of crime varies significantly from month to month with noteworthy fluctuations over the 12 month period. Property-related crime is most notable, peaking during June 2014 and reaching a low point December 2014. Looking at the cross section, for the month of March, property-related crime represented 40% of all the crime incidents, followed by contact crime representing 20%. The total number of incidents for the time period April 2014 to March 2015 is graphically illustrated for the all crime categories per type of incident in figure set Figure 5.43 to Figure 5.49.

Property-related crime within the Villiera precinct, as indicated within Figure 5.58 showed a similar fluctuation per month as that for the contact crime incidents for the time period April 2014 to March 2015. Burglary at residential premises fluctuated and peaked in August 2014, after which it stayed more constant throughout the rest of the time period. Looking at the cross section of March 2015, burglary at residential premises represented 52% of all property-related crime incidents, followed by theft out of, or from motor vehicles. The total number of incidents for the time period April 2014 to March 2015 is graphically illustrated for the property-related crime categories and sub-categories in figure set Figure 5.59 to Figure 5.63.

From the above time series data, no one type of crime is constant (increasing / decreasing) within the precinct. As stated by Villiera station commander, “the type of crime is depended on the flavour of the month”.

- **Sector 2**

From the sectoral breakdown, as indicated in Figure 5.64, most of the crime incidents occurred within Sector 3, for the month of March, representing 45% of all the crime incidents. Figure 5.65 graphically illustrates all crime indictments for Sector 2.
Figure 5.44


Sector 1
Sector 2
Sector 3

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015 . ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Sector 1

Sector 2

Sector 3

LEGEND

- Crime Detected as a Result of Police Action

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villieria Police Precinct Data
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Figure 5.48

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Figure 5.49

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Figure 5.51
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- Assault with the Intent to inflict grievous bodily harm
- Attempted Murder
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- Robbery with aggravating circumstances
- Total Sexual Crimes

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO HARM (2014 – 2015)

Sector Boundaries
- Railway Station
- Railway
- Roads
- Villieria Police Station
- Police Stations

LEGEND
- Assault with the Intent to inflict grievous bodily harm

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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LEGEND

Murder
Attempted Murder

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Figure 5.54
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Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villeria Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – TOTAL SEXUAL CRIMES (2014 – 2015)

Sector Boundaries
- Railway Station
- Railway
- Roads
- Villieria Police Station
- Police Stations

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villieria Police Precinct Data
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**Figure 5.58**

**VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT - PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME 2014 - 2015**

- Burglary at non-residential premises
- Burglary at residential premises
- Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle
- Theft out of or from motor vehicle
- Stock-theft

### March 2015

- Stock-theft: 0%
- Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 26%
- Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 18%
- Burglary at residential premises: 52%
- Burglary at non-residential premises: 3%

Source: Snyders, E. 2015 ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER SECTOR
2014-2015

ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER SECTOR - March 2015

AVERAGE PER ANNUM:
ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER SECTOR
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5.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The context analysis indicated the study area in a national, provincial, metropolitan and local context. Highlighting the relevant crime information, clearly indicates that within the South African context, the Gauteng province has the highest crime rates compared to the other eight provinces. Following, within the metropolitan context, the Villieria Police Precinct has fewer crime incidents (total number reported) and incidents per 100 000 people compared to the surrounding police precincts.

As indicated in Figure 5.66, representing contact crime incidents, most of the incidents occurred within Sector 3, for the month of March, representing 67% of all the contact crime incidents. Figure 5.67 graphically illustrates all contact crime indictments for Sector 2.

Property-related crime, as indicated in Figure 5.68 clearly indicates that property-related crime is more amongst Sector 2, representation 40% and Sector 1, representing 38% of all the property-related crimes for March 2015. Figure 5.69 graphically illustrates all crime indictments for Sector 2.

From the above analysis it is evident that on average Sector 2 has less crime incidents compared to Sector 3, although more crime incidents compared to Sector 1. Sector 3 has the most violent crime incidents, whilst Sector 1 has the most property-related crime incidents.

The Villieria Police Precinct has fewer crime incidents (all crime categories) per 100 000 people compared to the Brooklyn, Sunnyside and Pretoria Moot Police Precinct, although relatively more incidents compared to the Silverton and Eersterust Police Precincts. It is noted that the Villieria Police Precinct has the lowest number of contact crimes per 100 000 people, compared to the other precincts, with the Sunnyside Police Precinct having the most contact crime incidents per 100 000 people. Property-related crime per 100 000 is relatively diverse, with the Kameeldrift Police Precinct with the lowest number of incidents per 100 000, compared to the Sunnyside and Brooklyn Police Precincts with the highest number of property-related crime incidents per 100 000 people.

Overall, the Villieria Police Precinct, compared to the surrounding Police Precinct, has relatively less crime incidents, particularly less contact crime incidents but to some degree, more property-related crime incidents.
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Figure 5.67
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Figure 5.69
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CHAPTER 6: RESEARCH FINDINGS

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objective of this chapter is to:
- Unpack the findings of the community and relevant role player engagements with regards to the effect of crime and fear of crime on the physical environment and the influence thereof on a sense of place within the study area.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

To determine the state of crime and fear of crime, the influence thereof and the existence / nonexistence of a sense of community within the study area, interviews and focus groups were conducted with local law enforcement and related entities and with the local community, thereby gaining a holistic view of the study area. Reference will be made to some of the statistical data SAPS Villieria made available for analysis with regards to the current state of crime within the study area.

The main themes discussed in both the interviews and focus groups are as follow:

- The Current State of Crime and the Fear of Crime Within the Study Area
- The Influence of Crime and Fear of Crime on a Sense of Community
- The Influence of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment

Following is an overview of the findings which prevail from the interviews, focus groups and statistical information, highlighting a practical example of a mixed use method in research as discussed in Chapter 4.

6.2 THEME 1: THE CURRENT STATE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

Theme 1 is unpacked according to three sub-themes, namely the current state of crime, predominant crimes and “hot-spot’s” of crime within the study area. Figure 6.1 graphically illustrates the Sector 2 boundary and the study area delineation within sector 2.

6.2.1 CURRENT STATE OF CRIME

From the interviews conducted with the Community Liaison Members, it is apparent that they are of the opinion that crime within the study area is quite bad and concerning. The Private Security Companies indicated that criminals are relatively active within the study area, leading to a high incidence of crime which is concerning. One of the members of a Private

4 NOTE: The interview transcripts are included in Annexure B and the focus group transcripts are included in Annexure D.

5 Note: The statistical data analysed and presented within this chapter is for the Sector 2 demarcated area.
Figure 6.1

STUDY AREA WITHIN SECTOR 2

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015
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Security Company is of the opinion that although criminals are active within the area, crime incidents in the area are under control. Two out of three CPF Members confirmed the Community Liaison Members’ opinion that crime within the study area is bad and of grave concern, although one of the CPF Members is of the opinion that crime incidents within the study area are of average occurrence, compared to the other sectors.

The Police Members interviewed specifically referred to crime incidents as being very *intense* within the study area, especially over the past two years. The Trauma Troup Members interviewed, indicated that crime is not only bad and increasing within the area, but that the severity of the crimes is increasing, especially that of contact crimes. The above opinions of the local law enforcement and related parties are supported by Kruger & Landman’s (2008:75) observation, indicating that “the general feeling is that the crime situation is worsening” within South Africa.

From the focus group discussions, it is evident that most of the participants in all five focus groups have no idea of the state of crime within the study area; they feel safe, although still vigilant to some degree. One of the participants in focus group two, indicated that she has no fear of crime and does not spend any time concerning herself about crime. Due to the ignorance of the participants in relation to the current state of crime, crime in the study area is viewed as average, more or less in line with national crime trends. On the other hand, three participants (one in group 1, the other in group 3 and the last one in group 5) are part of the community radio program, and thus informed of the current state of crime within the study area. The informed community members view crime within the study area as very active, increasing, and therefore of great concern.

It is noted that numerous authors (e.g. Scarbrough *et al.*, 2010; Pitner *et al.*, 2012; Perkings, 1992; Kelling *et al.*, 1997; Gau & Pratt, 2010) highlight that community members’ awareness / observation of physical and social disorder within the built environments leads to a heightened sense of fear of crime. However, within this particular study, it is deduced from the focus groups that community members are oblivious to the current state of crime, be it consciously or unconsciously, and therefore experience no sense of fear of crime.

As indicated in *Figure 6.2*, the statistical data contradicts the perceived increase in crime as indicated by the local law enforcement and related parties. For the 12 month period, April 2014 to March 2015, the total crime incidents decreased within the Villieria precinct, calculated at approximately -0.1%, of which Sector 2 decreased by an average of -1.6%. The interviews were conducted July 2014 to September 2014. During this time period crime spiked within the Villieria precinct, the interviewee’s observation was thus confirmed by the statistical data. It is noted that Sector 2 on average, has less crime incidents however, compared to the other sectors, contact crime especially is lower.

It is noted that most (70.6%) of the law enforcement and related parties are of the opinion that community members are informed of the current state of crime within the study area by means of social media (Facebook...
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groups, Zello and WhatsApp groups) and the community radio system. This assumption by the law enforcement and related parties is highlighted as being misguided, as concluded from the community focus group sessions. The community is mostly unaware (76.2%) of the current state of crime.

Additionally, the law enforcement and related parties (88.2%) are of the opinion that community members are fearful of crime due to the following observations:

- Community members are fearful of crime mainly due to the national state of crime,
- Community is aware of crime through the community radio system and social media, and therefore fearful,
- The visible patrolling by security companies rendering services in the area heightens fear of crime,
- Due to the observation of high fences / electrical fences / barbwire / burglar bars etc. around houses for safety purposes, community members might be fearful of crime.

The above observation is in contradiction with the findings from the focus group sessions. Community members are aware of crime, due to the national crime situation fuelled by the media and therefore have taken the necessary precautionary measures (e.g. fences / electrical fences / burglar bars) but only two (9.5%) of the participants indicated living in fear of crime. It is noted that the participants who are fearful of crime had been victims of crime, with specific reference to contact crime.

The law enforcement and related parties who are of the opinion that community members do not live in fear of crime (11.8%) indicated the belief that community members firstly trust the security companies rendering services to the community to keep the neighbourhood safe (due to visibility of patrols), and secondly, due to a lack of information / ignorance on the prevalence of crime, members do not experience fear of crime.

As highlighted by Ceccato (2012:10) and Breetzke et al (2014:125), media plays a big role in fostering and increasing a fear of crime. This statement was supported by the focus group finding of community members indicating their fear of crime due to the national state of crime being portrayed by the media, but to a lesser extent being fearful of crime within their immediate area, due to ignorance.

What is of concern, stemming from the interviews with the local law enforcement and related parties is the apparent fact that most of the respondents (94.1%) are of the opinion that due to the current state of crime primarily within the study area and secondly nationally, community members should live in fear of crime.

6.2.2 PREDOMINANT CRIMES

In terms of the predominant crimes within the study area, the Community Liaison Members indicated that house robberies (to a lesser extent), house burglaries, theft of motor vehicles, theft out of motor vehicles...
represent most of the crime incidents within the study area (with the last three types of crime incidents mentioned, all representing property-related crimes). The CPF and Police members, as well as the community liaison members, indicated the same predominant crimes with the inclusion of drugs.

The Police members are very concerned regarding drug dealing within the study area, as two drug houses are located within the study area. Additionally, drugs are being sold to the school children attending schools (primary and secondary) within the study area.

The Private Security Members interviewed also identified house robberies, house burglaries, theft of motor vehicles, theft out of motor vehicles and drugs as the dominant crimes within the study area. In addition, one of the Private Security Members indicated that cable theft was increasing. The Trauma Troup members concurred with the five predominant crimes within the study area, but also indicated that they had a number of family violence and sexual assault incidents within the study area.

Due to the ignorance of community members with regards to the current state of crime within the study area, no predominant crime was identified by the community members. Participants however indicated isolated incidents - for example: a respondent from focus group 1 one, indicated she was aware of a motor vehicle having been stolen from a neighbour’s property; a respondent from focus group 2 two, indicated she was aware of a motor vehicle being stolen from her complex due to the main gate being left open; a respondent from focus group 5 five, indicated because her property is located next to the stream (open space system) it is a target; a second respondent from focus group 5 five, indicated a motor vehicle had been stolen from their property and that their neighbour had been murdered many years before. Overall, most of the crime incidents related to theft of motor vehicles and house robberies (with the one historic murder incident).

Comparing the interview and focus group findings with the statistical data, as indicated in Figure 6.3 to Figure 6.5, is clear that property-related crimes (54% of all crime incidents – March 2015) is the most severe within Sector 2, confirming the indication of burglaries at residential premises (58% - March 2015), theft out of, or from motor vehicles (23% - March 2015) and theft of motor vehicles or motorcycles (19% - March 2015) as the dominant crimes.

Although the local law enforcement and related parties identified drugs and related activities to be a big concern within Sector 2, Colonel Alberts (2014) explained that it is very difficult to arrest individuals for the crime unless they are in possession of the illegal item. Drug related crimes therefore fall under the Crime Detected As A Result Of Police Action category – representing merely 8% of all crime incidents – March 2015.
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6.2.3 “HOT-SPOTS” OF CRIME

All the members interviewed (with the exclusion of the Trauma Troup members) are of the opinion that there are hot-spots of crime within the study area, with certain crimes linked to the various hot-spots. It was indicated though that it should be noted that the hot-spots change over time, as criminals’ modus operandi changes.

The corresponding hot-spots identified by the Community Liaison Members include the Queens Corner Shopping Centre, along the railway line, close to the N1 freeway and along the main movement streets (for example Nico Smit Street, Soutpansberg Road and CR Swart Road). According to the Community Liaison Members, the main movement spines link up with the exit / escape routes out of the study area. The CPF members identified Queens Corner Shopping Centre, along the railway line and close to the N1 freeway hot-spots of crime. Additionally two of the CPF members alluded to the drug houses operational within the study area, and drug dealing within the parks.

The Police members are in agreement with the Community Liaison and the CPF members, with strong emphasis on the drug related hot-spots. The Private Security members confirmed the crime hot-spots as identified above, with the inclusion of the stream (open space system) area.

Due to the type and nature of the crime incidents to which the Trauma Troop members respond, no crime hot-spots were identified by them. According to the Trauma Troup members, the crime incidents to which they respond are scattered throughout the study area.

Figure 6.6 graphically illustrates the escape / exit routes as identified / indicated by the local law enforcement and related parties.

No hot-spots of crime were identified by the focus group participants (community members) due to fact that most of the respondents are unaware of crime incidents within the area.

According to Kruger & Landman (2008:84) “people best know the areas where they live and / or work and these people are often in the best position to point out where particular crime problems are experienced”. It became clear however from the interviews and focus groups that the local law enforcement and related parties who mainly work in the area, are aware of hot-spots of crime, whereas in contrast, local residents who stay in the area are totally unaware of any hot-spot of crime.

From the graphical representation (Figure 6.7 to Figure 6.9) of all the crime incidents from the time period April 2014 to March 2015 on heat maps, the hot-spots of crime are clearly visible. Most of the crime incidents (for all crime categories – Figure 6.7) are recorded at Queen’s Corner, due to the number of property-related crimes (theft out of, or from motor vehicles and theft of motor vehicles or motorcycles) at the centre. Some secondary hot sports are noted along the main movement spines.
STUDY AREA – IDENTIFIED ESCAPE / EXIT ROUTES

Escape rout to Mamelodi / Eastlynne
Escape rout to Steve Biko Road
Escape rout to CBD
Escape rout to Hatfield
Escape rout onto N1

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015 © University of Pretoria
Figure 6.7

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015
ex Villiera Police Precinct Data

© University of Pretoria
Figure 6.9
Source: Atkinson, A. 2015
ex Villieria Police Precinct Data
© University of Pretoria
Contact crime hot-spots (Figure 6.8) are identified at Queens Corner and at the on- and off-ramps of the N1 at Stormvoel Road. A secondary hot-spot is identified in close proximity to the Villieria police station. These incidents are linked to a bar/tavern located adjacent to the police station. As indicated in Figure 6.9, property-related crime is dominant at Queen’s Corner and along the main movement network.

The inverse to Kruger & Landman (2008:84) observation is also noted. Criminals who have mental maps (awareness space), of a given area know the easy/soft targets and related escape routes, and thus hot-spots of crime are established, in many instances by criminal syndicates and re-occurring criminals (Bower et al., 2014:553; Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:10).

To gain a better understanding of the total number of incidents per identified hot-spot area, buffer areas were included along the N1 freeway (500m), the railway line (500m), main roads (250m), parks and open space system (150m) and the shopping nodes (300m). It is noted that insurance companies levy a higher monthly fee to households located within a 500m radius from a railway line.

From the corresponding statistical analysis, (Figure 6.10) most of all the crime incidents (60%) for the time period April 2014 to March 2015 are located within the main road (250m) buffer, this confirms the interviewee’s opinion that the main roads are target/hot-spot area as the main roads provide easy access to escape/exit route. Figure 6.11 to Figure 6.15 graphically illustrates all crime incidents per buffer areas.

The railway line (500m) buffer represents 46% of all crime incidents within the study area, also confirming the interviewee’s opinion that the railway line is an easy escape/exit route. In terms of the N1 freeway (500m) buffer, 26% of all the crime incidents occurred within close proximity to the N1 which is also viewed as an escape route.

The aforementioned findings are supported by the statement of Ceccato (2012:19) indicating that “areas that are highly accessible (served by arterial roads, railways, bus routes) can be more susceptible to crime”.

The parks and along the stream/open space areas (150m), although only identified by 16.7% of respondents as hot-spot areas, according to the statistical data 29% of all crime incidents occur within 150m of the parks and stream/open space areas. The high number of criminal incidents occurring within the parks and open spaces are concerning, as highlighted by Iqbal & Ceccato (2015:1) “parks [and open spaces] that is a magnet for crime and disorder becomes deemed an unsafe place”, which in turn leads to the avoidance of the parks and open spaces, especially after dark (Nasar & Fisher, 1993:198).

In terms of the shopping nodes (300m), although Queen’s Corner was identified as the predominant hot-spot, 27% of all the crime incidents are recorded for all three shopping nodes located within the study area. The
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shopping nodes are targeted in terms of property-related crime, primarily theft out of, or from motor vehicles and theft of motor vehicles or motorcycles. **Figure 6.16 to Figure 6.27** indicate the contact crime and property-related crime breakdown per buffer area.

The above findings are in line with the observation of Reynald & Elffers (2009:26) that “the physical design and layout of urban living environments are a principal factor that determinate why some places are more vulnerable to crime than others.”

With the hot-spots of crime identified, analysing the land use per buffer zone might shed some light on the crime situation. Jacobs (1961:31) acknowledged the relationship between “different combinations of land uses and crime” whilst Brantingham & Brantingham (1993:17) concurred with Jacobs stating that the physical clustering of certain land uses can attract crime.

Therefore **Figure 6.28 to Figure 30** indicates the land use associated with the main transport corridors - the railway line, N1 freeway and main movement spines.

From Figure 6.28 it is evident that most of the land use within the national road (N1) buffer is residential with some institutional and special (retail) land uses. The properties located directly adjacent to the N1 is primarily residential of nature. This land use observation correlates with the identified main type of crimes (Figure 6.23), which is burglary at residential premises.

Figure 6.29 indicates the land use along the railway line. Within the railway line buffer the main land use is residential, special (retail) and a large industrial area. The main type of crime (Figure 6.24) associated with the railway line is burglary at residential premises and theft out of or from motor vehicles.

The land use along the main movement spines is indicated in Figure 30. It is evident that the main land use along the main movement spines is residential, special (retail), industrial and government. The main type of crimes (Figure 6.25) associated with the main movement spines are theft of motor vehicles or motorcycles and theft out of or from motor vehicles.

From the above brief land uses analysis, it is evident that certain land uses associated with certain transport corridors attract specific types of crime.

**6.2.4 CONCLUDING THEME 1**

In comparing the final results from the three data gathering strategies pertaining to Theme 1 (current state of crime and fear of crime within the study area) it is evident that the majority of local law enforcements and related parties are of the opinion that crime is prevalent within the study area and concerning, which is supported by the statistical data. The community members on the other hand are oblivious / unaware of the
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### SECTOR 2 - PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME INCIDENTS PER BUFFER AREA 2014 – 2015

#### Source:
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#### Figure 6.22

**SECTOR 2 - PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME INCIDENTS PER BUFFER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buffer</th>
<th>Burglary at non-residential premises</th>
<th>Burglary at residential premises</th>
<th>Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle</th>
<th>Theft out of or from motor vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1 Buffer (500m)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Line Buffer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Roads Buffer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Buffer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Node Buffer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTOR 2 - PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME INCIDENTS**

- **N1 Buffer (500m)**
  - Stock-theft: 0%
  - Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 38%
  - Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 12%
  - Burglary at residential premises: 49%
  - Burglary at non-residential premises: 1%

- **Railway Line Buffer (500m)**
  - Stock-theft: 0%
  - Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 29%
  - Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 19%
  - Burglary at residential premises: 46%
  - Burglary at non-residential premises: 6%

**SECTOR 2 - PROPERTY-RELATED CRIME INCIDENTS**

- **Main Roads Buffer (250m)**
  - Stock-theft: 0%
  - Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 40%
  - Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 27%
  - Burglary at residential premises: 29%
  - Burglary at non-residential premises: 4%

- **Open Space Buffer (150m)**
  - Stock-theft: 0%
  - Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 32%
  - Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 23%
  - Burglary at residential premises: 43%
  - Burglary at non-residential premises: 2%

- **Shopping Node Buffer (300m)**
  - Stock-theft: 0%
  - Theft out of or from motor vehicle: 40%
  - Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle: 34%
  - Burglary at residential premises: 22%
  - Burglary at non-residential premises: 4%
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current state of crime within the study area, although they do not live in fear of crime (as the main fear of crime generator is linked to contact crime); they are aware of the national crime situation and therefore vigilant and attentive to their surroundings.

In terms of the predominant crimes within the study area, confirmed by all three data gathering strategies, house burglaries, theft of motor vehicles and theft out of motor vehicles (all property-related), are the predominant crimes within the study area, while, the local law enforcements and related parties are of the opinion that there are hot-spots of crime within the study area with certain crimes linked to the various hot-spots. The identified hot spots were supported by the heat-maps and buffer analysis based on the statistical data.

6.3 THEME 2: THE INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON A SENSE OF COMMUNITY

Theme 2 only has relation to the focus groups (community members), as the law enforcement and related parties do not necessarily reside within the study area and can therefore not relate to a sense of place.

Theme 2 is unpacked according to two sub-themes, namely the importance of a sense of place within the study area and the influence of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place.

6.3.1 IMPORTANCE OF A SENSE OF PLACE (SOCIAL ASPECTS)

NOTE: The community referred to sense of community and not sense of place, therefore the following section referees to sense of community although it touches on the social aspects as identified within the sense of place theory.

First and foremost, the focus group participants made it clear that at minimum, one should know one’s neighbours, as most of the participants do. Focus group 1 one indicated that the participants know their neighbours and other than immediate neighbours, even additional residents located in a wider area. A participant also indicated knowing the basic routine of a neighbour to the point of immediately being able to identify something out of place. Two of the participants concurred however, that due to the high walls / fences they do not communicate with their neighbours as much as they would like to do. Overall, the focus group members agreed that they know their neighbours and their basic routines and keep an eye open on their behalf.

In focus group 2 two, most of the participants also knew their immediate neighbours and some additional residents within their street / block. One participant indicated she had been staying within the area for more than 40 years and knew all her neighbours and additional members within her street / block, although she values her privacy and does not communicate with them in the street / over the fences. Another participant in focus group 2 two indicated that amongst the residents within their street, they have a
whistle initiative, whereby all residents within the street own a whistle and if an individual is in trouble or fearful of something, the individual can blow on the whistle to make the neighbours attentive to their situation whereby they could respond accordingly. Although the members participating in the whistle initiative do not all know each other personally, due to the overall sense of community, they are willing to assist their fellow neighbours. Lastly, one of the participants, residing in a block of flats, also indicated knowing the neighbours and being able to identify most of the permanent residents within the flats. Most of the participants of focus group 2 two were in agreement that they look out for their neighbours, although they are not personally involved in each other’s lives.

From focus group 3 three, it was clear that the participants almost felt compelled to know their neighbours and to look out for them. One participant indicated it is important to have personal relationships with your neighbours, supported by another participant, who indicated that one should have a positive relationship with your neighbour so that one could feel comfortable enough to ask for assistance, for example to look after one’s house and pets whilst one is away on holiday. Overall, most of the participants were in an agreement that neighbours should know one another and have positive relationships.

Focus group 4 four’s participants indicated that they mostly know their neighbours and feel it is important. One of the participants indicated she had been residing within the area for a number of years with the same neighbours, and over the years they had installed a gate between their properties to have easy access to one another’s property. On the other hand, another participant indicated that the neighbouring property was rented with a constant change in renters, with the result of not knowing them. Additionally, the participant indicated that due to the constant flux in renters, a feeling of vulnerability existed in terms of possible crime emanating from that particular property. Overall, the participants know their neighbours and are of the opinion it is important to know neighbours.

From focus group 5 five it was clear that most of the participants knew their neighbours. One participant indicated that she had moved into a security complex a few years before and due to the high walls it was very difficult to get to know the neighbours. Another participant indicated that the residents within their particular street, would arrange an annual “street braai” to touch base with fellow residents, during which opportunity to learn more from the residents than just being “your neighbour”. Overall, these focus group participants concluded that they knew their neighbours and additional members in their street / block.

From the above sense of community analysis, it is evident that the community members participating in this particular study feel a sense of community due to the social connections they have with neighbouring community members and the sense of guardianship expressed towards their neighbours, thus enforcing a positive sense of place (Pain, 2000:370). This is supported by Francis et al, (2012:401) whose observation is that community members experience a sense of community when “community members have a sense of belonging, a feeling that
members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to each other. Although personal relationships are highly valued by most of the participants, it is apparent that due to the high walls and fences it is difficult to maintain an open line of communication with neighbours (referring to the “old” days of quickly having a few words from across the yards with neighbours).

6.3.2 INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON A SENSE OF COMMUNITY

From the focus group analysis it became clear that most of the participants are of the opinion that it is not crime and fear of crime influencing a sense of community, but the overall rushed lifestyle of individuals.

One of the participants in focus group 1 one indicated that she is of the opinion that it is not due to crime and fear of crime that neighbours do not communicate with one another, but it is due to limited time. A second participant of focus group 1 one supported the opinion, indicating that fences/walls are just a convenient excuse not to communicate with your neighbours.

The members of focus group 2 two were mostly of the opinion that it is due to new technology and other forms of communication, that neighbours do not communicate in person any more, not due to crime and fear of crime. Additionally, one member indicated that due to the rat-race, she has no time to communicate with her neighbours. She would rather send a quick SMS / WhatsApp. Overall, the participants did not feel that crime and fear of crime is influencing a sense of community.

Focus group 3 three’s participants, had similar opinions. One participant indicated that due to the responsibilities and rushed lifestyle of the young people, they do not communicate frequently, although she does not take offence at the lack of communication with her neighbours. Additionally, she indicated that should the need arise, she would feel comfortable to contact them at any time. One participant indicated that the high walls do detract from communication with neighbours, but do not negatively affect the overall sense of community.

Focus group 4 four has a strong sense of “alienation” due to the high walls and fences. Compared to the other focus groups, this particular group put a lot of emphasis on the high walls and fences that limit and detract from free unhindered communication with neighbours which does foster a sense of community. The participants indicated that they arrange to meet formally with their neighbours, over coffee, to reinforce / strengthen the sense of community lost due to the walls / fences.

The participants from focus group 5 five had mixed opinions. One participant preferred to have high fences in terms of privacy preferences, with no correlation to any effect on a sense of community. Two participants indicated that the high walls and fences detract from easy access to neighbours, but alternatively, the “street braai” helped to strengthen a
sense of community. One participant indicated that it was not due to the crime and fear of crime, but the rushed lifestyle of individuals, that neighbours did not communicate as much.

It is noted that within this study, community members’ opinion, contradict the opinion of Muniz (2011:334), Gau& Pratt (2010:763) and Kelling & Coles, 1997:7) in terms of the influence of fear of crime on community members. The aforementioned authors are of the opinion that crime and disorder are the primary causes for community members to retreat into their homes due to fear of crime, Kelling & Coles (1997:2) clearly state “don’t get involved”! Community members within this particular study however, indicated that it is because of the overall rushed lifestyle of individuals that community members “retreat” into their homes, and not due to fear of crime.

6.3.3 CONCLUDING THEME 2

Most of the participants are of the opinion that it is important to know your neighbours and additional residents within the street / block, as these connections foster a sense of community. Furthermore, community members should have positive relationships with neighbours and look out for one another (guardianship) as this reinforces a sense of place (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:19). The connections, relationships and expressed guardianship are critical in the fostering of a sense of community, which in turn forms the basis for informal social control networks and the establishment of a defensible space (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:28).

In terms of the influence of crime and fear of crime on a sense of community, it is evident that most of the participants are of the opinion that crime and fear of crime does not have a direct effect on a sense of community. Most of the participants indicated that due to their rushed lifestyles, people have limited interaction. It is highlighted that the high walls and fences detract from free and unhindered communication; however it does not influence the overall sense of community. A limited number of respondents however were of the opinion that due to crime and fear of crime, high walls and fences were erected and that this subsequently therefore deters communication between neighbours and thus negatively influences a sense of community.

6.4 THEME 3: THE INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (AND A SENSE OF PLACE)

Theme 3 is unpacked according to three sub-themes, namely the influence of crime and fear of crime on the built environment and a sense of place, current physical elements utilised as crime prevention mechanisms and proposed physical interventions as future crime prevention mechanisms.
6.4.1 INFLUENCE OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND A SENSE OF PLACE

From the interviews conducted, it’s clear that the Community Liaison Members are of the opinion that crime and fear of crime has an influence on how and when community members utilise the built environment. One respondent indicated that he observed that community members utilise the area during the day; they would walk, cycle and jog in the area, but not at night. Even during the day, certain areas will not be used e.g. near railway line. Another respondent indicated that individuals who have been victims of crime (e.g. muggings, will not utilise the area at all and become very isolated.

The CPF members had a similar view to the Community Liaison Members, indicating that due to crime and fear of crime, community members only utilise the built environment during the day. One respondent indicated that he had observed a significant decrease of community members walking / running / cycling in the area and / or visiting the local parks over the past few years.

The SAPS and Private security firm members are of the same mind, indicating that crime and fear of crime has led to the withdrawal of community members from the streets, especially at night. One may observe community members walking / running / cycling in the area during the day, although avoiding areas near to the railway line and the stream area (open space system). One private security member indicated that he had observed that community members “arm” themselves when they go walking / jogging / cycling within the area – by means of pepper spray, a chain, charka-sticks, “kieries”, and mostly commonly accompanied by a dog.

The Trauma Troops supported the opinions of the Community Liaison Members, stating that community members utilise the area during the day - they would walk, cycle and jog in the area, but not at night. Additionally they indicated that individuals who had been victims of crime would not utilise the area at all, they preferred to stay indoors and therefore become very isolated.

From focus group 1 one it is evident that crime and fear of crime has an effect on how and when community members utilise the built environment. Community members indicated that they only utilise the built environment during the day, walking, jogging, and cycling. One participant indicated that she is not fearful of crime, but as a precautionary measure due to the current state of crime nationally, she will not walk within the area (during the day) without having her pepper spray with her.

Focus group 2 two had a slightly different view, focusing on the night time when community members do not feel comfortable to utilise the built environment. Two of the participants were of the opinion that due to load shedding, crime and fear of crime is heightened – darkness foster a sense of fear.
The participants of focus group 3 three held similar opinions to the participants of focus group 1 one, indicating that community members to some extent still utilise the study area during the day, but not at night. One participant indicated that she walked her children to school, as she felt it is not safe for them the walk the 3 blocks alone. A second participant, living close to an old age home, had ten years ago observed the elderly walking past going to the shopping centre a few blocks away, but not anymore. According to the participant, the elderly are easy targets for criminals. Another participant indicated that currently she is too fearful of crime to walk her dogs alone in the area, even during the day.

Focus group 5 five had mixed opinions. Some participants indicated they would walk / jog / cycle in the area during the day, whilst others felt that due to the high fences and walls they were no longer visible on the street, and therefore felt unsafe and would not utilise the study area at all.

From the above analysis it is evident that the local law enforcement and related parties observe community members utilising the area during the day, although some community members are clearly fearful and will not walk / jog / cycle within the area (not even to mention utilising the parks). The local law enforcement and related parties and the community members are in agreement that due to crime, and fear of crime, the study area is not utilised at night. Crime and fear of crime thus leads to avoidance behaviour in terms of limiting community members’ movement outside of their homes and thus negatively influencing a sense of place (Perkings et al, 1992:22; Plain 2000:370).

The local law enforcement and related parties and the community members opinions are supported by the finding of Ceccato, (2012:19) indicating that crime and fear of crime have an effect on the social life of communities due to changed patterns in the utilisation of the built environment. Crime and fear of crime enforces avoidance behaviour which leads to limited social interaction, diminishing social cohesion and limits physical activities. Crime and fear of crime thus enforces a diminishing sense of place as it restricts community interaction and limits the utilisation of the built environment, in turn influencing community members’ mental health and well-being (Lorenc et al, 2012:758; Lorenc et al, 2012:759; Plain 2000:370).

Overall, analysing the statistical SAPS data, most of the crime incidents occur during the day (67%), and not at night (33%) as most community members fear (Figure 6.31 and Figure 6.32). Although it is noted that in terms of contact crime, the murder and attempted murder recorded for the time period April 2014 to March 2015 both occurred during the night (18:00-06:00). Figure 6.33 to Figure 6.34 graphically illustrates the day / night split in terms of all the crime incidents.

The community members’ elevated fear of crime, related to night time, is supported by Painter’s (1996:193) observation that darkness adds to “the potential risk and heightened fear for personal safety”. On the other hand, light (even adequate street lighting) is viewed as a “psychological deterrent to offenders” Painter (1996:193).
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The load shedding data, received from the City of Tshwane, could not be meaningfully compared to the SAPS Villiera Crime data due to the limited data available. Most of the load shedding occurred during the month of April 2014 / May 2015, for which no corresponding SAPS data is available. From the load shedding data however, it is apparent that the study area experienced load shedding between 20:00 and 22:00 in the evenings. For the month of April, the study area experienced load shedding 9 out of the 31 days of the month and during the month of May, the study area experienced load shedding 16 out of the 31 days of the month.

Additional information regarding the Day / Night, Time Category and Day of the Week split is included in Annexure G.

6.4.2 CURRENT PHYSICAL ELEMENTS UTILISED AS CRIME PREVENTION MECHANISMS

From the interviews conducted, it’s clear that the Community Liaison Members are of the opinion that at minimum, in terms of physical crime prevention element, burglar bars, fences, walls, electrical fencing, alarms and dogs are a must. Additionally, one respondent suggested the inclusion of CCTV systems, whilst another alluded to the inclusion of proper lighting as a crime prevention element.

The CPF and SAPS members, supported the suggestions of the Community Liaison Members, indicating the need for burglar bars, fences, walls, electrical fencing, alarms and dogs. Additionally one CPF member alluded to the community radio program as a good crime prevention mechanism. One of the SAPS respondents indicated that walls are not an optimal crime prevention element. Due to impermeability of the walls, they cannot see what is happening behind the wall, thus affecting their work and the safety of the SAPS members if there is a need to enter such a property.

The Private Security members indicated that most of the properties which they patrol, have burglar bars, fences, walls, electrical fencing and in some instances, dogs. One private security member indicated that it is important to have small dogs inside the house at night which can make alarm should there be an intruder and big dogs, outside, to catch the intruder. Another private security member indicated that it is important to have a motorized gate, so that community members do not need to get out of their vehicles to open a gate (especially at night) and so to lessen the opportunity for a possible high-jacking.

The Trauma Troops supported the suggestions of the CPF and SAPS members, indicating the need for burglar bars, fences, walls, electrical fencing, alarms and dogs as physical crime prevention elements.

The participants from focus group 1 one, all indicated that they have burglar bars as means of a physical barrier to deter criminal activity. One participant indicated having a double set of burglar bars, one set on the outside and the other set inside of the house. Another participant indicated that beams in the garden are a good add on to a security system.
Focus group 2 two indicated, in addition to burglar bars, that high fences are important, although the fences should be permeable, allowing for the residents to observe what is happening in the street, and vice versa, for passers-by in the street to be able to observe what is happening behind the fence. Other participants indicated they only have a low fence on the property boundary, which they prefer, as they are able to observe the street and individuals passing by.

Most of the participants from focus group 3 three indicated, that over time they had added (higher) boundary fences and motorized gates. One participant indicated that he had added barbed wire fencing at the back of his property, preventing "jumpers" from passing through his property.

The focus group 4 four participants were of one mind. The participants indicated that they all have palisade fencing for permeability reasons, dogs, and are members of private security firms. One participant indicated considering adding a CCTV system to his property, to be able to view the property through remotes during the day, for any suspicious movement.

The participants from focus group 5 five indicated that they all have high fences, burglar bars, alarm systems and dogs. One participant confirmed being part of the community radio program, and keeping her radio with her at all times. Another participant indicated having beams in the garden which are linked to the alarm system and numerous panic buttons throughout the house.

From the above analysis it is evident that the community members are vigilant and have taken the necessary precautionary measures to add to their personal safety, including physical crime prevention elements (barriers) such as high fences, burglar bars, barbed wire, electrical motor gates and CCTV systems, all elements identified by the local law enforcement and related parties. The findings are in line with Reynald,& Elffers’ (2009:28) observations that “physical barriers would reduce both crime and fear of crime in residential areas”. The physical barriers are thus a form of target hardening.

Additionally, the community members feel it is valuable to be a member of a private security firm connected to an alarm system with beams in the garden, and to have dogs. The local law enforcement and related parties alluded to the fact that walls are not an optimal crime prevention element and to some degree hamper crime prevention.

6.4.3 PROPOSED PHYSICAL INTERVENTIONS AS FUTURE CRIME PREVENTION MECHANISMS

This section deals with additional physical precautionary mechanisms to prevent crime incidents on two levels, the first being on a personal property related level, and the second on a broader study area wide level.
PERSONAL SAFETY

The local law enforcement respondents were all of the opinion that at minimum, the following elements should be included as home owners’ crime prevention precautionary measures:

- Palisade fences
- Burglar bars.

Some of the Community Liaison members indicated electrical fencing and CCTV cameras as additional crime prevention mechanisms to be considered by home owners. The CPF members highlighted the inclusion of an alarm system linked to armed response, whilst the Private Security company members indicated the relevance of automated motor gates. The SAPS and Trauma Troops reiterated that dogs are a must – a small dog inside the house and large dogs outside, patrolling the yard.

Additionally most of the local law enforcement respondents were of the opinion that community participation is key in crime prevention, linking up with the CPF crime prevention initiatives (e.g. community radio project).

Krahmann (2008:382) supports the opinion of the local law enforcement and related parties by indicating that “rather attempting to deal with, and remove the causes of a threat, security [initiatives] based on deterrence seeks to hold off a threat from becoming an actuality”. Whereby, the main deterrence of crime is active community involvement, visible policing etc.

From focus group 1 one it is clear the most of the participants are of the opinion that no additional physical interventions can be made to their properties - fences, burglar bars and dogs are sufficient. One participant indicated as a last resort, one could install a CCTV camera system / nanny watchers’ system, whereby one can remotely, via a cell phone, access the video feed from one’s property and view what’s going on while you are not there.

The focus group 2 participants held similar points of view to that of focus group 1 one, confirming that no additional physical interventions would make them feel any safer. One participant reiterated that community members should be vigilant and look out for one another.

The focus group 3 three and 4 four participants concurred with the other focus groups, indicating that no additional physical interventions would keep criminals out. One participant indicated that the police should have more focused “clean-up” actions and remove all street-traders and homeless from the open space areas. Another participant indicated that she is armed and would advise other community members to arm themselves to protect their families. One participant indicated that it is not only very important to know your neighbour, but to have their contact information.

Focus group 5 was also of the opinion that no additional physical interventions are needed in terms of personal safety. One participant indicated that community participation is important in crime prevention and
not physical elements as they are alienating the community. Another participant indicated that fences merely create a false sense of safety. One participant reinforced the opinion of a participant in focus group 3 three indicating that she and her husband are armed and will use their weapons as needed to protect their loved ones, additionally advising other members to arm themselves as well.

The physical barriers community members indicated (palisade fencing, burglar bars, electrical fencing, etc.) are target hardening elements identified and encouraged to be utilised by Zinn (2010) in terms of personal safety measures, although, as highlighted by Kruger (2005:8) in support of the community members’ opinion, “environmental design interventions are only appropriate to address particular crime types in particular locations”.

➢ STUDY AREA WIDE INTERVENTIONS

It was found that all of the Community Liaison members are of the opinion that no physical interventions in terms of the broader study area would assist in crime prevention. One respondent proposed the inclusion of CCTV cameras within the study area, focused on the main entries to the study area.

The CPF members were in agreement with the Community Liaison members who indicated that no physical interventions would assist in crime prevention. One respondent alluded to the value of community awareness and participation in crime prevention. Another CPF member indicated that there is a definite lack in community patrols within sector 2 which could assist in crime prevention (visible policing). Additionally, the member referred to the value of the Broken Windows theory, by keeping the study area clean and well-kept, will deter criminals from entering the area.

The SAPS members were all in agreement, echoing the opinions of the other law enforcement related parties that no additional physical interventions would assist in crime prevention. One SAPS member specifically, indicated that in her opinion, crime is a social ill, due to unemployment and hunger and can therefore not be addressed by means of physical interventions. Another SAPS member indicated that stricter immigration laws would assist in crime prevention – the SAPS member alluded to this as according to SAPS the study area has an influx of Nigerians who are linked to drug trafficking, operating from within the study area. During final discussions with Colonel Alberts (2015) he confirmed that the Nigerians have since been forced to move.

Most of the Private Security members indicated that no additional physical interventions should be included within the study area. Two of the respondents indicated that the fencing of the N1, the railway line and the stream area only hindered active crime pursuits and prevention.

The aforementioned observations are supported by Landman (2012:252) indicating that “fortification measures … alter movement patterns of the
city, obstruct emergency access by police and ambulances and place an
unplanned burden on infrastructure such as roads”.

The Trauma Troops were of one mind, indicating no physical interventions
would assist in crime prevention. They felt that crime is a social ill and
needs other intervention as opposed to physical barriers.

The focus group 1 one participants, indicated no physical interventions in
terms of the broader study area, would help in crime prevention. One
participant indicated community members driving patrols should have
some sort of branding to identify themselves. Another participant referred
to the importance of community structures (know your neighbour). One
participant indicated that the inclusion of security guard “huts” at the main
entrances to the study area might add value. One participant indicated that
community members need to be informed of the current state of crime to
be able to respond accordingly.

Focus group 2 two was of the opinion that booms would add value to
securing the study area. Two participants indicated the importance of
knowing / understanding the current state of crime within the area. One
participant indicated that to gain a holistic community attitude to crime
prevention, one should start small and “mobilize” one’s neighbours in the
street, and then the next street, and then the entire block. Another
participant indicated crime is religious / culturally based and thus a social
ill which cannot be addressed by means of physical interventions.

Focus groups 3 three, to 5 five, shared the opinion that no physical
interventions in terms of the broader area would help in crime prevention.
One participant indicated that booms hinder the easy and free movement
within the area and would hinder emergency personnel from entering the
area. Another participant indicated that it is a nuisance for guests to sign in /
out at booms to visit within the area, and therefore not needed. Overall,
the participants agreed that better social structures need to be in place for
neighbours to be able to assist each other in crime prevention.

Bower, et al, (2014:550) supports the opinions of the local law
enforcement and the community members, affirming that in “over 30 year
of research on this topic, referred to as crime displacement [by means of
target hardening], suggests that crime relocates in only a minority of
instances” and is therefore not the solution to crime prevention within the
built environment. Landman (2012:250), resonating the community
members opinions, alludes to the fact that “urban spaces [are] not only
controlled physically but also through social control of space” highlighting
the importance of social structures within communities to ensure
ownership (a sense of territoriality) of a given neighbourhood and in turn
community participation in crime prevention (Moran & Dolphin, 1986:399;
Perkings et al, 1992"22). The ownership / control displayed by means of
the social structures within communities form symbolic barriers “which do
not physically restrict entry into an area [but] psychologically conveying the
message of private or restricted access” (Reynald & Elffers, 2009:28).
6.4.4 CONCLUDING THEME 3

It is noted that most of the community members are of the opinion that no additional physical interventions in relation to personal precautionary measures and the broader study area would keep criminals out. It is softer issues in terms of community structures / relationships that need to be in place to ensure the communal safety of all.

Additionally, most of the law enforcement and related parties were of the opinion that little additional physical interventions in terms of personal safety can be included in home owners’ crime prevention attempts. The law enforcement and related parties indicated that physical barriers hinder active crime pursuits and preventions, and therefore no additional physical elements should be included in the study areas as crime prevention initiatives. Most of the law enforcement and related parties alluded to the fact that crime is a social ill and not a physically stoppable occurrence. According to Bower, et al, (2014:552) active crime prevention will inevitably have a direct effect on the displacement of crime, not physical structures.

6.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the finding chapter, it is evident that the community members are oblivious to crime within the study area, although fearful of victimisation due to the national state of crime. The local law enforcement and related parties are concerned regarding the current state of crime within the study area, and are of the opinion that community members should be fearful. The primary hot-spots of crime are associated with the main structuring elements within the study area, consisting of the N1 freeway, the railway line and the main movement network. Additionally, the shopping nodes are identified crime generators.

Community members are of the opinion that it is very important to know one’s neighbours, emphasising the importance of a sense of community. Physical developments (e.g. walls, burglar-bars etc.) in response to crime and fear of crime, do not influence a sense of community and community interaction. Through technology, neighbours still communicate (not over the boundary wall as in the “old days”).

It is acknowledged that the local law enforcement and related parties and community members are of the opinion that no additional physical interventions will assist in crime prevention. Community participation and a sense of community are central to crime prevention.

The principles of the Crime Prevention Though Environment Design (CPTED) approach are to some degree visible within the study area, and alluded to by the focus group and interviewed participants.

In terms of surveillance and visibility it is noted that community members should be vigilant, the eyes and ears of the police. Additionally, proper lighting is important as community members will, as a rule, not
utilise the built environment in the dark. Poorly lit areas pose an opportunity for victimization.

**Territoriality and defensible space**: relate to a strong sense of community, whereby community members take ownership of their area (in some instances only a street or block) to ensure that a specific area is safe and that strangers acknowledge the community presence and that they are unwelcome.

Within the context of this study, the **access and escape routes** are viewed as negative elements, as they are utilised primarily by criminals to escape from the study area. Specific initiatives need to be developed to ensure better control at the access and escape routes.

**Image and aesthetics** play a crucial role in crime prevention. Community members clearly highlighted the effect of vacant land and the open space system being un-kempt in terms of being crime generators. Due to this, numerous community, CPF and local law enforcement activities / actions have been developed to deal with un-kempt properties and opens spaces. Overall, the study area is well-kept with individual home owners taking pride in their properties' appearance, parks are maintained and the shopping nodes are clean of litter.

Individual home owners have included numerous **target hardening** elements to their properties, including high walls, burglar-bars, electrical fencing, etc., to keep criminals at bay. Within the broader study area, no additional target hardening elements are required, as the local law enforcement and related parties indicated, fencing / booming the study area will only hamper their crime prevention and emergency services mandate.

**Study Area Specific Planning Implications**

The City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality could consider investing in the following study area based crime prevention initiatives:

- Provide additional lighting to the parks and opens space within the study area, high mask light would be advantageous at the open space area.
- Provide paved paths (with lighting) throughout the open space system with seating to attract community members.
- Consider the development of a hard / soft interactive area / space within the open space system.
- Some community public art elements could be considered at the shopping nodes, parks and open space system.
- The grass along the railway line, at the opens space system and parks need to be cut on a regular basis.
- Homeless people living under the bridges at the open space system need to be relocated.
- A clean up initiative in conjunction with the “Friends of the Colbyn Wetland” and community members to clean up the opens space system will add to the visual appeal and overall tidiness of the stream area.
CHAPTER 7: IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER:
The main objective of this chapter is to:
- Highlight the objectives which the study set out to achieve.
- Indicate the implications for theory, planning and for SAPS.
- Indicate the limitation of the study.
- Highlight future research to be conducted.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The final chapter highlights the objectives of the study and how they were achieved, the implications of this study for theory, planning of the built environment and SAPS, the limitations of the study and indicating any additional research to be conducted.

7.2 OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED

Moving through any neighbourhood in South Africa, one is faced by high walls and burglar bars, with signs of guard dogs on duty. Crime and fear of crime has led to numerous built environment initiatives to assist in the prevention of crime.

The primary goal of the study was therefore to gain a better understanding of the relationship that exists between crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place in terms of the current planning and design initiatives to assist in the prevention of crime within the built environment. A case study analysis was therefore conducted within a non-gated community located in the east of Pretoria, Kilner Park and Queenswood (South Africa).

As point of departure, a theoretical analysis of numerous academic sources were undertaken to establish a theoretical baseline for the study (literature review). A detailed contextual analysis was then compiled to gain a better understanding of the study area (Kilner Park and Queenswood) within the context of South Africa and the current state of crime determined accordingly. Following on this, a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis of the study area was undertaken.

The Table 7.1 lists the objectives guiding the study and the corresponding outcomes gained from the study.
Table 7.1: Research Objectives and Corresponding Research Methods and Tools Applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What is the current state of a sense of place within Kilner Park and Queenswood in respect to the built environment? | • From the focus group discussion with community members, it is evident that community members experienced a strong sense of community within the study area. Community members feel connected to their neighbours and to some degree responsible for their neighbours (in terms of personal and property safety) as they “look out for each other”.  
• Community members relate to the built environment by means of taking ownership of their immediate surroundings, e.g. helping to keep the parks / open spaces clean, reporting suspicious people / meetings within parks and open spaces / etc. |
| What is the current state of crime and fear of crime within Kilner Park and Queenswood and the influence thereof on the built environment? | • According to the local law enforcement and related parties the state of crime within the study area is bad and concerning. Most community members are unaware of the current state of crime within the study area, some by choice.  
• The local law enforcement and related parties are of the opinion that community members should be fearful of crime within the study area. On the other hand, community members are to a large degree not fearful of crime within the study area, primarily due to ignorance of the current state of crime. Community members are vigilant and fearful of crime but only due to the national crime situation (contact crime related national incident).  
• Community members feel safe to utilise the built environment during the day, (walking, jogging, cycling within the study area), but not at night.  
• Crime and fear of crime influence a sense of place due to avoidance behaviour of community members in terms of the utilization of the built environment. |
| How does crime and fear of crime (and the implementation of crime prevention mechanisms) influence a sense of place within Kilner Park and Queenswood. | • Crime and fear of crime has to some degree influenced the utilisation of the built environment within the study area but not so much on a sense of community.  
• Community members are of the opinion that crime and fear of crime does not have a direct effect on a sense of community as community members still communicate over fences or via technology, they look out for one another and assist each other as the need arises. Most community members highlighted that fact that neighbours communicate less, due to the current pace of life and the rat race, as opposed to the existence of walls and fences.  
• Fencing off some of the open spaces within the study area had an effect on limiting through movement of unwelcome outsiders, although at the same time it has hindered community members to freely enter the open space. |
7.3 PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

The findings also revealed that many of the responses to crime in the built environment may be linked to specific perceptions and that these may not always be directly connected to the actual crime statistics/reality. The following section therefore highlights the most noteworthy perceptions of local community members and local law enforcement and related parties in terms of crime and fear of crime in the built environment.

7.3.1 CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME

From the focus groups it became clear that community members are not afraid of crime within the study area, primarily due to their ignorance of crime. Community members are under the impression that crime within the study area is limited / under control. Although, it is noted that approximately 1200 residents residing within the broader GPF area have community radios for the sole purpose of being informed of the current state of crime within the area. One would therefore assume that community members would be informed of the state of crime within the given area by means of the community radio system and thus be fearful of crime to some degree.

Subsequently, during the course of the study it came to light that only 400 to 500 of the community radios are utilised, of which less than 50 within the study area. This is quite the contradiction, as community members participating within this particular study were very outspoken in terms of access to information (state of crime within the study area), whilst significantly few community members actually utilise the available communication methods in place. Community members indicated that the non-utilization of the community radio system and other available communication methods in place are due to the lack of relevant crime incident reporting. Community members are therefore uninformed of the current state of crime within the study area and do not utilise their community radios due to the lack of communication of available crime / incident information.

An additional perception of the focus group members centralised around who is ultimately responsibility for community safety in the country. Most of the members are of the opinion that it is the ultimate responsibility of the Government to provide enough resources which can be utilised to ensure the safety of its citizens. Community members place the responsibility of crime prevention on the state, taking a position that it is not their problem, as they are not afraid of crime due to their ignorance of the current state of crime. However, community members who are more informed / sensitive to the current state of crime within the study area (and nationally), advocated that due to the current political environment and state of crime, citizens need to become active in the fight against crime and therefore take part in safety initiatives (community based) and support the government in its plans to promote safer built environments.
7.3.2 THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

From the community members discussions, it is evident that certain spaces within the built environment are perceived as unsafe places due to the structural form and function of these spaces and are therefore avoided (for example the parks and open spaces). While on the contrary, from the statistical data and from the local law enforcement and related parties inputs it is evident that the spaces perceived as unsafe by community members are not primary crime spots at all. The perceptions of community members are mainly influenced by the visible appearance / disorder within the spaces (litter, grass not being cut timeously, non-utilisation of the spaces). While, the statistical proven hot spots of crime within the area are primarily the shopping nodes which have a clean, nicely kept appearance.

Secondly, most community members are fearful to utilise the built environment after dark. The fearfulness of crime after dark is strengthened by media reports of the national crime situation highlighting most contact related crimes (murder, rape etc.) occurring during the night and especially in the early hours of the morning. The local law enforcement and related parties indicated it wise of community members not to utilise the built environment after dark, as limited visibility (lack of / breakdown of infrastructure) can foster unsafe spaces and thus opportunity for victimisation. While, from the statistical data, within the study area the perceived fear of crime after dark is not substantiated, as most of the crime incidents occurred during the day, and not at night. Darkness is thus perceived as a crime generator.

Lastly, high fences and locked gates as response to crime and fear of crime within the built environment is often previewed as the main contributing factor for the non-involvement of community members and the breakdown of a sense of community. Although, the participating community members hold the view that it is not necessarily the case, the cause for non-involvement of the community members should rather be blamed on the “rat race”, not high walls and fences. Additionally community members are of the opinion that walls and fences do not impact on their sense of community and caring nature for neighbours. Community members keep in touch through new technology and social media (e.g. Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.).

7.4 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Following is the implication of the study for Theory, Planning and SAPS. This section concludes by highlighting what is special with regards to these particular results of this study from South Africa and what can the Global North learn from the experience on crime and safety in residential areas from the Global South.

7.4.1 IMPLICATION FOR THEORY

From the observations of national and international authors it is evident that crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place are interconnected and influence each other. As highlighted by numerous authors (Yavuz, & Welch, 2010:2491, San-Juan, et al. 2012:656; Loader et
crime and fear of crime within the built environment leads to two distinct approaches, the first entailing the avoidance of space, negatively influencing a sense of place, whilst the second entail fortification of individual properties or entire neighbourhoods, influencing the built environments form and function.

From the study it is evident that the built environment has reacted to crime and fear of crime by means of primarily target hardening measures. Zinn (2010:155) stresses the fact that within the South African context one needs to follow a multi-layered target hardening approach to secure one’s property, at minimum including high walls / palisade fencing, burglar bars, an alarm system and dogs. Simultaneously crime and fear of crime has led to the avoidance of the built environment. Places which feel unsafe, are neither vibrant nor comfortable are avoided and in turn negatively influence a sense of place. Alienation of individuals thus set in as they retreat into their fortified homes (Bannister & Fyfe, 2001:809; Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993:11).

Thus, due to target hardening and avoidance of the built environment, a sense of place is negatively influenced.

As highlighted by the Crime Prevention through Environment Design Crime guidelines (utilised within the South African context specifically), crime and fear of crime can be prevented to some degree by means of physical intervention within the built environment, for example by target hardening mechanism, proper street lighting, limiting access and escape routes etc. (Kruger et al, 2001:33).

Although, this particular study highlighted that due to the heightened perceived risk of victimization and the fact that crime is a social ill (as highlighted by the interviews and focus group discussions), the built environment cannot prevent the incidents of crime alone nor limit the fear of crime. Crime syndicates and crime entrepreneurs carrying out their daily criminal activities as a normal lifestyle pattern for those involved in such operations within neighbourhoods they are familiar with, as described by Bower et al (2014:552) as the awareness space of criminals.

On the other hand, it has become a way of life for South Africans to be aware of crime and to some degree life in a constant state of fear of victimization in fortified homes (Zinn, 2010; Cartwright & Shearing, 2012).

The local law enforcement and related parties (2015) emphasised that planning theory need to focus more on an integrated approach to crime prevention within the built environment. The theory needs to be developed in conjunction with police and other crime prevention organisations and social welfare institutions to identify and address both physical and social disorder problems within the built environment, possible role player could include:

- Local law enforcement – police precincts
- Private security companies
- Community policing forums
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- Metro police
- City improvement district forums
- Emergency and trauma personnel operational within a given area – e.g. Trauma Troops
- Departments of social development.

In terms of the physical built environment, planning theory need to guide future development by identifying physical structuring elements which are crime generators in its current form / function (for example how to integrate a railway line into a neighbourhood development to provide access without becoming a crime generator / escape route) and address the challenges accordingly grounded in the CPTED principles.

Additionally, planning approaches need to be flexible and focus on a local level. Flexibility in the application of the crime prevention related theory is needed as the built form and structure differs from one neighbourhood to another. Crime preventative planning interventions therefore need to be tailor made for a specific neighbourhood / police precinct before implementation can commence.

7.4.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

From the study it became clear physical structuring elements within the built environment can become crime generators or easy escape route for criminals, for example the main movement network, the N1 and the railway line within this particular study was identified and confirmed as crime generators / escape routes.

In the development of new neighbourhoods consideration should be given to integration of main structuring elements within the community to minimize the possibility of such elements to become crime generators, for example:

- Provide proper street lighting on main movement roads with safe pedestrian walkways visible from to road (ensure eyes on the pedestrians) with pedestrian orientated lighting
- Limit / manage vegetation in close proximity to main movement roads, to limit / eliminate hiding places (especially at road intersections)
- Fence off freeways which cross through neighbourhoods with the inclusion of proper lighting on the neighbourhood side – limiting pedestrian access onto / off of the freeway
- Fencing off railway lines with dedicated entrances at stations, with proper lighting along the railway line crossing through residential areas
- Provide pedestrian walkways form the train stations to the nearest street intersections with proper pedestrian lighting
- Limit / manage vegetation in close proximity to railway lines, to limit / eliminate hiding places (especially at the railway stations)
- Ensure the upkeep of open spaces and parks, the grass need to be cut on a regular basis and any stream / river / wetland area cleaned of litter, pedestrian walkways with proper lighting should be provided.
In addition, new forms of crime prevention mechanisms and technology should be explored, for example the incorporation of cameras (CCTV) on strategic points, focus on permeability in developments and safer pedestrian orientated designs (especially lighting). Planning authorities and police departments need to work together to inform and guide National, Provincial, and Local planning activities.

In the sphere of public health, there is growing recognition of the need to build supportive environments that encourage people to be physically active. One necessary component of a supportive environment to provide individuals to opportunity to utilise the built environment for physical activities is the safety of the local neighborhood. Neighbourhood safety is affected by several factors, including visible elements of social disorder, vehicle traffic, and road design and infrastructure condition, to name a few. Future planning initiatives should be planned holistically on the basis of public safety as point of departure, for example focusing on:

- Providing sidewalks and cycle lanes within neighbourhoods with proper lighting
- Ensuring basic infrastructure is maintained – roar surfaces need to be maintained, storm water entrances cleaned, sidewalks maintained, etc.
- Provide public benches at open spaces and parks
- Provide litter bins along main pedestrian movement roads and within parks and open spaces

- Provide outdoor urban activity spaces (hard and soft) for adults and children in parks and open spaces with adequate lighting, benches, bins etc. to promote family outdoor activities within neighbourhoods
- Remove unsightly graffiti from walls and rather promote a community driven graffiti project.

7.4.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR SAPS

During the research process, it came to the attention of the Researcher that SAPS Villieria do not have the “correct” tools to help in crime trend analysis. The utilization of a GIS system opened up new lines of analysis and spatial representation previously not accessible to SAPS – for example, the utilization of heat maps that indicate crime hot-spots or analysing and spatially representing crime incidents with buffer areas.

During consultations with the SAPS Villieria station Commander and the Chairman of the Villieria CPF, they indicated that they have been in discussions with neighbouring Police Precincts (Moot Police Cluster) with regards to the spatial trend analysis undertaken within this study. Some of the Moot Cluster Police Precincts indicated they would strongly consider analysing their crime data according to the Built Environment Related Crime Analysis Model as created for this study.

As testimony, the SAPS Villieria Precinct in conjunction with the Metro Police, CPF and private security firms operational within the policing precinct, initiated a month long intervention based on the outcome of the
model. From the model is was identified that most of the crime incidents within the Villieria Precinct occurred during the day, within Sector 1, in terms of burglaries at residential premises. With a strong visible policing initiative in conjunction with the related parties, the total number of crime incidents within Sector 1 decreased significantly, and for the entire police precinct by approximately 40% within the intervention month. Unfortunately the intervention month falls outside the time series data analysis of this study, and the statistical accuracy could therefore not be tested.

Clean-up, removal of homeless, etc. (order-maintenance) interventions were initiated along the N1, the railway line and stream area based on the preliminary outcome of this study. Numerous drugs were located within these areas and removed, community members spontaneously joined in the clean-up effort (with garbage bags) and homeless were taken to places of safety.

To replicate the crime data / hot spot analysis as utilised within this study, for other police precincts the following information would be required:

- Case number
- Date of incident (begin and end date)
  - Day
  - Month
  - Year
  - Day of the week
- Time of incident (begin and end time)
- SAPS CAS block
- Physical location of incident
  - Street address
  - Place name (e.g. business complex)
- Type of incident
  - Main crime categories
  - Sub-crime categories

Additional information that may be of value for further research / analysis in terms of profiling includes:

- Victim - age / gender / race
- Offender - age / gender / race
- Property related crimes – relevance of insurance
- Type of crime prevention elements – CCTV, burglar bars, palisade fencing, electrical fencing etc.

### 7.4.4 IMPLICATIONS FOR GLOBAL NORTH

Due to the violent nature of crime within South Africa, most individual has turned to target hardening and fortification as primary means of crime prevention. Although, from this particular study it is evident that target hardening and fortification is not the only answer to crime prevention. Target hardening and fortification elements are merely utilised as barriers for criminals to overcome before gaining access to residential properties.
These barriers “buy time” for resident to sound the alarm and call for private security, police and community assistance.

The main element identified as possible crime prevention mechanism within the South African context is community integration and participation. Due to the current state of crime, the SAPS is overwhelmed and cannot address crime alone. Therefore, the importance of communities to take-hands with their local police service in crime prevention initiatives. In addition it is very important for community members to know their neighbours and take ownership of their neighbourhoods.

The main element the Global North can thus learn from this particular study on crime and safety in residential areas is the utmost importance of community integration and participation in crime prevention and that even in contexts of high levels of violent crime, physical fortification and target hardening alone is not the answer to crime prevention.

7.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In terms of statistical data to test the opinion of the law enforcement and related parties regarding the increase in crime due to load shedding (infrastructure failure) could not be tested due to limited crime stats data and load shedding data for the same timeframe.

A second limitation to the study was in terms of crime trend analysis and accordingly identifying crime prevention strategies, be it physical interventions and / or social interventions. A criminologist opinion on the data analysis would have been valuable to gain a better insight on understanding and identifying criminal operations in terms of possible criminal trends and syndicate operation. Although, due to time and confidentiality constrains, it was not possible to gain a criminologist opinion.

7.6 FUTURE RESEARCH

The following areas of research can be explored to add value to this study:

- Analyse the influence of infrastructure failure on crime and fear of crime (e.g. load shedding).
- Analysis the findings of this study according to Systems Theory and accordingly determine the level of intervention needed.
- Analysis of the relationship between the functional land use along main transport corridors and crime.

7.7 CONCLUDING REMARK

From the research it is apparent that crime and fear of crime, the built environment and a sense of place influence one another. Crime and fear of crime leads to the avoidance of the built environment and / or target hardening, which in turn negatively influence a sense of place. Crime prevention within the built environment should therefore be a multi-pronged approach, including different stakeholders - for example local law enforcement, community structures, welfare organisation to name but a
few. Crime and fear of crime has for most become a way of life which can and should be addressed by pro-active built environment planning and design.
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5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 14/08/2014

Witness: __________________________ Date: 14/08/2014

Researcher: ________________________ Date: 14/08/2014
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 14/8/2014

Witness: __________________________ Date: 14/8/2014

Researcher: ________________________ Date: 14/8/2014
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I [Signature] hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 16/08/2014

Witness: [Signature] Date: 14/08/2014

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 14/08/14
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I [Name redacted] hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 22/07/15

Witness: [Signature] Date: 22/07/15

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 22/07/15
ANNEXURE B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>CPF</th>
<th>SAPS</th>
<th>Private Security</th>
<th>Trauma Troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – by means of social media (Facebook groups, zello) and radio communications</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, primarily due to radio programme, although community members do not want to get involved “apaties teenoor makue”</td>
<td>Yes – due to radio project</td>
<td>Yes, due to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – crime concerning</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Radio project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No – especially people in flats (change of people – not settle in with community)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, due to radio initiative</td>
<td>+ Social media (Facebook, zello):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, only those with radios, who do not wish to be informed</td>
<td>No – turn a blind eye compared to other sections, due to not wanting to get involved</td>
<td>Yes, due to radio project</td>
<td>+ News letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Social media (Facebook, zello):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ News letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – due to being aware of crime in area</td>
<td>Yes – walls / fences etc.</td>
<td>Yes – more so now due to high crime rates and social media</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, a trauma victim is afraid, and affects direct neighbours. Whilst other incidences bring neighbours together and help in the fight against crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No – not informed / ignorant of crime</td>
<td>Yes – national crime issues and due to pitfalls in justice / legal system</td>
<td>Yes, due to nationwide severity of crime (murder / rape etc)</td>
<td>Yes, women especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community members have no trust in the police and legal system</td>
<td>Yes, community members are aware of crime AND current initiatives to prevent crime AND arrests.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – due to nature of crime in SA</td>
<td>Yes – but still negligent</td>
<td>Yes – crime is everyday reality</td>
<td>Yes, and they should be</td>
<td>Yes, due to nature of crime (violent crime nationally) – can see it in terms of fences, alarms, etc. of households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime</td>
<td>Yes – community need to be careful</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime (murder / rape etc.)</td>
<td>Yes – due to nature of crimes</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
<td>Yes – crime is bad</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA</td>
<td>Yes – crime is a big issue in SA</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
<td>Yes – due to violent nature of crime in SA (media portrayal grim picture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>Private Security</td>
<td>Trauma Troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Corner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>Private Security</td>
<td>Trauma Troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – built use of built environment / isolation</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize area during the day to some extant, although not at night</td>
<td>Yes, community members utilize the area, although only during the day</td>
<td>Yes – built environment is utilized, primarily during the day, with community being vigilant</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not at night. And certain areas during the day will not be used e.g. near railway line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – people become isolated, fortification of dwellings, which leads to targeted hardening / displacement of crime</td>
<td>Yes – during the day you will find people utilizing the area (walking with dogs / cycling / jogging etc.), although, as night falls people retreat into their fortified houses.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize area, although primarily during the day you will find people walking with dogs, jogging, cycling etc.</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not at night. And certain areas during the day will not be used e.g. near railway line. Individuals who have been victims of crime (experienced trauma) will not utilize the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – during day people utilize area, not at night</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day though less than compared to a few years ago</td>
<td>Yes, less people utilize the built environment</td>
<td>Yes, people do utilize the area during the day for walking, jogging, cycling, but they arm themselves with a kerrie, a chain, charka-sticks, dogs etc.</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not at night. And certain areas during the day will not be used e.g. near railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not at night. And certain areas during the day will not be used e.g. near railway line. Individuals who have been victims of crime (e.g. muggings) will not utilize the area</td>
<td>Yes, people will utilize area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not in the evening. Opinion – during the day, crime is covered under a blanket</td>
<td>Yes – during the day you will find people utilizing the area (walking with dogs / cycling / jogging etc.), although, as night falls people retreat into their fortified houses.</td>
<td>Yes, less people utilize the built environment</td>
<td>Yes – community utilize the area during the day, walk, cycle, jog, but not at night. And certain areas during the day will not be used e.g. near railway line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>None, need access for emergency personal to move through area.</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Walls / fences</td>
<td>Fences, not so much walls – can’t see behind walls</td>
<td>Fences and walls (although walls not preferred, can’t see behind walls)</td>
<td>Fences and walls (although walls not preferred, can’t see behind walls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar bars</td>
<td>Burglar bars</td>
<td>Burglar bars</td>
<td>Burglar bars</td>
<td>Burglar bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms with beams</td>
<td>Alarms with beams</td>
<td>Alarms with beams</td>
<td>Alarms with beams</td>
<td>Alarms with beams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barred wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barred wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barred wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barred wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barred wire and electrical fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small dog inside the house – make alarm</td>
<td>Small dog inside the house – make alarm</td>
<td>Small dog inside the house – make alarm</td>
<td>Small dog inside the house – make alarm</td>
<td>Small dog inside the house – make alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, not walls</td>
<td>Fences, not walls</td>
<td>Fences, not walls</td>
<td>Fences, not walls</td>
<td>Fences, not walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
<td>Fences with beams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbed wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barbed wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barbed wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barbed wire and electrical fencing</td>
<td>Barbed wire and electrical fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
<td>Fences, walls, electrical fencing, burglar bars etc. are the norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>Alarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
<td>CCTV cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
<td>- Walls / fences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
<td>- Electrical fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
<td>- Burglar bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
<td>- Architectural design of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
<td>- Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
<td>- Alarms est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing off area makes it difficult for law enforcement to chase thieves</td>
<td>Fencing off area makes it difficult for law enforcement to chase thieves</td>
<td>Fencing off area makes it difficult for law enforcement to chase thieves</td>
<td>Fencing off area makes it difficult for law enforcement to chase thieves</td>
<td>Fencing off area makes it difficult for law enforcement to chase thieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
<td>Need community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to actively manage current initiatives / physical interventions (e.g CCTV cameras) more pro-actively</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to actively manage current initiatives / physical interventions (e.g CCTV cameras) more pro-actively</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to actively manage current initiatives / physical interventions (e.g CCTV cameras) more pro-actively</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to actively manage current initiatives / physical interventions (e.g CCTV cameras) more pro-actively</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to actively manage current initiatives / physical interventions (e.g CCTV cameras) more pro-actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
<td>- Additional physical interventions needed, need to focus on social crime prevention (broken window theory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>- No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>- No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>- No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
<td>- No – need better co-ordinated patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
<td>- Need community involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>CPF</th>
<th>SAPS</th>
<th>Private Security</th>
<th>Trauma Troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Distance travelled from reporting incidents: • Motor – 2km / 120 km/h &lt; 1km / 60km/h Bike – 1km = 30km/h • Running – 750 m Average reaction time of Kilnerpark security is approximately 1-2 minutes • Approximately 2 000 radios within CPF area (Sector, 1 Sector 2 and Sector 3) • The N1, railway line, stream are seen as barriers, to the criminal, once they cross one of the aforementioned barriers, they are out of reach of law enforcement. • The N1.</td>
<td>Not involved in each others lives, afraid to get involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more pro-active crime prevention strategies, whilst current initiatives are reactive in nature • Need better relationships between: • Family members (adults and children) • Community members • Community and law enforcement • Good relationships between active role players • Communication • Viability of information (good and accurate) • Proper management of available information • Application if available resources • Community members – patrols • Law enforcement private security firms • Communication project was launched in October 2013 with the aim to get better community awareness and participation • Need joint operations committee • SWOT of community • NB of sector policing • Need information determine crime profile (day / night)</td>
<td>Need more involvement • Need positive press • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se • In terms of age, community is well balanced, although it is found that older people do not want to work together with younger people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more involvement • Need positive press • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se</td>
<td>Radio Programme - Very good, keep people informed</td>
<td>Community is informed and connected by means of radio initiative, although, community members do not want to get involved – fear for their own lives • School children involved in crime – theft / assault / drugs mainly (using and dealing) – primary and high school kids • Need to inform kids of dangers of drugs / talking to strangers eat. • Have private security to protect kinds within school grounds / help prevent drug dealing etc • Teach kids to use the radio by means of weekly “maatjies radio roep” • Parent not involved in kids’ lives anymore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more involvement • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se</td>
<td></td>
<td>More during the day and when people come home after work • Relative sense of community cohesion (know neighbours) – add to safety of area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more involvement • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se</td>
<td>• Sector 2 = Mike / Lima / November with approximately 500 radios within the area • Very important and implementable with right role-players • Approximately 2 500 radios in CPF area – community therefore informed and actively involved in crime prevention • Community cohesion and awareness • CPF operational with crime prevention initiatives (eg patrols), although lacking active environmental design initiatives to eradicate the opportunity for crime to occur • Desire to commit crime / The opportunity to commit crime – can be eradicated through proper environmental design / The ability to commit crime • According to Maslow certain elements need to be in place to ensure self-actualisation, of which safety is the second most important element, without safety, one cannot progress to achieve self-actualisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more involvement • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se</td>
<td>• Need more involvement • More radios within area • Need more patrols – pro-active policing, not so much focused on catching criminals per se</td>
<td>Incidences of trauma are wide spread throughout the area, and getting worse • No formal trend of trauma is recorded, although it seems that per week / per month the type of crime and an area / household type targeted change continuously • E.G.: For a period of a month to two months, kids of black households were targeted and held at gunpoint, with the domestic worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If a family is in need and asks for help (especially over the community radio), the community will mobilize and within at least 30 minutes, help would have arrived, be it food, warm clothes, shelter etc…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© University of Pretoria
ANNEXURE C
1. Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2. I Alexander Ross hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3. The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4. I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5. I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6. Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: Alexander Ross
Date: 18/07/2015

Witness:
Date: 18/07/2015

Researcher:
Date: 18/07/15
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I, [Name], hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 2015/07/18

Witness: [Signature] Date: 2015/07/18

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 2015/07/18
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I, [Name], hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 2016-07-18

Witness: [Signature] Date: 2015-07-18

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 18-07-15
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I **Dorothea Vorster** hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by **Elsa Snyders**.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: **Dorothea Vorster** Date: **18/07/2015**

Witness: **[Signature]** Date: **18/07/2015**

Researcher: **[Signature]** Date: **18/07/2015**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Nr</th>
<th>Respondent Nr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I, Talitha Randelehoff, hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: Randelehoff  
Date: 18/07/2015

Witness:  
Date: 18/07/2015

Researcher:  
Date: 18/07/2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by *Elsa Snyders.*

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed:  

Date: 18/7/2015

Witness:  

Date: 18/7/2015

Researcher:  

Date: 18/7/2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I, Hendrina J. Huster, hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 18 July 2015

Witness: [Signature]  Date: 18 July 2015

Researcher: [Signature]  Date: 18 July 2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1  Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2  I, [Name], hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3  The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4  I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5  I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6  Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 21/07/2015

Witness: [Signature]  Date: 24/07/2015

Researcher: [Signature]  Date: 21/07/2015

© University of Pretoria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Nr</th>
<th>Respondent Nr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

1. Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2. I, **Maire Langley**, hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by **Elsa Snyders**.

3. The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4. I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5. I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6. Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: **Maire Langley**  
Date: **27/07/2015**

Witness: **A.Y. Moore**  
Date: **27/07/2015**

Researcher: **A]**  
Date: **27/07/2015**
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I, [Name], hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 27.06.15

Witness: [Signature] Date: 27-07-15

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 27-07-15
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I, J S Snyders, hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 27/07/2015

Witness: [Signature] Date: 27/07/2015

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 27/07/2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: __________

Witness: ___________________________ Date: __________

Researcher: ___________________________ Date: __________
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1. Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2. I Annali Sloane hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3. The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4. I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5. I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6. Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: Annali Sloane  Date: 1 Aug '15

Witness:  Date: 1 Aug 2015

Researcher:  Date: 1 Aug 2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I **FOOG OF BEEF** hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by **Elsa Snyders**.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 1 Aug 2015

Witness: [Signature]

Date: 1 Aug 2015

Researcher: [Signature]

Date: 10 Aug 2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I _______________________ hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 1-08-2015

Witness: ___________________________ Date: 1-08-2015

Researcher: ___________________________ Date: 01/08/2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: *The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa*

2 I _______________________ hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by *Elsa Snyders*.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: 01-08-2015

Witness: __________________________ Date: 01-08-2015

Researcher: _________________________ Date: 01-08-2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 2015/08/01

Witness: [Signature] Date: 2015/08/01

Researcher: [Signature] Date: 2015/08/01
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1  Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2  I, [Name], hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3  The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4  I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5  I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6  Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature]  Date: 1/6/2015

Witness: [Signature]  Date: 1/8/2015

Researcher: [Signature]  Date: 1/10/2015
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I [Preceding name] hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Preceding name] Date: 1/08/15

Witness: [Preceding name] Date: 1/08/15

Researcher: [Preceding name] Date: 1/08/15
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

1 Title of research project: The Effect of Crime and Fear of Crime on the Built Environment and Sense of Place in South Africa

2 I [Petra Austin] hereby voluntarily grant my permission for participation in the project as explained to me by Elsa Snyders.

3 The nature, objective, possible safety and health implications have been explained to me and I understand them.

4 I understand my right to choose whether to participate in the project and that the information furnished will be handled confidentially. I am aware that the results of the investigation may be used for the purposes of publication.

5 I understand the confidential utilization of recordings made of my participation in the project and therefore hereby give permission for recordings to be made of my participation.

6 Upon signature of this form, you will be provided with a copy.

Signed: [Signature] Date: 1/08/2015

Witness: [Signature] Date: 1/08/2015

Researcher: [Signature] Date: [Signature]
ANNEXURE D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group No 1</th>
<th>Focus Group No 2</th>
<th>Focus Group No 3</th>
<th>Focus Group No 4</th>
<th>Focus Group No 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours look out for one another, inform them when they're out of town, look why dogs are barking, inform them when they observe any unknown people in the street. Keep gates closed. Keep backdoor open go in and out through the day.</td>
<td>We use a wire close approach. All the ministries-neighbours have whistles and whenever something strange or a crime incident is taking place we blow our whistles and the response is immediate effect. We have observed that people who jump walls always use the same route (over my premises and disappear in Soutpansweg road) as such we call a security company and they get the criminals two blocks higher up.</td>
<td>Community participation is very important. Important to know your neighbours and to build a relationship with them. One should look take care and responsibility for another's belongings in their absence.</td>
<td>Know nearby neighbours very well. Have a gate between the premises for easy access in one of the side exits. However do not know the rest of the people in the street that well.</td>
<td>Stay in a safety complex do not know my neighbours. High concrete fences between us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours still know one another but they withdraw beyond high fences. Keep doors closed. Dog and cat and enclosed and she wants to be free.</td>
<td>It is good to be familiar with all your neighbours even those on the opposite of the street. Go out and check what actually triggers alarms and inform one another if you did observe non familiar behavior patterns around your premises.</td>
<td>Would like to see boom gates in the area.</td>
<td>Know most of the people in the street. Due to the annual street braai. Do not know rental tenants in one of the houses.</td>
<td>Crime is currently under control. There was a time when it was an era where we were not afraid. I still maintain that feeling. Do not feel frightened. Security guards at the entrance of the complex where she stays. Ever since she added new burglar alarms and security bars and ensures all security gates are locked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel safe in the area. Keep doors open during the day. Know neighbours but do not relate to them anymore because of high fences. Lots of homes for aged in the street also create a sense of security. Familiar with the workers who use the street to reach out of town, look why dogs are barking, inform them when they observe any unknown people in the street.</td>
<td>It is the responsibility of each of us to be knowledgeable about occurrences in the community.</td>
<td>Next to me is a rental house - the people come and go I do not know them. It is a risk, I feel safe because I have put in safety measures such as beams, fences, razor wire at the back ends of my yard and have dogs.</td>
<td>It is the responsibility of each of us to be knowledgeable about occurrences in the community.</td>
<td>Crime neighbours. It is important to know them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel safe take dogs for a stroll during the day. Approach strangers with precaution. Sometimes we do visit our neighbours in the evening and feel safe to do so.</td>
<td>Approaches to neighbours. Be aware of any strange vehicles in the area.</td>
<td>Very aware of what is happening in area and act accordingly.</td>
<td>Are aware of crime in the area and because my house is adjacent to the flat I am a soft target and people continuously try to get into my house. However I am not afraid. I look them directly in the eyes, and stay in control of the situation.</td>
<td>Are familiar with both neighbours next to us. Do not know the rest of the people in our street. Do recognize people who stay in the street by seeing which cars go to which houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Question: What measures have you taken to ensure your safety?</td>
<td>Not knowledgeable about crime incidents in the community. Get some news from a neighbour.</td>
<td>Not aware of the state of crime, feel safe like in any other first world country.</td>
<td>Are aware of crime in the area and because my house is adjacent to the flat I am a soft target and people continuously try to get into my house. However I am not afraid. I look them directly in the eyes, and stay in control of the situation.</td>
<td>Are familiar with both neighbours next to us. Do not know the rest of the people in our street. Do recognize people who stay in the street by seeing which cars go to which houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar bars are important do not think of blade and electric wires. Beams are good but is sometimes just a nuisance. High fences - although it does not keep people out of your yard but it does keep people from your yard.</td>
<td>Not knowledgeable about crime incidents in the community. Get some news from a neighbour.</td>
<td>Not aware of the state of crime, feel safe like in any other first world country.</td>
<td>Are aware of crime in the area and because my house is adjacent to the flat I am a soft target and people continuously try to get into my house. However I am not afraid. I look them directly in the eyes, and stay in control of the situation.</td>
<td>Are familiar with both neighbours next to us. Do not know the rest of the people in our street. Do recognize people who stay in the street by seeing which cars go to which houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did add more burglar bars to my house for safety. Also installed inside and outside beams.</td>
<td>Not knowledgeable about crime incidents in the community. Get some news from a neighbour.</td>
<td>Not aware of the state of crime, feel safe like in any other first world country.</td>
<td>Are aware of crime in the area and because my house is adjacent to the flat I am a soft target and people continuously try to get into my house. However I am not afraid. I look them directly in the eyes, and stay in control of the situation.</td>
<td>Are familiar with both neighbours next to us. Do not know the rest of the people in our street. Do recognize people who stay in the street by seeing which cars go to which houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a double set of burglar bars around the house one set inside the windows and a second set outside - Spanish bar type. Use spikes on outer walls.</td>
<td>Security gates, burglar alarms and a panic button linked to the security guards patrolling the complex are in place.</td>
<td>Not aware of the state of crime, feel safe like in any other first world country.</td>
<td>Are aware of crime in the area and because my house is adjacent to the flat I am a soft target and people continuously try to get into my house. However I am not afraid. I look them directly in the eyes, and stay in control of the situation.</td>
<td>Are familiar with both neighbours next to us. Do not know the rest of the people in our street. Do recognize people who stay in the street by seeing which cars go to which houses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group No 1</th>
<th>Focus Group No 2</th>
<th>Focus Group No 3</th>
<th>Focus Group No 4</th>
<th>Focus Group No 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The effect of crime and fear of crime on a sense of place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show them. If you find something that seems wrong act</td>
<td>Make use of latest technology and communicate what is</td>
<td>STILL try to talk to neighbors at areas where the fence allow</td>
<td>Fences limit access and direct contact with one another.</td>
<td>Fences for privacy no direct contact with neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriately on it. Some residents are not meshed at all</td>
<td>happening in area. Have very good relationships with</td>
<td>easy communication.</td>
<td>However we still get together seeing our immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of fear that they might be at risk if they intervene.</td>
<td>neighbors. If I lower my whistle they respond immediately.</td>
<td>neighbors.</td>
<td>neighbors. Not the high fences that prevent inter personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to school working assistants about possible risks</td>
<td>Some neighbors are armed.</td>
<td>Make use of modern technology and communicate what is</td>
<td>contact but different interests. However very high walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and how they should react in any incident.</td>
<td>Fences are just an excuse for poor community interaction.</td>
<td>happening in the area.</td>
<td>between houses in complex prevent you to see your neighbors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People still go out in the evening. Just on Sundays it is</td>
<td>People still go out in the evening.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>and to greet them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dangerous for them to go to church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be careful what information you share with people around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you. Nigerians in the area is very dangerous and exploit</td>
<td>No time for neighbors time in which we live is just a rat race</td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working assistants.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be the fact of poor neighbour relationships really an counter</td>
<td>What to out for one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect of crime? Or does the current lifestyle of leaving early</td>
<td>High walls make it difficult to talk to your neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and arriving late the actual culprit?</td>
<td>Feel safe even at night. Will not walk alone in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>during the night. Will stop at gate inside car and open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>electrified gate to enter. Bought the house with its fences 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years ago. Did not erect the fences because of crime. Have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safety gates in the house at various spots. Lock it during the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High walls, fear our neighbors talking, but not seeing them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More friends with people of own age. However would like to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see neighbors from eye to eye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The effect of crime and fear of crime on the build environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Build in a different way, as far as possible away from street</td>
<td>Need to walk with children to school is it is not safe for them</td>
<td>During the day I still feel safe and will walk around, but not at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level. Make sure you have enough sets of burglar doors to</td>
<td>to walk alone. Awareness of crime in the area contribute to</td>
<td>all during the evening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep them out of your space or to enable you to call for help.</td>
<td>fear of crime.</td>
<td>Not afraid but for safety measures in case of a house break as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we have high fences, burglar alarm and is connected to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>armed response security company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Switch on lots of lights during night. Criminals prepare very</td>
<td>Ten years ago you did observe mothers walking with prams</td>
<td>I am involved in exercising programs. I love running, but feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well before they break in. Climb on Telkom poles and check</td>
<td>and elderly people going for walks. Today you hardly see</td>
<td>trapped with all the fences around open spaces like the vlei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>that. Some time ago it was safe to go out for a picnic in the vlei</td>
<td>area. Now a days I drive to Moreleta and run around their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent to our house, now it is totally impossible because</td>
<td>vlei area as it is not enclosed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>People live with fear especially in times of loadshedding.</td>
<td>If I do go for a walk I take a shocker stick with me as a</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety mechanism. It is not safe for children to play in parks</td>
<td>High fences is the current norm. It is the point of departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without supervision. Bedelaars must work, one should not</td>
<td>when they erect new household is no longer safe to go for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>just give them money and or food. The entire community</td>
<td>stroll in the area. When we go we walk with pepper spray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>should take that approach.</td>
<td>ready to use if needed. House worker was attacked by one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>There is an assumption that some criminals actually plan</td>
<td>I am aware of crime incidents in the area, but still go for a</td>
<td>I am currently taking my dogs for a walk. Feel unsafe to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their burglaries when it is loadshedding.</td>
<td>walk.</td>
<td>do that. However some neighbors are still doing it. Perhaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am aware of crime incidents in the area, but still go for a</td>
<td>we have perceptions that we are not aware of about crime that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walk.</td>
<td>scare us unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>I am armed. I will use my weapon when needed. I will not</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td>Fences around the vlei area was erected to prevent a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give it to the police to destroy. If you was attacked then you</td>
<td></td>
<td>passing through situation in the area and to prevent people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>react violently.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td>of sleeping under Neath the bridges. Before it was enclosed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>I am armed and I will not hesitate to shoot when required.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td>there was quite a few incidents where strikers were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td>attacked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>If you live with fear you experience feelings of anxiety. I do</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have burglar bars.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group No 1</th>
<th>Focus Group No 2</th>
<th>Focus Group No 3</th>
<th>Focus Group No 4</th>
<th>Focus Group No 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing besides our fences and dogs. That is enough.</td>
<td>People come and steal stuff during day time. I use a whistle system.</td>
<td>The police should move into premises like &quot;red ants&quot; and destroy them.</td>
<td>We need to have all the numbers of the people in the street on our cellphones. We should participate in a patrol lie routine in the immediate area. We can even start a what’s up group with strict rules. Informing the immediate neighborhood of movements.</td>
<td>Neighbors do not look out for one another now a days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One must be aware of what is happening in your immediate environment and act pre caution based on that information.</td>
<td>Not withstanding the fact that back sales are covered with razor or blade wires - house breakers jump over it.</td>
<td>Electric fence or only serve a purposes if all four sides of an premises are covered with it. I take the approach to keep my family safety. ...</td>
<td>We need to have all the numbers of the people in the street on our cellphones. We should participate in a patrol lie routine in the immediate area. We can even start a what’s up group with strict rules. Informing the immediate neighborhood of movements.</td>
<td>Nothing besides our fences and dogs. That is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police should move into premises like &quot;red ants&quot; and destroy them.</td>
<td>Burglar's occur during day time, used a big tiporry to drive light into a house as a form of access.</td>
<td>Burglar’s occur during day time, used a big tiporry to drive light into a house as a form of access.</td>
<td>We need to have all the numbers of the people in the street on our cellphones. We should participate in a patrol lie routine in the immediate area. We can even start a what’s up group with strict rules. Informing the immediate neighborhood of movements.</td>
<td>Nothing besides our fences and dogs. That is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House are of a security company most important, carry a community radio with her. The criminal intelligence network is brilliant, it is important to outline them by staying in control. Continue them with your where about. Look them in the eye.</td>
<td>Nothing else than burglars bars.</td>
<td>Nothing else than burglars bars.</td>
<td>We need to have all the numbers of the people in the street on our cellphones. We should participate in a patrol lie routine in the immediate area. We can even start a what’s up group with strict rules. Informing the immediate neighborhood of movements.</td>
<td>Nothing else than burglars bars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Built environment that foster a sense of place</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Built environment that foster a sense of place</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Built environment that foster a sense of place</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Built environment that foster a sense of place</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Built environment that foster a sense of place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side. People come and steal stuff during day time.</td>
<td>Birds fly over as a warning sign that the area is monitored.</td>
<td>Like an open area not in favor of booms.</td>
<td>Like an open area not in favor of booms.</td>
<td>Like an open area not in favor of booms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some bright lights and funny shadow faces which scare people.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old gate/Clust plants to prohibit criminals to jump my fences with huge success. Unfortunately neighbour do not want to follow same approach on his side of the fence.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
<td>The N1 highway cut through our street. It is only fenced of at each side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supportive Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supportive Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supportive Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supportive Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not anything extra then current safety bars and alarm system.</td>
<td>Do not anything extra then current safety bars and alarm system.</td>
<td>Do not anything extra then current safety bars and alarm system.</td>
<td>Do not anything extra then current safety bars and alarm system.</td>
<td>Do not anything extra then current safety bars and alarm system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group No 1</td>
<td>Focus Group No 2</td>
<td>Focus Group No 3</td>
<td>Focus Group No 4</td>
<td>Focus Group No 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private volunteers who do patrols must use marked cars (branding)</td>
<td>Proposal to use “booms” to enclose area. Municipality did not want to approve it. Only approve it in so called “richer” areas. Information about what is happening is very important. One need to focus on one block at a time...get together and communicate all incidents in that block. A well maintained Facebook page can work. You cannot trust all security companies nor the police. Communities need to take care of themselves by means of a small group approach. We need roll models from ward councillor level up to the level of state president. Need to set an example of leadership which can be followed. We must address the real problem and not the symptoms.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to all residents on the incidents of crime in an area can help to create a sense of awareness in the community</td>
<td>Our streets cannot be “boomed” as it is “deurgang” strata. Be careful for beggars at street crossings and at ATM’s and at your gates. Children involved in drug smugglers...just look out and you will observe it.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information can bring about a mind shift on how people react in a supportive manner to one another.</td>
<td>Holds the opinion that house breaking and theft have a cultural spinoff and that it is acceptable for some belief systems to just go and take what ever they want.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to know all the people who stay and use to walk in your street. Build relationships with them. Security officials in wooden huts all over Waverly create a sense of safety. It is something other areas should think about.</td>
<td>Communities need to work together. One should foresee things like “street braais”. Community radios can assist with response times to crime and also to alert neighbors of possible incidents.</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
<td>No comments answer in previous remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEXURE E1
1. Elma Smuts
(full name)

solemnly declare that

1. I have taken note of the provisions of the Protection of Information Act (Act 84 of 1982) and in particular of the provisions of section 4 of the Act;

2. I understand that I shall be guilty of an offence if I reveal any information which I have at my disposal by virtue of my office and concerning which I know or should reasonably know that the security or other interests of the Republic require that it be kept secret from any person other than a person

- to whom I may lawfully reveal it; or

- to whom it is my duty to reveal it in the interests of the Republic; or

- to whom I am authorised by the Head of the Department or by an officer authorised by him to reveal it;

3. I understand that the said provisions and instructions shall apply not only during my term of office but also the termination of my services with the Department; and

4. I am fully aware of the serious consequences that may follow any breach or contravention of the said provisions and instructions.

(Signature)

(Place) PRETORIA

(Date) 23/6/2015

WITNESSES 1.

2.

RESTRICTED
UNDERTAKING ON DISCLOSURE OF CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS AND PENDING CASES BY EMPLOYEES OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICE

1. I (Initials and Surname) ………….…….. Persal No: …………………………………………
   Rank: …………………………………

Hereby make an undertaking that I have disclosed that I have / not have (delete which is not applicable) any criminal convictions and / or pending criminal or misconduct cases against me.

I further undertake to disclose to management any criminal cases for which I may be charged for in future.

I declare that the information provided above is to the best of my knowledge true and correct and that failure to comply with the contents of this undertaking constitutes misconduct for which disciplinary steps will be instituted against me.

SIGNED on this ………… day of (Month) ……….. (Year) ………… 20……

___________________________
SIGNATURE
PP NUMBER

CR NUMBER

COMPONENT *

CASE NUMBER

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 8604280024085

BIRTH DATE

PRIMARY NAME

SECONDARY NAMES

POPULATION *

GENDER _ ( A = MALE / B = FEMALE )

KRI050 -> No records exist for the information you have provided.

COUNT: * 0
ANNEXURE E2
ATTENTION: THE UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

DEPARTMENT: TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

THESIS: THE EFFECT OF CRIME AND FEAR OF CRIME ON THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND A SENSE OF PLACE: MRS ELSA SNYDERS FOR MTOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

1. As per the confidentiality agreement, I reviewed Chapters 4 to 6 of the above mentioned study, which refers to the Villiera SAPS data.

2. In my opinion the data were correctly interpreted and graphically represented on the figures and maps in the study.

STATION COMMANDER: SAPS VILLIERA
G J JALBERTS
ANNEXURE F
What is load shedding?

As South Africa’s primary electricity supplier, Eskom’s mandate is to ensure security of supply to service the South African economy and society.

Eskom therefore generates, transports and distributes electricity – and this is managed predominantly by Eskom for the entire country; however, Eskom only directly supplies more than 5 million households which means that most of us are supplied by municipalities.

At all times there must be sufficient supply to meet demand, but electricity demand is not consistent because of:

- peak periods when demand is higher
- and continuous growth in the number of customers requiring electricity services.

This means that the power system requires constant and prudent management of supply to meet demand but, today, Eskom faces the challenge of a constrained power system that will affect us until substantial new power capacity is available. In the meantime, to meet demand, our older power stations and infrastructure are being used to full capacity. In addition, routine and necessary maintenance of plant and infrastructure is carefully scheduled to limit compromising supply capacity during periods of high demand. We have also strengthened the distribution network to reduce the incidence of localised outages when the power trips because of overload in local areas such as suburbs.

Localised outages should not be confused with load shedding. Local outages can occur when there is either a technical fault in the transmission or distribution network, or when electricity equipment has been tampered with such as theft of cables, or when there is an overload of the local system because of irregular high usage due to electricity theft as well as normal faults.

Load shedding, or load reduction, is done countrywide as a controlled option to respond to unplanned events to protect the electricity power system from a total blackout. While we generally use the word blackout loosely to mean “no lights” in our local area, a country-wide blackout has much more serious consequences, which can occur when there is too much demand and too little supply, bringing the power system into an imbalance – tripping the power system in its entirety.

Many countries and cities in other parts of the world have experienced complete blackouts. To re-start their system, they are able to tap into a power system from a neighbour which can take a few hours or days, but we have to rely on ourselves to start the system from scratch – energising one power plant at a time and one section of the country at a time. It could take up to two weeks to restore full power, which would have a severe impact on our country! This is why we use load shedding, or load reduction, to effectively manage our power system and assist in protecting it from such an event.
Eskom’s Load Shedding Protocols

Keeping the power system balanced at 50Hz, as per international standards, is critical to prevent a nation-wide blackout and when the national electricity grid is under pressure with normal measures implemented, Eskom must reduce demand, as agreed with the National Energy Regulator (NERSA), and implements a process of Load Reduction which has two components:

1. **Load Curtailment.** Our agreement with some of our large industrial customers means we can instruct them to reduce electricity consumption when it is urgent to balance the system. They are able to **reduce their load by up to 20%**, significantly easing capacity on the grid; but it **takes a minimum of 2 hours to implement**.

2. **Load Shedding.** If, after Load Curtailment, the demand on the system is still greater than available supply, we have to implement a process of load shedding to prevent an imbalance and subsequent blackout. Load shedding will also be implemented if there is insufficient time to request load curtailment; and in winter load shedding can be implemented before curtailment due to the peaky nature of the problem.

ANNEXURE G
VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS DAY VS NIGHT (MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Source: Snyders, E. 2015 ex Villieria Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS DAY (MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS NIGHT (MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Figure G.3

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015, ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS TIME CATEGORY 2 (10:00-14:00) (MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villieria Police Precinct Data © University of Pretoria
Figure G.7

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS TIME CATEGORY 4 (18:00-22:00) (MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS TIME CATEGORY 4 (22:00-06:00)
(MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Figure G.9

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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- **Sunday**
- **Saturday**
- **Friday**
- **Thursday**
- **Wednesday**
- **Tuesday**
- **Monday**

**ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER DAY OF THE WEEK March 2015**

- **Sunday:** 10%
- **Saturday:** 12%
- **Friday:** 15%
- **Thursday:** 11%
- **Wednesday:** 17%
- **Tuesday:** 15%
- **Monday:** 20%

**ALL CRIME INCIDENTS:**
- **Monday:**
- **Tuesday:**
- **Wednesday:**
- **Thursday:**
- **Friday:**
- **Saturday:**
- **Sunday:**
VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER DAY OF THE WEEK – MONDAY
(MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villieria Police Precinct Data

© University of Pretoria
VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER DAY OF THE WEEK – TUESDAY
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Figure G.14

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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Figure G.16

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
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VILLIERIA POLICE PRECINCT – ALL CRIME INCIDENTS PER DAY OF THE WEEK – SUNDAY
(MARCH 2014 – APRIL 2015)

Source: Atkinson, A. 2015. ex Villiera Police Precinct Data
© University of Pretoria