

Property Safety*

Strategic Overview

Property crime has been declining in Canada, but it is still far too high. In 2007 there were 1.1 million property crimes reported to Canadian police departments and many more went unreported. However, there is strong evidence that if municipalities analyze their community's property crime problems, look at the evidence about works in crime prevention, and implement comprehensive prevention initiatives at a sufficient level of intensity, they can dramatically reduce the rates of these crimes.

Social development programs represent a short and long-term solution to property crime. Providing stronger communities with nurturing families and strong schools will reduce crime. However, these initiatives should be part of a comprehensive prevention strategy that also involves changing the built environment, implementing community programs and encouraging smarter use of police resources.

Municipal governments must be at the centre of property crime prevention initiatives. They are uniquely placed to plan, coordinate, and implement the programs that will bring rates of these offenses down. If these steps are taken, there is ample evidence that property crimes can be reduced.

What specific steps should you take in order to reduce property crime in your municipality?

Action for Municipal Stakeholders

1. Follow the systematic crime prevention planning process described in Series 1 *Invest Smartly in Safety for the City*;
2. Ensure that your prevention strategy is a comprehensive one (law enforcement, designing out crime, social development) and that the specific programs used are based on evidence concerning what works;
3. Stay focused on your specific problems and ensure that sufficient human and financial resources are allocated to your program to ensure that the problem is addressed successfully;
4. Find as many community partners as you can and work hard to ensure that efforts are coordinated across organizations;
5. Provide strong leadership to keep the program on track.

Justification

Property crime has declined in Canada since the early 1990s, but it is still far high. For some property offenses, including auto theft and break and enter, rates are higher in Canada than in the United States and are much higher than in many other industrialized countries.

In 2007, almost 1.1 million property crimes were reported to Canadian police departments and many more went unreported. Over half were thefts under \$5000, many of which are shoplifting. The most serious

* Prepared by Rick Linden, University of Manitoba

common property offenses are break and enter (over 250,000 reported offenses) and motor vehicle theft (nearly 160,000 offenses). These two offenses are the property crimes that we will consider in this brief.

Patterns of Break and Enter

In 2007, over 250,000 break and enters were reported to the police (Dauvergne 2008a). The majority (60 percent) of break and enters are residential and the most frequently stolen items were audio/video equipment and money, checks or bonds. The recovery rate is very low (12 percent) for these goods. Only 16 percent of break and enters are cleared by arrest and young males are overrepresented among those arrested (Fedorowycz 2004).

In 2004, the average insurance claim for a household break and enter was about \$3600 and for business break and enters was about \$6500.¹ Break and enters also create fear among victims and potential victims. Over 20 percent of property crime victims had trouble sleeping after the victimization and females who have been victimized have higher fear levels than males (AuCoin and Beauchamp 2007).

Patterns of Motor Vehicle Theft

In 2007, there were about 146,000 motor vehicle thefts. While most stolen vehicles are recovered, very few thefts (11 percent) result in an arrest (Dauvergne 2008b). Most of the identified offenders are young with a peak age of 15 – 18.

Motor vehicle theft does not likely cause as much fear as burglaries but it is a very costly offense. The financial cost is estimated at over \$1 billion a year. Vehicle theft can also cause death or injury – an average of about 40 people die each year and another 65 people are seriously injured (Dauvergne 2008b).

Preventing Property Crime

One of the keys to successful crime prevention is utilizing different types of prevention strategies. For property crime, some strategies are targeted at specific offenses, while others are directed at street crimes in general because most offenders do not specialize in one offense type, but commit a variety of different crimes.

The different categories of programs described in this action brief are: social development programs; Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) programs; and community programs. Other measures can also help reduce property crime - some cities have bylaws regulating pawn shops to reduce the fencing of stolen property while other jurisdictions have implemented mandatory prepayment systems to prevent drive-offs from self-service gasoline bars.

Crime Prevention Through Social Development

These strategies are aimed at reducing the pool of potential offenders by altering the risk factors that lead to crime. These factors are not specific to property crime, but affect most types of crimes. Some risk factors are community disorganization, poverty, ineffective parenting, academic failure, and negative peer influences. Many effective programs can ameliorate these factors including parental training, youth

¹ Claims data for 2004 obtained through personal correspondence with the *Personal Insurance Bureau of Canada* in 2007.

employment, preschool programs, home visiting for newborns in high-risk families, recreational programs, and school completion initiatives. Some of these are described in other briefs, but it is important to emphasize here that changing peoples' lives is not easy and the programs you select must be carefully implemented and provided with the resources needed to make a real difference. Young people commit most property crimes, so children and youth should be the main clients of social development programs.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

CPTED means understanding the relationship between physical design and levels of criminal activity and then manipulating the environment to reduce the incidence of crime.

Burglary and auto theft are often crimes of opportunity. Even sophisticated offenders who may sometimes target specific homes, businesses, and vehicles prefer vulnerable targets (Bennett and Wright 1984). Environmental design changes that increase the potential offender's perceived risk of being caught should help to reduce these crimes.

Some CPTED strategies are quite simple. For example, upgrading locks on doors and windows and taking other 'target hardening' measures can reduce burglaries. Other successful initiatives are far more complex than simply changing door locks. The Bushbury Triangle Project shows the need to consider the needs of the community when changing their living environment and also illustrates the crime reduction potential of CPTED-based neighbourhood revitalization.

The Bushbury Triangle Project involved renewal of a public housing project in England. This entailed a modernisation programme, home security improvements, and new fencing. During the modernisation, planners realized that behaviour was not improving and that that the project needed more consultation with residents so they would develop a sense of ownership of the improvements.

To facilitate this ownership, part of the estate, the Triangle, was designated a separate community, and physical changes were made to encourage pedestrian circulation within this area. Several community activities were run by the residents from a newly-designated community house.

Following these changes, crimes reported to the police dropped by one third compared with other parts of the estate which had been modernised, but which lacked the community component. Victim surveys showed substantial reductions in crime, and fear of crime declined by 50 per cent.

Box 1: CPTED in Ottawa

In Ottawa, CPTED strategies have reduced property crime¹. The Ottawa Police Service randomly selected 10 existing locations where CPTED audits had been requested by the owners/occupiers and 10 locations that had a CPTED audit during the pre-building planning process. Where recommendations made at the planning stage were implemented, subsequent criminal activity was very low. However, the crime problems predicted by the CPTED analyst have occurred in locations where recommendations were not implemented. Similarly, where the owners of existing locations followed the recommendations of the analyst, crime decreased. If recommendations were not implemented, crime subsequently remained the same or increased (VanRyswyk and Shimuzu 2007).

Community Programs

Many property crime prevention initiatives involve the actions of individual community members. Programs such as Neighbourhood Watch, Operation Identification, and Citizens on Patrol are carried out by individuals, though municipalities typically play a central role in organizing and maintaining them.

Neighbourhood Watch

These action briefs advocate a problem solving approach to prevention. A good example of this approach is a project that began with a study of burglary patterns. Planners found that many residents in a public housing project were repeat burglary victims. The probability of a second burglary was four times higher than the probability of a first burglary elsewhere in the housing project. In response, the municipality improved security in burglarized homes and also established 'cocoon' Neighbourhood Watch programs involving the immediate neighbours of the victimized household (Forrester, Chatterton and Pease 1988). Burglaries declined by 53 percent after the implementation of the program.

This study is one of several positive evaluations of Neighbourhood Watch. However, you should know that many other evaluations have not shown positive results, typically because participation rates are too low. Some neighbourhoods may require a significant effort to involve people in community programs such as Neighbourhood Watch, but without this effort the programs will fail.

Also, the successful project involved several different types of interventions, including improving home security. An evaluation of a multi-city Burglary Reduction Initiative in the United Kingdom found that **using a combination of several types of intervention** is more effective than single interventions (Kodz and Pease 2003). Another study of this initiative showed that **the intensity of the crime prevention effort** is also crucial to success. Programs that had more intense activities reduced more burglaries than those with less program activity (Bowers, Johnson and Hirschfield 2004).

The lessons for Canadian municipalities are clear. Burglary reduction initiatives should be:

- Based on research on the nature of your community's problem;
- Involve a combination of prevention strategies;
- Intense enough to ensure the problem is addressed.

Preventing Auto Theft

The lessons learned from burglary prevention also apply to other types of property crime. We can see this in the case of an auto theft prevention program in Winnipeg that was based on detailed research into the nature of the problem, developed a comprehensive reduction program integrating policing, environmental design, and social development strategies. It also had a strong community partner in Manitoba Public Insurance (MPI); very committed and effective leadership from government, police, and MPI; adequate resources to ensure that the initiative was effective; and a commitment to working together rather than maintaining organizational silos.

Winnipeg – An Auto Theft Prevention Success Story

For much of this decade, Winnipeg has been the auto theft capital of North America. The city's rates were about 4 times the national average. A prevention program instituted in 2005 has led to dramatic reductions in auto theft. Rates dropped by 42 percent between 2007 and 2008 and are down 64 percent from the peak in 2004. Rates have continued to fall dramatically and by mid-2009 were down by more than 75 percent from the 2004 peak.

These reductions are the result of a multi-agency program called the Winnipeg Auto Theft Suppression Strategy (WATSS) (Linden and Munn-Venn. 2008). WATSS was based on the best available evidence about how to reduce auto theft. The three main components of the program are all based on strategies that had been effective elsewhere:

- Intensive supervision of chronic auto theft offenders. Curfew checks are done as frequently as every 3 hours;
- Installation of electronic immobilizers in vehicles (mandatory for the most at risk vehicles). These make it almost impossible to steal the vehicle without the keys; and
- A broad range of programs dealing with the root causes of auto theft.

Not only has this program reduced motor vehicle theft, but it is likely that the supervision and programming for young offenders has also contributed to the significant reductions that have also occurred in break and enter and robbery in the city.

Other programs which target chronic offenders have also reduced auto theft significantly in Regina and in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

Conclusion

The successful examples of property crime reduction discussed in this action brief demonstrate that something can be done about crime. It is up to municipal governments to put this knowledge into action in order to improve the quality of life in our communities.

References

- AuCoin, K. and D. Beauchamp. 2007. *Impacts and Consequences of Victimization, GSS 2004*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Bennett, T. and R. Wright. 1984. *Burglars on Burglary*. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing.
- Bowers, K., S. Johnson and A. Hirschfield. 2004. "The Measurement of Crime Prevention Intensity and Its Impact on Levels of Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 44: 419-440.
- Dauvergne, M. 2008a. *Crime Statistics in Canada, 2007*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Dauvergne, M. 2008b. *Motor Vehicle Theft in Canada, 2007*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Fedorowycz, O. 2004. *Breaking and Entering in Canada, 2002*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Forrester, D., M. Chatterton and K. Pease. 1988. *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*. London: Home Office, Crime Prevention Unit, Paper 13.

Kodz, J. and K. Pease. 2003. *Reducing Burglary Initiative: Early Findings on Burglary Reduction*. London: Home Office.

Linden, R. and T. Munn-Venn. 2008. "Making Communities Safer: Lessons Learned Combating Auto Theft in Winnipeg". Briefing, October. Conference Board of Canada.

VanRyswyk, Sgt. W. and B. Shimuzu. 2007. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): Ottawa Case Study*. Ottawa: Ottawa Police Service.