Security by Design: SecureCity - 10 Rules of Thumb

Urban Agenda for the EU Partnership on Security in Public Spaces

Kaya-Malin Franke and Paul van Soomeren (DSP-groep)

1

Table of Contents

Disclaimer

This report has been delivered under the Framework Contract "Support to the implementation of the Urban Agenda for the EU through the provision of management, expertise, and administrative support to the Partnerships", signed between the European Commission (Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy) and Ecorys.

The information and views set out in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this report. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Introduction

SecureCity

Security contributes to quality of life and attractiveness of a territory for its citizens and businesses, to a good and safe environment to live in, and it has an impact on socio-economic development. Urban authorities are amongst the most important players to ensure that actual and perceived security are addressed by targeted measures, as they have a strong local presence and know the local challenges. Security is a multi-factor issue that should include areas such as social integration (access to good quality and non-segregated basic services including education, social and health care, etc.), law enforcement, society's resilience, and community empowerment against any forms of violence, including preventing radicalisation. In addition, it also concerns enhancing the protection of buildings and infrastructure.

Cities should be safe, secure, and free of violence, crime, harassment, and fear of crime for all their citizens. Security by Design (SbD) as a partly new approach has the potential to keep cities safe and secure. The implementation of an approach based on SbD principles to enhance security in public spaces is an innovative practice in which local and regional authorities, to date, often have little experience and/or expertise. The SbD approach builds on knowledge from physical protection; site and target hardening, access control, and surveillance/censoring techniques like CCTV. Nevertheless, SbD also builds on notions and concepts like the resilience of cities, the quality of life in cities, inclusiveness, security-co-production, efforts to counter actual and perceived lack of security, the use of new digital technologies, behavioural sciences, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), environmental psychology and nudging practices. These are all approaches to reduce and prevent crime, incivilities, nuisances, and other safety and security issues like specific types of terrorism (e.g., ram raiding).

The SbD approach is relevant for both smaller and larger cities. It could help balance efforts to increase urban resilience whilst also promoting the open and inclusive character of the public sphere. SbD can contribute to the quality of life in cities and improve conviviality, liveability, and the attractiveness of areas.

As there is limited knowledge and/or expertise on the SbD approach in various cities, is it important to promote and mainstream the concept of the SbD approach for cities by presenting a basic set of 'rules of thumb' of this approach on how to include safety and security considerations into the planning, design, and management of urban spaces. This is also stated in Action 6.2 of the Action Plan of the Urban Agenda for the EU Partnership for Security in Public Spaces[1]. There is also a connection to other Actions of the Action plan: for instance, to Action 5 on social cohesion, and to Action 1 which focuses on creating a self-assessment framework for urban authorities to measure how they are progressing in terms of safety and security.

The ten rules of thumb presented in this report aim to support cities in their implementation of the SbD approach and can be seen as a checklist for effective implementation of the approach. While

---

[1] https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/urban-agenda/security-public-spaces/action-plan/security-public-spaces-partnership-final-action-plan

the ten rules of thumb contain various areas that overlap in order to see them as a set of rules, they also function well independently from one another and can stand on their own.

Together, the ten rules of thumb can be summarised under the acronym 'SecureCity'. Each of the ten rules of thumb will be presented by briefly explaining the following elements:

- **Why** (the purpose): An explanation on what the need is for the implementation of the rule, and why does it need to be executed.
- **How** (the process): Specific actions to be taken in order to address the need and what the expected results and/or achievements would be of the actions.
- **Examples and Resources**: A list of examples of best practice of the specific rule, as well as suggestions for additional reading material, institutions, and sources that could give more information.

1 Stakeholders: take a multi-stakeholder approach

It is important to engage multiple stakeholders in discussing, analysing, decision-making, and implementing urban design solutions to mutually perceived crime and safety problems.

1.1 Why

The multi-stakeholder (also known as multi-agency or partnership) approach aims at bringing various stakeholders together to discuss, make decisions, and implement urban design solutions to mutually perceived crime and safety problems. The involved stakeholders could consist out of city maintenance, city management, local authorities, urban planners, architects, police, security, businesses, residents, etc. A multi-stakeholder approach allows for the confluence of different points of views, which makes the study and implementation of measures that are considered beneficial for securing the urban environment more holistically by co-producing solutions that apply to multiple contexts, reflects various perspectives, and sustain over short-and long-term. Additionally, the inclusion of vulnerable groups such as the physically and mentally disabled, children, the elderly, members of the LGBTQ+ community, as well as the introduction of specific areas or districts in which to introduce measures to improve urban design and management, will provide a greater and more effective active-passive integral security.

1.2 How

All stakeholders that are involved either the origins and/or the solution of the identified crime and safety problem should work together. Local and/or regional authorities that are democratically legitimised to take decisions on crime and safety will decide which issues need to receive attention and together, the stakeholders should scan, set priorities, analyse, plan, actively intervene, assess and process the effects of the intervention, and learn from this.

Specific recommendations for activities are:
- Form a working or project group that includes all relevant stakeholders, and either meet face-to-face or work and exchange digitally e.g. video conferencing, app-group, mail-group.
- Check if a legal status of a Business Improvement Zone/District (BIZ/BID) is possible to work more effectively together and outsmart free-riders.
- Use co-design processes & participatory methods (following the principles of the New European Bauhaus initiative), for instance in the form of a 'think and do tank', that brings together data and information from several stakeholder (yielding informed decision-making) who work together to co-create, model, and test new tools, solutions, and policy recommendations
- Be inclusive in the multi-stakeholder approach; include stakeholders like children, the elderly, members of the LGBTQ+ community, etc.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be inclusive urban planning, design, and management which reflects and takes into consideration multiple perspectives from multiple stakeholders.

1.3   Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Business Improvement Districts (BIDs): a best practice example of a collaboration between entrepreneurs and the municipality of Amsterdam: https://www.interregeurope.eu/policylearning/good-practices/item/3895/business-improvement-districts-amsterdam/
2	BIDs in Belgium: https://bids-belgium.com/about-bids/
3	The BPS (*Bruxelles Prévention & Sécurité*) introduction of regular working groups on SbD issues with regional partners (territorial planning office, mobility office, urban permits office etc.), both at strategic and operational level (see this link for further information [in FR/NL only]: https://bps-bpv.brussels/fr/bruxelles-prevention-et-securite-newsletter-mars-2021)
4	The European Forum for Urban Security (Efus) Manifesto: Security, Democracy and Cities - Co-producing Urban Security Policies: https://efus.eu/the-manifesto/
5	The Secu4All project, led by Efus, will publish a comprehensive training manual which promotes a multi-stakeholder approach: https://efus.eu/secu4all-en/

2 Examine crime in context and focus

Crimes are not just crimes; they exist in various types and forms, and do not follow a uniform distribution among time, space, victims, population, and offenders.

2.1 Why

A robbery is different from a terrorist attack or a nuisance: crime exist in specific types and forms. For countering, reducing, and preventing crime and safety problems, it is essential to understand the differences in the types of crime: differences in offenders, their motives, the victims or targets they select, and places and times they choose to commit crimes. Therefore, specific attention should be given to a typology and contextual analysis of crime and safety problems.

First of all, a crime is not just a crime. Crime types differ.

Secondly, each type of crime is not equally distributed: 80% of crimes in a city occur in 20% of all possible places. Crimes concentrate in hot spots on hot times. Furthermore, only a few offenders are responsible for the majority of crimes being committed (prolific offenders or 'hot shots'), and some victims are victimised multiple times (repeat victimisation). Crime and safety problems are often opportunistic and so **focus** should be on the hot spots, hot times, hot shots, and hot victims of crimes. In short: the focus should be on the hot opportunities.

2.2 How

The various types of crime that should be addressed in a local context (a city, neighbourhood, square, street) should be clearly defined. In 2017, Eurostat published a European version of the United Nations International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (UN ICCS) as a "common framework to group all kinds of criminal offences into categories".

Additionally, the focus should be to identify the hot spots, hot times, hot shots, and hot victims for the specific types of crime, and then focus on these hot issues. Total security is impossible to achieve, and so one should prioritise and select one or two types of crime to focus on preventing.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be a list of the identified types of crime, and a list of the hot spots, hot times, hot shots, and hot victims for that identified type of crime.

Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Typology: The purpose of the ICCS is to strengthen comparability and consistency as well as to improve analytical capabilities at a national, regional and international level." (EU-ICCS, 2017/7): https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/8305054/KS-GQ-17-010-EN-N.pdf/feefb266-becc-441c-8283-3f9f74b29156
2	Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (September 2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3), September, pp. 1-65. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cl2.1051
3	Weisburd, D., Groff, R.R. & Yang, S. (2012) The Criminology of Place, Oxford Press
4	Wolfowicz, M., Litmanovitz, Y., Weisburd, D., & Hasisi, B. (2021). Cognitive and behavioural radicalization: A systematic review of the putative risk and protective factors. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 17*(2), Sept. pp. 1-90. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cl2.1174
5	Some cities, like Madrid, use Territorial Security Plan for each district/neighbourhood, to focus on hot spots.

3   Criminal thinking

Be empathetic: try to put yourself in the shoes of those you seek to understand, and therefore use 'criminal thinking'.

3.1   Why

In order to pre-emptive the actions of a criminal, it is important to think ahead and plan accordingly. Therefore, it is recommended to try and think like a criminal in order to assess what is on their minds. It is difficult to counter – or solve - problems that one does not understand, and so try to put oneself in the shoes of another. By involving more stakeholders in such an activity, multiple angles and perspectives can be analysed. Empathy is the essential element for understanding a specific way of thinking, as well as for understanding actions manifested by "the other". Therefore, it is suitable to understand, identify the context, and know the objectives and threshold of the offender. If 'criminal thinking' can be accomplished, the following activities can be improved upon:

- Identifying high-risk places, times, and victims due to better understanding of the offender's motives, the victims or targets they select, and locations and times they choose to commit crimes.
- Predicting and preventing future crime and safety problems.
- Become pro-active rather than reactive.

3.2   How

There are several ways 'criminal thinking' can be achieved in order to think and plan ahead:

- Role-playing and perspective-taking are scientifically proven techniques that enhance critical thinking and better understanding another's perspective and motives.
- Follow a human-centred approach: rethink and reframe problems previously described from a top-down perspective to better meet the needs of end-users; better understanding of the motivations and needs of an offender can subsequently lead to a more equitable system that takes unmet needs of every person into account, be it a criminal, police, policymaker or resident.
- The red vs. blue lining approach: a simulation game in which one group acts like criminals planning criminal strategies while the other group reacts or prevents the strategies.
- Combine 'criminal thinking' with safety walks/surveys (see rule of thumb 4)

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be a better understanding of the crime and safety problem that has been identified, and there should be a better understanding of the criminal's motives and thresholds.

3.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Blue and red team operations: https://purplesec.us/red-team-vs-blue-team-cyber-security and https://www.infosecinstitute.com/podcast/red-team-operations-attack-and-think-like-a-criminal/ (a webinar, video)
2	The Madrid Municipal Police uses role-play to increase the imagination and mentality of police officers thus improving the preventive function of the police for the benefit of society. Plan de formación de Policía Municipal - Ayuntamiento de Madrid; Plan Anual de Estudios 2021 PMM (madrid.es); Policía Municipal de Madrid en Instagram
3	The EU funded H2020 Cutting Crime Impact (CCI) project: https://www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu/ and https://efus.eu/tag/cci-en/

4 Use crime and safety survey walks

In a survey walk, a small group of stakeholders jointly explore a specific environment where action might be needed by walking around the area together.

4.1 Why

A survey walk can have multiple purposes: one purpose could be to look for risks (see rule of thumb 5), in which case the types of crime should be clear beforehand (see rule of thumb 2). The second purpose could be to look for places of fear and come up with feasible solutions to confront the identified issues.

Fear and perceptions of insecurity are subjective. The aim of survey walks is to get as many perspectives possible from various stakeholders as this will foster a greater understanding of the who, what, where, when, why, and how. It is important to not only focus on the crime and safety problem but also to focus on - together while walking, talking, and brainstorming – possible solutions.

4.2 How

Specific actions suggested to undertake when executing survey walks are as follows:
- **Group size:** Walk with a **small** group of five to ten people through the city.
- **Group diversity:** Walk with a **mixed group of stakeholders**: resident, expert, politician, police, designer, etc. Be aware of one group taking the lead.
- **Situational differences:** Walk both **during the day (when it is light) and in the evening (when it is dark).** Also, execute a survey walk in both crowded and silent places.
- **Report:** Make notes, take photographs, and have a meeting afterwards to discuss outcomes and proposed solutions. Also decide on who will be responsible for doing what.
- **Other:** Play 'hiders' and 'seekers (in cooperation with rule of thumb 3); the hiders have a small parcel (e.g. bomb, paint) they have to hide; the seekers should prevent that. This will allow one to identify where such parcels could potentially be hidden.

The end result of implementing this rule of thumb should be a better situational analysis of the crime and safety problem and also feasible ideas on how to confront and reduce the identified problem. Another end result could be an analysis and plan with more significant stakeholder and community involvement.

4.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/get_to_know_your_neighborhood_with_a_walk_audit.pdf
2	Guide to analysing and responding to outbreaks of perceived unsafety: https://interior.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/010_el_departament/publicacions/seguretat/Toolkit/booklet_Digital_ENG_no_20210602.pdf
3	See SafeGrowth ideas: About_SafeGrowth_-_SAFEGROWTH® and Saville, G. (2018). *SafeGrowth: Building Neighbourhoods of Safety and Liveability.*
4	Tracking fear – measuring safety perceptions in Saskatoon: https://www.safegrowth.org/blog/tracking-fear-measuring-safety-perceptions-in-saskatoon
5	"Following night walks in an inner district by the Local Women's Commission to identify spaces of anxiety (…)", see p. 180 in https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/urbandevelopment/publication/handbook-for-gender-inclusive-urban-planning-and-design
6	Community-led Jane's Walks: https://janeswalk.org/about/
7	Google for CPTED Audit and Site-Management Checklists. A PDF document including information on how to plan & carry out 'Safety Audits'. And: https://www.cpted.net/

5 Risk management approach

In a world of uncertainty, one has to account for and assess (identify, analyse, and evaluate) potential risks in respect to crime and safety problems. Therefore, it is recommended to have ideas and guidelines, a framework, and a process for managing risks in a city: international standards and guidelines could be useful in this regard.

5.1 Why

The notion of bringing risks in general – and especially crime and safety problems– under control has become a central idea in modern society. Both international and European standards exist in order to support cities to master risks. These documents are abstract but are built on an international consensus which can convince others. Most important is that the aforementioned standards have defined a clear 'risk language and terminology', which is helpful when working with several different stakeholders. A risk assessment (for new environments) and risk review (for existing environments) have to follow three steps: risk identification, risk analysis, and risk evaluation. These steps have to be performed before starting a risk treatment, which is the development of a plan to counter the issues concerning crime and safety together.

5.2 How

Most of the aforementioned standards can be accessed online in multiple languages from various national standardisation institutes. Some standards that could support the development of guidelines and such are:

- The European Committee for Standardisation developed the European Standards series CEN 14383 to help and encourage the inclusion and consideration of safety and security issues in urban planning and design focusing on crime, anti-social behaviour, and fear of crime and feelings of insecurity: CEN 14383 series of reports, in particular technical report CEN 14383-2.
- The International Organisation for Standardisation provides a common approach to managing any type of risk and is not industry or sector specific: ISO 31000:2018 - Risk Management – Guidelines.
- The International Organisation for Standardisation also provides guidelines for establishing the basic elements, strategies, and processes for preventing and reducing crime and the fear of crime at a new or existing environment: ISO 22341:2021 - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb could be reading the aforementioned standards and guidelines and a group action to define a common language, principles and processing in the new science of risk management together. The end result could also be a specific terminology and approach as part of a local SbD project: it is not essential to use the official standards. Own

guidelines and processes can be developed as long as the involved stakeholders are aware and use the same terminology.

5.3   Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	CEN/TC 325 (Crime prevention through building, facility and area design (https://www.cencenelec.eu/european-standardization/) and http://www.costtu1203.eu/the-only-crime-prevention-standard-in-europe-since-the-roman-empire/
2	ISO 31000:2018(en) - Risk Management – Guidelines
3	ISO - ISO 22341:2021 - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.
4	Madrid Municipal Police uses an EFQM management model, introducing risk indicators with quantifiable objectives for improvement, allowing for a "CQ seal of excellence, Caf with level 300-499". A "community policing" model was added including a "risk map" and " key elements" like critical installations. Policía Municipal - Ayuntamiento de Madrid; Unidades del Ayuntamiento de Madrid con certificaciones EFQM y CAF - Ayuntamiento de Madrid
5	Brussels-Capital Region Guide to the integration of security systems in public spaces: https://bps-bpv.brussels/en/guide-integration-security-systems-public-spaces
6	Standards and guidelines on the protection of public spaces. See the Joint Research Centre: https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/protection-public-spaces-from-terrorist-attacks
7	On Vehicle Security Barriers. The international ISO practice guideline IWA 14-1: 2013 offers knowledge to cope with current terrorism threats and provides a good overview of the state of the art and the knowledge concerning the protection against hostile vehicles. Also: https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC121582

6   Explore from a birds-eye view

Zoom out and take a bird's eye view on space, time, and people.

6.1   Why

Security often focuses only on the most probable target at risk: one specific building (e.g. a town hall, places of worship, a festival venue) or a specific person (e.g. the President of the United Stated of America in his car). By zooming out and looking at the specific location and/or person from a broader context, one can assess how a target can be defended differently. For instance, by placing bollards a few blocks ahead instead of in front of the building itself, or by creating a car-free pedestrian area or park as a 'defence system' of some sorts.

Furthermore, it is important to take a broader timeframe into account when assessing the risk perspective: before – during – after – and aftermath. The consequences of a crime that takes place are often forgotten. After a robbery, the victim(s) or witnesses could come to have Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of their experiences. This can be prevented and avoid various problems and costs. The same could result after a terrorist attack, and people want to remember that fact which is essential for psychological healing.

Lastly, it is important to zoom out and look at a criminal offence from a wider perspective when it comes to space and time, but it is also important to always keep the **people** in mind. People behave with an idea and purpose based on multiple elements (e.g. culture, background), and they tend to congregate and perceive situations in different ways. Perceptions differ across people, and sometimes perception is reality. Public space should be **public and inclusive.** Street harassment is frequently experienced by women and members of the LGBTQ+ community in night-time entertainment spots and is commonly perpetrated by men (for more information, see example 2 in section 6.3). Consequently, the fear of being victimised "has been found to limit activities and territory, heighten stress, make people feel like prisoners in their homes and neighbourhoods, disrupt neighbourhood cohesion and, by doing so, may actually increase crime" (Nasar & Fisher, 1993).

6.2   How

When considering potential risks, zoom out and analyse the potential risk from a wider context. When it comes to space, take a bird's eye perspective of the location (e.g. by using a map) and identify what has to be protected, how can it be protected close to the location, and how can it be protected further away from the location. When it comes to time, consider the before, the during, the after, and the aftermath of possible risk, and identify what the consequences might be for the different people (e.g. citizens, victims, aid workers, witnesses, etc.) after different time periods (e.g. a day, a month, a year). Apply these ideas to people and think about tangible and intangible costs, and possible harm done to the people. Bear in mind that these actual and perceived tangible and intangible costs change as people develop: what has upset us yesterday, may not upset us today and may even be different tomorrow. Keep in mind that differences exist **between** people.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be an in-depth analysis (e.g. using Giga-Mapping (systems thinking)) on how crime and safety problems develop and are influenced by time, space and people. It is important to understand how people behave in time and space according to, for example, age, gender, socio-economic status, nationality, being a resident or not, etc.

6.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Giga-Map: Visualisation for complexity and systems thinking in design; How to GIGA-map
2	From "Ghettoization" to a Field of Its Own: A Comprehensive Review of Street Harassment Research - often experienced among women and LGBTQ+ community and commonly perpetrated by men
3	Nasar, J. L., & Fisher, B. S. (1993). Hot spots of fear and crime: A multi-method investigation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 13*(3), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(05)80173-2
4	Partnership between the PACTESUR project and the Sustainable Design School of Nice: https://efus.eu/topics/public-spaces/security-by-design-towards-greater-integration/

7 Be conscious of the negative by effects of solutions

Every solution and/or treatment has consequences, and sometimes these consequences could be harmful. It is important to face this and try to soften the effects.

7.1 Why

It is well known that security and target hardening could have a significant effect on the way people perceive a situation. The visibility of security measures could potentially evoke fear and feelings of insecurity. This could be a psychological cue for the perception of insecurity. This is also the reasoning behind the golden rule of good security: security should be invisible.

7.2 How

When a specific solution and/or measure for a given crime and safety problem is being considered, it is important to take a step back. This rule of thumb advises to test all SbD solutions beforehand on the issue of negative and positive consequences. Show the SbD solution 3D beforehand and test it as a cardboard solution in situ, and ask an array of people what they think, feel, and perceive regarding the solution. A quick try-out and combined action research will help to determine the effects of the measure. Furthermore, analyse the cost and the benefits, the tangible and the intangible costs, and benefits.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be a clear indication of the possible positive and negative effects of a SbD solution designed to address a specific crime and safety problem.

7.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Use the Bono's hat game in a group and consider each solution always also with the black hat: https://www.debonogroup.com/services/core-programs/six-thinking-hats/
2	Van Soomeren, P. and Wever, J. (2005) Review of Costs and Benefits Analysis in Crime Prevention. Report to the European Commission. Amsterdam (DSP-groep) / Brussels (EUCPN)
3	https://eucpn.org/document/a-guide-on-how-to-determine-costs-and-benefits-of-crime-prevention
4	Conducting Community Based Participatory Action Research & The ethics of action research participation and on Ethical, legal & social issues impacting Crime Prevention through Urban Design & Planning: https://www.cuttingcrimeimpact.eu/resources/factsheets/crime-prevention-through-urban-design-and-planning-cp-udp---/

8 Evidence-informed working

There is plenty of knowledge from meta-analyses and (systematic) reviews, as well as evidence on what does and does not work in addressing crime and safety problems. Therefore, it is recommended to work evidence based and/or evidence-informed.

8.1   Why

The SbD approach or CPTED understands that good, evidence-based, human-centred design, planning, and management can make a city fit for the future. Evidence-based – or evidence-informed – working implies that a thorough assessment after SbD-interventions (treatment and/or solutions) are included in the planning, design and management and are implemented. Such an assessment – or ex-post evaluation of output, outcome, and impact – is necessary to learn what works and what does not work. The SbD approach should draw on this robust body of established scientific knowledge about urban environments, (social) psychology, sociology, criminology, systems design/engineering, urban planning, design, and city-management/maintenance. This existing body of knowledge should constantly be renewed by new scientific evidence and pay attention to "the accumulation and confrontation of knowledge from different disciplines"[2].

8.2   How

It is important to actively learn from each other and earlier experiences. This process is known as 'SPATIAL': Scan, Prioritise, Analysis, Task, Intervene, Assess, Learn. Some refer to the PDCA-Deming cycle: Plan-Do-Check-Act, which is also used in Risk management (see rule of thumb 5). Therefore, it is useful to assess afterwards if an intervention, treatment, or solution worked and what the outcome was[3]. An innovative and daring idea is to design the intervention in **cardboard first,** try it real time for a limited period of time (e.g. few days/weeks), check the effect in action research, and discuss the results with relevant stakeholders (no negative side-effects see rule 7; check political judicial economic/costs issues etc.). Most treatments and/or solutions need an adjustment period, so adjust and repeat the process. Dare to try and experiment, but also invest in action research, assessments, ex-post evaluations of the experiments as only this makes the results definitive.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be effective and evidence informed – by action research, assessments, systematic reviews – solutions. These final solutions could be based on earlier failures, as what works can build on failures. Evidence-based working means to search for good and bad practices: one can search in databases for approaches that already have been implemented and whether or not they worked and why, to avoid making the same mistakes.

---

[2] Chen, Y., Daamen, T.A., Heurkens, E.W.T.M., & Verheul, W.J. (2020). Interdisciplinary and experiential learning in urban development management education. *Int J Technol Des Educ*, *30,* 919–936. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-019-09541-5

[3] Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997) Realistic Evaluation (Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi) use the trio Context – Mechanism – Outcome

8.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	Chen, Y., Daamen, T.A., Heurkens, E.W.T.M., & Verheul, W.J. (2020). Interdisciplinary and experiential learning in urban development management education. *Int J Technol Des Educ*, *30,* 919–936. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-019-09541-5
2	Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997) Realistic Evaluation (Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi) use the trio Context – Mechanism – Outcome
3	Sherman et al. (1998). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. *National Institute of Justice*, retrieved from: https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles/171676.pdf
4	Problem Oriented Approach of High Impact Crime: www.ProHIC.nl

9 Thoughtful ethical design

Good security design is unobtrusive, advances human well-being, and minimises the possibility of unintended outcomes like social exclusion, discrimination, hostile architecture, and data misuse.

9.1 Why

Good security is designed in a plan or project unobtrusively, invisible (see also rule of thumb 7), and in ways that do not disrupt the overall feeling (e.g. cultural or atmospheric imprint) of a place too much (see also the ideas of the New European Bauhaus). Good security design nudges people toward more favourable behaviour and perceptions without necessarily being aware of it, all done in an ethical responsible way.

Furthermore, good security design aims at creating inclusive places and avoiding social exclusion and gated communities. Specifically, modern debates emphasise the importance of taking a broader and nuanced security approach that is minority- and gender-inclusive. For instance, the SbD approach should not rely on defensible design measures, or a fortress mentality, or considered to be exclusionary, hostile, and unpleasant. Hostile design should be avoided and so, there should be no:

- Spikes on benches.
- Sweeping barbed wire on fences.
- Gated communities for the rich.
- Sensors (e.g., CCTV) that endangers privacy rights.
- Exclusive public areas (e.g. for women or members of the LGBTQ+ communities).

9.2 How

It is important to convene a safe and secure "space of encounter to design future ways of living, situated at the crossroads between art, culture, social inclusion, science and technology"[4]. Per the New European Bauhaus concept and movement, it is important to plan and design inclusive, accessible spaces where the dialogue between diverse cultures, disciplines, genders, and ages becomes an opportunity to imagine a better place for all.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be a new way of looking at security. Design should be there to make people feel content, and security should not be defensive and negative but open and inviting. Furthermore, it should reduce and prevent crime and safety problems in the form of positive crime prevention with new approaches that are ethically sound.

---

[4] https://europa.eu/new-european-bauhaus/index_en

9.3 Examples and Sources

Nr.	Example
1	https://europa.eu/new-european-bauhaus/index_en
2	Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention, 2005): https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention
3	PACTESUR's pilot security equipment for protecting public spaces while avoiding "bunkerisation" of cities: https://efus.eu/topics/public-spaces/the-pactesur-partners-draft-recommendations-for-local-authorities-on-public-space-security-equipment/
4	Guide to the integration of security systems in public spaces: https://bps-bpv.brussels/en/guide-integration-security-systems-public-spaces

10 You: it is about you

The process starts with active and motivated people taking action such as oneself.

10.1 Why

Cities should be safe, secure, and free of violence, crime, harassment, and fear of crime for all citizens. It is everyone's personal and non-transferable responsibility to improve security and the environment, with the utmost respect for fundamental rights and public freedoms to contribute to citizens' health, liveability, safety, and security.

SbD helps to keep cities safe and secure. Implementing a SbD-based approach in order to enhance security in public spaces is an innovative practice in which local and regional authorities, planners/designers, city managers, police, researchers, and residents and users of public space are responsible for implementing and using this SbD approach for safe and secure cities. This is not an abstract aim or plea: **it involves everyone in their position as a** local/regional authority, politician, planner/designer, city-manager and city maintenance, researcher, police officer, but also as a resident, a person of culture and arts, the user of public spaces, etc. In all of these different roles, one should steer and be part of the co-creation process in designing new projects.

10.2 How

The New European Bauhaus concept and movement challenges and mobilises designers, architects, engineers, scientists, students, and creative minds across disciplines to reimagine safe and secure living in Europe and beyond. It is important to search for new ways to look at safety and security; fight and counter, or crime and safety problems in a new way by being open and inviting instead of defensive. What is needed is a vital coalition of a politician who is willing and dares to act, combined with an experienced civil servant who knows the rules and to make them more flexible and a motivated group of citizens. Therefore, 'you' is often a part of this vital coalition, which leads back to rule of thumb 1.

The end result of the implementation of this rule of thumb should be to take an approach to SbD that was shaped and designed **by**, in consultation **with**, and **for** the people involved: you.

10.3 Examples and Sources

Here you can collect your examples and your sources.

Nr.	Example
1	
2	
3	