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1.0 Executive Summary

The King George Safety Audit process is intended to gauge both real and perceived safety concerns throughout the King George neighbourhood, and to develop recommendations to address them. This process arises from recommendations in the King George Local Area Plan (LAP), and is based on the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

The process involved the participation of neighbourhood stakeholders and civic staff in the following Neighbourhood Safety-related activities:

- **Community-Wide Safety Meeting** – The entire King George neighbourhood was invited to this meeting which introduced stakeholders to the project and involved them in the identification of safe/unsafe areas.
- **Crime Statistics Analysis** – This compared crime incidence reports with areas perceived as safe/unsafe and identified specific sites/areas that warranted further investigation.
- **Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee** – The subcommittee met on seven occasions throughout the safety process to identify those stakeholders that should be involved in the process, review and prioritize the results of the Community Safety Meeting and Crime Statistics Analysis and establish a Safety Action Plan to guide the safety review process.
- **CPTED Workshop** – This special meeting of the Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee educated participants on the principles of CPTED.
- **Neighbour to Neighbour Surveys** – During two surveys, participants interviewed residents adjacent to identified areas of concern regarding their perceptions of safety.
- **Safety Audits** – These area-specific walkthrough reviews identified safety concerns and opportunities for crime to occur; five specific locations were audited over the course of four audits.
- **User Survey** – Users of a park facility were surveyed to assess their perceptions of safety and identify concerns.
- **Youth Participation** – Based on feedback from the Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee, youth participants were involved in the King George safety process through the King George Job Registry. Using an adapted process, this group of local youth also identified safe/unsafe areas in the neighbourhood, completed a CPTED workshop, and participated in two Safety Audits.

The four sites/areas identified at the Community Safety Meeting as requiring further investigation (e.g. Safety Audits, User Surveys, etc.) were: King George School grounds, St. Andrews Park, Victoria Park SkatePark and Gardener’s Residence site, and the 700 block of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O South. The majority of the findings and recommendations of this report relate to one or more of these sites/areas.

Participants found that in some locations in the review areas vandalism (including graffiti vandalism), litter, and lack of maintenance negatively affected the neighbourhood’s image, and consequently users’ perceptions of their safety in these areas. Territoriality was also raised as a concern in some areas where image concerns, limited natural surveillance, and minimal activity support may contribute to a reduced sense of ownership among community members over these areas. As activity support (use of these areas/facilities by intended, legitimate users) declines,
there is an increased risk that illegitimate users may take ownership of the areas. Comments from participants relating to threats and gang activity show that this may be the case in some instances. However, participants agreed that the neighbourhood is generally safe during the day and at other times when there are activities and people around.

This report contains 27 recommendations (summarized in Section 2.0) that are designed to address a number of safety concerns in King George. Each recommendation addresses one or more of the CPTED principles identified in the City’s Official Community Plan (Bylaw No. 8769). These principles are outlined in Appendix 8.1. Most of the report’s findings and recommendations deal with concerns raised in the four Safety Audit areas. The timeframe for implementation ranges from the short term (less than one year) for recommendations, such as tree trimming in Victoria Park, to the long term (five to ten years) for others, such as establishing the Gardener’s Residence Site as a destination for special events. Implementation of the report’s recommendations involves the participation of a range of civic and community partners.

The consultation process for the King George neighbourhood provided stakeholders with a number of opportunities to identify those neighbourhood safety issues that are of the greatest concern, and hence priorities for implementation. A number of recommendations in this report are intended to be implemented in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan process. These, and any other recommendations that can be coordinated with ongoing capital projects or other LAP/Neighbourhood Safety initiatives, are considered to be priorities for implementation. Recommendations related to children’s safety are also a high priority. To ensure that recommendations are implemented in an appropriate timeframe and that adequate resources are allocated, this report calls for the coordination of operating and/or capital budget costs between affected civic departments.
2.0 Summary of Recommendations

6.1 **NATURAL SURVEILLANCE**

6.1.1 **TREE TRIMMING:** That the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department identify and potentially trim and/or remove trees on the north-east corner of the tennis courts, near the Victoria Park SkatePark, to increase natural surveillance and reduce hiding places in the area. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.1.2 **AVENUE N PROPERTIES:** That Fire and Protective Services advise property owners of the vacant lots located on the west-side of 800 block of Avenue N, across from St. Andrew’s Park, to clear or trim overgrown trees and bushes and to remove or maintain sheds that may be a hazard.

6.2 **TERRITORIALITY**

6.2.1 **WAY-FINDING SIGNAGE:** That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place large way-finding signage in the Victoria Park SkatePark, along Spadina Crescent and on the Meewasin Trail. These signs should indicate direction to nearby attractions and include who to call in cases of emergency or for maintenance issues. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.2.2 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK SIGN:** That Community Development Branch, Community Services Department advise the King George Community Association of possible funding sources to install a St. Andrew’s Park sign on the south-east corner of the park to clearly identify the park.

6.3 **ACCESS CONTROL**

6.3.1 **SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCES:** That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School in support of painting the fence posts at each of the entrances to the King George School grounds a bright colour. This will ensure that they are easily recognized as points of entrance/exit for users.
6.3.2 CLOSE SOUTH SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCE: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School to support the closure of the entrance to the school grounds fencing on the south side to encourage students to use the sidewalks, as opposed to the lane, as safe routes to and from school.

6.3.3 SKATEPARK GATEWAY: That the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department design and install a gateway welcoming people into Victoria Park, in general, and to the Victoria Park SkatePark. This gateway should include steps or a ramp to cross the retaining wall that is located between the skatepark and Spadina Crescent to allow users easier access to the skatepark. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.4 IMAGE

6.4.1 MURAL ARTWORK: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department write a letter to the King George Community Association and the King George School advising them of the benefits of discouraging graffiti vandalism by adding more mural artwork, created by students, on the King George School, its grounds and on the rink boards and that the letter include examples of funding options.

6.4.2 SKATEPARK MURAL: That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Riverside Badminton and Tennis Club, the King George Community Association, and the Victoria Park SkatePark users to discuss the possibility of the creation of a skatepark-themed mural on the north-west corner wall of the tennis courts to cover the existing graffiti vandalism on the wall. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.4.3 LITTER: That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department place additional garbage cans in and around the Victoria Park SkatePark to decrease the amount of litter in the area and ensure that emptying schedules match high usage times.

6.4.4 ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND: That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department re-paint the playground equipment located in St. Andrew’s Park to assist in properly maintaining the equipment, making it welcoming to users and reducing negative perceptions of the park.
6.4.5 ST. ANDREW’S PARK MURAL: That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with King George Community Association and the neighbourhood youth to examine the feasibility of creating a mural on the walls of the St. Andrew’s Park paddling pool to celebrate the neighbourhood and its young people, and encourage ownership and respect of the park amongst users.

6.5 CONFLICTING USER GROUPS & LAND USE

6.5.1 SKATEPARK SIGNAGE: That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place highly visible signage at the Victoria Park SkatePark to:
   (a) encourage respect for other users,
   (b) help keep the area clear of litter, and
   (c) inform new users of basic SkatePark etiquette.

6.6 CRIME GENERATORS

6.6.1 GARDENER’S RESIDENCE FENCING: That the Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department, in consultation with Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department, remove any unnecessary fencing around the Gardener’s Residence site to reduce the danger of current entrapment areas. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.7 ACTIVITY SUPPORT

6.7.1 DOG BYLAW SIGNAGE: That the Animal Services Program Coordinator, Corporate Services Department review the dog bylaw signage throughout Victoria Park and communicate the results and recommendations of this review and of the dog bag dispenser pilot program to the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department for incorporation into the Victoria Park Master Plan.

6.7.2 GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE: That Leisure Services, Community Services Department, examine the possibility of developing part of the Gardener’s Residence green space as a destination for special event photography and gatherings through the Victoria Park Master Plan.

6.7.3 VICTORIA PARK & GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE: That the Neighbourhood Planning Section ensure that a copy of this report and summaries of all relevant surveys be forwarded to the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department and the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department for inclusion in the plans for upgrading Victoria Park and revising the Victoria Park Program.
6.7.4 ST. ANDREW’S PARK: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department and the King George Community Association, to review the number and location of picnic tables and benches throughout St. Andrew’s Park to identify whether more are needed to encourage the park as a destination point for local residents.

6.7.5 ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT: That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to address the recreation need identified by the neighbourhood’s youth for playground equipment in St. Andrew’s Park for older youth (10-14 years).

6.8 MOVEMENT PREDICTORS

6.8.1 RINK ENTRANCES: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, in cooperation with the King George Community Association, advise the King George School of the benefits of adding a second exit to the school’s rink in either the south-west or south-east corner to provide an escape route.

6.9 NEIGHBOURHOOD COHESION

6.9.1 SAFE AT HOME BOOKLET: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department ensure that the King George Community Association receive copies of the “Safe at Home” booklet and that the booklet be advertised in the Community newsletter and available to residents at a convenient neighbourhood location.

6.9.2 PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BROCHURE: That the King George Community Association distribute copies of the Property Maintenance brochure to residents, in advance of and in conjunction with the annual Community Clean Up, to reinforce and expand the community's knowledge of proper waste disposal and recycling processes.

6.10 COMMUNITY CULTURE

6.10.1 PUBLIC ART PROGRAM: That the Planning and Development and Community Development Branches, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to help them establish a mural or public art program for facilities and structures in the neighbourhood, such as the rink boards on the school grounds.

6.10.2 CULTURAL/HISTORICAL SIGNAGE: That the King George Community Association, in consultation with the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, organize a meeting with the Saskatoon Public Schools Division and
the King George School administration to discuss the addition of signage on the school grounds that recognizes the heritage, diversity and history of the school and community.

6.11 CONNECTIVITY

6.11.1 COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING: That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association establish additional community programming and activities in St. Andrew’s Park, such as festivals, horse shoes, or a games table to encourage more community activity in the park.

6.11.2 MAINTAIN NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFETY CONNECTION: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, report annually to the King George Community Association on the status of the King George Neighbourhood Safety Report recommendations in conjunction with the annual Local Area Planning status report.

6.12 GENERAL

6.12.1 COORDINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BUDGETS: That the Neighbourhood Planning Section contact all identified departments to coordinate the estimated operating and/or capital budget costs and submit a comprehensive Neighbourhood Safety budget request to City Council for funding and implementing these recommendations once the report has been approved.
3.0 Background

3.1 History of King George

The King George neighbourhood is a historic community with a grid street pattern, which was typical at the time it was developed. Located on the west side of Saskatoon, the neighbourhood is within walking distance of downtown, the Saskatoon Farmers’ Market, River Landing and the Riversdale Business Improvement District (RBID). The neighbourhood has an area of approximately 44 city blocks that is bounded by 17th Street on the north, Avenue P to the West, 11th Street on the south and the South Saskatchewan River on the east (see Map 1). King George is one of the older areas in Saskatoon and is defined as a core neighbourhood.

King George Community School, located in the centre of the neighbourhood, is one of Saskatoon’s earliest schools and is a historic landmark. Today, King George School serves as a neighbourhood focal point, providing social, recreational, cultural, and educational programs to residents of all ages and cultural backgrounds.

Located along the South Saskatchewan River, Victoria Park is largely located within the King George neighbourhood, with approximately 38.8 acres of its total 50.76 acres falling inside the neighbourhood boundaries. This Special Use Park accommodates a number of organized sports clubs such as badminton, tennis, rowing, canoeing, kayaking, lawn bowling, and many other recreational activities like skateboarding and biking. Riversdale Pool, Saskatoon’s largest outdoor swimming facility is also located within Victoria Park South. In 1989, Victoria Park was host to the Jeux Canada Games. During this time, the Meewasin Trail was extended to Victoria Park, increasing the opportunity for residents to enjoy jogging, walking, and cycling.
Map 1: King George Neighbourhood
3.2 King George Local Area Plan

Local Area Planning is a public, participation-oriented planning approach to developing comprehensive neighbourhood plans that give residents, business owners and other stakeholders an active role in determining the future of their neighbourhood. Participants work with each other to identify issues, develop goals and outline strategies to ensure the long-term success of the neighbourhood. Their input is used to create a Local Area Plan (LAP), which sets out objectives and policies to guide growth and development at the neighbourhood level.

Nine LAPs have been adopted by City Council since 1998. These include the areas of Airport Industrial, Caswell Hill, King George, Nutana, Pleasant Hill, Sutherland, Warehouse District, West Industrial and most recently, Riversdale.

City Council adopted the King George Local Area Plan on June 4, 2001. Recommendations in the report were drafted to help address many concerns and issues in the King George neighbourhood.

Those recommendations specifically related to neighbourhood safety include:

4.1 Safety Audit
That the King George Community and School Association work with the Community Services Department, City Planning Branch and Community Development Branch to conduct a Safety Audit, using the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), on part or all of the neighborhood to identify issues of concern to residents and; that the King George Safety Audit Report be forwarded to the King George Community and School Association, the Safer City Committee and the Saskatoon Police Services.

4.2 Partnership
That the Community Services Department, City Planning Branch and Community Development Branch and Saskatoon Police Service enhance their working relationship with the King George Community and School Association to further identify, prioritize and address specific and potential safety concerns that arise during the King George Safety Audit.

When the Neighbourhood Safety Program was begun in King George, the King George School and Community Association was heavily involved and was a joint Community and School association. Recently, provincial legislation required all schools to create their own Community School Councils. With this change, the joint association was split. The King George Community Association now focuses on Community initiatives and the new King George Community School
Council focuses on curriculum and activities in the school. The material for this report was created when the joint association existed and therefore, the balance of this report will refer to the King George School and Community Association with the exception of the recommendations. The recommendations have been assigned to the appropriate group based on the topic and resources mentioned in the recommendation.

The implementation of each LAP requires resources, usually greater than normal operating resources, to fulfill the recommendations contained in the LAP. Implementation is important to sustain and improve conditions within Saskatoon’s core neighbourhoods and to generate confidence amongst residents as they plan their future in these important areas of Saskatoon. The Planning and Development Branch works with an array of City of Saskatoon departments and branches, as well as community organizations and citizens, to implement the recommendations of each LAP.

A workshop participant presents group work at the Community Safety Workshop on January 25, 2006.

---

1 City of Saskatoon Municipal Manual 2006, City of Saskatoon, page 76.
4.0 King George Neighbourhood Profile

4.1 Demographic Trends

Demographic statistics provide an initial picture of the present state and potential future condition of King George.

The total population of King George has decreased from 1,960 in 1988 to an estimated 1,868 in 2006, a decrease of 4.7 percent. Additionally, Figure 1 shows that the age distribution between the number of children, young adults and adults in the King George neighbourhood has become more balanced since 1991.

**Figure 1: King George Population, 1991-2006**

More specifically, the age distribution characteristics in the King George neighbourhood show relatively more young children and middle aged adults and relatively fewer young adults and seniors. Typically, this type population distribution can have an impact on crime in the neighbourhood, as young children and middle aged adults are generally involved in less criminal activity than other age groups.

According to the 2006 Census, the Aboriginal population of King George rose from 325 in 2001 to 525 in 2006, accounting for 28% of the neighbourhood's total population.
According to the Saskatoon Neighbourhood Profiles 8th Edition, in 2006 approximately 65 percent of households in King George were two-parent families, while 18.6 percent were one-parent families. The average household size was 2.4 people per household, which is the same as seen for the King George neighbourhood in 1996. Saskatoon’s average household size has moderately increased, from 2.4 in 2001 to 2.5 in 2006.

The average family income in King George was approximately $36,805 in 2006, an increase of 9 percent from 2001. The citywide average family income was $65,487, with a 4 percent increase from 2001.

King George is one of the most affordable neighbourhoods in Saskatoon to buy a home. In 2006, the average selling price for a single family dwelling unit was $98,167. This compares to a city average price of $165,089. The King George neighbourhood consists of 765 dwelling units of which 672 (87 percent) were one unit dwellings and 103 (13 percent) were multiple unit dwellings.

**Figure 2: Core Neighbourhood Home Ownership 2001**

![Percentage of Home Ownership Chart]

According to the Saskatoon Neighbourhood Profiles data, the number of owner-occupied homes in King George increased by 13.2 percent from 470 in 1996 to 532 in 2006. Renter-occupied housing has decreased by 11.6 percent in the same time period, going from 275 units to 243 units in King George.

King George is a mature neighbourhood with a diverse and affordable housing stock. This quiet neighbourhood values and celebrates the uniqueness of their multi-generational and cultural community. Residents of King George include families who have lived in the area for generations, young families starting out, and those who want to establish a home for their children located close to many amenities.
4.2 Crime Activity Profile

During the King George Local Area Planning process, residents expressed that they generally felt quite safe in their neighbourhood. However, residents had indicated that they felt there had been an increase in the number of property crimes in the neighbourhood, such as break and enter, theft, and vandalism. Residents also had concerns regarding incidents of drug use and prostitution near King George School grounds and St. Andrew’s Park. (LAP 2001:53)

According to the Saskatoon Police Service Incident Counts for King George (see Figure 3), reports of break and enter crimes had increased from 94 incidents in 2001 to 142 incidents in 2003, an increase of 51 percent. However, since 2003, the number of break and enter incidents reported has decreased by more than 50 percent, to 76 in 2005. The total number of crimes against property has also decreased since 2003 from 455 to 279 in 2005, a decrease of 39 percent. See Map 2 for the distribution of crime incidents.

**Figure 3: King George Selected Crime Incidents, By Type 2002 to 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>KG % change '02-'07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violations Causing Death</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Threat - Robbery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Threat - Armed Robbery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence or Threat - Criminal Harassment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crimes Against the Person</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-16.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter - Residential</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-68.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter - Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter - Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-70.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Break and Enter</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-68.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property - Theft Over $5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property - Theft Under $5000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-50.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property - Theft - Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property - Have Stolen Goods</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-68.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property - Mischief</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crimes Against Property</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-47.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saskatoon Police Service

Information from Police Services identifies a higher incidence of crime per 1000 people in King George when compared to the city and the neighbourhoods of Sutherland and Nutana, based on incident reports. Figure 4 shows this comparison.
The application of the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will support the continued reduction of a number of the types of crime summarized in the previous tables. CPTED principles help encourage visibility and create a sense of ownership among neighbourhood residents for their public spaces. Individuals considering break and enter or mischief crimes may be deterred if they feel too visible and have the sense that people in the area are likely to view and report their activities. Appropriate enhanced lighting, tree trimming and property maintenance are all elements of CPTED that can make a neighbourhood feel safer to its residents while making criminals uncomfortable, thus deterring their activities.

Neighbourhood connectivity is also an important element in reducing crime. Residents who are actively engaged in their community are more likely to be aware of and take ownership for their surroundings. King George, with its active Community Association, Community School Council, and the King George Work Registry, already has a number of strong community connections. These connections should continue to be supported and promoted as a key element of maintaining a safe community.

The remaining sections of this report will outline the activities, findings and recommendations of the King George Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee and the participants in the Safety Audit process. The recommendations contained in the report are intended to help increase the perception of safety in the neighbourhood while reducing opportunities for crime.
Map 2: King George Selected Crime Incidents by Location, 2006
5.0 The King George Safety Audit

5.1 Project Summary

The King George Local Area Plan (LAP) included recommendations to assist in improving safety for local residents, property and business owners, as well as other King George stakeholders.

In April 2005, representatives of the City of Saskatoon City Planning Branch Neighbourhood Safety Program met with the King George Community and School Association to confirm their interest in the implementation of the neighbourhood safety recommendations of the King George LAP. As a result, the King George Community and School Association Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee was established to work in partnership with the City of Saskatoon and complete the neighbourhood safety recommendations from the LAP.

An initial Safety Subcommittee meeting was held in June 2005 to discuss the project and to identify additional local stakeholders that should be involved.

At an August 2005 Safety Subcommittee meeting, attendees discussed hosting a neighbourhood-wide community safety meeting. The three main goals of this meeting were to:

- provide a forum for a facilitated discussion of safety issues impacting all King George stakeholders;
- gather information regarding perceptions of safety in the neighbourhood; and
- encourage people to join the King George Community and School Association Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee.

Flyers were sent to all neighbourhood residents, property owners and other stakeholders inviting everyone to attend a community-wide neighbourhood safety meeting. The King George Neighbourhood Safety Community Meeting was held on September 28, 2005 with 28 people in attendance.

One of the main goals of the meeting was to specifically identify areas and sites in the neighbourhood where participants felt safe or unsafe. These were identified on a map of the King George neighbourhood (Appendix 8.2). This activity outlined residents’ perceptions of safety which was combined with an analysis of the neighbourhood crime statistics to determine locations for Safety Audits to be performed.

The Safety Subcommittee reviewed the results of the Community Safety Meeting at an October 2005 meeting. The safety issues identified were reviewed and prioritized in an order that Subcommittee members felt would best represent the opinions of King George stakeholders at
large. Perception of safety was considered to be of equal importance as police crime statistics. Therefore, areas of concern identified by participants were considered, whether or not crime statistics indicated a problem existed in the area.

In January 2006, a CPTED Workshop was organized by the City of Saskatoon Neighbourhood Safety Program. Participants learned about the principles of CPTED (Appendix 8.1) and discussed how these principles can be applied to reduce the opportunity for crime in King George, while improving perceptions of safety for all local stakeholders.

In February 2006, the Safety Subcommittee reviewed a draft action plan that would guide the neighbourhood safety process over the next several months. The action plan included all of the activities the Safety Subcommittee wanted to accomplish prior to the Safety Audit Final Report. The King George Neighbourhood Safety Action Plan was then approved by the Safety Subcommittee (Appendix 8.2).

5.2 Youth Participation

At the suggestion of the Safety Subcommittee, the King George Job Registry group, which is made up of local youth from grades 5 to 8, was included in the safety project to provide the opinions of young people. The group meets weekly during the school year, as well as doing odd jobs to raise money for various activities. Various organizations, including the City of Saskatoon Planning and Development Branch, often announce upcoming events or meetings by hiring the group to conduct flyer drops throughout different areas of the city. It was noted that conducting flyer drops would likely provide them with a special, first-hand point of view of the King George neighbourhood.

The City of Saskatoon Neighbourhood Safety Program attended a Job Registry meeting in March 2006 to provide the group with background on the safety project, as well as to lead them through a CPTED Workshop modified for youth.

The next month, the group applied the principles of CPTED in activities similar to those from the Community Safety Meeting. This group was also invited to participate in upcoming Safety Audits.

Youth participating in the King George School Grounds Safety Audit.
5.3 Prioritized Areas of Concern

Using the information gathered from the community-wide safety meeting, the Safety Subcommittee considered their prioritized list of sites and decided to conduct a number of Safety Audits, with the assistance of City of Saskatoon Administration, to make first-hand observations of each area of concern.

The following areas were examined during Safety Audits (see Map 3):

- King George School grounds;
- Victoria Park SkatePark and Gardener’s Residence;
- St. Andrew’s Park; and
- 700 Block of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O South.

King George Safety Subcommittee members wanted additional information on each of these sites, particularly from residents living in and around the identified areas. A short survey was developed that would allow the Safety Subcommittee to record the opinions and perceptions of those nearby residents, who may have additional knowledge due to their proximity to the area of concern (Appendix 8.4). The Safety Subcommittee members performed this neighbour to neighbour survey, to gather the first hand experiences of other residents with crime, mischief and perceptions of safety.
Map 3: King George Safety Audits
5.4 Safety Audits

All members of the King George community, the King George Community and School Association Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee and the King George Community and School Association were invited to participate in a series of Safety Audits. A flyer drop across the entire King George neighbourhood notified people of the upcoming Safety Audits. City of Saskatoon Administration, such as representatives from the Parks Branch and Saskatoon Light and Power, were also invited to provide their technical opinions.

Prior to beginning each of the audits, participants were provided with a brief overview of the Neighbourhood Safety project and discussed the Safety Audit survey form (Appendix 8.5). Following the audit, all participants and facilitators returned to a designated meeting location to complete their Safety Audit survey form and debrief. The results of these surveys were compiled and analyzed.
The following pages summarize the results of the Safety Audits and highlight the concerns noted by the participants. The participants used maps, with previously-agreed upon locations highlighted, to guide their Safety Audits. These maps indicated specific locations with letters where audit participants were to focus their attention during the Audit. See Appendix 8.8 for the Safety Audit Maps.
Audit Area:
King George School Grounds
Date: Tuesday, May 2, 2006
Time: 7:00 – 9:30 p.m.  Participants: 16

The King George School grounds have a chain link fence surrounding the area, with few entrances. Located near the south-east corner is the staff parking lot, which is also fenced.

There is a paved play area, surrounded by rink boards near the south-west corner of the school. This area has direct lighting, although only one entrance. The play structure area is located on the west side of the school.

Safety Audit participants generally felt that the school grounds were safe and provided valuable open space in the north and south portions.

Participants’ Areas of Concern:

Lighting:
Although the Saskatoon Public School Division is using signage to discourage people from hanging around after dark, well-lit areas can also act as a deterrent for undesirable behaviour because of increased natural surveillance.

Entranceways and Escape Routes:
Personal safety could be compromised by having only one exit from the rink.

Entrapment Zones:
An entrapment area was identified in front of the school, where a second layer of fencing lines the sidewalk. Various sheds adjacent to the school were unintentionally placed in such a way that hiding places were created.

Graffiti Vandalism:
The rink boards are often subject to graffiti vandalism.
The Youth Perspective

A number of youths participated in the School Grounds Safety Audit. As students at the school, their perspective differed from the adult participants. It was obvious from their remarks during the Safety Audit that their perceptions of safety on the school grounds were influenced by their daily use of the site.

Both the youths and the adults mentioned that the entrances and exits from the site were hard to see, that the playground equipment needed increased maintenance and painting and that more lighting should be added.

The students had a number of further suggestions:

- Add more garbage cans to help deal with litter;
- Need new benches and seating;
- More exits are needed as it is too far between them and this is dangerous when being bullied;
- More colour should be added, and student art;
- The alleyway should not be lit as this will attract people to it; and
- Graffiti vandalism needs to be removed quickly.
Audit Area: St. Andrew’s Park
Date: Wednesday, May 31, 2006
Time: 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.  Participants: 17

St. Andrew’s Park is a 2.25-acre neighbourhood park, surrounded by a residential area. The park is bordered by 15th and 13th Streets West to the north and south and Avenues M and N South to the east and west. The park offers both a ball diamond and paddling pool in the south-west and north-east corners, respectively. A set of play structures, is located near the paddling pool, and a fenced picnic area is at the corner of Avenue M and 15th Street. The park has a variety of trees that provide park users with shade.

Participants’ Areas of Concern:

Vacant Lots:
Neighbouring vacant and overgrown lots to the west provide little surveillance.

Structures:
Picnic table is moved to provide access to roof of pool facility or other unintended activities.

Use:
The park is underutilized. A park sign should be added on the south end of the park.

Lighting:
Overhead lighting and large trees create areas of low visibility in the park.

Opinions of the park were extremely positive and most felt there were very few concerns about the space. It was agreed that the park is underutilized.

Aerial Map of St. Andrew’s Park.
The Youth Perspective

A number of youth from the King George Work Registry participated in the Safety Audit of St. Andrew’s Park.

Both the youths and the adults mentioned the need for lighting improvements in the park, improved maintenance and the need for trimming of bushes and trees around the park to improve natural surveillance and reduce hiding places.

A number of other improvements were suggested by the youth participants:

- Add more garbage cans to help deal with litter;
- Put up signage with emergency contacts; and
- Put a pay phone in the area in case of emergency.

The youths also had suggestions that would enhance the facilities in the neighbourhood and make the park more interesting for them:

- A larger pool;
- Play equipment geared for older children; and
- More benches and seating.
Audit Area:
700 Block of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O South
Date: Monday, June 12, 2006
Time: 7:00 – 9:30 p.m. Participants: 7

This residential area located in the north-west corner of King George contains one and two-unit dwellings. It is located adjacent to heavy industrial properties which tend to cause friction between those living in the residential area and those businesses located in the industrial area.

Participants noted that the traffic on these residential streets appeared to be quite sparse and helped create a very comfortable atmosphere.

Most Safety Audit participants believed the main issues in this area were focused on:

- The negative impact the nearby industrial businesses have on the quality of life of local residents;
- The busy Avenue P roadway;
- The resulting dust and noise from heavy trucks on Avenue P; and
- Maintenance concerns in lanes.

Infrastructure Services has committed to provide regular sweeping of Ave P from 11th to 17th Street to reduce dust from the businesses along the west side of Avenue P.

Participants observe a large tree overhanging a back lane.

Participants’ Areas of Concern:

Property Maintenance:
Some residents appear to not be providing the necessary upkeep on their homes, resulting in overgrown weeds and broken windows.

Lanes:
Graffiti vandalism and evidence of arson were apparent, along with overgrown weeds and broken windows.

Traffic:
Avenue P is heavily used and truck traffic may be a concern for noise.

Land Use:
Nearby industrial uses may create disturbance in the residential area.

Evidence of previous garbage can fire.

During the walk-about, participants noticed that signage had been placed on the fence of an industrial business on Avenue P. The sign reminded truck drivers to be mindful of the nearby residents by eliminating any unnecessary idling and offering overnight parking on the other side of the building to reduce noise for the residents.
Audit Area:
Victoria Park SkatePark and Gardener’s Residence

Date: Friday, May 12, 2006
Time: 8:00 – 11:00 p.m.  Participants: 12

The SkatePark is located directly to the north-east of the Riverside Badminton and Tennis Club, between Spadina Crescent and the riverbank. The 20,000 square foot facility draws users from across the city.

The SkatePark is considered to be unsupervised, although the City of Saskatoon employs a roving security guard on an intermittent basis during typical peak usage hours, from April until October. The guard patrols the area to help ensure the SkatePark and surrounding area remains safe for anyone spending time in this portion of Victoria Park. As a part of the Safety Audit process, a SkatePark User Survey was also conducted. A summary of results is included on page 29 and the survey itself is included as Appendix 8.6.

Areas of Concern:

Graffiti Vandalism:
Wall adjacent to SkatePark, on the back-side of the Riversdale Badminton and Tennis Club rebound wall is frequently targeted by graffiti vandalism.

Gardener’s Residence Site:
Thick vegetation around the site reduces visibility. The buildings and sheds on the site appear to have been used for sleeping and other activities.

SkatePark Security Presence:
A review of Daily Security Guard logs revealed minor incidents that were witnessed or reported to security, such as gang presence, abandoned or stolen bikes, Skateboarding injuries, users reporting fear of being followed home by gangs, and reported drug use.

The property is surrounded by thick bushes and trees which limits the natural surveillance of the site. Follow-up discussions with Parks Branch employees revealed that the area had been recently cleaned and that it is typically overrun with litter.

The Gardener’s Residence shed has been subject to numerous break-ins and trespassing.

In the summer of 2006, the small shed located beside the main shed building was removed, although unnecessary fencing remained. In the summer of 2008, the main shed was also removed. The thick bushes along Avenue H and Spadina Crescent were also removed to increase natural surveillance.
5.5 User Survey: Victoria Park SkatePark

Date: Thursday, August 17, 2006  Time: 3:15 – 4:45 p.m.  Participants: 27
Date: Friday, August 18, 2006  Time: 7:30 – 9:00 p.m.  Participants: 19

A survey of skatepark users was used to gather information from those using the facility (Appendix 8.6). Appendix 8.8 shows the distribution of participants by postal code.

User Demographics:
- 37 participants were male, 9 were female
- Age range from under 9 years up to 40+, 54% aged between 10 and 19.
- Frequency of visits (Daily-11, 3-5 times/week-13, Once/week-7, Once/month-7).
- Most popular activities were biking (20), skateboarding (17) and watching (15).
- Average typical skatepark visit length between 1-3 hours or 4-6 hours (16 each).

Perceptions of Safety:
- 41 respondents felt safe during the day, citing protection in numbers and daylight.
- 37 respondents felt safe during the early evening, although only if they were with friends or there were lots of people around.
- 13 respondents felt safe at the skatepark at night.
- 26% (12) had personally experienced an incident that made them feel unsafe, with most being thefts, assaults or threats of assault.

Users’ Areas of Concern:
- Young children being allowed to use the facility as a playground, which is unsafe for the children and the skatepark users.
- No separation between expert and beginner users which is dangerous for both.
- Night time users had concerns mainly focused on gangs, drugs and poor lighting.
- The security patrol was generally perceived to be poor for reasons such as infrequent patrolling and lack of proper training to step in and take control.
- Inappropriate activity occurring at the skatepark included: fights, drugs, graffiti, thefts, litter, gangs, and people not there to skate/bike.

Users’ Suggested Improvements:
- Add another skatepark on the City’s east side;
- Supervision and education for younger kids and a separate area for beginners;
- Security should have a background in skating/biking to gain respect from users;
- More/better lighting;
- Roof added to allow facility to be used year-round;
- Video cameras; and
- Police presence.
5.6 Neighbour to Neighbour Survey

A survey of residents was conducted to record the opinions and perceptions of people living in close proximity to areas of concern as prioritized by the King George Safety Subcommittee (Appendix 8.4). The survey was performed by fellow residents, members of the Safety Subcommittee. Below is a summary of the responses, based on location of survey.

Neighbour Survey: Weldon Avenue and Avenue O  
**Dates:** March 19, March 23, March 28 and April 3, 2006  
**Participants:** 14

- The majority of respondents do not feel safe walking in the area during the evening or at night; some do not feel safe walking in the area during daylight
- Residents have noticed possible gang activity, as well as lots of police presence
- Most respondents have had personal or family experiences of crime in the area including attacks and break and enters
- Dust and pollution were also cited as reasons for discomfort in the area

Neighbour Survey: St. Andrew’s Park  
**Dates:** May 7, 2006  
**Participants:** 7

- The majority of respondents do not feel safe walking in the area during the evening or at night
- Most respondents have noticed people drinking, partying or gathering in the park and some have seen or experienced harassment in the area
- A couple of residents have had break-ins to yard, garage or house over the years
- Residents noted that the addition of the light to the park has improved the area and would like to see additional lighting

Neighbour Survey: King George School Grounds  
**Dates:** March 5 to 8, 2006  
**Participants:** 15

- The majority of respondents feel safe walking in the area at all times
- Some residents have noticed such things as gang activity, men in vehicles, and kids bullying others outside of school hours
- Several residents felt that additional lighting on the grounds may be helpful
- A number of residents noted that they felt uncomfortable when groups of youth are in the area
6.0 Significant Findings and Recommendations

Recommendations of the King George Safety Audit have been grouped by the CPTED principle they reference. In many cases, recommendations could have been listed under multiple principles, as the recommended improvement will impact more than one principle.

The material for this report is based upon activities carried out in partnership with the King George School and Community Association. Due to a recent legislative change which resulted in the separation of the King George Community Association from the Community School Council, the recommendations have been assigned to the appropriate group based on the topic and resources mentioned in the recommendation.

6.1 NATURAL SURVEILLANCE

Natural surveillance refers to what can naturally or easily be seen within a line of vision. It also refers to the ability of people to see and be seen. Any element of design that increases the chance that a potential offender will be seen, or at the very least think that they may be seen, is a form of natural surveillance. Common strategies to improve natural surveillance include window placement, lighting improvements and removal of obstructions.

It is important to note that lighting improvements, while often requested, do not always act to deter unwanted behaviour. Improved lighting may, in some cases, attract more unwanted behaviour, which is then better lit. Requests for improved lighting must therefore be considered carefully. Consideration should be given as to whether the facility or area being lit should be used, or encouraged to be used, at night time.

6.1.1 TREE TRIMMING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>While users generally felt that the SkatePark area is safe and well-used, nearby areas have limited natural surveillance due to trees. The area behind the rebound wall of the tennis courts is frequently targeted with graffiti vandalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department identify and potentially trim and/or remove trees on the north-east corner of the tennis courts, near the Victoria Park SkatePark, to increase natural surveillance and reduce hiding places in the area. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The ability to see and be seen greatly enhances personal perceptions of safety. Additionally, if illegitimate users cannot find hiding places, they may choose to go elsewhere which reduces undesirable behaviour in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trees north of the tennis courts during the day

Trees north of the tennis courts at night
### 6.1.2 AVENUE N PROPERTIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Overgrown bushes and trees and poorly maintained sheds on lots on the 800 block of Avenue N have led to poor natural surveillance into these properties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That Fire and Protective Services advise property owners of the vacant lots located on the west-side of 800 block of Avenue N, across from St. Andrew’s Park, to clear or trim overgrown trees and bushes and to remove or maintain sheds that may be a hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Natural surveillance into and out of properties, particularly in proximity to public parks will ensure a feeling of safety for park users. Reducing hiding places and creating the appearance of consistent and ongoing maintenance will also increase users’ perceptions of safety in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avenue N South properties from 811 to 821 are overgrown and poorly maintained
6.2 Territoriality

The concept of territoriality refers to clearly defining public, semi-public and private spaces. It includes the idea of re-defining the physical space so that local residents and legitimate users can be responsible for their part of the public environment.

6.2.1 Way-finding Signage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Victoria Park is a large space with a number of attractions that may not be identifiable to all park users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place large way-finding signage in the Victoria Park SkatePark, along Spadina Crescent and on the Meewasin Trail. These signs should indicate direction to nearby attractions and include who to call in cases of emergency or for maintenance issues. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Placing way-finding signage will ensure that users have a better knowledge of their destination as well as other park facilities. This will encourage legitimate uses in the park, as well as establish a greater sense of ownership over particular areas such as the SkatePark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2 St. Andrew’s Park Sign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Audit participants felt that St. Andrew’s Park is currently underutilized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That Community Development Branch, Community Services Department advise the King George Community Association of possible funding sources to install a St. Andrew’s Park sign on the south-east corner of the park to clearly identify the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Signage will help establish a feeling of ownership and clearly identify the park as a public space. Clearly defining the space as public may help encourage residents to use the park space more often.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 **ACCESS CONTROL**

Access control is an element of territoriality. It includes the creation of access points, exits and gateways to a particular area in such a way as to encourage legitimate users of the area to take ownership of it. Access control may help discourage illegitimate users from inappropriate behaviour in the area.

6.3.1 **SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Fencing around the grounds of King George school limits the access points into and out of the grounds for the safety and control of the area and its students. However, the access points or gates are difficult to see.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School in support of painting the fence posts at each of the entrances to the King George School grounds a bright colour. This will ensure that they are easily recognized as points of entrance/exit for users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Easy-to-recognize entrance and exit points will help users of the school grounds easily identify how to exit the grounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Openings in the fencing are difficult to see
6.3.2 CLOSE SOUTH SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>The south access to the King George School grounds leads to the back alley between Avenue K and Avenue L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School to support the closure of the entrance to the school grounds fencing on the south side to encourage students to use the sidewalks, as opposed to the lane, as safe routes to and from school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Alleys do not separate pedestrians from vehicle traffic creating an unsafe situation for students using this alley to travel to and from school. Students are safer on the public sidewalks where they are visible. Closing this entrance will also discourage inappropriate use of the alley during recess and lunch times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entrance to school grounds at south end is difficult to see and exits into a lane.

Looking south from the south entrance to the school grounds
6.3.3 SKATEPARK GATEWAY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>SkatePark users generally access the SkatePark using an informal trail through Victoria Park from Spadina Crescent West.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department design and install a gateway welcoming people into Victoria Park, in general, and to the Victoria Park SkatePark. This gateway should include steps or a ramp to cross the retaining wall that is located between the skatepark and Spadina Crescent to allow users easier access to the skatepark. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The existing retaining wall is a barrier to all park users who seek a more direct route into or out of the park to Spadina Crescent. The retaining wall is quite high on the south end and would prevent most people from accessing the park from Spadina Crescent. A welcoming gateway will more clearly establish the entrance to this area of the park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trail from Spadina Crescent to SkatePark

Elevation change at retaining wall is about a metre (3 feet) which prevents access to Victoria Park and the SkatePark from a long section of Spadina Crescent.
6.4 **IMAGE**

The image of an area is either enhanced or detracted from by the maintenance of the area. If a property is well maintained, it indicates that the owner will protect and/or defend the property against crime. Lack of maintenance may signal that the owner will overlook crime or nuisance activities on the property.

6.4.1 **MURAL ARTWORK:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Areas of the King George School grounds have been consistently victimized by graffiti vandalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department write a letter to the King George Community Association and the King George School advising them of the benefits of discouraging graffiti vandalism by adding more mural artwork, created by students, on the King George School, its grounds and on the rink boards and that the letter include examples of funding options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>The placement of murals and artwork on the school grounds may help to instil a sense of ownership and pride among its students. Signage and artwork would also be an opportunity to make the school’s name more visible to passers-by.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.4.2 SKATEPARK MURAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>An existing wall of the Riverside Badminton and Tennis Club’s courts is a target for graffiti vandalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Riverside Badminton and Tennis Club, the King George Community Association, and the Victoria Park SkatePark users to discuss the possibility of the creation of a skatepark-themed mural on the north-west corner wall of the tennis courts to cover the existing graffiti vandalism on the wall. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>The creation of a themed mural designed and/or painted by SkatePark users, will help to encourage SkatePark users to take ownership of the area and will also reduce the chances of graffiti vandalism occurring on the wall in the future. The Victoria Park Master Plan offers a great opportunity to address the graffiti vandalism in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.3 LITTER:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Litter in the SkatePark creates a poor image of the area and indicates a lack of maintenance to users which may encourage further acts of vandalism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department place additional garbage cans in and around the Victoria Park SkatePark to decrease the amount of litter in the area and ensure that emptying schedules match high usage times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>Increasing the availability of garbage cans should help discourage littering in the area, thereby improving its appearance and image to all park users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.4 ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>St. Andrew’s Park playground equipment was showing wear.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department re-paint the playground equipment located in St. Andrew’s Park to assist in properly maintaining the equipment, making it welcoming to users and reducing negative perceptions of the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Evidence of a good maintenance program shows the area is cared for and indicates that the owner will defend the property against crime and vandalism. This enhances the safety of legitimate users of the space and helps them feel that the area will be protected and maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Andrew’s Park Playground

Play equipment in need of paint
### 6.4.5 ST. ANDREW’S PARK MURAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>St. Andrew’s Park was viewed as a good space with few safety concerns although it did appear to be underutilized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with King George Community Association and the neighbourhood youth to examine the feasibility of creating a mural on the walls of the St. Andrew’s Park paddling pool to celebrate the neighbourhood and its young people, and encourage ownership and respect of the park amongst users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Murals and other art helps to establish a sense of place and ownership of an area. A mural celebrating the neighbourhood and youth may help attract more users to the park and help establish it as a destination for residents. Working together to design and create a mural brings different user groups together and helps build cohesiveness between them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 CONFLICTING USER GROUPS & LAND USE

The principle of conflicting user groups refers to identifying and easing the conflicts between diverse user groups in an area. The separation of land uses due to potential conflicts is one strategy that is commonly used to deal with conflicting user groups.

6.5.1 SKATEPARK SIGNAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>SkatePark users indicated that trouble was caused by people in the area not there to skate or bike. They also indicated the new users or young children in the area, as well as their parents, may not be aware of the typical etiquette of the SkatePark users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place highly visible signage at the Victoria Park SkatePark to: (a) encourage respect for other users, (b) help keep the area clear of litter, and (c) inform new users of basic SkatePark etiquette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>The establishment of “rules” through signage may decrease conflicts between multiple user groups around the SkatePark by supporting appropriate behaviour. When conflict does occur and the rules are clearly stated it is much easier for users, residents, security or the police to enforce them. The current Victoria Park Master Plan project is a great opportunity to review the signage in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An appropriate and balanced mix of land uses can reduce the opportunity for crime, whereas a limited mix of land uses can create areas that are only used at certain times and abandoned at others. Such a situation makes it difficult to establish territoriality and surveillance outside of the regular hours. An appropriate mix of land uses can provide natural surveillance throughout the day, discourage criminal activities and create a strong sense of community and territoriality.

Residents of King George living near Avenue P have to deal with a number of external impacts from the adjacent industrial area such as dust, noise, smoke and traffic impacts. The residential and the industrial land uses come together at a hard edge along Avenue P resulting in a land use conflict. Typically, a transitional land use area would be used as a buffer for this type of land use conflict. However, the historical development of these two areas has produced this configuration and both areas are active and vibrant. Reducing the impacts of the nearby industrial uses may help contribute to an improved quality of life in the nearby residential area which may encourage improved property maintenance and image in the area.

There have been a number of developments over the past couple of years that will help ameliorate this land use conflict. They are:

1. The West Industrial Concept Plan, which describes future development in the area, establishes mixed-use areas adjacent to residential areas to buffer them from some of the heavy industrial uses. The King George Community Association was part of the public consultation process for the approval of the West Industrial Concept Plan.
2. The Local Area Planning (LAP) process and implementation program ensures that all land use and zoning changes are reviewed by the LAP group for conformance with the LAP recommendations and the spirit of the process.

3. The LAP program produces an annual status report for City Council and the LAP neighbourhoods. The implementation status of recommendations from all LAPs is listed and future priorities are identified. This helps keep all participants up to date on what is happening in their neighbourhood but also in the neighbourhoods around them.
Crime generators are local activity nodes or areas in the community that tend to attract criminal activity. The presence of crime generators increases the risks of crime for everyone. Common examples of crime generators include drinking establishments, unsupervised playgrounds and vacant, or poorly maintained properties.

### 6.6.1 GARDENER’S RESIDENCE FENCING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Fencing around the Gardener’s Residence site, combined with the surrounding dense trees and bushes limits natural surveillance of the area and creates entrapment areas in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department, in consultation with Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department, remove any unnecessary fencing around the Gardener’s Residence site to reduce the danger of current entrapment areas. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Removing unnecessary fencing in the area will reduce the possibility of entrapment in the area, and may also increase the attractiveness of the site, particularly in light of the recent demolitions of the residence and shed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7 ACTIVITY SUPPORT

The principle of activity support refers to encouraging appropriate uses of buildings and space to ensure that an area is being used as intended. Activity support can include programming and other uses that extends the time period a building or space is typically used for.

### 6.7.1 DOG BYLAW SIGNAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Dog walkers typically enjoy using park spaces but must be reminded of their duties to pick up after their pet, which contributes to the area’s image, and to keep their pet on a leash.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Animal Services Program Coordinator, Corporate Services Department review the dog bylaw signage throughout Victoria Park and communicate the results and recommendations of this review and of the dog bag dispenser pilot program to the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department for incorporation into the Victoria Park Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Dog walkers tend to use park spaces and public spaces at a range of times throughout the day and can provide “eyes on the street” but they must also contribute to maintaining the neighbourhood’s image. Signage and facilities such as bag dispensers will help encourage this maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7.2 **GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>The green space around the Gardener’s Residence site, when properly maintained, offers an attractive, green, open space that is not well-used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That Leisure Services, Community Services Department, examine the possibility of developing part of the Gardener’s Residence green space as a destination for special event photography and gatherings through the Victoria Park Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>Establishing this site as a destination will contribute to its image, enhance the maintenance of the site, attract new legitimate users to the area and preserve the heritage aspect of the space. All of these will help deter crime and nuisance activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gardener’s Residence site looking west
### 6.7.3 VICTORIA PARK & THE GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Since the completion of meetings in the neighbourhood, The City is working on an upgrade to Victoria Park and a new Victoria Park Program Plan. The upgrade will address physical aspects of the park and the program plan will address what goes on in the park. Public consultation for the Gardener’s Residence Program Plan was held in April 2009 and the Victoria Park Program Plan consultation will occur in the fall of 2009. It is anticipated that Phase 1 of this project will occur in 2010 and Phase 2 in 2012.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Neighbourhood Planning Section ensure that a copy of this report and summaries of all relevant surveys be forwarded to the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department and the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department for inclusion in the plans for upgrading Victoria Park and revising the Victoria Park Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The information collected through the safety audits and SkatePark user surveys will contribute an added dimension to both the upgrade and the new program plan of the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7.4 ST. ANDREW’S PARK:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>A limited number of picnic tables may not provide adequate facilities for the neighbourhood to use in the park.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department and the King George Community Association, to review the number and location of picnic tables and benches throughout St. Andrew’s Park to identify whether more are needed to encourage the park as a destination point for local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The provision of facilities, such as picnic tables, encourages the proper use of the park, establishes users in the area and promotes ownership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.7.5 ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Playground equipment in the area is targeted at young children while the neighbourhood population also includes a healthy level of older youth, for whom there are limited facilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to address the recreation need identified by the neighbourhood’s youth for playground equipment in St. Andrew’s Park for older youth (10-14 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>Providing equipment targeted to older youth will help provide legitimate activities for this group, perhaps reducing their desire to participate in nuisance behaviours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 MOVEMENT PREDICTORS

Movement predictors are elements of the built environment and landscaping that force potential victims to take a certain route. Providing obvious alternative routes reduces the ability of potential attackers to predict an individual’s route. Isolated and limited routes are examples of movement predictors.

6.8.1 RINK ENTRANCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>The school’s rink currently has only one entrance/exit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, in cooperation with the King George Community Association, advise the King George School of the benefits of adding a second exit to the school’s rink in either the south-west or south-east corner to provide an escape route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>A second exit from the rink will provide an escape route from the rink and reduce the likelihood of the rink becoming an entrapment zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

King George School rink from the south

King George School rink from the north
Neighbourhood cohesion refers to creating opportunities to encourage participation and responsibility among residents for their neighbourhood. Positive social interaction allows residents to foster a sense of community, responsibility and pride in their area.

### 6.9.1 SAFE AT HOME BOOKLET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Available materials should be distributed to help residents make their homes safer and reduce their risk of being the target of crime.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department ensure that the King George Community Association receive copies of the “Safe at Home” booklet and that the booklet be advertised in the Community newsletter and available to residents at a convenient neighbourhood location.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>The “Safe at Home” booklet provides information and resources to help residents improve their home environments and reduce opportunities for crime. Distribution of this booklet and advertisement in the community newsletter will help ensure residents are aware of the resources that are available to make their homes safer. Combining this with indoor registration or other community activity is also an opportunity to bring community members together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Safe at Home booklet has been distributed through various organizations in Saskatoon.
6.9.2 PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BROCHURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Improper dumping on streets and back alleys negatively impacts the appearance of the neighbourhood and can increase the likelihood of more dumping occurring in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the King George Community Association distribute copies of the Property Maintenance brochure to residents, in advance of and in conjunction with the annual Community Clean Up, to reinforce and expand the community's knowledge of proper waste disposal and recycling processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The Property Maintenance brochure helps communicate proper disposal methods. This resource should be distributed in advance of a planned Community Clean Up to help residents properly deal with their waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overgrowth of trees, shrubs, and grass in vacant lots on Avenue N South

Garbage in overgrown lots on Avenue N South
6.10 **COMMUNITY CULTURE**

Community culture is created through a shared sense of place and history among residents. This can be established and strengthened through festivals, sporting events, public art and music events. A strong sense of community culture enhances pride and territoriality, thereby helping to reduce crime rates.

**6.10.1 PUBLIC ART PROGRAM:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>There are a number of locations in the community where a mural or other public art installation may help reduce graffiti and other vandalism from occurring.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That the Planning and Development and Community Development Branches, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to help them establish a mural or public art program for facilities and structures in the neighbourhood, such as the rink boards on the school grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>A Community Public Art Program may offer an opportunity to establish a group available to provide art services specific to the community. This program could also provide an activity for youth or seniors to actively contribute to community image and culture, remove graffiti vandalism and encourage property maintenance efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.10.2 CULTURAL/HISTORICAL SIGNAGE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Cultural diversity and historical events that are significant to the community offer an opportunity to celebrate the community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>That the King George Community Association, in consultation with the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, organize a meeting with the Saskatoon Public Schools Division and the King George School administration to discuss the addition of signage on the school grounds that recognizes the heritage, diversity and history of the school and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification:</strong></td>
<td>Recognizing significant events in the community can help establish a sense of belonging for residents and create a community “culture” that residents can identify with. Signage, markers and structures such as entrance gateways and archways can provide significant settings to celebrate cultural or historical events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.11 Connectivity

The principle of connectivity refers to maintaining connections both within the community and with other groups and organizations external to the community. These connections help the community to access information and services that support the goals of the community and its residents.

6.11.1 COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>St. Andrew’s Park is underutilized and it may offer space for programming that would appeal to different segments of the residents in the community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association establish additional community programming and activities in St. Andrew’s Park, such as festivals, horseshoes, or a games table to encourage more community activity in the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Community programming in the park will help create a sense of pride and ownership over the park. New activities may also encourage people to use the park at different times of the day and increase natural surveillance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Andrew’s Park, looking NW, is underutilized

6.11.2 MAINTAIN NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFETY CONNECTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>The King George Community Association, Safety Subcommittee brought together a group of residents interested in enhancing neighbourhood safety. Some of these residents were long time Community Association members and some were brand new participants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That Neighbourhood Planning report annually to the King George Community Association on the status of the King George Neighbourhood Safety Report recommendations in conjunction with the annual Local Area Planning status report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Maintaining communication between Administration and the Community Association, through the Local Area Planning section and the Neighbourhood Safety program, will help ensure that issues or concerns can be dealt with in a proactive manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.12 GENERAL

Coordination within the implementation process is critical to the timely completion of recommendations and empowerment within the neighbourhood. A clear understanding of what will be completed, when and by whom, and what resources are needed helps all stakeholders understand their role in contributing to the safety of the King George neighbourhood.

6.12.1 COORDINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BUDGETS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding:</th>
<th>Coordination of projects and budgets, both operating and capital, is critical to the timely implementation of the recommendations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>That the Neighbourhood Planning Section contact all identified departments to coordinate the estimated operating and/or capital budget costs and submit a comprehensive Neighbourhood Safety budget request to City Council for funding and implementing these recommendations once the report has been approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>Funding specifically identified to address Neighbourhood Safety recommendations will ensure that implementation can move forward, in a planned and timely manner, to reduce the opportunity for crime to occur in their neighbourhood and to increase residents’ perceptions of safety in the neighbourhood. A collaborative and proactive approach to funding these recommendations will allow the departments involved in these projects to budget staffing and funding in a comprehensive and efficient manner and will lead to safer environments in our community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making the Neighbourhood Safety Connection at the Community Safety Workshop, January 2006
7.0 Implementation

7.1 Summary of Implementation Activities

The recommendations and findings presented in this report offer a number of opportunities to reduce the opportunity for crime to occur and increase perceptions of safety in the King George Neighbourhood.

The King George LAP Committee identified three neighbourhood safety goals:
- To reduce the occurrence of vandalism and other types of crime in the King George area;
- To ensure that King George remains a safe place to live, work and visit; and
- To foster a long term, cooperative approach to neighbourhood safety and crime prevention.

Implementation of the recommendations contained in this report will support the goals of the King George LAP Committee, the action plan created by the Safety Subcommittee, as well as the related recommendations in the King George Local Area Plan.

This report will be submitted to the King George Community Association and various civic departments including the Saskatoon Police Services for future consideration. Although the King George Local Area Plan recommended submitting this report to the Safer City Committee, this cannot be done as the Committee has since been disbanded. The Neighbourhood Planning Section of the Planning and Development Branch will use this report in the continued implementation of the recommendations of the King George Local Area Plan.

The following section reconfigures the recommendations, by site, for ease of searching and implementation.

7.2 Recommendations by Location

Safety Audit participants considering St. Andrew’s Park.
King George School Grounds

6.3.1 SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCES: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School in support of painting the fence posts at each of the entrances to the King George School grounds a bright colour. This will ensure that they are easily recognized as points of entrance/exit for users.

6.3.2 CLOSE SOUTH SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCE: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association write a letter to the Saskatoon Public School Division and the King George School to support the closure of the entrance to the school grounds fencing on the south side to encourage students to use the sidewalks, as opposed to the lane, as safe routes to and from school.

6.4.1 MURAL ARTWORK: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department write a letter to the King George Community Association and the King George School advising them of the benefits of discouraging graffiti vandalism by adding more mural artwork, created by students, on the King George School, its grounds and on the rink boards and that the letter include examples of funding options.

6.8.1 RINK ENTRANCES: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, in cooperation with the King George Community Association, advise the King George School of the benefits of adding a second exit to the school’s rink in either the south-west or south-east corner to provide an escape route.

6.10.2 CULTURAL HISTORICAL SIGNAGE: That the King George Community Association, in consultation with the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, organize a meeting with the Saskatoon Public Schools Division and the King George School administration to discuss the addition of signage on the school grounds that recognizes the heritage, diversity and history of the school and community.
6.1 **TREE TRIMMING:** That the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department identify and potentially trim and/or remove trees on the north-east corner of the tennis courts, near the Victoria Park SkatePark, to increase natural surveillance and reduce hiding places in the area. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.2.1 **WAY-FINDING SIGNAGE:** That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place large way-finding signage in the Victoria Park SkatePark, along Spadina Crescent and on the Meewasin Trail. These signs should indicate direction to nearby attractions and include who to call in cases of emergency or for maintenance issues. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.3.3 **SKATEPARK GATEWAY:** That the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department design and install a gateway welcoming people into Victoria Park, in general, and to the Victoria Park SkatePark. This gateway should include steps or a ramp to cross the retaining wall that is located between the skatepark and Spadina Crescent to allow users easier access to the skatepark. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.4.2 **SKATEPARK MURAL:** That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Riverside Badminton and Tennis Club, the King George Community Association, and the Victoria Park SkatePark users to discuss the possibility of the creation of a skatepark-themed mural on the north-west corner wall of the tennis courts to cover the existing graffiti vandalism on the wall. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.4.3 **LITTER:** That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department place additional garbage cans in and around the Victoria Park SkatePark to decrease the amount of litter in the area and ensure that emptying schedules match high usage times.

6.5.1 **SKATEPARK SIGNAGE:** That Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department place highly visible signage at the Victoria Park SkatePark to:
   
   (a) encourage respect for other users
   
   (b) help keep the area clear of litter, and
   
   (c) inform new users of basic SkatePark etiquette.
6.1.2 **AVE N PROPERTIES:** That Fire and Protective Services advise property owners of the vacant lots located on the west-side of 800 block of Avenue N, across from St. Andrew’s Park, to clear or trim overgrown trees and bushes and to remove or maintain sheds that may be a hazard.

6.2.2 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK SIGN:** That Community Development Branch, Community Services Department advise the King George Community Association of possible funding sources to install a St. Andrew’s Park sign on the south-east corner of the park to clearly identify the park.

6.4.4 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND:** That Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department re-paint the playground equipment located in St. Andrew’s Park to assist in properly maintaining the equipment, making it welcoming to users and reducing negative perceptions of the park.

6.4.5 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK MURAL:** That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with King George Community Association and the neighbourhood youth to examine the feasibility of creating a mural on the walls of the St. Andrew’s Park paddling pool to celebrate the neighbourhood and its young people, and encourage ownership and respect of the park amongst users.

6.7.4 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK:** That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department and the King George Community Association, to review the number and location of picnic tables and benches throughout St. Andrew’s Park to identify whether more are needed to encourage the park as a destination point for local residents.

6.7.5 **ST. ANDREW’S PARK PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT:** That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to address the recreation need identified by the neighbourhood’s youth for playground equipment in St. Andrew’s Park for older youth (10-14 years).

6.11.1 **COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING:** That the Community Development Branch, Community Services Department and the King George Community Association establish additional community programming and activities in St. Andrew’s Park, such as festivals, horse shoes, or a games table to encourage more community activity in the park.
Victoria Park

6.6.1 **GARDENER’S RESIDENCE FENCING:** That the Facilities Branch, Infrastructure Services Department, in consultation with Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department, remove any unnecessary fencing around the Gardener’s Residence site to reduce the danger of current entrapment areas. This should be done in conjunction with the Victoria Park Master Plan which is slated for late 2009 or early 2010.

6.7.1 **DOG BYLAW SIGNAGE:** That the Animal Services Program Coordinator, Corporate Services Department review the dog bylaw signage throughout Victoria Park and communicate the results and recommendations of this review and of the dog bag dispenser pilot program to the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department and the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department for incorporation into the Victoria Park Master Plan.

6.7.2 **GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE:** That Leisure Services, Community Services Department, examine the possibility of developing part of the Gardener’s Residence green space as a destination for special event photography and gatherings through the Victoria Park Master Plan.

6.7.3 **VICTORIA PARK & GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE:** That the Neighbourhood Planning Section ensure that a copy of this report and summaries of all relevant surveys be forwarded to the Leisure Services Branch, Community Services Department and the Parks Branch, Infrastructure Services Department for inclusion in the plans for upgrading Victoria Park and revising the Victoria Park Program.
King George Neighbourhood

6.9.1 SAFE AT HOME BOOKLET: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department ensure that the King George Community Association receive copies of the “Safe at Home” booklet and that the booklet be advertised in the Community newsletter and available to residents at a convenient neighbourhood location.

6.9.2 PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BROCHURE: That the King George Community Association distribute copies of the Property Maintenance brochure to residents, in advance of and in conjunction with the annual Community Clean Up, to reinforce and expand the community's knowledge of proper waste disposal and recycling processes.

6.10.1 PUBLIC ART PROGRAM: That the Planning and Development and Community Development Branches, Community Services Department meet with the King George Community Association to help them establish a mural or public art program for facilities and structures in the neighbourhood, such as the rink boards on the school grounds.

6.11.2 MAINTAIN NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFETY CONNECTION: That the Planning and Development Branch, Community Services Department, report annually to the King George Community Association on the status of the King George Neighbourhood Safety Report recommendations in conjunction with the annual Local Area Planning status report.

6.12.1 COORDINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BUDGETS: That the Neighbourhood Planning Section contact all identified departments to coordinate the estimated operating and/or capital budget costs and submit a comprehensive Neighbourhood Safety budget request to City Council for funding and implementing these recommendations once the report has been approved.
7.3 Implementation Priorities

The consultation process for the King George neighbourhood provided stakeholders with a number of opportunities to identify those neighbourhood safety issues that are of the greatest concern. Additionally, wherever possible the implementation of recommendations will be incorporated within existing operating activities or capital projects to minimize the cost of implementation and ensure recommendations are addressed in rational sequence. In light of these factors, the Administration has identified the following priority areas for implementation:

- **Victoria Park Master Plan** – This major park improvement project is currently underway within and adjacent to the King George neighbourhood. This presents an excellent opportunity to address the implementation of recommendations relating to the park in conjunction with the overall master plan. The implementation of those recommendations identified for coordination with the Victoria Park Master Plan in 2009 and 2010 will be integrated with the overall Master Plan process. This includes recommendations:
  - 6.1.1 – TREE TRIMMING,
  - 6.2.1 – WAY-FINDING SIGNAGE,
  - 6.3.3 – SKATEPARK GATEWAY,
  - 6.4.2 – SKATEPARK MURAL,
  - 6.5.1 – SKATEPARK SIGNAGE,
  - 6.6.1 – GARDENER’S RESIDENCE FENCING,
  - 6.7.1 – DOG BYLAW SIGNAGE,
  - 6.7.2 – GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE, and
  - 6.7.3 – VICTORIA PARK AND GARDENER’S RESIDENCE SITE.

- **Children’s Safety** – Throughout the community meetings, Safety Audits, and surveys, a major focus of the community was on the places and activities of children and youth. Safety concerns affecting children were given special attention during the Safety Audits, and the youth perspective constituted a significant part of the broader public consultation process. As such, issues affecting children and youth are considered an area of priority for implementation. This includes the following recommendations, in addition to a number of recommendations identified to coincide with the Victoria Park Master Plan:
  - 6.3.1 – SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCES,
  - 6.3.2 – CLOSE SOUTH SCHOOL GROUNDS ENTRANCE, and
  - 6.8.1 – RINK ENTRANCES.

- **Coordination of Budgets** – The coordination of implementation items with operating and capital budgets is a high priority. Where possible, implementation of this report’s recommendations will be integrated into existing operating budgets and capital projects. In some cases, specific capital budget requests may be necessary. The following recommendation addresses this matter:
  - 6.12.1 – COORDINATION OF IMPLEMENTATION BUDGETS.

The King George Community Association and Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee will have opportunities to revisit these identified priorities throughout the implementation process of the King George Neighbourhood Safety Audit Report.
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King George youth participating in the King George School grounds Safety Audit.
8.1 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Summary of Principles

Definition
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) focuses on the relationship of the built environment and the social behaviour that occurs in that built environment. It is an inclusive, collaborative, and interdisciplinary approach to reducing opportunities for crime, improving perceptions of safety, and strengthening community bonds. CPTED principles, which are now widely applied in the United States, Canada, and other Commonwealth countries, stem from the observed phenomenon that certain “cues” in the physical environment can prompt undesirable or crime-related behaviours as well as perceptions of being safe or unsafe in users of that same environment.

CPTED practitioners utilize design, activity, and community involvement to reduce opportunities for crime and reduce users’ fear of crime. CPTED strategies are usually developed jointly by an interdisciplinary team that ensures a balanced approach to problem solving that includes the community in all aspects of the process.

CPTED Principles
The principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design are divided into categories commonly known as “First Generation”, “First Generation Advanced”, and “Second Generation”. First Generation and First Generation Advanced principles focus mainly on addressing the physical environment, while Second Generation principles focus on how people interact with each other in that physical environment and have a distinctive social change theme. A brief explanation of each CPTED principle follows.

- **Natural Surveillance**: is the concept of putting “eyes on the street”, making a place unattractive for potential illegitimate behavior. Street design, landscaping, lighting and site design (i.e. neighbourhood layout) all influence the potential for natural surveillance.

- **Access Control**: is controlling who goes in and out of a neighbourhood, park, building, etc. Access control includes creating a sense of “turf”, for legitimate users, while focusing on formal and informal entry and exit points.

- **Image**: is the appearance of a place and how this is instrumental in creating a sense of place or territory for legitimate users of the space. A place that does not appear to be maintained or cared for may indicate to criminals that the place will not be defended and criminal activity in the area will be tolerated.

- **Territoriality**: is the concept of creating and fostering places that are adopted by the legitimate users of the space (i.e. take ownership); making it less likely for people who do not belong to engage in criminal or nuisance behavior at that location.

- **Conflicting User Groups**: refers to instances where different user groups may conflict (e.g. a school near industrial development or a seniors centre near a nightclub). Careful consideration of compatible land uses can minimize potential conflicts between groups.
- **Activity Support**: is the concept of filling an area with legitimate users (by facilitating or directly scheduling activities or events) so potential offenders cannot offend with impunity. Places and facilities that are underused can become locations with the potential for criminal activity.

- **Crime Generators**: are activity nodes that may generate crime. For example, a 24 hour convenience or liquor stores may not be a problem in itself but where it is located in the community may cause conflict or unforeseen secondary activity. The location of some land uses is critical to ensuring an activity does not increase the opportunities for crime to occur or reduce users’ and resident’s perceptions of their safety in the area.

- **Land Use Mix**: is the concept that diversity in land uses can be a contributor or detractor for crime opportunities. Separating land uses (i.e. residential) from each other can create places that are unused during certain times of the day.

- **Movement Predictors**: force people, especially pedestrians and cyclists, along a particular route or path, without providing obvious alternative escape routes or strategies for safety. Potential attackers can predict where persons will end up once they are on a certain path (e.g. a pedestrian tunnel or walkway).

- **Displacement**: can be positive or negative so it is critical to understand how crime may move in time or space and what the impact may be. In general, the displacement that must be considered is:
  - Negative displacement – crime movement makes things worse;
  - Diffusion of benefits – displacement can reduce the overall number of crimes more widely than expected;
  - Positive displacement – opportunities for crime are intentionally displaced which minimizes the impact of the crime.

- **Cohesion**: is the supportive relationships and interactions between all users of a place to support and maintain a sense of safety. Though not a specific urban design function, design can enhance the opportunity for positive social cohesion by providing physical places where this can occur, such as activity rooms, park gazebos, or multi-purpose rooms in schools and community centers. In some cases property owners or building managers can provide opportunities for social programming. This will increase the ability of local residents or users of a space to positively address issues as they arise.

- **Connectivity**: refers to the social and physical interactions and relationships external to the site itself. It recognizes that any given place should not operate in isolation from surrounding neighbourhoods and/or areas. Features such as walkways and roadways connecting a particular land use to the surrounding neighbourhoods and/or areas can accomplish this. Features such as centrally located community centers or program offices can also encourage activities to enhance this.
• **Capacity**: is the ability for any given space or neighbourhood to support its intended use. For example, excessive quantities of similar land uses in too small an area, such as abandoned buildings or bars, can create opportunities for crime. When a place is functioning either over or under capacity, it can be detrimental to neighbourhood safety.

• **Culture**: is the overall makeup and expression of the users of a place. Also known as “placemaking”, it involves artistic, musical, sports, or other local cultural events to bring people together in time and purpose. Physical designs that can encourage this include public multi-purpose facilities, sports facilities, and areas that local artists and musicians might use. Community memorials, public murals, and other cultural features also enhance this. These features create a unique context of the environment and help determine the design principles and policies that best support the well being of all user groups and contribute to their cohesiveness.

CPTED principles are generally considered and utilized in combination with one another. However, for any CPTED strategy to be successful, the nature of the crime or safety-related issue must be carefully and accurately defined. It is important to understand the context within which crime occurs in an area to be able to implement appropriate solutions.

**Risk Assessment**
Risk Assessments combine scientific field research and analytical methods with the practical experience of crime prevention practitioners and the perception of community members; a combination of qualitative (statistical) and qualitative (perception) approaches. In a Risk Assessment, a wide variety of qualitative and quantitative data is collected and considered to allow for an accurate portrayal of issues. This in turn allows for a much more effective solution or action plan to be developed. A Risk Assessment is critical to the success of a CPTED strategy because, in addition to “obvious” problems, there are often less obvious or underlying problems that need to be identified and addressed.

Data collection such as crime statistics, resident surveys, user surveys, and population demographics are all part of the quantitative picture. This information aids in understanding the context around the issue and the opportunities for crime. The other part of the picture, the qualitative, deals with the perceptions that people have about their safety. Safety Audits, perception and intercept surveys (of actual users), and site inspections all add to the understanding of what environmental cues the area is presenting and how these affect people’s “feelings” of safety.

Without this larger picture, the appropriate solutions to a problem may not all be identified. Solutions will be generated by virtue of the discussion around the issue, in this case identifying a new use for an existing underutilized area, but the best solution may not be generated or solutions chosen may, on the surface, look effective but may create another problem entirely.

**The Safety Audit and CPTED Review**
A Safety Audit is a process that allows the regular users of an area to identify places that make them feel unsafe. Area residents are considered the “local experts” because they are the most familiar with the area and what happens on a day-to-day basis. Change then becomes the responsibility of a group of people who care about the community and will include audit
participants, the community as a whole, and local government. Residents become directly involved in making their community safer through this process.

The goal of a Safety Audit is to identify and to improve an environment. Reduced opportunities for crime and improved perceptions of crime in the area improve everyone’s personal safety. Depending on the circumstances, residents, local business, and local government should work together to find solutions to safety problems in the community using the audit results as one tool, or input, in the overall Risk Assessment of the area. A Safety Audit is a highly flexible process and can be easily adapted to meet the needs of the community. In Saskatoon, Safety Audits based on CPTED principles have now been applied in a number of settings including parks, streets, and buildings.

A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Review is similar to a Safety Audit in that it reviews an area of concern using the principles of CPTED, but has less public participation. It can be used when the area is small, timelines are short, or public participation is not possible or very difficult. It is also effective if there is specialized knowledge needed to assess the site or the potential solutions.
8.2 Safe/Unsafe Areas Exercise Results

King George Neighbourhood Safety Community Meeting  
September 28, 2005

The goal of this exercise was to identify areas in the neighbourhood where participants felt safe, unsafe or whether they had no concerns to note. These were identified on a map of the King George neighbourhood.

Participants were split into four groups and each group marked on the map:  
- Areas where they feel safe, in green marker;  
- Areas where they feel unsafe, in red marker, and 
- Identified and explained these areas.

Each participant in the group then marked on the map:  
- One specific site where they felt safest, using a numbered green dot;  
- One specific site where they felt the most unsafe, using a numbered red dot;  
- If they did not feel strongly about either the safe or unsafe sites, their coloured dot was to be placed under the “No Concern” heading; and 
- Identified and explained each dot.

The following is a summary of this exercise. It includes the reasons that participants identified areas and specific sites as safe or unsafe.

“Areas Where We Feel Unsafe”

1-A – Large dog, poor fence  
1-B – School yard & residential, older youth act intimidating to younger children  
1-C – Empty lots & condemned house  
1-D – Tight corners – problems backing out of garage  
1-E – Poorly cared for rentals property  
1-F – 13th St between L & M because beaten up here (1-10)  
1-G – Aggressive youth, theft, mugging, stories of Indian Posse charging a toll to use  
1-H – Youth hangout – no parents  
1-I – Prostitution, sexual assault, drug deals, stolen goods deals  
1-J – Potential for safety concerns with closure of Ave H so pay attention  
2-A – 814 Ave J: Transients – lots of come & go. 825 Ave J: suspicious activity, gang activity  
2-B – Incident with intimidating person  
2-C – Speeding traffic on Ave K which is a bus route (North & South bound b/w 11th & 16 Ave)  
2-D – Difficult to see when pulling out from Avenue K to 11th St east or westbound.  
3-A – Gardeners’ Residence – very protected so always individual hiding in area. Mainly night time but still an issue during the day.  
3-B – Enclosed due to fencing – can get trapped.  
3-C – Skate Park – Signage poor, security not dealing with concerns, should be supervised by leaders just like swimming pools. Suggestion for fence to control atmosphere.  
3-D – Right at closing time, kids are being accosted.  
3-E – Poor traffic control devices. Generally there are a number of uncontrolled intersections which create unsafe intersections.
3-F – With increased traffic flow concern with mainly kids crossing from Riversdale and Pleasant ill to go to school at King George.
4-B – When there is no programming and at night.
4-E – When school is vacant.
4-F – Suspicious house, stolen goods, children’s toy – have not kids, constant roommate wanted sign in yard
4-G – Unkempt, ½ vacant, often robberies from store.
4-H – Vacant Lots, overgrown, junk needles, no lights.
4-I – Unsafe during unlit hours in some areas.
4-J – Unsafe crossing, very busy due to pool, park.
4-K – High crime area.
4-L – Unkempt, no sidewalks, busy traffic due to business
4-M – Poor lighting.

“Sites Where We Feel Unsafe”
1-1 – Youth in the 2 homes unsupervised, gang ties, aggressive verbally pos. physically.
1-3 – Traffic. Hell
2-1 – Skate Park because son has been threatened & harassed.
2-2 – Traffic
3-7 – Avenue I & 11th Street tree blocks sidewalk – pedestrians have to walk on road.
3-10 – Empty lot with garage corner of Avenue O & 13th Street
3-12 – 800 block of Avenue N – empty lots with over grown weeds, shrubs, trees and condemned houses.
3-13 – Would like lighting at north side of school.
3-14 – Where’s the lighting form St. Andrew’s Park?
4-2 – Low visibility into Gardiner’s residence, frequented by kids.
4-3 – I hate everything that happens around that house, scary. I don’t feel safe there at anytime.
4-4 – Vacant lots/unsafe/uncared for.

General Comments:
Garbage cans damaged, poor condition, graffiti.

No Concerns: 2

“Areas Where We Feel Safe”
1-K – 11th St – Avenue H to P – good lighting
3-G – During the day, due to the people, adults moving around, nighttime is not considered as safe.
4-A – Lawn Bowling Club
4-C – Safe when there is programming and in day.
4-D – Safe in AM
“Sites Where We Feel Safe”
1-52 – my house block
1-53 – safe/block
1-54 – safe anywhere
1-55 – my house/block
2-51 – Feel safe on my block even though things are going on, especially feel safe in my yard.
2-52 – My block – knowing neighbours.
4-51 – St. David’s Church
4-52 – My home, block of Avenue L 600
4-53 – My house and 1000 M South

General Comments:
Most areas generally safe
Feel generally the whole area is safe during the day. Except the back alleys. This is because of unknown (transient) individuals looking in garbages.
Generally felt safe around their homes.

No Concerns: 0
### 8.3 Action Plan: February 2006

#### King George Community and School Association

**Neighbourhood Safety Subcommittee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subdivision's Perceived Issues</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>King George School</td>
<td>School yard &amp; adjacent residential area can feel unsafe, especially when school is vacant. Older youth act intimidating to younger children. Inadequate lighting at the north end of school.</td>
<td>Survey of residents in adjacent area will provide additional information and get more people involved. Subcommittee to invite those surveyed to join group and participate in later Safety Audit walk-about.</td>
<td>Neighbour to Neighbour Survey</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 1, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Andrew's Park and 13th Street, between Avenue L and M</td>
<td>Park feels unsafe when there is no programming and at night. Vacant lots, overgrown trees, needles, poor lighting. Feels unsafe and uncared for.</td>
<td>Survey of residents in adjacent area will provide additional information and get more people involved. Subcommittee to invite those surveyed to join group and participate in later Safety Audit walk-about.</td>
<td>Neighbour to Neighbour Survey</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td>March to May, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>700 block of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O</td>
<td>Weldon - Poorly cared for rental properties. Avenue O - Relatively high # of property crime incidents reported in 2004</td>
<td>700 block of Weldon was perceived to have a high percentage of renters, although ownership data shows the street is approximately 50% owner-occupied. Avenue O appeared to have a slightly higher # of property crimes reported in 2004. Survey of residents in adjacent area will provide additional information and get more people involved. Subcommittee to invite those surveyed to join group and participate in later Safety Audit walk-about.</td>
<td>Neighbour to Neighbour Survey</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td>March to May, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>King George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee's Perceived Issues</td>
<td>Subcommittee wants to hear the opinions of local young people and suggested the King George Job Registry group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>A Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Workshop will help the group understand the Safety Audit process and encourage group members to share their feelings and perceptions of safety. This workshop will be a primer course for later Youth Safety Audits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>CPTED Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>King George Job Registry, City Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monday, March 20, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>King George School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee's Perceived Issues</td>
<td>School yard &amp; adjacent residential area can feel unsafe, especially when school is vacant. Older youth act intimidating to younger children. Inadequate lighting at the north end of school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Safety Audit will identify specific safety concerns, opportunities for crime to occur, and users/residents' perception of their safety. Youth Audit may be in conjunction with Regular Audit or moved to a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Regular Safety Audit and Youth Safety Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>City Planning, Subcommittee, Adjacent Residents and King George Job Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 2, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Skateboard Park and Gardener's Residence area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee's Perceived Issues</td>
<td>SkatePark issues include aggressive youth, theft, mugging, stories of gang members charging a toll for use. Signage poor, security not dealing with concerns, should be supervised by leaders just like swimming pools. Area hidden from view. Gardener's Residence is very isolated from view. Poorly lit, which attracts individuals at night. Frequented by kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Skateboard park was given high priority by Subcommittee, but will need to wait for spring, when facility is used, to perform a proper assessment. Safety Audit will identify specific safety concerns, opportunities for crime to occur, and users' perception of their safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Regular Safety Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>City Planning, Subcommittee and Adjacent Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Friday, May 12, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>St. Andrew’s Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee's Perceived Issues</td>
<td>Park feels unsafe when there is no programming and at night. Vacant lots, overgrown trees, needles, poor lighting. Feels unsafe and uncared for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Safety Audit will identify specific safety concerns, opportunities for crime to occur, and users/residents' perception of their safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Regular Safety Audit and Youth Safety Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>City Planning, Subcommittee, Adjacent Residents and King George Job Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 31, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>700 blocks of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittee’s Perceived Issues</strong></td>
<td>Weldon - Poorly cared for rental properties. Avenue O - Relatively high # of property crime incidents reported in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Safety Audit will identify specific safety concerns, opportunities for crime to occur, and users/residents' perception of their safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Regular Safety Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>City Planning, Subcommittee and Adjacent Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>Monday, June 12, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Skateboard Park and Gardener’s Residence area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcommittee’s Perceived Issues</strong></td>
<td>Skatepark issues include aggressive youth, theft, mugging, stories of gang members charging a toll for use. Signage poor, security not dealing with concerns, should be supervised by leaders just like swimming pools. Area hidden from view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td>Survey of skatepark users will identify concerns regarding the area and their perception of safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>User Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>City Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>Thursday, August 17 and Friday August 18, 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Neighbour-to-Neighbour Survey

Area: ___________________

Date: _______________ Surveyor: __________________________

Postal Code: __________ Gender: Female Male (Circle one)

How many years have you been a resident of King George? (Circle one)

Less than 1 year 1-4 years 5-9 years 10-14 years 15-19 years 20-24 years 25 and over

Which of the following age categories do you fall in to? (Circle one)

19 and under 20-29 years 30-39 years 40-49 years 50-59 years 60-69 years 70 and over

How often do you or your family walk on the King George School grounds? (Circle one)

Daily 3-5 times/week Once a week Once a month Never

Do you feel safe walking on the King George School grounds:

During the day? YES NOW Why?

During the early evening? YES NO Why?

At night (after 10 pm)? YES NO Why?

Have you ever noticed any illegal activity on the King George School grounds? YES NO What was going on?

Have you, or anyone you love, ever experienced an incident on the King George School grounds that made you feel afraid or unsafe? YES NO If YES, please explain

Do you have any other safety-related comments about the King George neighbourhood?
8.5 Safety Audit Form

King George Neighbourhood

Name: ________________________________________________________________

General Area: ___________________________________________________________________________________________

Specific Location: ___________________________________________________________________________________________

Date: ______________ Day: ___________ Time: ___________

Age: (Please circle the age range that applies to you)

10-14 40-44 70-74
15-19 45-49 75-79
20-24 50-54 80-84
25-29 55-59 85-89
30-34 60-64 90-94
35-39 65-69 95+

Sex: _________

Affiliation (Community Association, Merchant, Resident, etc.):
__________________________________________________________________________________________

One of the goals of the City of Saskatoon’s Strategic Plan is to increase the participation of Aboriginal people in City programs and processes. By answering the following question, you will be helping the City Planning Branch to evaluate its current efforts to increase participation from the Aboriginal community in local area planning and related processes.

Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal person? YES / NO (circle one)

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

1. Your gut reactions: ________________________________________________________________________________

2. What five words best describe the place? ____________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________
LIGHTING

3. General impression of lighting:
   - [ ] Very poor
   - [ ] Poor
   - [ ] Satisfactory
   - [ ] Good
   - [ ] Very good
   - [ ] Too dark
   - [ ] Too bright

4. Is the lighting even? [ ] yes [ ] no where? __________________

5. Is there glare from the lights that prevent you from seeing where you are going?
   - [ ] yes [ ] no where? __________________________________

6. Can you identify a face 25 paces away? (walk 25 paces from the group to check)
   - [ ] yes [ ] no where are you?______________________________

7. Do you know where/whom to call if lights are out, broken, not yet turned on, etc.?
   - [ ] yes [ ] no

8. Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?
   - [ ] yes [ ] no where? ________________________________

9. How well does the lighting illuminate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrances</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleys</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkways</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone booths</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   If poor or very poor, please describe why or use this space for any other comments:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   ________________________________
**SIGNAGE**

10. Are there location or street signs nearby that can help identify where you are?

☐ yes  ☐ no

11. Are there signs that show you where to get emergency assistance if needed?

☐ yes  ☐ no

12. Impression of overall signage:

☐ Very poor  ☐ Poor  ☐ Satisfactory

☐ Good  ☐ Very good

13. What signs should be added? (if necessary)

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

**SIGHTLINES**

14. Can you clearly see what's up ahead?  ☐ yes  ☐ no

15. If no, why not?

☐ Bushes  ☐ Fences  ☐ hill

☐ Other  ______________________________________

16. Are there places someone could be hiding?  ☐ yes  ☐ no

17. If yes, where? ______________________________

18. What would make it easier to see?

E.g.:

☐ Transparent materials such as chain link fence, glass, etc.  ☐ Angled corners

☐ Security mirrors  ☐ Trimmed bushes

☐ Snow cleared  ☐ Vehicles moved

Other comments?

____________________________________________________________________________
19. How many people are likely to be around?

- In the early morning:
  - □ None
  - □ A few
  - □ Several
  - □ many

- During the day:
  - □ None
  - □ A few
  - □ Several
  - □ many

- In the evening:
  - □ None
  - □ A few
  - □ Several
  - □ many

- Late at night (after 10pm):
  - □ None
  - □ A few
  - □ Several
  - □ many

20. Is it easy to predict when people will be around?

- □ yes
- □ no

Other comments?

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

**ISOLATION – EAR DISTANCE**

21. Are there any areas where a call for help could not be heard?

- □ yes
- □ no
- □ don’t know

22. How far away is the nearest emergency service such as an alarm, security personnel, crisis telephone? _____________________ □ don’t know

23. Can you see a telephone or a sign directing you to emergency assistance?

- □ yes
- □ no

24. Is the area patrolled? □ yes □ no □ don’t know

25. If yes, how frequently?

- □ every hour
- □ once per afternoon/evening
- □ don’t know
**MOVEMENT PREDICTORS** (a predictable or unchangeable route or path)

26. How easy is it to predict a person’s movements (e.g., their route)?

- [ ] very easy  
- [ ] somewhat obvious  
- [ ] no way of knowing

27. Is there always an alternative well-lit and frequently travelled route or path available?

- [ ] yes  
- [ ] no  
- [ ] don’t know

28. Can you tell what is at the other end of paths, tunnels, or walkways in this area?

- [ ] yes  
- [ ] no

29. Are there corners, alcoves, or bushes where someone could hide and wait for you?

- [ ] yes  
- [ ] no  
- [ ] where? ________________________________

Other comments?
___________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

**POSSIBLE ENTRAPMENT SITES**

30. Are there small, confined areas where you would be hidden from view?

- [ ] between garbage bins  
- [ ] unlocked equipment or utility shed  
- [ ] alley or laneway  
- [ ] recessed doorway  
- [ ] construction site

Other: ___________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

**ESCAPE ROUTES**

31. How easy would it be for an offender to disappear?

- [ ] very easy  
- [ ] quite easy  
- [ ] not very easy

32. Do lanes/ streets / walkways have more than one exit?

- [ ] yes  
- [ ] no  
- [ ] don’t know

33. If yes, please describe.
___________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
**NEARBY LAND USES**

34. What is the surrounding or nearby land used for (list all that apply)?

- [ ] stores
- [ ] offices
- [ ] restaurants
- [ ] residential houses or streets
- [ ] factories
- [ ] busy traffic
- [ ] heavily treed/wooded areas
- [ ] riverbank
- [ ] parking lots
- [ ] campus buildings
- [ ] don’t know
- Other: _______________________________________

35. Can you identify who owns or maintains nearby land?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

where? __________________________________

36. Impressions of nearby land uses:

- [ ] Very poor
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Satisfactory
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Very good

**MAINTENANCE**

37. Impressions of maintenance:

- [ ] Very poor
- [ ] Poor
- [ ] Satisfactory
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Very good

38. Is there a lot of litter lying around?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

39. Do you know to whom maintenance concerns should be reported?

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

40. From your experience, how long do repairs generally take?

- [ ] 1 day
- [ ] Within 1 week
- [ ] 1 – 3 weeks
- [ ] More than 3 weeks
- [ ] Don’t know
FACTORS THAT MAKE THE PLACE MORE HUMAN

41. Does this area feel cared for?
   □ yes □ no

42. Does this area feel abandoned?
   □ yes □ no

   Why?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

43. Is there graffiti on the walls?
   □ yes □ no

44. In your opinion, are there racist or sexist slogans/ signs/ images on the walls?
   □ yes □ no

45. Are there signs of vandalism?
   □ yes □ no

46. Would other materials, tones, textures or colours improve your sense of safety?
   □ yes □ no

   Other Comments:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

OVERALL DESIGN

47. Impressions of overall design of this area:
   □ Very poor □ Poor □ Satisfactory
   □ Good □ Very good

48. If you weren't familiar with this area, would it be easy to find your way around?
   □ yes □ no
49. Does the place “make sense”?
☐ yes  ☐ no

50. Is your neighbourhood walkable (i.e. to school, to work, to friends, to places you need)?
☐ yes  ☐ no

Other comments:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

**IMPROVEMENTS**

51. What improvements would you like to see?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

52. Do you have any specific recommendations?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
8.6 User Survey – Victoria Park SkatePark
See page 28 for summary of the survey results.

Date: ________________  Surveyor: __________________________

Postal Code: __________  Gender:  Female  Male  (Circle one)

1. Which of the following age categories do you fall in to?  (Circle one)
   9 and under  10-14 years  15-19 years  20-24 years  25-29 years  30-34 years  35-39 years  40+

2. How often do you come to the skatepark?  (Circle one)
   Daily  3-5 times/week  Once a week  Once a month  Never

3. What activities do you do at the skatepark? (Circle all that apply)
   Skateboarding  BMXing  Watching  Just hanging out with friends  Other __________

4. How much time do you typically spend at the skatepark each time you come?  (Circle one)
   1 hour or less  1-3 hours  4-6 hours  6 hours or more

5. Do you feel safe at the skatepark:
   During the day?  YES  NO  Why?
   During the early evening?  YES  NO  Why?
   At night (after 10 pm)?  YES  NO  Why?

6. Do you feel that people respect the skatepark and use it appropriately?  YES  NO
   If NO, why not?

7. Do you feel that skatepark users respect other users?  YES  NO
   If NO, please explain.

8. Have you ever noticed any inappropriate activity at the skatepark?  YES  NO
   If YES, what was going on?

9. Have you ever experienced an incident at the skatepark that made you feel afraid or unsafe?
   YES  NO  If YES, please explain

10. Do you have any ideas for improving the safety of the skatepark and surrounding area or
    your feelings of safety in this area?
8.7 Victoria Park SkatePark: Participants by Postal Code
8.8 King George Safety Audit Maps

King George School Grounds Safety Audit
Tuesday, May 2, 2006
Victoria Park Skatepark and Gardener’s Residence Area Safety Audit
Friday, May 12, 2006
700 Blocks of Weldon Avenue and Avenue O S Safety Audit
Monday, June 12, 2006