## **Abandoned Buildings and Lots**

Jon M. Shane, Ph.D.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

22<sup>nd</sup> Annual Problem-Oriented Policing Conference Miami, Florida

October 10-11, 2011

#### Overview of the Presentation

- General Description of the Problem
- Harms Caused by Abandoned Buildings and Lots
- Factors Contributing to the Problem
- Understanding Your Local Problem
- Responses to the Problem
- Obstacles to Implementation
- Limitations of Situational Prevention

- Subcategory of physical disorder
  - May attract vandals, homeless and squatters
  - May be used as "stash houses"
  - Intentional damage may accelerate deterioration
- Related problems may require separate analysis

#### Definition

- No universal definition
- Terms such as "property," "vacant,", "lot," "evidence of vacancy" and "building" delimit legal remedies (e.g., Chula Vista, CA)
  - May not include "accessory structures"
- Typically includes a time element to allow for repairs
- Rely on a broad definition

- Estimates on Prevalence and Cost
  - No national estimates, only regional
  - Counting relies of definitions, which differ
  - U.S. Census estimated 19 million (end of first quarter of 2010)

- Estimates on Prevalence and Cost
  - 2000-2005: St. Louis, MO \$15.5 million to raze buildings
  - 2008: 8 cities in Ohio 25,000 properties; \$15 million direct city services; \$49 million lost tax revenue
  - 2010: Detroit, MI 33,500 vacant houses;
     91,000 vacant lots; \$28 million to raze remaining buildings

# Harms Caused by Abandoned Buildings and Lots

- As a Crime Attractor and Crime Enabler
  - Criminals are drawn to the property
    - Hiding places
    - Shelter
    - Easy access
  - Reputation as a suitable environment grows
  - Primary reason: Lack of controls

# Harms Caused by Abandoned Buildings and Lots

- Blight, Crime and Fear
- Arson and Accidental Fire
- Burglary and Theft
- Pet Displacement
- Property Values
- Public Health
- Squatting

# Harms Caused by Abandoned Buildings and Lots

- Tenant Displacement
- Trespassing
- Vandalism

# Factors Contributing to Abandoned Buildings

- Lending Practice and Foreclosure
- Costs of Commercial Compliance and Remediation
- Rising Property Taxes and Tax Delinquency
- Job Loss and Population Loss
- Older Housing Stock

# Factors Contributing to Abandoned Buildings

- Absentee Owners
- Real Estate Speculators
- "Demolition by Neglect"

#### Stakeholders

- Share responsibility for the response
  - Government
  - Private
  - Community and Nonprofit
- Collecting and Analyzing Data
  - Grants; influencing public policy; crafting responses
  - No data collection standards

# A Framework for Asking the Right Questions

#### Magnitude

- A. Number of properties by type
- B. Total abandoned acreage
- Period of abandonment for each property before reuse (expressed in days)
- D. Spatial distribution (i.e., "hot spots")
- E. Cost of services in money and manpower hours
- F. How your problem compares with other cities of similar size and character, in state and out of states

#### Seriousness and Priority

- A. Economic losses
  - 1. Retail sales
  - 2. Tourism
  - 3. Tax revenue
  - 4. Property values
- B. Residents' and business owners' perceptions
- c. Injuries and deaths
- D. Other crime and disorder conditions at these properties and the disposition
- E. Physical condition
  - 1. Top 10 properties in each neighborhood that need immediate attention (e.g., contamination levels)
  - Danger of collapse
- F. Age, functionality and marketability of each property

#### III. Rate of Change

- A. Is abandonment increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable?
- B. Abandonment rate over the last 1, 3, 5, 10, 15 and 20 years

#### IV. Persons and Institutions Affected

- A. Residents
- **B.** Business owners
- c. Tourists
- D. Children
- E. Schools
- F. Elderly

#### **V.** System Responses?

- A. What has been done in the past?
- **B.** What was the outcome?
- c. Which responses should be replicated?
- D. What is the status of existing mitigation efforts at each property?

#### VI. Forecasting

- A. If you do not do anything, then what state will you be in next year?
- B. What is the problem expected to be like in the next 6 months? 1 year? 5 years?

#### VII.Origins/Causal Assumptions for Abandonment

- Measuring Your Effectiveness
  - Collect baseline measures
  - Take measurements in the target area and surrounding area
  - Two types of measures:
    - Process Measures: Response to the problem(+)
    - Outcome Measures: Impact on the problem
       (-)

## Sample Process Measures (+)

- Increased percentage of fines and fees collected
- Increased percentage of property taxes collected
- Increased number of enforcement actions
- Increased employee training in addressing abandoned buildings and lots
- Increased grant funds secured to address abandoned buildings and lots
- Increased new building and construction permits issued

# Sample Outcomes Measures (-)

- Reduced percentage of workload
- Reduced percentage of the budget allocated to address abandoned properties
- Reduced number of injuries and deaths
- Reduced citizen fear
- Reduced need for stabilization efforts: 1) cosmetic improvements; 2) board ups; 3) clean ups; 4) fencing; 5) demolitions; 5) environmental changes
- Increased property values

- General Considerations for an Effective Response Strategy
  - Prevention: Aimed at keeping the current homeowner in the house
  - Management: Aimed at enforcement action and seizure
  - Reuse: Aimed at restoring it as a taxgenerating parcel

- Streamlining and Coordinating Local Bureaucracy, Reporting Mechanisms and Infrastructure
  - Co-locate equipment and staff
  - Cross-train staff
- Observing Due Process, and Developing Capacity and Support
  - Assumption-based planning: Identify assumptions, vulnerabilities, opportunities and future states to create contingency plans

- Specific Responses to Abandoned Buildings and Lots
  - 29 responses categorized according to the 5 opportunity-reducing principles
  - Categories are not mutually exclusive
  - Responses are most effective when layered

#### Opportunity-reducing Principles

- Increasing Effort (2)
- Increasing Risks (5)
- Reducing Rewards (8)
- Removing Excuses (6)
- Reducing Provocations (1)
- Responses with Limited Effectiveness (7)

#### **Increasing Effort**

- 1. Physically securing abandoned properties
- 2. Altering environmental features

#### **Increasing Risks**

- 1. Initiating privatized public nuisance lawsuits
- 2. Aggressively enforcing building codes
- 3. Establishing a mortgage fraud task force
- 4. Creating incentives for responsible ownership and occupancy of abandoned buildings
- 5. Training interagency task force members

#### Reducing Rewards

- 1. Acquiring properties through tax foreclosure
- 2. Acquiring properties through an order of possession
- 3. Promoting responsible ownership through special tax sales
- 4. Acquiring properties through asset forfeiture
- 5. Acquiring properties through eminent domain

#### Reducing Rewards

- 6. Maintaining and abandoned property master list
- 7. Acquiring properties through a land bank program
- 8. Razing abandoned buildings

#### Removing Excuses

- 1. Registering foreclosed properties
- 2. Establishing an abandoned property early warning system
- 3. Educating owners/landlords/place managers to facilitate voluntary compliance
- 4. Conducting will planning and family heirs workshops

#### Removing Excuses

- 5. Establishing capital rehabilitation programs
- 6. Conducting public education campaigns

#### Reducing Provocations

1. Creating urban homesteading programs

#### Responses with Limited Effectiveness

- 1. Conducting city-initiated cosmetic improvement and clean-up campaigns
- 2. Conducting additional police patrols and enforcement crackdowns, and continually arresting offenders at problem properties
- 3. Offering property-tax incentives
- 4. Holding property owners criminally liable for illegal conduct on their property

## Responses with Limited Effectiveness

- 5. Increasing formal surveillance through closed circuit television (CCTV)
- 6. Operating a specialized housing/problemproperty court
- 7. Charging service fees for police response

# Obstacles to Implementation

- 1. Unanticipated technical difficulties
- 2. Inadequate supervision of implementation
- 3. Failure to coordinate action among different agencies
- 4. Competing priorities
- 5. Unanticipated costs

#### **Limitations of Situational Prevention**

- 1. Intervention may not be deep enough
- 2. Intervention too easily defeated by offenders
- 3. Too much vigilance expected from others
- 4. May provoke escalation
- 5. May facilitate rather than frustrate crime
- 6. Inappropriate intervention from poor analysis
- 7. Preventive measures have a limited life

# **Abandoned Buildings and Lots**

# Thank You

Guide is available at www.popcenter.org

October 10-11, 2011

#### Sources

- Clarke, R.V. (1997). Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies. Guilderland, NY: Harrow Heston.
- Clarke, R.V. & Eck, J. (2005). Crime Analysis for Problem Solvers in 60 Small Steps. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, COPS Office.
- Dewar, J. (2002). Assumption-Based Planning: A Tool for Reducing Avoidable Surprises. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Scott, M. & Goldstein, H. (2005). Shifting and Sharing Responsibility for Public Safety Problems. Problem-Oriented Guides for Police, Response Guide 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, COPS Office.
- Shane, J.M. (in press). Abandoned Buildings and Lots. Problem-Oriented Guides for Police. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, COPS Office.