

Calles y Muros: La Forma Urbana y el Miedo a Transitar en Bogotá

Streets and Walls: Urban Form and the Fear of Walking in Bogotá

Michelle Y. Castro Quevedo¹  

¹Bogotá, Colombia.

Cite as

Castro Quevedo MY. Streets and Walls: Urban Form and the Fear of Walking in Bogotá. SAP Land and Architecture. 2025; 4:219. <https://doi.org/10.56294/la2025219>

Publication History

Submitted: 26-09-2024

Revised: 20-01-2025

Accepted: 03-09-2025

Published: 04-09-2025

Corresponding Author

Michelle Y. Castro Quevedo 

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes how urban morphology influences theft from persons in Bogotá, highlighting the relationship between physical space, citizen perception, and the phenomenon of fear of moving through the city. The study is based on the master's thesis "Contagiando el miedo: Inseguridad urbana como patología producida en la ciudad de Bogotá" (2021) and continues through a documentary review of academic, institutional, and press sources. The results showed that theft is concentrated in persistent hot spots, where low visibility, fragmented pedestrian continuity, and the presence of floating populations facilitate criminal opportunities. It is also evidenced that theft is not exclusively the result of socioeconomic need but, in many cases, a professionalized activity based on rational choice, in which offenders select routes, times, and techniques. Likewise, it is observed that the perception of insecurity remains high even when incident reports decrease, and that fear of moving through certain spaces—characterized by poor lighting, blind facades, or deterioration—restricts mobility and the use of public space. In conclusion, the study confirms that insecurity in Bogotá results from the interaction of physical, social, and subjective dimensions, and emphasizes that the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) provide useful tools to reduce criminal opportunities and strengthen trust in public space.

Keywords: Urban Morphology; Perception of Insecurity; Fear of Moving; Theft From Persons.

RESUMEN

El artículo analiza cómo la morfología urbana influye en el hurto a personas en Bogotá, destacando la relación entre el espacio físico, la percepción ciudadana y el fenómeno del miedo al transitar por la ciudad. El estudio se basa en la tesis "Contagiando el miedo: Inseguridad urbana como patología producida en la ciudad de Bogotá" (2021) y continúa a través de una revisión documental de fuentes académicas, institucionales y de prensa. Los resultados mostraron que el hurto se concentra en puntos calientes persistentes, donde la baja visibilidad, la fragmentación de la continuidad peatonal y la presencia de población flotante facilitan oportunidades delictivas. También se evidencia que el hurto no es exclusivamente producto de la necesidad socioeconómica sino, en muchos casos, una actividad profesionalizada basada en la elección racional, en la que los ofensores seleccionaban rutas, horarios y técnicas. Asimismo, se observa que la percepción de inseguridad permanece alta incluso cuando los registros de incidentes disminuyen, y que el miedo a transitar por determinados espacios caracterizados por escasa iluminación, fachadas ciegas o deterioro, restringen la movilidad y el uso del espacio público. En conclusión, el estudio confirma que la inseguridad en Bogotá resulta de la interacción de dimensiones físicas, sociales y subjetivas, y resalta que los principios de Prevención del Delito mediante el Diseño Ambiental (CPTED) ofrecen herramientas útiles para reducir oportunidades delictivas y fortalecer la confianza en el espacio público.

Palabras clave: Morfología Urbana; Percepción de Inseguridad; Miedo al Transitar; Hurto a Personas.

INTRODUCTION

Bogotá is also defined by its corners. The same block can be welcoming or intimidating depending on the time of day, the light, and the ease of transit.⁽¹⁾ Pickpocketing does not occur randomly: it is rooted in micro-scenarios where urban morphology opens up opportunities. Narrow passages with blind fronts, the edges of large avenues that fragment the fabric, stations and portals where crowds distract attention, or sidewalks under construction that force people to walk close to fences are examples of environments that facilitate criminal activity. The shape of the city, its continuities and ruptures, its voids and edges, conditions both the practice of crime and the daily experience of insecurity.⁽²⁾

Urban space is not neutral. The legibility of routes, visibility from a distance, and the presence of active eyes on the street modify the risk equation. Where natural surveillance is reduced and escape routes abound, crime finds fertile ground.⁽³⁾ Conversely, when the environment is continuous, permeable, and well-lit, the same route takes on another meaning: the feeling of safety increases and fear diminishes.⁽⁴⁾

However, limiting the explanation to inequality or economic precariousness is not enough. Theft is also understood as a choice: many actors evaluate locations, times, and techniques, and adopt this practice as a recurring trade. The professionalization of crime reflects that the motivation is not always immediate need, but rather the logic of a job that is performed based on the opportunity provided by the space. Therefore, reducing the debate to the absence of police or poverty is equivalent to looking at only part of the problem.

From this perspective, the city can be read as a set of small ecosystems of theft, rather than a uniform map. This article explores which features of the built environment encourage crime and which inhibit it, while discussing how theft ends up being an activity not only out of necessity but also by choice. The proposal is clear: combine preventive urban planning and public space management criteria with security strategies. A harmoniously designed city does not eliminate crime, but it does restore pedestrians' confidence in living in it.

METHOD

This article is based on research conducted in 2021, entitled "*Spreading fear: Urban insecurity as a pathology produced in the city of Bogotá*".⁽⁵⁾ Based on this work and supported by a documentary review, we continue to reflect on the relationship between urban security, city morphology, and social dynamics, and new approaches have been promoted that seek to understand how the built environment conditions both citizen perception and the occurrence of crime. Along the same lines, this paper continues to explore the branches of urban security, understood as not only a social phenomenon but also a spatial one.

DEVELOPMENT

Theft in Bogotá has shown a paradox: although overall figures have declined moderately in recent years, the spatial distribution of crime remains almost intact. The most affected areas continue to be the same, reinforcing the idea that the shape of the city directly influences the occurrence of this type of behavior. Urban morphology, with its edges, breaks, and connections, is a factor that persistently organizes risk.^(1,2)

One of the key elements is visibility. When a street lacks wide sightlines, with extensive walls, bends, or vegetation obstructing the view, the likelihood of an aggressor acting increases, as they feel that their actions will go unnoticed. Environmental criminology studies in Latin American contexts have shown that low visibility is associated with higher rates of minor crimes in public spaces.⁽³⁾ In Bogotá, it has been documented that sections of Avenida Caracas and the areas surrounding transportation stations present these conditions and are frequent sites of theft.⁽⁴⁾ These findings coincide with previous analyses that pointed out that blind fronts and urban voids fostered scenarios of insecurity.⁽⁵⁾

Pedestrian continuity and street connectivity are also determining factors. In areas with well-connected local networks, pedestrians have several possible routes, which reduces the predictability of their journeys. However, when closed streets predominate, bottlenecks form that concentrate the flow of people and make it easier for criminals to identify opportunities and plan quick escape routes. Recent research shows that urban connectivity, measured by intersection density, is associated with the likelihood of crime, even above factors such as income or socioeconomic status.⁽⁶⁾

Another relevant factor is the mix of uses and the presence of active storefronts. When residential and commercial properties open onto the street, natural surveillance is generated: the eyes of those who live or work in the area become a control mechanism. Conversely, high walls or blind facades eliminate this visual relationship with public space and make pedestrians feel more vulnerable. Bogotá has found that streets surrounded by extensive fences or parking lots without visual control generate mistrust and fear, even in the absence of recent crime.⁽⁷⁾

However, floating population density is another common feature in places with high levels of theft. Areas near mass transit stations, portals, markets, or commercial hubs concentrate large numbers of pedestrians during peak hours. This flow serves as a "screen" for criminals, who take advantage of the natural distraction of the crowd. In Latin American cities, it has been observed that routes connecting public transportation and commercial areas are particularly prone to theft in the afternoon and evening.⁽⁸⁾ In Bogotá, data from the District Security Secretariat confirm that these areas coincide with the times of day when the highest number of thefts are reported.⁽²⁾

Thus, the possibility of a quick escape route is decisive. When urban design offers secondary access points, poorly monitored cross streets, or immediate connections to other neighborhood networks, the aggressor perceives that the risk of being caught is reduced. This calculation of the right moment explains why certain corridors continue to concentrate crime despite police controls. Previous research had already warned that areas with immediate escape routes, such as Chapinero and Suba, were critical locations

for theft.⁽⁵⁾ Current evidence shows that the same logic is repeated in other areas of the city.

It should be clarified that the explanation for theft in Bogotá cannot be reduced to economic precariousness. Although inequality and poverty are risk factors, multiple studies have shown that there is no linear relationship between low income and crime. In fact, in areas with similar social conditions, very different criminal behaviors are observed, indicating that other variables are involved, including the individual decision to commit a crime.⁽⁹⁾

In Bogotá, several studies have shown that some people who commit theft repeatedly do so as part of a “profession,” where crime is seen as a stable and predictable way of life. This pattern of professionalization involves the conscious selection of locations, times, and techniques that minimize risk and maximize profit.⁽¹⁰⁾ From this perspective, the offender acts as a rational actor who calculates the opportunities offered by the physical and social environment, beyond immediate need.

Rational choice theory has been used to explain this phenomenon, pointing out that crime occurs when opportunities outweigh perceived risks and benefits are considered to exceed potential costs.⁽¹¹⁾ In practice, this means that spaces with little natural surveillance, high floating population density, and multiple escape routes are evaluated positively by those planning a theft. In light of this, research in Colombia confirms that criminals value the ease of escape more than the amount of money they can obtain in a single event.⁽¹²⁾

On the other hand, the existence of organized networks also reinforces the idea of theft as a profession. In several sectors of Bogotá, small but coordinated structures have been identified that divide specific functions among themselves: observers, distractors, and executors. This division of labor shows that crime can be planned with a degree of sophistication that contradicts the idea of an impulsive act motivated solely by economic deprivation.⁽¹³⁾ Professionalization is also reflected in accumulated learning: criminals adapt their techniques to the urban context, such as the use of motorcycles on main avenues or the selection of congested corridors to facilitate escape.

In addition, recidivism in thefts from individuals is a key indicator. National Police reports have indicated that a small number of individuals are responsible for a significant proportion of the crimes reported in the capital.⁽¹⁴⁾ This concentration of crime coincides with what international research has shown about “prolific offenders,” who consider theft an occupation and repeat it systematically.⁽¹⁵⁾

Therefore, although social inequality remains a relevant factor, in Bogotá it is clear that theft is not solely the result of necessity. It is also a product of individual choices and the way in which the urban environment facilitates or hinders those choices. In this sense, the city acts as a stage where personal motivations and spatial opportunities converge, creating micro-territories where theft becomes a recurring and, in many cases, professionalized practice.

At the same time, the analysis of insecurity in Bogotá must also be approached from the perspective of preventive urban design. The strategy known as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is based on the premise that the built environment directly influences the likelihood of criminal behavior. This approach proposes that the organization of the physical environment, lighting, visibility, the delimitation of areas, and the presence of legitimate activity in public spaces are factors that can reduce opportunities for crime.⁽¹⁶⁾ In various cities, it has been shown that interventions that strengthen natural visibility, encourage active use of space, and limit areas of anonymity contribute to reducing theft and improving the perception of safety.⁽¹⁷⁾

In the case of Bogotá, applying the logic of CPTED allows us to understand why sectors with similar socioeconomic conditions have different levels of insecurity. Where streets offer visual continuity, sidewalks are well lit, and there are active storefronts, the perception of risk decreases and crimes are less frequent. Conversely, when the urban environment is fragmented, with gaps and physical barriers, citizens perceive a greater level of threat and criminals find incentives to act.⁽¹⁸⁾

Citizen perception is therefore a key focus of the discussion. In recent security surveys, a high proportion of residents report feeling unsafe when traveling around the city, even in areas where theft rates have fallen.⁽¹⁹⁾ This reveals a disconnect between objective risk and subjective experience. The explanation lies in the fact that citizens do not experience the city solely on the basis of statistics, but also through the immediate physical attributes of their surroundings: lighting, the condition of sidewalks, the presence of other pedestrians, the accumulation of trash, deteriorated walls and fences, and the feeling of being watched. Comparative studies in Latin America show that the perception of insecurity can remain stable or even increase despite a decrease in reported crimes, indicating that fear has a component deeply linked to urban design and the collective memory of space.⁽²⁰⁾

This link leads to a fundamental category: fear of transit. This is the feeling experienced by residents when traveling through streets or areas considered unsafe, which conditions the way they inhabit the city. Fear of transit is not limited to the possibility of being a victim of crime; it also reflects the uncertainty of walking through a poorly lit corridor with blank walls or piles of trash. Such scenarios, already described in previous studies on Bogotá, limit the use of public space and generate routines of self-control that restrict mobility, especially at night.^(5,21) In this sense, urban insecurity is not only measured by the occurrence of theft, but also by citizens' reluctance to occupy certain spaces, which undermines urban vitality and deepens social fragmentation.

RESULTS

The documentary review carried out allows us to identify four major findings on the relationship between the urban environment, theft, and citizen perception in Bogotá. These results not only confirm patterns previously identified in local research, but also draw on comparative studies in Latin America and established theories in environmental criminology.

The first finding is the persistence of theft hotspots in the city. Despite variations in overall figures, the same areas continue to have a disproportionate concentration of cases. This confirms that theft is not distributed randomly, but responds to specific spatial conditions that remain stable over time. Previous studies in Bogotá had already shown that less than 10 % of city blocks could account for up to 40 % of reported thefts.⁽⁵⁾ Current evidence corroborates that, although the total number of reports

fluctuates, areas with narrow streets, poorly monitored intersections, and a high density of transient populations continue to be epicenters of crime.^(2,14)

The second finding relates to the professionalization of theft. Documentary analysis shows that a significant proportion of offenders do not act on the spur of the moment or solely out of economic necessity. Recent literature indicates that theft in large Latin American cities has become established as a “profession” with specialized techniques and roles.^(10,13) In Bogotá, official reports have identified small but organized networks that repeat patterns of operation, which coincides with what has been documented in other urban contexts where prolific crime is concentrated among a few individuals who systematically reoffend.^(14,15) This finding challenges narratives that explain crime exclusively as a product of structural poverty and forces us to consider the dimension of individual choice in the analysis.

The third finding is the importance of the physical environment on the perception of insecurity. The data reviewed show that citizens perceive places with certain physical characteristics as unsafe, even when crime rates are not particularly high in those areas. Perception surveys have found that in Bogotá, more than 70 % of residents say they feel unsafe walking around the city, a percentage that exceeds actual victimization levels by several points.⁽¹⁹⁾ This discrepancy is explained by what is known in environmental criminology as “perceived risk”: the feeling produced by the environment in terms of visibility, lighting, and urban vitality.⁽²⁰⁾ In other words, citizens do not need to have been victims to experience fear; simply walking down a dark corridor with blank walls and accumulated trash is enough to increase the perception of vulnerability.

A fourth key finding is the consolidation of fear of transit as an analytical category. A review of the literature shows that this concept appears repeatedly in urban studies in Latin America, although under different names such as “diffuse fear” or “subjective insecurity”.⁽²¹⁾ In the case of Bogotá, fear of transit manifests itself in everyday decisions to avoid certain routes, change travel schedules, or even reduce the frequency of nighttime outings. This behavior limits the use of public space and weakens social ties, as citizens prioritize self-protection over urban interaction. Fear, then, becomes a factor that reconfigures the city, as certain spaces become underused and end up feeding back into the feeling of abandonment and risk.⁽²²⁾

These results allow us to affirm that insecurity in Bogotá must be understood as a spatial, social, and subjective phenomenon at the same time. It is not enough to look at crime statistics or study the socioeconomic conditions of neighborhoods. It is necessary to recognize that urban morphology directly affects the opportunity for crime and the way citizens feel and inhabit the city.

In comparative terms, Bogotá shares characteristics with other large Latin American cities where theft is the most frequent crime. In Mexico City, for example, it has been found that areas with greater urban fragmentation and high floating density account for the majority of reported thefts on public transport.⁽²³⁾ In Lima, recent studies have shown that the perception of insecurity far exceeds actual victimization levels, due to the precariousness of urban infrastructure in peripheral sectors.⁽²⁴⁾ These regional similarities reinforce the hypothesis that, beyond the particular conditions of each city, there is a common pattern where urban design and subjective perception of risk interact to produce environments conducive to theft.

The evidence also allows us to conclude that theft in Bogotá is a persistent phenomenon over time. Despite police control strategies and a reduction in some overall figures, critical points remain. This result coincides with situational criminology studies that indicate that criminal opportunity tends to be concentrated in specific locations and that, if the environmental factors that enable it are not addressed, crimes reappear again and again in the same spots.^(11,16)

Subsequently, the results confirm that preventive urban design is a useful way to understand and address the problem. Thus, the literature review shows that cities that have applied CPTED principles have succeeded in reducing minor crimes and improving citizen perception.^(17,18) Although insecurity in Bogotá has multiple dimensions, the findings of this research indicate that physical space can no longer be seen as a neutral backdrop: it is an active actor that conditions security and fear in urban life.

DISCUSSION

The results confirm that insecurity in Bogotá must be understood as a complex phenomenon in which spatial, social, and subjective dimensions converge. The evidence indicates that, despite partial declines in overall theft figures, critical points persist over time and reproduce the same territorial logic. This supports the thesis that urban morphology is a structural factor and not a secondary element in the configuration of crime scenarios.^(1,5)

A first aspect to discuss is the relationship between the professionalization of theft and urban morphology. This research showed that theft does not always respond to immediate needs but, in many cases, to rational decisions and the consolidation of this practice as a profession. This professionalization finds conditions in the physical space that amplify opportunities: streets with little surveillance, quick escape routes, and environments with high floating density. In this way, the urban environment acts as a catalyst for a practice that combines individual motivations and structural factors. In other words, space not only facilitates but also legitimizes the criminal’s strategic calculation.^(10,13,15)

The second point relates to public perception. The difference between objective risk and perceived risk shows that insecurity is not just a matter of numbers. In Bogotá, as in other cities in the region, the feeling of fear remains high even when reports of theft are declining.^(19,20) This discrepancy reinforces the hypothesis that citizens interpret safety based on the immediate attributes of the space. A well-lit sidewalk, a street with active commerce, or a clean park convey confidence, while a dark corridor with blank walls generates fear, even if no recent crime has been reported in that location. This subjective dimension is key, as it conditions daily routines and the use of public space.

This is where the category of fear of transit comes in, which is a central part of the urban experience. The fact that people avoid certain routes, change their schedules, or limit how much they move around in certain areas shows that insecurity isn’t just about crimes that happen, but also about not being able to fully enjoy the city. This finding connects with the observations of

authors who have described diffuse fear in Latin American urban contexts as a factor that undermines urban vitality and reinforces social fragmentation.^(21,22) In Bogotá, fear of transit turns certain areas into underutilized spaces, which, paradoxically, can increase opportunities for crime by reducing citizen presence.

A third area of discussion concerns the role of preventive urban design (CPTED). The literature reviewed shows that interventions that improve natural visibility, encourage active use of space, and reduce areas of anonymity can decrease opportunities for crime and strengthen citizen confidence.^(16,17,18) However, in the case of Bogotá, the incorporation of these principles has been partial and fragmented. The findings of this research suggest that, although security does not depend solely on urban design, it is a fundamental resource for modulating risk. The physical environment can increase or reduce the costs perceived by the offender, which directly influences their decision to act.

Thus, the results pose a methodological and conceptual challenge: it is insufficient to analyze insecurity solely from criminal statistics. The combination of official figures, citizen perception, and analysis of the physical space is essential to understand the phenomenon in its entirety. This comprehensive view provides more solid tools for interpreting urban insecurity as a complex pathology that affects not only coexistence but also the fundamental right to live in the city without fear.

CONCLUSIONS

This study confirms that theft in Bogotá cannot be understood solely as an effect of social inequality or the absence of police control. The evidence shows that urban morphology plays a central role in shaping crime scenarios, as certain physical attributes of space, such as limited visibility, the presence of blind walls, interstitial voids, dead-end streets, or a high density of floating population, create conditions that favor crime. These elements allow us to conclude that space is not neutral, but rather an active player in the dynamics of urban insecurity.^(1,2,5)

Likewise, the findings highlight that theft is not always the result of immediate need, but in many cases responds to conscious decisions and the professionalization of crime. The fact that individuals and small networks plan their actions, select locations and times, and adapt techniques to the urban context reinforces the idea that theft functions as a form of recurring occupation. This aspect requires us to move beyond simplistic explanations that associate crime solely with poverty and to consider that individual choice interacts with the opportunities offered by the physical environment.^(10,13,15)

Public perception is another fundamental factor. Even though theft figures fluctuate and show declines in some periods, the perception of insecurity remains high in Bogotá. This discrepancy shows that fear is not explained solely by victimization records, but also by the daily experience of moving around the city. Dark corridors, deteriorated sidewalks, or public spaces with little vitality fuel a diffuse fear that conditions mobility and limits the use of public space.^(19,20,21) In this context, the category of fear of transit is proposed and presented, which synthesizes how insecurity is expressed not only in crimes that have occurred, but also in citizens' daily renunciations of free movement.

In conclusion, it can be said that the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) are confirmed as a useful analytical and operational framework for understanding and addressing theft in urban environments. Although insecurity in Bogotá has multiple dimensions, the results of this review show that the design of space can reduce or amplify opportunities for crime, influence the perception of risk, and contribute to restoring confidence in public space.

In short, theft in Bogotá should be understood as an interaction between three dimensions: the physical structure of the city, the individual decisions of those who commit crimes, and the subjective perception of citizens. Addressing the problem requires a comprehensive approach that recognizes the complexity of these interactions and, beyond police statistics, incorporates the analysis of urban space and the daily experience of insecurity as central elements of academic discussion and urban management.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Alcaldía Mayor de Bogotá. En el primer semestre de 2025 el hurto común en Bogotá se redujo un 16,5 %. Bogotá: Alcaldía Mayor; 2025. Disponible en: <https://bogota.gov.co/mi-ciudad/seguridad/en-primer-semestre-de-2025-el-hurto-comun-en-bogota-se-redujo-un-165>
2. Policía Nacional de Colombia. Estadística delictiva – Hurto a personas. Bogotá: Policía Nacional; Disponible en: <https://www.policia.gov.co/estadistica-delictiva/hurto-personas-0>
3. Céspedes EN. Criminología ambiental y homicidio en la ciudad de Bogotá. *Rev Crim.* 2018;60(2):45-67. Disponible en: <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/815/81554612005/html/>
4. Secretaría Distrital de Seguridad, Convivencia y Justicia. Estadísticas y mapas. Bogotá: SDSCJ; Disponible en: <https://scj.gov.co/cifras/estadisticas-mapas>
5. Castro M. Contagiando el miedo: Inseguridad urbana como patología producida en la ciudad de Bogotá [Tesis de Maestría en Urbanismo]. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia; 2021.
6. García López PJ. La metodología CPTED para reducir el delito. *Rev Investig La Salle.* 2018;10(2):33-49. Disponible en: <https://revistasinvestigacion.lasalle.mx/index.php/mclidi/article/download/1651/2038/11714>

7. Rau Vargas M. Prevención de la violencia y el delito mediante el diseño ambiental en Latinoamérica. Rev INVI. 2008;23(62):21-52. Disponible en: <https://revistainvi.uchile.cl/index.php/INVI/article/view/62293/66340>
8. Monguí PEG. Criminalidad, seguridad y percepción de inseguridad en Bogotá. Via Inveniendi Et Iudicandi. 2023;20(1):157-81. Disponible en: <https://revistas.usantotomas.edu.co/index.php/viei/article/download/9197/8177/24727>
9. Cornish DB, Clarke RV. The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1986.
10. Vargas MR. CPTED de tercera generación: Nube de los sueños y metodologías participativas. Constructos Criminológicos. 2021;1(1):9-22. Disponible en: <https://constructoscriminologicos.uanl.mx/index.php/cc/article/view/4>
11. Clarke RV. Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies. 2nd ed. Albany: Harrow and Heston; 1997.
12. Policía Nacional de Colombia. Informe sobre reincidencia delictiva en Bogotá. Bogotá: Policía Nacional; 2024.
13. Farrington DP, Welsh BC. Criminological theories of repeat offending. Crim Behav Ment Health. 2020;30(4):179-95.
14. ProBogotá. Informe Anual de Seguridad en Bogotá 2023. Bogotá: ProBogotá; 2024. Disponible en: <https://www.probogota.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Informe-Anual-de-Seguridad-2023.pdf>
15. Cámara de Comercio de Bogotá. Encuesta de Percepción y Victimización de Bogotá 2024. Bogotá: CCB; 2025. Disponible en: <https://www.ccb.org.co/observatorio>
16. Jeffery CR. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. 2nd ed. Beverly Hills: Sage; 1977.
17. Cozens PM, Love T. A review and current status of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). J Plan Lit. 2015;30(4):393-412.
18. Armitage R, Monchuk L. What is CPTED? Reconnecting theory with application in the words of users and abusers. Policing. 2019;13(3):312-30.
19. DANE. Encuesta de Convivencia y Seguridad Ciudadana (ECSC). Bogotá: DANE; Disponible en: <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/seguridad-y-defensa/encuesta-de-convivencia-y-seguridad-ciudadana-ecsc>
20. Dammert L, Malone MF. Fear of crime in Latin America: The role of social and institutional factors. Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2020;44:e80.
21. Carrión F, Núñez J. El miedo y la ciudad: prácticas de inseguridad en América Latina. Quito: FLACSO; 2019.
22. Núñez F, Calderón J. Temor difuso y percepción de inseguridad en el espacio público urbano. EURE. 2022;48(143):117-36.
23. Vilalta C. Spatial concentration of crime in Mexico City. Appl Geogr. 2019;104:10-20.
24. León J, Muggah R. Urban security in Lima: Insecurity and the public realm. Stability Int J Secur Dev. 2021;10(1):1-15.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Data curation: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Formal analysis: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Research: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Methodology: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Project administration: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Resources: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Software: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Supervision: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Validation: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Visualization: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Writing – original draft: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.

Writing – review and editing: Camila Paz Jorquera Gallardo, Simón Ignacio Pereira Bruna, and Pedro Di Vicenzi Sánchez.