

Graffiti in London

Report of the London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee

May 2002



Graffiti in London

Report of the London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee

May 2002

copyright

**Greater London Authority
May 2002**

Published by
**Greater London Authority
Romney House
Marsham Street
London SW1P 3PY
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458**

ISBN 1 85261 366 1

Cover photograph

The graffiti on the street furniture shown was removed very speedily

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Foreword by the Chair of the Graffiti Investigative Committee



In the Association of London Government's 'Survey of Londoners 2001,' 77% of Londoners listed graffiti as a quality of life concern. The London Mayor's 'London Survey' by MORI did not, surprisingly, address the issue directly but 73% of respondents said that London was not a clean city and 52% listed crime as a major concern. Graffiti will have been a contributing factor to both these responses.

Our investigation included interviews with graffiti writers and a full day receiving evidence from Local Authorities, the police, transport organisations and major companies. In addition we received over two hundred written responses, including most valuable input from overseas.

It is clear that graffiti is a problem that affects ALL London Boroughs, not just those situated in 'inner' London. South London appears to be particularly blessed or cursed by graffiti depending upon your point of view. It is also clear that the amount of graffiti is growing. Some respondents to our investigation signalled that their spending on removing graffiti has tripled over the last five years. Our standards for combating illegal graffiti are way below the best practice internationally. Our standards also vary dramatically across London.

I am very grateful to my Assembly colleagues on the committee, Valerie Shawcross and Lynne Featherstone for their significant input into this investigation. We enjoyed a very positive and non-party tone to our discussion on an issue that can have a very high party political profile in London's Boroughs.

The investigation engaged a very good number of London's residents. This is partly a reflection of the high degree of public concern about this issue. I am personally very grateful for the personal contact I had from individual residents associations with their practical experiences of graffiti.

This report moves the debate forward on graffiti with its emphasis upon a broad and co-ordinated menu of solutions to illegal graffiti. I trust also that the document will also serve as a handy aide-memoire for all dealing with the challenge of illegal graffiti writers defacing London.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew Pelling". The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined.

Andrew Pelling

Chair of the Graffiti Investigative Committee

The Graffiti Investigative Committee

The London Assembly established the Graffiti Investigative Committee on 11th July 2001 with the following membership:

Andrew Pelling (Chair) - Conservative
Valerie Shawcross - Labour
Lynne Featherstone - Liberal Democrat

The terms of reference of the Committee were as follows:

- To investigate graffiti across London examining examples of best practice in its prevention and removal, to be made available to London Boroughs and all interested parties.

Contacts: Ijeoma Ajibade, Scrutiny Manager, Tel: 020 7983 4397
Penny Housely, Committee Administrator, Tel 020 7983 6559

Table of Contents	Page
Executive Summary	4
Chapter 1. Introduction	6
Chapter 2. Graffiti – Exploring the Sub-Culture	8
Chapter 3. The Cost of Graffiti to London	14
Chapter 4. Quality of Life Issues	18
Chapter 5. Legislation and Law Enforcement	22
Chapter 6. Local Authorities and Partnership Working	28
Chapter 7. Community Involvement and Self-Help	34
Chapter 8. Young People and Graffiti	37
Chapter 9. Conclusion	43
Annex A Summary of Recommendations	44
Annex B Evidentiary Hearing - List of Witnesses	48
Annex C Site Visit to Groundwork Merton	49
Annex D List of Written Evidence and Bibliography	51
Annex E Summary of Written Evidence	56
Annex F Table of Recommended Solutions	141

Executive Summary

Graffiti is an increasingly prevalent and obvious environmental crime in London, degrading streets, houses, offices, buses and trains. For the majority it is ugly, and sometimes offensive. It engenders an atmosphere of neglect and criminality. Graffiti also involves serious risks to the graffiti writers themselves.

The London Assembly decided to undertake the first London-wide focussed consideration of how to prevent and reduce graffiti in the capital. We have brought together for the first time a wealth of best practice and data from all over London which can be used to develop a more targeted and co-ordinated approach. We have heard not only from Boroughs and transport companies but also from residents and graffiti writers. Our report investigates the culture and motivations of graffiti writing. We look at what works in graffiti prevention both across London and also in the rest of the United Kingdom and in cities around the world.

Our main recommendations can be found in the body of the report and are listed in full at Annex A.

Our principal findings are:

❖ *The Cost of Graffiti*

We estimate the total cost of graffiti in London to be over £100 million per annum. In this report we have identified expenditure by London Boroughs and transport companies of approximately £13 million per annum. This figure rises to £23 million if all the etched glass on the underground is replaced, but does not include costs to businesses, utilities, rail companies and homeowners. Costs go beyond just removal costs and include damage to economic development and loss of capital values to people's homes. We were unable to identify accurately these additional costs, but we estimate that when they are taken into account, the cost of graffiti to the London economy each year exceeds £100m. This is money lost to productive expenditure and investment in our public services. Graffiti involves an unacceptable cost to Londoners.

❖ *Enforcing the Law*

Illegal graffiti is criminal damage. Effective law enforcement should deter graffiti writers and reduce the incidence of graffiti in London.

- We support current proposals to ban the sale of graffiti materials to minors and believe that legislation should be introduced to apply such a ban across the country.
- We found some examples of effective law enforcement where the courts, the local council, the police and the Crown Prosecution Service have joined together with an agreed commitment to take graffiti more seriously. Such an approach must be extended across London. Graffiti should no longer be considered a minor offence.
- There must be more use of reparations – those who are convicted of graffiti should be made to remove it.

❖ ***Community involvement***

All parts of the local community must get involved in the fight against graffiti and we saw some impressive examples of involvement from community groups which local councils across London should encourage. We are critical of a number of the utility companies which appear to allow graffiti to remain on their property, thus harming the local environment.

❖ ***The need for more youth provision***

Our investigation revealed an absence of alternative, legal and creative outlets for the young people whose energies are currently misdirected into illegal graffiti. Those projects that do exist are often short-term and unsustainable. We call for further work to be undertaken on reviewing the state of youth provision in London.

❖ ***The Capital Standards Programme***

We have found pockets of success across the boroughs of London, but our city is an integrated whole and graffiti writers are no respecters of borough boundaries. There is an urgent need for a co-ordinated approach, sharing intelligence and best practice amongst boroughs, transport operators, the police and other key bodies. The Capital Standards Programme established by the Mayor, Tidy Britain Group and the Association of London Government is a good vehicle to promote such a London-wide effort against graffiti and to promote the insights and recommendations of our report. The fullest participation in the Programme will come when it has moved on from establishing what current standards are to setting standards.

1. Introduction

Is graffiti a problem?

- 1.1 Graffiti has become of increasing concern to Londoners, with local authorities, transport organisations, businesses and private individuals spending millions of pounds each year trying to prevent and remove it. Graffiti has a negative effect on the lives of the thousands of Londoners who travel in vandalised, unpleasant buses and trains, and live in areas blighted by graffiti. Its presence often coincides with other environmental problems such as abandoned cars, litter and fly posting. Graffiti also spreads fear and can be offensive. The increasing importance attached to graffiti removal is evidenced by the increase in the demand for Councils to remove it.¹
- 1.2 We believe that graffiti is an issue that needs to be addressed urgently. The London Assembly has a clear role in providing leadership and strategic direction for London. Our scrutiny aims to initiate and to encourage a co-ordinated, effective response to graffiti across the capital.

The scrutiny process

- 1.3 As part of the scrutiny process we took oral evidence at a one-day hearing² and analysed over two hundred written memoranda. These included written evidence from several world cities who provided us with examples of a variety of innovative anti-graffiti strategies with which to benchmark and develop our own. Our investigation has also included studying literature and press articles, analysing the evidence received, investigating graffiti web sites and interviewing graffiti writers. We visited Groundwork Merton³ that has a diversionary youth programme, to see examples of how graffiti has been used in diversionary youth work. We have considered wider issues such as social exclusion, urban design and crime and have taken these issues into account in making our recommendations. We are grateful to all who assisted us in our investigation.

Our definition

- 1.4 In this report we have chosen to use the term "graffiti writer" as our definition of a person who does graffiti. We have used this as a generic term to cover both legal and illegal graffiti and it also encompasses the different types of graffiti. We recognise that the term "graffiti writer" is also the term used by those who practice graffiti. Our purpose in using this is for ease of reporting. We wish to make it clear that our use of this term does not confer any validity on the practice of illegal graffiti.

¹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.8 Association of London Government

² Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002

³ Site Visit to Groundwork Merton Annex C

Areas covered in the report

1.5 The main areas discussed in the report are:

The Graffiti Sub-Culture

To emphasise the balanced approach taken to the investigation of graffiti in London and to assist our own understanding of some of the wider issues, we carried out studies into the graffiti sub-culture. In the main we have focused on the types of graffiti and the motivation behind graffiti writing. Our report considers the way the sub-culture has existed alongside mainstream culture and the use of graffiti in the field of advertising. We have also outlined less recognised issues such as access to dangerous places and the improper use of spray paints.

Costs of Graffiti

We report on the costs of graffiti to London that we have been able to identify through our scrutiny process. We outline the problem of the deficit of accurate information and how this hinders the development of an assessment of the costs. We consider other quality of life issues that cannot be measured in terms of financial costs but have an impact on people.

Legislation and Enforcement

We consider the issues faced by law enforcement agencies such as the use of reparations. We also discuss the proposals for legislation restricting the sale of graffiti materials to minors. Our recommendations highlight the fact that restrictions on the sale of graffiti materials will need to be applied nationally in order to have a recognisable impact on the level of graffiti in the streets of our city.

Responding to Graffiti

Throughout the report we identify the main issues of concern arising from both the oral and written evidence. These issues include the role of education in preventing graffiti and the variations in local authority expenditure and practice. In the body of the report and in the appendices we outline some of the examples of best practice we encountered during the course of our work including best practice from other world cities and from different sectors of the community. We have also highlighted examples of self-help, as we believe there is a definite need for action by the community in general. Graffiti cannot be effectively dealt with by organisations and statutory authorities acting on their own, but will require active involvement from the community. We also consider wider issues such as social exclusion and the lack of youth provision. We have highlighted the diversity of the different strategies.

2. Graffiti – Exploring the Sub-Culture

The arrival of graffiti in the UK

2.1 There are various opinions as to how graffiti developed and arrived in the UK. The practice of writing and drawing on walls dates back to ancient times,⁴ but modern graffiti emerged on the streets of New York in the seventies. Since then it has evolved with the growth of hip-hop music culture which emerged as a response to American ghetto life.⁵ Graffiti came to the UK as the popularity in hip-hop culture grew and as corporate America recognised that hip-hop was a marketable commodity. Our evidence shows that graffiti in the UK has grown in popularity and status particularly with young people. It is seen by young people as a way of providing an opportunity to acquire fame and respect amongst their peers.⁶

Types of Graffiti.

2.2 There are different types of graffiti:

- tagging (more common type of graffiti, consisting of what appears to be scrawl)
- murals (more artistic types of graffiti),
- etching (scratching of glass surfaces),
- general graffiti (racist, obscene, consisting of political slogans) etc

The various materials used include chalk, marker pens, tippex, sharp implements and paint.⁷

2.3 Tagging is the most common type of graffiti. The tag is a type of signature. It is a way of saying "I was here" and is used in some cases to mark out territory. Tagging on housing estates is predominantly carried out by young people in the age range of eight to eighteen.⁸ Murals or pieces (as they are known by graffiti writers) are the more artistic forms of graffiti. These usually contain large complex lettering and are often a form of tagging that cannot be easily deciphered.

2.4 As various organisations have become more effective in graffiti removal, spray can graffiti has been displaced by a new type of highly damaging graffiti known as etching. Etching is very common on buses and trains and involves the scratching of glass with a drill bit or sharp implement. Etching has become a serious problem for transport organisations and they have expressed grave concerns about the increasing costs of replacing etched glass.⁹

2.5 In some cases graffiti is highly offensive and inflammatory, being used as a form of attack against an individual or group of people. Some local authorities reported an increase in instances of offensive graffiti. We are pleased to report that all the Local authorities that submitted written evidence confirmed that they endeavour to remove such graffiti within 24-48 hours of receiving a report. The majority of the local authorities that responded to the scrutiny also remove offensive graffiti free of charge from both public and private property.

⁴ Memorandum Mr Axel Thiel <http://people.freenet.de/graffitiforschung.de/KSurl.htm>

⁵ Memorandum Dr Kurt Iveson

⁶ Memorandum Ben

⁷ Memorandum Bradford Metropolitan District Council

⁸ Interview with graffiti writer 17th January 2002

⁹ Memoranda: Arriva, Go Ahead Group, London Underground Ltd, London United Busways, Metroline, Stagecoach London.

The Profile of a Graffiti Writer

- 2.6 We found that there is no specific profile for a graffiti writer. Traditionally it was thought that graffiti writers were largely from socially disadvantaged backgrounds, but the evidence we received contradicts this. The economic, social and ethnic background is largely irrelevant and does not determine whether some people are more likely to become involved in graffiti than others.¹⁰ *“Two or three years ago we considered the perpetrators as being from deprived backgrounds and single parent families, but there is evidence today that individuals from well ordered and “better off” families are also turning to graffiti as a pastime.”*¹¹
- 2.7 Evidence submitted from boroughs, businesses and world cities points to the majority of graffiti being carried out by young males between the ages of 11 and 16. However, the evidence also makes clear that a lot of graffiti writing is done by those in their thirties and beyond. *“Many graffiti writers are not young kids as is popularly believed. The majority of graffiti writers are over eighteen and many are in their thirties. Some hold down respectable jobs. Although it may be difficult to understand, graffiti is a way of life for some people and is something they enjoy”.*¹² A recent Guardian article reported the arrest of six graffiti writers two of whom were aged thirty.¹³ We considered whether the age of the graffiti writer had any influence on the type of graffiti they did. It appears from our evidence that tagging is predominantly carried out by younger people in their early teens, whilst the more artistic types of graffiti are carried out by older people.

What motivates graffiti writers?

- 2.8 People write graffiti for a variety of reasons, the main motivation being the achievement of fame and notoriety amongst peers.¹⁴ *“People become involved in graffiti because they see it as a way of achieving fame, respect, identity and notoriety. It provides them with an opportunity to be noticed. Spraying their names (tags) brings recognition especially when the tags are complex designs. In some ways it is similar to advertising”.*¹⁵ Greater recognition is achieved if one is able to put their tag in dangerous, inaccessible places.
- 2.9 Councillor Dolezal of the Association of London Government said that to young people graffiti was seen as a challenge and contributed to their self-esteem and identity.¹⁶ Other reasons given for writing graffiti include: alienation, gang culture, boredom, bravado, the influence of popular culture and artistic expression.¹⁷

¹⁰ Memoranda: Bradford Metropolitan District Council, London Borough of Croydon, London of Greenwich, Metropolitan Police Service

¹¹ Memorandum British Transport Police

¹² Interview with graffiti writer 17th January 2002

¹³ Guardian Newspaper 2nd February 2002 – *“Graffiti bombers jailed in crackdown on cult.”*

¹⁴ Memoranda: Jon, Craig, Simon

¹⁵ Interview with graffiti writer 4th December 2001

¹⁶ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.22

¹⁷ Memorandum London Borough of Croydon

Community and Codes of Conduct

- 2.10 The graffiti sub-culture appears to be well established. It consists of graffiti writers from all over the world who enter competitions, display photographs of graffiti on the internet and travel to other countries to spray graffiti.¹⁸ The internet is used to promote graffiti with web-sites showing hundreds of pictures of graffiti from all around the world on trains, walls, planes, cars etc. The internet is also used to sell graffiti magazines, videos of people spraying graffiti, paints and clothes with graffiti designs.
- 2.11 A graffiti writer may act alone or form part of a group known as a "crew". Within a crew you may have graffiti writers that are in their thirties and twenties as well as those who are minors.¹⁹ In some circumstances crews may be highly organised, meeting regularly to plan where to write graffiti. Some members of the crew may keep watch for others when carrying out illegal graffiti.²⁰ There may also be a form of apprenticeship, with older graffiti writers training the younger members of the crew.
- 2.12 Various codes of conduct exist. These include not going over another person's work, as this is seen as a mark of disrespect; not informing on other graffiti writers and not writing on places of worship, private property or trees. These codes are not followed by everyone and the choice of which codes to abide by is largely down to the individual.²¹ The graffiti writers interviewed admitted that codes of conduct are as varied as the writers themselves.²²
- 2.13 The graffiti writers interviewed questioned why there has to be war between themselves and the authorities. They wondered why they are portrayed as hardened criminals. They acknowledged the fact that graffiti is seen as vandalism, but were annoyed at being categorised the same way as those who commit rape, robbery, drug dealing and murder. They highlighted the positive aspects of graffiti which are ignored by statutory authorities, such as projects where graffiti has been used in mentoring young people, and various advertising and art commissions, which provide opportunities for employment.

Art or Crime?

- 2.14 We briefly considered the debate about whether graffiti is an art or a crime. We are aware that this is a contentious issue, and we felt that focussing on this issue would distract us from fulfilling our main objective of identifying and sharing good practice in graffiti prevention. Our research revealed the presence of many web sites that focus on this question and we felt that adding to the debate would not be of much value and as such we have only given it brief consideration.
- 2.15 At the hearing Sonia Blair told us that young people understood that many people did not like graffiti but many did not understand why. She referred to the Turner

¹⁸ Memorandum British Transport Police

¹⁹ Interview with graffiti writer 17th January 2002

²⁰ Memorandum City of Chicago

²¹ Memorandum Jon, Ben, Craig

²² Interview with graffiti writer 4th December 2001

Prize and commented that different people did have different ideas of what art is.²³ We were informed that some types of modern art has no more validity than a tag. *"Graffiti is another form of art. When I see tagging I look to see who is up. I don't see scrawl. I look to see whose tag is up"*.²⁴ Much of this argument misses the point. Graffiti is disliked because it is placed on space belonging to others and is not confined to the art galleries. Therefore people have to see it whether they appreciate it or not.

- 2.16 The writers interviewed were quite candid and felt that where tagging is a problem residents should not wait for the local authorities to remove the graffiti, but paint over it themselves. This would eventually prevent repeat attacks. One of the main issues for society is how to develop the artistic and creative elements of graffiti whilst at the same time prevent the vandalism.

Graffiti - the risks

- 2.17 Although graffiti writing may appear attractive and fashionable to some of our young people, participation in the graffiti sub-culture is not without risk. There are major health risks associated with the improper use of spray paint. Such paints are often harmful when they are inhaled or come in contact with the skin. Paint fumes have been seen to affect individuals and the effect of inhalation is similar to that of solvent abuse or glue sniffing.
- 2.18 The spray paints we examined had clear safety instructions detailing how they should be used. These instructions included the fact that the paint should not be inhaled and should be used in a well ventilated area. Spray paints are also highly flammable and if used near naked sources of ignition such as cigarettes or direct heat, could result in serious injury. All the paints examined contain instructions about keeping them out of the reach of children and they also specified that before use, protective clothing such as masks and gloves should be worn. It is highly unlikely that the young people using these paints are adhering to these safety requirements.
- 2.19 We considered the issue of young people becoming involved in crime as a consequence of graffiti writing. There is a considerable amount of shoplifting generated by the fact that young people want materials to carry out graffiti.²⁵ Involvement in graffiti has also led to involvement in street robbery and drug offences.²⁶ In a reported incident, one graffiti writer undertook to write over another's work. This led to an argument in the street between the two graffiti writers resulting in a fatal stabbing.²⁷ The perpetrator received six years imprisonment for manslaughter. *"Further anecdotal evidence indicates that assaults and injuries involving graffiti writers are common, as are incidents involving graffiti gangs and other crimes"*.²⁸

²³ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.88

²⁴ Interview 17th January 2002

²⁵ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.25 London Borough of Wandsworth

²⁶ Memoranda: British Transport Police, Metropolitan Police Service

²⁷ Guardian Newspaper 5th September 2001

²⁸ Memorandum Metropolitan Police Service

2.20 Serious graffiti writers operate in areas of danger as this commands greater respect amongst their peers.²⁹ This fact is demonstrated by the presence of graffiti on bridges, roof tops, railway property and other high and inaccessible places such as inside tube tunnels. The dangers associated with railway trespass are quite clear. In 2001 an eighteen year old male was struck and killed by a passing train whilst in the act of spraying graffiti.³⁰ The potential for serious injury or death is high simply by the nature of the activity.

2.21 Through the work of this investigation we have become aware that there are issues around the lack of parental control. Some parents do not see the involvement of their children in graffiti as anything to be worried about and view it as a harmless teenage activity which is virtually safe when compared to drugs and alcohol.³¹ Parents need to be aware that the dangers for those who participate in the graffiti subculture are real.

The existence of the graffiti industry.

2.22 There is a growing industry based around the practice of graffiti. We have been made aware of specific graffiti web-sites and magazines that promote graffiti through the display of photographs of graffiti on walls and trains. There is also a plethora of web-sites from all over the world displaying photographs of graffiti and other related information. Whilst we would be unable to restrict the activities of foreign web-sites and graffiti magazines, we are concerned about the existence of UK- based magazines and web-sites that exist solely for the purpose of promoting criminal damage and which profit financially from this activity.

2.23 One of these magazines (Graphotism) has a shop in London which sells spray paints, markers and other graffiti materials. Their advert on the internet cynically lists Railtrack, the Environment Agency, Connex and various local authorities as their satisfied customers. This shows a blatant disregard for the way graffiti impacts on the lives of Londoners. This company also sells spray paint and markers through the internet. We were concerned to learn that the magazine Graphotism is sold from high street shops such as Virgin, Forbidden Planet and Tower records. The magazine has a disclaimer stating that they do not encourage or support any illegal activity and that photographs of damaged trains and other property are sent to them anonymously.

2.24 It is our belief that any organisation that clearly promotes criminal damage should be made legally accountable and have these activities restricted. We are concerned that any attempts by local authorities to restrict the sale of spray paints and graffiti materials will be severely undermined by such organisations. We also note with disquiet that some of the paints they sell are marketed as spray paint formulated for the graffiti writer.³²

²⁹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.13 London Borough of Islington Anti-Social Behaviour Unit

³⁰ Memorandum British Transport Police.

³¹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.13 London Borough of Islington Anti-Social Behaviour Unit

³² Graphotism Issue 16 1999.

2.25 Transport organisations and the police have expressed their concerns about the activities of this company and others like it.³³ The British Transport Police have informed us that these activities border on incitement and we welcome the suggestion of further research into the possibility of specific offences relating to these magazines and web-sites.³⁴

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Metropolitan Police and Transport for London should jointly explore whether the activities of magazines that promote and encourage illegal graffiti can be restricted.

³³ Memorandum Arriva

³⁴ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.105 British Transport Police

3. The Cost of Graffiti to London

- 3.1 Removing and preventing graffiti costs Londoners many millions of pounds every year, and this does not include the wider costs to business and society from a degraded environment. We have attempted in this chapter to collate available data on the costs of graffiti to London.

Local Authorities

- 3.2 Table 1 shows the annual expenditure on graffiti for thirteen London Boroughs. Not all the boroughs that responded were able to provide us with detailed information. The variations in the expenditure shown should not be taken as a reflection of an individual borough's commitment to remove graffiti because the expenditure is calculated in different ways. Graffiti removal costs are not always identified separately and may be included in expenditure on general street maintenance, which is not shown in the table.
- 3.3 Graffiti removal services are also delivered in different ways. In some local authorities it is provided in-house, whilst others have external contractors. The Association of London Government (ALG) informed us that large sums of money were being spent on a variety of different approaches across the 33 London Boroughs and that even within individual authorities the responses of various departments to graffiti were different. (For example between those departments responsible for the street scene and those responsible for housing or parks.)³⁵
- 3.4 The expenditure below covers a variety of different activities including: graffiti removal, graffiti prevention, staffing costs, art projects, and publicity. Many local authorities have reacted to residents concerns and in response increased their expenditure. Although there are variations in what is budgeted for, most boroughs have indicated that they went over budget last year, and expect to again this year.
- 3.5 There are also differences in the levels of services provided. Some authorities are very effective at removing graffiti from their own premises but policies on removing graffiti from private or commercial property vary. Some local authorities remove graffiti free of charge from private premises, and others do not. We were informed that these differences further complicate the analysis of what strategies work and how much is being spent.
- 3.6 Our ability to undertake a detailed comparison of the levels of expenditure was complicated by the fact that the boroughs do not have common standards or indicators. There was therefore difficulty in getting common data sets against which judgements could be made on the efficacy of graffiti removal and whether the methods of dealing with graffiti provide value for money. We have estimated that total local authority expenditure on graffiti removal is approximately £ 7 million per annum.

³⁵ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.2 Association of London Government

TABLE 1

London Borough Approximate Expenditure Per Annum £	
Barking and Dagenham	175,000
Bexley	126,000
Bromley	103,000
Camden	350,000
Corporation of London	1,500
Croydon	250,000
Ealing	150,000
Greenwich	144,000
Kensington & Chelsea	87,000
Lambeth	600,000
Lewisham	390,000
Merton	90,000
Newham	18,000
Richmond	150,000
Southwark	241,500
Sutton	155,000
Tower Hamlets	10,500
Wandsworth	625,000
Total	3,666,500
Average per Borough	203,694
Extrapolated for 33 Boroughs = £6,721,902	

Transport Organisations

- 3.7 We did not receive details on expenditure from all the London transport organisations. The costs shown in Table 2 do not include associated costs such as the provision of school liaison officers, the operation of CCTV, organising rectification work due to graffiti and loss of passenger confidence and comfort. As reported earlier, etching has become of increasing concern to transport organisations. Arriva reported that a fleet of 25 new buses had 85 etched windows after just one month of service.³⁶ Arriva are considering the cost and logistics of the use of a special film that prevents the glass from being scratched.³⁷

³⁶ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.46 Arriva

³⁷ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.48 Arriva

TABLE 2

Transport Companies Approximate Expenditure per Annum £	
Arriva	450,000
Go Ahead Group(buses only)	364,000
London Underground	2,500,000
London United Busways	615,000
Metroline	200,000
Stagecoach	750,000
Adshel	250,000
Transport for London	1,000,000
Total	6,129,000

- 3.8 Etching is also a growing problem on the underground. This protective film cannot be used on the underground for safety reasons. London Underground report that it will cost an additional £8-10 million to replace all the etched glass on the trains and hundreds of millions of pounds to remove trackside graffiti and replace etched interior panels on the trains.³⁸
- 3.9 The cost of preventing and removing graffiti is increasing. Transport for London report that the bill for removing graffiti last year increased by 40% compared to the previous year.³⁹ Adshel report that about 7% of their resources are lost to graffiti removal each year, reducing investment in other services.⁴⁰ Local authorities have reported increases in incidences of graffiti over the past few years resulting in increases in the expenditure on graffiti removal.

Other London Businesses

- 3.10 We were unable to identify what graffiti costs London businesses. These costs include insurance, cleaning, negative impact on property values, lost investment opportunities, security costs, use of preventative wall coatings, negative impact on custom etc. Members of the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry made the following comments:⁴¹

"We managed to recover the cost of cleaning the building area affected by graffiti from our insurer."

"To comply with the terms of our lease, our building has to be cleaned regularly to remove graffiti. We have had to buy wire brushes that connect to electric drills in order to be sure of complete removal. So there is a financial and personnel impact as well as a social one".

"The building had graffiti all over the arches and next to the brass plaque. The total cost for cleaning which includes applying anti graffiti lacquer was £2,500. Six months later it looks just as bad as it did before. I have just received another quote and this comes to £700."

³⁸ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.44 London Underground

³⁹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.36 Transport for London

⁴⁰ Memoranda Adshel

⁴¹ Memorandum London Chamber of Commerce and Industry

The evidence confirms that people feel that graffiti lowers the tone of an area making it less attractive to new business and causing some businesses to close.⁴²

London's Residents

- 3.11 In some areas property owners have to bear the cost of graffiti removal themselves. Repeat attacks of graffiti are serious problems for property owners because of the recurring cost of graffiti removal.⁴³ In these situations continuously removing graffiti is seen as a waste of money. Property owners therefore stop removing graffiti from their property and this has an impact on the overall effectiveness of the local authority anti-graffiti work. There are also indirect costs such as the impact on property values in areas where graffiti is prevalent, costs of local authority graffiti removal through the council tax and insurance premiums.
- 3.12 There are also costs that we have not been able to identify in the course of this investigation. This is due to the deficit of information about costs incurred by organisations. One result of this deficit is the inability to determine accurately whether the money spent could be targeted in ways that are more effective in ensuring a lasting reduction in the level of graffiti on our streets.

Cost of Graffiti to London

- 3.13 In this section we have identified expenditure of approximately £7 million per annum by London Boroughs and over £6 million a year by the Transport companies that responded to our request for information. This combined cost of £13 million rises to £23 million if the costs of replacing all the etched glass on the underground is taken into account. London Underground also stated that it could cost them hundreds of millions of pounds to remove trackside graffiti and etched train panels.
- 3.14 The figure of £23 million does not take other costs into consideration such as costs to businesses, utilities, rail companies, Railtrack, homeowners, voluntary organisations, the loss of investment opportunities and capital values, and the funding of various education and diversionary programmes. We were unable to identify accurately these additional costs in this report, but we estimate that the cost of graffiti to the London economy each year exceeds £100m.
- 3.15 The City of San Diego state that the American public spends nearly US\$12 billion per annum fighting graffiti.⁴⁴ If this cost were extrapolated to London, taking into account weighting for population and exchange rates, London could be spending anything up to £200m per annum. These costs are increasing each year and represent money lost to productive investment and services.

⁴² Memorandum London Borough of Ealing

⁴³ Memorandum Merton

⁴⁴ www.ci.san-diego.ca.us/

4. Quality of Life Issues

- 4.1 The costs of graffiti prevention and removal are only one of the ways graffiti affects Londoners. In this section we discuss the impact graffiti has on their quality of life.

The Impact of Graffiti on the Visual Environment

- 4.2 Graffiti appears everywhere: on public buildings, in parks, on shop shutters, street furniture, bridges, railway track sides, cable boxes, bus stops, play areas, subways and other open surfaces. It is not just an urban problem, but also occurs in rural areas. We received written submissions from over one hundred residents associations from all over London. They said that not only does graffiti degrade their environment, it attracts other forms of vandalism such as abandoned vehicles and litter; and incidents of graffiti are increasing.⁴⁵
- 4.3 Graffiti appears on monuments and listed buildings. In these circumstances graffiti removal becomes very complex, as the surfaces require products that will not erode or damage the monument.⁴⁶ English Heritage informed us that graffiti is a growing problem at most of their London sites and that the stonework and exposed timber are hard to clean. They report that constant graffiti and its removal accelerate the erosion and decay of monuments.⁴⁷ We are witnessing the damage of monuments and buildings that make London a place of cultural and historical interest.

The Fear of Crime⁴⁸

- 4.4 Many of the residents associations that we consulted complained that the presence of graffiti gives an indication that an area is unsafe. The Wimbledon Park Heritage group mounted a successful graffiti removal campaign in their area. This included removing graffiti from park buildings and seats. They report that before they started to tackle graffiti in the park very few elderly people used the park because the graffiti there made them feel unsafe. The group report that now the graffiti is swiftly removed the number of elderly people using the park has increased.⁴⁹

Recommendation 2

We are concerned to learn that the presence of graffiti in our parks has such a negative impact that members of the community feel unable to enjoy their local amenities. The London Assembly has conducted an investigation into the use of green spaces in London.⁵⁰ We welcome the initiative to establish the London Parks Forum, and request that they address the issue of removing graffiti from parks as part of their remit to increase the use of green spaces by Londoners.

⁴⁵ Memoranda Residents Association

⁴⁶ Memorandum Fitzroy Park Residents Association

⁴⁷ Memorandum English Heritage

⁴⁸ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.22

⁴⁹ Memorandum: Wimbledon Park Heritage Group and Wimbledon House Residents Association.

⁵⁰ London Assembly Scrutiny of Green Spaces in London.

- 4.5 The evidence also suggests that where graffiti is prevalent there are higher levels of other crime such as vandalism.⁵¹ We considered the broken window theory, which states that *“If a factory or office window is broken, the passer-by observing it will conclude that no one cares or no one is in charge. In time a few will begin throwing rocks to break more windows. Soon all the windows will be broken, and now the passer-by will think that, not only is no one in charge of the building, no one is in charge of the street on which it faces. Only the young, the criminal, or the foolhardy have any business on an unprotected avenue, and so more citizens will abandon the street to those they assume prowl it”*.⁵²
- 4.6 We believe that with the rising levels of crime in the capital this is an issue that we ignore to our cost. In Toronto the police found that residents felt much safer in their neighbourhoods when graffiti was removed swiftly. Crime indicators also showed a reduction in the level of crime which the Toronto police attribute to swift and persistent removal of graffiti.⁵³

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the Metropolitan Police conduct research to determine whether there are higher levels of crime in areas where graffiti is more prevalent compared to areas where graffiti is not a problem. Such research should also consider if the swift removal of graffiti has any effect on the level of crime in an area. The outcome of this research should then be used to determine the priority the police give to graffiti crimes.

Other Enviro Crimes

- 4.7 There are of course other enviro crimes that impact on the visual environment such as fly-posting, fly-tipping, abandoned vehicles and dog fouling. Many local authorities have comprehensive strategies to deal with this wide range of environmental issues.⁵⁴ There is a clear indication that people believe that the presence of graffiti in their neighbourhood encourages other enviro crime such as abandoned cars and litter. Although we cannot confirm whether the presence of graffiti causes further environmental problems or whether the environmental problems encourage graffiti they are all symptoms of deprivation and neglect which often coincide and must be dealt with in a comprehensive and holistic strategy. We are pleased that the London Boroughs and the Association of London Government see enviro crime as a priority and are developing innovative strategies, projects and partnerships to tackle these complex issues.⁵⁵
- 4.8 As part of the GLA’s strategic role, the London Assembly Environment Committee is planning a scrutiny on the impact of environmental crime in London. This scrutiny will start later this year and will consider the ways in which both public and private organisations can work together with local authorities to ensure all types of environmental crimes are dealt with effectively across London.

⁵¹ Interview with Mr Robert Wasserman

⁵² Fixing Broken Windows, Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Communities George Kelling and Catherine Coles

⁵³ Memorandum Toronto Police Service

⁵⁴ Memorandum London Borough of Lewisham

⁵⁵ London Borough of Lewisham Envirocrime Strategy, 8th London Local Authorities Bill

Design and the Urban Landscape.

- 4.9 The way in which certain urban areas are designed and the materials used for building within these areas, make it difficult to prevent and remove graffiti. Some local authorities are taking steps to address this issue. The London Borough of Barnet is encouraging shopkeepers to make their property less vulnerable to graffiti by encouraging them to fit lattice shutters and the Council's Neighbourhood Management Service is making graffiti prone environments less susceptible by encouraging better lighting.⁵⁶
- 4.10 The London Borough of Merton are considering ways of reducing the opportunity for graffiti on new developments.⁵⁷ The designs of new developments are evaluated at planning application stage to design crime out at source. In some circumstances they specify the use of planning conditions requiring the use of graffiti resistant surfaces, CCTV or other measures that will prevent and reduce the opportunity for crime. Other ways in which local authorities can deal with graffiti include demolishing and clearing derelict buildings and wasteland.

Recommendation 4

Where possible London Boroughs should consider using planning conditions which specify the use of building materials that are easy to clean and can be treated with anti-graffiti coatings.

- 4.11 *"The careful design of public spaces and active management and maintenance of the physical environment are key components for reducing graffiti, vandalism and other forms of anti-social behaviour. With good lighting, surfaces that are easy to clean and well defined spaces it is possible to design out 50% of the acts of street vandalism. Regular maintenance is also crucial. Graffiti writers tend to go into secluded areas which are not overseen, so it is important to create environments which encourage good pedestrian flow".*⁵⁸ Action must be taken to design out all crime including graffiti. This should also include incorporating anti-graffiti treatments at the planning stage of new developments.
- 4.12 In the initial proposals for the Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy, "Towards the London Plan", one of the proposed policy directions for the urban environment is "To promote enhanced accessibility and security in London's buildings and public spaces...and to ensure that new buildings and public spaces take account of good practice principles such as those for designing out crime."⁵⁹ We welcome this commitment to designing out crime in our urban spaces and look forward to detailed policy propositions in the draft spatial development strategy.

⁵⁶ Memorandum London Borough of Barnet

⁵⁷ Memorandum London Borough of Merton

⁵⁸ "Design and Management key to Preventing Graffiti," Urban Environment Today

⁵⁹ Towards the London Plan p53

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the London Plan require new developments in London to be designed in such a way that they are not susceptible to crimes such as graffiti and vandalism.

- 4.13 Planning obligations (or section 106 agreements) can be used to help facilitate local authority anti-graffiti work. These are usually contractual agreements reached between a local authority and a planning applicant. They may include a financial contribution covering, for example, community benefits.⁶⁰ Section 106 agreements have been used as a source of funding for anti-graffiti initiatives.⁶¹ The London Borough of Sutton used Section 106 money that had been provided to the Council for environmental improvements, to fund their anti-graffiti strategy. Their strategy included education programmes, joint work with the police, graffiti removal from both public and private property and community activities. The London Borough of Merton used Section 106 money to fund diversionary art projects.

⁶⁰ DETR Circular 01/97 Planning Obligations

⁶¹ Memoranda: London Borough of Merton, London Borough of Sutton

5. Legislation and Law Enforcement

- 5.1 As part of the investigation, we considered the existing legislative provisions that govern the issue of graffiti. We did this in order to determine whether there is a need for further legislation to assist statutory agencies in their attempts to prevent and remove graffiti. Where graffiti is carried out illegally the offence is criminal damage.

The Courts

- 5.2 Magistrates can impose fines of up to £5,000 and sentences for up to 6 months (12 months in some circumstances) for the offence of criminal damage. Where the offence is serious, on conviction magistrates can refer the matter to the Crown Court where higher sentencing limits apply.
- 5.3 There is a generally held opinion that the courts and law enforcement agencies do not regard graffiti as a serious offence and those apprehended are not given sentences that act as a deterrent to others. The London Borough of Ealing felt that magistrates needed to be fully informed about the graffiti sub-culture, as this would assist them in developing more consistency in sentencing with stiffer penalties.⁶² The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea advised us that the powers to prosecute need to be strengthened and the notion that graffiti is a punishable crime needs to be reinforced.⁶³
- 5.4 Arriva stated that they have experienced problems getting the Crown Prosecution Service to instigate court proceedings. They have taken out private prosecutions, but the costs of doing so are prohibitive.⁶⁴ Go-Ahead transport company informed us that the courts are out of touch with the extent of the problems faced by companies and that compensation orders are far below the real costs to the company.⁶⁵
- 5.5 We asked a representative from the Magistrates Association if the fines handed out to graffiti writers were proportionate, bearing in mind the cost of graffiti removal. We were told that there are rules which state that in imposing penalties, courts have to consider the ability of the offender to pay. We heard that a new system is being introduced for Magistrates and youth offending teams which will allow for action plan orders to be used for first time offenders. These action plan orders will include activities designed to deal with the offence such as reparative work and participation in group sessions. These orders will rely upon very close liaison between prosecuting authorities, the probation service, the police and the courts. Local authorities and transport organisations wish to see the courts working in partnership with them, making similar commitments and taking the issue of graffiti seriously.

⁶² Memorandum London Borough of Ealing

⁶³ Memorandum The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

⁶⁴ Memorandum Arriva

⁶⁵ Memorandum Go-Ahead

Declaring Graffiti a Prevalent Offence

- 5.6 One method of encouraging closer working between local authorities and law enforcement agencies has been to declare graffiti a locally prevalent offence. This means that the Crown Prosecution Service and magistrates acknowledge that graffiti is a serious local problem. In Bexley, the local police and the Council, recognising an increase in graffiti across the Borough, decided that graffiti should be made a locally prevalent offence. The Police and the Council gave a presentation to the Crown Prosecution Service and youth courts explaining how serious an issue graffiti had become for the residents of the Borough.⁶⁶ The different agencies then came to an agreement that graffiti offences would be dealt with seriously.
- 5.7 In April 2001 graffiti was deemed a locally prevalent offence in Bexley. Prior to this a person apprehended for criminal damage (illegal graffiti) would only have received a caution for a first offence. Now a first offence results in a referral to the Youth Offending Team and a subsequent offence results in a referral to the courts. Declaring an offence locally prevalent does not require any pre-set crime indicators, stipulations, or any statutorily defined format. It only requires the written agreement of the head of the local Crown Prosecution Service and the Chief Superintendent of the local police. Since the start of the scheme in Bexley there have been 117 arrests for graffiti. The Council believes it now receives greater support from the courts on graffiti cases than they might otherwise have expected.⁶⁷

Recommendation 6

Declaring graffiti a prevalent offence is one way that local law enforcement agencies can develop an understanding of the impact of graffiti on the local community thereby enabling them to give sentences that reflect the seriousness of the offence. We recommend that this method be adopted by all local authorities where graffiti is a serious problem.

Restricting Access to Graffiti Materials

- 5.8 Under the London Local Authorities Act 1995 London local authorities can order property owners to remove graffiti from their property, but if the property owner fails to do so and the local authority chooses to remove the graffiti they cannot recoup the costs. The local authority can only recover the costs where the owner or occupier have requested that the local authority remove the graffiti. In order to overcome this problem the Association of London Government (ALG) is promoting the 8th London Local Authorities Bill on behalf of all the London Boroughs.
- 5.9 This bill includes measures to deal with a range of enviro crimes including litter, abandoned cars, fly-posting and dumping rubbish. In relation to graffiti the bill proposes restrictions on the sale of spray paints and marker pens to minors, requirements on retailers to restrict physical access to such materials and provides councils with powers to remove graffiti and to recharge property owners. We commend the Association for London Government and the individual London boroughs for their work in developing and promoting this bill.

⁶⁶ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.16

⁶⁷ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.10, 4.16

5.10 We received evidence from a residents organisation which is calling for a complete ban on the production, sale and import of aerosol paints. This independent non-political group states that such a ban is the only way to prevent graffiti and totally eradicate it from our streets.⁶⁸ We believe that alternative means of providing spray paints would have to be considered before such a ban could be implemented.

5.11 Earlier in this report we explored the nature of the graffiti subculture, particularly the fact that some graffiti writers work in crews and have a form of apprenticeship in which younger graffiti writers learn from older graffiti writers. At the hearing it was generally thought that the proposed restrictions were a good idea, but it was recognised that this could result in young people acquiring graffiti materials by other means such as the internet.⁶⁹ We are also concerned that older graffiti writers could quite easily purchase graffiti materials on behalf of younger writers. We believe that the provisions of the bill should be extended to further reduce the opportunity for such materials to come into the possession of minors.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the 8th London Local Authorities Bill be amended to include the following:

- That it be an offence for anyone to supply graffiti materials to minors, unless they are an appropriate adult. We define appropriate adults as being parents, guardians, teachers (or those acting in a similar capacity such as youth leaders) or employers.
- That those convicted of offences relating to graffiti be made to clear up graffiti where possible as part of any community service order.

5.12 We recognise that young people may have legitimate reasons for needing spray paints and we believe the concept of such materials having to be supplied by an appropriate adult should cover these occasions.

5.13 We are concerned that this legislation will be undermined by people purchasing graffiti materials outside London. The only way to prevent this is to enact national legislation preventing the sale of graffiti materials to minors throughout the UK. The cost of removing graffiti and its impact on the environment is not just an issue of concern for London alone. Any legislation should be applicable nationally. We therefore recommend that the government bring forward further legislation to tackle graffiti.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the Government introduce legislation extending the provisions of the 8th London Local Authorities Bill to the rest of the UK, thereby restricting the sale of graffiti materials to minors across the country.

⁶⁸ Memorandum Residents Against Graffiti

⁶⁹ Minutes of Evidence 14th January 4.63

Acceptable Behaviour Contracts

- 5.14 The Islington Crime Reduction Partnership developed the Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) as a way of tackling anti-social behaviour caused by young people.⁷⁰ Islington Council Housing Department and the Islington Borough Police first introduced the contracts in November 1999 as a pilot scheme to tackle problem behaviour on estates and on the street. This included threatening behaviour, harassment, racist behaviour, graffiti, criminal damage and other sub-criminal behaviour.
- 5.15 In February 2000 the scheme was implemented borough wide with approximately one hundred contracts signed. To date there have only been two serious breaches of contract. The Council has also found that where the ABC is tied to tenancy conditions and a breach of the ABC considered to be a breach of Council tenancy, both the parents and young people involved consider the issue far more seriously than they would have done had the matter been dealt with by the police alone. Young people adhere to the terms of the ABC because they contribute to the design of the content.

Recommendation 9

Local authorities must develop the use of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC) within their communities as a way of tackling graffiti.

Use of Reparations

- 5.16 Local authorities consider reparative activities such as participation in graffiti removal to be an effective method of dealing with illegal graffiti. In the London Borough of Barnet reparative activity is carried out in the Borough's parks under the supervision of the Neighbourhood Management Service.⁷¹ The London Borough of Ealing informed us that making graffiti writers clean off graffiti makes them aware of the consequences of their actions.⁷²
- 5.17 At the hearing the Probation Service informed us that graffiti removal is used as part of community service, but that the offenders who remove graffiti were not necessarily the perpetrators.⁷³ We were also advised that for health and safety reasons only offenders aged eighteen and over are involved in graffiti removal. There are concerns that removing graffiti sometimes involves the use of power wash jets and various chemicals which cannot be used without training. Although the chemicals used in graffiti removal are not hazardous there are safety considerations and these chemicals need to be handled correctly. We have been informed about organic graffiti removal products that are as effective as chemical products. These organic products could be used for reparative activities that involve graffiti removal.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Memorandum London Borough of Islington

⁷¹ Memorandum London Borough of Barnet

⁷² Memorandum London Borough of Ealing

⁷³ Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 National Probation Service 4.61

⁷⁴ Annex E Summary of Written Evidence - Businesses

- 5.18 In Bradford a cream cleanser was provided for four graffiti writers to clean off the graffiti they had sprayed on ceramic wall tiles. It took them more than four hours to clean what would have been a thirty minute job for the graffiti removal teams, but the aim of this exercise was to make them understand the consequences of their actions and prevent them from carrying out further graffiti.⁷⁵ In Lewisham children caught on a first offence are brought in with their parents and are told the cost of the graffiti removal. They are then given the option of removing the graffiti or paying for the damage. The Council has found that there has been no re-offending where this method has been used.⁷⁶
- 5.19 We would like to see the use of reparative activity extended to include those under eighteen. Although there are health and safety issues with regard to the use of chemicals, there is nothing preventing the use of plain household detergents. It is not the efficacy of the graffiti removal that is the issue. The aim of the activity is to ensure that young people understand the consequences of their actions and the effect their actions have on other members of their community.

Recommendation 10

The Probation Service and Youth Offending Teams should extend the use of reparative activities such as graffiti removal, for those who are convicted of illegal graffiti writing. This should also be done in partnership with transport organisations so that young offenders carry out reparative activity on buses.

Use of CCTV

- 5.20 CCTV is increasingly being used by transport organisations to prevent graffiti and other crimes on buses. Arriva have installed CCTV on some buses and use CCTV footage to produce wanted posters. These posters are displayed on buses and a £500 reward is available for successful identification. Names are usually received within 48 hours. Posters are then displayed with an arrested sign to let the public know that the person has been caught and to send the message that action has been taken.⁷⁷
- 5.21 Transport for London is also a large user of CCTV, first because it is a good deterrent and secondly because it provides a good chance of catching offenders. They hope that all buses will have CCTV within two or three years.⁷⁸ We note that in a day time television news broadcast the Mayor commenting on the issue of the safety of bus drivers promised that all London buses will be fitted with CCTV.⁷⁹ We believe this will assist the transport organisations in dealing with this expensive and destructive problem.

⁷⁵ Memorandum Bradford Metropolitan District Council

⁷⁶ Memoranda: London Boroughs of Lewisham

⁷⁷ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.47

⁷⁸ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.51 Transport for London

⁷⁹ 30th January 2002

Recommendation 11

We recommend CCTV should be installed on all London buses. We look forward to the Mayor of London fulfilling his promise to do so.

Private Prosecutions

- 5.22 Arriva have taken out successful private prosecutions against perpetrators of graffiti. Once an individual is caught, the first thing Arriva do is to speak to their parents and present them with a bill for the damage. Compensation is sought from the families of children caught spreading graffiti. These are made via agreements outside of the court system. This produces a swift remedy for Arriva and the children involved avoid getting a criminal record. If matters cannot be resolved in this way then Arriva will bring a private prosecution. The Committee heard that so far Arriva had brought three private prosecutions and had won all three cases.
- 5.23 Other transport organisations have undertaken private prosecutions but are concerned about the cost of this approach. They feel that a designated officer within Transport for London should have the responsibility of prosecuting cases on behalf of the transport organisations in order to develop joint action.

Recommendation 12

Transport for London should ensure that a consistent approach is taken to dealing with graffiti and etching amongst transport operators. This should include the sharing of best practice amongst the different transport operators and the undertaking of joint prosecutions of offenders where possible.

6. Local Authorities and Partnership Working

Local Government Act 2000

- 6.1 This act came into force in October 2000. It provides local authorities with new powers to promote or improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of their area. Local authorities are now also required to prepare community strategies with local strategic partnerships and to involve fully local people in this process. The Government believes this will allow local authorities, other local public and private bodies, voluntary and community groups, as well as local people to come together to identify the objectives for their area and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in the UK.⁸⁰
- 6.2 Although many local authorities already work in this way, this now places them under a statutory obligation to do so. In order to be effective any approach to dealing with graffiti must be developed in consultation with the community and form part of a wider community strategy, so that the issue of graffiti is dealt with as part of broader community concerns. This will enable local people to play a greater part in shaping their local communities and determining local authority service priorities.

Recommendation 13

In meeting their legislative requirement to develop a community strategy, local authorities should develop seamless anti-graffiti programmes in partnership with both public and private sector organisations and the local community.

Development of Common Standards - Capital Standards Programme

- 6.3 Where graffiti removal in one area is swift, graffiti writers move on to new locations since rapid graffiti removal prevents them getting adequate exposure of their work. Holmesdale Residents Association informed us that whilst incidents of graffiti have reduced in their area due to swift removal by residents working in concert with their local council, graffiti has increased in surrounding areas.⁸¹
- 6.4 There are wide variations in practice across the London Boroughs. Common standards need to be developed to ensure that all boroughs give graffiti removal sufficient priority and that expenditure is made on those strategies that are most effective in terms of reducing the level of graffiti on the streets. The implementation of such standards will facilitate benchmarking, and the sharing of intelligence and information. If this is not done across London, some boroughs will become graffiti magnets because of their slow response to graffiti removal, whilst others who maintain swift standards of graffiti removal will find that their boroughs will remain relatively graffiti free.

⁸⁰ Local Government Act 2000 & Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, Local Government Act Factsheets

⁸¹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.123 Holmesdale Residents Association

- 6.5 Whilst we appreciate that individual boroughs will tailor their practice to the local needs of their community, we believe that there is a need for some basic uniformity of practice. This could be achieved through the Capital Standards programme. This programme, led by the Mayor, seeks to develop common standards for street cleanliness across London. The programme is a unique vehicle that should be used to achieve consistent practices and data collection on expenditure on graffiti removal across all the London Boroughs. This programme should aim to ascertain what strategies offer value for money and are sustainable. It should also be used to develop specific targets to ensure the rapid removal of graffiti within specified time periods across the whole of London. This would therefore prevent displacement of graffiti by location. Other world cities have targets for graffiti removal that are applied uniformly across the city thereby ensuring that levels of graffiti are reduced.⁸² London should seek to adopt the highest of such standards as practised by other world cities.
- 6.6 The importance of regular cleaning and maintenance as a way of controlling the level of graffiti in our streets cannot be over emphasised. Swift removal of graffiti and regular routine maintenance, although expensive is necessary to keep an area clear of graffiti.

Recommendation 14

We recommend that the Mayor in agreement with the local authorities use the Capital Standards programme to develop a common set of standards by which local authorities can measure the efficacy of their graffiti removal and anti-graffiti strategies. The Capital Standards programme should also be used to agree the minimum standards of graffiti removal which will be applied across London. The programme should also be used to benchmark standards with other world cities thereby ensuring best practice in graffiti removal and prevention. London should seek to adopt the highest of such standards as practised by other world cities.

Voluntary Codes for Vendors

- 6.7 Several local authorities have or are in the process of developing voluntary codes for vendors.⁸³ These schemes consist of persuading shops that sell articles that could be used for graffiti, such as spray paints and marker pens, to sign up voluntarily to a code of practice. The shops agree not to sell these materials to anyone who is or appears to be under 16 unless they are accompanied by an adult. Shops taking part in the scheme have some form of identification such as stickers or posters in their windows and in their shops. Often the local authority trading standards department tests how effective the code is.
- 6.8 We asked the police if in their opinion such restrictions had have an effect on the levels of graffiti in London. They told us that there are examples of voluntary initiatives that appear to work well, but that such initiatives will only be effective if they are part of a range of measures designed to prevent graffiti.

⁸² Memoranda: San Diego, Seattle Public Authority

⁸³ Memoranda: London Boroughs of Barnet, Croydon and, Greenwich.

Recommendation 15

We recognise that the part of the purpose of the 8th London Local Authorities Bill is to prevent the sale of graffiti materials to minors. In this interim period as the legislation is being considered by Parliament, we recommend that all London local authorities develop voluntary codes of practice to restrict the sales of graffiti materials in their areas.

The Role of Utility Companies and Other Service Providers

- 6.9 The presence of graffiti on properties which are not under local authority control presents problems.⁸⁴ We were informed that some statutory undertakers did not co-operate with requests for graffiti removal from local authorities and that this was a source of frustration for the local authorities. It is apparent that the different priorities of the organisations involved affect the ability of the local authority to deal successfully with the graffiti within a borough. In particular, attention was drawn to the graffiti on and around railway stations and tracks and how this gives visitors the impression that an area is covered in graffiti, when in fact this may not be the case. There is a need for a common approach towards graffiti from all service providers.
- 6.10 The London Borough of Richmond has advised Railtrack that they will take legal action to ensure that railway property, where it directly affects the street scene, is cleared of graffiti promptly.⁸⁵ However, the Council always endeavours first to attempt to persuade the organisation either to undertake the work voluntarily or to pay the Council's contractors to do it. In Merton, the utility companies and the transport operators are being approached regarding partnership working to achieve cost effective and timely removal of graffiti from their equipment and property in conjunction with Council led initiatives.⁸⁶ Barking and Dagenham have organised utility liaison meetings in order to reach some form of agreement which will enable this problem to be overcome.⁸⁷
- 6.11 One way of resolving this issue would be for Local Authorities to consider acting as clearing houses for the reporting of graffiti. They would collate incidences of graffiti and pass them on to the relevant organisation to arrange for removal. Another way would be for the utility companies to enter into service level agreements with such organisations that already have established graffiti removal services such as Adshel. The proposals in the 8th London Local Authorities Bill will enable local authorities to remove graffiti not tackled by utility companies and to recharge the cost to the company concerned,⁸⁸ but in the interim local authorities must establish ways of working with such companies. Residents have stated that utility companies should have regular maintenance schedules for removing graffiti which enable them to respond swiftly to requests for graffiti removal.

⁸⁴ Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 Graffiti Committee 4.7

⁸⁵ Memorandum London Borough of Richmond

⁸⁶ Memorandum London Borough of Merton

⁸⁷ Memorandum London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

⁸⁸ 8th London Local Authorities Bill

Recommendation 16

Owners of street property such as Consignia, Cable companies, BT, Railtrack and other utility companies must become more accountable to local communities and work more closely with local authorities to ensure that the graffiti on their properties is removed swiftly. This must include publishing details of how to report graffiti, and developing and publicising standards for graffiti removal.

Partnership Approaches**Barnet Police and Barnet Council**

- 6.12 Barnet Council and the local police believe that it is only through close inter-agency working that methods to deal with graffiti can be found. They have developed a framework through a dual-agency borough wide Anti-Graffiti Group. Joint action has focused on the rapid removal of graffiti, initiatives to limit the sale of graffiti materials and the adoption of pioneering policing methods.
- 6.13 An intelligence database was developed and using this information the Police photograph tags, identify the owners of the tags and issue search warrants under the Criminal Damage Act. The Police have a 100% record of finding evidence of exact tag matches in the homes searched. In addition to this intelligence led approach, the Police also run joint surveillance operations with the Council. Barnet Police informed us that this approach has been successful.⁸⁹ During the first six months 20 arrests were made, half of which have come before the courts and all of these have been guilty pleas.
- 6.14 There is a need for closer working between the police and local authorities across London. Such partnerships should also be extended to include local transport operators, the Crown Prosecution Service and Magistrates. Partnership working will enable organisations to develop an understanding of the impact graffiti has on local communities and ensure that the work undertaken by one organisation is not counteracted by another (e.g. transport organisations prosecuting offenders only for them to be given lenient sentences).

⁸⁹ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.93

Toronto Police – The 5/5/5 Programme⁹⁰

- 6.15 Partnership working with the police, the community and both public and private sector organisations is also used in other world cities. The Graffiti Eradication Programme was developed by the Toronto Police in 2000. It consists of an operational equation known as 5/5/5.
- 6.16 The first five involves programme activities made up of five components (focussing on methods and procedures).
- Eradication - through the physical removal of graffiti, using victimised property owners, volunteers, students, and prisoner work programmes.
 - Education - anti-vandalism programmes through schools, community centres and places of religious worship.
 - Empowerment - by working with business improvement associations, ratepayer groups, community police liaison committees and local politicians.
 - Enforcement - through arrest and prosecution, surveillance, informant information, Crime Stoppers and municipal by-law enforcement aimed at forcing property owners to maintain their property to civic standards.
 - Economic development- through urban beautification programs, graffiti transformation initiatives, youth murals, businesses and tourism.
- 6.17 The second five involves partnership work. Programme partners and stakeholders are made up of the police, community, media, city agencies, and politicians. The third five involves the action to be taken to influence the activity and the partners. This involves motivation, communication, Speed/Simplicity, Triggering and Recording Action.
- 6.18 Since the inception of the programme 17,212 square feet of heavy graffiti has been cleaned. Thousands of information letters were sent and community meetings and information sessions were held. Undercover operations led to sub-culture intelligence gathering. A national paint manufacturer offers discounted and free paint to communities for use in clean ups. The programme has also led to a 2% reduction in crime. The Police conducted a safety perception survey and 95% of the survey participants felt safer and believed that the programme made their respective neighbourhoods cleaner. The Police also formed a partnership with the Toronto Graffiti Transformation Project. The Transformation Project is also able to provide job opportunities for young people. The Toronto Police recommend community involvement and partnership working. A similar model of partnership work has been developed in Helsinki.⁹¹
- 6.19 The City of Copenhagen has developed a special subscription arrangement whereby home owners, shopkeepers and other organisations can have graffiti removed within 24 hours for a low and moderate payment.⁹² We would like to see the development of schemes that provide swift graffiti removal services for an annual fee. When graffiti is to be removed from private properties, the property owners complete indemnity forms so that the local authority will not become liable for any damage. The removal schemes developed could include the use of annual

⁹⁰ Memorandum Toronto Police www.TorontoPolice.on.ca

⁹¹ Memorandum Helsinki "Stop Scrawls on Walls Project"

⁹² Memorandum City of Copenhagen

indemnity agreements which would then reduce administration. This type of graffiti removal service would act as a form of insurance against repeat attacks and enable the control of graffiti in areas where incidents are high.

Recommendation 17

In order to facilitate the removal of graffiti from privately owned business premises, local authorities should develop low cost schemes with economies of scale that will remove all graffiti from such properties for an annual fee.

6.20 Partnership working is the best approach that can be taken to deal with graffiti, especially in view of the fact that graffiti writers do not acknowledge boundaries between private and public property or between boroughs . Public and private sector organisations, as well as the community all need to come together to tackle graffiti in order to achieve lasting results.

7. Community Involvement and Self-Help

We encountered sterling examples of successful graffiti removal work undertaken by members of the community.

Lewisham Resident Graffiti Busters

- 7.1 The London Borough of Lewisham employs a variety of methods to deal with graffiti including the involvement of members of their community in graffiti removal.⁹³ This community initiative is known as the "Resident Graffiti Busters". These groups of residents receive training in the use of environmentally friendly graffiti removal products. The Council has 30 such teams, who conduct their own graffiti clean-ups. The Council believes it is important to encourage people to undertake a self-help approach. Once a resident group has been trained, the Council kick-starts the work of the local team by organising a complete clean up of the area. Once trained, residents pass their skills to other neighbours and supervise their own clean-ups. Lewisham Council is looking at spreading this scheme throughout the Borough to create a sustainable rolling programme of graffiti removal.

Camden Square Neighbourhood Association - Clean and Dine⁹⁴

- 7.2 About twice a year the Camden Square Neighbourhood Association organises graffiti clean-up days. A survey of the whole area is undertaken. Work tasks are allocated according to the material and equipment needed. On a well publicised day, up to twenty members turn out to help with tasks of chemical cleaning or over-painting, as appropriate. This effort is synchronised with Camden Council's Grimebusting Team who join the Association to clean brick walls with their high-pressure hoses.
- 7.3 With the help of members and the co-operation of the Council the area can be rid of all graffiti in one morning. The residents have been very encouraged by the results over the past two years. Apart from a few persistent black spots, very little graffiti returns. Residents now feel that it is worthwhile to clean their own properties between times. The Association has currently spent £350 from their funds on paint and cleaning equipment which is made available for any member to make use of at any time. The Association also provides the Council with a list of sites that the residents cannot clean themselves. The Council co-ordinates their own work with the Association's graffiti days and visits occasionally between the clean-up days. The clean-up day is concluded with the residents sharing lunch.⁹⁵ Members of the Association believe that this method of regular cleaning discourages repeat attacks of graffiti.

⁹³ Memorandum London Borough of Lewisham

⁹⁴ Memorandum Camden Square Neighbourhood Association

⁹⁵ Daily Telegraph Saturday 9th February 2002

Holmesdale Residents Association – Adopt a Wall⁹⁶

- 7.4 Holmesdale Residents Association have tackled graffiti in their area by getting different residents to adopt specific parts of their neighbourhood and take responsibility for keeping that particular area free from graffiti. They have called it the “adopt a wall” approach. They estimate that 90% of graffiti has now been driven out of the local area. When the graffiti was not being removed, it was leading to further vandalism such as windows being broken in public buildings, fly-tipping, abandoned cars and other anti-social activity.
- 7.5 In addition to the adopt-a-wall approach the association organises general graffiti clean-ups. When there is a general community initiative to clean, residents are divided up into teams with different responsibilities. For example, some are responsible for cleaning masonry, some for using gloss paint to cover graffiti on painted surfaces, and others for using graffiti removers on stubborn graffiti. One of the keys to success in the work was making people believe that it would be possible to prevent graffiti. The scheme also has the support of the local authority and the local community police officer.
- 7.6 As a result of this initiative a very strong sense of community has been created, and members include people from all walks of life and different backgrounds. Residents are now purchasing their own materials to remove graffiti although, initially, much of the resources were provided by the local authority. Members of the Association feel that encouraging youngsters to take a pride in their community is also very important. Dealing with the graffiti in their area has been a means of empowering the local community. Residents understand that their home does not end at their gate.
- 7.7 Our responses from Residents Associations from all over London demonstrate that there are members of our community who are willing to take an active role in protecting and preserving their local environment. Other ways of enabling community involvement include the provision of free technical advice, provision of information packs and free advice, free phone hotlines for reporting graffiti, and the provision of graffiti removal products at trade prices.

Recommendation 18

Local authorities should consider ways in which they can facilitate and enable local community involvement and self-help. This may include the provision of free technical advice, graffiti removal kits at trade prices etc.

Parental Control

- 7.8 There is a serious issue of parental control and a reluctance on the part of some parents to acknowledge the fact of their child’s involvement in graffiti. Residents highlighted the lack of citizenship and decline in community values, which has led to vandalism and anti-social behaviour.

⁹⁶ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.123 Holmesdale Residents Association

- 7.9 Some organisations have sought to raise parental awareness of graffiti and its impact through publicity campaigns.⁹⁷ The London Borough of Bexley produced a leaflet that reminded both parents and children that graffiti is a serious offence. The leaflet also detailed the way in which acts of illegal graffiti would be dealt with by the authorities.⁹⁸ This leaflet was also sent to schools in other boroughs bordering Bexley. The bus company Arriva show parents pictures of the damage their child has done. This is to make parents aware of the cost and the full impact of their child's actions. This also provides the parent with an opportunity to make arrangements for the payment of the damage thereby avoiding the need for criminal action to be taken against their child.
- 7.10 Residents state that they would like to see young people involved in their local communities. They believe this would then encourage young people to take pride in their areas. In Bexley "public spirited " young people remove low-level graffiti from their neighbourhoods. The residents associations recommend that where possible young people should be involved in local graffiti clean ups and that associations should seek to develop sub-committees through which young people will have a means of expressing their concerns about their areas.

⁹⁷ Memorandum London Borough of Bexley

⁹⁸ Memorandum London Borough of Bexley

8. Young People and Graffiti

- 8.1 Many young people today have grown up with hip-hop culture and graffiti. We wanted to know what their perceptions are about graffiti and their environment. We were interested in the issue of whether their perceptions would differ greatly from older members of the community.

Young People Speak About Graffiti⁹⁹

- 8.2 The Imagine London project is a five-year programme set up and run by the Kings Fund. It gives a voice to young people's hopes, concerns and aspirations as to how their city can be made a healthier place to live. The programme examines the views of young people on their health and quality of life. The programme is divided into five modules: transport, the environment, crime and safety, healthy living and emotional well being. Each module consists of an event set up by steering groups of young people and other work with schools and youth groups. Over the course of the programme graffiti has emerged as an important issue for young people. The views expressed show that young people have a range of attitudes towards graffiti.¹⁰⁰

- 8.3 *"The only thing that spoils my area is the graffiti and rubbish dumped out on the streets. If I could change my area I would make more places for young people to hang out on school holidays and weekends because by doing this a lot of young people won't be bored, therefore turning to vandalism."*

"The bad thing about my area is that there is so much vandalism, graffiti and litter around."

"I think my area is getting better. I like the new centre and the new house. Most of the graffiti has been removed and therefore the area looks nice. I would like to see cleaner streets and more lights in the night for protection."

"Round here you can get served cigarettes and spray cans and you can be any age to get served spray cans...if you go to the shop down the road. At the car shop they sell it to you."

"For people to stop doing crime and stuff we need more accessories like adventures and stuff round the area.. more clubs for children...cause people get bored with nothing to do...and start smashing up the windows and stuff."

"It's marking territory isn't it? It's like saying...'I have been here'..."

"Cause there is nothing else for children to do"

"It's a bit artistic really...it's everywhere around here. You've got it on the shop-shutters, you've got it on people's garages. You've got it down alleyways. It's everywhere".

⁹⁹ Memorandum Imagine London www.imaginelondon.org.uk

¹⁰⁰ Memorandum Imagine London

- 8.4 Imagine London state that many young people feel that graffiti on transport and in public spaces damages the quality of the local environment, but they also feel that providing more facilities for them and setting aside dedicated space where they are allowed to do graffiti could prevent offending. Young people feel that used in the right way and with the right facilities, graffiti can be a legitimate and attractive form of self-expression. We discuss this further below.
- 8.5 We commend the use of such programmes as a way of seeking the opinions of young people. We believe that provide an opportunity for organisations to enter into dialogue with young people as well as providing them with a forum in which to express their concerns and consider the opinions of others.

Diversionsary Work

- 8.6 We have seen and heard of various successful diversionary projects. Some graffiti clearly involves a high degree of artistic ability. This talent should be encouraged within general youth work and community art projects which ensure clarity among participants as to what is and what is not appropriate behaviour. The ALG informed us that it is important to have sophisticated systems to provide diversionary activities for young people which will enable them to grow, mature and to have the sort of challenges which stretch them physically and mentally, which they may not otherwise receive.
- 8.7 In Lambeth diversionary initiatives have included various types of art programmes. In some instances the skills that are developed can lead to paid commissions and can also draw socially excluded individuals into a setting to develop basic business skills and improve social skills.¹⁰¹ We were told about the need to ensure that such art programmes are sustainable and linked to some form of external accreditation such as the NVQ.¹⁰² Although expensive, such projects paid off in the long term as they provided young people with long term skills and options. We were told that although there appears to have been an increase in funding for arts, the funding is project-based and the projects are not sustained and come to an end as soon as the funding runs out. Young people are then left aware of what they can learn, but with no one to teach them the channel of communication is lost.
- 8.8 Our visit to Groundwork Merton demonstrated how art projects encourage dialogue with young people, some of whom may be disaffected.¹⁰³ This project which used graffiti art received a positive response both from the young people involved and the local community.

¹⁰¹ Memoranda London Borough of Lambeth

¹⁰² Memoranda and Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 Sonia Blair

¹⁰³ Visit to Groundwork Merton Annex C

Legal Graffiti Walls

- 8.9 The issue of legal graffiti walls arose frequently during the course of our investigation. One opinion is that the main problem in London was the lack of sites for legal graffiti which prevents young people from practising graffiti legally. The written evidence shows that some local authorities had used graffiti walls in parks and this had reduced graffiti on parks, building and fences where installed.¹⁰⁴ Bradford are considering this issue. In their evidence they stated “...We know that the introduction of a number of legal poster boards around the city centre has virtually eliminated indiscriminate fly-posting. There seems to be little to suppose that a graffiti zone would not be equally successful”.¹⁰⁵
- 8.10 This view is not shared by all. There is the argument that legal graffiti walls legitimise graffiti and act as a practising ground for graffiti writers who then commit illegal graffiti in other areas.¹⁰⁶ Assistant Chief Constable Nicholas of the British Transport Police stated that in his experience such sites were useful for graffiti writers, who had a pride in their work and just wanted to be allowed to put it somewhere where it could be seen. However, he considered that the most kudos was not gained from doing graffiti on legal sites but in the most dangerous places.¹⁰⁷
- 8.11 We asked if graffiti spread out from legal sites. We were not given conclusive answers on this. We were told that the reason graffiti walls often fail to contain graffiti is that many local initiatives are often not sustained and the young people are left with no options to fill their time once the projects are completed.¹⁰⁸
- 8.12 Legal walls may provide an opportunity for those who wish to paint legally, but will not prevent “hardcore” graffiti writers from doing illegal graffiti. For these people graffiti provides a thrill and an adrenaline rush that is comparable to extreme sports such as base jumping and the element of illegality is necessary. We acknowledge that there have been successful projects that have used graffiti walls, but such projects must also provide young people with an awareness of their environment and teach them how to develop and practice their creative talents in a non-destructive way. It is vital that any graffiti wall initiatives receive long-term management and support otherwise they may just teach graffiti writing rather than channel creative talent away from illegal writing.

Recommendation 19

In developing strategies to deal with graffiti, we recommend that local authorities consider whether the use of legal graffiti walls in a contained and sustainable environment may be used as part of a range of general youth activities or as part of diversionary work. It is vital that any graffiti wall initiatives receive long-term management and support otherwise they may just teach graffiti writing rather than channel creative talent away from illegal writing.

¹⁰⁴ Memorandum London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

¹⁰⁵ Memorandum Bradford Metropolitan District Council

¹⁰⁶ Memoranda: Go Ahead Group, British Transport Police

¹⁰⁷ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.106

¹⁰⁸ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.79 Sonia Blair

The Role of Education in Preventing Graffiti

- 8.13 Many organisations already use education as part of a wide range of strategies to deal with graffiti. In some boroughs the police as part of the community safety team have discussions with local secondary schools and as a result there has been a slight reduction of graffiti in the vicinity of these schools. The London Borough of Wandsworth is hoping that their approach of graffiti removal, together with education and enforcement will reduce graffiti in the Borough.¹⁰⁹
- 8.14 Pimlico Village Housing Co-operative used a youth programme as a means of educating their young people about why graffiti is not acceptable in the estate. They feel that together with swift removal, this has kept the level of graffiti on the estate to a minimum.¹¹⁰ We have also been advised that Transport for London and other transport organisations run various projects in schools which explain to young people how to use buses and the impact of damaging buses through vandalism and graffiti.¹¹¹ Arriva employ a Schools Liaison Officer (SLO) whose primary role is education. The SLO talks to children about the effects of graffiti and vandalism and works with Junior Citizen programmes and local Youth Offending Teams. The SLO also assists Transport for London and the Police with street operations. The magistrates courts have an educational programme to inform local children about their role. Magistrates give the message that graffiti is not a harmless activity and has serious consequences for society.¹¹²

Lack of Youth Facilities

- 8.15 Although those who write graffiti are not always from disadvantaged backgrounds, many young people see graffiti as offering a structure and a culture in which to be somebody, in a society where quite often they do not have a voice.¹¹³ In considering graffiti we must take account of other social issues. One of these is the lack of facilities for young people. It was recognised across the evidence and by the various organisations and communities consulted that there is a need for youth facilities that provide challenging opportunities for young people to develop. Research confirms that there is a lack of youth provision, particularly in the age ranges of 10-14.¹¹⁴ The National Youth Agency informed us that local authorities are not under any statutory obligation to produce local youth strategies, although some have done so of their own volition and that for those local authorities that wish to produce local youth strategies there is no agreed national guidance. Our visit to Groundwork Merton highlighted the lack of youth provision, the falling levels of funding for youth work and how this can lead to involvement in drugs, alcohol and crime.

¹⁰⁹ Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 4.5 London Borough of Wandsworth

¹¹⁰ Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 4.112 Pimlico Village Housing Co-Operative

¹¹¹ Memoranda Arriva, Stagecoach

¹¹² Minutes of Evidence 14th of January 2002 4.62 Brian Oliver

¹¹³ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.72 Sonia Blair

¹¹⁴ Daycare Trust "Older and Bolder"

- 8.16 A report by the Daycare Trust states that there is a largely unmet need for out of school services for young people and their families. *“An infrastructure and services that meet the needs of this specific group of young people are needed now, supported by the necessary funding”*.¹¹⁵ The report warns that the failure to provide out of school clubs is leaving over one million 10-14 year olds vulnerable to a life of drugs and crime. We are concerned that young people of this age are therefore in danger of being drawn into activities such as graffiti and vandalism, other more serious crimes such as drugs, and are also increasingly exposed to health risks such as alcoholism and under-aged sexual activity.
- 8.17 The Daycare Trust recommend that young people be involved in the design of youth programmes which should be flexible in order to change with their needs and priorities and the communities in which they live. They also recommend that such services must also be joined up and bring together different professions and practitioners who will be able to address all the issues that matter to the development of young people. These services must also be sustainable and promote equality and fairness.
- 8.18 We would like to see the provision of youth services that will engage our young people, aid their social development as well as provide opportunities for them to develop skills which help them later on in life. This is one of the most important ways to tackle graffiti in London.

Recommendation 20

Local authorities need to examine their provision of youth services and consult with young people in their areas to ensure that the services provided are relevant to the needs of young people. Youth programmes provided should aim to encourage citizenship and ownership and provide opportunities for creative development.

Recommendation 21

The Mayor’s forthcoming culture strategy must ensure that the cultural needs of young people are addressed. This will entail consultation with young people through existing youth forums and schools.

Recommendation 22

We recommend that the London Assembly conduct a scrutiny of youth provision and funding in London. The aim of this would be to identify areas with poor youth provision and encourage private sector and voluntary organisations across London to become involved in providing opportunities and facilities for young people.

¹¹⁵ Daycare Trust *“Older and Bolder”*

Media Influence

- 8.19 We have considered what influence the media has had on the growth of graffiti, whether the media provide the graffiti sub-culture with validity in the eyes of young people, or whether it is just that the media have recognised the artistic element of the graffiti sub-culture and wholeheartedly embraced it. We found that graffiti is used to sell products such as videos, CDs, and computer games.¹¹⁶ At the hearing we heard that graffiti featured in many mainstream products including the video to the Destiny's Child Bootylicious single, Rimmel Lipstick and a soon to be launched campaign by Sprite where a graffiti writer has designed the can.¹¹⁷
- 8.20 A recent newspaper article states that some of the world's largest firms are promoting their brands to the youth market by associating them with crime. The article reveals that leading firms have been presented with a report advising them on how to make their products more attractive by giving them criminal kudos. It is alleged that the report offers advice on how to use the glamour of crime, sub-cultures and consumer trends from around the world.¹¹⁸ Whilst these advertising methods may result in financial gain for the companies that use them, our report clearly demonstrates that there are long term financial costs of dealing with the consequences of the behaviour which occurs as a result of this advertising.
- 8.21 Arriva pursues action against companies who promote graffiti through their products. For example, ITC upheld a complaint and withdrew an advert for a CD that featured a youth perpetrating graffiti. Arriva have also tried to convince Sega Dreamcast to withdraw their Jet Set Radio game from sale in the UK. (This game involves youths tagging buildings before being caught by police). Arriva were not successful in this, but succeeded in bringing the matter to the attention of Edward Davey MP who subsequently met with Sega representatives. Arriva have also complained to various agencies about certain magazines that promote graffiti.
- 8.22 We believe use of graffiti to promote products and attract the youth market tacitly encourages graffiti by presenting it as exciting and as an acceptable activity. We are concerned that the young people in our society are therefore receiving conflicting messages about what is and what is not acceptable behaviour. We wonder how possible it will be to control graffiti effectively when large companies and the media in general are condoning it by using graffiti to sell products and as a backdrop in many pop videos.

Recommendation 23

The media, music industry and other businesses that use graffiti to promote products and services aimed at young people must conduct their advertising campaigns responsibly considering the wider environmental and social implications. We recommend that the Capital Standards programme exert pressure on businesses on behalf of Londoners to observe these responsibilities.

¹¹⁶ Memorandum Arriva

¹¹⁷ Minutes of Evidence 14 January 2002 4.69 Sonia Blair

¹¹⁸ Sunday Times April 14th 2002 Crime Pays When Advertising to Youth

9 Conclusion

- 9.1 London has tolerated illegal graffiti as inevitable for far too long, but we do not have to live with it and graffiti must not become an acceptable part of our urban environment. We welcome the growing determination to tackle environmental crime and improve our street environment. Our report brings together good practice and advocates changes in the law. It demands that all of London including boroughs, transport operators, utilities, schools, communities play their part. We believe that for us to see lasting results and live in communities that are free from the blight of graffiti this campaign against the deterioration of our environment must be led by the Mayor working together with London local authorities.

Annex A - Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the Metropolitan Police and Transport for London should jointly explore whether the activities of magazines that promote and encourage illegal graffiti can be restricted. **Page 13 [Action: Metropolitan Police and Transport for London]**

Recommendation 2

We are concerned to learn that the presence of graffiti in our parks has such a negative impact that members of the community feel unable to enjoy their local amenities. The London Assembly has conducted an investigation into the use of green spaces in London.¹¹⁹ We welcome the initiative to establish the London Parks Forum, and request that they address the issue of removing graffiti from parks as part of their remit to increase the use of green spaces by Londoners. **Page 18 [Action: London Parks Forum]**

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the Metropolitan Police conduct research to determine whether there are higher levels of crime in areas where graffiti is more prevalent compared to areas where graffiti is not a problem. Such research should also consider if the swift removal of graffiti has any effect on the level of crime in an area. The outcome of this research should then be used to determine the priority the police give to graffiti crimes. **Page 19 [Action: Metropolitan Police]**

Recommendation 4

Where possible London Boroughs should consider using planning conditions which specify the use of building materials that are easy to clean and can be treated with anti-graffiti coatings. **Page 20 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the London Plan require new developments in London to be designed in such a way that they are not susceptible to crimes such as graffiti and vandalism. **Page 21 [Action: Mayor]**

Recommendation 6

Declaring graffiti a prevalent offence is one way that local law enforcement agencies can develop an understanding of the impact of graffiti on the local community thereby enabling them to give sentences that reflect the seriousness of the offence. We recommend that this method be adopted by all local authorities where graffiti is a serious problem. **Page 23 [Action: London Boroughs]**

¹¹⁹ London Assembly Scrutiny of Green Spaces in London.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the 8th London Local Authorities Bill be amended to include the following:

- That it be an offence for anyone to supply graffiti materials to minors, unless they are an appropriate adult. We define appropriate adults as being parents, guardians, teachers (or those acting in a similar capacity such as youth leaders) or employers.
- That those convicted of offences relating to graffiti be made to clear up graffiti where possible as part of any community service order. **Page 24 [Action: Government]**

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the Government introduce legislation extending the provisions of the 8th London Local Authorities Bill to the rest of the UK, thereby restricting the sale of graffiti materials to minors across the country. **Page 24 [Action: Government]**

Recommendation 9

Local authorities must develop the use of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC) within their communities as a way of tackling graffiti. **Page 25 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 10

The Probation Service and Youth Offending Teams should extend the use of reparative activities such as graffiti removal, for those who are convicted of illegal graffiti writing. This should also be done in partnership with transport organisations so that young offenders carry out reparative activity on buses. **Page 26 [Action: London Boroughs and Probation Service]**

Recommendation 11

We recommend CCTV should be installed on all London buses. We look forward to the Mayor of London fulfilling his promise to do so. **Page 27 [Action: Mayor]**

Recommendation 12

Transport for London should ensure that a consistent approach is taken to dealing with graffiti and etching amongst transport operators. This should include the sharing of best practice amongst the different transport operators and the undertaking of joint prosecutions of offenders where possible. **Page 27 [Action: Transport for London]**

Recommendation 13

In meeting their legislative requirement to develop a community strategy, local authorities should develop seamless anti-graffiti programmes in partnership with both public and private sector organisations and the local community. **Page 28 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 14

We recommend that the Mayor in agreement with the local authorities use the Capital Standards programme to develop a common set of standards by which local authorities can measure the efficacy of their graffiti removal and anti-graffiti strategies. The Capital Standards programme should also be used to agree the minimum standards of graffiti removal which will be applied across London. The programme should also be used to benchmark standards with other world cities thereby ensuring best practice in graffiti removal and prevention. London should seek to adopt the highest of such standards as practised by other world cities.

Page 29 [Action: Mayor and London Boroughs]

Recommendation 15

We recognise that the part of the purpose of the 8th London Local Authorities Bill is to prevent the sale of graffiti materials to minors. In this interim period as the legislation is being considered by Parliament, we recommend that all London local authorities develop voluntary codes of practice to restrict the sales of graffiti materials in their areas. **Page 30 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 16

Owners of street property such as Consignia, Cable companies, BT, Railtrack and other utility companies must become more accountable to local communities and work more closely with local authorities to ensure that the graffiti on their properties is removed swiftly. This must include publishing details of how to report graffiti, and developing and publicising standards for graffiti removal. **Page 31 [Action: Owners of Street property, Utility Companies and other service providers]**

Recommendation 17

In order to facilitate the removal of graffiti from privately owned business premises, local authorities should develop low cost schemes with economies of scale that will remove all graffiti from such properties for an annual fee. **Page 33 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 18

Local authorities should consider ways in which they can facilitate and enable local community involvement and self-help. This may include the provision of free technical advice, graffiti removal kits at trade prices etc. **Page 35 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 19

In developing strategies to deal with graffiti, we recommend that local authorities consider whether the use of legal graffiti walls in a contained and sustainable environment may be used as part of a range of general youth activities or as part of diversionary work. It is vital that any graffiti wall initiatives receive long-term management and support otherwise they may just teach graffiti writing rather than channel creative talent away from illegal writing. **Page 39 [Action: London Boroughs]**

Recommendation 20

Local authorities need to examine their provision of youth services and consult with young people in their areas to ensure that the services provided are relevant to the needs of young people. Youth programmes provided should aim to encourage citizenship and ownership and provide opportunities for creative development.

Page 41 [Action: London Boroughs]

Recommendation 21

The forthcoming Mayor's culture strategy must ensure that the cultural needs of young people are addressed. This will entail consultation with young people through existing youth forums and schools. **Page 41 [Action: Mayor]**

Recommendation 22

We recommend that the London Assembly conduct a scrutiny of youth provision and funding in London. The aim of this would be to identify areas with poor youth provision and encourage private sector and voluntary organisations across London to become involved in providing opportunities and facilities for young people. **Page 41**

[Action: London Assembly]

Recommendation 23

The media, music industry and other businesses that use graffiti to promote products and services aimed at young people must conduct their advertising campaigns responsibly considering the wider environmental and social implications. We recommend that the Capital Standards programme exert pressure on businesses on behalf of Londoners to observe these responsibilities. **Page 42**

Annex B - Evidentiary Hearing 14th January 2002 List of Witnesses

Association of London Government	Councillor Nick Dolezal Chair of Transport and Environment Committee
Association of London Government	Nick Lester Director of Transport and Environment
London Borough of Bexley	Dave Saunders Works and Contract Department
Bexley Crime & Disorder Partnership	Sgt Tony Peach
London Borough of Islington	Paul Dunne Anti-Social Behaviour Team
London Borough of Islington	Alison Blackburn Anti-Social Behaviour Team
London Borough of Lewisham	Sam Kirk Service Development Officer
London Borough of Wandsworth	Roy Evans Assistant Director of Housing
London Borough of Wandsworth	Debbie Coady Graffiti Manager Housing Department
Adshel	Karen Thompson Development Director
Adshel	Peter Johnson Operations Director
Arriva	Mark Yexley Managing Director
Infraco SSL	Mark Willer Fleet Asset Manager
London Underground	Kevin Clack Security Development Manager
Transport for London	Peter Heather Street Management
Transport for London	Ken Davidson Surface Transport
Probation Service	Nick Howell-Ives Senior Probation Officer
Probation Service	Barry Henderson Community Service Officer Graffiti Project Manager for Havering
Magistrate	Brian Oliver
Theatre Venture	Benedict Ayrton Director
University of Durham	Dr Kurt Iveson
Sonia Blair	Commercial Artist
Dave Smith	Graffiti Writer
Metropolitan Police	Chief Inspector Mat Bell
Metropolitan Police	Inspector Marshall Kent
British Transport Police	Assistant Chief Constable Paul Nicholas
British Transport Police	PC Brian Taylor
Barnet Police	Sue Akers Barnet Borough Commander
Pimlico Village Housing Co-operative	John Everett Director

Annex C - Site Visit to Groundwork Merton Monday 10 December 2001

Present: Greater London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee
Dave Frame, Groundwork Merton and staff members from Groundwork Merton
Steve Brennan, Merton Partnership Against Crime
Sgt. Nick Tittle, The Racially Motivated Crime Project
Pat DeJesus, London Borough of Merton
Sonia Blair, Commercial Artist

The Committee was given a brief explanation of the background to the graffiti initiatives run by Groundwork Merton. The Committee were advised of two graffiti initiatives which young people had been involved in on Phipps Bridge Estate and Armfield Crescent. They were also informed about the former Tandem Works, where a major new arts and environment project is being proposed. The aim of these projects was to explore the use of creative youth work approaches in addressing issues relating to graffiti. The young people that took part in the project had an opportunity to examine the impact of their behaviour and attitudes, and began to explore potential solutions to the problem of graffiti. The projects included the creation of official sites, allied with youth projects that employ young graffiti artists to act as mentors for young people in the area, with support from youth workers and artists. The project also involved local community representatives and councillors.

The Committee watched a short video that showed some of the young people involved. The video also showed an interview with a representative of a local Residents' Association who saw the Phipps Bridge Estate project as a positive step. The Committee heard that the group of young people involved in the Phipps Bridge Estate had been working with detached youth workers over a long period of time. Youth workers reported that the young people involved had begun to help and encourage each other and had collaborated on the design for the wall mural.

The Committee heard from Dave Frame, Groundwork Merton, that it was important to get young people involved in the decision making process. Mr Frame acknowledged that those who looked at measures beyond punitive measures were often labelled as having a laissez-faire attitude to the problem of graffiti but stressed that he did not feel that this was the case. Mr Frame advocated the approach of working intensively with a specific group of young people as this would provide them with transferable skills. Mr Frame stressed the importance of an integrated approach to dealing with the problems associated with graffiti and advised Members that it was important to start from where young people are and work with them from this point. He used the example of a London Borough which had introduced a well publicised policy of zero tolerance. Rather than stopping graffiti, this had led to young people spraying the phrase "zero tolerance" around the borough.

The Committee asked representatives from Groundwork Merton why they thought young people became involved with graffiti. Mr Frame responded that one reason was that young people were not involved in the functioning of their communities. He did not believe that it was credible to believe that a whole generation was bad and this was why they took part in graffiti. Mr Frame referred to massive social deprivation and the decimation of youth work provision. Mr Frame reported that youth work funding was £300 million down from what it was in 1979. He added that youth work provision was not a mandatory obligation for local authorities. Mr Frame reported that in a pan-London survey, 70% of the young people who responded said that they would like to

get more involved in decision making in their communities but many did not know how to do so and did not think they would be listened to.

Representatives from, Groundwork Merton advised the Committee that graffiti was also linked to self esteem. They reported that many young people held themselves in low regard and thought that others held them in low regard. The representatives stated that there was a need to build up the confidence of young people and that young people need to learn how to initiate and create dialogue and get involved in their communities. The Committee heard that graffiti also provided young people with a sense of status. Tagging in particular was seen as a way of marking territory.

Mr Frame advised the Committee that when questioned young people raised the same five concerns about their communities that residents raised. Mr Frame stated that it should be acknowledged that young people had rights in the present and asked how attitudes towards young people would be changed if young people had the vote. The Committee asked for Groundwork Merton's views on the zero tolerance approach as undertaken in New York. Mr Frame responded that he believed that there should be a more holistic approach to dealing with the problem of graffiti and stated that it would be cheaper to look at measures of preventing graffiti rather than focusing on removing it.

The Committee asked if Groundwork Merton considered that in many cases the damage had already been done by the time young people reached the age where they could become involved in youth work projects and if work with younger children was required. Mr Frame responded that there needed to be link between play work and youth work and stated that he felt that work with young people, such as debates about citizenship, should begin at an earlier age as possible. Mr Frame stated that Youth Work funding in Britain was the lowest in Europe. Mr Frame also stated that there was a need to map out areas to ensure that help was provided where it was needed and not on the back of a moral panic. The Committee heard from Steve Brennan, Merton Partnership Against Crime that summer projects for 8-11 year olds ran for 3 weeks but something more long term was needed.

The Committee asked if graffiti initiatives such as those ran by Groundwork Merton would help to reduce tagging in the long term. The representatives from Groundwork Merton responded that tagging was about identity and once young people became involved in projects, tagging stopped being enough for them. Young people wanted the chance to develop skills and gain a meaningful status rather than just 'I was here'.

Annex D – List of Written Evidence and Bibliography

Local Authorities

Bradford Metropolitan District Council
City of Edinburgh Council
Corporation of London
Glasgow City Council
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Bromley.
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Ealing
London Borough of Greenwich
London Borough of Harrow
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
London Borough of Southwark
London Borough of Sutton
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Borough of Westminster
Plymouth Youth Offending Team
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Police and Law Enforcement Agencies

British Transport Police
Bromley Police
Magistrates Association, Youth Courts Committee
Metropolitan Police Service
National Probation Service

Businesses/Chambers of Commerce

Action Against Graffiti
Adshel
Back to Base
Eco Solutions Ltd
Investigator Training Services Ltd
Hubdean Specialist Coatings
JC Decaux
L E Group
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry
London Graffiti Solutions
ntl Group Limited
Remade Essex
StewartWalesSomerville International
Telewest Communications plc

Transport Organisations

Arriva London North
Go Ahead Group PLC
London Underground Limited
London United Busways Limited
Metroline PLC
Stagecoach London
Transport for London

Academic Institutions

Dr Kurt Iveson University of Durham
Mr Axel Thiel International Work
Group on Graffiti
Dr Staffan Jacobson
Professor Andy Steele University of
Salford

Graffiti Writers/Websites

Ben
Boyd
Jack
Jon
Metroburner
Sugery3000

Members of Parliament

Diane Abbott MP
Tom Brake MP
Harry Cohen MP
Edward Davey MP
The Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP
Richard Ottaway MP
Dr Jenny Tonge MP

Tensid uk plc
Waltham Forest Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Community Organisations/Voluntary Sector

English Heritage
Groundwork Merton
Haringey Arts Council
Kings Fund - Imagine London Programme
Pimlico Village Housing Co-operative
Sonia Blair, Commercial Artist
Theatre Venture

World Cities

Association of Portuguese Municipalities	Helsinki – Stop Scrawls on Walls Project
City of Chicago	Swedish Association of Local Authorities
City of New York	Tokyo Metropolitan Government
City of San Diego	Toronto Police Service
City of Kosice	Union of Local Authorities in Israel
City of Stockholm	Trondheim, Norway
Federation of Canadian Municipalities	Vilnius City Council, Lithuania
Federation of Swedish County Councils	Washington DC
City of Copenhagen	

Residents and Tenants Associations

122B Residents Association	Aeroville Residents Association
Addington Residents Association	Agar House Residents Association
Albion Road Residents Association	Alexandra Mansions Ltd
Amhurst Park Action Group	Arkwright Mansions Residents Assoc.
Barry Area Residents Association	Belsize Village Residents Association
Belmont & South Cheam Residents Association	Benhill Residents Association.
Bethnal Green Estate Tenants Association	Beverley Court Residents Association
Bishops Walk Residents Association	Bourne Estate Tenants Association
Bramham Gardens Garden Committee	Broadwalk Court Residents Assoc.
Brookscroft Management Ltd	Bush Hill Park Residents Association
Cambell Court Residents Association	Camden Square Residents Association
Camden Square Neighbourhood Association	Canning & Clyde Road Residents
Caroline Gardens Residents Association	Cayford House Residents Association
Charlotte Street Residents Association	Chaucer Gardens Residents Assoc.
Chelsfield Park Residents Association	Churchfield Road Residents Assoc
Church Street Area Residents Association	Copers Cope Area Residents Assoc
Cottington Close Tenant Management Co-op	Coulsdon Forum
Crawford Mansions Tenants and Residents Assoc.	Croydon Society (The)
Dacres Tenants & Residents Association	Dartmouth Park Conservation Area
Darwin Court Residents Association	De Beauvoir Residents Association
Downs Estate Tenants & Residents Association	East Cheam Householders Org
Edith Grove Residents Association	Egerton Gardens Mews Residents
Ealing Fields Residents Association	Earls Court Gardens Residents Earls
Court Village Residents Committee	East Coulsdon Residents Association
Effra Close Residents Association	Elaine Grove & Oak Village Residents
Elizabeth Estate Tenants & Residents Association	Elliott Square Residents Association
Embassy Gardens (Beckenham) Residents Assoc.	Esher Gardens & Bisley House
Fayland Avenue Residents Association	Fitzroy Park Residents Association
Florida Court Residents Association	Fordwych Residents Association

Forestdale Residents Association
Gaywood Estate Tenants & Residents Assoc.
Gordon Hill Residents Association
Guinness Trust (Draycott Ave) Tenants Assoc
Haling & District Residents Association
Harmondsworth & Sipson Residents Association
Haven Green Ltd
Hayes Town Centre Residents Association.
Heath Residents Association
Holland Park Ave Residents Association
Holmesdale Residents Association
Hornchurch Residents Association
Ingestre Road Residents Association
Jeffreys Street Association
Kelly Street Residents Association
Kensington Court Residents Association
Knighton Close Residents Association
Lauceston Place Residents Society
Leaves Green & Keston Vale Residents Assoc
Links Estate Residents Association
Lower End Kingsdown Ave (leKara)
Mead Road Residents Association
Court Residents Association
Nineteen the Mall Management Co.
North Wimbledon Residents Association
Onslow Neighborhood Association
Park Court Residents Association
Park Langley Residents Association
Pilgrims to Willoughby Residents Association
Portobello Court Residents Association
Residents Against Graffiti
Rowberry Close Residents Association
St. Pancras Court Housing Cooperative
Selden, Hathway, and Evalina Association
Sidmouth Mews Tenants Association
Southgate Green Association
Templewood Ave Residents Association
Upminster & Cranham Residents Association
Warwick Crescent Residents Association
Wessex Gardens Residents Association
Wharfedale/Lonsdale Gdns Residents Assoc
Willow Residents Association
Wynter Street Residents Association

Gatehill Northwood Residents
Glebe Court TMO
Grange Residents Company Ltd
GWB Residents Association
Hanger Hill Garden Estate Residents
Harwood Court Residents Assoc
Hawkstone Tenants & Residents
Hayes Village Association
Heron House and Warfield Residents
Hollycroft Avenue Residents Assoc
Home Farm Residents Association
Inkerman Area Residents Association
Ivy & Adelaide Tenants & Residents
John Aird Court Residents Assoc.
Kenly & District Residents Association
Keston Mark Residents Association
Knightsbridge Association
Laxton Court Residents Association
Lincoln Court Tenants & Residents
Lissenden Gardens Tenants Assoc
Mandells Chartered Surveyors
Merton Park Ward Residents Milton
Mozart Estate Tenants & Residents
North West One/Mornington Crescent
Oak Farm Residents Association
Oregon Park Residents Association
Park Hill Residents Association
Petts Wood and District Residents
Pond Square Residents Association
Radnor Walk Residents Association
Riddlesdown Residents Association
St. Mary Cray Action Group
Samuda Estate LMO
Semley House Residents Association
Silwood Tenants & Residents
Summers Street Management Ltd
Troy Court Residents Association
Walpole Residents Association
WEDSSTRA
West Hendon Residents Association
Whitefield Residents Association
Wimbledon Park Heritage Group
Zenith Project (The)

Other

Ms Margaret Clark
Mr Graeme Lewis
Mr Magrath
Mr Mark Farrant
Mr Robert Wasserman, Chairman, PSComm, LLC Boston USA

Bibliography

Articles

- "Anyone for a Slice of Mango," West2 Summer/Autumn 2001
"Criminal Damage: Posters, Stickers and Graffiti." Legal Action November 1991
"Design and Management key to Preventing Graffiti," Urban Environment Today 10th May 2001
"Keeping Britain Tidy", Public Service and Local Government: Street Design and Maintenance Supplement August 1998.

Books

- Macdonald, N. (2001) *"The Graffiti Subculture, Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York"*
Hampshire: Palgrave.
Halcrow Fox and Associates. (1998) *"Vandalism and Graffiti on Public Transport"* HFA.
Tidy Britain Group (1992) *"A Survey of Cleanliness in Six European Capital City Centres."*
Wallace, J, Whitehead, C (1989) *"Graffiti Removal and Control"* DES
George Kelling and Catherine Coles *Fixing broken windows Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in Our Communities*

Magazines, booklets, newspapers and newsletters

- Association of London Government "Streets Ahead" Enviro Crime Conference
Bromley News and Biggin Hill News September 20th 2001
Combat Graffiti "Reclaiming the Public Spaces of New York", City of New York Police Department
Croydon Guardian 4th October 2001
Daily Telegraph 27th October 2001
Daily Telegraph Saturday 9th February 2002
Evening Standard 1st October 2001
Evening Standard 15th October 2001
Evening Standard 29th January 2002
Finding Choices, Artistic Alternatives to Graffiti, Seattle Public Utilities (Video)
Garden Square News Spring 2001
Graffiti Conference Speakers Notes, London Borough of Wandsworth, April 2001
Graphotism Issue 16 1999
Groundwork Today Issue no.30
Guardian 29th August 2001
Guardian 5th September 2001
Guardian 16th January 2002
Guardian 2nd February 2002
Highbury & Islington express September 7th 2001
Islington Gazette 23rd August 2001
Kingston Informer 5th October 2001
Pimlico Village Housing Co-operative Newsletter, December 2001
Planning 15th September 2000
Spotlight on Hayes & Wickham Issue 7 December 2001
Sunday Times 14th April 2002
Tackling Graffiti Seminar, London Borough of Greenwich
The Job October 19th 2001
The Times 26th October 2001
Walpole Residents Association Newsletter, September 2001

Minutes of Meetings

Kingsbury & Kenton Area Consultative Forum September 2000

London Borough of Bromley, Leisure and Community Services 1st November 2001

Merton Park Ward Residents Association Management Committee Meeting Minutes

Wandsworth Borough Council, Housing Committee 3rd July 2001

Wandsworth Borough Council, Housing Committee 18th February 1998

Copies of the written evidence that we have gathered during the course of this scrutiny can be inspected by the public during office hours. Please contact:

Ijeoma Ajibade

Greater London Authority

Romney House

Marsham Street

London SW1P 3PY

tel. 020 7983 4397

fax 020 7983 4437

ijeoma.ajibade@london.gov.uk

Annex E: Summary of Written Evidence

LOCAL AUTHORITIES/OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS

<p>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</p>	<p>There has been a gradual increase in incidents of graffiti over the last few years. Graffiti is found on public buildings, parks, shop shutters, property belonging to public utilities, and railway land/property. The Housing Department has a dedicated team that deals with removal and preventative measures. They remove offensive or prominent graffiti as soon as possible. They also carry out work for other departments/private sector on request.</p> <p>Cost: Exceeds £175,000 per annum.</p> <p>Profile: 8-18 years of age.</p> <p>Best Practice: Swift removal and use of preventative measures such as sealants. Graffiti walls in parks. This has reduced graffiti on parks, buildings and fences where installed.</p> <p>Recommendations: Early removal. The Council would also like to see further legislation</p>
<p>London Borough of Barnet</p>	<p>Graffiti is both a public nuisance and an environmental blight. Levels of graffiti vandalism have increased dramatically across Barnet in recent years. Reflecting a common determination to tackle graffiti in Barnet, the Council and the Police have developed a shared approach to the issue. As a result of this close partnership the Council and the Police have found a number of effective solutions to the graffiti problem. It is only through close inter-agency working between local authorities and the Police that methods to manage the problem of graffiti can be found. In Barnet this framework has been established through a dual-agency Borough Wide Anti-Graffiti Group. Joint action has delivered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pro-active system of neighbourhood management that ensures graffiti is removed rapidly across the Borough as well as targeting graffiti hotspots. • Innovative policing methods based on the "intelligence led" approach to identifying offenders. • Policies to restrict the provision of materials to those who are likely to use them to carry out graffiti. <p><u>Wiping Graffiti Out in Barnet: The Partnership Approach</u></p> <p>Graffiti is a serious problem; it blights communities and makes people feel unsafe in their neighbourhoods. In common with many London Boroughs, levels of graffiti in Barnet have increased dramatically in recent years. The Barnet Crime and Disorder Audit 2001 found that graffiti is an endemic problem across the Borough and that graffiti sites exist even in predominantly rural locations. However the greatest concentrations of graffiti are to be found in the Borough's most deprived wards, Colindale and Burnt Oak. Within these wards housing estates are most blighted by the problem. Further the Borough's 22 town centres are a particular target of graffiti vandals.</p> <p>The Council and the Police are determined to wipe out graffiti in Barnet and have adopted a partnership approach to tackling the issue. Joint action has focused on the rapid removal of graffiti, initiatives to limit the sale of spray paint and marker pens to minors and the adoption of pioneering policing methods to identify and arrest offenders. A Borough Wide Anti-Graffiti Group co-ordinate this work, linking services to deliver a holistic and targeted approach. The following services contribute to the work of the of the Anti-Graffiti Group:</p>

Barnet Council's Neighbourhood Management Service

The Neighbourhood Management Service (NMS) is responsible for locating and ensuring the removal of graffiti in Barnet. The service also works with other public organisations, such as the utility companies, to ensure that their properties remain free from graffiti. The service guarantees the following:

- To remove offensive graffiti on council building or highway areas within 24 hours of it being reported.
- To remove large areas of graffiti on council premises within 14 days.
- To remove all graffiti on public property during block cleansing programmes.
- To remove offensive graffiti on private property free of charge.

A low-cost graffiti removal service is also offered to residents and businesses.

The *Block Cleanse Programme* is an example of the innovative approach to street based services adopted by Barnet Council. On a rotating basis every street in the Borough has a twice yearly deep cleanse and as part of this programme all graffiti on public buildings is removed. The Block Cleanse Programme was recently recognised as an example of environmental best practice, winning a prestigious Green Apple Award. The Council targets extra resources to the areas of the Borough worst affected by graffiti. For example, the *StreetWise Barnet* initiative operates in town centres where graffiti and other forms of anti-social behaviour have the greatest impact. As part of a number measures in these areas, extra resources have been targeted at the rapid removal of graffiti. To support this activity no charge is made for the removal of graffiti from privately owned premises. Channelling additional resources into policy innovations like the Block Cleanse Programme StreetWise means Barnet Council invests significant resources removing graffiti. Reflecting a corporate determination to wipe graffiti out, the Council is considering establishing an in house graffiti team and a designated Graffiti Officer to co-ordinate its work.

Barnet Council's Trading Standards Department

The Council recently backed proposals introducing a voluntary code of practice banning the sale of spray paint and marker pens to minors. These proposals were introduced to the Council as a Private Member's Bill; a new legislative mechanism introduced to Barnet as part of the Council's political modernisation process. Private Member Bills give Councillors who are not a member of the executive the opportunity to introduce policy proposals. Outlets subscribing to the code of practice commit not to supply spray paint or marker pens to minors or people whom they suspect will use them to write graffiti. Retailers also pledge to make their employees aware of the code through staff induction programs and training schemes. Trading Standards Officers are available to give advice to traders on the best way to secure spray paint and markers so that they are inaccessible to shoplifters.

Barnet Borough Police

The Police in partnership with the Council have adopted an "*intelligence led*" approach to combat tagging graffiti in the Borough. An intelligence database has been developed from interviews with offenders, stop and search data and information from the public, Neighbourhood Management Officers and Barnet's new Neighbourhood Wardens. Using this information the Police have adopted the following procedure to secure the arrest of graffiti offenders:

- Photograph the most prominent graffiti tags in an area.
- Establish who is believed to be the tag artist.
- Obtain a search warrant for their home address under a seldom used section of the Criminal Damage Act.
- Search the address for evidence of the artist's tag.
- Arrest and interview.

	<p>The Police have a 100% record of finding evidence of exact tag matches in offender's homes. Twelve offenders have been arrested and have been charged with a total of 22 offences. All offenders have confessed when charged. Should a suspect deny committing an offence scientific processes such as graphology and paint type identification are available to Police Officers. In addition to the "intelligence led" approach, the Police also run joint surveillance operations with the Council's Neighbourhood Management Service. As a result of this action, the profile of a typical graffiti offender is emerging. Arrests to date suggest that the majority of offenders are white males aged between 13 and 15. Offenders are often experiencing problems in engaging with the educational process and many are excluded from school. A significant proportion of offenders are from single parent families and a number live in housing owned by Barnet Council.</p> <p>The "intelligence led approach" utilised by the Police is underpinned by the theory of "crime problem solving", a strategic policing methodology imported from the United States. The "problem solving triangle" states that all crimes require an offender, a victim and an environment where the offence is committed. To have a long-term impact on crime action needs to be taken to not only tackle offenders but also to make victims less vulnerable to further offences and to change the environment where the offence was committed. Putting theory into practice Barnet Police are encouraging victims to make their properties less vulnerable to graffiti, for example by encouraging shopkeepers to fit lattice shutters. The Police are also working with the Neighbourhood Management Service to make graffiti prone environments less susceptible, for example by encouraging better lighting and ensuring that graffiti is rapidly removed.</p> <p>Youth Offending Team As a result of effective police action the Youth Offending Team has worked with an increased number of graffiti offenders in recent months. The team has found direct and indirect reparative activity to be most effective when dealing with graffiti offenders. For example, offenders have carried out community service in the Borough's parks under the supervision of the Neighbourhood Management Service.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, Barnet like many other boroughs has a growing problem with graffiti damage to private property. There is a specific problem with property and plants owned by utility companies, and this is particularly evident in case of the telecommunications industry. While there is some provision in law that can potentially allow councils to remove such graffiti, the position on legal liability is however unclear and all the costs have to be borne by the local authority. As part of its determination to tackle this issue, Barnet has therefore promoted a significant clause in the forthcoming ALG 8th London Local Authorities Bill that will enable councils to remove graffiti not tackled by utility companies and to recharge the cost to the company concerned. By empowering authorities in this way, we believe we will be able to deliver a consistent and effective response to improving the local environment.</p> <p>Conclusion and Policy Recommendations Working within a focused partnership framework has enabled the Council and the Police in Barnet to develop innovative and effective solutions to graffiti. We believe that only through true inter-agency co-operation can a holistic and comprehensive solution to the problem of graffiti be delivered. In Barnet we are confident that we have developed a dynamic approach to the problem of graffiti.</p>
<p>London Borough of Bexley</p> <p>(Responses received from the Works and Contacts Dept. and Bexley Community Safety Partnership)</p>	<p>In Bexley graffiti is most likely to occur in shopping areas, parks, open spaces and subways. The Council removes offensive graffiti within 24 hours; provides limited free removal services to private residents and businesses and issues free graffiti removal kits to the public, traders' associations and community groups. The Council also works jointly with the police, probation service and other local authorities. The council is currently looking at proposals to implement a voluntary code of practice on the sale of graffiti material to those under 16.</p> <p>In August 2000 a youth disorder project was piloted in Welling. The project included a programme of summer activities, targeting of main perpetrators with Acceptable Behaviour Contracts and an increased police presence. A graffiti wall was installed at a local youth centre.</p> <p>In April 2001 the local police in conjunction with the Crown Prosecution Service deemed graffiti a "locally prevalent offence". This meant that the crime was taken more seriously. Now, instead of receiving a caution for a first offence an offender will be referred to the Youth Offending Team. A subsequent offence means a referral to court. This was widely publicised and piloted in Sidcup where graffiti was seen as prevalent. A</p>

	<p>youth disorder project was also run in Sidcup. A leaflet was produced for children and parents informing them of the consequences of offending. Posters and leaflets were also distributed in the rest of the borough and at surrounding schools in other boroughs. The Council has set up a graffiti hotline for reporting offenders and a green line for graffiti removal requests. The projects have been completed but the hotlines are still available. The Youth Offending Team are working with offenders on reparations including the cleaning of graffiti.</p> <p>Profile: White males, aged 11-15</p> <p>Cost: £126K for 2001/02. Costs have risen over the last five years from 18k to £126k.</p> <p>Recommendations: Swift removal of graffiti and the total removal of all graffiti at known hot spots.</p>															
Bradford Metropolitan District Council	<p>The Council created a graffiti removal unit in 1989. The service is self-funding and also includes the removal of fly-posters and the application of graffiti/poster resistant coating. The Unit charges for graffiti removal, unless the graffiti is racist, obscene, sexist or inflammatory. Graffiti is categorised and targets for removal are set according to the category e.g. clearly visible obscene graffiti is removed within 24hours of notification.</p> <p>Graffiti has increased over the last eight months due to the emergence of tagging gangs/individuals. Graffiti resistant coatings make removal easier, but do not prevent graffiti. CCTV only provides protection if backed up by the police. The Unit has found that painting large and colourful murals has prevented graffiti in some subways. The Council is considering introducing a graffiti wall/zone. The Council has found making offenders remove graffiti acts as a deterrent, but this has to be supervised due to safety considerations. A variety of methods and processes are used to remove graffiti. This largely depends on the substance used for the graffiti and the surface on which it is done. The council uses water-soluble and organic based cleaning solutions, as they are less damaging to the environment. They also use mechanical cleaning methods.</p> <p>Profile: This depends on the type of graffiti.</p> <p><i>Protest graffiti</i>- no typical offender or site. Includes racist or inflammatory graffiti. Any materials may be used.</p> <p><i>General graffiti</i>- usually done by children or teenagers. It occurs at bus stops, playgrounds, and areas where young people or children meet. They use marker pens and occasionally spray paint. This type of graffiti returns very quickly after removal.</p> <p><i>Tag graffiti</i>- well organised territorial marking with spray paint. It is usually carried out by males aged 14-28, but there are some females involved. Offenders are generally well spoken and intelligent young people. The graffiti occurs in dark corners and quiet areas where the graffiti is visible to the public. It is usually sprayed at night. Once cleaned an area will remain free from tag graffiti for some time.</p> <p>Cost: Average reactive costs for 2000/01.</p> <table> <tr> <td>41 private sites (commercial and domestic)</td> <td>@ £66.00 per visit =</td> <td>£2706.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>218 council sites</td> <td>@£76.00 per visit =</td> <td>£15,568.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>73 housing sites</td> <td>@£75.00 per visit =</td> <td>£5,575.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>49 sites (no charge made)</td> <td>Cost to unit =</td> <td>£3000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total cost =</td> <td>£26,849.00</td> </tr> </table>	41 private sites (commercial and domestic)	@ £66.00 per visit =	£2706.00	218 council sites	@£76.00 per visit =	£15,568.00	73 housing sites	@£75.00 per visit =	£5,575.00	49 sites (no charge made)	Cost to unit =	£3000.00		Total cost =	£26,849.00
41 private sites (commercial and domestic)	@ £66.00 per visit =	£2706.00														
218 council sites	@£76.00 per visit =	£15,568.00														
73 housing sites	@£75.00 per visit =	£5,575.00														
49 sites (no charge made)	Cost to unit =	£3000.00														
	Total cost =	£26,849.00														
London Borough of Bromley	<p>The Council has reported a 45% increase in requests for removal this year compared to last year. Requests have been received from residents and businesses. The Council is in the process of developing a Safety Partnership Plan with Police, outside agencies and Residents Associations. In some cases graffiti reoccurs within hours and in other areas the graffiti does not return for weeks. Bromley do not have information on the cost to the local economy. Council policy is to remove racist or abusive graffiti within 48 hours of notification. The Council removes graffiti free</p>															

	<p>of charge to properties where the graffiti is visible from the highway. Cost: 2000/01=£103,000 They are forecasting a spend of £230,000 for 2001/02 although the budget is £57,330.</p>
London Borough of Camden	<p>The Street Environment Service piloted a graffiti removal scheme 18 months ago, to remove graffiti from Council owned street furniture. The pilot was successful and was expanded. The Council now has 4 cleaning teams known as Grime Fighters. The teams regularly clean graffiti prevalent areas such as schools, bus and tube stations, parks and open spaces, leisure and community centres and council street furniture. They also assist in removing small amounts of graffiti from privately owned property. The Grime Fighters also organise graffiti clean ups with local people. The Council feels that businesses do not appreciate the negative impact that graffiti has on the environment. Although shop owners have graffiti sprayed on their shop shutters they do not seem to mind because the shutters are only in place when the shop is closed. The Council advises businesses to invest in mesh shutters or install shutters behind the windows. The Council uses black rubberised paint on lamp columns and junction boxes as this prevents fly posting and can easily be repainted if sprayed. The most prolific graffiti in the borough is tagging. Graffiti is prevalent where young people congregate or pass by. They find that if tags are removed areas can be kept graffiti free for long periods.</p> <p>Cost: The annual cost of the Grime Fighters is £250,000. In addition to this the Housing Department spends over £100,000 per annum on graffiti removal.</p> <p>Profile: Male, aged between 12 and 18. regular routing maintenance is expensive, but effective.</p> <p>Recommendations: Use of anti-social behaviour orders to improve parental control. Making offenders and their parents clean up graffiti. This would also help reduce labour costs.</p>
Corporation of London	<p>Within the City, contractors undertake graffiti removal. Graffiti is attended to within 48 hours. Instances of graffiti have increased by 5-10% each year over the last five years. It typically appears overnight in pedestrian subways, river bridges and the Thames walkway. Graffiti on private property is brought to the attention of the property owner, but is not removed by the Corporation.</p> <p>Cost: Annual cost of removing graffiti from street furniture is £1,500.</p> <p>Best Practice: Use of anti-graffiti paint. This allows the graffiti to be removed more easily. Swift removal –when not removed swiftly more graffiti appears in the same area.</p> <p>The Corporation has some housing estates located in other boroughs. When graffiti occurs on the se estates it is removed by resident estate staff or a contractor may be used. Where residents/children of residents are involved in graffiti, they are asked to pay for removal costs. On the estates graffiti is most likely to appear in areas where it is already present or nearby. It tends to be worse where there is another nearby local authority estate in which graffiti is prevalent. On the estates graffiti is removed within 24 hours if racist or offensive. Other graffiti is removed within five days. Where the graffiti is on private property adjoining the estate efforts are made to ensure the owner cleans it. If the owner does not clean it then the Corporation will clean it to prevent further incidents.</p>

<p>London Borough of Croydon</p>	<p>The council has a dedicated graffiti removal team. They aim to remove non-offensive graffiti from council buildings, highway signs and equipment within 7 days. Where graffiti is racist or offensive they aim to remove the graffiti within 24 hours, regardless of who owns the property. They also provide a low cost rechargeable graffiti removal service to local residents and businesses. Recognising that there is no single or simple answer to graffiti, the Council is tackling graffiti through a variety of measures. They have also included copies of information and advice for residents and businesses on graffiti. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local community cleanups. • Detection and surveillance through CCTV. • Encouraging the joining or setting up of neighbourhood watch. • Use of community service offenders to carry out graffiti removal under supervision. • Sale of graffiti protection/removal materials at discounted trade prices. • A voluntary agreement scheme with vendors, restricting the sale of spray paints and markers to minors. • Public art projects in the form of street murals. • Partnerships with the police, probation service and Youth Offending Team. • A joint database of graffiti tags is being developed with the police. • The Council held a conference during 2000 bringing many residents and community groups together to discuss the Borough's response to its graffiti problem. • Croydon has a free hotline number for advice about graffiti problems and to report incidents of graffiti. • Croydon are developing a scheme whereby graffiti vandals will have to pay for their damage or clean it off. • The Council is currently pressing the Home Office for new legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to require that the sale of graffiti material is restricted, -to enable councils give notice to utility companies to remove graffiti from their boxes or for the council to remove the graffiti and recover the cost, to prosecute companies currently involved in promoting sales of their graffiti products and inciting graffiti via the internet <p>Recommendations: Swift removal. The planting of climbing plants, shrubs and hedges. They also recommend increased parental vigilance and educational visits to schools.</p> <p>Cost: Over £250,000 per annum. This is more than three times what it was between two and five years ago.</p> <p>Profile: Graffiti is committed due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alienation-graffiti offers a perceived opportunity to gain some notoriety amongst peers. • Gang culture-graffiti is a form of marking gang territory. • Bravado-graffiti often takes place in extremely public places that are often dangerous and hard to reach. • Popular culture-it is currently a trend in many parts of the media to exemplify graffiti as pop culture art form. • Artistic expression-there are some people that believe they have genuine artistic talent. Where this is the case some of this energy may be directed with suitable projects and opportunities.
----------------------------------	--

London Borough of Ealing	<p>Within the Borough graffiti is common in subways, car parks and parks. Commercial premises are seen as an easy target especially shop shutters. The Council has found that murals in parks deter vandals from re-offending in the short term. Making offenders clean off graffiti is also an effective deterrent. The offenders become aware of the costs of removal and the feelings of property owners. If a tag is removed from a shop front within 24 hours it can remain graffiti free for up to several weeks/months. If a whole street is cleaned up, the area can remain graffiti free for up to six months or longer.</p> <p>Profile: 11-24, male from middle to upper class backgrounds.</p> <p>Costs: £150,000 per annum. This does not include the costs residents spend themselves. Five years ago the cost per annum was £65,000.</p> <p>Recommendations: Tougher law, which would make it easier for the police to arrest and prosecute vandals. Swift removal. Education for magistrates about graffiti and more consistent prosecutions/penalties. Education at school about the dangers, penalties and impact graffiti has on society. Pupils age 10-14 are usually unaware that graffiti is an offence.</p>
Edinburgh Council	<p>Graffiti in the City is common on vacant buildings, adjacent to bus stops and in areas that are not well overlooked. The Council only removes graffiti that is likely to cause offence, although they recently allocated funds to remove all graffiti from some pedestrian underpasses. They only deal with graffiti on council property, bridges, the adopted road network and public toilets. They do not remove graffiti from privately owned property or structures. Graffiti removal forms an integral part of the Council's cleaning regime. They are considering the use of CCTV and the use of offenders to clean graffiti under community service programmes.</p>
Glasgow City Council	<p>The Council has a dedicated graffiti removal team. They do not charge households or commercial premises for graffiti removal. Racist/sectarian graffiti is given priority. Graffiti is found everywhere in the city on walls, doors, street furniture, common entrances to properties etc. The Council works closely with the police in order to catch offenders.</p> <p>Profile: Male aged 12-16 years living in less desirable areas of the City.</p> <p>Cost: £600,000 per annum</p> <p>Recommendations: Speedy removal and police action against perpetrators. They also recommend speaking to secondary school children about the effect graffiti has on the environment. They do not recommend the use of offenders to clean graffiti due to the chemicals used and the protective clothing required.</p>
London Borough of Greenwich	<p>The Council won a Charter Mark Award for Graffiti Removal in 1997. Greenwich established a graffiti hotline in December 1995. Greenwich remove racist graffiti within 24 hours of receiving information. The graffiti removal service is provided to both council and non-council premises. Offensive graffiti is removed free of charge, and includes graffiti that is racist, sexist, obscene, homophobic or potentially threatening. The Council also removes stickers and fly posters of such nature. They provide free technical advice on graffiti removal to private property owners, but there is a charge to remove non-offensive graffiti from private property. Since April 1997, Greenwich experienced a significant increase in activity by racist organisations and an increase in racist graffiti and stickers. They have managed to contain this through prompt removal and high profile policing. The Council organised a seminar on tackling graffiti in order to focus attention on the issue. Areas</p>

	<p>targeted in Greenwich include poorly lit streets, isolated areas such as parks, subways, public conveniences, community centres and the Cutty Sark Gardens. The Council intends to pilot an improved graffiti removal service from Autumn 2001 and undertake further initiatives outlined below. Greenwich provided the investigation with a copy of the summary of their Waste Services seminar on tackling graffiti which was held in May 2001.</p> <p>Profile: The Council has not conducted specific studies, but offenders are usually between the ages of 10-16. Adults are also responsible for tagging which sometimes signifies other illegal activity such as drug distribution and raves. Offenders are from different ethnic origins and social backgrounds.</p> <p>Initiatives: Information pack for the removal of graffiti. Graffiti buster teams-volunteer environment groups keep certain areas graffiti free. High profile media campaign with the aim of highlighting costs to council, businesses and the community. Enforcement and prosecution including the use of community orders and antisocial behaviour orders. Confidential Hotline for reporting offenders. Reduce access to graffiti materials in partnership with the police, businesses and schools. Enable the public to purchase graffiti removal kits direct from the suppliers Development of an education programme for young people. Establishment of good partnerships with utility companies/external agencies to facilitate the rapid removal of graffiti. Graffiti clean up projects with young people during the summer holiday.</p> <p>Recommend: Rapid removal of graffiti</p> <p>Cost: 2000/01= £144,000.00</p>
London Borough of Harrow	<p>Graffiti is found on underpasses, stairwells, flank walls of property and shop fronts. The Council removes obscene and racist graffiti within 24 hours of notification and other graffiti when resources are available. They only remove graffiti from private property if it is racist or obscene. They supply free graffiti removal materials to members of the public. From October 2001, the Council will have a team for removing non-offensive graffiti from busy areas. The Council has found that graffiti reoccurs on cleaned areas and questions whether swift removal of graffiti is the best answer. Harrow do not record the cost of removing graffiti as a single item and they have no records of costs to business or the local economy.</p>
London Borough of Islington (Anti-Social Behaviour Unit)	<p>The Islington Crime Reduction Partnership developed the Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) as a way of tackling anti-social behaviour caused by young people. Islington Council Housing Department and the Islington Borough Police first introduced the contracts in November 1999 as a pilot scheme to tackle problems on estates and on the street. The aim was to stop the behaviour rather than punish the offenders. The behaviour tackled included threatening behaviour, harassment, racist behaviour, graffiti, criminal damage and other sub-criminal behaviour. The ABC has proved to be an effective means of educating both children and their parents and getting families to take responsibility for unacceptable behaviour. The scheme can also be used as part of an incremental approach leading to possession orders or Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO), should the behaviour continue. Since February 2000 the scheme has been implemented borough wide with approximately 100 contracts signed. To date there have only been two serious breaches of the contract. The Council has also found that where a breach of the contract is considered to be a breach of Council tenancy, both the parents and youths involved consider the issue far more seriously than they would have done had the matter been dealt with by the police. The ABC is also a faster process than ASBO. Individuals can be signed up in days rather than the months it would take to apply for ASBO through the courts. The ABC is also flexible and allows for each case to be dealt with individually. The contract normally lasts for six months, although it can be renewed after a case</p>

	<p>conference has been held. The Council has found that young people adhere to ABC because they contribute to the design of the content. Parents also support the ABC, as the consequence of a breach affects the entire family. Residents support them because they have a direct, positive impact upon the quality of life for the local community.</p>
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	<p>The Council is currently piloting an anti-graffiti campaign for one year, which includes direct removal of graffiti from both public and private properties. It is intended that more pro-active measures will be developed as the pilot progresses. These will include the implementation of reparative activities in partnership with the Council Youth Offending Team. The police as part of the community safety team have engaged in discussions with local schools and there has been a reduction of graffiti in the vicinity of these schools. Education is seen as a vital part of the initiative and the Council is committed to developing this area of work. Graffiti occurs on main commercial roads and on particular hot spots within residential streets. They have also provided a copy of their Committee report on the progress of their Anti-Graffiti and Fly-posting initiative.</p> <p>Cost: 2001/02- £87k, includes £20k for removal of graffiti from council buildings. Costs also include removal from private property. They have no details of costs to the local economy, but have had positive feedback from businesses especially in the areas of tourist attractions.</p> <p>Recommendations: Education, stronger legislation and policy (magistrates view graffiti as a soft crime). Swift removal and community involvement.</p>
London Borough of Lambeth	<p>Graffiti is a borough wide problem in Lambeth, but the Authority also has areas where graffiti is particularly prevalent. The graffiti appears in many forms ranging from tagging to graffiti art. Graffiti is often racist or offensive and is universally unwelcome. It occurs on nearly every possible surface visible to the public including walkways, subways, overhead bridges, train stations, public buildings, parks, toilets, changing rooms, housing estates etc. The Council currently has no capacity to deal with etched graffiti.</p> <p>Profile: Young people with a variety of socio-economic problems.</p> <p>In Lambeth there are four council service provider areas that deal with graffiti removal these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Estates • Residential Housing and Street Environment. The in-house Grimebusters team undertakes to remove racist/offensive graffiti within 24 hours of notification; removal of non-offensive graffiti within five working days of notification on principal roads; 14 working days on other main roads and 28 days on all other roads. This is a free service. From April-September 2000, the team removed 20,000 metres of graffiti. • Parks and Open spaces • Business Premises. Local businesses are responsible for their own premises, but the Grimebusters team offer free removal from shop shutters and offer reduced costs for other surfaces. <p>Costs: Total costs for the Council are in the region of £600,000. This does not include the costs to the local economy or costs due to higher levels of crime in graffiti prone areas.</p> <p>Initiatives: Application of preventative coatings. The Council uses mainly sacrificial coatings in graffiti prone areas. In addition, they are working in partnership with Lambeth Police and an invest to save expression of interest has been made to the Treasury with regard to graffiti prevention initiatives.</p>

	<p>Deterrent and enforcement promotion. Prompt removal of graffiti. Clear council statement regarding a zero tolerance approach. This necessitates co-ordinated action and commitment to roles amongst the various agencies involved. There should be agreements as to respective roles and responsibilities. Other initiatives include targeted enforcement activity involving surveillance and partnerships with local retail outlets selling spray paints.</p> <p>Diversionary projects Community art development projects. There must be clarity amongst participants as to what is and what is not appropriate. Initiatives have included graffiti murals, graffiti demonstrations at events, graffiti workshops linked to Black History Month. In some instances these skills can lead to paid commissions and draw in socially excluded individuals so that they can develop basic business skills and improve social skills.</p> <p>Community education projects Initiatives include working with schools and youth groups to raise awareness of the effects of graffiti and costs, working with local residents on cleanups, working with businesses on how to tackle graffiti and engage with local forums.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council would like to see greater London wide liaison on anti-graffiti strategies and removal/prevention techniques. • Better partnership working with strategic bodies with responsibilities in this area e.g. Railtrack, Met. Police, Home Office etc. • Improved legislation to aid enforcement action e.g. 8th London Local Authorities Act. • Availability of additional or combined resources for preventative and diversionary measures. • Clear statements from the Mayor/GLA in support of Borough anti –graffiti measures.
London Borough of Lewisham	<p>The Councils policy is to remove graffiti, for free from any property that is on, or facing the public highway. The Councils parks contractor is responsible for graffiti removal from parks and open spaces. Lewisham have a call centre and three websites that can be used for reporting graffiti and their street leaders also have pre-paid phone cards. The Council has developed a database for recording graffiti removal requests and showing the square mileage of graffiti removed. They take before and after photos, and collect information on tags to share with the police. Other initiatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident Graffiti Busters-Resident groups that receive training in graffiti removal. The Council has 29 such teams, who conduct their own graffiti clean-ups. • Probation Service Partnership-People on community service take part in supervised graffiti removal. • Covert CCTV –The Council is currently in the process of identifying graffiti hotspots and vandals, which will lead to prosecutions or reparations for damage. • Reparation work-Children caught spreading graffiti have agreed with the council and the police to work with graffiti removal teams. • Poster Campaign- Lewisham have run a poster campaign, but do not feel that this has been effective. • Police-The police in partnership with the Council have encouraged shops in the Brockley area to sign up to a voluntary code of practice agreeing not to sell materials that could be used for graffiti to anyone who appears to be under 16, unless they are accompanied by an adult. This scheme is in the process of being launched borough wide. The Council also carries out joint surveillance of graffiti hot spots with the police.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Projects- Art/mural projects with young people. • Creation of a graffiti task force to look at all the issues surrounding graffiti. They also intend to set up a local authority forum where local authorities can share best practice. • Schools-Provide an education programme and graffiti removal training. • Junior Citizens-Two week sessions for year 6 pupils focussing on a number of issues including graffiti. • Utilities-In the process of getting the utilities to agree to remove graffiti from their property. These include Connex and Railtrack. • Crime Concern Project-This DETR funded project aims to prevent, reduce and tackle graffiti and vandalism on public Transport. <p>Removal Costs: 2000/01=£334,000.00 2001/02=£390,000.00</p> <p>Recommendations: The council would like to see an endorsed strategy to combat “enviro-crime”; Property owners enforced by law to clean graffiti from their property; More court time for hearing enviro-crime cases; Magistrates more aware of the impact on the environment and awarding stiffer penalties; Community service orders made by the courts.</p>
London Borough of Merton	<p>All reports of graffiti and the actions taken are recorded on a computerised complaints and contract management system. Target times for removal for Housing Department are 12 hours for racist/offensive graffiti and 5 days for all other graffiti; for the Leisure Department 48 hours for racist/offensive graffiti and 14 days for other graffiti; for Highways 48 hours for racist/offensive graffiti and there is no set response time for non-offensive graffiti.</p> <p>Graffiti usually occurs in remote quiet areas such as back alleyways, footpaths, industrial areas etc. There has in recent years been a noticeable spread into more public areas such as residential roads, the fringe of town centres, routes to schools, bus stops, stations etc. The reoccurrence of graffiti on highway equipment is relatively low.</p> <p>The problem of graffiti on private property is of increasing concern to residents. The Council offers advice and puts property owners in touch with specialist contractors who can carry out effective removal. In the badly affected areas residents are frustrated at the apparent lack of support/assistance from the Council. The Council is considering the use of S12 of the London Local Authorities Act 1995 to force property owners to remove graffiti. The Council is seeking legal clarification on the appropriateness of using these powers. They have provided a copy of their Graffiti Strategy and Action Plan.</p> <p>Cost: (includes graffiti removal by Housing, Leisure Services and Highway Services) 2000/1 = £92,000 2001/2 = £90,000</p> <p>In previous years there was no specific allocation for the removal of non-offensive graffiti from highway surfaces or equipment, but the increasing concern about the impact of graffiti on the street scene has necessitated the provision of a specific budget for highway services graffiti removal.</p> <p>Profile: Those responsible for tagging are aged 12-18 and can come from any sector of society. They maybe involved in other minor criminal activity or be members of a gang. Those involved in “artistic” graffiti tend to be older and are usually loners who are involved in graffiti for the excitement and kudos of creating a particular graffiti image in the most inaccessible dangerous locations.</p>

	<p>Best practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has developed a graffiti strategy and action plan. • Joint work with the police to carry out covert surveillance of known hotspots. Over 30 people responsible for doing graffiti were identified. • Organised training and support for volunteer residents in graffiti removal. • Appointed a graffiti project officer to act as a focal point for residents and businesses, and to develop partnerships with third parties. • Engaged a contractor to carry out removal of graffiti from the highway network 3 days a week. • Approaching the utility companies and transport operators regarding partnership working to achieve removal of graffiti from their equipment and property in conjunction with Council led initiatives.
London Borough of Newham	<p>Reports of graffiti are received from staff and the public. These reports are recorded on the Council's environment database. The database enables the monitoring of action and responses. The Council has a graffiti removal team and organic solvents are used in removal. Offensive graffiti is removed by the end of the next working day after notification. This also includes graffiti on private property and business premises. Non-offensive graffiti is removed within 3 working days. There is a small charge for the removal of non-offensive graffiti from business premises.</p> <p>Costs: £18,000 per annum (this is the contract price to the DSO). The costs are incorporated in a budget that covers other environmental services such as fly poster removal.</p>
Plymouth Council (Youth Offending Team)	<p>The Council has a small graffiti removal team. Because of the volume of graffiti, the council concentrates on removing racist or offensive graffiti. Graffiti occurs on trains, tunnels, underpasses, bridges, walkways and other quiet places. There are several magazines encouraging graffiti. Virgin Records 24/7 magazine has an article showing graffiti and offers cash prizes for published photos. A similar magazine called 'Hip-Hop' does the same. 'Graphotism' magazine is devoted entirely to graffiti.</p> <p>Profile: Most graffiti is carried out by males from mid-teens upwards. They give themselves a tag, which is their own personal sign/signature. The tag is a way of saying, "I was here".</p>
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames	<p>Compared with the rest of London the Borough has a relatively small problem with graffiti. The issue is treated seriously because of the concerns of customers. Richmond have had a specialist graffiti removal team since 1988. The council removes racist or offensive graffiti within one day and other graffiti within 7 days. The removal teams are available to clean residential property at no cost, but they encourage residents to attempt to remove it themselves first. A modest charge is made for graffiti removal from commercial property. They have an anti-graffiti co-ordination team consisting of various council departments, the Justices Clerk and the Richmond Housing Partnership.</p> <p>They have implemented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A borough wide graffiti clean up day involving volunteers. • A series of articles in a local paper to maintain public awareness. • A voluntary ban on the sale of graffiti materials to minors. • Regular local graffiti clean ups.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of surveillance equipment in targeted areas. • Use of offenders under Community Service Orders to repaint property defaced by graffiti in parks. • The Magistrates court organises an educational scheme for schools, about the operation of the courts. Graffiti is also discussed as part of this programme. The scheme covers all the schools in the Borough. • Richmond Housing partnership tackles graffiti on housing estates. • The Council works closely with residents associations and community groups. • Railtrack have been advised that the Council will take legal action to ensure that railway property (where it directly affects the street scene) is cleared of graffiti promptly. • The Police work jointly with schools to identify offenders. <p>Cost: The allocated annual budget is currently £150,000</p> <p>Recommendations: Changes to the S12 of the London Local Government Act 1995 so that Councils can recover the cost of graffiti removal work on property other than their own.</p>
<p>London Borough of Southwark Direct (Cleanteam)</p>	<p>This organisation is the in-house estate cleaning contractor for Southwark Council. They are responsible for half of the council estates. They report a 118% increase in graffiti on Southwark council estates (that they are responsible for) over recent years.</p> <p>Removal Costs: August 1995 - 2051 sq. mtrs. = £9,230 £110,760 (per annum) August 2000 - 4469 sq. mtrs. = £20,111 £241,326 (per annum)</p> <p>Profile: Male aged 8 – 20. In Southwark graffiti is committed on poor standard estates, in poorly lit areas, particularly where entrance security systems are lacking. On some estates graffiti is replaced within 24 hours of removal.</p> <p>Recommendations: joint action by councils, tenants associations and the police to target problem areas and known offenders. They also believe publicising the actual costs to individual council taxpayers would encourage the reporting of the offence.</p>
<p>London Borough of Sutton</p>	<p>Sutton have developed a strategy involving the Police, London Transport and other community projects. This includes education, arrests clean-ups, community involvement, and a poster campaign. London Transport cleaned bus shelters and buses. The Police worked with London General Buses to use covert cameras to detect offenders, leading to 15 arrests. Community projects included cleaning shop shutters, arranging for young people to paint murals on shop shutters and painting murals on graffiti prone areas. Graffiti was digitally photographed to develop a police database for prosecution purposes. The Council have also used reparation orders to get offenders to clean off their graffiti. By March 2001, 125 people were arrested and over 8000 tags were removed. The bus company is obtaining compensation from parents of offenders. The Council intends to involve retailers to control the sale of paints, markers drill bits etc. They also intend to use the local media to raise awareness of the issue and its cost to the community. The removal service is provided free of charge, but private owners are asked to make voluntary contributions.</p> <p>Recommendations: Swift removal of graffiti. On Council estates racist and offensive graffiti is dealt with within 24 hours and other graffiti is removed within a week (porous surfaces-quarterly).</p> <p>Cost: 2000/01 Clean up -£155,000 This included £35,000 for clean up on a targeted estate. 2001/02- initial allocation of £50,000 (but will</p>

	<p>need to be topped up during the year).</p> <p>Funding: From S106 money provided to the Council for environmental improvement. Graffiti was seen as sufficiently damaging to the environment to warrant the use of such funding.</p>
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	<p>The Councils policy is to remove racist/offensive graffiti within 24 hours and all other graffiti within 20 days. Graffiti occurs mostly where young people congregate e.g. stairways, outside blocks of flats.</p> <p>Cost: 2000/01 £10,500 on work orders to contractors.</p> <p>Profile: Age 11-20 There is a growing problem of young women offending.</p> <p>Best practice: Tower Hamlets are currently getting offenders to remove graffiti. This model has seen re-offending drop dramatically. Swift removal is the best answer as it sends a message to offenders that their actions will not be tolerated.</p>
London Borough of Waltham Forest	<p>Over the last three years, the borough has experienced an increase in graffiti. Council policy is to remove or cover offensive graffiti within 72 hours from the initial report. Although they do receive a lot of complaints about non-offensive graffiti, Waltham Forest only remove offensive graffiti due to limited resources. Businesses have to pay a charge for removal of offensive graffiti, but the service is free to residential property owners. The majority of graffiti occurs on bridges, underpasses and near train lines.</p>
London Borough of Wandsworth	<p>The Housing Department has responsibility for Borough wide graffiti removal. The majority of graffiti that occurs in the Borough is tagging. The Council aims to remove racist or obscene graffiti within 24 hours of notification and other forms of graffiti within 48 hours. They have experienced a growth in incidents of graffiti over the past few years. Although the police in the borough are very keen to tackle environmental crime they have a high percentage of officer vacancies and this together with the use of resources to support the anti-terrorist measures makes it difficult for more proactive policing in this area. It is also unlikely that the Crown Prosecution Service would pursue a case against a graffiti vandal particularly one who had no previous conviction.</p> <p>Concerns over health and safety have prevented greater use of graffiti removal by offenders as a sentencing outcome.</p> <p>In April 2001, the Council together with key agencies such as the Police, Youth Offending Team, Railtrack, others held a conference on graffiti. The aim of the conference was to examine the issues surrounding graffiti, the effect on the local communities and to form new strategies for tackling this problem. It was agreed at the conference to raise the profile of graffiti with appropriate government departments and agencies in an attempt to push the issue up the political agenda in the hope that early and effective action will be taken.</p> <p>Costs: 2001/02 - £625,000 2000/01 - £508,000 1999/00 - £415,000 1998/99 - £373,000 1997/98 - £360,000</p> <p>Profile: Male aged 13-17 from a variety of social and educational backgrounds.</p> <p>Best practice: Current initiatives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A graffiti hotline. • A reward scheme whereby an amount of up to £1000 can be paid for information leading to the successful prosecution of a graffiti vandal. • Enabling the reporting of graffiti by e-mail. • Regular cleaning of graffiti from Wards, the town centre and various routes through the Borough. • Educational exhibitions at the borough show

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the Junior Citizen Scheme which exposes children to the impact of crime on their lives and environment. • The Housing Department also runs a graffiti workshop. • Council tenants are advised that anti-social behaviour of themselves or their visitors could render them liable to eviction. <p>Recommendations: Compelling utility companies/statutory authorities to remove graffiti from their property or empower Local Authorities to enter land for the purpose of graffiti removal and re-charge the owners.</p> <p>Wandsworth also provided the Committee with examples of publicity materials such as key rings, pens, balloons etc. and their conference pack and a committee report that outlines the progress on dealing with graffiti in the Borough.</p>
City of Westminster	<p>Grffiti is a growing problem in Westminster, despite past and current attempts by the City Council to deal with it. Unattractive, unpleasant and frequently offensive, it degrades the City's environment, deterring businesses and visitors alike. Westminster has long suffered from the problem of graffiti despite continued attempts by the City Council to deal with it. With increasing attention on the quality of life and the built and natural environment, there is increasing emphasis being placed on addressing this issue. We have operated a number of anti-graffiti schemes over the years but now have a new unit to deal with this.</p> <p>The City Council's new Anti Graffiti and Fly-posting Unit was established on 31 July 2001. Its responsibilities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying sites with graffiti or fly posting. • Dealing with reports from other staff such as our Street Environment Managers. • Responding to reports from others, such as residents and businesses contacting us through the City Council's Environment Action Line. • Gathering evidence, making Land Registry searches to establish ownership. • Interviewing people for possible prosecution, and attending Court. • Attending site clear-ups. • Serving of statutory notices on responsible persons. • Rigorously pursuing enforcement action against the perpetrators. • Commissioning the removal of graffiti and fly posting by the Council's approved removal contractor or through existing arrangements such as the City Council's cleansing contracts. • Working with property owners, managing agents and other agencies to introduce preventative measures to stop graffiti and fly-posting re-occurring. • Ensuring that graffiti is removed from all private property in co-operation with property owners. • Raising awareness through publicity campaigns in order to promote the Council's graffiti/fly-posting service and minimise the nuisance. <p>In response to your specific queries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current budget for the Graffiti and Fly-posting Unit is £200,000 p.a. (the costs of these two related services are not readily separated). • Depending on the surface, typical charges for graffiti removal range from £3 to £6 per square metre. • Incidents of graffiti are identified by the Anti Graffiti and Fly-posting Unit itself, and by Westminster's 54 Street Environment Managers. Incidents are also notified to the City Council by the general public and by businesses. The City Council has a reporting hot-line and e-mail address specifically for this issue. All incidents are recorded on a comprehensive database. • Since inception of the new Anti Graffiti and Fly-posting Unit (c. 5 months) it has received 762 inquiries concerning graffiti and 388 sites have been cleared. The City Council is building case files on all known "tags" being used in the City and court cases are imminent with two individuals already being charged for Criminal damage.

TRANSPORT COMPANIES

<p>Arriva</p>	<p>The area most vulnerable to graffiti is the upper saloon rear section of a double decker. The majority of graffiti is committed in the early evening after school hours. The damage to vehicles includes etching of windows and throwing objects at moving buses. Arriva have used a variety of strategies to deal with graffiti. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of a Schools Liaison Officer (SLO) whose primary role is education. He talks to children about the effects of graffiti and vandalism and works with Junior Citizen programmes and local Youth Offending Teams. The SLO assists Transport for London (TfL) and the Police on street operations. • Recovery of compensation from families of children caught spreading graffiti. These are via agreements made outside of the court system. This produces a swift remedy for the company and the child avoids a criminal record. • Pursuing action against companies who promote graffiti through their products. For example, Woolworth's withdrew sales of the Taga-Boys toy from their UK stores and ITC upheld a complaint and withdrew an advert for a CD that featured a youth perpetrating graffiti. Arriva have also tried to convince Sega Dreamcast to withdraw their Jet Set Radio game from sale in the UK (this game involves youths tagging buildings before being caught by police). Arriva were not successful in this, but succeeded in bringing the matter to the attention of Edward Davey MP who subsequently met with Sega representatives. Arriva have also complained to various agencies about Graphotism Distribution Ltd (mail order firm for graffiti equipment). They have not been successful in restricting the operations of this company. (A copy of Graphotism magazine is available). • Installing CCTV on some buses. • Taking out successful private prosecutions against perpetrators of graffiti. <p>Profile: Children between the ages of 11-15, largely from deprived backgrounds. They may be gang members or lone individuals (often seeking gang membership).</p> <p>Costs: 1997/98 approx. £300,000 per annum 2001 approx. £450,000 per annum</p> <p>Recommendations: Prosecution of offenders and tougher sentencing. The Crown Prosecution Service is not always willing to instigate court proceedings. Graffiti is given a low priority by the courts and the police and the cost of private prosecutions is prohibitive. The offence needs to be taken more seriously.</p> <p>The GLA or TfL should appoint an officer who would be would responsible for pursuing offenders through the courts on behalf of all public transport operators. This would then enable the operators to increase investment in preventative measures. Arriva believe a multi-strategy approach is needed. Graffiti will not be eliminated by a single tactic.</p>
---------------	--

<p>Go Ahead Group</p>	<p>Graffiti occurs on the buses after school, early evenings, and weekends and holidays from 11.00am to mid-evening. Mondays and Tuesdays suffer the least damage. Few parts of the bus are exempt from attacks. Graffiti is done with marker pens, spray paints and glue sticks. Etching is done with small grinding stones, broken spark plugs etc. It makes the buses look old, dirty and uncared-for. There is also the potential for passengers clothing to get marked and soiled. It results in a reluctance to use public transport and creates an atmosphere of insecurity. The company has 35 vehicles fitted with CCTV and pinhole cameras. The company works closely with the police and passes evidence to them. The best results are achieved with police divisions that provide a dedicated officer. In Sutton over the last six months approximately 100 arrests were made, 12 court cases were heard and there was a noticeable decline in graffiti. At Bexleyheath 14 cases were presented to the police in 2 weeks. Rather than issue a formal reprimand, culprits receive a final caution if caught for the first time, otherwise they are processed through the court. Letters are also sent to parents of culprits seeking recovery of the costs of the damage. The company does not support the idea of legal graffiti walls. Go Ahead Group believe the graffiti spreads to other surroundings when a wall is full. They experienced this at the Danson Show and at London Borough of Merton's Car Free day activities. In both instances the legal wall became full and the bus was targeted instead. The company feels that the courts are out of touch with the problem. Compensation awarded by the courts is far below the real costs of damage. Go Ahead Group are trying to arrange for a magistrate to visit one of the garages to see the damage. The personal impact on the culprits is greater when they pay for the damage as this reduces their spending power.</p> <p>Cost: Approximately. £7,000 per week including parts and labour.</p> <p>Profile: Youths aged between 12-16 years, male and female equally mixed. Young people are often ignorant of the fact that graffiti is a crime. They believe they cannot be prosecuted because of their age and that the government pays for cleaning and repairs through the tax system.</p>
<p>London Underground Limited (LUL)</p>	<p>London Underground have a current strategy of prevention and prosecution. They work in partnership with the British Transport Police (BTP). BTP have a team of specialist police officers who are dedicated to investigating graffiti crimes. They use various techniques including the collation of a database of graffiti tags, covert surveillance, provision of crime prevention and reduction advice and the establishment of effective contacts with Local Authorities and other national and international police forces. LUL have invested millions of pounds over the last ten years in preventative measures. 85% of rolling stock now has paintwork which allows rapid removal of graffiti and rolling stock depots have physical security installations that make access for offenders more difficult. Graffiti is removed by cleaning contractors with tight performance measures. Graffiti on station premises is removed within 24 hours and is carried out as part of the cleaning and maintenance regime.</p> <p>Graffiti on trackside infrastructure is extremely expensive and logistically difficult to remove. This work can only be carried out at night and removal is often followed by swift re-application of graffiti. LUL has conducted customer research and has discovered that customers put more value on having graffiti free stations and trains than they do on having graffiti free trackside infrastructure. LUL therefore concentrates on removing station and train based graffiti.</p> <p>The number of reported graffiti crimes has steadily reduced from nearly 900 in 1990 to less than 150 in 2000/01. However, many vandals are now switching to etching train windows. Etched windows are only replaced if the graffiti is offensive. Total replacement of glass is estimated to cost between £15 and £20 million.</p> <p>Graffiti results in trains being cancelled and delays to maintenance work. Their strategy only limits the problem of graffiti. LUL believe that it is time to consider the wider social and cultural issues associated with graffiti, with one option being to decriminalise the activity when it is carried out in an acceptable and managed way.</p>

	<p>Profile: Aged between 14-19. A small number are aged up to 30. They believe that their work is a form of art or a way of expressing themselves and gaining credibility from their peers.</p> <p>Cost: £2.5 Million per annum</p>																					
London United Busways Ltd.	<p>Operates in Southwest London. Currently installing CCTV on vehicles. Buses are targeted when parked overnight and damaged by spraying and etching. They work with the police, youth offending teams, schools and Local Authorities. The company has developed a youth awareness programme for schools; agreed with certain schools to stagger leaving times; provided school buses; and arranged for perpetrators to clean buses on Saturdays. The company is receiving compensation via the courts and the perpetrator's parents. They have noticed a reduction in the number of repeat offenders and incidents of graffiti and are using the powers under the new Youth Justice Scheme. London United Busways Ltd. included a copy of the London Borough of Kingston upon Thames graffiti strategy and their Bus Quality Commitment document.</p> <table> <tr> <td>Costs per garage:</td> <td>Fulwell</td> <td>£200,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Hounslow</td> <td>£120,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Houslow Heath</td> <td>£60,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Stamford Brook</td> <td>£60,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Shephards Bush</td> <td>£100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Kingston</td> <td>£75,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total cost 00/01</td> <td>£615,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>The costs include removing and repairing seats, replacing etched windows, labour costs, costs of contract cleaning and loss of revenue whilst the bus is being repaired. A new bus costs approximately £140,000 and the company would prefer that the money spent on graffiti be used for the purchase of new buses.</p>	Costs per garage:	Fulwell	£200,000		Hounslow	£120,000		Houslow Heath	£60,000		Stamford Brook	£60,000		Shephards Bush	£100,000		Kingston	£75,000		Total cost 00/01	£615,000
Costs per garage:	Fulwell	£200,000																				
	Hounslow	£120,000																				
	Houslow Heath	£60,000																				
	Stamford Brook	£60,000																				
	Shephards Bush	£100,000																				
	Kingston	£75,000																				
	Total cost 00/01	£615,000																				
Metroline plc	<p>Graffiti comes in many forms including the spraying of paint on buses, etching of windows and the painting and marking of seat backs and side panels. There is also a growing trend of setting light to seat backs. The spray painting normally takes place during the night by people who illegally enter the garage premises. The company employs various preventative measures including providing security for the depots during the night. The company states that the police seem reluctant to attend the garages when contacted and when they do attend it is often some considerable time after the event. Metroline do not believe the level of graffiti has increased but state that the level of more permanent graffiti damage has. Graffiti is now often permanently damaging partly due to the chemicals in the paints/markers and sometimes in the surfaces written on. The company remove graffiti as soon as possible. They have enhanced cleaning arrangements in 6 of their 8 garages with more emphasis on daily cleaning including graffiti removal.</p> <p>Preventative Measures: Security at some bus depots during the night. Use of materials and colour schemes that minimise the problem.</p> <p>Costs: Graffiti costs the company more than £200,000 per year in materials and labour costs.</p>																					
Stagecoach London	<p>Costs: Removing normal graffiti costs approx. £250,000 per annum. They also have a growing problem with etching on windows. Replacing etched glass costs approx. 500,000 per annum on the basis of replacing the glass once a year. To replace glass every three months will cost over £2million per annum. In certain areas new buses have all their glass etched within a week of entering service. They have installed CCTV on some buses. The majority of the damage is done by children under the age of criminal responsibility. They do not believe the issue of graffiti is taken seriously by the courts.</p>																					

<p>Transport for London (TfL)</p>	<p>Transport for London's various panels, committees and board provide a mechanism through which any major issue regarding graffiti can be brought to the attention of decision makers. The responsibility for dealing with graffiti is divided between the various businesses.</p> <p>SURFACE TRANSPORT</p> <p>London Buses (including East Thames buses) Graffiti on the buses and on bus property is a major problem. Removal of graffiti from buses is the responsibility of the contractors. No information is available that allows a proper estimate to be made of the true cost of graffiti including soft issues such as adverse passenger reactions to graffiti. There is no robust information on the costs of cleaning as this is usually incorporated within the overall cost of the cleaning contracts, however the cost of removing offensive graffiti on a special basis is approximately £100,000 per annum. There is anecdotal evidence that suggests that instances of graffiti are increasing in both volume and the areas in which it occurs. The agreed code of practice states that following notification, graffiti will be removed from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bus stations - within 1 month or 24 hours if offensive; • bus stops as - soon as is practicable or within 24 hours if offensive or extensive; • bus shelters - within two weeks or 24 hours if offensive or extensive. <p>Tramlink Generally the trams do not suffer significant levels of graffiti. At tram stops graffiti is removed within 24 hours if extensive or offensive. The graffiti on trams is cleaned within the general cleaning regime, unless offensive in which case it is cleaned within 24 hours.</p> <p>London River Service There is no current problem with graffiti. Festival Pier has been affected, but any graffiti found is immediately removed.</p> <p>Victoria Coach Station Graffiti is not perceived to be a major problem and is dealt with immediately as part of the general cleaning regime.</p> <p>Public Carriage Office There are no problems with graffiti.</p> <p>Surface Transport Initiatives There has been a major investment in CCTV, which now covers virtually all bus stations, tram stops and London River Service piers. New Quality Incentive Contracts are being introduced which will give the bus operators a contractual obligation to remove graffiti from buses. TfL works closely with the police, but detection of offenders is a major problem. At present London Buses is engaged in various initiatives to increase passenger security. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation Seneca—involving Revenue Protection Inspectors, and police officers in deterring and catching vandals. • An increasing number of buses installing CCTV. • A major schools programme called Buswise which is part of the Junior Citizens programme and is to be extended to all areas of London. <p>DOCKLANDS LIGHT RAILWAY Trains are not allowed onto the system with graffiti. Where a train with graffiti is allowed to travel on the network, it does not count towards</p>
-----------------------------------	---

	<p>the performance targets of the franchisee. Consequently there is little or no graffiti on the DLR.</p> <p>STREET MANAGEMENT There is a problem with graffiti on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). Graffiti occurs in different locations including in the close vicinity of schools, on subways, footbridges, walls and street furniture. There are no separate costs recorded, although graffiti removal costs £13.00 per square metre. There is a cleaning programme and photographs are taken of extreme and offensive graffiti to assist with prosecution. Once notified offensive graffiti is immediately removed. It is difficult to control graffiti on the TLRN because of the open nature of the road system.</p> <p>TRANSPORT INTERCHANGES Policy and projects are currently being developed to encourage the reduction of graffiti at these locations. The Best Practice Guidelines published by TfL in Jan 2001 recommends guidelines to help reduce the occurrence of graffiti. TfL are also developing a pilot study to improve personal security at seven transport interchanges.</p>
--	---

POLICE/LAW ENFORCEMENT

<p>British Transport Police (BTP)</p>	<p>Graffiti is seen as an indication of a deprived area lacking in authoritative supervision by the forces of law and order where criminal activity is allowed to flourish. The railways are seen as a fair target for those who believe that they are cheering up the dark and drab embankments and underpasses. Graffiti can occur anywhere and at any time. The BTP Graffiti Unit has found that graffiti offences diminish when the leaders of known graffiti gangs are apprehended. The graffiti Unit has a computer database within which details of all known tags and offenders are logged, this assists in identifying persistent offenders and graffiti hotspots. The Graffiti Unit is a “hub” nationally, for the gathering and distribution of graffiti related information for all Metropolitan Police Boroughs and County forces.</p> <p>Profile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School children who may daub surfaces to and from school. • Premeditated offenders who carry marker pens and spray paint with an intention to tag walls or other high profile surfaces. An individual or a group may do graffiti. • Seasoned writers who pride themselves as “artists”. They will daub any large wall or train carriage with complex and multicoloured large-scale murals. Photographs of their work are taken and sent to graffiti magazines. <p>The aim is for the graffiti to be seen widely. The majority of offenders are between 14 and 19. A smaller number are up to 30 years of age. Most are male, although there are a small number of female offenders but they are not involved to the extent of their male counterparts. After 20 years of age the majority of offenders move on to other criminal activity or more lawful pursuits. Offenders have been known to travel from other countries in Europe to daub the underground system.</p> <p>Costs: Estimated at £1.2 million per year. Painted graffiti is being superseded by etching.</p> <p>Best practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining security of fencing at train depots.
---------------------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patrolling guards at train depots. • Use of specific anti-graffiti paint on train carriages • Removing rolling stock from circulation to clean graffiti. • Swift removal of graffiti from walls and other surfaces. <p>Further Preventative Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education at junior and primary ages. • Deterring Local Authorities from providing authorised graffiti sites. These have been seen as a practice ground for future offenders • Highlighting graffiti issues during magistrates training so as to ensure appropriate penalties are awarded. • Prohibiting the sale of aerosol spray paint to those aged under 18. • Swift removal of graffiti to prevent the broken window effect. • Increasing police powers of stop and search for items that could be used in criminal damage. <p>Statistics for London Statistics for graffiti have only been recorded as a separate category since 1998.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>No. of Offences</th> <th>Detected</th> <th>Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998</td> <td>589</td> <td>172</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999</td> <td>684</td> <td>185</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000</td> <td>676</td> <td>200</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Accidents/Injuries This information is not specifically captured on the database, but in April 2001 an 18 year old male was struck and killed by a passing train whilst in the act of spraying graffiti.</p>	Year	No. of Offences	Detected	Rate	1998	589	172	29%	1999	684	185	27%	2000	676	200	30%
Year	No. of Offences	Detected	Rate														
1998	589	172	29%														
1999	684	185	27%														
2000	676	200	30%														
Bromley Police	<p>Graffiti, abandoned vehicles and other 'quality of life' issues have assumed high priority in Bromley in recent months. Bromley police are leading on developing a multi-agency strategy on behalf of the Bromley Community Safety Partnership. It was quickly apparent that although these issues all impact on quality of life, they were best dealt with separately as they have very different features for example vehicles are abandoned by adults & motive is often commercial, whilst graffiti is generally a youth issue. Bromley police set up a separate Graffiti Group & Abandoned Vehicle Group. From the outset it was assumed that, to be successful, their strategy needed to address graffiti simultaneously on a number of fronts - Diversion/Education, Physical Removal/Prevention, Intelligence Led Activity, Criminal Justice and Marketing.</p> <p>The police gathered as broad a group of players together as they could, threw a lot of ideas around, and came up with a draft Action Plan. The Group then split up into 5 topic groups to focus on developing the 5 strands. Strand groups were asked to come back with firm, detailed proposals on where energies would need to be focussed in the coming months. Work on many of the themes has been started and is ongoing. The biggest frustration found on starting this is the lack of information/knowledge on why the youngsters do it. There is probably no one answer and probably no single motivation. There are those who see graffiti as art and want opportunities to display their talents [this tends to be the mural type of graffiti]. Others seem to go for kicks - where can they get their tag displayed. Peer pressure plays a part. There is also the more serious type of damage - etching.</p> <p>Graffiti is not a separate offence logged on police crime systems. If reported it is logged on as criminal damage. Retrieving information on offences reported/cleared up was thus tricky. A search was made of the Bromley police database using words such as graffiti and etching.</p>																

	<p>Relatively few offences are actually reported to police. Most are reported to the Council who take responsibility for cleaning it up. Getting a definitive picture is thus not possible. The Bromley Police have now placed a tag on graffiti offences on CRIS which will make their data easier to retrieve in future.</p> <p>A typical offender - those arrested over the first 6 months or so of 2001- were all males, between 14 and 17. The numbers were small - circa 28 in 6 months. Most [12] were arrested for the first time and hence dealt with by reprimand. Eight others were finally warned and eight charged to court. The court cases were not straightforward – graffiti [or possession of material to cause] not necessarily the main offence dealt with. The Bromley Police are not aware of any deaths/serious injuries suffered or caused by graffiti artists at roadside in Bromley. Bromley Police have developed software and are about to pilot a local database of tags. There have mixed views on the usefulness of this. Why would they be doing it? For intelligence purposes or evidential purposes? Is it cost effective? The doubt arises as - anecdotally – they have heard that a tag is not unique to an individual - a group of people may use the same tag. Hence - evidentially, they cannot prove that an offender is responsible for all occasions a tag appears. They are considering putting a group of offences to an arrested individual to see if he/she admits them but is this worth the work involved in running/maintaining a database? Bromley Police’s reaction is to pilot a database for a few months and reassess things. The software needed even to run a local database apparently needs to be quite powerful. They want to run this pilot as best they can and are looking for some help.</p> <p>Each Borough has its own local priorities. In Bromley, police rate anti-social behaviour very high on their priorities and include graffiti in this. However, as with everything, resources are in short supply. If the issues in the Bromley Police action plan are to be progressed they will need money. Diversion/intervention initiatives are really important but need funding. The Youth Services are extremely important - but seem very poorly funded. Our local Council is seeking to make all sorts of cuts to save money. The police would like to see far more speedy clean up of graffiti, followed by a much greater use of 'anti graffiti' coatings which are expensive, and then empower residents, through Neighbourhood Watch which have circa 30,000 households involved, including Residents Associations, etc] to effect further instant cleanups by providing them with graffiti removal kits. All this takes monies not available. The police would like to see more done to involve the youngsters themselves. For example junior resident association committees. Bromley Police state that they should consult, empower and involve businesses and residents to try and engender a sense of pride and ownership that seems to have gone by the board.</p>
Magistrates Association (Youth Courts Committee)	<p>Graffiti was predominately a city issue, but has now spread to suburban areas. The Association recognises that Local Authorities are spending increasing amounts of money on cleaning graffiti. Very few offenders appear in court. Catching offenders is difficult and it is difficult to prove intent even when materials are found on the person. Both the police and transport companies tend to issue final warnings and reprimands in preference to court action. Civil action is also taken to seek financial compensation through the parents.</p> <p>The charge brought to criminal courts is criminal damage and unless the graffiti is of a racial nature it is regarded as low in seriousness. The sentencing options for the court will vary depending upon the risk of re-offending. These options are: conditional discharge, fines, paying compensation or reparation orders.</p> <p>Profile: It is a crime committed predominantly by 14 and 15 year olds, but offenders can be as young as 10 and have been known to be 55. There is no racial or financial background particular to offenders. When questioned in court as to why they committed the offence reasons given included boredom; to impress friends; 'its an art form'; 'it isn't really a serious crime'.</p>

<p>Metropolitan Police Service</p>	<p>In their response the Met. state that the British Transport Police maintain a database of tags found on the Underground. The Met. believe that a similar London wide database would be extremely helpful and would be useful for intelligence gathering and sharing information.</p> <p>Profile: Low level-use pens, spray cans or etch windows. They are usually aged between 12 and 16, with no history of offending. Once caught they receive a formal or final warning following arrest. Repeat serious graffiti offenders-these are serial offenders. They are often found in gangs and are usually involved in other offences such as street robbery, criminal damage and drugs. In some cases the crimes are committed to purchase graffiti materials. Both types of offenders come from a mix of ethnic backgrounds and are both male and female. They are from diverse social and economic backgrounds and have different backgrounds in schooling and education.</p> <p>Statistics: Criminal damage in which graffiti was a feature of the offence:</p> <table> <tr> <td>1997/98</td> <td>204</td> <td>crimes</td> <td>detected</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998/99</td> <td>516</td> <td>"</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999/00</td> <td>509</td> <td>"</td> <td>"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000/01</td> <td>655</td> <td>"</td> <td>"</td> </tr> </table> <p>They do not have specific data relating to serious injury and death, however there is anecdotal evidence that assaults and injuries involving perpetrators is common. Last year an altercation between two graffiti artists led to one of them being stabbed to death.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid removal - various Local Authorities have protocols for the speedy removal of racist or obscene graffiti. • The Stad Wacht warden scheme in Holland - wardens patrol city estates and report incidences of graffiti. Rapid removal of graffiti is carried out within a day. Police wardens and surveillance officers carry out this function in city centres such as in Amsterdam. They provide a visible uniform presence and act as a deterrent. The city has a noticeable absence of graffiti in public places and transport. • Removing Graffiti in designated areas. This approach of removing all graffiti in a designated area in one go should be provided free of charge. It makes an immediate visible and significant impact and reassures the community that they are safe and secure. The presence of graffiti sends a message to criminals that such areas are "their areas". Graffiti is a crime generator and blights communities. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full partnership approach. The police role would be co-ordination of patrols, intelligence gathering, information sharing and enforcement. • Amendment of S1 of Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 to allow the police to stop and search individuals reasonably suspected of carrying articles for use in tagging and graffiti. The current legislation does not allow the power to stop, search and seize articles for use in causing criminal damage. • Amendment of S115 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 so that all businesses and companies would have a statutory duty to consider and work towards crime and disorder reduction. This would then assist in proactive graffiti removal and joint working with public authorities. 	1997/98	204	crimes	detected	1998/99	516	"	"	1999/00	509	"	"	2000/01	655	"	"
1997/98	204	crimes	detected														
1998/99	516	"	"														
1999/00	509	"	"														
2000/01	655	"	"														

National Probation Service	<p>The National Probation Service state that graffiti offenders are hard to catch. When offenders are caught the graffiti is usually incidental to the offence which has led to their coming to the attention of the law. There is very little evidence in the area of offender profiles.</p> <p>Specific Projects Using Offenders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Estates Project in Islington uses offenders to clean estates and trains caretakers in the removal and control of graffiti.• Islington has a rolling programme of projects in Tower Hamlets and Islington.• The Safer Schools Programme involves the painting out of graffiti by groups of offenders on Community Punishment Orders.• The Rivers Cleaning programme includes two canal boats staffed by offenders who clean up graffiti especially around the Little Venice and the Camden Lock areas.• The Safer Stations Programme includes the removal of graffiti.• The Mobile Graffiti Groups project is still under development, but will include the use of offenders on graffiti removal teams.• Police Co-operation: Graffiti tags are photographed and transferred to the police to for the identification and capture of offenders.
----------------------------	---

SCHOOLS/ ACADEMICS/EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

<p>Dr Kurt Iveson Dept. of Geography University of Durham</p>	<p>Dr Iveson has conducted academic research into public policy responses to hip hop culture and graffiti in Sydney and Perth. He also participated in a graffiti project in Sydney that was set up to test the merits of providing legal graffiti opportunities for juvenile graffiti offenders. He states that it is the geography of certain kinds of graffiti that make it a regulatory problem rather than an issue of personal or artistic taste. The core problem with graffiti is where it is written. Graffiti attracts regulatory attention because it is unauthorised writing on specific urban surfaces. Ownership of these surfaces is supposed to guarantee exclusive control of their appearance. Graffiti has transgressed the exclusivity of this control. Regulatory authorities also group together a vast and diverse array of textual and artistic practices as the “graffiti problem”. These different forms of graffiti may have very little in common and may include for example, a tag on a housing estate, a colourful mural on a railway line, a political slogan painted on an advertising billboard, a racist message on a shop window etc. All of these instances of graffiti are likely to have been written by very different people, with very different aspirations. Any attempt to find a simple or final “solution” to the graffiti problem will invariably produce very blunt policy instruments that are not sensitive to the diverse range of practices and motivations of those who write different kinds of graffiti. More sophisticated and inclusionary policies must be developed and politically defended.</p> <p>Calls for war on graffiti are based on dubious assumptions about graffiti writers. In particular there is little evidence to suggest a serious or direct connection between graffiti and violence. Some members of the community may nonetheless have the perception that graffiti signals a threat to their personal safety. These perceptions may be inaccurate, but they are important and must be addressed by the regulatory authorities. The experience of cities like New York and Sydney over the last thirty years suggest that there is no technological solution to the graffiti problem, no weapon that will finally win the war. In New York for example, graffiti was primarily found on the subway, until new cleaning technologies made regular cleaning of rolling stock a possibility. The reduction in graffiti on the subway system was matched with an increase of graffiti in other parts of the city. Wars on graffiti are effectively wars on certain young people who come to be defined as enemies and are unfairly made the scapegoats of apparent declines of shared community values. Harsh penalties from graffiti offences also bring more young people into contact with the criminal justice system, an outcome that contradicts more progressive efforts to prevent juvenile crime.</p> <p>After the failure of the all out wars on graffiti, some authorities have sought to develop a better understanding of the motivations and aspirations of graffiti writers through specialist police units established to gather intelligence about graffiti subcultures. Specialist anti-graffiti police operations usually co-exist with the more general anti-graffiti measures. This will result in an intensification of competition between urban authorities and some graffiti writers. When police attempt to gather intelligence about graffiti with the sole intent of arresting graffiti writers, this pushes graffiti cultures even further underground.</p> <p>Those who oppose harsh regulatory measures often propose the provision of outlets for legal graffiti as an alternative solution to the graffiti problem. Whatever form s such projects might take, their defining characteristic is that they seek to address the graffiti problem by opening up alternative spaces for graffiti, rather than seeking to eliminate graffiti entirely. They attempt to shift the geography of graffiti through engagement with young people and their cultures rather than through coercion. Community based efforts to provide opportunities for legal graffiti engage directly with young people involved in writing graffiti. In contrast to wars on graffiti they add to the social and cultural opportunities available to young people, rather than seeking to punish and further marginalise those who are involved in writing graffiti. Legal graffiti projects may provide opportunities for employment and for young people to develop a range of skills. Significantly, community-based projects also assist some young people to make connections with wider service networks within their community, such as housing assistance or youth health. A second strength of these programs is that they can be place specific, thus taking into account the diversity of graffiti writing practices and contexts. Different programs can be developed in different contexts –from commercial spaces, public transport networks, to housing estates etc and they can be tailored to suit these various context. The provision of space for legal graffiti is not a panacea, however. Most obviously, it tends to work best with graffiti associated with hip hop culture. But beyond this stimulation, there is a range of potential difficulties with the use of these projects as solutions to the graffiti problem. Some police authorities have seen legal graffiti projects as</p>
---	---

	<p>legitimate a perfect opportunity for intelligence gathering – it is hoped that individual graffiti writers might be attracted to these projects and then captured. However these projects will only be able to engage young people if they can establish the trust of various networks of graffiti writers.</p> <p>The experience in Sydney suggests that legal graffiti programmes can result in reductions in problem graffiti in particular places. Legal graffiti murals written by writers from respected community projects can reduce the likelihood that a wall will be constantly tagged by other writers. The experience suggests that this method of reducing unwanted tagging is also far cheaper than other technological measures. However legal graffiti will undoubtedly continue to exist alongside illegal graffiti rather than completely replacing it. If support for community based projects is conditional solely on their ability to curtail illegal graffiti, the projects are being set up to fail.</p> <p>The motivations of graffiti writers, the kind of graffiti that they write and the meanings attached to that graffiti by other Londoners are all quite diverse. It should by now be clear that there are no single answers to questions posed by the Committee in its invitation for written evidence. Different forms of graffiti may have very little in common, other than the fact that they are considered to be a problem in need of a solution. Thus the decisions facing the committee with regard to graffiti policies are neither clear nor easy. Policy options should be judged according to their ability to deal with a diverse range of graffiti practices. In particular the GLA should resist any pressure to wage war on graffiti and graffiti writers. While responses underpinned by a law and order focus will give the appearance of a local authority that is doing something, this something is unlikely to succeed on its own terms and is likely to involve escalating financial and social costs. Options that provide cultural and economic alternatives to young people through their local communities are preferable to those that seek to eliminate graffiti and catch graffiti writers. In reviewing its approach to graffiti the GLA has the opportunity to develop and lobby for policy responses that can address the diverse geographies of graffiti.</p> <p>Dr Iveson has also provided a copy of chapter 5 of his research titled “Anonymous fame “:Graffiti in Sydney, 1986-1999.</p>
Staffan Jacobson Ph.D.	Mr Jacobson’s personal thoughts are that harm reduction and constructive response seem to be more successful than zero tolerance policing.
Axel Thiel Kassel, Germany	<p>Has conducted over 25 years of research into graffiti. Mr Thiel writes that Graffiti has been in existence for 50,000 years. It has become a form of expression and via the internet and created a new profession. Graffiti became prevalent in society with the creation of colour spray paint. The graffiti/graffiti removal industry is now annually worth 50 billion dollars globally. Annual cleaning costs for the US alone amount to \$15 billion. In trying to develop a solution, contradicting interests are not taken into consideration and so graffiti remains prevalent. There is no perfect solution to graffiti. Germany is slowly adopting a policy of having unemployed persons working on professional cleaning units. Graffiti is an indicator of social problems i.e. lack of work, lack of economic opportunities, playgrounds etc.</p> <p>In a social context graffiti acts as an early warning signal to society indicating the need for change. This is particularly the case in politically uncertain times. Graffiti is part of a modern complex society and if totally eradicated would be replaced by riots and social disorder.</p> <p>Recommends: Growing live greenery in front of walls, providing legal walls for the graffiti (although he states that this would not totally prevent graffiti.)</p> <p>International Work Group on graffiti – http://people.freenet.de/graffitiforschung.de/Ksurl.htm</p>
University of Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit	Profile: Young people. It provides them with an opportunity to make their mark on the environment when the scope to make a mark in other ways is limited. Swift removal of graffiti seems to be effective and in a particular case it appeared to reduce other forms of vandalism as well.

BUSINESSES/CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Action Against Graffiti	<p>Action Against Graffiti has been set up to develop practical solutions to eradicating graffiti. This would be done through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting the controlled sale of aerosol paints through responsible retailing and responsible manufacturing. • Stop making factory-filled spray paints so easy to obtain by minors by forcing shopkeepers to store aerosol paints under the proper conditions. • Remove existing graffiti using dry mineral cleaning equipment. This uses no chemicals and is environmentally friendly • Use of anti-graffiti coatings. • The company is currently looking to develop paint that stores solar energy during the day and emits a bluish white light after dark. • Use tags to identify offenders. • Provision of legalised graffiti spaces. • Residents or shopkeepers who leave graffiti sprayed n their walls may be contravening the planning rules and should be forced to remove it. • Use of bridge baffles to prevent access to railway and road bridges. <p>These initiatives could be funded from the profit gained from the sale of each spray can. Alternatively existing property insurance may cover the damage caused by graffiti. This could be discussed with the British Insurers Association.</p>
Adshel	<p>Adshel provides street furniture and outdoor advertising including advertising at bus shelters. They have experienced an increase in incidents of graffiti. In some areas of London it has increased by as much as 50%. They aim to remove offensive graffiti within 2 hours. Graffiti occurs in low traffic areas, low pedestrian environments, and dark environments in and around large housing estates or garage areas. Common forms of graffiti include graffiti art (graffiti using colour spray and paint) and tagging or etching (vandalism of glass or plastic). The most prolific form of graffiti is tagging. This is reapplied more often due to its simplicity. It is prevalent in areas where there are few facilities for young people. Tagging is common in local school environments and both tippex and felt tip markers are used. Graffiti increases during school holidays. A growing problem is etching. Areas with high incidences of etching include Croydon, Merton and Kingston. Evidence suggests it started in South/South west London and is now prevalent across the whole of London Etching is very difficult to correct and requires complete replacement of the glass or plastic.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Swift removal: Adshel have a 24-hour hotline to receive reports from the public, authorities etc They have three maintenance teams for graffiti and flyposting removal. The teams have planned routes covering areas where graffiti is most prevalent.</p> <p>Community based initiatives: Adshel have worked with Neighbourhood Watch schemes. They have also working with DETR Neighbourhood Wardens outside London to assist in hot-spot identification and vandalism reporting. They intend to extend this programme to other areas. Adshel support community schemes for young people through the provision of activities. They are also working with DETR Crime concern to explore the best approaches to dealing with street crime. They have worked with Groundwork UK on education and regeneration initiatives and are currently considering involvement with rehabilitation schemes for young offenders.</p> <p>Costs: For the year 2000 more than £250,000 was spent on graffiti and fly posting removal. These figures are for advertising shelters alone. In productivity terms, graffiti results in loss of over 7% of London maintenance resources.</p>

Back to Base	<p>Back to Base started business in 1991 by selling imported graffiti remover to Local Authorities. The business expanded to include graffiti removal. Over the last ten years the company has seen an increase in the incidents of graffiti. The company provides a 24 hour response time to offensive or racist graffiti. They photograph every square metre removed, both before and after. These photographs are then sent to clients. The company provides free estimates for the removal of non-offensive graffiti. It is the company's opinion that graffiti has been around since 5000BC and cannot be stopped, but can be reduced by frequent removal and making examples of people caught applying graffiti.</p>
ECO Solutions Ltd.	<p>ECO Solutions Ltd manufactures and markets coating removal products including a graffiti remover (Graffiti Go). They have seen a rise in graffiti over the last five years and the graffiti remover is one of their fastest growing products. They have carried out research and developed a safe graffiti remover that can be used on all surfaces. They sell more products in Europe than in the UK and believe that this may be because other countries in Europe are more prepared to remove graffiti and are more educated in safe removal products than in Britain.</p> <p>Recommendations: Anti-graffiti education programmes (especially at a young age). Perpetrators of graffiti should be made to remove it. They do not believe that the total prevention of graffiti is possible. Website: www.ecosolutions.co.uk</p>
Hubdean Specialist Coatings	<p>Hubdean Specialist Coatings produces an anti-graffiti product known as Agproshield. It is a specialist anti-graffiti coating which is an encapsulation system. The existing surface or paint is mechanically scraped back and then covered with Agproshield. It is designed to protect communal areas, high rise buildings, hospitals, housing estates, car parks, schools and other buildings. The company states that it is 100% graffiti proof and is currently used by various London boroughs. The company also provides 24 months free graffiti maintenance with the use of their product.</p>
Investigator Training Services Ltd.	<p>Graffiti is an organised criminal offence committed by a small number of serial offenders. It is an easily detected crime because the clothes and room contents etc will contain paint and graffiti equipment. Few cases are brought to court and judges do not view graffiti as a serious offence and therefore small fines /punishments are inevitable.</p> <p>Relevant Legislation: <u>The Police and The Criminal Damages Act 1971</u> –requires the evidence of one witness or circumstantial evidence such as graffiti equipment, paint , samples of graffiti on books etc.</p> <p><u>Highways Act 1980.</u> If an offender is taken to court and found not guilty the police or prosecution can ask for compensation and should properly cost the amount of loss, damage, or removal costs. Generally this is not done.</p> <p>Recommendations: Graffiti is committed across Borough boundaries. Therefore a common approach should be taken to investigation and prosecution. The GLA should set up a central database as a means of detecting graffiti offenders in London.</p>
JCDecaux	<p>JCDecaux installs and maintains street furniture including bus shelters, council information panels, and automatic public conveniences. They operate an in-house maintenance organisation to clean and repair the furniture. They have found that there are more instances of graffiti on street furniture in remote areas as opposed to town centres. This is largely due to the fact that town centres are busier, more visible and often monitored by CCTV. Bus shelters on routes to schools are also affected by graffiti.</p> <p>The types of tools used for graffiti range from felt markers and spray paint to posting of flyers, leaflets and stickers. More recently they are experiencing the etching of glass. They have noticed a general increase of graffiti in London. They monitor vandalism and graffiti through their own in-house team of technicians. They believe that the speed at which they remove graffiti has a direct impact on repeated incidents. They</p>

	have used technicians on motorbikes rather than in vans to facilitate swift removal. They are currently discussing school educational initiatives with some boroughs.
LE Group	London Power Networks is part of LE Group and owns and manages the electricity distribution network. They have nearly 16,000 substations housing electrical equipment. Some are entirely underground, others are inside fenced compounds and the remainder are freestanding structures with facing brickwork. These are subject to various types of vandalism including graffiti. Substation walls and doors carry essential warning messages and it is important that these are not obscured by graffiti. Any graffiti that obscures the signage is removed as a matter of urgency. These sites are kept secure as a matter of public safety, but they are often breached and damaged by those entering a site to carry out graffiti. Last year nearly £200,00 was spent removing graffiti from substations and this included 1,500 site visits by the maintenance team. The company also uses anti-graffiti paint and other more expensive solutions to prevent graffiti.
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry	<p>The LCCI represents more than 3000 businesses across the metropolitan region. Graffiti is a problem that affects companies in all parts of London. It is a quality of life issue on which London fares badly in the eyes of business leaders from within the UK and those from overseas. Graffiti imposes direct cost burdens on employers in terms of clean-up operations and often it accompanies other forms of crime and disorder like football hooliganism or organised violent protests. London businesses also view fly posting and cards in telephone boxes as similar problems. In spring 2000 the three principal London business organisations LCCI, CBI London and London First produced a document titled <i>"Business manifesto for the Mayor and GLA"</i> ahead of the mayoral election. This highlighted the problem of graffiti and called on the mayor to lead a "Clean London" campaign to tackle the problem. LCCI hope that the work of the committee will set the scene or a rather more sustained and substantive project by the GLA.</p> <p>Anecdotal Examples of How Graffiti Affects London Business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graffiti degrades the environment. There is a financial and personal impact as well as a social one. Graffiti has to be removed by some businesses to comply with the terms of their leases. • Traders in Oxford Street face a constant battle to remove unsightly advertising stickers from street furniture. Their removal is not included in the street-cleansing contract and a special operation has to be mounted to get them off. Traders have been trying to get the City of Westminster to mount a test case in court against one of the advertisers for illegal fly posting but they are not optimistic of any action at least for a number of years. • Poor street lighting does not help the matter of graffiti. Properties have to be cleaned regularly or repainted. The brickwork of buildings also suffers. • It takes a considerable amount of time to remove and organise the cleaning of graffiti. The costs of removing graffiti are recurring costs due to repeat attacks. This affects businesses and prospective clients comment on the appearance of buildings as the overall look of buildings is taken into account by clients looking for premises. • In some cases the cleaned areas look starkly different to the overall building because of discoloration of the building over the years. The costs of graffiti removal are sometimes recoverable from insurers • Manufacturers of spray paint themselves should come up with a technical solution to the problem of cleaning up graffiti. • Graffiti should be tackled as part of a zero-tolerance policy. Some graffiti is left for a very long time. There should be a legal obligation on property owners, landlords and tenants to remove graffiti in a very short specified time after it occurs. The full rigours of the Criminal Damage Act and cost recovery law should be applied to perpetrators without the necessity of specific complaint from those suffering damage. • There is some difficulty finding a company able to remove graffiti.

<p>London Graffiti Solutions</p>	<p>London Graffiti Solutions has been involved in developing solutions to graffiti since 1985. It was also funded by the GLC to develop a programme to take graffiti art “off the streets” and put it in galleries. Other strategies developed by the organisation have included working with perpetrators of graffiti and assisting them in developing careers as youth workers, DJ’s, graphic designers and art teachers. The organisation is currently considering ways to make graffiti “uncool”, by replacing it with a less destructive artistic activity using the world wide web. London Graffiti Solutions are also developing a Best Practice Graffiti Toolkit. They state that one of the main reasons why anti-graffiti strategies fail is because they are abstractly formulated without consulting young people generally and the graffiti community specifically. Young people want to be assured that if they stop vandalising their communities the millions of pounds that would be saved from removing graffiti would be invested in creating facilities and resources for them. The company is keen to develop proactive sustainable strategies to prevent graffiti.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A holistic, multi-agency, London-wide strategy co-ordinated by the GLA. • Use of S40 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998. This states that every Local Authority should join with its partner agencies to produce a Youth Justice Plan. This part of the legislation should also be used to develop strategies for dealing with graffiti offenders. • Fully implement existing legislation before introducing more legislation that will be difficult to police. • Development of community art projects. Provide legal artistic opportunities for young people at risk. Employ a community artist and guest tutors to mentor and work with young people.
<p>ntl:</p>	<p>ntl encounters problems of graffiti on their street property. It is a recurring problem across the whole of the London area particularly within the central area around Kensington and Chelsea and Westminster. They have used various methods to try and improve the local environment, in some instances working alongside the individual London boroughs. Company policy is that all cabinets where reported by their own staff, Local Authorities or members of the public are repainted as soon as possible after notification.</p> <p>In the London Borough of Bromley the problem was addressed jointly with the Council. In Kensington and Chelsea all cabinets on the main traffic routes were deemed to be a priority by Council officers. A special paint was used with an added substance to prevent fly posting and graffiti. However due to the extensive amount of fly posting it has proved difficult to keep pace with the culprits and the company has since tried other substances. This method has also been tried in Lambeth and they have achieved reasonable success. ntl are also in the process of testing a graffiti wipe which removes the graffiti whilst leaving the painting surface undamaged. It costs approximately £35.40 to rub down and repaint a cabinet. In central London the graffiti returns within 2-3 days after removal. They are currently investigating the possibility of allowing advertising on the cabinets. This would reduce graffiti and would provide income and charitable organisations (possibly linked via Local Authorities) could also receive some financial assistance through its implementation. They have worked in partnership with London Local Authorities in an effort to improve the environment and would be pleased to partake in any future partnerships that may be developed.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tighter control on the sale of aerosol paints. • Greater vigilance from the police. • Local ‘adopt-a cabinet’ schemes perhaps linked into neighbourhood watch schemes. • All companies/interested organisations should, as a joint venture investigate the possibility of a material that is resistant to graffiti. <p>www.ntl.com</p>

Remade Essex	<p>Recyclable Market Development Essex is a five-year project that has been established in order to create new markets and secondary uses for recycled materials in Essex. They promote the use of recycled glass as a cost effective, successful alternative for the removal of graffiti rather than the more traditional shot blasting methods. Recycled glass is inert and non-toxic and as a result causes no harm to the environment.</p> <p>Website: www.remadeessex.org.uk</p>
Stewart Wales Somerville Ltd	<p>Stewart Wales Somerville Ltd have seen an increase in both graffiti art and general graffiti vandalism over the past 5 years. Stewart Wales Somerville Ltd have a continuous research and development programme into graffiti removal and have introduced six removal products over the last five years.</p>
Telewest Communications plc	<p>Telewest is one of the leading broadband companies in the UK. They provide cable television, telephone and internet access to 1.7 million homes and deliver business communications solutions to 69,000 public and private sector accounts. With Flextech they are the biggest provider of basic channels to the UK pay TV market. They aim to be the broadband provider of choice to homes and businesses within our areas of operation. The company takes the issue of graffiti extremely seriously.</p> <p>Telewest's national cable network is dependent on both active and passive technology housed in street cabinets, sited within the confines of the public highway. In common with other 'utilities', Telewest is permitted to locate these cabinets under its Telecommunications Licence (granted by the DTI) and within the confines of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991. Due to nature of synchronous broadband and telephony networks, the 'cable' industry deploys more items of 'street furniture' than other utilities. Most of them are located within metropolitan areas. In the Company's 'London and South East' region, they have a total of 32,400 cabinets, some 9,500 of which are in central London. Historically graffiti was an issue largely within town centres or central urban areas, where illegal flyposting generated the majority of complaints. In recent years, however, the problem of 'tagging' using aerosol paint has become the biggest problem and a significant complaint-trigger. The problem has also extended beyond high street or urban areas and now stretches across Telewest's nationwide network. The vast majority of their street cabinets have been defaced.</p> <p>All complaints about cabinet graffiti, whether verbal or in writing, are recorded and allocated a unique reference number until they have been concluded. A complaint is classed as an "Expression of dissatisfaction" whether justified or not. All complaints on this issue are also passed to the Office of the Telecommunications Regulator (Ofcom) as they are deemed as 'being caused by the operation of a telecommunications network...' A standard letter explaining company policy on cabinet graffiti is sent out to all complainants. Details are then passed to the appropriate Construction Engineer requesting a site visit to assess and categorise the condition of the cabinet. On visiting the site, cabinets are classed as: a) Racist, Offensive or Obscene; b) Badly Defaced; c) Slightly Defaced or: d) No graffiti. Photographs should then be taken as substantiation, and the information is passed back to regional Administration staff. Administration staff record details and, if removal is required, make the necessary arrangement. They aim to remove any racist, offensive or obscene graffiti as quickly as resources permit, ideally within 48 hours. From the beginning of December 2001, details of all regional graffiti complaints will be forwarded each month to a national co-ordinator for processing and analysis. This initiative has been set up to provide a national picture of the problem, with the aim of targeting their necessarily finite resources as efficiently and accurately as possible.</p> <p>It is difficult to provide precise figures on the costs of removing graffiti as there are many variable factors across the UK network. However, in the greater London area the average of cost of cleaning a cabinet is £30, while the average cost of re-painting is £80. Assuming 15% of our 32,400 cabinets in London require some action just once per year (50% cleaning/50%repainting), this would amount to an annual cost of £267,300.</p> <p>The experience of the company indicates that graffiti 'artists' tend to see repainted cabinets simply as 'a blank canvass' on which to improve upon their previous 'work'. In London during the early 1990's Telewest embarked on a massive £1million cabinet repainting programme. To the frustration of Telewest and local residents' alike, the graffiti began to appear again within days. Telewest believe their current policy, as</p>

	<p>outlined above, is the most practical approach to this perennial and widespread problem. They are, however, open to any informed suggestions that may help to discourage the incidence of graffiti or improve their existing procedures.</p> <p>The graffiti problem is not confined to 'street furniture' operated by cable companies although dealing with it, and the complaints received can amount to significant drain on their resources. Vandalism is an arrestable offence covered by the Criminal Damage Act (1971). Under the Act, the police have the authority to arrest a person they suspect is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) about to cause criminal damage b) in the process of causing criminal damage c) have caused criminal damage <p>However, perpetrators of graffiti will, in most cases, take only a few seconds to deface street furniture. Such crime must therefore be extremely difficult both to detect and enforce. Telewest hope that their recent initiative, to collate and analyse statistics on cabinet graffiti across the Telewest network, will help them reduce the problem. Proposals include sharing this data with relevant enforcement authorities (local Crime Analysis Managers in the Police Force for example), in order to allow the efficient concentration any viable enforcement action.</p> <p>Telewest would be prepared to work in partnership with Local Authorities and other public sector bodies to resolve this problem and are already investigating such initiatives with Local Authorities in Croydon and Merton. The former has a dedicated unit to deal with the removal of graffiti from all services for which they are responsible. Telewest have negotiated a trial programme, which started on 5 November, that will allow this unit to clean all of their street furniture to the required specification. They are also working with the London Borough of Merton, which aims to monitor areas badly affected by graffiti with a view to prosecuting offenders. Telewest do not have any best practice examples on the prevention of graffiti and once the Committee investigation is complete, would welcome knowledge of practices that may assist in reducing the problem.</p>
Tensid UK plc	<p>Tensid UK has been trading for over 12 years and provides a variety of products for tackling graffiti including training in the use of such products. They have seen a rise in graffiti over the last three years accompanied by an increase in public pressure to remove graffiti. An increasing number of private properties have been attacked and a recent trend is graffiti on vehicles. They do not believe that graffiti can be curtailed. It is their opinion that most aerosols are stolen or bought cheaply on internet sites.</p> <p>Types: Tagging - signature used in marking out territory. Usually single coloured, using marker pen, leather dye or spray paint. Pieces - usually artistic work comprising of multi-coloured spray paints often seen on the sides of trains, subways and gable walls.</p> <p>Profile: Varies from children tagging buses or trains, to adults carrying out large pieces.</p> <p>Recommend: Graffiti management policies with dedicated budgets that are high in early years to enable a complete clean up regime. Joint co-ordination between Local Authorities and utility companies. Good lighting, CCTV, and the use of anti-graffiti coatings on surfaces. The approach should be remove ,protect and maintain. Website: www.tensid.com</p>

Waltham Forest Chamber of Commerce and Industry	<p>The organisation states that graffiti encourages a general lack of pride in the environment and leads to litter and various other unsociable behaviour. They state that the police often know who the culprits are but are unable to deal with them due to a lack of resources and paperwork problems. The courts do not make the punishment fit the crime either.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Make the policing of such a crime easier.• Make the court process shorter.• Perpetrators should do community service and clean up their own mess, or be fined then the cost of clean up where they can not remove the graffiti themselves.• Swift removal of graffiti. The presence of graffiti encourages further attacks.
---	--

GRAFFITI ARTISTS/MAGAZINES/WEBSITES

<p>Artist@concretejungle</p>	<p>This graffiti artist feels that some strategies are counterproductive in tackling graffiti. His opinions on graffiti are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The banning of spray paint to minors will not work, as most of the prolific writers tend to be in their mid to late twenties. The younger ones are actually less prolific, but are targeted by the police and the media. If banned, the spray paint would be sold or transported from elsewhere and the ban would result in an increase in glass etching instead. • The media and government stereotype graffiti writers as being young tearaways and this makes graffiti feared by the public as they associate it with other violent crime and danger. It is this stereotyping that attracts bad graffiti by attracting people who know relatively little about graffiti as an art form. These people buy cheap paint and do messy work thereby reinforcing graffiti as a crime rather than an art form. • It is seen as a taboo by real graffiti writers to write on private property, places of worship etc. People who do this generally belong to the group who know very little about graffiti, are attracted to it as a fashion and take very little time to research the history of graffiti. • Graffiti writers tend to paint on railway tracks, rooftops and property that belongs to businesses or the government rather than personal property. This is because the aim is to create work that people will see in places where they have more time to paint. Spots are chosen carefully. • In inner city areas where housing is run down and the landscape is bleak graffiti has a role in brightening the area up, adding character and life. However in rural areas and middle class residential areas it does not fit in with the surroundings. • The painting over of trackside graffiti is often done in such a way that the tracksides end up looking worse than with graffiti on. Where off-white paint is used to cover the graffiti, the wall often looks like a patchwork quilt and is often replaced by tagging or bad graffiti because writers know their work will not last and therefore take less care over it. • The general public do not have a problem with graffiti that is attractive and colourful. The Artist has found that the public actually enjoy seeing it. People living near the few legal graffiti walls in London often purposefully walk past to admire the new pieces that have been painted. When painting legally he has only had positive feedback from people who often comment on why there aren't more walls to see this kind of work. • There is a use and purpose for good graffiti. Talented graffiti artists should be able to paint over graffitied walls instead of just painting them white. This would prevent the reoccurrence of graffiti, as it is disrespectful for graffiti writers to paint over others work. This would also raise the standard of graffiti and add character to the local environment murals on shop shutters in Islington and Holloway. • There are a limited number of legal graffiti walls and there is often ambiguity about whether the wall is legal or not. Some of these walls are in unsafe areas. Not every graffiti writer paints in order to cause damage. Painting of legal walls should be made easier, safer and accessible. It may not reduce illegal graffiti, but would provide more opportunities for those who wish to paint legally. • He does not believe that graffiti can be stopped and putting money into cleaning and painting over graffiti is not always cost effective. • Councils should commission murals over graffiti hotspots. Art should not just be placed in galleries, it has a function in the community and many Councils ignore this. It has a function of bringing communities together and making the streets more colourful and interesting. It is a pity that local communities and people interested in art are not given more chances to paint and help brighten up their surroundings legitimately.
------------------------------	--

Ben	<p>People become involved in graffiti because they see it as a way of achieving fame, respect, identity and a sense of belonging. It's also an adrenaline buzz, a risk, a cheap thrill. It provides them with an opportunity to be noticed and to do "something". It's an outdoor, active, free leisure pursuit. Spraying their names (tags) brings recognition especially when the tags are complex designs and expertly executed. Graffiti can be seen as a way of claiming territory. When people come into the area they will know whom the area belongs to or who is "up" in that area. It is similar to advertising. Graffiti is seen as a way of reaching out, a form of expression. The fame is enclosed within the graffiti culture for those that appreciate it. No one else will know who did it. It doesn't matter where graffiti is done, as long as it can be seen. There is a preference for trains and moving objects, because moving objects have a wider audience. If trains run with graffiti on them the graffiti is seen over a wider distance. Even when the graffiti is removed the "shadow" or image from the paint may still be visible. The graffiti culture may have a negative impact on a young person's educational attainment and lifestyle, but this is not the case for everyone involved in graffiti. Equally, graffiti writers can hold down good jobs, do well in education and when settled make good parents. Many opportunities exist for graffiti writers in the fields of graphic design and sign writing. Practising graffiti writers may be dealing with other social issues such as family problems or loneliness and for them graffiti may be an outlet. Graffiti also teaches a person real life lessons. It gives you a sense of the world, society and your place in it. A sort of "rites of passage". The impact graffiti has on persons life also depends on how involved they are. Tagging is the more common type of graffiti. It is more common because it is easy to spray and can be done quickly. Doing a "piece" (more complex mural/master piece) takes much longer and can take hours, whilst a tag can be sprayed in a matter of seconds. Tags are not as good to look at as pieces, but people do them more often because you are less likely to get caught or arrested doing tags. Some people develop their tags as well as pulling off complex pieces.</p> <p>The main code for the graffiti writer is not going over someone else's work. This is a mark of disrespect and an insult. People do break this code and it causes trouble. There are also other codes such as not informing on other graffiti writers. There are codes such as not writing on places of worship, private property or trees, but these codes are not followed by every one and it is mainly down to the individual which codes they choose to abide by.</p> <p>People learn graffiti by practice. They may form their own "crew" (group) with friends from school or bump into other writers whilst out. You can also know when you meet a graffiti writer through the way they may be looking intently at graffiti whilst on a train. There are also writer's conventions. Through doing graffiti they may also get to know other older graffiti writers who may in turn act as mentors. Legalised graffiti walls are a good idea. They will not stop illegal graffiti writing and it would be hard to measure their effectiveness in preventing graffiti but there is a need for legitimate places for people who wish to practice their art to do so (piecing). There are no real legal places.</p> <p>Even the existing halls of fame (legal graffiti walls) are not really legal places to do graffiti. You can still be arrested for spraying graffiti on these walls, even though it is known that people practice graffiti there. Trying to stop graffiti has failed in the past and the various ways used to prevent graffiti do not work. Legal walls will provide an opportunity for those who wish to develop their art.</p> <p>Although tagging is considered to be anti-social the graffiti writer is also driven by a desire to brighten up dingy run-down areas. They wish to make their surroundings look brighter like most public art. Media influence is not the main reason why people get involved with graffiti. Although the media flirts with graffiti and use it in advertising (e.g. Rimmel lipstick), this would not be the driving force for a graffiti writer. Graffiti also has links to music and the internet. The illegality of graffiti provides a thrill for some people, but not for those who wish to practice their art. It is most unpleasant to be arrested or have your house raided, when all you wish to do is to practice and develop your art. That is why there should be legal spaces.</p> <p>Banning the sale of spray paints and markers will not prevent graffiti. Spray paints are often stolen anyway, although a ban does send out a message of non-tolerance. The ban could be overcome by getting an adult to buy the spray paint as young people do now when they want to buy cigarettes. Sometimes these schemes actually encourage graffiti through the re-enforcement of the "us and them" culture. Some graffiti artists like to be seen as the "public enemy" as this is seen as attractive. It is seen as a form of rebellion against authority.</p> <p>Etching has grown in response to the rapid removal of graffiti. Etching is far more unsightly than graffiti, but it is permanent and so the tag will be seen. It is also more costly to deal with because the glass needs to be removed. The transport companies have been victims of their own success. This is what also occurred in the U.S. Draconian sentences do not prevent graffiti either. Community sentencing would be more preferable to jail</p>
-----	--

	<p>sentences, although some people have been sent to jail for graffiti. This is a harsh way of dealing with graffiti and it does not prevent it. One way of dealing with graffiti would be to have controlled art programmes where young people could be taught graffiti art as opposed to just tagging. They could also be taught about the acceptable way to practice this art. This may then reduce tagging. Another way of dealing with graffiti would be to encourage legal commissions and art programmes, which would then enable some people to make a living from their art. This may not prevent all graffiti or hard core writers (who may not be interested in the legal side), but it would provide a legitimate outlet for those who want to develop their art. In the end most people grow out of graffiti. For some people it is just part of the process of growing up. "Winning is a state of mind".</p>
Craig	<p>People do graffiti as an outlet for artistic expression and for stress relief and entertainment. People get a buzz out of putting it up in places that it can be seen. Tagging is part of the subculture, some artists stop tagging as they progress. Tagging is also a quick (but cheap) way of getting to know if you have the skills to do the more complex stuff. There are many reasons why people do graffiti, some are driven by the art, others fame, anger - there are as many reasons as there are people doing it. The principle/code of conduct acknowledged amongst graffiti artists is that you don't destroy someone else's stuff, but as people do this causes a lot of trouble (and mess - less full colour pieces and more tags and silver and black quick dubs). People learn the graffiti technique from friends and, word of mouth. They learn the style from sketching, books, the internet, magazines, and from studying things that inspire them (colour shape etc). People take others under their wing that they respect, admire or think show promise.</p> <p>Legalised spaces should be set up as spray can graffiti has not gone away more than fifteen years after it first arrived here and crackdowns have backfired. Any legalised spaces should be highly visible, as a big part of graffiti is to get your skills seen - anything else would be a waste of time. As the graffiti culture has grown older it has changed. The artistic side used to be a bigger than it is now. In the mid-nineties crackdowns popularised quick silver and black dubs so the people who grew up with that aspire more to that damage aspect. Walls used to be the most popular target but these days people who do walls are seen as not being hardcore. Trains are the targets of the credible writers these days, and quality seems to matter less. As this change has already happened, setting up legal wall space is more of a problem today than it would have been in 1990, but it would keep the younger less experienced kids from causing the mess they do. Young taggers often tag more than some of the established writers, and as they are less proficient, their stuff is not as good, so they can only get known by tagging as much as possible. However, many artists would avoid tagging because they have an attitude where they want to keep it hardcore and raw.</p> <p>Community art in the form of legalised space would reduce graffiti possibly, with regard to some parts of the tube, and even allow people to put together full colour quality productions - you need to make the quality stuff respectable again.</p> <p>The media and companies occasionally use graffiti to cast themselves in a certain light (which could be seen as irresponsible.) Brands such as Nike, Adidas, MTV, popstars and countless others use it to give life to their products. This is not something specific to graffiti - youth advertising often glamorises the "street cred" of crime and poverty and yes, graffiti has become fashionable again, although it didn't even die out in the mean time, a sure sign that a change of tactics by the authorities is due. The reason graffiti appeals, the core of graffiti is the grass roots, do-it-yourself aspect of it - graffiti is about giving yourself exposure and showing you have skills.</p> <p>Graffiti is an art form, but like most art forms not all artists are good. It's just that with graffiti you can make your own gallery space.</p> <p>Further references: www.burnresistant.com http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/world/americas/newsid_592000/592262.stm</p>
Jack	<p>Graffiti is an art form, a way of expression just like architecture. Graffiti started in the States as territory marking for runners around the city. People signed their names in a certain part of town to mark their territory. These days tagging is done by 10-15 year old kids. Although they are seen as vandalising buildings they could well be the top graffiti writers or artists of the future. They have to start somewhere. More legal zones would be helpful. The amount of derelict buildings in London, could be an opportunity to create art work etc. These derelict buildings are a waste of space. It will keep young boys out of trouble if they can get involved in a scene like graffiti. Graffiti artists are motivated by the same things that motivated Van Goch. Art is a medium through which somebody can express their feelings about their lives, other lives etc The main rules of conduct acknowledged amongst graffiti artists are that the best "pieces" stay up longer.</p> <p>In the Bristol area people can learn graffiti art by attending classes, but at the end of the day practice makes perfect. In the future there may be a</p>

	<p>form of apprenticeship or training. In Bristol there are legal graffiti areas and artists also do commissioned work. If you have more legal walls it transforms the illegal tagging into art form within an environment where the young people can relax. The best artwork comes from being able to hang about somewhere for a day and produce a "piece" with more time. The media and pop culture encourage graffiti. Graffiti is seen as being fashionable. It is used in fashion, the music industry, graphic design degrees, and for advertising well known brands, e.g. Red Stripe. Please see www.artcrimes.com for reviews by artists and to learn the graffiti terms and to find out about the history etc</p>
Simon	<p>This submission is from an Animator who is not actually a Graffiti Artist. He covers the work in and around 'The Pit' (West London). He states that the artwork changes so frequently down there and is of such good quality that he felt it needed recording. People do graffiti because all artists want their work to be seen, and graffiti art is a public display. Visually prominent positions may be preferred. Graffiti artists are motivated by the same thing that motivates any artist. They get a nice buzz from creating something good, and they get recognition. The principles/codes of conduct acknowledged amongst graffiti artists are about respect for the artwork. Graffiti has a massive international community, you only have to search for graffiti on the net to realise. Graffiti should be legalised in certain places or circumstances. This would certainly brighten up some places. London is a grotty, dirty place. The carnival graffiti on route was fantastic this year. London would benefit from designated graffiti areas and it would probably do tourism some good too. Legalised graffiti may not reduce incidents of graffiti elsewhere, because like joy riding, some people may get a kick out of breaking the law. Community art activities may not reduce the incidents of graffiti, but it would be nice to see such projects. The media encourage graffiti, Saatchi and Saatchi had some on their reception window display.</p>

WORLD CITIES

<p>City of Chicago</p>	<p>Graffiti in the City is either gang related or tagging. The majority is tagging. Taggers primarily target public transportation and buildings along major thoroughfares. Their purpose is to achieve maximum visibility. They work across the city and have no territorial boundaries. The instruments used include marker pens, etching devises, and spray paint. Graffiti gives an indication of poor quality of life in a neighbourhood and this negative perception breeds other crime.</p> <p>Tagging has become a sub-culture with its own magazines, books, videos, films, music, organised meetings, exhibitions, contests, clothing and jewellery. The City of Chicago removes graffiti from business facades at no extra cost. They try to remove graffiti within 5 days of notification.</p> <p>Profile: Taggers are from diverse backgrounds ranging from the upper classes to poverty levels, encompassing all races and sexes. They are usually aged 12-24 years. Taggers truly believe themselves to be artists and use tagging as a means of expressing themselves. They generally work under the cover of darkness, particularly when doing a large mural or in rail yard. Some taggers work together and will meet to plan where to tag, what drawings to do etc By planning in this way they can work more efficiently, reducing the amount of time spent at the location therefore minimising the risk of being caught.</p> <p>Legislation: There are several municipal codes and state statutes that address the issue of graffiti.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vandalism. This is punishable by a 500 dollar fine, up to 30 days in prison or up to 1,500 hours of community service, or payment of compensation. • Possession of paint or marker with intent to deface unlawfully. Intent can be established if the offender is a known tagger or gang member. The location of arrest if in proximity to a popular graffiti drawing board, can also establish intent. • Possession of spray can or marker by underage persons. This does not apply where the minor is under the immediate supervision of their parent, teacher, employer etc. • Aiding or assisting an underage person in obtaining paint spray cans or markers. This does not apply to a parent, legal guardian, teacher, employer etc. assisting or supervising a child or ward. • Enforcement action against business establishments. Action can be taken against businesses that sanction sales of spray paint or markers to minors. • Aiding minors in obtaining paint in spray cans. • Criminal Defacement of property. A person knowingly damages the property of another without his/her consent by the use of paint, markers etc <p>Other Initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Public Transportation Section uses a computerised system known as the Tagger Implementation Program (TIP) for tracking offenders. This is a citywide database used to assist in identifying offenders. • Graffiti Fax Line. The Department of Streets and Sanitation has a fax line for the reporting of incidents of graffiti and to enable prompt removal action. • Give Graffiti the Brush Programme. This program offers free paint to block clubs and other community organisations for use in covering graffiti on private properties. • Graffiti Blasters. This programme addresses the problem of graffiti on stone, cement, metal structures and damage that cannot be removed by painting. It consists of a fleet of trucks equipped with a blasting device that uses baking soda and high-pressure water to
------------------------	---

	<p>remove graffiti.</p> <p>Costs: Approx. £3Million per annum</p> <p>Recommendation: Prompt removal of graffiti, community involvement and education. Joint work by law enforcement personnel to identify taggers/gang members. The police of Chicago do not treat graffiti lightly.</p>
City of Copenhagen	<p>In 1999 the City of Copenhagen launched a successful anti-graffiti campaign. The City has been affected by graffiti since 1984. At first the graffiti was limited to the state owned railway local trains and stations, but through the years it spread to other parts of the city. In the 1990s it assumed endemic proportions. Graffiti creates insecurity and has a negative affect on tourism, business and the use of public transport. It is the first sign that an area is developing into a slum. Graffiti is often linked to other forms of criminal behaviour. It contributes to the destruction of the physical environment of an urban area. If responsible politicians do not act a small group of people may succeed in exercising a kind of environmental terrorism which only considers their own egocentric need for recognition in relation to their own aberrant subculture, which according to criminology and culture scientists has grown to be one of the biggest in Europe today.</p> <p>The campaign launched by the city consisted of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Active information and Publicity The community was informed about what graffiti really is, its different types and how they could assist in fighting against it. 2. Graffiti Removal Owners of private property have graffiti removed from their property within 24 hours for a low and moderate payment. After graffiti removal the façade of the property is treated with anti-graffiti film which makes it possible to remove any new graffiti quickly. 3. Preventative Measures Education work is carried out in schools, youth clubs and other places frequented by young people. This is also done through radio and the City produces preventative radio programmes for popular radio stations. The City has also produced a preventative film known as "pieces". The City also produces preventative information for parents and teachers and other people who work with young people such as youth workers. The preventative work is developing along with the growth of the campaign. <p>The campaign covers most of the city. Each year more areas of the city are added to the campaign. Dealing with graffiti involves long term strategies and cannot be dealt with by using short-term sporadic efforts. The nature of the urban areas such as the social profile, housing and occupational standard of an area must also be taken into account when developing a strategy. No two areas are the same. There must also be political consensus, stability, sufficient financial resources and close co-operation with the police. The City is building up intelligence on the graffiti that is sprayed and pictures of graffiti are taken before it is removed to help facilitate police investigations. The City does not believe dialogue with the graffiti subculture or the introduction of legal walls is of any benefit as this only leads to the recruitment of more children and young people to the subculture. This only serves to propagate mixed messages and confuses children and young people. Zero tolerance is the only responsible alternative. The City has closed all the legal graffiti areas that used to exist. The City undertakes continuous evaluation of the anti-graffiti campaign through the use of surveys and opinion polls. These surveys provided a precise view on the success of the campaign. In two and a half years the graffiti on the streets of Copenhagen has been reduced by 55.6% in the area with the highest incidents of graffiti this has been reduced by 80% Graffiti is also an international problem. The Internet has also become an extremely efficient means of communication for those who commit graffiti. There have been two Scandinavian</p>

	<p>graffiti conferences in 1998 and 2000 and this gave the Nordic countries a substantial foundation for developing close Scandinavian co-operation in the fight against graffiti. The City, along with representatives from Stockholm, Oslo and Helsinki, believe that the time has come to establish European co-operation in order to fight graffiti across Europe.</p>
<p>Helsinki "Stop scrawls on walls" project.</p>	<p>Establishing the project. During the 1990s, Helsinki was one of Europe`s worst cities for the defacement of public facades. Defacing comprised of spray-painted graffiti and signatures scrawled with felt-tipped pens. In 1996, the City of Helsinki clarified the situation on defacement by widely circulating a questionnaire to elicit the views of various committees and civil-service departments. As a consequence, the city council unanimously approved a separate grant in its 1998 budget for removing the scrawls and adopting preventive measures. Based on initial calculation undertaken in 1998, it was ascertained that there were some 250,000 defaced surfaces throughout Helsinki. The project was handed over to the Public Works Department.</p> <p>Overall operating principle. The operating fundamentals on which the project is based are resident oriented, communication, charting the extent of defacement, removing it, preventive treatment of surfaces and supervision and mediation. Each component part is of equal importance to the overall project and thereby vital in achieving a good final result.</p> <p>Resident oriented. The "Stop scrawls on walls" project is progressing on area-by-area basis and is currently operating throughout the Helsinki city region. Co-operating with the Federation of Associations for Helsinki City Quarters(HELKA) has been important from the very beginning and indeed the great majority of HELKA member associations have participated in the project from its inception. Other local associations, such as area forums, have been involved in the project`s start-up in various areas. Having decided it was willing to become involved in removing graffiti and adopting preventive measures in its particular area, a local association would organise a meeting in which project personnel outlined the situation in the area in question. During the meeting it was agreed that the "Stop scrawls on walls" project would undertake to clean city buildings and structures at regular intervals in the area. In other areas, real-estate owners were thereby stimulated to clean their own premises. In this way, an active network of residents was created to mediate in each residential area. Close interaction with active residential communities is an essential part of the project.</p> <p>Communication Publicity, whether negative or positive with respect to defacement, always leads to more scrawls. For this reason, publicity must always be level-headed and precisely targeted. However, at the early stage of the project it was necessary to convey the idea to as many city residents and associated groups as possible. A "Facts about defacement" campaign was initiated to clarify what defacement actually means. After the initial stage, communication was more precisely targeted at residents associations, suburban and regional newspapers and through individual evening sessions organised for residents.</p> <p>Charting the extent of defacement Charting involves actually counting defaced surfaces in a specific area. In addition to city buildings, graffiti and scrawls etc. are counted on all other surfaces. In each district, a route encompassing the area`s most central parts and which covers 50-80% of the street network is chosen. The route takes in all city-owned buildings, light-traffic underpasses and parks. Charting the extent of defacement, which is undertaken by foot, is carried out twice annually. On the bases of charting, area-specific comparative statistics were collated. Based on these statistics, it has been established that from the project`s inception in 1998 up to the end of 2001 the amount of defacement has fallen by 60% throughout Helsinki.</p>

	<p>Cleaning As a result of an annual competition, the most successful private enterprises were engaged by the “Stop scrawls on walls” project to clean the defaced surfaces. The project has its own cleaning unit to ensure that professional skills were upheld and developed also within project. Chemical or mechanical methods were adopted in the cleaning process. The method chosen depended on the surface to be cleaned and on the time of the year. From 1998 to the end of 2001, the “Stop scrawls on walls” project has been instrumental in cleaning some 260, 000 square metres of defaced surfaces. This large measure can be accounted for by the fact that defaced surfaces prior to the initiation of the project were included.</p> <p>Preventive treatment A significant sum in cleaning costs was saved by prior treatment of surfaces sensitive to defacement. The same enterprises, which carried out the cleaning, also carried out the required surface treatment. It became evident during the annual competition that the companies in question were also capable of handling the treatment process. Depending on surface and the object, either dispersible- or durable protective substances were utilised in protective treatment.</p> <p>Supervision and mediation Defacing is designated as a damage-related criminal offence. On the basis of annual competition, the “Stop scrawls on walls” project engages the most successful private security firms to photograph the defacement of public surfaces, to initiate the criminal complaints procedure, and to moderately supervise city buildings and structures. Defacers are in every case apprehended jointly with police. The project acts as the plaintiff in matters concerning the defacement of city buildings and structures. The “ Stop scrawls on walls” project handles mediation jointly with the social-service authorities and supervises acts of conciliation.</p> <p>Other information The perpetrators of graffiti are men aged 17-30 (professionals). Younger boys aged 12-16 imitate these professionals. Perpetrators come from all social classes. Graffiti is mostly likely to be marked on visible buildings and vehicles (trains, buses, trams, metro etc.), mostly at nights, but vehicles are also defaced in the daytime. The areas with graffiti make people feel unsafe and anti-social elements enjoy these areas Areas with lots of graffiti can be a “social desert” for people. There are cleaning methods for every surface. The project uses a lot of prevention treatment for building surfaces. The penalties and sanctions range from fines to prison. Mediation is used for first-time offenders. The clean up costs of graffiti are £10.00 per square metre approximately. The cost of graffiti to businesses has not been calculated, but people generally keep away from areas with graffiti. In Helsinki there are 50 persons we call professionals defacers. At the inception of the project in 1998 there were about 200 “professionals” and a lot of others. Now in 2001 there are 50 re-offenders and 200 first time offenders have been caught. The mediation system is a good deterrent for younger offenders. Some of the professionals end their activities after penalties. After the first cleaning graffiti returns but after re-cleaning offenders look for other places.</p>
City of Kosice	<p>The City Police took action to reduce the level of graffiti in the City. They set up a database of tags to identify offenders. A typical graffiti offender is aged from 14-23. Graffiti occurs under bridges, on walls of block of flats and on buildings after construction. Incidents of graffiti are reducing due to the use of the graffiti database and an increase in police patrols in the city. The swift removal of graffiti once sprayed also acts as a deterrent. The city is currently gathering information from other city districts to help it evaluate its work and develop other strategies to deal with graffiti.</p>

City of New York	<p>Due to the efforts of the city they have experienced a decrease in the amount of graffiti over recent years. In 1991 the Council enacted legislation expressly outlawing graffiti and defacement of public property. It is also illegal to enter public property carrying spray paint or broad tipped indelible markers with the intent of defacing the property. It is illegal to sell aerosol spray paint cans or broad tipped indelible markers to those under 18. Vendors cannot display such products unless the cans/containers are empty. Anyone convicted of such acts can be fined \$500 for each violation, given a jail sentence for up to three months, or both.</p> <p>In 1991 the Council established an anti-graffiti task force to assess their approach to graffiti, the effectiveness of legislation, and to assist in the establishment of local anti-graffiti task forces. In 1992 the Council established a cash reward of up to \$500 for any person providing information leading to the apprehension, prosecution and conviction of anyone violating the legislation. In 1994 a 24-hour graffiti hotline was established, staffed by New York police to deal with reports of graffiti. The city has increased the numbers of police and housing staff dedicated to anti-graffiti programmes. They are also considering further regulation of business licensing of vendors who sell spray paint and regulations that would hold property owners responsible for cleaning graffiti.</p>
Ottawa, Canada (Federation of Canadian Municipalities)	<p>Graffiti is not seen as a major concern in the municipalities. Some municipalities provide paint to cover graffiti, while others have conducted minor research. The City of Winnipeg enforces graffiti removal through a by-law, which regulates untidy and unsightly premises. Two cities in Saskatchewan had a problem with graffiti, but none had a graffiti removal program effecting private properties. The City of Prince Albert deals with graffiti removal as part of a programme of cleaning.</p>
Portugal (Association of Portuguese Municipalities)	<p>Although graffiti is a problem in the cities of Portugal, they do not have the expertise to tackle the problem.</p>
City of San Diego Graffiti Control Programme	<p>The graffiti control programme consists of twelve staff which includes five utility managers to remove graffiti. The programme is responsible for education, prevention, enforcement and removal of graffiti. The city adopted a graffiti Abatement Ordinance in 1991, which made it illegal for minors to use or possess spray paint and other graffiti tools. The ordinance also made it illegal to leave graffiti on private property. The education and awareness consists of presentations to the business community and community planning groups as well as education awareness in schools. There is a hotline number and website for reporting graffiti and obtaining information on the programme, prevention and removal techniques. Where graffiti is found on private property, the owner is sent a notice of violation requiring them to remove the graffiti within ten calendar days or send a consent form requesting the City's assistance in removal. Graffiti is removed from city property within five working days. Graffiti is most likely to occur on utility boxes, traffic signals, under bridges, on trash dumpsters and in alleyways. To reduce or eliminate graffiti takes the collective effort of the judicial system, City Attorney, District Attorney, the police, and the graffiti control programme.</p> <p>Cost: The graffiti control programme spends approximately £850,000 per annum. A study was carried out some years ago which showed that city schools spent approximately £350,000 San Diego Transit £90,000 and nationally £10, billion per annum on graffiti removal.</p> <p>Best Practice: Swift removal through the use of chemical removers, painting, hydro blasting or sand blasting.</p>

Seattle Public Authorities	<p>They have a city anti-graffiti programme. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Graffiti Nuisance Ordinance enacted in 1994. Under this legislation the City notifies private property owners that they have graffiti on their property and must remove it within a reasonable time –failure results in a fine. • Community clean-up events and volunteer graffiti cleaners. • Grants for community based anti-graffiti projects, free workshops on eliminating graffiti. • Graffiti and litter hotline. • Graffiti rangers (City employees) who remove graffiti from public property. The rangers also provide technical advice on the removal of graffiti and free paint <p>Profile: White, male aged 12-25 years with low self-esteem. They see graffiti (tagging) as a mean of getting recognition from their peers.</p> <p>Costs: Clean up costs for the city range from £400,000–550,000 per annum. This includes staff, removal supplies and equipment. This estimate does not include policing costs. The costs for businesses/private individuals are estimated at over £680,000.00 per annum. No official records are kept.</p> <p>Recommendations: Quick removal using chemicals, painting over or scraping. It is unclear if any one activity stops graffiti because in some US cities it is firmly entrenched as a subculture. Perpetrators eventually grow out of it. The City finds it difficult to get convictions as property is usually defaced late at night. They recommend a multi-agency approach to change the level of graffiti occurring within a community. This would involve the police, courts, schools and the community. The information provided also includes an anti-graffiti video and examples of leaflets used.</p>
Real Estate, Street and Traffic division Stockholm Sweden	<p>For the last three years the City of Stockholm has acted firmly and strictly against graffiti, stating that all graffiti within the city shall be considered illegal, and that all graffiti on walls, schools etc shall be removed within 5 working days. This City co-operates with the police and SL (the organisation responsible for public transport.)</p>
Swedish Association of Local Authorities And Federation of Swedish County Councils	<p>Illegal graffiti is regarded as a crime and vandalism, when the writer has not been first been given permission to paint on the surface in question. There are no reliable figures available about the overall costs due to graffiti. The estimated cost for Local Authorities and transport authorities is £40 million pounds annually. Graffiti also has a tendency to create a feeling of discomfort and insecurity. Local authorities tackle the problems of graffiti from three angles namely, risk management, local crime prevention work and within the social welfare service with particular interest in young people at risk of developing anti-social behaviour. The majority of Local Authorities in Sweden have established local crime prevention councils to develop preventative measures. There are a wide range of strategies used to tackle graffiti including from zero tolerance to supporting “graffiti schools” and providing legal walls. There are problems reported in using legal walls as graffiti spreads in the area of the legal walls and becomes a place for recruitment of new illegal painters as well as a place where you can practice before doing illegal graffiti. There are also positive reports from authorities that use legal walls. Strategies that are tough against graffiti need to be communicated in a way that is not seen as a challenge to be accepted.</p> <p>The organisations do not have enough background material to present best practice. All preventative action should be knowledge –based. The Swedish ministry of justice has declared a need for an inventory concerning measures carried out in order to prevent graffiti. This inventory will form a base for a structure with a central bank of knowledge about measures against graffiti. The ministry of justice have declared their will to initiate experimental preventative projects that will be thoroughly evaluated. Another strategy is to criminalize attempt of damage (which will include graffiti) and another is to provide the legal possibility for the police to make a body search when a person is under suspicion of such an attempt. There is also a suggestion to increase the severity of the penalty for damage. These proposed changes in the criminal law would act as a deterrent of some potential graffiti writers.</p>

Tokyo Metropolitan Government	In Tokyo they do not have serious problems with graffiti. There are no laws or regulations to control graffiti in Japan. Owners of property are responsible for cleaning up graffiti on their facilities or buildings.
Toronto Police Service	<p>The Toronto Police Service state that “Graffiti” comes from the Greek word “Graphion” (to write). Their Graffiti Eradication Programme was developed in 2000. The programme is set to run for 3-5 years after which it will be reviewed. Full details can be viewed at www.TorontoPolice.on.ca The program consists of an operational equation known as 5/5/5.</p> <p>The first five involves programme activities made up of five components (focussing on methods and procedures).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eradication-through the physical removal of the graffiti, using victimised property owners, volunteers, students, and prisoner work programmes. • Education- anti-vandalism programmes through schools, community centres and places of religious worship. • Empowerment-by working with business improvement associations, ratepayer groups community police liaison committees and local politicians. • Enforcement-through arrest and prosecution, surveillance, informant information, Crime Stoppers and municipal by-law enforcement aimed at forcing property owners to maintain their property to civic standards. • Economic development -through urban beautification programs, graffiti transformation initiatives, youth murals, businesses and tourism. <p>The second five involves teamwork. Programme partners and stakeholders are made up of the police, community, media, city agencies, and politicians.</p> <p>The third five involves the action to be taken to influence the activity and the partners. This involves communication motivation, articulation, Speed/simplicity, triggering and recording action.</p> <p>Since the inception of the programme 17,212 square feet of heavy graffiti has been cleaned. Thousands of information letters were sent and community meetings and information sessions were held. Undercover operations led to sub-culture intelligence gathering. In addition to this a national paint manufacturer offers discounted and free paint to communities for use in clean ups. The programme has led to a 2% reduction in crime (using their 7 crime indicators). The Police conducted a safety perception survey. 95% of the survey participant s felt safer and felt that the programme made their respective neighbourhoods cleaner. The Police also formed a partnership with the Toronto Graffiti Transformation Project that applies murals over graffiti. This project provides job opportunities for young people. Several other Canadian police services have expressed an interest in the programme.</p> <p>Profile: 97% are male aged 12-20 years, living in urban environments. People write graffiti in order to achieve fame, artistic expression and power.</p> <p>Recommend: Community collaboration.</p> <p>Further reading: Fixing Broken Windows, Restoring Order and Reducing Crimes in Our Communities. George Kelling and Catherine Coles.</p> <p>Information provided also includes badges, posters and leaflets about the graffiti transformation programme. They are also willing to provide their three-hour power point presentation on the graffiti eradication programme.</p>

Trondheim, Norway	<p>Graffiti was not a problem in the city before the early 1990s, but now it is a serious social problem. Graffiti crews in Trondheim have a leader known as a “king” who lays down the rules for all their activities. Anyone wishing to practice graffiti must have the “kings” permission to use a signature and a crew name. All major Norwegian cities have web sites dedicated to graffiti, offering information and answering questions. Many of the se sites are password protected. These sites are also used as “scrapbooks” by prominent crews, where they present pictures of their graffiti art to be admired. There are currently about 100 graffiti painters in Trondheim. The most established graffiti painters often have interests that relate to the hip-hop community. In Trondheim ninety-nine per cent are male and they are from 12 to 30 years of age. An accomplished graffiti artist has enormous status in his peer group. Some are involved in graphics courses in school or other art and handicraft subjects. Some of them are very talented artists. Many young people are attracted to this type of vandalism because of the status of being part of the graffiti milieu. The authorities believe in peer information, getting young people to talk to other young people. Because of their status and position in the teenage milieu it is natural to attempt to reach young girls. If girls can be encouraged to reject graffiti, this may impact the recruitment of the youngest boys. Parents have clear responsibilities with respect to graffiti. Sadly many parents are naïve and actually buy cans of spray paint for the children, thus it is useful to have the police supply information at parents meetings in schools.</p> <p>Trondheim authorities have an official stance: All graffiti must be removed or painted over immediately. If graffiti is left on a wall it serves as an invitation to others to put their signature or another piece there. If graffiti is removed speedily and continues to be so, graffiti artists will eventually lose interest in the site in question. The point of all graffiti is that as many people as possible should see it, therefore any surface seen by many people walking or driving past will be vulnerable. All graffiti is generally painted late in the evening or in the middle of the night. The Trondheim Local Authorities co-operate closely with the police. The political decision has been that Trondheim will not accept graffiti. All forms of graffiti are reported to the police and a photograph of the vandalism and a compensation claim are attached with each report. The police have also established a data register and photographs of graffiti are scrutinised to establish the identity of the writer and crew who have perpetrated the vandalism. When a person is apprehended for graffiti vandalism this register can be searched and with some luck there will be other reports of the same crew/writer. In such cases some young people have been forced to pay relatively large sums of money in compensation (approx. £8,000) Those who are apprehended and confess are initially sent to dispute resolution (small Claims) board. There they meet the victim and will be allowed to settle claims against them without getting a police record. Most who are dealt with this way paint over the graffiti themselves. The proportion of recurrent offenders is small among those who are apprehended at an early stage of their careers. Thus early apprehension and the dispute resolution board are effective deterrents. The police graffiti register gives a good overview of the number of cases reported annually. In recent years the number of cases reported has increased dramatically, 104% from 1998 to 1999. There was a small decline from 1999 to 2000.</p> <p>The problem for the authorities is that not all surfaces can be painted over. A type of sandblasting is used on stone surfaces. On marble polished lime stone is used, on bricks and tiles a silicate of aluminium is used and on concrete, sand is used. The coarseness of the material to be used depends on the surface from which the graffiti is to be removed. The Local Authorities spend approximately £80,000 on removing graffiti. Additional costs are incurred and paid by power companies, public transport companies, the national railway company, telephone companies, private businesses and in some cases private households. No costs can be stipulated, but a considerable amount of money is involved that is why it is regarded as a serious problem.</p>
Union of Local Authorities in Israel	<p>Graffiti offenders are in the majority of cases street gangs. Graffiti is mostly committed in town centres, central junctions, main roads, tunnels and bridges. Machines using sand and water under high pressure remove graffiti. Most graffiti offenders are not caught, as the graffiti is committed late at night. From 1997 to 2000 there was a decrease in graffiti, but incidences of graffiti started to rise in 2000.</p>

Vilnius, Lithuania	<p>The capital city of Lithuania, Vilnius, like other cities of old European culture and architecture, has experienced the impact of other cultures including the phenomena of graffiti which has a negative influence on the city's regeneration, maintenance and economy. The attitude of the citizens towards the so-called graffiti artists is negative. In seeking to restrict illegal drawings on building facades, fences and other public places in Vilnius City, city officials maintain co-operative contacts with educational and legal institutions, mass media, and the administrators of private and state holdings.</p> <p>The followers of graffiti art by their activities (drawing on building facades, fences and other places) in some way induce the activities of various daubers. On July 9, 1999, by its Decision No. 399, Vilnius City Council adopted "The Rules of Vilnius City Maintenance and Cleanness". Paragraph 15.17 thereof states: "it is forbidden to paint or otherwise scribble on buildings, fences and other erections". While following paragraph 13 of the said rules, the building owners shall regularly take care of facades. The erection facades and fences shall be maintained (painted) basing on designs made following the established procedure.</p> <p>Last year, the Vilnius graffiti artists and young Center Union's members, supported by the employees of the Department of Social Education of Vilnius Pedagogical University, painted the walls of a jail in July; however, they were called to order by officials. Three students were expelled from M.K. iurlionis High School of Arts for similar activities.</p> <p>The majority of such "painters" are at various art schools, M.K. iurlionis High School of Arts, <i>Jeruzal</i> Secondary School, Vilnius <i>emyna</i> High School, and elsewhere. These are mainly teenagers (aged 12-17). They select the time when they can draw on walls without let or hindrance. They usually draw early in the morning, when there is a proper mood, and an especially convenient time is in summer, when the sun rises. These manifestations of artistic hooliganism from primitive states are transforming themselves through new technologies and this is an important development for the future.</p> <p>City officials consider that the best thing would be to establish a certain order and equip places with indications for this purpose. This issue should be seriously considered by specialists from various institutions (educational, legal, municipal, press, etc.) Any placement of artistic production or painting in a place not intended for this is an infringement. Therefore, it is expedient to organize a well-prepared, long-term and purposeful campaign to stop the infringing persons and apply other preventive measures.</p>
Washington DC	<p>The city offers anti-graffiti kits to homeowners and small businesses to enable them to remove graffiti from their property. Graffiti is mostly committed on large walls on commercial or vacant buildings; buildings and walls along rail lines; under bridges and in tunnels. The City prevents graffiti by constant surveillance and the clean up of hot spots. In the last year the city has passed legislation banning the sale of spray paint to minors, making parents liable for their children's graffiti damage and giving the City authority to enter private property to clean graffiti. Graffiti usually returns within 48-72 hours or not at all.</p> <p>Profile: Male aged 16-25. The offender may be part of a gang or act alone. Backgrounds of offenders are diverse. Many offenders consider themselves "professional" graffiti artists.</p> <p>Cost: For 2001/02 = £410,000 approx. This is clean up costs only.</p>

RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONS

Aeroville Residents Barnet	<p>There is a problem with graffiti in this block. Most graffiti is found around the perimeters of the estate on both sides of the fences and on the garage shutters. Barnet Council is responsible for removing graffiti, although the police are dealing with some recent racist graffiti.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much harsher penalties with re-education of offenders. • Better vigilance from neighbours. • Stricter education of children. • Promotion of different attitudes by parents and children. • Better policing. • Better lighting. • CCTV surveillance. • Use of anti-graffiti paint where possible.
Fordwych Residents Association Barnet	<p>There is some graffiti on the road and on the street furniture. There is also a mural on the Brondesburyline railway bridge, which has remained graffiti free for some time, although it has now been defaced. The worst graffiti in the area is on the garage doors in Gondar Gardens.</p>
Mandells Surveyors Finchley , Barnet	<p>Mandells is a firm of Chartered Surveyors that manages over 3,000 units within the Greater London Area on behalf of landlords. The problem of graffiti within the London Area on estates and within individual properties has become more serious over the past three years. The Company continually encounters problems with graffiti on properties and estates. The graffiti is normally perpetrated on weekends and during evenings. The company is aware that some Local Authorities do arrange for graffiti to be cleared from buildings but would be grateful to have a more efficient and quicker system whereby there was a hot-line available in order for graffiti to be removed within 24 hours.</p>
West Hendon Residents Association Barnet	<p>There is a massive problem on the Perryfield Estate and elsewhere. Graffiti is common on walls, doors, windows, ceilings, lifts within the communal areas and anywhere a tag can fit. The Council is responsible for removing graffiti. The estimated cost for graffiti removal in their area for October was £4,000. To gain access to certain areas perpetrators often damage the security doors. The Residents Association would like the Council, the Police and the newly formed Neighbourhood Warden Teams to listen to the complaints from residents and act accordingly.</p>
Whitefield RA Barnet	<p>There is a problem with graffiti in this area within the tower blocks. The graffiti is sometimes removed by caretakers, but mostly by specialist contractors as soon as can be arranged after the event.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of CCTV cameras, concierge systems and 24-hour patrolling wardens. • More help from the police. • Tenant awareness. • Common-sense measures. The blank wall on Claremont Way did have a mural that the Association did not approve of and it was very soon covered in graffiti. It was repainted with plain, specially treated paint, but graffiti appears on it on a regular basis. The contractor then repaints it and the cycle repeats itself. If the perpetrators are caught much stronger methods of control should be enforced. Part of the law is there, but there is too much time wasted and not enough action being taken.
Campbell Court Brent	<p>Graffiti is widespread in the area of Kingsbury. It is found on bus shelters, domestic property, lamp posts and inside railway carriages. It is probably done by school children. The graffiti is removed, but it quickly reappears again.</p>

	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head Teachers and school assemblies should educate the pupils in an attempt to instil some decency in their behaviour. • Paint sprays should not be sold to young people.
Chelsfield Park Bromley	<p>The estate consists of 350 detached properties, each on a plot of approximately ¾ acres. The estate lies adjacent to a shopping area that is in gradual decline with empty retail units. Graffiti began to appear around the shopping area several years ago. It appears on property such as litter bins, recycling containers, community centres etc. Graffiti was unknown on the estate until two years ago. Now graffiti is also found on empty shops, end terrace walls, telephone kiosks, advertising signs etc.. Graffiti has also started to appear within the estate on garden gates, cable boxes, road names and on the sports facilities in the private recreation ground. The graffiti appears on areas that are infrequently maintained or that are remote or on property that is lacking direct and viable ownership. Incidents of graffiti are at there highest during school holidays. The Residents Association has discussed the problem, but does not have any formal procedure for removing graffiti.</p> <p>Recommendations: CCTV, police patrols.</p>
Copers Cope Area Bromley RA	<p>Bromley Council responds to requests to clean graffiti off private property. Since cameras were installed in the high street graffiti has decreased, although side roads and alleys are repeatedly scrawled on. There are also scratched windows on buses and continuous graffiti alongside railway lines, walls, buildings and on station notices. It is probable that the railway company cannot afford to constantly clean it up. Walls could be covered by creepers or painted with a colour that is off-putting. Even though there are cameras at Beckenham Junction station a hoarding on the platform is always scribbled on. Large areas of white anywhere are an attraction. It appears that the guilty are seldom caught or prosecuted. There should be a TV campaign showing these vandals to be wimps and no-hopers. To them this is their only way of making their mark.</p>
Embassy Gardens Beckenham Ltd Bromley	<p>This is an estate of about 48 flats half a kilometre west of Beckenham Junction Station. The blank end walls of two of the blocks face the railway at a distance of approximately 10 metres with garages below. This unfortunately provides two highly visible canvases and somewhere for the artists to stand. In early 1999 and May 1999 the walls were adorned with tags which after some months were removed by the council free of charge. In late 2000 both walls were re-done by different artists. Bromley had changed their policy and would only clean the areas accessible from the ground, so the company paid to have the walls cleaned. The walls were also cleaned on 5th February 2001 and one wall was sprayed a third time on 9th February 2001. The second wall remained clear for about four months. On both occasions the artist made a return visit to complete the work. There is also a problem with graffiti on the garage doors and it is the responsibility of individual residents to remove it. There was a major attack when about 15 garage doors were sprayed, but there have also been smaller random attacks. At the last AGM, the company considered the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of anti climb paint around the perimeters of the garage roofs. • Use of protective coating on the walls to make graffiti more easily removable. • Lighting the area (although the area is only partly visible from flat windows). • Erecting a trellis in front of the walls on which fast growing plants could be trained. • Growing tall conifers against the perimeter walls. • Use of dummy CCTV cameras. • Replacing the graffiti with murals to the taste of residents. <p>It was decided that since the present graffiti is not obscene or offensive and is not visible from the main road it should simply be left. The</p>

	<p>residents take a pride in the appearance of the estate and it is very annoying that other people think they have the right to spoil the environment. It seems as if the prime sites are under observation so that removal of graffiti may be an invitation rather than a deterrent. The company is also considering ways to make the walls invisible from the railway, in the belief that the aim of the graffiti artist is publicity.</p>
Florida Court Bromley	<p>At present the residents association do not have any problems with graffiti.</p>
Hayes Village Association Bromley	<p>Until two or three years ago Hayes, Kent, was completely graffiti free, but today graffiti is a recurring problem. Graffiti appears on brick walls, fences, car parks, pillar boxes, telephone booths, cable boxes and around the baselines of shops. The Council, once informed is very good about removal. The cable company is also co-operative and cleans their property regularly. Recurrence after clearance varies from two to three days to several weeks. It mostly re-occurs quickly on secondary school routes. Graffiti is endemic on the railway line from Charing Cross to Hayes. There is graffiti every where in the most inaccessible places. Also the outer surfaces of some trains are covered with solid graffiti "art" to part way up the windows. Graffiti is symptomatic of the society at present. There are too many young people with too much money, too much time on their hands, no motivation and a lack of parental interest and discipline. The energy of young people should be channelled into compulsory community corps along the lines of national Service.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCTV may be effective in some situations, but the law needs to be more effective. If the culprits are caught they should be made to clean off graffiti and do other community work such as clearance of litter. • More police on the beat and more railway police with adequate powers would probably prevent much of the graffiti being done. • Use of anti-graffiti paint. • A lively advertising campaign may raise awareness of the problem within the community.
Keston Mark RA Bromley	<p>Graffiti is found in the area on walls, fences, and garages. Although the local Authority claims it removes graffiti from private properties with written consent, in practice this is rarely carried out. In one case a resident has been waiting for two years to have graffiti removed from their property. Local schoolboys do the graffiti during the daylight hours. The staff of the school are aware of the problem but they have no power to control the students after school hours. The cable boxes are constantly sprayed with graffiti.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cable companies should have regular maintenance schedules for removing graffiti. • Perpetrators should be made to remove graffiti and personally apologise for the inconvenience to residents. • Parents should be stricter with their children when they are apprehended.
Leaves Green & Keston Vale Bromley	<p>This is a semi-rural area and they do not experience any graffiti problems.</p>
Links Estate Bromley	<p>The association is pleased that the Committee has been set up. They encounter problems with graffiti, not often on private property but on garden fences, phone junction boxes, under railway bridges and on the local parade of shops. Graffiti is sprayed on any available space and more latterly sprayed and etched on glass. This etching is becoming a major problem in Central Bromley. The Council will normally remove the graffiti if it is visible to the public, but it is sometimes difficult to get the shopkeepers to give permission for this. The association is unsure of the costs to council taxpayers. They would like to see more preventative measures and severe penalties against the perpetrators or responsible adults. In Bromley the lack of policing is a carte blanche for taggers to operate unchecked. They would like to see focussed policing or CCTV. Once removed graffiti often returns within 24 hours.</p>

<p>Mead Road RA Bromley</p>	<p>At present there is no graffiti on Mead Road, but there is a lot in nearby areas and it appears to be spreading. Walls and shopping parades seem to be most vulnerable to attacks of graffiti. The Council has an established process for reporting and removal, usually within 48 hours, with a consent form for removing graffiti from private properties. There are teams of local volunteers who keep regular watch and undertake removal if practicable. Once removed the graffiti usually returns within a few days.</p>
<p>Nineteen The Mall Management Company Ltd. Bromley</p>	<p>This company is responsible for managing the common parts of a ten storey block of privately owned flats. The escape staircase and the goods lift are both frequently subjected to graffiti and are also used as toilets. The goods lift has been daubed with dark blue paint on the walls, ceiling, light fittings and the floor. The entrance hall is also in a secluded position and within a week of graffiti being removed it is sprayed again. The area of the entrance hall and goods lift is to be redeveloped and this will enable us to deal with the problem. There will also be a new CCTV system and this will allow miscreants to be caught.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local newspapers, TV and radio to broadcast the names of offenders. • Re-install a sense of civic pride in to the younger generation. This should be a fundamental part of the school curriculum.
<p>Oregon Park RA Bromley</p>	<p>Graffiti is found on the telephone junction boxes, road signs, lampposts, shops, fences and garages of local homes. The graffiti is carried out by gangs of local youths some of whom are not from this area. The Cleansing and Parking departments of the Council will deal with it quickly once it is reported, but it reappears very quickly after removal. The underlying problem is the current youth culture. Youngsters need somewhere that is safe, affordable and accessible where they can meet together.</p>
<p>Park Langley RA Bromley</p>	<p>The area is wholly residential with limited scope for perpetrating graffiti. Part of the area is designated a conservation area and part an "Area of Special Residential Character". They do encounter graffiti in the area and it is particularly unwelcome and damaging. Graffiti is found on street furniture and walls. Responsibility for removal rests with the owner of the vandalised property. The most of the utility companies and the post office respond within a reasonable time when notified by residents. The residents have an adopt-a-box scheme, but there are insufficient volunteers to cover all the sites. BT largely appears to ignore the problem. The Council provides a free removal service for householders who wish to remove graffiti from their property.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish appropriate social facilities for dis-affected youths to redirect their energies and interest. • Establish a more responsible attitude by shopkeepers in the display and sale of relevant materials. • Establish obligatory approved anti-graffiti finishes for street furniture, which will discourage vandals, but remain acceptable within the visual environment. • Deter juvenile offenders thorough "name and shame" at schools. • Deter older offenders through a more systematic public exposure of successful prosecutions. • Make it a legal obligation for all owners of street furniture to monitor their property within a specified frequency and to remove any graffiti within the following five days. • Require Local Authorities to maintain free cleaning services to remove graffiti from private property within public view, whilst encouraging householders to do the work themselves but not under the threat of legal penalty. • Require identified offenders to participate in clean-up programmes (not necessarily just their own work).

<p>Petts Wood & District RA Bromley</p>	<p>Graffiti is most prevalent on walls, railway footbridges, underpasses, sports pavilions, residential garages, street furniture, lampposts, street signs, litter bins, and telecommunication boxes. Bromley council undertakes to remove graffiti that is visible from the highway within 48 hours, but this service is haphazard and some graffiti has not been removed for months. A local resident with assistance from the Association has therefore formed a group of volunteers now numbering over 50. They arrange to clear graffiti generally by repainting and then they ensure that the area is kept free from graffiti by inspecting the area each morning and any recurrence of graffiti is immediately removed. Graffiti initially returns very quickly, but within a matter of days the problem fades away as it becomes apparent to perpetrators that it will be removed again before their tag can be seen by their cohorts. Paint and other materials have been supplied or funded by Bromley Council, Railtrack or major local businesses</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint work with the community. The local council should provide specialist teams. • Local businesses should ensure that their premises are cleared of graffiti immediately it appears. • Residents should notify the council immediately they become aware of graffiti and where practical assist in its removal.
<p>St Mary Cray Action Group Bromley</p>	<p>Within the past year there has been a noticeable increase in the amount of graffiti in the district and beyond. Graffiti tends to be found on all surfaces, including walls, electricity cabinets, roads signs, bus shelters, rail coaches, telephone kiosks etc. Contractors working on behalf of the Council remove graffiti, but the costs and workforce limitations often prevent immediate removal. Graffiti tends to return quickly after removal. Well maintained districts are left alone, but an untidy neglected area will attract miscreants. A good example of a well maintained district is the newly pedestrianised Broadway Shopping Centre in Bexleyheath.</p> <p>Recommended Possible Solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved parental control and involvement of schools in the training programmes. • Provision of dedicated areas where youngsters could be invited to work on large public compositions. There is a great deal of talent around which should be used for the public good. • Aerosol spray paints should be locked away to reduce theft. • Community service for apprehended perpetrators that involves cleaning off graffiti. This would also act as a deterrent. • Residents involvement in removing graffiti.
<p>Heath RA Bexley</p>	<p>At this present moment graffiti is not a problem on the estate. On the rare occasion that graffiti is found, it is usually in the alleyways between buildings. It also appears along the pathway to the station. It is immediately brought to the attention of the Council or London and Quadrant and is dealt with quickly.</p>
<p>Alexandra Mansions Ltd Camden</p>	<p>Graffiti is found on external walls and rendered skirting at street level. Removal is carried out by the porter and is done fairly quickly. The initial cost of applying anti-graffiti paint to skirting is approximately £600. The removal cost is small. The association is not aware of more effective ways of prevention. The rate of return of graffiti is variable and perhaps depends upon the easy availability of other "targets".</p>
<p>Arkwright Mansions (AMRA) Camden</p>	<p>Graffiti is not a major problem in the building. There is the occasional outbreak of pencil scribble on internal walls, and tagging and political slogans on external fences and brick walls. The caretaker quickly removes these. The cost for this work is included in the service charges paid to the Council. Graffiti appears on any expanse of wall especially when it has been freshly painted. The graffiti returns almost immediately after removal. Further up the Finchley Road the visual environment of the Childs Hill area has been destroyed by a virulent</p>

	<p>outbreak of graffiti found on doorways and on materials like marble. There are also tags that have been etched directly onto the glass of shop windows and this means replacing the glass, which is expensive. The graffiti makes an area look extremely run down and adds an aura of fear and menace to the cityscape. This is a major form of vandalism, which, contrary to the view of some people has no link to artistic expression. It is done to mark out territory to make rivals aware of the writer. The more elaborate the tag and the more inaccessible and dangerous its position, the more worthy of respect is its author. Efforts to educate the age group most likely to engage in the activity, giving access to walls set aside for the purpose, send out the wrong message by encouraging legitimate graffiti in the form of work shops for the perpetrators. This minority of disaffected youth, or their parents, should be prosecuted for vandalism to public property and made to contribute to the cleaning-up operation, either physically or financially.</p>
<p>Belsize Village Residents and Traders Assoc. Camden</p>	<p>This association exists to deal with traffic and parking issues affecting the area. Graffiti has not been a major problem. Most of the graffiti has been sprayed on paintwork that is easy to paint over. However, as a local resident the Honorary Secretary to the association has been a victim of graffiti and has had graffiti sprayed on his house on three occasions. He obtained the name of a graffiti removal company from the Council but as a private resident had to bear the cost himself. A friend informed him that some local police were interested in receiving photographs of graffiti for the purpose of identifying tags.</p> <p>The Secretary found that the local police at Hampstead do not do this. By arranging for immediate removal repeat attacks of graffiti did not occur for well over six months.</p> <p>Recommendations: That the GLA take steps to see that information on graffiti removal facilities are made more readily available.</p>
<p>Bourne Estate Camden</p>	<p>Graffiti occurs on this estate wherever there is a flat plain surface. Much of the graffiti present on the estate has been there for sometime and although Camden Council are responsible for its removal this does not seem to happen on a regular basis.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopkeepers refusing to sell young people spray paint. • More widespread use of anti-graffiti paint.
<p>Camden Square Area Tenants and Residents Assoc.</p>	<p>The problem of graffiti is encountered all the time. It is done on blank walls, stairwells and every where possible. Camden Council and the Housing Associations do clean it from time to time, but not regularly enough or with any great efficiency or effectiveness.</p> <p>Recommendations: Swift removal. Perpetrators if known should be made to remove it.</p>
<p>Camden Square Neighbourhood Association</p>	<p>About twice a year the Camden Square Neighbourhood Association organises graffiti clean-up days. They operate in the immediate area of Camden Square NW1 and the streets leading off the area. They practice a zero tolerance policy towards graffiti. A survey of the whole area is undertaken. Work tasks are allocated according to the material and equipment needed against each type of attack. On a well publicised day, up to twenty members turn out to help with tasks of chemical cleaning or over-painting, as appropriate. This effort is synchronised with the Camden Council 'grimebusting team' who join the association to clean brick walls with their high-pressure hoses. With the help of members and the co-operation of Camden Council the area can be rid of all graffiti in one morning. The residents have been very encouraged by the results over the past two years. Apart from a few persistent black spots, very little graffiti returns. Residents now feel that it is worthwhile to clean their own properties between times. CSNA has currently spent £350 from their funds on paint and cleaning equipment which is made available for any member to make use of at any time.</p> <p><u>Problem Areas:</u> Graffiti is very bad round the periphery of the Camden Square area e.g. Camden Road, York Way and Brecknock Road. The</p>

	<p>Irish Centre and the shops in Murray Street are most likely to be targeted. Some shopkeepers have actually encouraged graffiti “vandals” to ‘decorate’ their steel shutters. The association intends to monitor the effect of this. In certain places graffiti returns at once. On a well used ‘notice board’, such as the entry to Cantelows Road from Camden Square graffiti will return overnight. In other areas there is a random trend. Once a wall has any graffiti on it, more is quickly attracted.</p> <p><u>Locations:</u> Graffiti is most likely to be committed on public buildings, through routes, railway sidings and areas not overlooked by domestic windows.</p> <p><u>Responsibility:</u> Camden Council is responsible for public buildings. The Council is very helpful and are seen to care about the local visual environment. The association provides the Council with a list of sites that the residents cannot clean themselves. The Council co-ordinates their work with the associations graffiti days. The council also visits occasionally between the cleanup days.</p> <p><u>Costs:</u> Recent purchases of paint to match frequently targeted walls cost the association over £100. They estimate that they spend over £200 a year on materials and paint.</p> <p><u>Solutions:</u> The association believes that the same few people are responsible for graffiti in the area. They have their recognisable signatures. Regular cleaning does discourage them. The residents also suspect that there is some connection with the drug culture and feel that it should not be difficult for a local authority to catch and punish them. The perpetrators are never seen. The residents feel that aerosol sprays are far too readily available and are sold to children of any age.</p>
Cayford House T&L Camden	<p>Cayford House is a high rise block of 14 stories. Three years ago the residents decided to watch and catch the teenagers responsible for graffiti. On catching them they gave them the option of cleaning the graffiti or being dealt with officially. The association has never had a problem since then.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u> Spend more time catching perpetrators and make them clean the graffiti they have written. The message will soon get round. The association does not see why the taxpayer should pay for this anti social behaviour. They believe that the authorities should stop being soft on these young people. Having said that the association also recognises that there are some great young people too.</p>
Charlotte Street Camden	<p>Graffiti is a major problem throughout London. During the last five years the problem has become progressively worse and more widespread throughout the Fitzrovia area of London. Graffiti is found on walls, lamp posts, utility boxes, gates, the children’s playground equipment and walls in Crab Tree Fields and the local park in Whitfield Street W1. Camden Council parks and environment departments are responsible for removing graffiti. There is an obvious cost which is outweighed by the cost of resulting environmental degradation and extensive vandalism that feeds off graffiti. Many tourists travelling to London are disgusted by the aggressive, violent atmosphere which greets them as soon as they land at any international airport and have the misfortune of having to take the train into London. The whole of their journey is blighted by graffiti scrawled on every spare surface running alongside the railway track and sides of buildings facing them. Many people do not want to return to London because it is a city that is seen to be degraded, morally bankrupt and unsafe. Graffiti and its consequential harmful effects on the environment, landscape and high levels of vandalism is costing the nation millions of pounds in lost tourist revenue. Many citizens now do not like to go out at night because of the gangs of lawless youths roaming the streets and public transport creating trouble creating a climate of fear. This is also a drain on the economy and lost revenue far higher than the cost of swift efficient removal of graffiti. Graffiti returns slowly but once the young vandals know that they can get away with spraying graffiti</p>

	<p>with impunity, they sense no one is bothered cleaning it up and they have a free reign to return over and over again committing acts of criminal damage to our local public spaces.</p> <p>New York has found many successful ways of eliminating graffiti and its resultant vandalism. A case in point is a scheme adopted on a housing estate constantly vandalised, trees dug up, benches trashed and graffiti. The trees were immediately replanted, benches instantly reinstated and graffiti swiftly removed. It solved the problem as the young thugs soon realised that their primeval desire to "mark out their territory" in destructive behaviour was not going to be tolerated by society at large. They stopped their destruction of the local environment. It should be made an offence for all shops to sell spray can paint to children and young adults.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be strict penalties of fines and closure of shops upon repeated offending. • More police presence on the streets. We now live in society where adults are frightened of children because law-abiding adults know that if they report vandals to the police or appear as witnesses in a trial, they live in fear of violent acts of reprisals against them by criminal youngsters. There is a need for far better security for witnesses and anonymity to spare reprisals from aggrieved young thugs. Far too many kids and young adults in this country are appallingly ill-disciplined and badly behaved. They are also well aware of their rights and the law and know that they can get away with anything. The police are too pressured and turn a blind eye. • Strict discipline, sanctions and punishment should be enforced in all schools. Children need boundaries. Law abiding citizens also know that the law is on the side the criminal not on the side of the law abiding citizen. • There should be instant action against perpetrators of acts of violence and vandalism and police should have much stronger powers for enforcing the law. • The age of responsibility should be lowered to eight years old. Most ten year olds are well aware of their criminal actions, the laws and what they can get away with. • Where are all the park-keepers who once looked after parks and open spaces? Their presence reduced levels of vandalism and they should be reinstated. • Children should not be left in open public spaces unsupervised. Children who are found to have vandalised public spaces with graffiti and other criminal acts should be made to clean up the mess they make and parents made to pay. Children have no sense of the destructive consequences of their actions because they are totally removed from the process of dealing with the consequences of their criminal damage. • New laws should be introduced to force local councils to implement swift removal of graffiti within strict time limits. Sanctions such as fines should be levied at local councils that fail to match the targeted time limits for removal. Local councils should be provided with extra financial and human resources for security officers to police parks after dark.
Darwin Court Camden	They experience occasional graffiti on walls which abut on to the pavement. They remove the graffiti themselves with help from Camden Council who provide a very good service. Their main problem is the post office who do not seem to bother about graffiti on letterboxes. The local letterbox has had graffiti on it for months.
Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee Camden	This conservation area covers 44 streets in Camden. They actively concern themselves with all streetscape matters. They have seen an increase in graffiti in the area. The key issue is a clear understanding of responsibility for removal of graffiti. Immediate removal is critical and must be carried out by residents and businesses, but is best organised by Local Authorities with costs covered through Community Tax. The Council is generally improving with quick removal from estates, by naming and shaming and getting culprits to remove graffiti.

	<p>Malicious vandalism is often due to the boredom of teenagers. Local libraries should be open seven days a week until at least eight at night and convenience stores should be open until 10pm to encourage people movement. There should be more police on the beat and caretakers should be re-instated on estates. Graffiti is most likely in areas with no natural surveillance, areas that are poorly lit, or where there is a decline of people walking. This should be improved by more reliable public transport. The fear of crime should be dispelled by encouraging pedestrian movement and more street benches. Street clutter should be disallowed through council policies and enforcement. This would include bus shelters with advertising, notice boards, uncoordinated traffic signs and utility boxes. There has been a huge proliferation of street clutter and these act as graffiti surfaces and encourage flyposting. Solid and perforated shop shutters attract graffiti, create a poor visual environment and act as a disincentive for residents to walk about. Planning enforcement should be carried out on unauthorised installations. Incentives are needed at neighbourhood level to encourage the upgrade of shop front security by other means. There should be better street lighting at pedestrian scale to humanise the street, clear the tree canopies and boost the quality of the urban realm. There should be improved education for the young on citizenship, urban design awareness etc When graffiti is removed regularly the problem often declines.</p>
Elaine Grove and Oak Village Camden	They would like to be kept abreast of the progress and outcomes of the scrutiny.
Elliott Square RA Camden	<p>This estate has recently suffered extremely abusive anti-Semitic graffiti on nearby white walls. The Police were informed, took photographs and have promised to step up their patrols. No other local estates have experienced this type of attack, but Elliott Square is vulnerable because the area where the graffiti was sprayed is near the public pavement.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community vigilance. • Allow the police to take details and photographs before removing the graffiti. • Swift removal. Jif cream applied with a scourer followed by a coat of white undercoat is effective. Thames Maintenance also regularly paint over no-offensive graffiti. • Use of Anti-vandal paint. • Mini time lapse camera. • Joint neighbourhood action.
Finchley Road- 122B Residents Association Camden	<p>This is a small block of five flats. Graffiti appears on the side wall off the street as well as on the front of the premises. The residents generally paint over the graffiti or use graffiti remover. The perpetrators are never seen. It is the same tag used along the Finchley Road for quite some distance. Some of the walls in the area are immediately tagged again once they have been painted. There are no police on the street in this area and this is an open invitation for people to do what they want. The police have said that the perpetrators need to be caught in the act. The Council does remove graffiti quickly if alerted. It could help if young offenders and those given community service are put to the task of cleaning graffiti. Refusing to sell spray paint to children is well meaning, but ineffective as children can buy spray paint from other areas and there are also adults involved in graffiti. Shopkeepers should be made to use lattice type shutters that don't give graffiti a clear board and shopkeepers should be made to clean up their premises when graffiti appears on them. Flyposting also needs to be nipped in the bud before the capital is nothing but free advertising for anyone to take advantage of and make the city like a slum.</p>
Fitzroy Park Camden	<p>This association comprises some 70 households in the Fitzroy Park area of Highgate. It is a leafy private road that leads directly to Hampstead Heath. Over the last year they have been plagued with graffiti. Not only is it an eyesore but given the fact that several buildings are Grade 11 listed, difficult to remove at short notice without consultation with the appropriate authorities. The association has discussed the matter as a matter of urgency. They have liaised with Highgate school who are aware that several of their pupils may be the main perpetrators. The graffiti appears on any public surface; walls, gates, road signs etc. It reappears usually two months or so after it has been cleaned, sometimes sooner. Local residents repaint the walls, the local council has removed some graffiti. It is a problem throughout</p>

	<p>Highgate and one that is recognised by all voluntary and statutory groups. It is a real and growing nuisance as everyone is aware of that the incremental deterioration of a locality attracts more graffiti, more anti social behaviour and ultimately more crime.</p> <p>Effective deterrent: Certainly the FPA committee and local residents feel frustrated by the scourge of graffiti and the inability of the Local Authorities to deal with it. There is a move for voluntary vigilante patrols to catch the culprits in the act. Certainly it would be an ideal role for the street wardens proposed by the Home Secretary. The Association would certainly welcome a directive from the GLA to the Metropolitan police and local magistrates articulating the concern of residents and urging them to bring severe penalties on those who degrade and destroy the local environment.</p>
Hollycroft Avenue Camden	<p>They do not have a problem with graffiti in their area. The Association is aware that graffiti is committed where it can attract attention and pedestrian areas that are abandoned and dirty. Graffiti could be prevented if the streets were made attractive. This would increase public presence and there will therefore be less of an opportunity for people to commit graffiti.</p>
Inkerman Area Camden	<p>The Members of this Association have raised concerns about graffiti, both on estates and in streets. Any blank wall is a target. The perpetrators seem undeterred by being out in the open. Camden council have a hit squad who will go in to estates but the Association is not aware of anything similar for streets. The responsibility for removal rests with individual occupiers if it's not a council estate.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide space where kids can graffiti legitimately and take some pride in it. • Provide alternative activities for young people - investing real resources in youth facilities, sport etc. • Quick removal. This does work and graffiti-ists give up if their work is always removed straight away. • Anything that fosters a sense of community so that people look out for each other's property and challenge any vandalism. • If people are caught graffiti-ing, making them clean it off.
Ingestre Road Tenants Association Camden	<p>They occasionally encounter problems of graffiti on their estate. Graffiti is found on metal and wooden garage doors that have a smooth surface and provide contrasting background colour. The council has a most efficient anti-graffiti strategy and graffiti removal team. Graffiti becomes more prolific at certain times of the year than others. The root causes of graffiti in our society are many and complicated. In order to succeed in the eradication of graffiti, detailed research must be done into who financially profits the most from the graffiti culture. We must accurately measure the balance between the winners and loser in the strategy against graffiti and adjust the balance to the satisfaction of both sides. A can of spray paint should be sold expensively under license and be tax refundable for those who use it in their work.</p>
Jeffreys Street Camden	<p>There is a major problem of graffiti on these properties. It is usually committed on the sidewalls of the end houses in the terraces. There is also a small block of six garages in the street, and the garage doors are often targeted. Removal is the responsibility of the property owners, or the leaseholders of the garages. Most of the residents have given up doing anything about graffiti, given the considerable cost, and the likelihood that fresh tags will appear almost at once. We feel that this is something that should be tackled by the council, and that where appropriate graffiti-resistant paint or other coating might be used.</p>
Kelly Street Camden	<p>This is a very small street which has not yet experienced any problems of graffiti. They have general concerns about graffiti in London.</p>
Lissenden Gardens Camden	<p>The Association is pleased to know that the GLA are investigating graffiti. This is an estate of Edwardian blocks, included in a conservation area and residents are anxious to preserve both the historic features and the appearance of the buildings. One graffiti hot spot is along a long dark green wooden fence that borders a private footpath from the Estate to Hampstead Heath. Other graffiti prone areas are parts of buildings, street notices and nameplates. In some blocks the common parts are vandalised. It is possible that the graffiti is sprayed at dusk. On one occasion when some small children were caught in the act in daylight, the adult admonishing them had his shirt sprayed too. The</p>

	<p>caretakers do their best to remove graffiti, but it is not part of their duty to do so. Removal seems to be an indication to target the same spot. The Association does not have an indication of the costs of graffiti removal. Camden Council tried tackling the problem by instructing youngsters in creative spray painting and providing legitimate outlets but there were letters in the local press deriding this project as counter productive.</p> <p>Perpetrators: Youngsters aged 10-12. The estate does not have “artistic” graffiti which suggests that the perpetrators are young. This is not a purpose built estate and there are no play facilities for children, so they are apt to get up to mischief when playing in the street.</p> <p>Effective Ways of Dealing with Graffiti: Providing caretakers with paint and give them the authority to clean up. Having an expert cleaner travelling around the district. Use graphologists to identify the handwriting.</p>
North West One and Mornington Crescent Camden	<p>These Association s have been asking the Council to improve the appalling conditions on the Long Meadow Estate at Torriano Avenue NW5. On this estate they do not have secure entry systems and as a result have to live with varying degrees of vandalism including graffiti scrawled all over stairwells, hallway walls and ceilings. The Council will not remove the graffiti until new front and rear entry systems have been installed, however there have been no entry phone systems for the last five years. The Association is willing to provide copies of letters written to the Council about this issue and states that the committee is welcome to visit the estate.</p>
Pond Square Camden	<p>This Residents association is very concerned about repetitive graffiti and continues to discuss the problem at their regular committee meetings. They have established a voluntary fund that attempts to deal with local graffiti. The fund is for the regular cleaning of daubed painted walls and brickwork. The Association is also discussing the possible introduction of further measures including CCTV and will be seeking the Council’s support for funding. The Association has arranged with the Council to remove graffiti from council owned buildings in the area. Graffiti is a modern menace that needs to be addressed and is slowly spoiling many areas. It brings an area down and leads to further abuse by other potential villains. Prevention is the ideal remedy as unfortunately, the culprits have to be caught in the act in order to face any form of prosecution.</p>
Pilgrim’s to Willoughby RA Camden	<p>In the past graffiti has been one of those simmering “quality of life” issues that bubble on the backburner waiting for action. Along with dog do, it has been one of the most annoying irritants of city life. There is graffiti in the area on utility boxes, on private front walls and on a few lampposts. In the past year, however, the problem seems to have abated somewhat. Perhaps the problem teenagers have moved away. There are few council properties in the neighbourhood and apart from the utility boxes, most of the graffiti has occurred on private property. The Association is aware of the services that the Camden environment department provide and in the past have considered hiring “graffiti busting” equipment for a day and making it available to anyone in the neighbourhood. If the Association has problems like this in the future they will consider this.</p>
St Pancras Court Housing Co-op Ltd. Camden	<p>They do not have a graffiti problem on the estate. They have had minor incidents in the past, but due to the vigilance of residents these were dealt with immediately. Graffiti mainly occurs in unlit or badly lit parts of stairs and communal areas. The co-op employs a handy man and cleaner who would deal with any incidents of graffiti. The removal of racist and offensive graffiti is considered to be extremely urgent, but all graffiti removal is treated as important and must be dealt with without delay.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spreading graffiti should constitute a breach of tenancy conditions and be worded in a manner so that it is easy for legal action to succeed. • There should be a central department in the local authority that deals with graffiti removal. • Pupils should be made aware of both the financial and emotional costs.

Sidmouth Mews TA Camden	There is very little graffiti on this estate, possibly because the estate is a square and the area is visible. When graffiti does occur the caretaker removes it within 3-4 days. Graffiti occurs on staircases and lobbies especially on wet and cold nights. Youth boredom is the most likely cause, along with a lack of places for them to go, nothing for them to do and no organised clubs for them to attend. Not enough money is spent on facilities for youth. If all the money spent on removing graffiti was spent on youth provision there would not so much graffiti.
Summers Street RA Camden	Comments are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graffiti is an eyesore in the area. • The perpetrators are never seen. • Local street traders claim to know who they are, saying it is a gang of teenagers. • There is a symbol that may be a signature • Our managing agents quickly remove or paint off the graffiti. Persistent quick removal may make the kids who do it give up. • Solid metal shutters on shops seem to attract graffiti, whilst the open grid type of steel shutters seem to deter it. • Brighter street lights, such as were installed recently by Camden in Hatton Gardens could help too.
Templewood Avenue Camden	Graffiti is not a problem in the area of this neighbourhood association.
Addington RA Croydon	They have graffiti in their shopping precinct. The graffiti is done in quiet out of the way places such as alleyways and along tramlines. Property owners are responsible for graffiti removal. The association feel that the Council should remove all graffiti. Having vegetation on the walls could act as a deterrent. Because graffiti returns so quickly one gets used to its presence. The association has heard of the technique of recording tags that are then used to identify perpetrators. They hope that when this is done magistrates will pass strong deterrent sentences.
Bishops Walk RA Croydon	This Residents Association has suffered graffiti damage to private property in the last two years. The area is not run down or neglected but graffiti is sprayed on the more prominent brick walls, road signs and fences. At times the graffiti has been a meaningless scrawl, but at other times the tag "Poska Donars" is quite visible. The graffiti is always sprayed at night. The householders were left to remove the graffiti. The slow response of the Council to remove graffiti from their property and street furniture, coupled with the failure of the tram operators to respond promptly has signalled an invitation to perpetrators to add more graffiti. This is seen by many as contributing to the proliferation of graffiti on private property in areas away from the centre of Croydon. The costs of graffiti removal for individuals is high and is labour intensive, especially where paint has been sprayed onto brickwork. When graffiti is sprayed on your home it is a violation of personal property. It is the complete antithesis to promoting community pride and values. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompt removal. • Educate parents and guardians that graffiti is not acceptable and that they are liable and will be prosecuted for the actions of their children. • When perpetrators are caught the sanction applied should not just be a penalty, but a punishment sufficient to be a deterrent. • The council should be compelled to promptly remove the graffiti from public and private property within a few days, without charge to the property owners. This would avoid the protracted business of the council vainly attempting to get individuals or companies to remove graffiti from their property. • Councils should not be seen to condone or encourage graffiti in any way such as graffiti murals.
Brookscroft Management Ltd. Croydon	Brookscroft Management Ltd is a management committee for local residents in the Forestdale area of Croydon. They recommend erecting trelliswork and climbing plants to discourage graffiti being applied to large expanses of brickwork.

Canning & Clyde Road Croydon	<p>This Association has a problem with graffiti in their two roads and the surrounding area. Graffiti is committed along property boundary walls that adjoin the pavements, on telephones, Telewest (cable) property, post office boxes and along alleyways in the area. The Council is responsible for graffiti removal, but it is the opinion of the Association that the Council is trying to pass the cost of this to local residents. Although the Council have publicised their own cleaning materials, one of the residents has discovered that some domestic cleaning agents are more effective and cheaper. Graffiti returns within a week of being removed. Graffiti was an important issue at the first of the Ward Neighbourhood Partnership meetings. The next meeting will be held on the 16th of January 2002 and they would welcome feedback from the GLA before then.</p> <p>Effective ways of dealing with graffiti :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More active interest by the Police. • Identifying perpetrators through their tags. Keeping a database of tags along with photographs of the perpetrators irrespective of their age. • Prosecuting all perpetrators regardless of their age. • Magistrates should have the powers to impose stiffer sentences. • Restricting the sale of aerosol sprays.
Coulsdon Forum Croydon	<p>This organisation does not support a ban on aerosols, but they are concerned about the damage and expense caused by the perpetrators of graffiti. They will support almost any action that will stamp out this form of vandalism. They wish to emphasise that the Committee must make sure that they take concrete action.</p>
Croydon Society (The)	<p>The Council is satisfactorily dealing with the problem of graffiti. The Association is not directly involved, but they have been represented at conferences and seminars organised by the Council.</p>
East Coulsdon RA Croydon	<p>The Association welcomes this investigation, since their area is badly affected by an increasing plague of graffiti and associated criminal damage. They believe that perpetrators of graffiti are mostly young people aged about 14 – 22, mostly male, who live in and around the area where they operate. The local population is mostly white, but there is a mixture of ethnic minorities. Graffiti are most likely to be marked/sprayed in places where the results may be plainly visible, especially to young people. These include walls, shutters, telecommunications boxes (often owned by Telewest), Royal Mail pillar boxes, sign-boards and even glass windows in (mainly central) public places, mainly in the open air, but also in covered car-parks, public toilets and subways. Walls targeted are mostly blank-rendered but also plain brick. Graffiti are even applied in places that are difficult/dangerous to access, eg on walls above flat roofs, on the outer sides of railway bridges, and along railway lines where trains pass close-by. Graffiti are usually applied at times when the perpetrators are unlikely to be seen by passers-by, such as evenings and at night.</p> <p>The impact of graffiti on the quality of local life is almost invariably adverse with the majority of graffiti being ugly, scribbled ‘tags’, that are quickly applied. Some graffiti are more elaborate, and in a few instances, very elaborate having a certain artistic quality. Graffiti are often accompanied by other criminal damage, such as scratched shop-windows, scratched and/or smashed bus shelter windows and/or public telephone booth glass. Other common criminal damage in such places includes broken traffic bollards, smashed seats in public places, damaged drainpipes, and upset and/or fire-damaged litter bins. Cars parked near-by may also be criminally damaged. Affected areas also seem to attract other crimes, such as street crime and robbery in shops.</p> <p>Affected areas soon appear run-down and unattractive unless quickly cleaned and repaired. Traders fear that shoppers will no longer call at their shops and businesses. Local residents and visitors feel unsafe in public places after dark. Graffiti that are not quickly removed soon</p>

	<p>attract more graffiti close-by, even applied on top of existing graffiti, and regeneration work is delayed or even suspended because of the cost and effort needed to deal with graffiti and other criminal damage. Insurance premiums rise in affected areas. The most effective practice to combat graffiti is to cover blank walls with trellis and climbing plants, to use paint and applied wall coatings that resist adhesion by paint or are sacrificial, and are easy to clean, and to clean up/remove graffiti as soon as possible. Graffitiists take time and effort to apply their tags and other marks to advertise their identity to those in their age groups who may be impressed. Quick removal of graffiti is therefore seen by graffitiists as ruining their work and negating their advertising. CCTV would also deter graffiti and other criminal damage.</p> <p>Local opinion is that penalties should deter and humiliate graffitiists and perpetrators of other criminal damage by example. Apprehending such criminals is not easy, but local people believe that convicted perpetrators should be made to clean off their work and rectify damage, in full view of the public and local media and at times that cause them most personal inconvenience, such as during football matches.</p> <p>Graffiti and associated problems are already common in this area as described above, and the problem seems to be getting steadily worse. Graffiti in this area are removed mostly by victims and volunteers but also by Croydon Council workers. The costs of removal, which can be considerable, are often borne by the victims, but assistance is also given by Croydon Council, which provides materials and sometimes labour to clear up graffiti and repair other damage to public property. The Association believes that more effective ways of dealing with graffiti and associated criminal damage should include the installation of monitored Closed Circuit Television in public places, deployment of more police officers in affected areas and initiatives to enlist the co-operation of young people to make graffitiists unpopular among their peers. An apparently effective system, recently introduced in Brighton, is to persuade young people to sign 'Acceptable Behaviour Contracts'. Such a system should be investigated for use in Croydon and London.</p> <p>Graffiti in this area returns relatively quickly after removal, especially where they consist of quickly scribbled tags. Very rapid removal of such graffiti tends to deter graffitiists for few days or so, since their advertising and efforts are negated. On the other hand, graffitiists seem to see the area, which has no CCTV and no large or regular visible police presence, as a soft target, where they may work without hindrance or fear of arrest and conviction. Local people are most grateful for the efforts of the Metropolitan Police and Croydon Council in the area, but it is clear that their resources are not nearly sufficient to deal effectively with the problems posed by graffiti and associated crime in this area. The Association has a local initiative to try to get Closed Circuit Television installed in certain areas in Coulsdon. This initiative is seen to be very important by local residents and business-people, and a lot of private money has already been pledged towards a CCTV system for the centre of Old Coulsdon village, should insufficient public funds become available. The Association would be glad to give oral evidence and to show interested visitors the extent of our problems with graffiti and associated criminal damage and other crime. We would also be interested to see a copy of the Investigative Committee's report in due course.</p>
Farm Drive RA Croydon	This Residents Association will be submitting a joint response with the Webb Estate Society.
Forestdale Croydon	One way of reducing graffiti would be to have a £5 deposit on any graffiti linked product. It was felt that this would create a more responsible approach to usage.
Haling & District RA Croydon	In this area graffiti occurs mainly in alleyways at the backs of houses in the Haling Grove Bridleway, on lock-up garages and in the local parks. Board fencing, brick walls and lock-up garage doors are prime targets. The council usually cleans the graffiti, but this provides a fresh slate for further graffiti within a few days. Vandalism is a related problem that occurs in the same locations as the graffiti. Measures to deal with these problems are inadequate. It is very difficult for the police to catch the offenders and they may well feel that they have more serious crimes to attend to. In any case magistrates usually let graffiti first offenders off with a warning. If that is the case and the young people concerned are aware of it they may well feel the risk of being caught is worth it.

Kenley and District Croydon	Give powers to the Police to stop and search possible graffiti suspects for the relevant marking material.
Knighton Close RA Croydon	<p>This residential area is not affected by graffiti. The main problems are at the bus stops and the chief culprits are from the local school. Apart from the graffiti there is also the problem of the breakage of glass, not only of the stops themselves, but also to the time table holders on the posts. The responsibility for removing the graffiti from the bus stops is probably that of JC Decaux who clean the site on a regular basis of about two or three weeks. Graffiti returns very quickly often within two or three days. Another problem is the etching of glass windows on buses. Underlying all these problems must be a lack of discipline in the homes and in the schools which has created a culture amongst our youth of wanton vandalism in the name of fun. It would seem imperative that punishment is again to be meted out at an early stage by those in authority over our children before matters get out of hand.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent but random out of sight observation by the school staff. • Conductors on buses.
Laxton Court Croydon	They have had graffiti both inside and outside their sheltered housing block. The Council has issued them with graffiti wipes and they intend too use this where they can. In the area blank walls and bridges are targets for graffiti. The Association is aware that a wooden trellis has been erected around one graffiti hotspot in the area and they are waiting to hear if this measure has successfully prevented further attacks. The Association feels that legal graffiti walls will not deter perpetrators of graffiti. They suggest that shops should be made aware of the impact of selling such products to young people. In addition to this identification marks should be put on spray cans so that when an offender is found in possession of a spray can the police will be able to identify the shop the can was bought or taken from.
Lower End Kingsdown Avenue (LeKARA). Croydon	They do not support a ban on graffiti materials. They would like to see stiffer penalties for criminal damage and feel that some form of ridicule of the person/persons concerned may well work where other ideas have failed.
Park Hill Croydon	<p>This Association represents approximately 2000 households in East Croydon. They have problems with graffiti in their area. It is mainly found on walls of buildings and gardens, public utility boxes, bus shelters and on parking payment machines. The Resident Association has found that once reported, Croydon Council remove graffiti swiftly from areas that belong to them. Utility companies will sometimes remove graffiti from their property, but cable companies are much slower and Railtrack is particularly bad. Residents also remove graffiti where the utility companies do not act.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swift removal. Removal should be carried out before the graffiti has time to embed. In such circumstances the graffiti can be removed without the need for sophisticated apparatus. • A sense of ownership amongst local residents. People need to be encouraged to take some responsibility for the environment surrounding their homes and to remove graffiti themselves instead of assuming that it is someone else's problem. A publicity campaign may help to foster this attitude. • A single point in each borough for registering complaints about graffiti which could then be passed on to the appropriate body
Residents Against Graffiti Croydon	<p>This is an independent, non-political group that is campaigning for a complete ban on the sale of aerosol paint. Whilst they commend the work that Croydon council is doing to counter graffiti, they do not think that a ban on the sale of aerosol paints to youngsters is going to work. Although tobacco products are banned to those under sixteen many of them still smoke. The organisation has have estimated cost of cleaning graffiti in London to be £10 million.</p> <p>Recommendation: Phasing out the production, sale and import of aerosols paint.</p>

<p>Riddlesdown Croydon</p>	<p>Graffiti has really started on a serious scale in our local area. There is constant graffiti in the area on virtually every post box/ bus shelter. The local church St Edmunds has been severely covered in letters 4 feet high. The bus shelters are constantly smashed and repaired and then smashed again the next day. In a recent survey of members some 70% put graffiti as the top of their list as the things that worry them.</p> <p>Croydon council, and the local councillors for the two wards, of Sanderstead and Purley, work hard in the removal but the perpetrators are back the next day. It really is an ongoing event that some people feel may never end but we cannot give up on the efforts to get the graffiti cleaned off. Regular cleaning events are arranged but these are about every 8 weeks and the graffiti gradually returns. Riddlesdown High School is right in the heart of the area. Obviously the pupils from the school are responsible for some of this graffiti but others from surrounding areas are also involved. A number of young people have been identified by the local police who do a good job with their reduced manpower. The local ward officer works hard but she is only one person and cannot be everywhere. Even when the person is finally caught they are either let off with a caution or given something that does not seem to deter them. Why are the police not given the powers of search for spray paint /markers etc which would help in the apprehension of these people. Why are perpetrators not made to pay for the damage that they have caused and the cost of removal.</p> <p>There are three main focal points for graffiti and wanton damage in the area. These are the school, the railway station and the main through roads (Mitchley Avenue and Riddlesdown Road). The Council is very active with removal of graffiti and it is hoped that when the "New Southern Railway" is operational they will assist the Council and not confine their graffiti removal purely to railway property thereby giving graffiti a shorter viewing life.</p>
<p>Wharfdale/Lonsdale Gardens Croydon</p>	<p>Graffiti in the area is more evident in the alleyway behind some of the houses, where the perpetrators can spray graffiti without public interference. It is also sprayed on garage doors and walls. According to the Council the owners of property are responsible for the removal of graffiti. As soon as the graffiti is faded a new lot appears. Banning aerosols could help with the problem.</p>
<p>Churchfield Road Community Assoc.. Ealing</p>	<p>The graffiti problem is not too bad now. The Churchfield Community Association was formed just over a year ago to try to deal with a number of problems in the area, including Graffiti. It occurs on the shop fronts, but not as much on the front of the ones that look the most cared for. However, any large plain wall is vulnerable and still attracts attention. Also, a railway bridge where teenagers hang out is very artistically painted. Where graffiti is used to deface rather than decorate, it's a mess. There is a graffiti clean up team, but the residents do not rely on them. A few local residents have taken responsibility for reporting it or dealing with it directly. It is best to work together and not just rely on the council as they can't do it all on their own. We organised a 'Graffiti Clean Up' day last November, involving the council graffiti team, local residents and traders. We wrote to all the traders in the street asking them to paint over ny graffiti on their shop fronts, and supplied the paint and in some cases offered to do the painting for them. This has not stopped the problem completely, but it is much better now the street looks more generally cared for. The Association managed to get a small grant to buy paint. Etching has become a problem. Many residents in Churchfield Road had their windows scratched one night by a single person. This costs a fortune because windows have to be replaced. The Association has been as effective as they can be. The graffiti has not disappeared but is much better and the community do not feel so powerless. If graffiti is painted out fairly quickly it doesn't always return. It seems to the association that the cleaner and more cared for an area looks, the less graffiti appears.</p> <p>Recommendations: Having a place for graffiti 'artists' to display their work helps up to a point – it has to be in a very visible place and not tucked away where no-one can see it – but there will always be the ones who do it because it is the only way they have of being noticed. It is very sad.</p>

Ealing Fields RA	<p>Graffiti tags are found in the shopping centres and on walls, shop shutters, signs and other surfaces and can remain there for years. Unfortunately graffiti seems to have become an acceptable feature of life in Ealing. Concerted efforts by a wide range of parties are needed to tackle this scourge of our urban environment.</p> <p>Parliament There are provisions under S12 of the London Local Authorities Act 1995, to enable London Boroughs to require private property owners to clean graffiti from their premises. This legislation does not allow Local Authorities to recover the cost of graffiti removal from property owners who do not comply with council notices requiring such action. We would urge that GLA use its good offices to seek amendments to the existing legislation so that councils can recover the full cost of graffiti removal from private property owners. Changes to the legislation could include provisions to levy fines from owners that did not pay councils for any necessary graffiti removal work within prescribed time scales. The legislation covering criminal damage is well drafted and the problem is with enforcement.</p> <p>Local Authorities In recent years Ealing Council has taken a number of welcome initiatives we also recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a wide ranging strategy to tackle graffiti in the borough which would include standards to be achieved by the graffiti removal service. • Use the provisions of S12 of the London Local Authorities Act more extensively and monitor the level of compliance with notices served. • Use the recent changes to the financial framework for Local Authorities to channel funds from parking fines etc to provide more resources for the council graffiti removal service. • Review the current use of resources which are predominantly aimed at cleaning graffiti from Council owned property on a cyclical basis and deal more effectively with graffiti on privately owned property. • Establish alliances with residents groups and businesses to clean graffiti in their communities e.g. adopting cable boxes, bridges etc. • Introduce regular community clean ups in hot spots. • Remove redundant Council owned buildings and structures. • Keep the numbers of Council owned street furniture to a minimum. • Benchmark good practice. • Use planning legislation to reinforce the anti graffiti strategy. • Use S106 agreements with developers to fund graffiti removal operations. • Undertake annual audits to assess how graffiti is being controlled in the borough. • Act as a clearinghouse for the reporting of graffiti on all property in the borough, these reports could then be passed to other property owners such as BT etc. • Provide detailed advice for residents and businesses on graffiti removal. • Work with the environmental task force to devote some of its resources to graffiti removal. <p>Police and Criminal Justice System The priorities of police forces in the capital need to be reviewed. The criminal justice system as a whole needs to ensure that appropriate cases are brought to court and that there is more co-operative working between the British Transport Police and the other elements of the criminal justice system. Magistrates should punish the perpetrators of graffiti. Graffiti is criminal damage and can attract 10 year sentences In some cases imprisonment may be appropriate. Reparation orders should be used to make offenders clean off their graffiti. CCTV should</p>
------------------	---

	<p>be used more extensively.</p> <p>Residents and Business Property owners should promptly remove graffiti from their property. Businesses such as Cable TV operators and the Royal Mail need to improve their response to graffiti. The Association has also attached a brief description of the Ealing Anti Graffiti Service.</p>
Hanger Hill Garden Estate RA Ealing	<p>They encounter graffiti on private property, cable TV boxes, pillar boxes, outside West Acton underground station and on the railway bridges. The Council has appointed an officer who is responsible for the removal of graffiti from hoardings, buildings and property not on private land. This officer can arrange for graffiti to be removed from private property, but at a cost to the property owner. The Association has asked all residents to take photographs of those who carry out this crime. They are concerned that private residents, who pay an exorbitant cost to have graffiti removed, are expected to pay again if it reappears.</p>
Haven Green Ltd Ealing	<p>Graffiti is a problem on this estate. Graffiti is most likely to be committed on the pillars in front perimeter fences. The company is responsible for removing graffiti, although they are reluctant to remove current graffiti for fear of doubling the amount next time. Once removed graffiti returns within ten days. The company is aware of the costs of removal as the last lot of graffiti was removed during their maintenance programme.</p> <p>Recommendation: A sting operation should be set up on Spring Bridge Road, using the CCTV in place on the wall of the parking garage, after cleaning the walls of the bridge. The local graffiti artists would not be able to resist the temptation due to the fact that they probably consider it a prime Location with high visibility. When caught they should be named and shamed in the various local newspapers along with posters showing their faces and sentences placed in areas where youngsters frequent (I.E. HMV, McDonalds etc).</p>
The Grange Residents Company Ltd. Ealing	<p>There are problems with graffiti in this area, particularly on perimeter walls. The Chair of the company takes personal responsibility for removing graffiti from the estate. The costs to the estate are not substantial, but they do not take labour costs into account. Graffiti is not a problem if it is removed quickly. Vandals have now virtually given up spreading graffiti on some areas of the estate because it is removed within a day. Bus stops in the area are also attacked and this is due to the fact that the service is poor and vandals get easily bored whilst waiting. Where possible bus stops should not be placed opposite solid walls and they should be fitted with CCTV. Telecom junction boxes are also targets and the owners should be made to remove the graffiti within 24 hours of notification.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councils should be required to have graffiti removal teams whose job should be to remove graffiti within 24 hours on council property, public buildings, signs and street furniture. • Legislation should be introduced requiring business and private property owners to report graffiti to the council team who would then remove it at the ratepayers expense. • Convicted vandals should be required to remove their own graffiti wherever possible. • Penalties for vandals should be severe and should include heavy fines, which should go towards the cost of graffiti removal. • Repeats offenders should be jailed. • TV documentaries showing criminal activities or interviewing vandals should be banned. • TV companies and journalists should not refer to vandals as artists, nor should their scribble be publicised or praised in any way. <p>These recommendations may be considered an extreme reaction to graffiti but these vandals have no respect for other people or for law and order. Graffiti is grossly offensive to the vast majority. It raises fear and if allowed to flourish makes an area so undesirable that it degenerates into a slum. The appearance of graffiti at railway stations creates an appalling impression on visitors to the capital and gives</p>

Walpole Residents Association Ealing	<p>the impression that the police have lost control of the streets. There must be a concerted, co-ordinated and prolonged campaign undertaken by the police, transport companies, local councils and the general public.</p> <p>This area suffers noticeably from graffiti. It is sprayed anywhere that provides a canvas including wooden walls in the local park, blank ends of terrace houses, garden walls and pedestrian walkways. The Council has a graffiti officer and the association believes that the situation has improved since the council allocated some resources to it. The residents are aware that there is some work being done in schools and that there have been some successful prosecutions. Residents have been advised that it is their responsibility to remove graffiti from their property. Removing graffiti from private property can be both time consuming and expensive.</p>
Bush Hill Park RA Enfield	<p>Most of the graffiti in the area is created by young people who appear to have nothing better to do than circulate in the neighbourhood and perform acts of anti-social behaviour such as threatening behaviour and gate crashing private and semi-private events. It takes a long time for graffiti to be removed and it re-appears very quickly. The Council and Railtrack are slow to remove graffiti from their property because they realise that the graffiti will re-appear almost immediately.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting the sale of spray cans to adults. • The installation of CCTV cameras in graffiti prone areas. • That the GLA hold a brain-storming session on graffiti prevention.
Church Street Area RA Enfield	<p>In the main, the area covered by the Association does not suffer from graffiti.</p>
Gordon Hill RA Enfield	<p>Graffiti is just one expression of general malaise that includes litter dropping and vandalism. The Association does not have a problem with graffiti, this may be attributable to the fact that there are no large bare vertical surfaces that invite defacing. However, there is a railway station in the area that has a graffiti problem. At the station there is a persistent problem of graffiti and vandalism of platform buildings, etc. This could be attributed to the fact that there are no platform staff at the station and the booking office is well removed from the platforms. The transport police are over extended and youngsters are bored because there are limited youth facilities in the area. Special anti-graffiti paint has been used but it is expensive.</p> <p>Graffiti is the expression of the alienation of people from society and hence a disrespect for other's property, whether public or private. Elsewhere in the Borough some road underpasses have been lined with tiles and decorated with scenes derived from a competition held in local schools. Unless the emphasis placed on educating students to be integrated into society rather than in order to "get a well paid job" (Democracy before Meritocracy), we will not have adults with a social conscience.</p>
Southgate Green Association Enfield	<p>Graffiti occurs on street furniture and areas used by the public ,e.g. footpaths. The local church has graffiti scratched into the stonework. The graffiti is usually spray paint or non-washable paint. Graffiti is etched into plastic surfaces. It is the responsibility of the Council, public utilities and private individuals to remove graffiti. The Council is very slow to respond to requests to remove graffiti, particularly if it is enamel. Etching is not removed at all. There are a number of ways Councils could hinder graffiti growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councils already have many rules in their respective Unitary Development Plans to cover advertising, street furniture and recycling. These areas of policy often conflict with the good practice necessary to prevent graffiti and its adverse effects. For example recycling bins have been placed in front of the 17th century pub in the area. They attract graffiti, fly posting and illegal rubbish. The Council has shown no flexibility in removing them, insisting that the recycling policy takes precedence over historical or conservation precepts. • Some councils also promote the increase rather than the reduction of street furniture. At present Enfield has a policy of installing advertising kiosks all over the Borough and these are another target for graffiti. Public utility property also contributes to

	<p>environments that invite graffiti. The Council could insist that utility companies justify the extent to which street furniture is or is not redundant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better street lighting. • Use of sturdier building material. The use of plastics that are prone to scratching should be avoided. • Better and more frequent rubbish removal. • Better community relations with the police. • Some of the perpetrators live locally and see graffiti as a prank. Youth education and participation in local environmental issues would encourage a more considered view of the impact graffiti has on the area. <p>Although graffiti is a problem in this area, fly posting is worse and is growing. Councils already have the means to reduce the generation of graffiti, but there appears to be a lack of will power and a low priority status given to this topic.</p>
Willow RA Enfield	<p>Graffiti is sprayed on the walls of the shops and on telephone boxes, fences and cable boxes and other street furniture. The graffiti is done by a group of approximately 25-30 youngsters. The headmistress from the nearby school has sent members of staff to many of the private driveways in the area to clean off the rude words that have been sprayed. The police have also been informed as many of these young people are also involved in smoking and drinking.</p>
The Plumstead Common Environment Group Greenwich	<p>The Plumstead Common Environment Group decided a few years ago that one of their major projects for the future should be the appalling amount of graffiti in the area. They have chosen particular sites and kept them clear of graffiti in order to demonstrate that the battle over this scourge can be easily won. They have demonstrated that successfully but sadly, people don't seem motivated to help themselves and keep their own properties clear of graffiti with the consequence that this area of London, like so many others, continues to be blighted. The sites they look after are, however, still clean. The local post office was one of our last chosen sites. The owners were convinced it was pointless and that the graffiti would soon come back. They are thrilled to report that the wall has been clean since they painted it more than three months ago. Other sites do require occasional attention, but they have proved that with a little will and effort they are easily kept clean. Website - www.pceg.org.uk</p>
Amhurst Park Action Group Hackney	<p>The Amhurst Park Action Group (APAG) is a federation of tenants and residents' associations. It was formed on a voluntary basis in 1990 after approximately seven years of serious street prostitution related problems in and around the Stamford Hill area of London. The group has had a limited degree of success in achieving some control over these problems by adopting a multi-agency approach, involving the community, Police, Local Authorities, Members of Parliament, local businesses and the Hackney Safer Cities Project.</p> <p>The aims of APAG can be defined as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>To combat street prostitution and associated crime</i> b. <i>To improve the local environment</i> c. <i>To influence a change in legislation with regard to prostitution and kerb crawling</i> <p>APAG hold three general meetings (one of which is also an AGM) per annum to update the local community and receive reports from police and other interested parties. Unfortunately graffiti is a large problem in Hackney. It occurs on walls and buildings in Hackney including private residential property and estates. As far as council estates are concerned removal of graffiti is the responsibility of Hackney Council or their managing agents. In most cases, unless racially abusive, it is almost never touched mainly due to the financial state of the Council.</p>

	<p>The costs average between £10 and £20+. A local cleaning company used by the managing agents of the Council would charge £80 for the first 5 metres and £14.00 per metre thereafter. With the financial crisis in Hackney it is not considered a priority to remove graffiti. On the rare occasions it is removed it returns within days. We have two prolific artists in Hackney called 'Casper' and 'Twisted' who leave their 'tags' everywhere including on the community safety police coach which travels around the Borough. This is a major problem as it has a big impact on our quality of life. We work hard to keep our local environment and homes in reasonable condition and it is very demoralising when graffiti appears and is not removed. In Hackney there is very little in the way of youth facilities to keep young people involved and part of their frustration is demonstrated by spraying graffiti. That does not mean it should be condoned but the Council needs to do more to keep idle hands active in different ways.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject needs to be covered in school under good citizenship skills. • A designated area for graffiti artists. • When perpetrators are caught they should be made to remove the graffiti and their parents fined. The pressure from the parents, who probably would not be too happy facing a large fine, may change the perpetrators minds in future. • Where possible large areas should be treated with anti-graffiti paint to deter would be artists. <p>The police resources to deal with this issue are just not there – local by-laws should be brought in and Council officers assigned to deal with the problem.</p>
De Beauvoir, Hackney	<p>Graffiti is mostly found on the sides of buildings and inside the blocks. The Council is responsible for removing graffiti, but because this is a big Borough wide problem it is not removed as quickly as residents would like. Racist or offensive graffiti is removed more quickly. The Association believes that the Council could do more if the culprits were caught, such as making their parents pay for graffiti removal.</p>
Downs Estate Hackney	<p>Although graffiti is not a major issue on the estate there are other types of anti-social behaviour that cause concern to residents such as abandoned cars and damaged bus shelters. Perpetrators of graffiti tend to be young people or people wishing to make political statements. Graffiti is mainly found in the stairwells. The Council has a graffiti squad that may now have been cut. Graffiti is cleaned if residents complain, but removal can take time. Residents are not informed of the costs. Generally once cleaned it does not return.</p>
Lincoln Court Hackney	<p>This tenants and residents association has a problem with graffiti. There are two prevalent tags which are "Twisted" and "Casper". The Association believe that the tags may belong to the same perpetrator because the writing is very similar. The tag "Twisted" is more prevalent and can be seen across the area from Hackney to Shoreditch and Islington. This tag goes on lorries, taxis, window shutters etc. The perpetrator of this tag is elusive. The estate services of the Neighbourhood Office (Paddington Churches Housing Association) usually remove graffiti, but not as quickly as residents would like. The Association has tried to think of ways of dealing with this problem, but they do not have the solution yet.</p>
Rowberry Close TA Hammersmith & Fulham	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular nighttime washes for streets and pavements. • A graffiti hotline with the aim of removing graffiti within 48 hours. • A separate sum of money from the GLA should be set aside to tackle the problem.
Hornchurch RA Havering	<p>Though there is a graffiti problem in the area, the worst problem is that of fly posting. These mostly emanate from nightclubs in Central Romford and the Council is attempting to tackle the problem.</p>

Upminster & Cranham RA Havering	<p>In Upminster there is a problem with graffiti, but it is not as bad as in other areas of London. Graffiti is found in run-down areas such as under railway arches, empty properties etc. The Council is responsible for the removal of graffiti from Council property, but not from private property unless it is of an offensive nature.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murals by local school children painted over the shutters of empty shops. In Upminster this has prevented fly posting and graffiti. • Local Authorities should be given permission to remove graffiti from all property, including railway property, phone boxes, green cable boxes, etc and then bill the appropriate company. • Use of anti-graffiti coatings and paint.
Gatehill Northwood Hillingdon	This is a small Association consisting of houses mainly on a private estate. They do not have a graffiti problem in their area.
Harmonsworth & Sipson RA Hillingdon	In this area graffiti appears on any flat surface including walls, street names, post boxes, sports changing rooms, etc. The Association is not sure who is responsible for graffiti removal. It does not appear that the Council has made any serious attempt to get rid of it. The Association believe that the control of aerosol sprays may prevent so-called artists from getting the means to paint. They have also noted that crayon has been used and this would be very difficult to control. The main barrier to overcome is the reasoning behind the graffiti that appears to stem from a desire on the part of the artist to make their mark on territory. The psychology behind this is incomprehensible to most people who thus find it difficult to offer any solution to what seems to be a motiveless crime. Once the graffiti is removed it returns in about three weeks.
Hayes Town Centre RA Hillingdon	<p>Graffiti is found on the doors and gates of the estate security entrance. It also appears on light coloured surfaces of buildings, items of street furniture, bus shelters and windows. The Council removes graffiti from their estates. Offensive graffiti is removed within 48 hours. Graffiti remains on shop and private properties, creating an eyesore.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education in schools and good examples set by adults. • Where offenders are apprehended the crime should be seriously dealt with.
Home Farm RA Hillingdon	Graffiti is encountered on roads, pavements, walls, fences and on street furniture. There have also been cases of racially offensive graffiti. The police were informed of this before the offending words were removed and they were able to record the signatures added to the script. The majority of the graffiti is indiscriminate, but it has occurred outside Asian homes. The Council remove graffiti fairly quickly from roads and pavements, but not from private properties.
Oak Farm RA Hillingdon	<p>There is no major graffiti problem in this area, but tagging does appear on the walls of shops and cable company boxes. Graffiti rarely appears on private property.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education in public responsibility, and good citizenship and the promotion of the idea that tagging is childish. Making offenders clean off the graffiti may be expensive in terms of providing supervision and time consuming. • Inform Council taxpayers of the cost to stimulate debate by parents.
The Zenith Project Hounslow	The estate (Butts Farm) has 1750 properties, of all types, belonging to different landlords. There is a serious problem with graffiti. Everything is sprayed or written on. There are stairwells and hallways covered with graffiti. There is even graffiti on the roof. The graffiti is done during the evenings and in the night. Most of the graffiti is tagging. Many residents blame the Council for building such a large estate

	<p>with no provision for youth activities. Every year the youth problem gets worse. There is not even a playground for the children. Provision of these things would divert some of their energy toward other activities. The largest landlord on the estate has a team that removes graffiti from the outside of properties they own, but they cannot remove the paint completely and it is still visible. Other landlords make their own arrangements. Nobody has taken responsibility for the street furniture. Graffiti on the estate makes everyone care less about their environment and this has also encouraged a litter problem, and abandoned cars. Pensioners are afraid to open their doors. If the estate looked better then people would behave better.</p>
Beverley Court Kensington & Chelsea	<p>Graffiti is not a serious problem in the neighbourhood. The worst graffiti is on London Underground property. The neighbourhood does have a problem with fly posting and would like any new or proposed legislation on graffiti to address the issue of fly posting as well.</p>
Braham Gardens Garden Committee Kensington & Chelsea	<p>The Committee will support any concerted effort to deal with this destructive behaviour. It is right that the GLA deal with this problem as it has a major impact on the visual viability of London as a great world city. Graffiti is a serious problem that will only get worse if nothing is done.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the population in general to view the practice as anti-social. • Remove graffiti as rapidly as it appears to wear out the perpetrators. • Apprehend and prosecute a few of the major offenders to demonstrate seriousness of intent.
Broadwalk Court Kensington & Chelsea	<p>The Residents Association suggest some initiatives that would be particularly helpful in reducing the amount of graffiti visible. The suggestions are designed to work in tandem with more concerted action by the Police to catch the small minority of repeat offenders who perpetrate this vandalism.</p> <p>Utility companies should be held accountable for ensuring that their street furniture is regularly checked for graffiti and where found, removed. A number of the BT street telephone cabinets in the area have had the same graffiti on them for nearly a year with no sign that any action will be taken to repaint them. A system similar to London Transport re bus shelters should be introduced whereby utility companies regularly inspect their sites and take restorative action where appropriate.</p> <p>A number of shops in this area have metal protective screens over their windows for added protection out of hours. The bulk of these have been covered in graffiti with no efforts made to clean them. This encourages the perception of an uncared for environment and also acts as a magnet for other anti- social acts. There should be a requirement for shopkeepers or the companies that own the premises to tend and care for their property and to ensure as far as possible that they are kept free of graffiti.</p> <p>The creation of mobile graffiti hit squads to deal with graffiti where others have failed to take appropriate action would then help to ensure that the problem is tackled. Graffiti is often left for too long, which then attracts more graffiti adding to the problem.</p> <p>Ultimately, the issue of graffiti removal is about responsibility – putting up buildings and erecting street architecture is all very well but often no thought is given to their maintenance. Sadly, there will always be a small number of people who are intent on ruining the environment. We will never catch them all, however, we can ensure that utility companies, retailers and Local Authorities are pressed into taking more action to combat the problem. Whilst there will be a cost involved, there is a hidden cost in not tackling the problem. If an environment looks dirty and dingy and covered in graffiti, it gives the impression that no one cares.</p>
Earls Court Gardens Residents' Association	<p>This Association does not have a problem with graffiti. However they are pleased that work is being done on this issue.</p>

Earls Court Village Residents Committee (ECVRC) Kensington & Chelsea	The ECVRC strives to maintain high standards of upkeep to their buildings and the streets within the area. Graffiti is one such problem that they have encountered and Kensington and Chelsea Council have supplied them with a limited number of graffiti cleaning packs for residents to use on their own buildings where necessary. With rented or shared buildings, i.e. a block of flats, there is a problem with encouraging people to become involved. In these instances the best solution is for well meaning neighbours or the local Council to remove the graffiti. The ECVRC would welcome guidance or legislation that would help their environment.
Edith Grove RA Kensington & Chelsea	There is a bad problem of graffiti in this area, but the Association is unaware of who the perpetrators are. The graffiti degrades local properties, especially in a conservation area.
Egerton Gardens Mews	The primary places for graffiti in this neighbourhood include the wall facing Brompton Road near the telephone boxes at Brompton Square. There was graffiti on this wall for more than six months. There is often graffiti on the corner of Brompton Road and Yeomans Row on a wall near the local pub.
Gledhow, Wetherby and Bolton Gardens Kensington & Chelsea	The Association occasionally suffers from attacks of graffiti in the area. Graffiti is sprayed on walls, garden railings, and pillars. It quickly gives the neighbourhood the look of a slum and leads to other problems such as dumping of trash. Kensington and Chelsea are dealing with the problem. The Association believes that until we know what motivates a person to spoil an area in this way they would not be able to recommend an effective way of resolving this issue. They included a copy of a local magazine (Garden Square News), which has an article on the Council's anti-graffiti strategy, including how the Council is using legal action to force British Telecom to remove graffiti from their street furniture.
Guinness Trust (Draycott Avenue) Kensington & Chelsea	Graffiti is not an issue for the estate or the immediate locality. They have observed that whilst graffiti is generally seen as a problem it can be used to brighten up drab buildings and underground trains. Graffiti can be a positive indication of artistic ability within the community. There are different types of graffiti and the Committee will need to be discriminating in its approach. The Association notes that successful projects have been undertaken in parts of London to harness the artistic ability within the community and they would support this approach. For offensive graffiti they would support criminal charges. They state that the key to deterrence is the likelihood of detection and there are therefore wider issues for the community to consider, such as the tension between surveillance and human rights. The Association feels that given the many serious issues facing London, consultation appears selective and lacks a formalised structure.
Holland Park Avenue Ltd Kensington & Chelsea	The Council has a plan of action that is working. The Association paints the side wall white when graffiti is sprayed on it to show the perpetrators that graffiti will not be tolerated. The Association does not view graffiti as an art and thinks that problem teenagers should not be encouraged to view it as such. Perpetrators: Pupils from the local school on their way to and from school via Holland Walk.
Kensington Court RA	Kensington Court is an area that is relatively graffiti free. Occasionally graffiti appears on the brick walls in the area. There are some embassies in the area and the residents experience occasional political demonstrations and slogans.
Knightsbridge Association (The) Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster	The Association considers the important issues to be the cleaning up of graffiti, its prevention and penalties. In their experience, the courts are too lenient and if existing by-laws for the dropping of litter and dog fouling are never applied, will regulation dealing with graffiti be any more effective? The Association has properties in parts of Westminster as well as Kensington and Chelsea. Both Councils are taking measures to combat graffiti.
Lauceston Place Kensington & Chelsea	Graffiti is not a problem on this street, but the sale of spray paint should be restricted to those over eighteen.
Onslow Neighbourhood Kensington & Chelsea	Graffiti is not a major problem in this area. One member experienced an incident of graffiti on a local wall and lodged a complaint with the Council. The graffiti was promptly removed, although it has since returned. The Association is currently pursuing the owners of the wall to persuade them to grow creeping ivy or similar over the exposed section of the wall. They believe that this sort of horticultural solution is one of the best ways of reducing graffiti. The Council had a major blitz on graffiti in the summer and this was largely successful. The Association states that much of the brutalist architecture favoured by local Councils has fermented the passions that need expression in

	<p>graffiti, whilst simultaneously providing plenty of blank concrete canvas ideal for the expression of those feelings.</p> <p>Recommendations: A tax on spray paint to cover the cost of graffiti removal.</p>
Portobello Court Kensington & Chelsea	<p>Nobody ever seems to see anyone carrying out the spraying. It is assumed it is young people, but a member of the Association has witnessed two middle-aged men spraying an estate wall. Graffiti appears along any white wall along Portobello Road and in the surrounding area. It is also sprayed on the shop shutters along Portobello Road. On our estate perpetrators climb over the railings to spray a utility cupboard and surrounding walls. As soon as it is cleaned off, it appears again several weeks later. The residents are vigilant and report incidents of graffiti immediately. The TMO then note the location and get the cleaners to remove it soon as possible. The Association has planted 'creeper-type' plants to grow along the bottom of one wall as a preventative measure, but this is not always possible on all walls. Graffiti destroys the visual look of a community and gives a bad impression to tourists who come to the Portobello Road every weekend.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high tax on sales of spray paints. • Improved lighting in dimly lit areas at night. • Heavier fines for damage to property etc.
Radnor Walk RA Kensington & Chelsea	<p>This area is not affected by graffiti. Although the Association feels graffiti it is a serious problem on the Underground, especially the approach from Heathrow to Earls Court, which in places is quite appalling and gives a terribly bad impression to visitors to London.</p>
Troy Court RA Kensington & Chelsea	<p>Graffiti begets further graffiti and it is therefore important that immediate arrangements are made to eradicate it before it spreads. The sites chosen for defacement by perpetrators are those that offer maximum publicity and visibility such as underground trains and track sides. Also, perpetrators find it hard to resist the temptation of defacing large, flat clean white walls of stuccoed buildings. There should be more publicity and availability of chemicals and other agents that can effectively remove the graffiti. The knowledge that the graffiti would soon be removed would deter this anti-social activity.</p>
WEDSSTRA Kensington & Chelsea	<p>WEDSSTRA fortunately represents an area that does not suffer from graffiti.</p> <p>Recommended further reading: The Tipping Point-How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference by Malcolm Gladwell. This book is worth reading for anyone who wishes to change culture.</p>
Agar House RA Kingston	<p>The Association feels that although they are always hearing about graffiti clean-up operations, nothing ever gets done. There is graffiti in their environment that has been there for over a year. This includes graffiti on public signs and it spoils the environment. They hope the Committee will be effective.</p>
Cottington Close TMC Lambeth	<p>Graffiti is encountered on the estate in stairwells, garage areas and lifts. The TMC is responsible for letting the contract for the removal of graffiti. Removal is three times a week, unless it is obscene or racist, in which case it is removed within 24 hours. There is a yearly contract with Graffiti Solutions, and the TMC budgets for the cost. Effective action should be taken against those caught vandalising property. Sometimes an area remains free from graffiti and other times it can remain free for over a week. The area is rarely vandalised in the following three to four days.</p>
Dacres T & RA Lewisham	<p>The residents of this estate feel very strongly about graffiti. Most of the graffiti appears during school time although some is done by friends of the youths living on the estate. The estate is adjacent to a local school and although out of bounds to the children, they still congregate in lift areas and on the first few flights of stairs. Graffiti is mostly committed on stairwells and in the lifts in the tower blocks. The graffiti is removed by the caretakers but this is only done on the days they clean the estate (every 2/3 days). More effective ways of</p>

	dealing with the problem would be to install entry doors for the tower blocks. Once it has been removed graffiti usually returns within a week.
Ivy & Adelaide T&RA Lewisham	<p>The Council owns this estate and graffiti is a constant problem. It is found on the ends of elevation walls of the buildings and on the walls of communal stairs. The caretakers remove graffiti. Offensive graffiti is removed on the same day that it is reported and other graffiti is removed within seven days. They are also experiencing etching on glazed communal doors and the windows on the communal staircases.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ban the sale of spray paint and certain markers to those under eighteen. • The parents of perpetrators should be made to pay for the removal of graffiti. • Coat susceptible surfaces with specialist anti-graffiti coating.
Selden, Hathway and Evalina T & RA Lewisham	<p>This Association has ceased to operate, but the former Chair of the Association would like to address the issue, as graffiti is a problem in the neighbourhood and does not seem to be treated with any measure of importance, despite the Council being made aware of whom the perpetrators are. There is graffiti in the streets, on pavements, walls, lampposts, post boxes, windows, people's homes, train bridges, foot bridges (Nunhead train station is particularly beset with it), bus shelters ,street signs, hallways, scratched on to windows etc A variety of media are used including wax crayons, markers, chalk pens, lighters(burning it on), spray cans, pencils etc. The Chair has no idea who is responsible for removing graffiti although an anti-graffiti van was once sighted. The Chair has on occasion painted over graffiti, including painting the communal hall almost daily and scrubbing the tiles with thinner. The people responsible for the majority of the graffiti in the neighbourhood and up at the station either live in the building or are friends with people who reside in the building. They have been reported to the Council (Kender neighbourhood) many, many times, yet are still offending.</p> <p>Nunhead train station was briefly painted by graffiti artists and it worked for a while to deter tagging, but the people who tag are more motivated by destruction than decoration. Irritation and annoyance are their driving forces. They are out late at nights, truant from school by day and spend their time smoking drugs and getting drunk. Measures imposed by the council or governing body do need to be enforced. When no action is forthcoming the message is very clear, i.e. do what you want and you will get away with it. Feeling sorry for offenders and their families, or behaving in a more 'politically correct' way will not solve the problem. Allowing more rights to those who deny the rights of others to clean, peaceful and crime free environments is a very upside down and unhealthy way to govern.</p> <p>Tagging/graffiti in areas of primarily social housing perpetuates the stereotype that those living in these environments are basically criminal in nature. It degenerates the area and drives ordinary, law abiding people inside their homes. The area looks unkempt and is a draw for drug pushers, joy riders, delinquents and more anti social behaviour. In the neighbourhood there is a strong element of fear as the perpetrators are seeing no action taken and are slowly taking over.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Penalise the parents of offenders, possibly more so in the case of younger offenders, by making the parents clean up the mess/repaint etc, wearing clothes that clearly state who they are and what they are doing.</p>
Effra Close RA Merton	This residents association does not have problem with graffiti. The property is a small block off the road and all the residents know each other. The residents are also very vigilant.
Glebe Court TMO Merton	They do encounter problems of graffiti on the estate. It occurs in the stairwells of blocks. On the estate caretakers are responsible for removing graffiti and it is generally removed within two days. The graffiti often returns within a couple of days, usually in the same spot.

Merton Park Ward RA	<p>There is a problem with graffiti in the area. It is carried out by young teenage boys, some of whom are from the local school. Residents have noted that the incidences of graffiti reduce during the school holidays. Graffiti is most likely to be found on letterboxes, Telewest cabinets, fences, walls, street signs, railway bridges, and school buildings. The routes to school are the worst areas. People do not see the graffiti being done. Some of it is done at night. Most of the graffiti in the area occurs on private property. In the majority of cases the residents clear it off themselves. A few residents have used private companies to do special work such as painting listed walls with graffiti resistant coating. Merton Council has an experienced team that can remove graffiti from Grade I and II listed buildings. It also offers a removal service and environmentally friendly products for cleaning. Residents are looking at ways to make the removal of graffiti easier. Graffiti often returns on average within a few weeks. Local residents are upset and angered by graffiti. It is especially annoying when it occurs on private property. Some residents find it recurs and are therefore continual victims of criminal damage. A number of residents are angry about having to remove graffiti from listed property.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go into schools and youth clubs and make young people aware that graffiti is anti-social and a crime. Encourage them to be responsible members of the community and care for their environment. • Introduce new laws to prevent the sale of spray paints to those under 16. • Permit the police to stop and search for spray paints/graffiti tools. • Make better efforts to track down offenders and take measures to ensure that they do not do it again. • Make offenders clean the graffiti. • Offenders should be fined/made to pay compensation to help with removal costs.
North Wimbledon Merton	<p>They encounter graffiti on bollards and on large expanses of walls. The Council is responsible for the removal of graffiti. The Association is aware of the costs of removal and feels that self-help is a more effective way to deal with the problem. They also believe that swift removal of graffiti is important.</p>
Wimbledon Park Heritage Group and Wimbledon House Residents Assoc. Merton	<p>The Wimbledon Park Heritage Group has mounted a successful anti-graffiti campaign. Although the Council has an anti-graffiti campaign this does not include the active removal of graffiti by Council staff. Local residents have begun to act themselves. In conjunction with the Council's Department of Leisure, supplies of paint, brushes and graffiti removal solvents were made available to the group so that they could restore the park buildings, seats, power stations, etc Other residents associations have also taken up this challenge and have cleared graffiti from their areas. They consider it worthwhile, as their streets are kept free from graffiti. The group would like to see a service in their Borough like that provided by Wandsworth Council.</p> <p>Perpetrators of graffiti are usually boys aged 10-15. Graffiti is applied everywhere especially on the property belonging to utility companies such as Telewest. Telewest hardly ever remove graffiti from their property. The group paint over anything that has graffiti on it. In graffiti strewn areas people feel threatened. Before the group stated to tackle graffiti in the park there were few elderly people that used the park. Now the elderly people are returning to the park. In some reports there are direct links to graffiti and crime. Having a graffiti free street is much more effective than having a Neighbourhood Watch sticker on the front door. The group is interested in the early implementation and enforcement of the new anti-graffiti legislation that is currently being proposed.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of heat/motion sensitive security lights and CCTV around public buildings. This would assist in combating all crime. • Swift removal of graffiti. • It should be the Council's responsibility to provide a graffiti removal service and the Council should also have the power to remove graffiti from property that belongs to private individuals or companies.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education-getting the word into schools that graffiti is not cool. • Recognise that graffiti is an entry-level crime and can lead to more serious crimes. • Parental involvement. When perpetrators are caught there should be meetings with parents and fine s should be imposed for subsequent offences. • Update the London Park by-laws.
Milton Court Richmond	<p>A tag has been left in this particular block and was immediately painted over when discovered by one of the residents. This same tag was also sprayed on other nearby blocks of flats along the road. Some blocks were not affected because they have door entry systems. Graffiti makes people sad and vulnerable, the sooner it is painted over the better.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of door entry systems for communal buildings. • Permanent marker pens and sprays should not be sold to the general public at all, as they are not essential. • Stiffer fines on those apprehended. They should be made to clean off the mess they have made. • Promoting the care of ones neighbourhood in schools and youth organisations.
Barry Area RA Southwark	<p>There is a problem with graffiti on the properties in this area. Graffiti is committed on walls, shop windows, bins, post office vans and buses. Someone climbed to the top of a high crane to put graffiti on the cab. Southwark Council are responsible for removing graffiti, but they only seem to remove it if it is racist or obscene. The cost of removing graffiti is approx. £40 per sq. metre. The best way to deal with graffiti is to catch those who commit it. The perpetrators are often bored children. More projects that interest them are needed. Once graffiti has been removed it returns in two days or less.</p>
Caroline Gardens RA	<p>This is a Grade II listed development. There are very few problems with graffiti in the area. The graffiti in the wider area of East Peckham is also very limited and does not impinge in a negative way on the environment.</p>
Elizabeth Estate Southwark	<p>There is a great deal of graffiti on the estate. It is found inside the entrances and stairways of blocks. The Council is responsible for removing graffiti, although the graffiti does not get cleaned for a month or so. Very often when the Council have removed the graffiti it is immediately re-sprayed. The Association is aware that graffiti removal is expensive. The Association has asked the Council to write to all residents telling them of the cost and warning them that if their children or friends are caught spraying graffiti they would be severely punished. This would be an effective way of removing graffiti. Another way would be to develop a graffiti resistant paint. Very often the graffiti returns within a day.</p>
Gaywood Estate Southwark	<p>There is a problem with graffiti on the estate and in the area (Elephant and Castle). Graffiti is perpetrated on any large clean space preferably where the perpetrators cannot be seen. It is often carried out late at night and on blind spots on stairwells, passage ways, walls and shed doors. Council cleaners remove the graffiti and this is carried out as soon as possible after a report has been received. Small amounts of graffiti are seen to quickly by estate cleaners. The Association feels that there should be harsher penalties for those people who are caught, regardless of their age. The parents should pay for the costs of removal or the perpetrators should do the cleaning under strict supervision. Shops should be prevented from selling paint spray to any one under the age of 18. People who are caught spraying graffiti should be asked why they do it and whether they realise what the costs are. They should also be asked whether they would like their pocket money used to remove the graffiti or if they would clean off the graffiti themselves. The total cost for cleaning graffiti for the</p>

	Borough should be identified. An alternative solution would be to designate a piece of land with large boards erected, or smooth walls which can be easily cleaned and let graffiti be sprayed in an area that would not annoy people. In the long run this would be less expensive than constant cleaning.
Hawkstone T & RA Southwark	Hawkstone Estate in the Abbeyfield Neighbourhood has been subjected to the most appalling amount of graffiti in the last 5 years. This Estate is a typical 1960s development and is built largely of concrete, has underground garages and poorly lit public walkways, stairwells and other poorly maintained areas, which have made it a haven for the graffiti artists. Abbeyfield Neighbourhood Housing Office is constantly issuing orders for the cleaning contractors to deal with this problem, but as quickly as it is removed the graffiti reappears. This graffiti is offensive, abusive and has become very personal to some tenants and residents. The Association is not aware how specific the cost of removing the graffiti is but they believe it is a cost the N.H.O. can do without. With regard to the effectiveness of dealing with the graffiti it is common knowledge who is responsible and in the case of Hawkstone Estate it is the children of residents who are responsible. Other residents are willing to name names if the N.H.O. had a mechanism for making the parents responsible for the costs.
Silwood TRA Southwark	The residents on this estate do not seem to suffer from graffiti. There is graffiti art on the top of the four high rise blocks, but this has been left because of health and safety to the Council workers who would have to clean it off.
Albion Road RA Sutton	Graffiti is not a problem on the estate, but it has been of concern to the residents of the Borough for some years. The Council have developed two strategies for dealing with the problem. The Council, Police and other agencies have a joint policy for the town centre and outer areas. The Housing Department has its own policy for Council estates. Graffiti first made its appearance in Sutton following the showing of the programme "Happy Days" on BBC1 on a Saturday. The Council should ask the BBC to make a voluntary contribution for the removal of graffiti within the borough.
Belmont & South Cheam RA Sutton	Graffiti is not a problem in this area of Sutton. Graffiti is found on road signs, at Cheam station and sometimes on shop windows in Cheam Village. Graffiti is generally removed by the Council, the graffiti action group and the rail authority, usually within two weeks. The cost of removal has been issued by the Council in the past, but is not presently available. At Cheam station graffiti returns in days depending on the methods used to remove tags. Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of CCTV cameras at trouble spots. • Use of graffiti and graffiti paint.
Benhill RA Sutton	There is a graffiti problem on this estate. Graffiti is found on exposed brickwork, concrete and indefensible areas. The removal of graffiti is carried out by Nordic UK. The cost of removal for 2000/01 was £6,500 and for 2001/02 it has been £2,606. If resources are devoted to regular removal it is normally effective. Recommendation: The planting of shrubs to protect exposed areas.
Chaucer Gardens Sutton	Graffiti is a problem, not just on the estate, but in Sutton in general. The caretakers on the estate are responsible for removal, but they do not seem to have the time or the equipment to remove it. The Association feels that more should be done to combat graffiti, as the local Council does not seem interested.
East Cheam Householders Organisation Sutton	Graffiti problems in this area are minimal. It usually occurs in poorly lit areas with no immediate residential properties in the vicinity. Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more visible police presence in residential areas, together with CCTV cameras. • Use of graffiti resistant paint in known trouble spots. • Known offenders may be helped by being given legitimate artistic outlets in dull residential areas or estates.

Bethnal Green Estate TA Tower Hamlets	In some parts of the estate e graffiti occurs on stairwells. It is sometimes offensive and impacts on the quality of life. The estate cleaners and caretakers are willing to erase the graffiti where possible, but with constant staff cutbacks by the Council they are kept too busy with general duties. The estate is near Bethnal Green Gardens, which is also disfigured by graffiti. The culprits enter the park after dark and increased security and effective night lighting could prevent this.
Samuda Estate Local Management Organisation Tower Hamlets	Graffiti is not seen as a major problem for the estate. Graffiti mainly appears in the communal stairwells. Often the caretakers are able to remove it quite promptly. Where the caretakers are unable to remove the graffiti the Organisation uses specialist services to remove it. As there are far more pressing problems on the estate the Organisation has not spent much time looking into alternative ways of dealing with graffiti.
Park Court Waltham Forest	This is a small estate with an enclosed garden and entry phone system. They do not have graffiti and parents usually remove the occasional marks made by the young children there. If they did have a problem then the Council would be responsible for removing it. There is graffiti in parks and playgrounds that is committed by teenagers, but the Council has the responsibility for removing it.
Esher Gardens & Bisley House RA	This Association has only encountered a very small amount of graffiti over the last few years. It appears on the landings, on signboards and on nearby external walls. The Council is responsible for removing the graffiti and they carry this out very quickly.
Fayland Avenue Wandsworth	There is little graffiti on the estate. When graffiti does occur it is removed. It is mostly sprayed on road signs and on property belonging to utility companies The main problem on the estate is litter.
Harwood Court Wandsworth	The area does not suffer from graffiti at all.
Heron House & Warfield Wandsworth	Graffiti is occasionally found on the Ethelburgh Estate. Approximately half the incidents of graffiti are obscene or offensive. Graffiti is most likely to be committed in communal areas such as walkways and stairwells. It is the Council's responsibility to remove graffiti. Obscene graffiti is usually removed within one week and other graffiti within two weeks. The Association is not aware of the costs of graffiti removal. They feel that it is important for graffiti to be removed quickly because the presence of graffiti encourages further graffiti and other acts of vandalism. Graffiti is an eyesore and contributes to feelings of vulnerability. People (particularly the elderly) feel unsafe in their homes.
Wynter Street Estate Wandsworth	There have been cases of graffiti on the estate, in particular in corridors of blocks and outside walls. The local authority are responsible for the removal of graffiti once it has been reported by residents, which is not often. The Residents Association have set up a weekly patrol with the local authority patrol officer to note and report any new cases. This used to be a big problem in the area but has drastically reduced as we drafted a strategy for combating anti- social behaviour which residents said was their main concern. A few residents have partly taken on the responsibility of cleaning graffiti from their immediate area with the aid of cleaning materials provided by the Council. They felt that this course of action was necessary in order to remove it promptly as it was found that old graffiti breeds new graffiti. The quicker the removal the better. The main culprits were young people with nothing better to do as there are limited youth facilities locally after the closure of a local club. We are looking at providing a youth facility and are in the process of putting together a bid for Single Regeneration Funding. We are not aware of the full costs of graffiti removal but are aware that it is a costly process. Once graffiti is seen , reported and removed quickly (within 48 hours) it returns shortly after. But once the cycle as explained is implemented it reduces the chances of it returning. This is what has happened on this estate and it is an ongoing process that has improved drastically over time Perpetrators of graffiti see it as an art and therefore it is necessary for them to have a place provided for them where it can be carried out in a controlled environment. It can also be an outlet for deeper problems and as the perpetrators in this case are young people between the ages of 9 and 15 years outreach youth teams are needed to provide a service to these young people as they do not see that they are affecting people by their actions.

Crawford Mansions CMTRA Westminster	The Association experiences very few incidences of graffiti in their area. Recommendations: Specially designated sites where youngsters can express their artistic talents.
John Aird Court RA Westminster	Graffiti is found on lamp posts, walls, play areas, gardens, street name plates, refuse collection bins, etc. Perpetrators should be caught and made to scrub the walls, or their parents made to pay a fine towards the cost of clean up. Parents must know their children are involved in graffiti because of the smell of paint, the cans of spray paint hidden in their rooms and the paint on the children's clothes. Westminster cleans the graffiti, but days later more graffiti is sprayed. There should be a concerted effort to stamp this out. CCTV should be used.
Mozart Estate (METRA) Westminster	There is occasional graffiti here, but it is confined to some blocks. It is mostly committed in the intake areas and communal staircases. The Area Office is responsible for removal. Offensive graffiti is dealt with within 12 hours. Graffiti that is more difficult to remove may take 24 hours. Graffiti removal is effectively dealt with on this estate.
Pimlico Village PVHC Westminster	Graffiti is a topic that regularly concerns the committee. Graffiti within the estate is mainly carried out by young people who are not residents. They can be categorised into two groups; school age children going to and from their schools and a wider age range of young persons who probably live close by the estate. This statement is based on experience, particularly gained through the Youth Project run by PVHC. PVHC employs its own staff, including a band of estate cleaners, who are responsible for tackling graffiti promptly. This normally means it is removed within a working day, but depends on the materials used and on what the graffiti has been applied to. Trades staff are sometimes called upon to redecorate areas. Favourite surfaces within the estate tend to be vertical and are those where the graffiti is easy to apply, and where it is visible. Quiet areas out of sight are more prone than public areas. The use of Post Office sticky labels for parcels on which graffiti is then applied is common and particularly awkward to deal with. Street furniture such as BT boxes and lamp posts are regularly attacked. Trees are especially difficult to deal with, and often remain tagged for long periods. PVHC has been reasonably successful in defeating graffiti because it has its own staff to react quickly and a Youth Project that is able to influence the behaviour of young people from the area as well as the estate. Some young people have actually been organised to remove graffiti they applied before being 'educated' by Youth Project staff. It is particularly annoying for residents to see graffiti on street furniture, etc adjacent to the estate that is the responsibility of others, normally the Local Authority. PVHC would be willing to deal with this in our locality if Westminster City Council were to pay for it. More visits by members of the Royal family would be helpful, as much activity on tidying up areas prior to their visits takes place, even including steam-cleaning pavements.
Semley House RA Westminster	Semley House is a single block of 104 flats. There is very little graffiti in the block. They only experience the occasional attack of graffiti on the "no smoking" signs in the lifts and a few rare small scribbles elsewhere.
Warwick Crescent RA Westminster	The cycle suggests that the perpetrators may be persons who are away for varied periods. There are probably different motivations for doing graffiti e.g. exhibitionism, thrill seeking, gang patch marking, persons with bitterness at exclusion from normal society etc. It is usually perpetrated at night where it will cause most offence with least risk for the perpetrator. The impact is to disturb passers by. Graffiti often gives the impression of slum conditions even in expensive/new areas. It is cumulative and if not removed quickly seems to encourage further attacks. The effect on the impression of a block or estate is a rapid decline in morale, an exodus of those who can afford it and further decline and multiple degradation. Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing out - use of texture, colour, anti graffiti surfaces, good lighting and CCTV. • Cleaning up- do it quickly and effectively as often as it takes. • Publish to appropriate organisations more information about techniques, materials and contractors. • Prevention - there is a wide spread view that it is not worth prosecuting offenders because of the pathetic response of the courts who

	<p>do not appear to take account of the individual and community irritation, loss of property values, costs of clearing up and other consequential social ills. Juvenile offenders might be used to clear up under supervision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A specialist intelligence group connected to security patrols should be formed to collate information and co-ordinate blitzes. • The advertising industry should be asked to avoid the used of pseudo graffiti designs.
<p>Wessex Gardens RA Westminster</p>	<p>There are sporadic problems of graffiti, mostly on communal staircases and in entrance lobbies. It is much worse in locations without door entry systems. The graffiti is usually written in marker pen, although paint is sometimes used. Graffiti is done by youths on the estate. It is worse during the holidays. There is an estate cleaning contractor appointed by the Council and they are responsible for graffiti removal. Most graffiti is removed within 48 hours and offensive graffiti is removed within 24 hours. There is a budget of approximately £2,000 per year for graffiti removal.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education in schools. • Perpetrators should be made to remove their graffiti. • Graffiti need to be tackled by all the authorities within an area, including the utility companies.
<p><i>Visit of the Chair of the Graffiti Investigative Committee to Holmesdale Residents Association</i> 5 January 2002</p>	<p>I visited Holmesdale Residents' Association on 5 January to review their experiences with graffiti. This was an excellent ninety minute meeting which emphasised the role of self-help for the community in resolving problems with graffiti. Paul Hope, the Residents Association Secretary, has quite clearly motivated a very significant community effort. He has been awarded a commendation by Croydon Council for his work.</p> <p>The work by Holmesdale Residents' Association has been achieved by getting different residents to adopt a very particular part of their community. There has been an "adopt a wall" approach. Mr Hope estimates that 90 per cent of graffiti has now been driven out of the local area as graffiti artists have become exhausted by the attention that the local community pays to removing graffiti. Mr Hope advises that removing the 'tag' is the key as youngsters want to be able to boast to others about their tag. Indeed, Mr Hope has gone undercover with his baseball cap, went around with the youngsters and heard them express disquiet when their graffiti disappeared so quickly. When the graffiti was not being tackled, it was leading to further vandalism, with windows being broken in public buildings, fly-tipping, abandoned cars and other social misbehaviour.</p> <p>The new activity has led to a huge increase in the size of the Residents' Association, going up from 200 to 700 members. The community work together has been noted in the local press. There are now over 20 people who take specific responsibilities for keeping particular areas clean. When there is a general community initiative to clean, Mr Hope divides up the teams into different responsibilities. For example, some are responsible for cleaning masonry, some for using gloss paint to cover graffiti on painted surfaces, and others for using graphic green to remove stubborn graffiti.</p> <p>One of the keys to success in the work was making people believe that it would be possible to fight the graffiti. This required a degree of persuasion and also material being circulated in the area. People gained confidence in the effectiveness of combating graffiti when there was work done on a smaller scale by a small group of dedicated community members. The scheme has also been able to work by goodwill with the local authority and with the local community beat officer.</p> <p>There was a particular large black Railtrack wall that I can recall being very frequently covered with a huge amount of graffiti. (I used to walk past here on the way back from Selhurst Park football Ground.) The wall is now pristine. It is notable that graffiti is very prevalent elsewhere in the locality outside the Residents' Association's zone.</p> <p>Mr Hope provides some very interesting insights into the different age groups of graffiti artists. He has been able to talk to youngsters as young as five years old, who use felt-tips to write on street signs. Many of the graffiti artists tend to be younger teenagers. However, he has also observed graffiti artists in their mid-twenties who arrived to plague a large part of northern Croydon in their company vehicles. It</p>

was quite clear from subsequent enquiries by the police that many of these individuals were in highly respectable employment. In getting the community involved, there has been a very strong sense of community created, and Mr Hope is very proud of the broad range of members from different ethnic minorities who have become involved. A community spirit has been created out of a sense of defiance. Residents are now purchasing their own materials to combat graffiti although, initially, much resource was provided by the local authority.

It is very notable that Mr Hope added that there was a significant impact on property values when the area become plagued by graffiti. Indeed, an estate agent informed Mr Hope that the value of properties would fall by 10% as a result of the prevalence of graffiti in the area. Mr Hope also felt that work with schools was important, and the poster campaigns being run in schools was extremely helpful. This campaign was entitled "Don't Draw on Croydon". (The poster winner was a five year old – the poster said "Don't Draw on Croydon".) We might think of having a "Don't Draw on London" campaign sponsored by the Mayor.

Mr Hope also detailed the importance of seeking consent from property owners before work could be conducted on removing graffiti. He also noted the importance of providing proper equipment, including goggles, for volunteers. The effectiveness of the local initiative in dealing with graffiti suggested that a lot of graffiti is carried out by local people. After all, only locals could be aware that this was an area where graffiti was combated. However, it might be considered sensible to erect signs saying "this is a graffiti-free zone" so that people who came out of the locality would be aware that their graffiti would be removed quickly. Vigilance is also required by residents. Mr Hope has frequently heard the tick-tick-tick of the graffiti spray can being prepared for action. Encouraging youngsters to take a pride in their community is also something to be sought. Getting children aged 10 or above involved (under 10s are not allowed to help with the graffiti cleaning for legal reasons) allows those youngsters to take a pride in their local community and realise that graffiti is not "cool".

The most fundamental point that Mr Hope left me with is that dealing with graffiti has been a means of empowering people within the local community, and that they understand "that their home does not end at their gate".

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Diane Abbott MP Hackney North and Stoke Newington	Graffiti is a real scourge in the inner city and anything that the GLA can do will be very welcome. Ms Abbott is very wary about piling responsibilities on local government without any corresponding resources to actually deliver. Many Local Authorities are very stretched to even perform their core activities, let alone taking on more responsibilities. The Committee should take care that any body that gets new powers or responsibilities to deal with graffiti also gets the appropriate resources.
Tom BrakeMP Carshalton and Wallington	Graffiti is an issue that is of great concern to local people. Mr Brake has in the past, raised with a government minister, the issue of publications that are using photos of defaced Connex trains to promote products used by graffiti vandals. Unfortunately the Minister believed that no legal action could be taken. Mr Brake has also raised this issue with Sutton Police and they are setting up an initiative with local retailers to try and cut down the supply of graffiti products. He has recently launched a campaign to clean graffiti off post boxes and he is asking people to ring the constituency office leaving the location of defaced post boxes. He will be presenting this list to Royal Mail for action. It is his view that unless a very effective voluntary agreement can be set up with retailers to ensure that marker pens and spray cans do not get into the wrong hands, legislation might be required to restrict the supply of graffiti products to certain age groups.
Harry Cohen MP Leyton and Wanstead	Mr Cohen’s suggestion is that Transport for London or the Greater London Authority should fully accept the commitment to effectively deal with graffiti passed on by the Highways Agency. All graffiti should be dealt with promptly, but graffiti that is an incitement to racism and violence should be got rid of rapidly. Poorer areas should also have a degree of priority or else the graffiti remains a factor in their continued poor state. Pedestrian bridges over major roads and motorways also need to be promptly cleaned.
Edward Davey MP Kingston and Surbiton	Mr Davey has taken a keen interest in this issue. His views can be found on his web site at www.edwarddavey.co.uk/graffiti.htm .
Iain Duncan Smith MP Chingford & Woodford Green	There are graffiti problems within this constituency, but Mr Duncan Smith feels that they do not have the resources to tackle the problems that come with its impact. He wishes to be kept informed of the investigations to stamp out graffiti and is interested in the work of the Committee and pleased to have been consulted.
Richard Ottaway MP Croydon South	Mr Ottaway’s personal suggestion is that Local Authorities have to be more proactive about graffiti than they currently are. There should be regular hit teams going into areas and removing graffiti before it has a chance to become established and overburdening. Graffiti is a tag, a symbol of the person who put it there. Experts in tags should be recruited, to identify the offenders and then clamp down on them.
Dr Jenny Tonge MP Richmond Park	<p>Dr Tonge states that graffiti is a topic that she is interested in and she is pleased that the GLA are taking it seriously. She raises the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The perpetrators are mainly young people aged 10-25 years, although tags are done by the younger children. • Council squads, police and the schools must all liaise and share information and educate. • Graffiti is the largest source of complaints that she receives and the London Borough of Richmond spends around £250,000 per annum cleaning graffiti. • Best practice for cleaning graffiti is for the Council to decide. • Further initiatives need to include a drive by Councils to encourage retailers to keep spray paint and jumbo markers out of reach or under lock and key and not to sell to juveniles,(50% have agreed to this in Richmond). Residents’ groups should be involved in clean ups and watch the area. There should be more CCTV near shops etc. The law should be amended to allow stop and search by police if they suspect a person is carrying equipment to be used for graffiti.

COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS /VOLUNTARY SECTOR

Croydon Community Conference 20/10/01	Feedback on proposals for combating graffiti included naming and shaming, powers to enable the police to search for graffiti materials, stiffer penalties and locking away graffiti products.
English Heritage	<p>Graffiti is a growing problem at most of their London sites. It is heavier on sites close to large schools. Graffiti is perpetrated after school hours and during term time in the summer. They also experience graffiti in the aftermath of political demonstrations e.g. West End statues were daubed at the May Day protests.</p> <p>Policy: Quick removal. Graffiti breeds more graffiti and paint is easier to remove before it hardens.</p> <p>Costs: Cleaning monuments at Chiswick Park - approx. £5K per annum. Approx. 10-12k for cleaning statues after May Day riots. Stonework and exposed timber are hard to clean. English Heritage use lime-wash shelter coats on exposed stone prone to graffiti and then scrub the stone when graffiti appears. Where a painted surface cannot be cleaned, it is re-painted. Constant graffiti and its removal accelerate the erosion and decay of monuments.</p> <p>Action: English Heritage works with schools, local communities and the police. They have an education officer for London and an education programme that aims to give pupils a stakeholder attitude. They have held exhibitions of schools artwork at heritage sites, invited schools to provide artwork for exhibitions and they encourage pupils to look at the need for and use of gardens in terms of citizenship. English Heritage board up statues in advance of known disturbances.</p>
Groundwork Merton	<p>Groundwork Merton has recently completed graffiti projects on Phipps Bridge Estate and Tamworth Farm Recreation ground in Merton. The aim of these projects was to explore the use of creative youth work approaches in addressing issues relating to graffiti. The young people that took part in the project had an opportunity to examine the impact of their behaviour and attitudes, and began to explore potential solutions to the problem of graffiti. The projects included the creation of official sites, allied with youth projects that employ young graffiti artists to act as mentors for young people in the area, with support from youth workers and artists. The project also involved local community representatives, and councillors.</p> <p>Community representatives and young people highlighted the need for better funding, more diverse and sustainable youth services. The programme manager states that graffiti is a form of expression of youth culture that needs to be addressed through a measured and holistic approach. He has found that for the last twenty years funding for youth work has been drastically cut, leading to inconsistent service provision, particularly evident throughout London.</p> <p>They have also provided photographs of the work done at the graffiti project, newspaper clippings and copies of the project briefs.</p>
Haringey Arts Council	<p>Haringey Arts Council has been working with the London Regional Parks Authority to use graffiti in new signage in the Upper Lee Valley. They brought in young graffiti artists to produce the tag lettering that was then converted into coloured stainless steel signage for use within the park.</p> <p>This project took place as a result of collaboration between the New Deal Community Arts programme (Factory 21) and the LPRAs. A number of unemployed beneficiaries created a video about lack of public consultation when art installations are mounted in public places. The LPRAs found it a refreshing view on the way public art is seen by the community and followed it up by commissioning the graffiti project. The Community Arts programme is targeted at young employed people in Tottenham and is one of 14 UK projects being monitored by the DCMS following the PAT 10 report on Arts and Sport to the Social Exclusion Unit.</p>

Kings Fund (Imagine London Programme)	<p>Imagine London was set up by the King’s Fund to examine young people’s views about their health and quality of life. The programme is divided into five modules: transport, the environment, crime and safety, healthy living and emotional well being. Each module consists of work with schools and youth groups and an event set up by steering groups of young people. Over the course of the programme graffiti has emerged as an important issue for young people. Young people have a range of different attitudes towards graffiti. Although many of them feel that graffiti on transport and in public spaces damages the quality of the local environment, young people also feel that providing more facilities and setting aside dedicated space where they are allowed to do graffiti could divert young people from offending. Young people also feel that used in the right way and with the right facilities, graffiti can be a legitimate and attractive form of self-expression. www.imaginelondon.org.uk</p>
Sonia Blair Commercial and Fine Artist	<p>Sonia is a commercial and fine artist. She has extensive experience of working with numerous graffiti projects in Australia and London and is sensitive to the issues faced by young people involved in graffiti. This has prompted her to develop sustainable graffiti programmes to be run throughout London, specifically working with excluded youth and those involved in high risk activities. This project aims to develop sustainable and accredited urban art programmes in London that are aimed at excluded youth involved in high-risk behaviour. Learning outcomes involve developing artistic skills, fostering creativity, and addressing the relevant issues these young people face. Graffiti is a perceived problem in nearly every capital city in the world. Historically dating back to New York in the 70s, it has spawned a global subculture of immense strength, resilience and determination. The people that now do large graffiti murals of artistic merit are the same ones that once “scribbled” on back street walls. While nearly all teenagers who do graffiti are finished with it by the time they enter their twenties, no graffiti programme of any merit should claim it will reduce graffiti in the short term. Instead it should aim to steer those responsible in a more positive direction.</p> <p>Since working with various graffiti programmes in London, Ms Blair has noticed a lack of centralised activity working on “steering the skid” of young people heavily involved in illegal graffiti. Instead there seems an openly antagonistic approach to the problem. Quite often these individuals are involved in more high-risk activities and so graffiti to an extent can be seen as the “lesser of evils” in which they are involved. Additionally graffiti writers are often backed by support networks that only strengthen under external resistance. Often programmes are initiated by youth clubs where there is a general interest in graffiti, but very few who are actually seriously involved in it. The merits of teaching bored kids who are “kind of” interested in graffiti how to paint with a spray can, and thereby possibly generating an interest in <i>doing</i> graffiti, is questionable at times. Ms Blair has found that graffiti programmes concentrating on improving these peoples’ artistic skills often opens up channels of communication otherwise not accessible to the usual adults in position of authority. Kids involved heavily in graffiti generally have a strong passion towards it bordering on an obsession, and a high level of respect for those able to do it well. Youth workers who have worked with these kids for years are often amazed at the attentiveness and enthusiasm they show towards these projects, and it offers great opportunities for communicating more positive ideas while their attention is held.</p> <p>Unfortunately these programmes are short-run with little or no follow up activity and this can leave participants disheartened. In addition, these opportunities to address issues the young people may be facing such as exclusion, racism, isolation, are often not taken due to insufficient youth worker support. A lot of young people involved heavily in graffiti are also considered to be excluded youth. They may be very bright or creatively gifted but for various reasons have fallen out of the education system. The fact that the energy they put into these programmes often surpasses any effort previously seen, suggests there is opportunity to develop these programmes to a level of accreditation that may one day help in furthering their education.</p> <p>Objectives of sustainable and accredited urban art programmes</p> <p>The objectives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Running these programmes in partnership with other organisations including Council Youth Services Departments, Youth Offending

	<p>Teams and Regeneration Trusts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically targeting those young people involved heavily in graffiti and other high-risk activities. • Employing independent youth workers and support workers with specific knowledge of graffiti and urban activities to work in conjunction with partnership organisations' youth workers on all programmes. • Employing Graffiti Artist Tutors of the <i>highest</i> standard. • Generating information channels to allow follow up activity by young people on related projects, with a long-term aim of fostering mentors. • Incorporating relevant issues into programmes, e.g. racism. • Developing programmes in conjunction with an awarding body that are accredited at GNVQ Level 1. • Incorporating access to further information and learning in related areas that graffiti is linked to, e.g. graphic design, fine art, web design, urban music, d-jaying, urban sports, tattoo art, urban fashion, etc. • To gain funding that will enable the sustainability of these programmes and their administration, maintenance and development.
Theatre Venture	<p>The word "graffiti" is Italian and means, "little marks". Graffiti is as old as human beings and dates back to drawings by cave men. Graffiti occurs mainly in urban/suburban areas in need of regeneration or recently developed areas yet to be "tagged".</p> <p>Profile: Male aged 13-30. There are also a growing number of female artists. Graffiti artists tend to be from an economically disadvantaged background and are not confined to specific ethnic groups. Codes of conduct exist amongst graffiti artists and there is a culture of apprenticeship of new artists.</p> <p>Types: Graffiti - seen as the creation of new ideas, visually arresting and often highly detailed. It is a form of expression. It is often about an artist showing off their talent and the visual profile of the work.</p> <p>Tagging - a notice that someone has been there, an identity mark. Tagging is also related to gang culture, but is mostly about competition (i.e. who can tag the most difficult/dangerous places).</p> <p>Murals- usually legitimately created.</p> <p>Motivation: Respect amongst peers; the human need to be creative and expressive; provides a clear sense of identity, place and status; is dangerous, exciting and subversive.</p> <p>Recommendations: Education, improvement of the environment, investment in quality art programmes/community art projects. It is not possible to totally eliminate graffiti. The provision of legal graffiti areas is an idea, but will only have limited effect in reducing graffiti.</p> <p>www.theatre-venture.org</p>

GENERAL PUBLIC

<p>Ms Margaret Clark, Sutton Surrey</p>	<p>Graffiti is scrawled on the business property of Ms Clark. It is a small end of terrace property and the graffiti usually appears over the weekend. The property has a small porch and sometimes beer cans are left there, which would suggest that the porch is used for people to gather in. Ms Clark removes the graffiti herself because she considers this necessary to maintain the good appearance of her property. She would like the local Council to take responsibility for graffiti removal, because there is also graffiti on nearby pillars and this affects the entire area and encourages further vandalism.</p>
<p>Mr Mark Farrant</p>	<p>Although not a direct victim of graffiti, Mr Farrant feels it degrades the community on a perpetual scale. The easiest solution is to outlaw the sale to and possession by, any person under a pre-determined age of aerosol based paints.</p>
<p>Mr Graham Lewis, Cheam Surrey</p>	<p>Suggests that the law should be modified to require any person convicted of defacing property to be responsible for removing the defacement.</p>
<p>Mr Magrath, Croydon</p>	<p>Clearing the graffiti off walls and street furniture is obviously essential to make the area more pleasant to live in. However, it is crucial that effort is also directed towards prevention. There are several prongs to this approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make surfaces unattractive to vandals: front walls with spiky bushes and other plants (e.g. Croydon Magistrates Court). • Use vandal-proof metal fencing (e.g. the fences separating East Croydon Station from 41 Cherry Orchard Road). • All new building designs in the Borough should be scrutinised for their vandal-resistance. • Dissuade children from causing the damage in the first place (it is almost without exception people in the 10-16 age range who cause this damage). The best place for this to happen is in school. Head teachers should give a talk in front of all school members. Perhaps a general talk on civic responsibility would not come amiss. • Pass a by-law to prevent the sale of spray paint to under-16s. Central government is uninterested in this one, as I have tried already. • Actually use the many CCTV cameras that exist in Croydon to apprehend vandals in the act. There are many surfaces that get re-vandalised within a day of being re-painted. Using this knowledge it should be possible to train a suitable camera on the relevant area for 24 hours. • Use juvenile offenders to clean graffiti and repair damage to bus-stops etc.

OTHER CONTRIBUTORS

Councillor Richard Barnes Greater London Authority	RE: Bus Video Initiative (Operation Seneca) Cllr. Barnes visited the Sutton bus depot on the 1 st of August 2001, to see the CCTV operation at London General Buses. Out of a fleet of 90 buses, 12 have CCTV. The others have mock camera spy holes. Since February 2001 there have been nearly 100 arrests resulting directly from the video footage provided. These were arrests for graffiti (using paints and marker pens), and the etching of glass. A protocol has been developed between the bus company and local police that ensures that video footage is transferred to a dedicated police officer for identification. Identification is undertaken using contacts in local schools and an intelligence database of graffiti tags, and school uniforms. 90% of the videos supplied to the police are resulting in arrest. The offenders are predominately under 18. The majority are first time offenders. Regular liaison meetings are held with the police to review tactics and identify which routes to place cameras on. There has also been a small reduction in street crimes and assaults on bus routes. The company has seen a major reduction in the cost of replacing windows and seats.
Councillor Brian Coleman	Graffiti is a severe problem in Gospel Oak, NW5. Graffiti is usually carried out at night and current methods of dealing with the problem are not working. Night patrols are required. These could be provided by the Council, volunteers or the Police. The patrols would arrest perpetrators. This would also prevent other crimes such as burglary and car theft which are also prevalent in the area.

ANNEX F: MATRIX OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS	ORGANISATIONS										
	Local Authorities	Transport Companies	Police/ Probation Service/ Magistrates	Academics	Businesses	World Cities	Residents Associations	Members of Parliament	Graffiti Writers	Voluntary Sector	Others
Swift Removal	Reactive									Preventative	
Use of Anti-Graffiti Coatings/ Paint/Sealants/Colour Schemes		Preventative			Preventative						
Increase parental vigilance/responsibility											
Fines/Compensation	Reactive										
Joint work with Police										Preventative	
Increase in Police Stop & Search Powers			Preventative								
Increase in Police Presence/Police to deal with seriously	Preventative				Preventative						
Declaring Graffiti Locally Prevalent	Reactive										
Stiffer sentencing		Reactive			Reactive		Reactive				
Banning Sale of Paints & Markers	Preventative		Preventative				Preventative				
Tax on Sale of Paints & Markers							Preventative				
Voluntary/Legislative Restrictions on Sales	Preventative				Preventative		Preventative				Preventative
Use of CCTV/ Targetted Surveillance/ Security	Reactive										Reactive
Reparation-Offenders to remove											Reactive
ABC/ASBO	Reactive		Reactive								
Restrictions on Graffiti Magazines / Products/ Advertising	Preventative										
Education/Schools Liaison	Preventative				Preventative		Preventative			Preventative	
Youth/ Art/ Diversionary Activities	Preventative			Preventative	Preventative		Preventative			Preventative	Preventative
Community Involvement	Preventative						Preventative				
Legal Graffiti Walls/Dedicated Space	Preventative						Preventative				
Murals/ Community Art programmes	Preventative	Do not agree	Do not agree		Preventative		Preventative		Preventative		
Councils remove(Recharge cost to Utility Companies)/ Joint Co-ord.	Reactive										Reactive
Utilities compelled to remove	Reactive										
London Wide Forum/Liaison	Preventative				Preventative		Preventative				
Provision of advice/equipment	Reactive										
Publicity Campaigns	Preventative						Preventative				
Graffiti Hotlines for reporting	Reactive										
Regular routine cleaning	Preventative				Preventative		Preventative				
Tenancy conditions	Preventative						Preventative				
Graffiti Database	Reactive										
Planting of Climbing Plants	Preventative				Preventative		Preventative				Preventative
Private Prosecutions		Reactive									
Neighbourhood Wardens			Preventative		Preventative		Preventative				Preventative
Use of S106 Funding	Reactive										

Types of Solutions

Reactive



Preventative



Some solutions may be both reactive and preventative.

How to Order

To order a copy of the Report, please send a cheque for £10 payable to the Greater London Authority to GLA Publications, Room A405, Romney House, Marsham Street, London SW1P 3PY. If you wish to pay by credit card (Visa/Mastercard), please phone 020 7983 4323, fax 020 7983 4706 or email to publications@london.gov.uk, or write to the above address, quoting your card number, expiry date and name and address as held by your credit card issuer. You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website: www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/index.htm.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email to assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

আসমব্লি বা অসেমব্লি কপি সংক্রান্ত আরও তথ্য জানতে বা অর্ডার করতে (বিশেষত বড় আকার বা ব্রেইল) কল করুন অথবা ইমেইল করুন।
020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারের লেন কল বা ই-মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানাতে;
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ler uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

আসমব্লি বা অসেমব্লি কপি সংক্রান্ত আরও তথ্য জানতে বা অর্ডার করতে (বিশেষত বড় আকার বা ব্রেইল) কল করুন অথবা ইমেইল করুন।
020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারের লেন কল বা ই-মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানাতে;
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Si usted o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativas a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk o en el siguiente correo:

Si usted o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativas a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس رپورٹ کے خلاصے اور سفارشات کی ایک کاپی چاہتا ہے تو براہ کرم اس پر
020 7983 4100 پر
رابطہ کریں یا assembly.translations@london.gov.uk پر ای میل کریں۔

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abiniba won, ki o kansuwa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbawa lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqanid, oo doonaayo ruu ko helo koobi aa warbixinta oo kuolaa iyo takowinka ee waaweyn ama farta qofka mifaha la' hoqa talapalaa, ama huuqadooda, oo helash u ah, dadan ragala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cimwanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Assembly Scrutiny: the Principles

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles –

- scrutinies aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- scrutinies are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- scrutinise examine all aspects of the Mayor’s strategies;
- scrutinise consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- scrutinise are conducted in a constructive and positive manner;
- scrutinise are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about the scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the GLA Webster at www.london.gov.uk/assembly.

GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY

Romney House
Marsham Street
London SW1P 3PY

www.london.gov.uk
Enquiries **020 7983 4100**
Minicom **020 7983 4458**