GRAFFITI: LOCAL SOLUTIONS TO LOCAL PROBLEMS

Guide Books for Design Professionals
Number 1

THIS GUIDE BOOK IS A JOINT PUBLICATION OF:

Griffin research consultancy

[DSP - groep]
Onderzoek – Advies – Management

INTERNATIONAL CPTED ASSOCIATION ICA

Contents

1. Introduction 2

2. Unpicking the Problem 7

3. Graffiti Mangement Framework 17

4. Local Responses to Local Problems 21

5. Summary of Design Guidelines and Recommendations 29

6. Websites of Interest 32

7. Contact Details 33

The Urban Design Guidebooks

The Design Guidebooks are written for design professionals and crime prevention practitioners such as architects, urban planners, landscape architects, engineers, crime prevention police officers, security officials, building and facility managers, and community members involved in building safer places. They are available from the individual writers of each Guidebook and from the website of the Society for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (ICA). They summarize the state of the art in research and practice on a particular urban design issue. They are written by recognized leaders in urban design and crime prevention.

The Guidebooks are written by international experts residing in different parts of the world. Thus, the text will reflect the nuances of local practice and the accepted language, spelling, and diction of the writer(s). However, the reader will discover there are generic solutions to common problems found in every urban environment around the world.

Each Design Guidebook provides the design professional with background to the issue, case studies with positive and negative examples, and suggestions to help make our communities and properties safer and more secure in future. It is important to note that no specific design guideline can guarantee freedom from crime and disorder. However, as with all coherent approaches based on systematic analysis, past experience, and current research, they provide practical ideas on how to build safer places. These ideas are summarized in a chart at the

Section 1
Introduction

A Perennial Issue.....

Graffiti forms a ubiquitous feature in our urban landscape. However as an activity that is considered to be "out of place" with its surroundings, it conflicts with popular ideas about how public places should look, feel and be used. In addition, graffiti is increasingly used in advertising campaigns, often targeted at young people, and in popular images of the city to market it as a place and a lifestyle. This has led to a confused dialogue on graffiti between those that believe it blights our landscape and those who believe that, like it or not, it has become a defining feature of our urban landscape and should be recognised, if not celebrated.

As we all know graffiti is not a new phenomenon. When broken down to constitute the physical act of creating an image on a wall in a public space we can point to this activity at all stages of human development from ancient civilisation to modern culture that sees graffiti art being lauded in the auction rooms at the highest aesthetic level. What is clear is that graffiti is not a simple issue. This is inherent in the fact that despite decades of investment and pilot schemes, interventions and approaches, graffiti is still here.

Just a Crime?

Some refuse to accept that graffiti is a complex process, citing that the fact it is considered a crime and this is enough. To say otherwise awards graffiti some sort of justification or value? This is not true. The danger with simplifying graffiti is that we then respond to it in a simple way and inevitably fail. For too long, our understanding and therefore our responses to graffiti, has taken place within a behavioural vacuum. The dialogue on graffiti has been dominated by words such as "mindless" and "virus", which suggest that graffiti is a random act that appears out of thin-air with no governing rules over:

- Why do people write graffiti
- Why is graffiti found where it is?

The fact is that people ***choose*** to paint graffiti in ***chosen*** places. There is a decision-making process behind this and unless practitioners are aware of it can unpick the various drivers for that decision-making, we are simply reacting to it rather than influencing or even pre-empting it. What makes this difficult is that many of the drivers for where graffiti takes place and by whom, are intangible: i.e., they are the result of social issues or a behavioural response to the environment, not to mention the apparent disrespect for law and rules. These issues are difficult to measure but that does not mean they have no value or are no less important to our understanding and for crafting a response.

Recent interest in street art from the fine art world has complicated the picture further by the distinction between art as formalised in galleries, or which gets commissioned by a professional artist or one that is exhibited and critiqued for its meaning and aesthetic value. Street art is being recognised as a powerful form of modern expression. This suggests that sometimes it is not the painting, scrawl or mural itself that is a problem because in a gallery it is enjoyed and prized – however on a wall of a house or a derelict building it doesn't matter what it looks like – it is there and it shouldn't be? Do we

need to revisit our attitude on what is and isn't allowed to take place in pubic space since the attitude to graffiti and street art has changed? Is there a compromise?

Context is Everything

Graffiti costs the public purse a considerable amount of money. A study conducted for the London Assembly in 2003 estimated that graffiti artists were costing Londoners £100million a year. British Waterways sent a team to clean a graffiti-strewn bridge in 2008 but ordered it to wash off only the most offensive words because of 'budget constraints'. It is a major issue for the public sector not least because of the amount of resources that is directed towards combating the problem but its effect on efforts to regenerate areas that have suffered from urban and economic decline. Places with a persistent graffiti problem have to face a greater challenge to alter that perception and encourage people to live or work there.

This is the crux of the problem; understanding what attributes of a place conspire to make it more prone or attractive to graffiti over others? It is this place-level approach that ensures that our understanding and response to graffiti takes place in a local context. What works in one place will not work in another because those two places have different social economic and environmental characteristics. **Context is everything!**

Therefore, as well as the key questions above, we need to get a clearer picture of:

- Is there a place in society for graffiti?
- What are the socio-economic characteristics of graffiti?
- How to harness some of those skills for greater benefit?
- Is it a symptom of a wider problem?

This guide has been designed to help practitioners formulate specific local responses to their specific local graffiti issues. It offers insights arising from case studies from the US and Europe where this approach has led to tangible results.


LIMITED.

Section 2
Unpicking the Problem

Environment and Behaviour: A Difficult Marriage

Defining what prompts people to commit crime or to behave anti-socially is almost impossible since a complex range of factors all combine to motivate a person into offending. There is also a multitude of ways a person can offend. In terms of graffiti there are various types each with a particular range of social and environmental factors that lead to it being committed.

Certain scenarios or environments are more favourable to graffiti than others. The built environment, how it is used and who by are major contributing factors to creating a favourable scenario for graffiti. For example Colquhoun 2003 summarises the conditions that appear to be linked to some graffiti in the United Kingdom.

- **Social exclusion** – areas with poor levels of services and skills levels, high levels of deprivation and unemployment and a lack of access to decent homes and open spaces all contribute to social exclusion and isolation. Multiple deprivation reduces the ability and capacity for people to participate in the local economy or wider society. Often crime is seen as an alternative means of gaining the resources they need or for devoting their time towards.

- **Lack of investment** – poor design standards often result from a lack of investment in developing decent homes and environments. Often homes and neighbourhoods are built without sound Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards in place leading to opportunities for crime pervading whole neighbourhoods.

- **Tenure** – for people who do not own their own homes the options and level of choice available is very limited especially in terms of quality. There is a stigma attached to social housing especially in terms of image and reputation so more people avoid it as an option leaving only the most deprived to live there.
- **Youth** - crime and anti-social behaviour is most often associated with young people. They are demonised easily and are almost expected to display this behaviour. However the real problem is the evident and gradual diminish of facilities and services that are able to cater for the needs of young people as legitimate members of society.

This four-some does not mean graffiti only occurs under those conditions. For example in cities like Amsterdam graffiti can be found throughout the whole city, especially on building site hoardings, rubbish tips, temporary offices and street furniture, but also on buildings and privately owned houses. Further tenure is very different in some European Countries such as the Netherlands where social housing is very common (45% of houses is social versus 55% privately owned).

Another favourite target for graffiti is public transport.

Public Space Includes Everyone?

The term “public” is often used in an all encompassing way; i.e., to describe a park or library, usually to denote access. However in practice the term public is not a title that belongs to everyone but only those included in society or a particular practice to which the term public has been awarded. It is too simplistic to consider the public as a single group. Rather gender, race, age, ethnicity, mobility, sexual preference and socio-economic status amongst others all separate us into groups and sub-groups sharing attributes and differing within them. There is a spectrum of groups that we can consider “public” and “other” and the way we design our environments can allow or deter access to anyone of them.

Young people in general are the exception to any theory of citizenship or public. Often their sub-cultural activities such as graffiti writing or skateboarding, are seen as a threat to the predictable tranquillity of public space.

Problem-Oriented Approaches

Problem-Oriented Policing applies at the local level; looking at particular settings of a given place and the related social issues inherent in that place. The shift towards this approach, along with government policies towards reducing poverty, unemployment, inequalities were have been influenced by a number of theories such as the “broken windows” theory (Wilson & Kelling 1982) and lately by the theory of collective efficacy (Nolan et al. 2004).

The broken-windows theory has recently been tested and proven by researchers at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. Keizer et al. (2008) showed that –in a neighbourhood covered with graffiti, litter, and unreturned shopping carts, people are more inclined (triggered) to steal a letter with a visible 5 euro note out of a letterbox.

Deprivation is a key factor in the decline of public housing estates and for high levels of crime such as graffiti. Communities feel abandoned by statutory services and society as a whole and this has a knock-on effect on the built environment. Areas in communal ownership start to decline given that there is little or no incentive to "own" or look after them. The subsequent reduction in the level of upkeep of the local environment leads to dissatisfaction with the local neighbourhood and fear of crime. If residents are too afraid to integrate with others or go out, the community have effectively lost control over their space. This is made physically evident in degradation in the environment such as graffiti and other petty acts of vandalism. These are all potent messages to criminals that crime will go unchallenged in this area.

Graffiti is considered to be an act of "incivility" i.e., of neighbourhood decline and a lack of respect for the built environment. It does this in two ways. First it can act as a cue for other acts of vandalism or crime to take place because it indicates that this area is not valued or looked after and can therefore be abused. Second, certain features such as poor lighting and vacant units have gained a reputation for their association with graffiti because of their suitability for providing a cue. Typically, when these cues are recognised by the public it creates a fear of crime in that space.

Graffiti Typologies: Canvas - Content – Audience - Motive

When attempting to analyse graffiti and the processes by which writers have chosen to write in the places that they do, it is useful to consider three key elements as a framework for understanding. Any piece of graffiti will have:

Canvas – the surface, place or location
on which the graffiti is drawn. The canvas can be government owned (bridges, buildings street furniture), semi-government owned (e.g. school buildings), company owned (e.g. transformer faults, railway tracks, trains etc) or privately owned (e.g. housing, cars),

Content – is it a tag or a mural, is there a message or a symbol of significance either because it has a contextual meaning, i.e. it is written in a local minority language or is a slogan condemning a certain society or local or political issue?

Audience – who has the graffiti been written for? For the selfish pleasure of the tagger alone? For other graffiti artists? For a particular social, ethnic or political group? For a sports fanclub (and their opponents)? For the general public?

Motive – graffiti can be used as a territorial marker, as en expression of personal freedom, an outlet for artistic talent or an act of rebellion.

The following types of graffiti are typically found all over the world and share similar characteristics in terms of **Canvas, Content, Audience and Motive.**

There are generally three main types of graffiti; **"tags"** and **"throw-ups"** which are scrawling of a person's name, pseudonym or personalised sign; **"street art"** which tend to cover whole walls or other large facades and which contain highly intricate imagery and lettering; and finally the **"political slogans"** much like those seen in Northern Ireland which are making a political statement or demanding a particular political action to be taken. Each of these different types of graffiti has a different motive behind it and a corresponding set of different spatial and social characteristics. Last, there are less conventional types of graffiti such as "**Stencilling, etching and stickering**". Different methods are used

Tags or **Throw-Ups** are less constrained in terms of where they are sited and offer the hardest task in terms of management. They are the most prevalent type of graffiti in the Netherlands and the UK. Again taggers are seeking maximum exposure for their tag. The premise behind their work is mainly driven by competitiveness and exclusivity; how many tags can they write? How obscure and unintelligible can

their tags become? Can they write them in increasingly difficult, awkward and dangerous places in order to set a precedent for other taggers? Hence tags being found on seemingly out-of-reach spaces such as bridges, tops of tall buildings and advertising hoardings. Tagging has also been linked to gang-activity where this type of graffiti is used to demarcate the territory of one gang – issuing a warning to other gangs to not transgress the boundaries of this territory.

Tags	Characteristics
Canvas	Areas of high exposure, hard to reach points such as bridges and tall buildings, railways, trains.
Content	Crudely scrawled or intricately stylised and unintelligible names or pseudonyms, territorial markers such as gang names or post/zip codes
Audience	Themselves, other taggers, gangs, groups
Motive	Notoriety or prestige, honour, hostility, taunts, excitement, risk, boredom

Street artists tend to see the least overt exposure when they are writing. They tend to favour areas that will have a low degree of activity and access to allow time for their complex and detailed murals to be painted undisturbed. They also usually require relatively ground level access, so walls in parks and on the sides of buildings offer the best canvas for their work. Street art can be found along railways, under bridges and along buildings adjacent to a railway line. Street artists seek recognition for the level of artistic skill in their work so tend to locate in areas where groups can gather to view their work. Street artists tend to distance themselves from taggers and similar graffiti writers because they see themselves as bringing an aesthetic quality to the environment.

Street poets consider themselves also street artists. Although their graphic work is not extremely skilful, their texts are (see e.g. www.laser 314.com

Street Art	Characteristics
Canvas	Large expanses of wall or buildings in semi-isolated areas to avoid detection or disturbance. Some muralists seek overtly decayed buildings in an effort to "brighten them up"
Content	Intricate and lifelike depictions of faces or scenes. High degree of sophistication and artistic content. Very stylised.
Audience	Other graffiti artists, general public.
Motive	Artistic prestige, notoriety, honor

Political slogans are interesting examples and are overwhelmingly sited alongside main access routes, i.e., along main roads, in particular socio-economic or ethnic areas. This is because they intend to obtain maximum exposure for their political statement. These areas offer a stream of observers who will be exposed to their message. It is about ensuring high visibility so height a large surface is ideal. Their economy of style and words means that the message is emphatic and direct. These examples of graffiti are unlikely to be the work of a "career graffiti artist". More likely it is a tactic used by a group or individual who feel that this is the most direct and unconstrained way to get their voice heard. It is not, like a tagger seeking an artistic or selfish outlet.

Political slogans	Characteristics
Canvas	Areas of high exposure, areas of social exclusion, economic deprivation, ethnic minorities

Content	Stark messages, emotive slogans, antagonistic, demands
Audience	Fellow sympathisers, society in general, specific groups/public bodies
Motive	Public protest, defiance, social comment, hostility, anger, boredom//??//

Stencilling, etching and stickering

Stencilling, etching and the posting of stickers have become quite popular in the UK having a proven to be a trend across Europe for some time.

Stencilling etc.	Characteristics
Canvas	Stencilling can cross over into Street art where it is another style of creating intricate and detailed images. Large expanses of wall or buildings in semi-isolated areas to avoid detection or disturbance. Etching and stickering is very opportunistic with the writer able to strike at random.
Content	Intricate and lifelike depictions of faces or scenes. High degree of sophistication and artistic content. Very stylised. Stickering offers the opportunity for the writer to put a message on a sticker and post it anywhere so often this can be political, subversive, offensive or obscure.

Audience	**Other graffiti artists, general public.**
Motive	**Play, rite of passage, artistic prestige, notoriety, excitement, impulse**

Cumulative Effects

It is not necessarily simply the graffiti itself that prompts fear or concern but the cumulative effects it can have on the environment and social fabric. Hence graffiti has a popular association with attracting crime. The consequences of damage to private property by vandalism and graffiti are suffered by the owner. However the overall steward of public space is more difficult to identify. When public space is violated by graffiti the graffity artists put a personal claim to that space and make it their own.

However there is a flipside. Some communities tolerate graffiti in the form of murals or specific graffiti walls where it allows the community express themselves and contributes to social cohesion. Community murals have been created for many years as a means of celebrating local identity, engaging young people, brightening up a neighbourhood or derelict area and in some cases offering a "sign of life". This Mural in a deprived area of Hackney is a key example and was commissioned by the Council by a local artist.

New York City is pioneering an approach to tackling graffiti by considering it as a "non-administered public art", effectively using graffiti as a signpost for sites in need of a community developed piece of public art that is designed
with or by the community. So, just as graffiti can be a cure for other crime, we can also use it as a cue for developing features for the benefit of the wider community.

Section 3
Graffiti Management Framework

Towards a Graffiti Management Framework (GMF)

The responses used in strategies to combat graffiti should be based on an analysis of the offenders, the type of graffiti they undertake and their motivations. **They should represent local solutions to local problems.**

This section is dedicated to the development of a **Graffiti Management Framework (GMF)** which practitioners can replicate according to the context in which local graffiti is considered a problem. The range of responses that are commonly used across the UK, US and Europe broadly come under a number of headings which are summarised in the table below. These responses are discussed in more detail in terms of how they contribute to the GMF.

The table below is the key starting point for the GMF. Practitioners can use this as a basis for analysing local graffiti and then using the menu of responses below, select an appropriate mechanism for responding.

GMF Element	Component
Type of Graffiti	Political Slogan
	Tagging or Throw-ups
	Street Art
	Stencilling
	Etching & Stickering
Canvas	Railway (line or bridge)
	Transport artery
	Hoarding
	Private building
	Public building (library, school etc)
	Signpost/paraphernalia
	Empty/derelict building
	Graffiti wall/community mural
	Socio-economic profile of area: i.e., housing quality, deprivation level, ethnic minorities, crime trends, employment levels, income levels, housing quality
	Other graffiti/incivilities nearby?
	Quality of environment overall?
	Level of CPTED measures in place?
Content	Slogan (political)
	Slogan (hostile)
	Slogan (other)
	Organisation

	Personal/group publicity
	Personalised tag
	Gang marker
	Artistic mural
	Random words/letters/numbers
	Indecipherable
Audience	Specific organisation/group
	Specific individual
	Specific area/postcode/gang
	Themselves
	Other taggers
	Other street artists
	General public
	Government/society
Motive	Boredom/personal satisfaction
	Artistic recognition
	Notoriety
	Honour/respect
	Fear/hostility
	Publicity for cause/protest
	Excitement/thrill
	Hostility/violence
	Demarcation of territory
	Artistic/public commission
	Rebellion/subversion
Offender/artist	Individual (spontaneous)
	Individual (persistent tagger)
	Individual (street artist)
	Gang
	Graffiti collective
	Male
	Female
	< 12 years
	12 -15 years
	16 -19 years
	20 - 25 years
	26 – 30 years
	Over 30 years
	Student
	Employed
	Unemployed
	Previous conviction

	Current address
Response	
Acceptance	Graffiti is actively encouraged and copied. For example in advertisements or pieces sponsored at Art Galleries or outside space
Tolerance	Graffiti is not encouraged just ignored and eventually not seen by the public
Zero tolerance	Graffiti is not tolerated and removed as quickly as possible
Situational crime prevention	Design of the physical environment/surface makes it risky or difficult to commit the offence.
Diversionary crime prevention	Alternatives for the youth are provided such as legal graffiti walls in the hope that they will not attack other illegal targets if they can do it legally.
Intervention work to change behaviour	Education in schools to get across the message that graffiti is not just 'a bit of fun' but a serious crime with serious impacts.
Communication/ Publicity	Educating the wider public on graffiti is necessary so they can play a role. However any such strategy should not provide the offenders with publicity which they crave or antagonise them by challenging them.
Targeted policing	Using database and intelligence sources to target prolific offenders by enforcement and hotspot physical targets by CPTED.
Public/Street Art	Using artists' creative skills to paint, mainly images/murals, on permitted areas to enhance public space.

Section 4
Local Responses to Local Problems

Responses to graffiti can be classified into prevention and management.

Prevention

Prevention focuses on reducing the likelihood of graffiti occurring in the first place. It aims to:

- Change people's (including the public's, victim's and offenders') attitudes to graffiti vandalism
- Reduce the number of people engaging in graffiti vandalism
- Manage the environment to reduce the opportunities, remove the excuses and prevent the encouragement of graffiti vandalism.

Approaches taken include:

- Engagement –youth/community/education/street art
- Removing the opportunity
- Communication
- Mainstreaming

1. Engagement

Preventing youth from committing graffiti in the first place is vital. It is particularly important in that not only will this help to stop graffiti at the most base level, but as some consider graffiti to be a gateway crime it may stop some from graduating to more serious offences. The aim is therefore to educate them of the impact of graffiti, the fact that it is a crime and the dangers and consequences involved.

There are a number of successful intervention programmes that change young people's attitudes to anti social behaviour, and address such behaviour that have taken place in UK schools. There are also a number of North American 'graffiti' lesson programmes that also aim to achieve this. Schools are also often visited by police school liaison officers who offer safety advice. Some schools in the Netherlands are visited by 'legal' graffiti artists who promote graffiti on legal spaces (e.g. designated legal graffiti walls). How effective these are is unknown.

Interventions that effectively target 'hardcore' graffiti vandalism offenders are more likely to lead to a rapid reduction in graffiti than those seeking to address pro-graffiti attitudes among all children and young people which tend to be a mid to long term solution.

However the majority of experience, for example in Barcelona, suggests that hardcore' graffiti vandalism offenders are largely immune to these approaches and a better success is achieved through targeted enforcement.

Engaging with local youth groups and organisations could be beneficial when working to address graffiti vandalism in the long term. Effective youth engagement can be a positive way to:

- Assess and change, if appropriate, local youth attitudes about graffiti
- Develop collaborative partnerships with the youth community to identify effective strategies to combat graffiti
- Foster a sense of community pride and respect in children and young people – with flow-on benefits in reduced graffiti and wider anti social behaviour.

Classic examples here are legal walls and projects where youth are allowed and even taught how to graffiti in permitted areas (e.g. Amsterdam, Barcelona).However there is little evaluated evidence to

suggest such an approach delivers outside a structured environment such as schools. In some cases, such as legal walls, the problem can be magnified.

In addition, experience of legal wall provision in the UK has shown that the existence of the site leads in most cases to a proliferation of unlawful graffiti in the general locality, often extending for some distance. This proliferation is coupled with the resultant inability of the police to deal with people “going equipped to commit criminal damage” - the existence of a legal wall close by is an instant defence. Thus the problem is further exacerbated.

Furthermore the broader community often reject the plans. For example in July 2008 the local council in Amesbury rejected a police led youth graffiti engagement scheme. A representation of the Councillors views included:

"No matter how good an artist they are, graffiti looks awful to the naked eye. I don't agree with doing any of that in the town."

“The sort of individuals who graffiti don't want to be watched by a professional, they do it in secret and then enjoy the satisfaction of knowing they've done it.”

"People who do damage will not be the ones taking advantage of the boards,"

"When someone commits criminal damage, that's an offence. I don't care how artistic it is."

On the other hand where street murals have been accepted by the community, for example religious murals in Hispanic gang neighbourhoods, they are left alone and not tagged.

Engaging local artists in other environments to paint in public space has been successful in reducing typical vandalism. For example in Brighton Police report that painting the windows of vacant buildings by a local artist cut vandalism.

"Even though that building has been derelict for some months it's not been vandalised.

"The residents seem to have welcomed the idea, it's improved the look of the area and their quality of life.

"It's unusual and quite calming. People seem to have a respect for the art of it."

There appears to be considerable support for approved street art, from all sources, which also removes one of the common excuses from graffiti artists which is they were only trying to beautify the environment because no else does. Therefore the findings above suggest that engaging youth outside the usual structured areas such as school to engage them in graffiti either as diversionary or behaviour changing approaches is not the most successful. However working in schools does succeed.

In addition, there is support from communities for approved street art. Further such support has been taken by some areas to a proactive level where communities have ‘adopted a spot’. They have taken responsibility for removing the graffiti themselves. The local authorities provide the training and materials but the local people remove the graffiti.

However, in other locations, such as Kilburn, North London, the existence of a graffiti-styled mural on the underside of a railway arch resulted in a proliferation of unlawful graffiti throughout the vicinity. Thus it can be seen that the style of the art utilised for such locations is an important element in assessing

the likely impact of the project on local graffiti levels. It appears that only art that does not have graffiti stylisation as a theme is likely to contribute positively to the level of attrition.

2. Differentiating between "Graffiti" and "Street Art"

In some cases, to manage the problem, there is a need to differentiate between approved graffiti which should be referred to as street art and illegal graffiti which should be referred to as graffiti vandalism.

The results of such a strategy should be the behaviour that is expected. In Barcelona they have produced a code of conduct which illustrates what is acceptable and not acceptable behaviour from its citizens. Graffiti is identified as an unacceptable behaviour.

As was discussed above approved street art can be beneficial. Some of the factors we suggest that should be included in the process are:

- What the street art hopes to achieve
- Location of the proposed art
- Content and style of the art
- Who the artists are (convicted or suspected graffiti vandals will not be allowed to participate).

3. Minimising the Opportunity for Graffiti by Design

Well designed spaces can significantly reduce the crime and antisocial behaviour that take place there. The application of crime prevention through environmental design is now a well established practice in most countries.

The seven CPTED qualities of well designed, graffiti-free places are:

- Access – safe movement and connections
- Surveillance and sightlines – see, be seen and know you are being seen
- Layout – clear and logical orientation, boundaries well defined
- Activity mix – using a range of people to provide 'eyes on the street'
- Sense of ownership – showing a space is cared for and policed
- Quality environments – well designed, managed and maintained environments
- Physical protection – using active security measures.

4. Communication

Effective communication is an important part of any action taken to combat graffiti. It's vital that young people are well informed on the negative impacts of graffiti on their environment. Raising the profile of work being done to tackle the problem can also help to encourage members of the public to report incidents of graffiti vandalism.

However, the portrayal of graffiti vandalism in media, broadcasting or publicity material is thought to encourage graffiti vandals by giving them the exposure they crave.

5. Mainstreaming

One of the motivations behind graffiti vandalism is often the challenge to authority. The offenders are breaking the law and in their view fighting back against Consumerism and Government. Encouraging street art and aping graffiti styles in fashion and furniture for example is one way of mainstreaming the 'art'. Once mainstreamed it can reduce the motivation as it is no longer such a rebellious act.

Management

Managing the problem of graffiti comprises analysis of the problem, responding and evaluating. Monitoring and measuring the problem. Any effective strategy for managing graffiti must be based on an analysis of the problems. The most basic analysis will answer the following questions (see GMF in the previous section.):

- Where does the graffiti vandalism happen?
- When does the graffiti vandalism happen?
- How much graffiti vandalism is there?
- What type of graffiti vandalism is it?
- Who is victimised by the graffiti vandalism and how does it affect them?
- Who is thought to be committing it? What is their motivation?

1. Responding to the problem

Having analysed the problem the solutions will include preventative suggestions, as suggested in the previous section, and action solutions. Action solutions come under two headings:

- Eradication programmes
- Enforcement

2. Eradication Programmes

These programmes comprise two main elements: 1) Removal of graffiti vandalism quickly, which reduces the likelihood of the offender receiving respect from their peers and 2) Protecting surfaces by making them more difficult to attack or by application of sacrificial layers (such as filming to protect windows).

As it is important to remove graffiti quickly, eradication programmes should include an agreed timeframe for responding to reports. Once an action solution is in place it is important to be clear about the key players' roles and responsibilities.

3. Enforcement

Enforcement aims to identify graffiti offenders, convict and punish them. The punishment is intended as a deterrent to other potential offenders. Generally, the penalties and activities for graffiti offences include:

- Reparation for the victim(s)
- Working for the victim(s)
- Writing a letter of apology and explanation to the victim(s)
- Participating in a relevant programme – for instance, to address the underlying causes of the offending
- Community work (particularly cleaning up graffiti or related work where this is possible)
- A fine imposed by the court
- For serious and recidivist offenders a prison sentence

- ASBO's

Some areas have dedicated police teams who just target graffiti offenders (e.g. BTP, Los Angeles) others do not (e.g. Barcelona). However, even when teams exist the liaison between teams appears to be limited.

One of the key needs for enforcement is intelligence on graffiti offences. Most enforcement teams, but not all, maintain dedicated graffiti databases to capture this data.

Sources of the data include information from:
- Eradication teams
- Staff such as drivers
- Members of the public (e.g. graffiti telephone hotlines are used in Swindon, reports and photos can be uploaded onto the Lewisham Council website).
- Schools (Long Beach)
- Internet

The databases can be used:
- To identify high-risk, recidivist offenders and consequently reduce the risks they pose
- To identify key offence locations ('hotspots')
- To determine the extent of multiple offences at various locations
- As a basis for criminal investigations
- As a prosecution resource.

Databases should be shared with operators within national boundaries and across them. Doing so will enable analysts to plot travelling offenders and their tags.

Another tool for providing enforcement intelligence is the Internet. The use of the Internet to promote crime, including graffiti vandalism, is a growing problem. Some websites, notably social networking forums, enable people to publicise crimes and can give offenders the notoriety they seek. However it also provides good evidential clues to the perpetrators if websites are monitored and investigated.

Another effective tool that appears to be commonly used for convicted offenders is Restorative Justice. Where 'traditional justice' is about punishing offenders for committing offences against the state, restorative justice is about offenders making amends directly to the people or organisations they have harmed.

Restorative justice is a process where parties with a stake in a specific offence come together in a facilitated meeting to talk about the effects of the offence and agree how those effects could be overcome or reduced.

Advantages of restorative justice are that it:

- Gives victims a greater voice in the criminal justice system
- Allows victims to receive an explanation and more meaningful reparation from offenders
- Makes offenders accountable by allowing them to take responsibility for their actions
- Builds community confidence that offenders are making amends for their wrong doing

4. Evaluation and Monitoring

Of course the final element of every management plan should be evaluation and monitoring. This appears to be undertaken piece meal by most operators if at all.

Section 5
Summary of Design Guidelines and Recommendations

Design Ideas	What they accomplish
1. Rapid graffiti removal	Rapid removal of graffiti is still considered the most effective means of preventing its growth in urban areas, and particularly on transport systems. It is successful in dealing with most forms of graffiti.
2. Graffiti walls	Youth diversionary activities can be successful. However one form, such as legal walls which are intended to divert them from further involvement in graffiti, have had at best mixed results and at worst increased the problem. They can lead to proliferation of graffiti in other areas.
3. Community public murals	Street or public art and murals can be positive but we need to clearly differentiate between that and graffiti vandalism and then put in a process to control street art, if allowed. New York is experimenting with non-administered public art as a cue that more needs to be done.
4, Re-filming etched surfaces	Some agencies have had success with Etch2 which consists of re-filming etched bus windows.
5. Natural surveillance and territorial control	Careful design of public spaces with large surfaces, such as blank building walls, should include plenty of opportunities for natural surveillance and eyes on the street by residents. These spaces should have a clear and logical orientation with well defined boundaries
6. Activity mix	Public spaces vulnerable to graffiti should encourage use by a range of different people. Providing these spaces are properly managed and maintained, an activity mix of different user groups will help minimize opportunities for unobserved acts of graffiti.
7. Protecting surfaces	There are a number of spray products and building materials that help protect surfaces from graffiti markings and paint. A number of anti-graffiti websites and blogs exist for product information, for example http://www.nograffiti.com/

Policy Ideas	What they can accomplish
8. Data collection	Better use can be made of existing database and internet monitoring tools. It is especially important to monitor pro-graffiti websites that discuss targets and methods. There should also be a better exchange of intelligence between organisations both nationally and internationally.
9. Media	There needs to be a very clear graffiti media strategy that does not send 'mixed messages' through publicity and/or advertising that some graffiti is artistic (street art) and acceptable, while others are not. It should also not use language that might be seen as challenging or antagonistic by any of the audience
10. Penalties	For ‘hardcore’ taggers the only way to get the message to them to stop offending appears to be custodial sentences, significant fines and restrictions on their movement and behaviour for example anti-social behaviour orders. However for young people just ‘experimenting’ with graffiti, restorative justice and education are seen as a better solution. This includes working for the victim(s), writing a letter of apology and explanation to the victim(s),

	participating in a relevant programme – for instance, to address the underlying causes of the offending, and community work
11. Education	Early intervention with young people is needed to educate them about the impact and consequences of graffiti. The most appropriate structure for this appears to be in school.
12. *Graffiti Management Framework*	Long term success preventing graffiti is more likely with a systematic plan that includes analysis, enforcement, prevention, and engagement. The GMF outlined in this Guidebook provides an outline of the elements needed in such a plan.
13. Enforcement	Some jurisdictions have dedicated police teams who just target graffiti offenders. However, even when teams exist, the liaison between teams and other agencies appears to be limited. One of the key needs for enforcement is collecting, and sharing, intelligence on graffiti offences. Most enforcement teams, but not all, maintain dedicated graffiti databases to capture this data. This needs to become standard practice during enforcement efforts.

Additional conclusions:

- After removal of graffiti, the tag, piece or slogan goes on existing on the internet. This is done with tags (advertise misbehaviour, territorial behaviour) as well as with pieces (exchanging skills) and slogans. The fact that some taggers/artists/writers are not affected by the removal of their work puts a new dimension on repression of graffiti.

- From this perspective, more research on the role of the internet graffiti is essential. Further, more comprehensive research on the effects of graffiti, and prevention strategies, is required. For example, if the criminal justice system is going to take into account the actual seriousness and cost of graffiti, then reliable evidence on that cost must be produced. Currently there is no reliable formula for that cost.

- A national mode of operation should be pursued. Some excellent examples are found on the Websites of Interest in the next section of this Guidebook. However, even on local prevention and management modes, many approaches perish because local cooperation between diverse agencies. In many cases, the famous multi-agency approach proved to be a myth time after time.

Section 6
Websites of Interest

The anti-graffiti web
http://www.dougweb.com/pgraf.html

The National Council to Prevent Delinquency Anti-Graffiti Project
http://www.anti-graffiti.org/index.htm

Drafting an Anti-graffiti ordinance: Some essential provisions
http://www.anti-graffiti.org/localrol.htm

Harvard University Innovation Awards: The Philadelphia Anti-Graffiti Network
http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/awards.html?id=3525

The Anti-Graffiti Association
http://www.theaga.org.uk/

Australian Retailers Association anti-graffiti legislation
http://www.retailtimes.com.au/index.php/page/Anti-Graffiti_Legislation_Sweeps_Across_Australia

Section 7
Contact Details

For further information regarding please contact:

Liane Hartley

Principal Socio-Economic Consultant Capita Symonds Ltd
Level Seven,
52 Grosvenor Gardens,
London SW1W 0AU
liane.hartley@capita.co.uk
Tel: 020 7808 4541
Fax: 020 7901 9901
Mob: 07827 842387
www.capitasymonds.co.uk

Dr Tim Pascoe

Griffin Research & Consultancy Ltd
7 Highover Way
Hitchin
SG4 0RF
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)462 622 250
enquiries@griffinrc.co.uk
www.grffinrc.co.uk

MSc Manja Abraham
Researcher

Dr Paul van Soomeren

DSP-groep
Van Diemenstraat 374
1013 CR Amsterdam
+31 20 625 7537
www.dsp-groep.nl
mabraham@dsp-groep.nl