

Appendix 1: responses to the public consultation

Question 1 – “How are you responding to this consultation? As a...”

Resident of Brighton & Hove	939
Visitor	26
A local landlord	9
A local business	22
A local community or voluntary group	15
A local stakeholder	5
Other	9
No response	3

Question 2 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that graffiti is a problem in your local area?”

This question had a total of **935** resident responses

Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
527	155	60	91	101	1

Question 3 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that graffiti is a problem in Brighton & Hove?”

This question had a total of **1,021** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	679	99	25	58	72	2
Visitors	15	4	0	5	2	0
Local landlord	9	0	0	0	0	0
Local business	18	3	1	0	0	0
Local CVS	13	0	0	2	0	0
Local stakeholder	2	2	1	0	0	0
Other	3	2	1	1	0	2
Total	739	110	28	66	74	4

Question 4 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that graffiti has a negative impact on people’s perception of an area?”

This question had a total of **1,023** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	642	127	44	66	56	2
Visitors	15	5	0	3	3	0
Local landlord	9	0	0	0	0	0

Local business	16	4	1	1	0	0
Local CVS	13	0	0	2	0	0
Local stakeholder	3	2	0	0	0	0
Other	5	1	2	1	0	0
Total	703	139	47	73	59	2

Question 5 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that the council should take enforcement action against property owners that fail to remove graffiti from their property?”

This question had a total of 1,025 responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	240	181	76	165	260	17
Visitors	5	4	1	7	8	1
Local landlord	4	1	0	0	4	0
Local business	3	4	5	4	6	0
Local CVS	4	3	4	2	2	0
Local stakeholder	2	2	0	0	1	0
Other	3	1	1	0	4	0
Total	261	196	87	178	285	18

Question 6 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach for utility, telecommunication and transport providers, referred to as statutory undertakers?”

This question had a total of 1,020 responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	424	213	74	76	130	18
Visitors	8	8	1	3	4	1
Local landlord	5	0	1	0	3	0
Local business	7	7	2	2	4	0
Local CVS	9	2	2	1	0	1
Local stakeholder	0	1	0	1	3	0
Other	2	2	1	0	3	1
Total	455	233	81	83	147	21

Several statutory undertakers participated in this consultation, self-identifying as “Other” and “A local stakeholder”. The following statutory undertakers completed the consultation:

- The Royal Mail Group Ltd
- UK Power Networks
- Sothern Water
- Network Rail

Free text comments on proposed approach to Statutory Undertakers

Common themes found:

- Too much time before action
- Happy with proposed approach
- The cost to the council is a concern
- Not enough time before action
- Police assistance is required to tackle graffiti
- Penalties should focus on perpetrators not victims of crime
- Proposal lacks sufficient preventative measures
- A safe space for graffiti would reduce private property being targeted
- The decision is up to the property owner
- A definition of graffiti is required for this framework
- Council needs to get its own house in order
- Graffiti is not a problem
- Community Protection Notices should not be used
- Worries of the cost being transferred to statutory undertaker customers

Question 7 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach for large businesses consisting of more than 250 employees?”

This question had a total of 1,017 responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	422	204	78	81	136	11
Visitors	8	6	1	3	6	1
Local landlord	5	0	0	1	3	0
Local business	5	8	2	2	5	0
Local CVS	7	5	1	1	1	0
Local stakeholder	1	1	1	2	0	0
Other	2	3	2	0	2	0
Total	450	227	85	90	153	12

Question 8 – Free text comments on proposed approach to large businesses

Common themes found:

- Too much time before action
- The cost to the council in a concern
- Not enough time before action
- Need to consider charities
- Police assistance is required to tackle graffiti
- Penalties should focus on perpetrators not victims of crime
- Proposal lacks sufficient preventative measures
- A safe space for graffiti would reduce private property being targeted
- Graffiti removal should be free to everyone by the council
- Cost to the business is a concern
- The decision is up to the property owner

- A definition of graffiti is required for this framework
- Council needs to get its own house in order
- Graffiti is not a problem

Question 9 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach for small to medium sized businesses?”

This question had a total of **1,016** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	277	211	81	142	203	18
Visitors	5	5	3	4	7	1
Local landlord	4	0	0	1	4	0
Local business	2	5	2	4	9	0
Local CVS	5	6	1	2	1	0
Local stakeholder	1	1	0	1	1	0
Other	1	1	4	1	2	0
Total	295	229	91	155	227	19

Question 10 – Free text comments on proposed approach to small to medium businesses

Common themes found:

- Too much time before action
- The cost to the council is a concern
- Not enough time before action
- Police assistance is required to tackle graffiti
- Penalties should focus on perpetrators not victims of crime
- Proposal lacks sufficient preventative measures
- A safe space for graffiti would reduce private property being targeted
- The decision is up to the property owner
- Graffiti removal should be free to everyone by the council
- Cost to the business is a concern
- The decision is up to the property owner
- A definition of graffiti is required for this framework
- Council needs to get its own house in order
- Small to medium sized businesses should not have to pay
- Geographically unfair as some businesses will get vandalised more than others

Question 11 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach for homeowners?”

This question had a total of **1,017** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	209	148	73	130	356	16
Visitors	2	5	2	3	14	0

Local landlord	3	1	0	0	5	0
Local business	1	5	2	4	10	0
Local CVS	5	2	3	3	2	0
Local stakeholder	1	0	1	2	0	0
Other	1	0	3	2	3	0
Total	222	161	84	144	390	16

Question 12 – Free text comments on proposed approach homeowners

Common themes found:

- Removal by homeowner may not be possible
- Cost to homeowner is a concern
- Graffiti removal should be included within council tax
- Too much time before action
- The cost to the council is a concern
- Not enough time before action
- Police assistance is required to tackle graffiti
- Penalties should focus on perpetrators not victims of crime
- Proposal lacks sufficient preventative measures
- A safe space for graffiti would reduce private property being targeted
- The decision is up to the property owner
- Graffiti removal should be free to everyone by the council
- Cost to the business is a concern
- The decision is up to the property owner
- A definition of graffiti is required for this framework
- Council needs to get its own house in order
- Geographically unfair as some homes will get vandalised more than others

Question 13 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that the council should set up a chargeable graffiti removal service for property owners to access across the city?”

This question had a total of **1,013** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	391	239	94	65	118	20
Visitors	9	9	1	2	5	0
Local landlord	3	2	0	0	4	0
Local business	3	9	4	1	4	1
Local CVS	5	5	3	0	1	1
Local stakeholder	3	0	1	0	1	0
Other	1	3	2	2	1	0
Total	415	267	105	70	134	22

Question 14 – Free text comments on proposed chargeable graffiti removal service

Common themes found:

- If the service is not compulsory to use
- Commercial service should operate on a minimal cost
- Commercial service should operate on a sliding scale of costs
- Culprits should remove graffiti rather than victims paying for removal
- Low income households/ businesses may still struggle to access the service
- Council needs to get its own house in order
- Commercial service should be free to residents
- The quality of removal by the commercial service is a concern
- Commercial service should be contracted out to an external contractor, rather than being ran by City Clean
- Graffiti removal should be provided for free by the council
- Commercial service should not operate on a sliding scale of costs
- A commercial service will not suffice without any preventative measures

Question 15 – “To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed charges should differ depending on whether it is a statutory undertaker, large business, small to medium sized business or homeowner?”

This question had a total of **1,010** responses

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/ not sure
Residents	432	216	118	35	90	33
Visitors	12	6	3	0	5	0
Local landlord	4	1	1	1	2	0
Local business	8	8	1	1	4	0
Local CVS	6	4	3	0	1	1
Local stakeholder	2	1	0	0	2	0
Other	2	1	1	1	4	0
Total	466	237	127	38	108	34

Question 16 – Free text comments on proposed differing charges for statutory undertakers, large businesses, small to medium sized businesses or homeowners

Common themes found:

- Graffiti removal should be included within council tax
- Commercial service should be free to residents
- Commercial service should not operate on a sliding scale of costs
- Commercial service should be free for homeowners and small to medium businesses
- Commercial service should be means tested to determine the price
- No commercial service needed
- Low income households/ businesses may still struggle to access the service
- Need to consider charities
- Geographically unfair, as properties in hot spot areas will need to use the service more than others
- Commercial service should be cost neutral

Further information and mitigating actions in relation to the free text comments are:

Too much time before action	The proposed approach is based on the legal parameters of the legislation and feedback from Legal Services. An additional step of sending a reminder letter to small and medium sized enterprises has been incorporated as a supportive approach in getting graffiti removed.
Police assistance is required to tackle graffiti	A prevention officer has been appointed by Sussex Police to support the prevention of graffiti vandalism and to ensure consistency between investigations. Joint patrols and communications will be actioned to deliver the Graffiti Reduction Strategy.
Penalties should focus on perpetrators not victims of crime	Other activities focused on the perpetrators of crime will continue to be delivered as part of the Graffiti Reduction Strategy. Based on the feedback of the consultation, enforcement action against homeowners is not being recommended.
A safe space for graffiti would reduce private property being targeted	Work is already taking place with the Phoenix Arts Association to create a mural. Opportunities for graffiti artists are being explored including further partnership working with Phoenix Arts Association, permissioned murals led by local residents and researching the benefits of a 'graffiti safe space'.
The decision is up to the property owner	Enforcement action will only be taken where there is proof that the graffiti is detrimental to the amenity of an area and having an impact on the residents in the locality.
Council needs to get its own house in order	The council is aware that additional effort is required to maintain council property. A new approach has been adopted by graffiti operatives to do this by working in zones and revisiting on a regular basis. Additional temporary operatives are being recruited to work during the summer months when removal is easier due to the weather. It is hoped that the increased capacity during the summer months will allow the two full time operatives to maintain the progress over the winter months.
Geographically unfair as some businesses will get vandalised more than others	It is recognised that some buildings are more likely to be subject to graffiti vandalism than others. The different approaches to graffiti enforcement have been proposed to take this into account. A scaled pricing system for the chargeable graffiti removal system has been proposed to make the service as accessible as possible.
Proposal lacks sufficient preventative measures	The Graffiti Reduction Strategy has a preventative workstream. Activities in this workstream include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trialling a range of anti-graffiti coating • working with Trading Standards to restrict the sales of spray cans to under 16's • working with Major Projects and Highways Teams to ensure preventative measures are considered in future designs
Graffiti removal should be free / covered by council tax	There are not sufficient resources available to do this. Graffiti removal is not a statutory service.
A definition of graffiti is required	Graffiti art: permissioned street art, created through obtaining appropriate Permissions, this can include tagging Graffiti vandalism: any kind of street art which has been done without the permission of the property owner, this can include tagging
Commercial service should be contracted out	Other graffiti removal companies are available. The council service is another option for residents and businesses in the city. Property owners can use which ever graffiti removal service they wish.
Need to consider charities	Charities will be considered under the SME approach to enforcement and will be able to use the graffiti removal service at the same price as homeowners and SMEs

