

Please select which one of these options best describes you:	Please select which one of these options best describes you: - If other, please specify:	Please include your comments in the text box below	Officer response
Councillor		<p>I think it would be helpful to start the policy copy with a clear statement, that graffiti is illegal?</p> <p>There will be some people who are not aware of this.</p>	This is covered and made clear under “4. Definitions”
		<p>Generally supportive of the policy although would hope that particularly offensive graffiti can be removed in a shorter timescale. I wonder if consideration can be given to applying some sort of anti-graffiti treatment on to walls in 'hot spot' locations, if such is available. When considering the positioning of CCTV do we take into account popular graffiti locations?</p>	<p>They urgency of removing offensive graffiti is recognised in the policy but is dependent on resources available.</p> <p>Whilst the draft policy refers to 14 days, it is “within” 14 days meaning that it could be less than 14 days, resources permitting.</p> <p>Although “anti-graffiti treatment” is not part of this iteration of policy review, officers will investigation this option and recommend further policy recommendations as required.</p> <p>CCTV needs assessment does consider “hot spots” and therefore includes graffiti as a “whole approach” consideration.</p>

Other, please specify	Council officer	<p>Identify and promote 'free walls' where people can express themselves within a few clear limitations. Provide volunteer groups with guidance and equipment to remove graffiti from low risk structures that might have graffiti on.</p>	<p>Draft policy does recognise authorised graffiti under paragraph 2, under “Definitions” on page 3.</p> <p>Use of “volunteer groups” can be considered in future iterations of this policy. Removal is a complex process that requires the correct equipment and chemicals.</p>
	Council officer	<p>Thank you for providing us with an opportunity to read and feedback on the policy. It looks like a well-researched document with clear objectives, and lines of responsibility for graffiti removal.</p> <p>It is with it’s implementation I have some concerns, particularly regarding existing graffiti hot spots. The Honeybourne Line being one such example where graffiti has existed on the retaining walls, bridges and structures for as long as I can remember. Recent attempts to clean selected walls saw the graffiti return very quickly. Much of the graffiti takes place under the gaze of existing CCTV cameras, and it's removal, and continued removal, I suspect is beyond the effective control of CBC and Ubico, and not necessarily a priority for the police. This creates conflict when you are enforcing other people to remove graffiti from private premises and the Council is unable to control graffiti on its own assets. Admittedly the Council is exposed to this far more than other property owners due to the varied nature and extensive distribution of our assets, but I do feel we need to manage expectation, as some people may be quick to draw attention to these issues once the policy is approved.</p> <p>One answer might be to specify areas of the town where the Council takes a zero tolerance approach, and</p>	

others where we are more pragmatic. So this might entail adding a third priority in the Classification under section 5 of the policy, and a sixth Aim under section 3 outlining where it will prioritise it's resources. So take the Honeybourne Line as an example; we commit to remove anything offensive, or visually obtrusive, but tolerate (or place a lower priority on , if those words are more acceptable) most of what is contained within the line. Like it or not, there are many places now where graffiti is a fact of life.
Hope that helps

The authority takes a zero tolerance approach to illegal graffiti everywhere. Work to address the problem is intelligence led to focus on high risk areas.

Creating a two tier approach, as suggested, will add additional complication and resource demand.

Other, please specify	Cheltenham BID Ambassador	<p>There is a specific issue with one individual whose tag has proliferated around the town centre in recent months. The tag (which looks like the word Rawk or Rawks or even, most recently, Rawksy) has been sprayed/inked on all kinds of surfaces, from business window shutters and residential boundary and commercial walls to traffic bollards, bus shelter windows, recycling storage units, postboxes, parking meters and utility boxes. I've personally noted at least 150 of these tags that have appeared within the last few months and have been cleaning much of it off myself (where practicable) with purpose wipes during my shifts as a matter of routine. Unfortunately, as soon as the graffiti is removed, the same tags reappear within days. Worst affected businesses locally are Machine Mart in Fairview Rd which has suffered repeated tagging in spite of regular wall repainting and the former Londis (now Welcome Cheltenham) which had its newly repainted wooden gates covered by the same tag within 24 hours. The graffiti is spreading further into town from Fairview as the miscreant is gaining confidence in getting away with it. Most recently seen in bus shelters, on post boxes and council litter bins in the Promenade (I have photographic evidence if required). I can't believe that there hasn't been any CCTV available in the town centre that could potentially identify the individual responsible, who obviously lives in the Fairview area and may already be known to local neighbourhood police. Until we as a community can apprehend the few people who are responsible and have the power to force them to face</p>	<p>This policy review does not address individual cases. However, the general approach proposed aims to deal with the individual case highlighted.</p>
-----------------------	------------------------------	---	--

the consequences of their actions (eg by having to remove each instance of their graffiti under supervision as opposed to relying on limited police resources to take individuals to court), I can only see this issue becoming impossible to reverse (and ultimately far more expensive to deal with, as minor crimes like this often lead to more serious crimes such as burglary, assault and street corner drug dealing etc being committed). Maintaining a list of the graffiti locations simply to watch the rash spread is not going to achieve anything without a concerted effort to clean it up, one way or another. Are there any other options for dealing with it other than the long and costly process of police prosecution, which seems not to have any deterrent effect? Court backlogs are already such that not even serious crimes are being dealt with in a timely manner at the moment. Is there a possibility of having enforcement action available to neighbourhood policing without having to go to court? Is this option available already?

As an aside, I was under the impression that offensive graffiti used to have to be removed within 48 hours as opposed to within 14 days. Am I correct in my understanding? If so, this suggests a weakening effort to tackle the problem. I acknowledge that the pressure on funding budgets combined with increased inflation may be impacting on current efforts but, as outlined above, failure to tackle this issue quickly is only likely to result in worse outcomes.

“Within” 14 days. All efforts will be made to remove offensive graffiti as soon as resources allow.

<p>Other, please specify</p>	<p>Secretary to the Gloucester Diocesan Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Comments relevant to the following sections of the policy: 'Different sites and assets' 'Permission and indemnity' Appendix 11. With regard to graffiti in closed churchyards, the relevant Parochial Church Council must be notified about the Council's intention to remove graffiti, prior to work commencing. 2. Consecrated Church of England churchyards are subject to Faculty Jurisdiction. With regard to both listed and unlisted structures in closed churchyards forming curtilages of listed buildings, the cleaning methodology must be agreed by the Diocesan Advisory Committee (DAC) in writing, unless an appropriate cleaning method has already been agreed. 3. The DAC accepts that a safe cleaning method for graffiti damage on stone is the DOFF system offered by many commercial cleanings contractors. The DAC believes that the Council's nominated contractors do not use this system. High pressure water jets, chemical products or abrasives must not be used as they can cause lasting damage to stone.</p>	<p>Process clarification noted. These are reflected in procedural documents to assist officers. The draft policy sets out the broad approach and policy and does recognise the special arrangements for "Churchyards and Historic sites" on page 5.</p>
------------------------------	--	---	---

Councillor		<p>I'd like you to include the phrase, "If it's not yours, don't paint it" beside Councillor Clark's request for "Graffiti is illegal" in big letters on the front or somewhere prominent.</p> <p>Your list of 6 types is not consistent with the next section which starts with Offensive graffiti because that isn't listed as a type... just drop the word Contentious and it's all good.</p> <p>You list of 6 types doesn't appear to cover normal graffiti where the perp paints their name freehand in large stylised letters. I don't consider this to be the same as tagging which is generally single-colour, quick signatures. Perhaps you should recognise 7 types? Perhaps you should not specify how many types? That's just setting yourself up for ridicule later on. "We recognise these types:" would be sufficient.</p>	<p>"Offensive graffiti" can manifest itself as part of any of the six forms of graffiti. Officers do not consider "offensive graffiti" to be a form in itself.</p> <p>Policy amended to remove "..., of which the authority recognises six basic categories:" on page 3 recognising the point made.</p>
------------	--	---	---

Resident

My name is xx and although I work part-time for the Cheltenham BID, the following views and opinions are not on behalf of the BID. They are the personal comments of a Council Tax-paying resident who has lived in the town for 34yrs and is currently residing in Regent Street. My first concern is that the proposed policy has 'Identify Preventative Measures' as No,5 on the list of key targets- this suggests that all activity will be reactive rather than proactive. Surely, this should be priority? During my 5yrs active in the Town Centre, I have become aware of greater activity in regard to graffiti and I get the impression that people who live and work in the town almost except it and in some cases, don't even notice it. But it is very apparent to those people who visit the town, spend money and boost the economy and if these people decide not to return to a town covered in graffiti, then we may as well all shut up shop and let the 'artists' have free reign to spray their paint. A couple of years ago, I came up with an idea where the town centre businesses would be contacted and informed of reporting procedures in regard to graffiti and also informed of where the CCTV cameras are. I am of the opinion that if the businesses know how they are protected/supported and what they need to do to eradicate graffiti, then they may take ownership of their immediate environment and report graffiti as soon as it manifests itself. Also, it would make catching the culprits a tad more possible. Due to a number of factors - primarily, the lockdown - my plan never saw the light of day. I still believe that this communication process with the businesses in the town

The draft policy includes a section on "Prevention", outlining work to address the problem of graffiti proactively (page 6)

The entire purpose of the policy is recognising that graffiti is a problem and outlines, reactive and proactive, steps to address this. It is a complex issue however that is not easily addressed. Through the policy, the authority will adopt a standard and clear approach that will assist officers, Members, partners and the public with addressing the issues within available resources.

CBC's Neighbourhood Team will be happy to work with the BID on this idea.

centre will help support your planned proposals. So, I believe the proposed Graffiti Policy should commence with identifying preventative measures. This could begin with signage emphasising the law/presence of CCTV cameras and education too. I have previously spoken to a Support Officer who stated that she intended visiting schools to talk about the scourge that is graffiti and to see if teachers could recognise some of the many tags that have appeared around town - T-Dizzy is one of the main offenders at the time of writing. From deterrents, education and business intervention, we can then ask the questions as to how we report it, how quickly the council respond, who has liability and just who is the victim. Because as I see it at the moment, culprits - if they are caught - are not being prosecuted but businesses are expected to remove the graffiti themselves or receive a fine. Bizarre. Back in 2019, I witnessed a graffiti artist get caught daubing the rear wall of a Promenade business which backs onto Regent Street (is now The Famous On The Prom). The police let her go and as she walked away down the High Street, I could hear her talking on her mobile phone, laughing at just "how easy" it all was. The building was empty at that time so maybe the property owner wasn't asked to remove it but regardless of this, everybody within the vicinity of that crime suffered but the police deemed it not to be worthy of any action. What message does this send out? And I was also told, by somebody employed by CBC, that the retrospective viewing of CCTV footage to check the daubing of graffiti "would not happen". So, this proposed policy must

The council will always seek to take enforcement action if there is sufficient evidence to do so. We recognise that enforcement is not purely an issue for this authority. It does rely on the support and input from the police, wider justice system, residents and businesses.

The authority can access footage from its CCTV network.

ensure we utilise all facilities available to us. If the police or CBC can't have a presence in town when these crimes are generally taking place (the Everyman Theatre recently told me that their side wall was attacked at 1.15am), then we need to have a clear, visible policy that screams graffiti will not be tolerated - allied with any possible deterrents - and a reactive response that doesn't make penalising the businesses a priority. PS - in my role as a Cheltenham BID Ambassador, I spent an hour today cleaning graffiti off of the green cycle rack which has been repositioned onto the pedestrianised area of the Promenade. I will try and attach photographs if possible

Councillor		<p>I think clarifying what graffiti is and what art is would help most people.</p> <p>We have some incredible street art in Cheltenham, but some may class this as graffiti. Therefore we need to be very clear in defining what is legal and what is not!</p> <p>Obviously unsightly slogans and deliberate vandalism needs to be addressed and listed buildings which are 'attacked' is not acceptable. However we have some awful areas which have been made to look incredible by street art.....yet if this is unauthorised will this therefore be classed as graffiti and illegal?</p>	<p>The distinction is made under section 4 "Definitions" i.e. "For the avoidance of doubt, the definition of graffiti does not include graffiti, street art or any other form of art involving graffiti that is either, or both, officially authorised or, undertaken with lawful permission from property owner(s). This includes, but not limited to, the local Paint Festival."</p>
------------	--	--	--

Resident	<p>Whilst I am in favour with the Council having a clear policy on 'graffiti', I find the language used in the policy creates confusion. Graffiti in general is a term for any text based imagery but as a name refers to big, colourful production pieces such as found in the Honeybourne Line tunnels. These generally take a good few hours to do and aren't what I feel are stated in the policy. Most of the actual graffiti around town is from the paint festival and has been done with permission. What causes offence, both to the general public and to us as artists, is the illegal TAGGING of public property. Tags are quick thrown up names or nicknames of the protagonist. They have a negative affect upon the population in the area, is what makes our beautiful town look messy and neglected and is the blight that I feel the policy should be aimed at, with explicit use of the word TAGGING replacing graffiti. Having worked with Jack on the Council's graffiti removal team, we have identified that it is roughly only a small handful of people in the town town doing this. Rawks or FNV is a relative newcomer, but has been prolific, and seems to be working alone; Chops/Crash, Griz, Kidchaos and Magi/Magic seem to be a group working together and, by some of their statements seen on the Honeybourne Line bridges, appear to have moved over here from Poland in the last 2-3 years. In particular, this group seem to be responsible for the vast majority of recent tagging. A couple of other protagonists Kaviar and Eulsio seem to have either stopped or moved away. Although I know most of the artists in Cheltenham, I have no idea who these, what I expect to</p>	<p>The distinction is made under section 4 "Definitions" i.e. "For the avoidance of doubt, the definition of graffiti does not include graffiti, street art or any other form of art involving graffiti that is either, or both, officially authorised or, undertaken with lawful permission from property owner(s). This includes, but not limited to, the local Paint Festival."</p> <p>Policy does include a recognition of "tagging" as a recognised form of illegal graffiti on 3.</p>
----------	--	---

be, kids are. My guess would be they're between the ages of 17-21 and male. Kidchaos seems to be a younger member of the group, possibly a younger brother. As I have told Jack, all of these are posting their works on Instagram and are proud of the damage they're causing. Surely if Instagram has to hand police the details of a person who racially abuses someone on their platform, then widespread defacing of public property should be reason enough for the police to be able to access their details from Instagram? It is my feeling that to stop this behaviour a concerted effort to find the small number of perpetrators should be encouraged. The group often tag local pub toilets etc and I know one of them got caught in the Frog and Fiddle some time ago. I would recommend a circulation around the local pubs showing the tags of Rawks, Crash/Chops (These 2 tags are by the same person) Magi/Magic and Griz etc asking for them to be reported to the police if caught. An email to local schools asking for them to look out for such tags on schoolbooks could also potentially be beneficial. Thirdly I would put out a social media campaign to places such as Cheltenham Noticeboard to try and gain information from there. Even if a parent who saw it didn't hand in the culprit then they would surely do their best to discourage their offspring, especially if this was backed up with the possible repercussions of the offence. As for the repercussions should one get caught, then I feel a strong message sent out when one is caught would be a huge deterrent to the others they may be working with. I know the Council keeps documentation of the tags so

Will pursue further with the police but as a police matter, not in scope of this policy.

all offences should be punished at the same time with fines for each offence. A huge fine, with the threat of custodial measures, would certainly discourage them. As an alternative, we are always open to using spots that are hit continually as places for the festival to paint. Fortunately, they tend to stay away from the big walls we paint, only tagging the works along the Honeybourne Line bridges and tunnels. Putting beautiful works in high tagging spots is a workable solution but unfortunately not one that will stop them in the long run.

Penalties are defined in legislation and not within the authority's discretion.

Other, please specify	Council Officer	<p>Typos x2 – page 2 point 3 – check numbering & page 5 point 8 second sentence of first paragraph does not make sense to me. Could Heritage crimes be more specific for CBC e.g list places? It might be good to keep generic though to cover all possibilities. Under point 4 - Add definition on what a 'Responsible' Party is and also consider, from Appendix 1, under residential information define what a 'Partnership Manager' is. Should be stated who the notices will be issued on – e.g. the responsible party as listed in Appendix 1 Page 4 under Discretion – responsible parties written in this paragraph reads as though it is the artist being talked about. The need to report a heritage crime to a rural police website seems odd, I would need reassurance that this is the right thing to do. Under section 9 refer to Authorities enforcement policy and any other procedures? I might be a little confused on who the Authority is – the Police or the LA / CBC Page 6 - Do we want to know how the DOCO will be contacted? Page 6 – Do we need to name Uniform why not just LA computer system. Systems do change. Appendix 1 – the only area it looks like there is a different level 1 and level 2 responsibility difference is with Residential Properties this could be made clearer by labelling responsibility in level 2 as 'same as level 1'. Not clear what the Partnership Manager is, is that the CBC Partnership Manager with CBH or a CBH Manager? Or its nothing to do with CBH and covers all registered social landlords or all residential properties...?? No Appendix 2? Although referred to in the policy</p>	<p>Noted and corrected.</p> <p>A list is likely to quickly become redundant and out of date requiring constant policy updates.</p> <p>Updates and changes made where considered necessary.</p> <p>It is how the police record “rural crime”</p> <p>Under “Introduction”, authority throughout the document refers to Cheltenham Borough Council.</p> <p>Corrected.</p>
-----------------------	-----------------	---	--

Resident		<p>The current rate of graffiti is making Cheltenham look dirty, vulgar and unpleasant. There is more popping up each time I travel around town. Even where someone has 'tagged' someone else goes and adds theirs on to it as well.</p> <p>I am not sure if it is because street art has been allowed but I haven't noticed this amount previously.</p> <p>Once reported or noted by members of the public / council there needs to be a decimated clean up time allowed. This will ensure that those graffitiing know it won't be around long.</p> <p>Bring back the town looking presentable than down trodden.</p>	<p>The purpose of the policy is recognising that graffiti is a problem and outlines, reactive and proactive, steps to address this. It is a complex issue however that is not easily addressed. Through the policy, the authority will adopt a standard and clear approach that will assist officers, Members, partners and the public with addressing the issues within available resources.</p>
----------	--	--	---

Resident		<p>The policy is a step in the right direction but is lacking both practically and strategically. There are several organisations involved in attempting to deal with graffiti. But each has their own set of demands. As with so many issues facing the public realm, this leads to inaction. Like the dead man in Yossarian's tent, someone needs to grasp it and take action rather than find reasons not to. CBC is the key body. You can either invest in a couple of staff and some suitable washing equipment, or use a contractor. You need to be out there visibly removing it, whether on private or public property. It's totally unfair to expect businesses to have to pay to remove it when it is effectively in the public domain. The idea that a business is fined /has enforcement action taken if they don't remove it is just another burden passed elsewhere. Ultimately, we need a zero tolerance approach to this and CBC should lead. But it's not just about practicality. I see very little in the policy about strategy. I appreciate some of this should be covert, so perhaps it shouldn't be made public. You need someone working discreetly on social media, identifying culprits. You also need intelligence in schools. I suspect the tags we see in the town centre might feature on the perpetrators' books. Other young people will know who these people are. Finally, the perpetrators need to be punished. It seems that the police no longer punish anyone, even when CCTV evidence has been produced showing people who clearly did the crime. Somehow there has to be use of the balance of probability in taking court action. Does this mean civil action rather than criminal? I'm not</p>	<p>The purpose of the policy is recognising that graffiti is a problem and outlines, reactive and proactive, steps to address this. It is a complex issue however that is not easily addressed. Through the policy, the authority will adopt a standard and clear approach that will assist officers, Members, partners and the public with addressing the issues within available resources.</p> <p>Noted comments regarding education and engagement with schools. Will be picked up separately.</p> <p>Penalties and threshold are matters defined in law with no discretion.</p>
----------	--	--	--

sure, but CBC should investigate. Without punishment, the problem will continue. So in summary - more practical action, better strategy, and convictions are all necessary.

Resident		<p>All graffiti should be removed and graffiti doers fined.</p> <p>Street art is great though.</p>	
Resident		<p>Love the clever stuff on the houses but the scribble makes the town look downmarket and scruffy</p>	
Resident		<p>I appreciate the street art that the artists at the Cheltenham Paint Festival create but St Paul's in particular is blighted by tags.</p> <p>A concerted effort to catch the perpetrators and to remove the graffiti as soon as possible is appreciated.</p>	
Resident		<p>The report seems to focus on who is responsible for removing and how long they have with fines if not done. as well as prevention through the police or solace. Maybe more focus should be on creating safe places for the graffiti to be done. some of the art is good and should be encouraged. There seems to be double standards from the powers that be for example when a local puts up some graffiti its a shocking crime and must be removed but if Banksy vandalizes a wall its art and we have to protect it.</p>	<p>Policy does recognise authorised graffiti. However, making more spaces available will not address the other forms of illegal graffiti.</p>

Resident		<p>14 days and 28 days are too long to provide an active deterrent, (listed as number 1.) 24 hours and a week would work much better.</p> <p>Known sites are currently not being policed, monitored or repaired. Are additional resources going to be put into this?</p> <p>How can the public or the council police this as they have no powers?. I have been informed by one of your officers that only the police can apprehend offenders. Are the police on board?</p>	<p>“Within” 14 days. All efforts will be made to remove offensive graffiti as soon as resources allow.</p> <p>The authority does work with the police and other partners recognising that each partner have a role to play.</p>
----------	--	--	---

Resident		<p>Street Art is JUST Graffiti by another name.</p> <p>It should all be removed and not permitted.</p> <p>Such work blights already ghetto areas like those around Coronation Square</p> <p>It's hideous and sends the wrong messages to the delinquents who aspire to tag things.</p> <p>Having the council endorse these eyesores is making the place a laughing stock to visitors and makes people feel they are unsafe.</p> <p>The only positive of them is that they signpost crappy deadbeat areas and trek people they are not welcome there and are probably unsafe.</p> <p>The whole proposed policy reads as the council sloping of its responsibilities and should not be approved.</p>	<p>The council does support authorised graffiti through, for example, the paint festival recognising the social value of this. This policy does not seek to address the specific point but instead, set the general policy and approach covering both, authorised and illegal graffiti.</p>
Resident		<p>If somewhere looks attractive and well-kept to start with, it's less likely that graffiti will occur. (Eg attractively decorated electrical boxes on the Bath Road.)</p> <p>Perhaps offer designated areas of large wall spaces where "street art" is allowed, and/or offer free or subsidised art classes to those involved or likely to be involved in graffiti.</p>	<p>Policy does recognise authorised graffiti. However, making more spaces available will not address the other forms of illegal graffiti.</p>

Resident		I didn't notice any part of the policy talking about engaging with these graffiti people, and working with them to help them to focus their graffiti somewhere else, develop some artwork. Seems like a reactive, not proactive doc to me. Also, how about planting things near the walls you don't want getting graffiti. Or Ivy draping down over walls to more Naturally discourage graffiti. More plans, good for the planet, less opportunity for graffiti. What's not to love?!	Policy does recognise authorised graffiti. However, making more spaces available will not address the other forms of illegal graffiti. Preventative steps include "Use Street art as an alternative outlet."
----------	--	---	---

Resident	<p>Delighted to hear there are plans to deal with the appalling graffiti blighting Cheltenham centre. Whilst I appreciate all forms of art I do not agree with holding a 'paint festival' I believe it blurs lines between art and graffiti and gives the wrong message. Cheltenham is a Regency Town and should work to highlight its Regency image and culture it has always been known for and why visitors and residents enjoy walking around Cheltenham. Cheltenham does not need to 'copy' other towns - leave the installation art, of which 'paint festivals' belong to places known for excellent street art such as nearby neighbour Bristol. Please work to remove graffiti quicker than 28 days! The longer it is left the more is added. Also much tougher penalties are needed for the perpetrators. Sadly Cheltenham centre is in danger of gaining a reputation of an unkept uncared for Town. Urgent action although late is needed quickly. When graffiti is spotted why is it acceptable to wait so long to remove it - it should be immediate. I don't see central Bath, Cirencester or smaller local towns blighted in this way so what happened to Cheltenham? Perhaps if the lamp posts and street furniture were given a lick of paint that too would give a look of a cared for town. Lamp posts in central Cheltenham in particular are desperately in need of a re paint to highlight their regency heritage. Also any fly posting should be removed immediately as this too adds to the 'uncared' and 'unmanaged' . URGENT action needed NOW.</p>	<p>Policy does recognise and defines the difference between authorised and illegal graffiti and "Work with our Town scape team to build prevention into design"</p> <p>"Within". All efforts will be made to remove offensive graffiti as soon as resources allow. Penalties and threshold are matters defined in law with no discretion.</p> <p>Within county council's remit. Will pursue with county separately.</p>
----------	---	---

Resident	<p>Graffiti blighting Cheltenham needs urgent attention. Does it really have to wait 28 days for actual removal? Why can't the removal begin as soon as it is seen? The appalling mess caused by paint, pens, whatever used, creates a totally uncared unloved and unkept appearance. perpetrators should be given a strong message this behaviour is unacceptable and fined accordingly. I disagree with holding a 'Paint Festival - I love and appreciate all forms of art but this 'paint festival' blurs the lines between art and graffiti. Cheltenham has many attributes to promote, mainly it's regency architecture, beautiful parks, shops and streets to stroll along and take in the atmosphere. Why not leave 'paint festivals' to near neighbour, Bristol, which is a town known internationally for its 'street art' . Why does Cheltenham think it needs to 'copy' leave 'paint festivals' to towns who do it well. Cheltenham needs to concentrate on what it used to be known for, namely Regency architecture! So please CBC along with removing graffiti immediately look to giving a coat of paint to those lovely regency lamp posts, peeling paint is not a good look! Cheltenham needs to be given the care to its street furniture. So please remove the graffiti and properly clean the town streets. Unless urgent action and a long lasting pledge to clear and KEEP CLEAR graffiti the town will continue to fall behind. I do not see Bath, Cirencester or our neighbouring small towns blighted with graffiti, dirty streets or unkept street furniture. So what happened to Cheltenham? URGENT ACTION needed to restore repair and bring our town up to the standard it deserves.Thank you</p>	<p>"Within". All efforts will be made to remove offensive graffiti as soon as resources allow.</p> <p>The council does support authorised graffiti through, for example, the paint festival recognising the social value of this. This policy does not seek to address the specific point but instead, set the general policy and approach covering both, authorised and illegal graffiti.</p>
----------	--	--

Resident		<p>Your survey says it all: “ One of authority’s key priorities is to deliver a number of town centre and wider public enhancements that will continue the revitalisation of the town. This will ensure its longer-term viability as a retail and cultural destination. Another key priority is to continue to enhance our public spaces, parks and gardens. Areas blighted by graffiti undermine these aims.”</p> <p>So why do CBC encourage a Paint Festival? If this is to thwart random graffiti, it is a policy that clearly does not work. If it is to enhance the town, it clearly does not work as some art is okay but most of it is inappropriate for a Regency town. It is yet another idea copied from another city, Bristol, where it may be better suited and can this town stick to what it does best and embrace originality.</p> <p>Originality is what leads to revitalisation, not short term marketing ideas.</p>	<p>The council does support authorised graffiti through, for example, the paint festival recognising the social value of this. This policy does not seek to address the specific point but instead, set the general policy and approach covering both, authorised and illegal graffiti.</p>
----------	--	---	---

Resident		<p>I think graffiti needs to be approached on a case by case basis. While I agree scratched markings and offensive work needs to be removed immediately, there is room within our neighbourhoods for protest art or work that enhances the space it's created on. For example, if someone creates beautiful art that covers an otherwise ugly, badly maintained wall, why remove it when it clearly enhances the area. We also need to take into account that protest art is important to share support or messages of empowerment. Gay, black and female empowerment tags should at least be raised to the public, given space and time to work and only removed if it obstructs, damages or otherwise causes an actual negative effect. Thank you for taking into account the public opinion, I am happy to discuss this further.</p>	
Resident		<p>I am very pleased to see how seriously the Council is taking the blight of graffiti, which so often goes unchecked.</p> <p>There is a big role for residents in reporting the appearance of graffiti, and I am sure if there were some kind of guidance or toolkit residents would be prepared to tackle the removal of smaller pieces of graffiti themselves, which might impact on their road. Your resources will be stretched, and priority areas will be the town centre and public parks. For me, it is very lowering when graffiti appears on a wall in my street, but I recognise this low level vandalism would not be a</p>	

		priority for anyone. None the less, it all damages the public realm	
--	--	---	--

Resident

The graffiti as you are aware is now what I consider to be a huge problem in Cheltenham especially the High St and other areas where footpaths lead off the High St like behind the closed Argos shop, down the side of New Look. Until it's boxes, bins and post boxes are sprayed with scribble including the gold post box in town. It is vandalism and anti social behaviour. The Minster in the town centre behind the Library has been defaced too.

I have had graffiti removed by the council only to have it return a few weeks later. There are many "tags" that are the same culprit. A member of the public had the side of there van sprayed whilst it was parked in Cheltenham. Businesses spend money removing it only for it to return again. It makes me feel quite desperate when people pay and work hard to keep the town looking nice and all for nothing as the vandalism continues. I believe it needs to be removed asap so not to encourage other vandals to add to it. If only plants had been grown up public walls and spaces to cover walls. I do t know if anti graffiti paint exists and if so how effective it is? Perhaps the public and the council could be encouraged to plant more.

Resident		<p>Once the definition of unacceptable graffiti is agreed, then the local authority should identify areas that need the graffiti removing. These areas could be identified either through complaints from the public or via local authority employees, or even the police, which would be passed onto the relevant department. It is up to the council to decide whether action from their employees could remove it, or whether specialist subcontractors are required.</p>	
Resident		<p>As a resident who has complained repeatedly about graffiti along Arle Avenue near collets drive, I have found a lack of feedback and inability to escalate the graffiti in my area frustrating. It encourages additional crimes in the area and is unacceptable for a school run.</p> <p>After 3 years some graffiti has been removed but it is inconsistent and is only a third of the area needed. When one area is removed as other graffiti remains it is not long before the removed area is re painted.</p>	Neighbourhood Officer responsible for location will be asked to make contact.
Resident		<p>I retired from Cheltenham Borough Environment Environmental department some 14 years ago. One of the things we did was to photograph any new graffiti that we saw when out and about and photographs were given to the police officer Bob' stationed at Municipal and who catalogued them.</p> <p>One I remember was a major 'graffitier' was sent to prison for spraying 'save the whale 'all over the town</p> <p>so perhaps the council officers could do this again .</p>	Noted. Policy include proposals to "Brief all authority staff on the action they can take if they see or witness acts of graffiti"

Resident		<p>The whole of Cheltenham is being blighted with this awful anti social graffiti. I can't imagine what it looks like to visitors to the town, and has a detrimental effect on residents.</p> <p>The council need to change their policy of not cleaning graffiti from private housing, it's unfair on the homeowners, and often means it's left for months on end. After all it's criminal damage, but not covered by home insurance, and we pay enough in council tax that we should expect some level of service from the council.</p> <p>The police need to catch and make an example of these individuals, who's behaviour impacts the whole town.</p>	<p>This is not the proposed policy position. Ubico will be contacted to remove from residential properties.</p>
----------	--	---	---