

Tilley Award 2005

Application form

The following form must be completed in full. Failure to do so will result in disqualification from the competition.

Please send completed application forms to Tricia Perkins at patricia.perkins@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

All entries must be received by noon on the 29 April 2005. Entries received after that date will not be accepted under any circumstances. Any queries on the application process should be directed to Tricia Perkins on 0207 035 0262.

1. Details of application

Title of the project: Reducing Reckless Moped Riding

Name of force/agency/CDRP: Metropolitan Police Service

Name of one contact person with position/rank (this should be one of the authors):
Insp Paul Scott

Email address:
Paul.scott2@met.police.uk

Full postal address:
Problem Solving Unit
15 Floor
Empress State,
Empress Approach,
Lillie Road,
Earls Court, SW6 1TR

Telephone number:
07747 761 507

Fax number
020 7161 2501

Name of endorsing senior representatives(s)
Chris Allison

Position and rank of endorsing senior representatives(s)
Commander, Borough Commander, Westminster

Full address of endorsing senior representatives(s)

Territorial Policing Head Quarters
6 Floor
Victoria Embankment
London SW1A 2JL

2. Summary of application

Reducing Reckless Moped Riding – Summary Report

Problem

This summary outlines a one-year problem-solving initiative designed to tackle youths riding mopeds recklessly in a small part of central London.

For years, the residents of Westminster's Queens Park ward have complained about the noise and fear of injury from youths joyriding mopeds in their area.

The residents' complaints created a demand on five groups: Avenues Youth Club, City Guardians, Detached Youth Workers, Local Authority and Police.

Together, they formed a problem-solving group with one aim: 'Complaints regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly in Queens Park ward will be reduced by 80%'.

Research / Analysis

The group started by asking themselves four basic questions:

- What do we know?
- What don't we know?
- Why don't we know?
- Where can we get the information?

From there, they developed a research strategy that would show the complainants lived in one small part of Queens Park. They were complaining about a group of 20 youths who shared eight mopeds and rode them around eight roads within the ward.

The analysis concluded that the cause of the problem was that the youths did not appreciate the affects of their joyriding on the local community.

Response

To design a customised response to the identified problem, the problem-solving group held an 'Options' meeting. From over 30 possible interventions, ten were selected:

- Residents' leaflet drop
- Partners' briefing sheets
- Complainants' home visits
- Presentation to Police on vehicle seizures
- Youth engagement by youth workers
- Sponsored Compulsory Bike Tests (CBT)
- Acceptable Behaviour Agreements
- Moped seizure
- Fast track Criminal Justice System
- 'Bike Safe' - Safe riding skills course

Evaluation

Independent evaluation was conducted to show the impact of this initiative:

All ten interventions were delivered and achieved their purpose.

A review of the success measures revealed:

- Calls to police reduced by 94% (Target 80%).
- Criminal Intelligence entries reduced by 85% (Target 80%).
- City Guardians identified a perceived reduction in sightings of reckless riding.
- Estate managers, Neighbourhood Forum representatives and the local authority all reported a perceived reduction in the number of complaints received regarding youths recklessly riding mopeds in the Queens Park ward.
- Mopeds are no longer an agenda item for the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum.

There was no evidence of displacement.

3. Description of project

Describe the project following the guidance above in no more than 4000 words

Reducing Reckless Moped Riding

For the past ten years, the residents of Westminster's Queens Park ward have regularly complained about youths recklessly riding mopeds on the roads and footways in the ward. During that time, the local police and council have repeatedly responded to the residents' complaints. Although the two authorities communicated with each other, they responded to the complaints in different ways. The police sent officers in search of offences, treating each incident as an isolated event. The council sent their environmental health officers to deal with moped noise complaints.

In more recent years, it has become common practice for a group of about 20 youths to meet on their mopeds in Droop Street, W.10. Droop Street is a residential street on the Queens Park ward that includes the Avenues Youth Centre. From Droop Street, the youths would ride their mopeds around the surrounding streets.

On average, both the police and the council were called eight times per week. Each call took about one hour to complete.

The Queen's Park Safer Neighbourhood Team consisting of one sergeant, two constables and three police community support officers was established in April 2004 to identify the concerns of the Queen's Park community and treat those concerns as their priorities.

The Safer Neighbourhood team identified the community's concerns through consultation with the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum. The Forum is a panel of 18 people who represent residents from the Queens Park area. Ten places belong to local residents and representatives from the community / voluntary sector. Statutory groups such as the council and residential social landlords occupy the remaining eight places. Forum members constantly consult their community regarding matters of particular concern. The Forum meets every six weeks to discuss those concerns. In 2004, the Forum produced an annual plan detailing the community's concerns divided under 12 themes. Crime and community safety accounted for one of the themes. Under the plan's crime and community strand, the reckless riding of mopeds was identified as a particular concern to the community (**See appendix A.**)

Historically, and in recent years, the residents' complaints concerning youths on mopeds has been: **'Youths steal mopeds and then recklessly ride them around the Queens Park area'**.

Other groups affected by the moped problem included:

Avenues Youth Club

Aware of the youths' moped riding behaviour, staff from the Avenues Youth Club often stood outside the youth club to observe the youths' conduct. From there, they would challenge and advise the youths on the risks and problems with their moped riding behaviour.

Whilst waiting outside the youth club, local residents complaining about the youths' behaviour and wanting the youth workers to address the youths' conduct regularly approached the staff.

City Guardians

Westminster Council has teams of street wardens called City Guardians. City Guardians help to make public areas safer and cleaner by patrolling the streets. They improve public confidence and safety by showing that the public areas are cared for. Working with the police and other council staff, their visible presence can help reduce crime. As the wardens patrolled, they received repeated complaints from residents in the street regarding the youths' reckless moped riding. In dealing with the complaints, the wardens were bearing the brunt of residents' frustrations on this issue. The processing of the complaints was also taking time out of their patrols. Whenever possible, the wardens would speak to the youths regarding their behaviour. However, the youths were well aware of the wardens' role and limited powers. Consequently, they paid little attention to the wardens. This added to the frustrations of the wardens and residents.

Detached Youth workers

Detached Youth Workers were working on Queens Park ward with youths who were failing to engage with statutory agencies. As many of the youths were already comfortable in their presence, they wanted to talk to the youth workers about the moped issue.

Local authority

The Council regularly received complaints about the noise from mopeds being raced around Queens Park ward. Their response was to dispatch environmental health officers, or forward the information to police for their attention.

Police – Queens Park Safer Neighbourhood Team

Having made their priority concerns clear to the Safer Neighbourhoods Team, the local residents expected the Safer Neighbourhoods Team to solve the moped problem.

In response to this, the Safer Neighbourhoods Team created a problem-solving initiative involving the above as partners.

All of the above groups were receiving demands from the Local Authority and / or residents to deal with the youths. Consequently, they were seen to share the problem and viewed as stakeholders in this initiative.

Initial Meeting

At the first meeting, each representative explained their understanding of the problem and how their organisation was affected by the youths' behaviour.

The newly formed problem-solving group unanimously agreed that the perceived problem was youths recklessly riding mopeds on the Queens Park ward.

All recognised that the initial aim should be an 80% reduction of reported incidents of reckless moped riding on the Queens Park ward.

The meeting also approved the following success measures:

1. 80% reduction in the number of calls for police regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
2. 80% reduction in the number of police criminal intelligence reports regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
3. Reduction in the number of reported sightings logged by City Guardians regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
4. Reduction in the number of complaints logged by estate managers, regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
5. Reduction in the number of complaints from the Neighbourhood Forum, regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
6. Reduction in the number of complaints received by the Local Authority regarding youths riding mopeds recklessly on the Queens Park ward.
7. The removal of irresponsible moped riding from the Queens Park Forum agenda.

As past records had not been kept regarding 3-6 above, the group decided on quantitative measures for 1 and 2 only. A perceived reduction within the group would be gauged with qualitative measures for 3-6.

As the Safer Neighbourhood Team was formed, the Local Authority and Police united to form a 'Civic Watch' group that included:

- City Guardians
- Detached Youth Workers
- Graffiti Unit
- Local Authority
- Neighbourhood Forum
- Parks Police
- Residential Social Landlords
- Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Street Environment Managers

'Civic Watch' regularly monitored the progress of the problem-solving initiative.

Definition of the problem

At the initial meeting of the problem-solving group, a collective knowledge of the moped problem was identified. To do that, the group asked itself four basic questions:

- What do we know?
- What don't we know?
- Why don't we know?
- Where can we get the information?

What do we know?

Victim

For years, adult residents from Queens Park ward have complained about the noise and danger caused by youths riding mopeds recklessly on the ward.

The council and police have repeatedly deployed resources to deal with the complaints.

Offender

Youths riding mopeds recklessly. Many of them live locally and frequent the 'Avenues' Youth Club. Over the years, numerous youths have been reported for traffic offences. However, that has not stopped them racing their mopeds or performing stunts such as 'Wheelies' and 'Sudden Stops' on the roads and footways within the ward. According to their peers, the status of a good rider is not measured by safe riding, but by speed and the ability to complete the above stunts.

It was widely known that the youths resented police authority. They would not talk to the police or accept them in the youth club.

Location

The location for this problem is the residential roads on Queens Park ward. Children play in the roads that are bordered on both sides by houses and parked cars. These roads already have speed humps from earlier attempts to stop moped racing.

What don't we know?

Victim

None of the agencies knew the complainants true feelings on this issue: whether they were willing to provide statements or give evidence in court. Their credibility as witnesses was also unknown. Nor was it known if the complainants had witnessed collisions, near misses or previously attended court. Uncertainty also surrounded the complainants' knowledge of the problem or offenders.

Offender

It was not known if the youths owned their own mopeds or had registered them.

Nobody was sure if the youths had the correct documentation, or if any of them had been previously reported for traffic offences. Nor could anyone in the group explain the motivation for youths' reckless riding or the reason they

could not understand the impact that their behaviour had on local residents.

Location

It was not known if the complaints related to incidents spread evenly over the ward or if there were hotspots. The times of offences were uncertain as were the number of reported collisions involving mopeds.

Why don't we know?

Previous complaints about the youths on mopeds had been reported by different people from the relevant organisations and treated as isolated incidents.

The issue was not a priority for the organisations. Consequently, nobody had ever taken ownership of the problem or considered it suitable for research and analysis.

Where can we get the information?

To close the identified information gaps, the problem-solving group designed a research plan:

'Avenues' Youth Club Staff

- Continued observations immediately outside the youth club.
- On-going engagement with the youths to learn the causes of their behaviour.

City Guardians

- Review of pocket book entries over the past twelve months.
- Intelligence gathering patrols.
- Speaking with moped riders to gather further intelligence.

Detached Youth Workers

- One-to-one engagement with the youths to learn the causes of their behaviour.

Neighbourhood Forum

- Residents' consultation.

Local Authority

- Active involvement in Civic Watch meetings.
- Environmental Health Officers deployment.

The Safer Neighbourhood Team

- Interrogation of Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) calls to police.
- Search of the police criminal intelligence system.
- Visiting complainants' addresses.
- Intelligence gathering patrols.

Analysis

All research was passed to the local authority analyst who concluded:

Victim

Repeat complaints came from adult residents living in Droop Street, and the seven immediate surrounding roads **only**.

The complainants felt angry and frustrated about the noise and risk of injury from the mopeds.

Complaints were made personally in the street or telephoned to the police or council.

Seven complainants provided statements and were willing to attend court.

Crash helmets hampered the identification of youths.

Offender

The main group of 20 youths were aged between 15 and 20 years. Between them, they rode mopeds seven days a

week from 12pm until 2am.

Out of the 20 youths, there was a hard core of eight who owned their own mopeds. This disproved the residents' belief that the mopeds were stolen.

They traveled to Hampstead to buy their mopeds for around £100.

Having registered them in their names, they frequently lent them to the remaining twelve members of their group for short rides around Droop Street. **(See Appendix B)**

Despite being repeatedly warned against racing the mopeds and knowing that it was wrong, they did not understand the affects on residents.

After paying around £100 for their mopeds, they did not see the sense in parting with a further £120 for a compulsory bike test (CBT). However, if funded they would be interested.

They believed they were already good riders.

Location

The youths were using Droop Street and the seven surrounding streets as a course to race their mopeds and show off their stunt riding skills.

Research did not identify any recorded road traffic collisions involving mopeds in the relevant area.

Redefined Problem

Following analysis of the group's research, by the local authority analyst, the group's suspicion that the reckless riding of mopeds was merely a symptom of the actual problem was confirmed. The real cause of the problem was found to be that the youths failed to comprehend the impact of their behaviour on the local community.

Despite the problem being redefined, there was little change to the initiative's aim:

Actual Aim

By 31 March 2005, reported incidents to police of reckless moped riding in Droop Street and the seven immediate surrounding streets will be reduced by 80%, when comparing 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005 against the previous financial year.

In light of the amended aim, the above success measures marked 1-6 were revised from '... on the Queens Park ward.' to '...in Droop Street and the seven immediate surrounding streets'.

Information Gap

Although the above research and analysis had increased the problem-solving group's understanding of this issue, it had not shown if the youths had the correct documentation for their mopeds. This point was raised at the 'Options Meeting' that followed.

Options meeting

Having identified the real cause of the problem, the problem-solving group held another meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to run a creative thinking session to identify as many possible options as could be thought of on how to solve the problem. That meeting generated over 30 possible interventions that were broken down around victim, offender and location. From the possible interventions, the following were chosen to form the customised response.

Response

Leaflet Drop

To educate the parents and give a clear message to the residents of Queens Park ward that action was being taken about their priority concern, the local authority funded and produced a leaflet for the problem-solving initiative that outlined the legal position relating to the reckless riding of mopeds. The leaflet highlighted the power to seize

mopeds and evidence required to do so.

The City Guardians and the Police Community Support Officers delivered the leaflets, from the Safer Neighbourhoods Team. They also left leaflets in the estate manager's office, community center and 'Avenues' youth club. **(See appendix C.)**

Briefing Sheets

Representatives from the different agencies forming the problem-solving group had different levels of knowledge regarding the power to seize vehicles S.59, Police Reform Act 2002. To ensure that a unified message was delivered by the whole group, throughout the initiative, a briefing sheet was produced by the Safer Neighbourhood's Sergeant.

Home Visits

To provide further reassurance, whilst securing previously unrecorded evidence from known witnesses, home visits were deemed valuable.

Having interrogated the CAD system, members of the Safer Neighbourhoods Team identified those calls that included the caller's details. Those callers were contacted in order to arrange a home visit. During the visit from a member of the Safer Neighbourhoods team, the information from their initial call was developed and statements taken whilst providing further reassurance to the occupiers.

Presentation to Colleagues

Evidence of earlier police encounters with youths riding mopeds highlighted a need to reinforce their understanding of S.59, Police Reform Act, 2002.

The sergeant leading the Safer Neighbourhood team attended the parades given to his colleagues, at the start of their shift. Whilst there, he briefed his colleagues on the requirements of S.59.

Youth engagement

The analysis had shown that the real problem was that the youths did not comprehend the affects of their reckless riding on the local residents. It was also known that the youths resented being told what they could or could not do by the police. Consequently, the youths had to be educated by someone they would listen to.

Detached Youth Workers were employed to speak with the hard-core youths in the street. The youth workers engaged the youths and got them to realise the impact that their behaviour was having on the local residents. The youth workers explained the police powers to seize their mopeds and the consequences to them if they continued to ride their mopeds recklessly.

City Guardians

City Guardians maintained reassurance and intelligence gathering patrols. Where youth workers were unwilling to meet youths because of the location, the City Guardians provided reassurance by accompanying them.

Compulsory Bike Test (CBT)Funding

Earlier Youth Worker engagement with the moped riders revealed that the youths judged themselves to be good riders based on their ability to perform stunts such as 'Wheelies' and 'Stops'. Their perception was also based on the approval of their peers when witnessing the completion of these stunts.

The encounters also revealed that the youths considered paying £120 to complete a CBT course as prohibitive.

To show them that good riding skills were not based on stunts, but on safe riding maneuvers, the problem-solving group submitted a funding request to the police to purchase three CBT courses. Each course provided twelve places.

Acceptable Behaviour Agreements

Concern that the youths might turn to stealing mopeds if theirs were seized highlighted the importance of a sustained solution. Consequently, the 'Avenues' staff produced an Acceptable Behaviour Agreement that promised a CBT course as reward for good behaviour. **(See appendix D.)**

A condition of the agreement was that the youths would have to produce valid driving documents for their mopeds. This condition was the result of creative thinking during the earlier 'Options Meeting, as a way of overcoming the information gap concerning whether or not the youths had driving licenses, test certificates and insurance for their mopeds.

S. 59, Police Reform Act, 2002

Despite clear warnings, one youth continued to ride recklessly. Consequently, uniformed officers attended his home address and seized his moped in full public view.

Criminal Justice System

To ensure a prompt response that reflected the seriousness of this issue, the problem-solving group engaged the local Criminal Justice Unit and Crown Prosecution Service in ensuring that the magistrates gave this issue proper attention.

The Criminal Justice Unit Chief Inspector was requested to allocate one of his clerks to deal with Queens Park moped summonses as a priority.

Agreement was also reached with the Crown Prosecution Service to prosecute all such offences, instead of disposal with a caution.

Any moped summons would receive its first court hearing within seven days of the original offence.

Bike Safe

As further incentive / reward for good behaviour, youths who passed their CBT and adhered to their acceptable behaviour agreement for six months would be sponsored by police to complete a Bike Safe course.

The Metropolitan Police Service, together with Transport for London, provide a Rider Skills Day that offers assessment on present skills, and advice to all motor cyclists to help make their riding in London safer and more enjoyable. The day costs £30.

Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to show the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum and the partner groups involved in this problem-solving initiative that the aim of the initiative had been achieved. It was also intended to show what worked well, what did not work well and how the initiative can be used elsewhere in the future.

To achieve the aim of our evaluation, we engaged an independent analyst who reviewed the response stage of our initiative to determine if we did what we said we would do. At the same time, the analyst checked to see if the various responses had achieved their purpose.

Having reviewed the responses, the agreed success measures were then examined to see if they had been achieved.

Impact evaluation

As indicated in the response phase above, all ten stages of the planned response were delivered.

Leaflet Drop

Feedback from the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum confirmed that the moped initiative had become the topic of conversation among residents. Youth workers confirmed the same regarding local youths.

Telephone calls regarding youths on mopeds changed from mere complaints to include useful intelligence. During such calls, it was confirmed that the leaflet prompted the contact and that they felt reassured by the initiative.

Briefing Sheets

Consultation with partners confirmed that the briefing sheet gave them an understanding of S.59 Police Reform Act,

2002 and the confidence to explain it to others.

Home visits

Home visits provided further evidence and written statements. Before leaving, reassurance from the initiative was confirmed.

Presentation to colleagues

A question and answer session following the presentation to colleagues confirmed a thorough understanding of their role in this initiative and of S.59, Police Reform Act, 2002. The quality of their subsequent evidence and intelligence reports reinforced this view.

Youth Engagement

Youth workers reported that following one-to-one encounters with the youths they recognised the consequences of their behaviour. Feedback from the youths is that they changed their behaviour because of that understanding.

City Guardians

Feedback from the City Guardians provided evidence of an obvious reduction in moped incidents. Their patrols also provided the intelligence that confirmed the links between the hard-core eight. Youth workers acknowledged that many of their visits would not have happened without the reassuring presence of the City Guardians.

Compulsory Bike Test (CBT)

The local youths quickly produced their driving documents in order to secure their place on a CBT course. On the day of the first course, the uniformed Safer Neighbourhood Sergeant attended the course and received thanks from the youths for getting them the courses. The youths now welcome the safer neighbourhood team into their club.

Since the course, the youths display safe riding skills instead of stunts.

Having passed the course is now a status symbol amongst the youths. The younger youths are applying for their driving licenses as soon as possible.

Acceptable Behaviour Agreements

No objection has ever been raised to the agreements, which to date have not been breached.

The youths know that the courses are as much a reward for their good behaviour, as their own safety. They also know that if they breach the agreement they will be excluded from future events such as the Bike Safe courses.

S.59, Police Reform Act, 2002

One moped was seized under S.59. The seizure caused much debate amongst the youths, who openly criticised the loser for behaving like a fool. He now accepts their comments.

Criminal Justice System

Recognition of the significance of this problem within the Criminal Justice System was seen through the development of a fast track system and the appointment of a dedicated clerk. However, the system was never used as no youths were witnessed committing riding offences. (The above seizure relied on previous evidence.)

Bike Safe

The Bike Safe course has now been redesigned to include moped riders. The course has witnessed full take-up, resulting in further developed riding skills and eligibility for cheaper insurance. Completion of this course is a further status symbol amongst the youths.

Success Measures

Calls to Police

Calls to the police control room were averaging eight per week. Since the start of the initiative they have fallen to an average of one call in two weeks. This represents a 94% reduction, which exceeds the 80% target.

Criminal Intelligence Reports

Reports were averaging ten per week. They are now running at three in two weeks. This represents an 85% reduction, which exceeds the 80% target.

Consultation with officers responsible for previous entries confirmed that they are not witnessing the numbers they once did.

City Guardians

Noticed a marked reduction in moped incidents. Those that were seen did not involve local youths.

Estate managers

Reported that complaints to them had stopped.

Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum

Declared a massive reduction in moped related incidents within four weeks of the start of this initiative. Since then, the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum no longer see mopeds as a priority concern and have removed it from their agenda.

Local Authority

Environmental health officers have stopped receiving complaints about mopeds.

Closure

In April 2005, a presentation was delivered to the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum and Civic Watch groups highlighting the findings from the basket of indicators above. Using those results, the problem-solving group submitted that the aim of the initiative had been achieved. In the absence of displacement, the groups accepted the submission and the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum removed mopeds from their agenda.

Elsewhere

Following the success of this initiative, the above approach has now been adopted by:

- Department of Transport's Road Safety Unit
- Church Street Neighbourhood Forum
- Westminster's Positive Activities For Young Children scheme.

The above youths were once seen as a hard to hear group. Today, they represent the Youth Forum within the Safer Neighbourhoods Programme.

Crime and community safety

Objective

To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour in Queen's Park and to reduce the fear of crime.

The latest figures show that crime has been falling in the Queen's Park area. However residents want to be sure that this will continue and that a number of incidents of anti social behaviour are dealt with.

The recent Safer Neighbourhood initiative by the Mayor of London and the Metropolitan Police will provide a dedicated team of six officers for Queen's Park.

Residents have welcomed the introduction of the City Guardians and the Neighbourhood Wardens and want to see these teams kept up to strength.

Residents want to see better co-operation between the police, the City Guardians and the Neighbourhood Wardens and want to see better relationships between these three bodies and local residents.

Residents want to see more CCTV cameras in potential crime hot spots.

A particular concern is the number of irresponsible moped and motor cycle riders in Queen's Park.

Actions

- o Ensure that council environmental staff, City Guardians, Neighbourhood Wardens, the police and Neighbourhood Forum staff meet daily to monitor the environment and take appropriate action.
- o Work towards providing a unified service across the City Guardians and Neighbourhood Wardens.
- o Review CCTV provision and prepare a plan for increasing the number of CCTV surveillance points.
- o Target anti-social behaviour by moped and motor cycle riders.
- o Prepare a drugs prevention strategy for the area.

CivicWatch

Moped/Go-Ped riders

New powers mean that if a police officer believes that a vehicle is being used
“in a manner causing alarm, distress or annoyance”

They can:

- **Seize** that Moped / Go-Ped or Vehicle being used regardless of who it belongs to
- **Enter any premises** (except a private dwelling house) to seize your vehicle if he has reasonable grounds for believing your riding/driving has caused alarm, distress or annoyance
- **Can** use reasonable force, to seize it or enter your home.

If you are riding a Moped/Go-Ped or driving a Vehicle,

You MUST **NOT**:

- **Race**, do **wheelies**, **rev engines**, **obstruct footways**
- Drive dangerously or without due care and attention (**motorcycles are one of the biggest killers of young people in the UK**)
- Drive on or over a pavement or footway,
- **Drive a vehicle in a dangerous condition**

You MUST:

- Have a valid insurance, driving licence, tax disc and MOT (if required)
- Wear a securely fastened helmet
- Have a full licence if you wish to carry a pillion passenger
- Be able to produce the above documents on request from a police officer or at a police station within seven days of the request

If you do not do this you may get:

- **A fine of up to £5000**
- **A fixed penalty ticket of up to £250**
- **Up to eight penalty points**
- **Disqualification**

The above regulations apply to all **Mopeds, Go-Peds & Vehicles**

What residents can do ...

If you see a Moped/ Go-ped or other vehicle being driven in such a manner the following information is useful to CivicWatch:

- **Place, times and date when it was seen**
- **Registration number**
- **Colour and make**

You can give this information to your Estate Office on the numbers below, or direct to Harrow Road police on 0207 321 9822 Safer Neighbourhoods Office.

Useful Numbers

Harrow Road Police Station

020 7321 9811

Safer Neighbourhoods Office

020 7321 9822

To report anti-social behaviour

Crimestoppers

0800 555 111

If you have any information about crime

Environment Action Line

020 7641 2000

To report dumped rubbish, noise, graffiti, flyposting, illegal street trading and abandoned cars

Highways Maintenance Helpline

020 7641 6275

To report faulty street lights

Your Estate Office

020 7641 4599 – Queen's Park

020 7641 4599 – Mozart

020 7641 4430/4431 – Avenue Gardens

For problems on your estate

For more information on CivicWatch or to become more involved call:

CivicWatch

020 7641 1085

Email

civicwatch@westminster.gov.uk

Don't Tolerate Anti-Social Behaviour, Report It!

Please note CivicWatch is not an emergency service. In an emergency please dial 999.



Moped / Go-Ped Acceptable Behaviour Contract

THIS CONTRACT WAS MADE ON: *Wednesday 25th August 2004*

BETWEEN: The Management, Staff and Members of the New Avenues Youth Project
3 – 7 Third Avenue, Queens Park, London W10 4RR

AND: _____ *(Name)*
_____/_____/_____ *(Date of Birth)*

_____ *(Tel. Number)*

I AGREE: The following can be expected of me, in respect of my future conduct while in and around the New Avenues Youth Project

PERIOD: I agree to the terms of this contract for a period of *52 weeks*

I AGREE TO:

- *Complete the Compulsory Basic Training Course in full*
- *Complete the Met Police Safer Riding course if offered to me*
- *My details being passed to Westminster Youth Offending Team for reference information ONLY*
- *Ride any moped / go-ped sociably, legally and safely to the best of my ability*
- *Register any moped / go-ped that is legally my possession with the DVLA to my home address as stated above*
- *Ensure that any moped / go-ped that is legally my possession is adequately insured against third party liabilities*
- *Ensure that any moped / go-ped that is legally my possession is taxed and has a current MOT*
- *Ensure that I will wear an appropriate safety helmet when riding ANY moped / go-ped*
- *Actively promote "good riding" with my peers and other road users*

I AGREE NOT TO:

- *Ride ANY moped / go-ped in a way that would cause annoyance, alarm or distress to members of the public, other road users, the Police or the Local Authority*
- *Ride dangerously and without due care and attention*
- *Race ANY moped / go-ped*
- *Do wheelies, rev engines or obstruct footways on ANY moped / go-ped*
- *Carry pillion passengers (unless I have a FULL motorbike license)*
- *Ride ANY moped / go-ped anti-socially*
- *Encourage any of the above with my peers or other road users*

FURTHER: I _____ will not act in a manner which causes or is likely to cause offensive, harassment, alarm or distress to

management, staff and members of the New Avenues Youth Project or local residents.

BREACH: If I _____ do anything which I have agreed not to do under the terms of this contract, which the management, staff or members considers to amount to anti social behaviour while at the or in the location of the New Avenues Youth Project, I understand that the New Avenues Youth Project will take further action as appropriate, which could result exclusion from the club or Police action (where appropriate).

DECLARATION:
I _____ confirm that the terms of this contract have been fully explained to me, and that I understand the meaning of the terms and the consequences of breaching the terms of this contract.

SIGNED: _____ (Young Person)

NAME: _____

DATE: ____/____/____

WITNESSED:

SIGNED: _____ (NAYP Youth Worker)

NAME: _____

OTHER WITNESS:

SIGNED:

NAME:

POSITION:

Appendix D

Anti Social Behaviour in Queens Park - Youths on Mopeds - Sanitised Network Chart
18 May 2004

