

Bolsover District Council

Budget Scrutiny

7th March 2016

CCTV

Report of the Executive Director Operations, Assistant Director Community Safety and Head of Housing

NOTE This is a discussion draft of a report which it is intended to progress to Executive following the discussion at Budget Scrutiny Committee.

Purpose of the Report

- To review the future of BDC funded CCTV systems across the District.

1 Report Details

- 1.1 In 2012 the Council tendered for a replacement CCTV system. The original tenders came in significantly over budget and the then Director of Operations was tasked with reducing the specification to deliver a CCTV system that was in line with the available funding, and to maximise the contributions made by Parish Councils.
- 1.2 Whilst the original tender aimed to provide a system that was the same quality as a town centre based system, with 24/7 monitoring, the cost was prohibitive. As part of the negotiations to secure an affordable system, there was a reduction in specification concerning both the quality of the hardware and the frequency of monitoring.
- 1.3 As part of the procurement of the system Members received a number of reports. The most relevant of these being:
- 28th May 2012 – Following the procurement process. This reported that the capital cost of the CCTV system was around £72k with £40k revenue costs to include both monitoring (c£37k) and maintenance (c£3K). This was in excess of the budgetary provision and accordingly was rejected by Members. Despite the significant cost of the system proposed it continued to rely upon the re-use of significant elements of the older system as a means of minimising cost.
 - 19th November 2012. This suggested a phased approach to implementation of what was largely the same scheme. While Phase 1 (The Depot) was introduced as soon as possible, later stages were not introduced until the budget shortfall was addressed. The report suggested a number of ‘earmarked’ financial reserves could be used to help cover the capital costs, although there remained a capital shortfall of around £48k.

- 4th March 2013. A reduced scheme was proposed which excluded Bolsover as the Town Council did not consider it appropriate to make a contribution to funding the scheme. Costs were minimised by reducing monitoring and increased reuse of existing kit. While the report noted that some parishes were willing to make a capital and revenue contribution to the scheme, no documentation was agreed regarding the amounts the Parishes were to contribute or how such an amount was to be calculated. While significant issues still required resolution it was agreed to progress the implementation of the revised scheme along the lines outlined within the report.
- 1.4 The approach was based upon switching from hard wired to Wi-Fi links between the cameras and the monitoring centre. As such it was a fundamental technical change from the previous hard wire based CCTV system. At the time of commissioning the system it was understood that whilst cheaper a WI fi solution was not as technically sound as a hard wired system. The system as commissioned is operational but there have been an unacceptable number of issues which have required a disproportionate amount of staff time to address. Although the contractor has partially secured the migration from the old to the new system in reality the new system has not met expectations in respect of the output quality. Officers have continued to work with the supplier to address performance issues and to secure improvements that would enable the system to meet the requirements of the council and its partners, including providing good value. This process however has been problematic for a number of reasons including the core performance of the system, together with issues concerning the desired location of the cameras and equipment. In practice a number of issues have arisen including image quality, system downtime and unreliable data links. The issues with the system has given rise to tensions with the other partners and a general reluctance to undertake further investment in the system. Efforts to resolve the issues have involved a significant commitment of staff time which could have been spent more productively on other duties. Given the perceived performance issues some of the partners in the Town and Parish Councils have withheld agreed contributions.
- 1.5 In addition there have been issues with the monitoring service - which is provided by a third party - with no evidence that the Council is receiving the agreed level of service. For example there have been occasions where a camera has malfunctioned, and not transmitted any images to the monitoring service, but this has not been reported. The Council have only paid for those periods where there has been an acceptable level of monitoring.
- 1.6. While work to date has secured a number of improvements it would be fair to say that the commitment to the project of some of the key partners has been weakened. The most successful element of the system is at the Riverside Depot. However this differs from the system in other areas as it is restricted to the site compound, does not monitor the surrounding areas and is the least complex in technical terms.
- 2. Assessment of Current System**
- 2.1 At this point in time there are outstanding issues at each of the four Town and Parish Council's where the system is installed. Resolution of these issues often requires a significant investment of both finance and time by both Parish Council's and District Council officers. On the basis of the evidence to date the quality of the images and the general functionality of a WI fi based system are likely to remain an issue. The current position in each area is as follows:

a. Clowne

- 4 cameras working based upon the components of the previous system.
- The Council are still awaiting written confirmation from Clowne Parish Council regarding their commitment to participate in the system and to fund the associated costs, including the relocation of some cameras.
- The Contractor provided a quotation to replace the existing set up with one based upon cameras relocated to the preferred site of the Parish Council. This relocation and renewal of major components would be at a cost of £40k.

b. Shirebrook

- All 7 cameras working with no current issues reported, although it is understood that the Town Council would wish to see a number of the cameras relocated.

c. Creswell

- 4 of the 5 cameras working, although there is an intermittent issue with the transmission signal of one of the four working cameras.
- One camera is waiting to be re-installed following its removal by DCC when they replaced the lighting column.
- The Council have received a price from the Contractor to replace the existing cameras. Prices for the equipment varies from £5k to £7k depending on the cameras chosen. This excludes installation, hire of 'cherry picker' surveys and testing.

d. South Normanton

- One camera is waiting to be re-installed following its removal by DCC when they replaced the lighting column.
- Survey carried out by Contractor who have confirmed that the proposed camera on the skate park (to be funded by South Normanton Parish Council) will be able to transmit to the Hub if the recorder is moved there. However, to achieve this they will need to install relay points (SNPC will need to obtain the necessary permission from the premises' owners and fund the costs).
- If the proposal with the Hub is agreed, a further relay point will still need to be installed at the current retail location to enable cameras 1 & 4 to transmit.
- The Council are still awaiting written confirmation from South Normanton Parish Council regarding their commitment to the scheme

e. Riverside Depot

In contrast to the other schemes, the CCTV system is designed for the security of the building and the people who work at the depot. It is not designed to monitor public areas, but a place of work outside working hours. Since the installation of CCTV and the move of Central Control to the Depot there has been significant decrease in thefts from the yard, and importantly the system provides security for staff who work out of hours. The security at the Depot has been improved significantly. During 2012 there were incidents of theft and damage on the yard

totalling almost £25k, since the installation and relocation there have been only minor issues.

This system works well, but is monitored through the control centre at Chesterfield. With some minor investment the system could be monitored within Central Control and therefore saving on the ongoing revenue cost. It is recommended that this system is retained, but shift the monitoring to Central Control regardless of the decisions made on other schemes.

3. Impact of CCTV

3.1 With the exception of the system at Riverside Depot there is no real evidence that the presence of CCTV has had a positive impact on issues of Crime and Disorder.

3.2 The Surveillance Camera Code of Practice (SCCP) states that cameras must be used “in pursuit of a legitimate aim” and to meet an identified “pressing need”. The Council are required to publish performance statistics to demonstrate that need. The following is a table of crime and ASB statistics in the relevant Safer Neighbourhood areas (SNA) since TIS took over the CCTV contract in 2013:

Table One – Crime Levels in Areas with CCTV 2013-15

Safer Neighbourhood Area	CRIME	ASB
Clowne		
2013 12 month total:	370	331
Monthly average:	31	28
2014 12 month total:	323	269
Monthly average:	27	22
Change: (on previous year)	-47 (-12.7%)	-62 (-18.7%)
2015 12 month total:	300	258
Monthly average:	25	22
Change: (on previous year)	-23 (-7.1%)	-12 (-4.4%)
Creswell		
2013 12 month total:	454	397
Monthly average:	38	33
2014 12 month total:	322	382
Monthly average:	27	32
Change: (on previous year)	-133 (-29.2%)	-17 (-4.3%)
2015 12 month total:	397	352
Monthly average:	33	29
Change: (on previous year)	+75 (+23.3%)	-30 (-7.9%)
Shirebrook		
2013 12 month total:	671	581
Monthly average:	51	48
2014 12 month total:	540	654
Monthly average:	45	55

Change: (on previous year)	-75 (-12.2%)	+72 (+12.4%)
2015 12 month total:	610	
Monthly average:	51	704
Change: (on previous year)	+73 (+13.6%)	59 +50 (+7.6%)
South Normanton (and Pinxton)		
2013 12 month total:	589	584
Monthly average :	49	49
2014 12 month total:	706	522
Monthly average:	59	44
Change: (on previous year)	+119 (+20.3%)	-65 (- 11.1%)
2015 12 month total:	759	522
Monthly average:	63	44
Change: (on previous year)	+56 (+8.0%)	No change

3.3 Overall this suggests that since the contract has been place there has been a 2.4% increase in Crime in these areas and a 3% reduction in ASB. On the basis of these figures it is difficult to demonstrate that the presence of CCTV is having a positive impact on crime figures.

3.4 Nor is there any real evidence that the images from the CCTV have had a positive impact on solving crime.

Table two – Requests from Police to View CCTV.

Period	Clowne	Creswell	Shirebrook	South Normanton	TOTAL	Average per month
Nov 13 to Feb 14	12		2		14	4.7
Mar 14 to Jun 14	18		1	1	20	5
July 14	3		1		4	4
August 14	2		1		3	3
Sept 14	3	1	2		6	6
November 14 to Jan 15					9 (no breakdown available)	3
Feb 15 to Mar 15					No data available	

April 15 to June 15	3	1	1		6	2
July 15 to 21 Sept 15	2	1	2		4	1.3
TOTAL	43	3	10	1	66	

This table suggest that from November 2013 to September 2015 a total of 66 incidents were recorded on CCTV. Moreover the number of incidents has declined during the period from around 5 or 6 incidents per month to less than 2 incidents per month. There is no information on the number of prosecutions that have been successful as a result of the CCTV information. There is no evidence that the CCTV system is acting as a deterrent to crime.

The total expenditure since November 2013 is around £83k. This suggests that the cost to the Council of each incident is around £1,250. There is no information on the number of prosecutions that have resulted from these incidents.

4. Legal Implications of CCTV Operations

- 4.1 All aspects of CCTV are covered by the Data Protection Act 1998. As well as the Regulation of Investigatory Powers 2000 (RIPA), Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and the Human Rights Act 1998 (because we are a public authority). This legislation requires intensive controls and mechanisms to ensure we do not breach the legislation or the privacy of individuals. The Information Commissioner's Office Code of Practice for surveillance cameras and personal information (May 2015) governs how CCTV must operate.
- 4.2 In addition the Surveillance Camera Commissioner has produced 12 guiding principles in the form of the Home Office Surveillance Camera Code of Practice (June 2013) which the Council has to adhere to. This year the Council has been asked to complete a Surveillance Camera self assessment tool and report back to the Commissioner.
- 4.3 The legislation requires that we have in place evidence of need and consultation on that need, control documents and operating procedures, up-to-date signage, privacy impact assessments, risk assessments, complaints procedure, subject access request system, a controlled viewing room, annual reporting and monitoring of conviction statistics (as a result of CCTV evidence), disclosure policy, written agreements with third party processors, regular staff training and induction. In addition authorities using CCTV are required to annually review the usage of the system to justify continued use e.g. is there still crime or anti-social behaviour? The guidance also states that the cost effectiveness of the system should also be reviewed on a regular basis as well as having evidence that CCTV remains an appropriate response to an indentified problem e.g. crime/theft/anti-social behaviour and evidence that alternative solutions have been explored rather than just relying on CCTV. The guidance also clearly states that the system has to be fit for purpose and that the quality of the recorded images should be good enough for court evidence. Any systems which are no longer working or fit for purpose should be disabled and the public made aware.

- 4.4 On the basis of the evidence currently available to the Council – as summarised in section 3 above – Officers are of the view that the case for continuing to operate the current CCTV system does require careful consideration. While there is an argument that the presence of a CCTV system acts to deter crime and ASB the evidence that would support that contention is relatively limited. On the basis of current information there is clearly an argument that the impact on the privacy of local people may be disproportionate to the benefits which flow from the current CCTV system.
- 4.4 The Police currently access the town centre CCTV through the control centre at Chesterfield Borough Council. The town centre CCTV generates subject access requests from members of the public, insurance companies and lawyers. This creates additional pressures for the Improvement Team who deal with these and are responsible for obtaining the correct footage from CBC, enabling appropriate redaction and releasing the data. More often than not no data is found as the cameras are not in the correct position or the quality is too poor for the images to be useful.
- 4.5 Although good processes are currently in place for the Town Centre CCTV work is still needed to ensure we are compliant with the ICO and Surveillance Camera Commissioner guidance. Failure to abide by either code is not a criminal act but failure to abide by the legislation is.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 The current CCTV project requires both a revenue and capital budget with the Revenue Budget for 2015/6 is £119.5k. This includes a significant rollover from previous years of £86.2k. Moving forward the annual revenue budget is around £33k per year.
- 5.3 There is an unspent capital budget of £135k, and an additional £100k in earmarked reserves, plus an additional £15.7k in contributions received by Parish Councils.
- 5.4 From the report it is clear that the existing system is not meeting the requirements of either the Council or its partners. There does not appear to be a do nothing option, therefore it is necessary to consider what options should be progressed in order to resolve the issues that have been identified. The potential costs of the various options are outlined in section 7 below:

6. Other considerations

- 6.1 When CCTV was first introduced, the areas where the cameras are now based enjoyed a significant night-time economy. However, over recent years there has been a decline in the number of pubs operating and a reduction in customers. There is a subsequent reduction in the requirement for CCTV to address issues of crime and anti social behaviour. This makes it more difficult to justify the continued use of CCTV.

7. Options to consider.

In the light of the above it is necessary for Members to give consideration to the options that are available to the District Council. Some of the options are complementary to other options. These are as follows:

Option 1:

Further investment could be made in the current system to secure an improved fit for purpose system. This would initially involve a full feasibility study and a retender for the work. The feasibility study is likely to cost in the region of £50,000. If the system is designed to meet the original expectations, then investment will be needed in both equipment and data links. While a procurement exercise would be needed to provide detailed costings the anticipated cost would be over £100,000 in capital and £50,000 annual revenue costs. While the upgrading is affordable against agreed capital allocations the revenue budget would need to be significantly increased. In addition to considering the affordability of the scheme Executive needs to consider whether in the light of section 4 above it would be appropriate to continue to operate the scheme on its current basis given that the available evidence does not appear to demonstrate that the system produces a clear benefit in the reduction of crime and ASB. Whilst a better system may achieve improved outcomes these need to be considered alongside the potential adverse impact of greater intrusion into the private lives of local residents.

Option 2:

To move to end the provision of CCTV during the 2016/17 financial year. The council would need to cover the cost of removing the existing cameras, but this option would provide a capital saving of up to £300k together with annual revenue savings of some £30k. Crucially it would eliminate any risk of non compliance with the requirements of the Information Commissioner.

Option 3:

To withdraw from BDC funding from the scheme and the gift the existing kit to the parish councils. Implications as above, but the Parishes will need to make their own future arrangements for monitoring and maintenance of the CCTV. At this stage this option has not been discussed with the Parish Council's concerned pending Members of this Council taking a view. It would, however, be the option recommended by Officers and would reflect the position in a number of other District Council's where CCTV is provided by the Parish rather than by the District Council. A factor that supports this approach is that the District should only fund CCTV in a limited number of areas on the basis that its funding goes to the areas with the highest level of need (ie the highest crime rate). Under current arrangements support has tended to go to those areas where the Parish Council is prepared to meet part of the costs. The Parish Council's would, however, in the same manner as the District Council need to give consideration to the issue of whether the continued use of CCTV could be justified in terms of reduced crime and ASB.

Option 4:

That the Council explores the option of increasing the amount of deployable cameras used by the CAN rangers and Environmental Health. This is likely to be a more cost effective option which would allow cameras to be targeted at areas or individuals where there is a current issue / complaint, either ASB or Environmental. This is currently a priority area for Members where additional investment may be welcome.

Option 5:

The CCTV system at the Riverside Depot is retained, but that responsibility for monitoring is transferred from CBC to Central Control. Given the increasing level of

activity that is being undertaken on the Clowne site it recommended that officers be requested to develop options for operating a CCTV system to cover the Council's land and buildings.

8 Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation

- 8.1 The CCTV system procured in 2012 appears to be unable to consistently provide the quality of images that were expected by the Council and Partners
- 8.2 There is little evidence to suggest that the current CCTV system has made a significant contribution to reducing the impact of either crime or ASB in those areas where it has been deployed.
- 8.3 Compliance with the legislation around the operation of CCTV systems is becoming increasingly challenging, and the Council may struggle to demonstrate that the existing arrangements have a sufficiently positive outcome to justify the continued use of CCTV.
- 8.4 Given the evidence provided within this report it is considered that the current CCTV system does not provide value for money for the District Council and that a reinvestment of current resources into deployable camera kits is likely to be both cheaper and to provide better outcomes in terms of addressing criminal activity and anti social behaviour.

9 Consultation and Equality Impact

- 9.1 On the basis that the recommendations set out within this report are agreed Council officers will commence discussions with the Town and Parish Councils involved in the current system to consider the options that are available for the future of the CCTV system.

10 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

- 10.1 See part 7 of the main report.

11 Implications

11.1 Finance and Risk Implications

As covered in the body of the report

11.2 Legal Implications including Data Protection

As covered in the main report

11.3 Human Resources Implications

Non directly

12 Recommendations

- 12.1 That the Council seeks to conclude the current arrangements in respect of CCTV at the earliest opportunity.
- 12.2 That the CCTV system at the Riverside Depot is retained but the monitoring is switched from Chesterfield to the Central Control, with consideration given to introducing a system on the Arc site at Clowne.
- 12.3 That the JAD Community Safety writes to the Parish Councils at Clowne, South Normanton and Creswell and also the Town Council at Shirebrook to ask if they wish to be take over the operation of the CCTV. If this is accepted the equipment will be gifted to the relevant Council on an “as seen” basis, while if the Parishes do not wish to take responsibility for the systems the equipment to be removed and disposed of appropriately.
- 12.4 That on conclusion of the above matters a further report is brought back to Executive setting out the options for acquiring deployable camera kits for use by Environmental Health and the CAN Rangers and to consider whether installing CCTV at the Arc would be an appropriate option.

13 **Decision Information**

Is the decision a Key Decision? (A Key Decision is one which results in income or expenditure to the Council of £50,000 or more or which has a significant impact on two or more District wards)	This is a discussion document which is not seeking a decision.
District Wards Affected	Creswell, South Normanton, Clowne and Shirebrook
Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework	

8 **Document Information**

Appendix No	Title
N/A	
Background Papers (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)	
Report Author	Contact Number
Assistant Director Housing and Community Safety	Ext 3038