

**CCTV SCRUTINY PANEL
WEDNESDAY, 16TH JANUARY 2013 AT 5.00PM
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, SOUTHFIELDS, LOUGHBOROUGH**

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES
2. ACTION NOTES - 27TH NOVEMBER 2012 (AND UPDATED SCOPE DOCUMENT)

The notes of actions agreed by the Panel at its fifth meeting on 27th November 2012 are attached, together with an updated Scrutiny Review Scope Document.

3. PANEL REPORT

To agree the Panel's report, for submission to Scrutiny Management Board on 30th January 2013.

Draft report circulated to members of the Panel.

Membership of this Panel:

Councillors Seaton (Chair), Gaskell, M. Hunt, S. Jones, Lowe, Pacey, Ranson, Shepherd, Smidowicz and Youell

NOTES OF ACTIONS AGREED BY CCTV SCRUTINY PANEL**MEETING 5** – 27 November 2012

ATTENDED BY: Cllrs Seaton (Chair), Gaskell, M. Hunt, S. Jones, Ranson, Shepherd and Smidowicz
(Apologies – Cllrs Lowe and Pacey)

CBC Officers W. Brown, J. Robinson and L. Strong

SUBMITTED TO/CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING:

DOCUMENT OR MATTER	ACTION(S) AGREED
Action Notes of CCTV Scrutiny Panel Meeting 4 – 07 August 2012	Agreed.
Scrutiny Review Scope Document (following CCTV Scrutiny Panel Meeting 4 – 07 August 2012).	Panel to progress on basis of submitted Scope Document. Further updates to be made to Scope Document to reflect progress/additional actions/work agreed at this meeting.
CCTV Control Room/Street Pastors Visits – Feedback	Feedback (summarised below) noted.
Use of volunteers in CCTV control rooms - Information from Officer CCTV Service Review	Information (summarised below) noted.
Informal Evidence Gathering Session – 26 November 2012 (Chief Insp. M. Thomson – Police resources for CCTV) - Feedback	Summary of evidence gathering session noted.
Police resources for CCTV control rooms - Information from Officer CCTV Service Review (as provided for Evidence Gathering Session – 26 November 2012)	Information noted. Further data available relating to Leicester City, also how Police contributed to CCTV services elsewhere, to be sent to members of Panel. Discussion on issue (summarised below) noted.
Further Submission to Panel – Loughborough BID	Submission (and value placed on CCTV by BID) noted.
Panel Recommendations	Proposed Panel recommendations were put forward by Chair for consideration and amendment by Panel.

	Recommendations to be amended to reflect changes noted at this meeting (including distinction between conclusions and recommendations) and then incorporated in Panel report.
Final Panel Meeting	Final meeting to be held January 2013, to agree Panel's final report for submission to Scrutiny Management Board on 30 January 2013.

**SUMMARY OF CCTV CONTROL ROOM/STREET PASTOR VISITS
FEEDBACK:**

CCTV Control Room

Councillors had been very impressed with skill/knowledge demonstrated by operators, including in respect of legal constraints. Skills of operators included ability to be suspicious on the right occasions, see likely problems before they happened and see beyond events in front of them. Important that operators had that level of skill/training.

Service enabled communication of information to assist all partners, including making Police aware of situations on the street at an early stage. Relied upon by Retail Radio, Pubwatch, Street Pastors. Often first port of call for Police. Enabled problems to be diffused on many occasions. Pity if such valuable service was lost. Could provide evidence of innocence as well as guilt, important function. Additional person to view material would be valuable, previously Police resource to do that (that issue to be discussed later in meeting).

Street Pastors

Street Pastors had very calm, quiet approach. Volunteers. Background presence unless help needed by drunk/vulnerable members of public. Help provided in all sorts of ways, including travelling home with person if needed, giving flip flops to females who had removed high heeled shoes, clearing away bottles/broken glass. Received well as presence by public, no animosity. Good relationship with Door Supervisors. Valuable work, Councillors who had attended had great deal of respect for Street Pastors. Police used to make small contribution to cost of flip flops, no longer did so. Pastors undertook work which otherwise might fall to Police. Pastors felt supported/safer as result of CCTV and control room, more vulnerable without it. Further to feedback, W. Brown recounted recent incident involving Street Pastors which had resulted in them taking position that they would not be able to operate without security of contact with CCTV control room and, via that, the Police. Issues relating to that incident being looked into.

USE OF VOLUNTEERS IN CCTV CONTROL ROOMS:

Summary of Information

Officers had explored use of volunteers. Had spoken with Stroud District Council, not dissimilar to Charnwood, CCTV set up 18 years ago, at that time staffed solely by volunteers, cameras/maintenance funded by Council. Had now moved entirely to paid members of staff, insufficient skills/local knowledge level of volunteers, concerns regarding contribution at Court, infrequency of some volunteers' involvement. Now had full-time paid supervisor funded by Council and two operators paid for by Police. Monitoring 9am-4pm weekdays, until 4am Friday and Saturday. Similar population to Charnwood, but not comparable night time economy.

Officers had also visited Melton Borough Council. Volunteers used only at non-peak times, recruitment via Police Volunteer Scheme so relevant security checks, also programme of training. High risk periods covered by paid staff. Significant differences between Melton and Charnwood. Different operating hours and Melton 16 cameras, Charnwood 179, Charnwood higher level of anti-social behaviour and crime and significant night time economy. Nature of volunteers, not always reliable. CCTV co-ordinator at Melton partly funded by Police. Also control room located in Police station, so accommodation costs met by Police.

POLICE RESOURCES FOR CCTV CONTROL ROOMS:

Informal Evidence Gathering Session – 26 November 2012 (Chief Insp. M. Thomson) - Feedback

To assist Panel members who had been unable to attend, a brief verbal summary was given of the discussion with Chief Insp. M. Thomson at the informal evidence gathering session on 26th November 2012 (Police resources for CCTV). At that session, Panel members had concluded that a Partnership arrangement similar to that which had been in place when CCTV service had first been set up should be pursued. That had included a contribution to accommodation costs (the control room had originally been located in the Police station), a Police staff resource and Police funding. Panel members had recognised that CCTV assisted the community as well as Police and that all budgets were tight, however the CCTV Service was of immense benefit to Police and was not a statutory service. Charnwood could not be compared to other districts in County, either in terms of crime/anti-social behaviour volumes or CCTV provision. More appropriate to compare to City in those respects. Chief Insp. Thomson had agreed to take back views and respond by mid December 2012.

Information from Officer CCTV Service Review - Discussion

In response to a question regarding why reported anti-social behaviour incidents down by 23% on this time last year, reference to strong partnership working and earlier intervention. Possible deterrent effect of CCTV cameras, difficult to know.

Brief discussion regarding staffing required for 24/7 operation of CCTV service (5.9 full-time staff, basis of calculation outlined, also Police figure for 24/7 cover, higher at 7.5 full-time staff). Service had 6 full-time staff (5 operators and team leader). Previous service pressure due to use of casual staff to maintain 24/7 (required skill levels ensured through use of existing full-time staff from elsewhere in Council).

CCTV Service met all requests from the Police for viewings. Some local authorities charged for viewings. Brief discussion regarding different ways in which Police contributions were made to CCTV services across country.

Brief discussion regarding night time economy in Loughborough, whether those businesses should meet more of costs of Policing/CCTV, as it was those businesses which were benefiting. Or Police/CCTV protecting vast majority enjoying that night time economy without behaving anti-socially or committing crime? Night time economy businesses already paid business rates, Door Supervisors. Also Loughborough BID levy. Noted 24/7 CCTV included in baseline level of services for BID, further discussion regarding Council's obligations in that respect. BID funds could only be used to enhance service, eg. cameras in additional locations.

W. Brown briefly outlined purpose of CCTV Strategy Group (would include Chief Insp. Thomson) and CCTV Operating Group. Reviewing Terms of Reference. Awaiting outcome of service review, intended to put together annual work/improvement plan.

Information illustrated extent to which CCTV service assisted Police. Particularly noted that Council picked up cost of maintaining 3 ANPR cameras, information from which used only by Police. The conclusions of evidence gathering session on 26th November 2012 were warranted.



SCRUTINY REVIEW: SCOPE

REVIEW TITLE: CCTV Scrutiny Panel

SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE

To review the effectiveness versus the cost of the Council's CCTV provision:

- (i) to consider the costs of CCTV to understand how the financial resources are spent;
- (ii) to consider the financing of the CCTV service so as to understand who pays for the service;
- (iii) to establish the effectiveness of the CCTV service, considering the impact on the local economy and the local community and on crime prevention, crime detection and displacement of crime;
- (iv) to consider alternative ways of designing the service, including alternative funding; and
- (v) safety issues relating to the night time economy and ~~safe routes home~~*.

* Safe routes home not implemented in Charnwood for reasons explained to Panel 09 May 2012.

REASON FOR SCRUTINY

To ensure that the CCTV Service is providing Value for Money while ensuring a reduction in crime (Overview Scrutiny Group, while scrutinising the proposed budget, noted that a service pressure of £174k had been included and it raised questions about the value for money of the current service provision).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE GROUP

Councillor Seaton (Chair)
Councillors Gaskell, M. Hunt, Jones, Lowe, Pacey, Ranson, Shepherd, Smidowicz and Youell

WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED

1. An analysis of when and where crimes were committed and the number of crimes that CCTV has helped detect and solve;
2. How effective do the Police find the system?;
3. Source evidence from relevant academic studies on the effectiveness of CCTV;
4. Gather evidence from other Councils or public bodies on the review of CCTV provision*.

*Officers are undertaking visits to other authorities as part of CCTV service review.

WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED

KEY TASKS** including consideration of efficiency savings

1. Site visit to the CCTV Control Room to see how it currently operates;
2. Understand the usage of CCTV for major events, e.g. Loughborough Fair;
3. Review the original Business Plan for establishing the CCTV service to compare actual outcomes to what was originally envisaged.

STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS **

Witnesses

1. Leicestershire Police (Head of Criminal Justice – Supt. P. Whiteley)
2. Retail Radio (Managed by Loughborough BID – Representative of)
3. Pubwatch (Current Chair and/or PC S. Jackson)
4. Community Representative - Rendell Street, Loughborough (recently had a camera installed following a petition requesting a camera) – (Neighbourhood Watch Volunteer)
5. NoCCTV (Representative of)
6. BCU Commander Chief Supt. C. Thomas (additional witness requested by Panel at Meeting 4 - 07 August 2012).

Written

7. Parish/Town Councils – Letter/questionnaire to all to provide opportunity to provide information/views on CCTV.
8. Members of the Public – Invite comments via publicising work of the Panel.

Issues to discuss with witnesses for 1-5 above agreed by Panel 09 May 2012.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

Is an impact needs assessment required?

To be considered at the Panel's penultimate meeting, if Panel's recommendations are of sufficiently detailed level to enable evaluation of their impact on individuals or groups of residents.

LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS

CCTV Service Review (Current) – Panel does not wish to duplicate this work, information gathered by this will be useful to/considered by Panel, when available.

Night Time Economy and Safe Routes Home – Scrutiny Report (Performance Scrutiny Panel 22nd November 2011).

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

1. Visits by Panel members to CCTV Control Centre on different occasions, include option of Friday or Saturday evening visit to Loughborough town centre with Street Pastors;
2. Research capacity to source evidence from academic studies and other Councils;
3. Visits to and from other Councils/public bodies, as identified*;

*Officers are undertaking visits to other authorities as part of CCTV service review.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)

Officer Support -

Technical

Julie Robinson - Head of Neighbourhood Services

Wendy Brown – Community Safety Co-ordinator

Administrative

Laura Strong – Democratic Services Officer

REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE

COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT

9th May 2012

Revised – January 2013

Originally September 2012, due to CCTV service review timetable. CCTV service review report to Cabinet now rescheduled to later date to enable outcomes of Scrutiny Panel to be considered at same time.

** Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

PROGRESS OF PANEL WORK

MEETING DATE	PROGRESS TO DATE
9th May 2012	Detailed in notes of actions agreed at this meeting. In summary, considered (i) Scrutiny Review Scope Document; (ii) summary of CCTV Budget 2008/09 to 2012/13; (iii) Summary of options CCTV Service Review; (iv) witnesses; (v) input from other stakeholders; (vi) publicity; (vii) other information required; (viii) visits; (ix) various issues/views in respect of CCTV; (x) Scrutiny Witness Charter; (xi) further meetings of the Panel/completion date.
25th May 2012	Detailed in notes of actions agreed at this meeting. In summary, considered information provided by Supt. P. Whiteley – Leics Police Head of Criminal Justice.
27th June 2012	Detailed in notes of actions agreed at this meeting. In summary, considered information provided by PC. S. Jackson and PC. M. Preston (Pubwatch Scheme – Loughborough) and statistical information from W. Brown. Also, considered decision of SMB 23 May 2012 to add to Panel's remit.
7th August 2012	Detailed in notes of actions agreed at this meeting. In summary, considered information provided by Mr R. Perrett and Mr P. Roberts (Retail Radio - Loughborough) and Ms A. Edwards and Ms G. Squires (Rendell Street, Loughborough Neighbourhood Watch). Also, considered written submission of NoCCTV, summary of responses from town/parish councils to CCTV questionnaire, breakdown of cost of CCTV service.
20th August 2012	This meeting date was cancelled to allow time for additional witness identified by Panel to be arranged.
26th November 2012 (Informal Meeting)	Evidence Gathering Session (Police resources) (Chief Insp. M. Thomson, representing Chief Supt. C. Thomas).
27th November 2012	Detailed in notes of actions agreed at this meeting. In summary, considered (i) CCTV Control Room/Street Pastor Visits Feedback; (ii) Information from Officer CCTV Service Review in respect of use of volunteers in CCTV control rooms and Police Resources for CCTV control rooms; (iii) Informal Evidence Gathering Session 26th November 2012 (Police resources) Feedback; (iv) Further Submission from Loughborough BID; (v) Proposed Panel recommendations; (vi) Final Meeting of Panel /completion date.
16th January 2013 at 5pm	To agree Panel's final report.

Note: Panel wishes to comment on officer proposals for CCTV Service prior to decision by Cabinet (current officer service review).

REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
--

Proposed – 30th January 2013

Updated 06/12/12