

Cabinet Meeting	
Meeting Date	Wednesday 13 July 2016
Report Title	CCTV Effectiveness Report
Cabinet Member	Cllr Alan Horton, Cabinet Member for Safer Families and Communities
SMT Lead	Kathryn Carr
Head of Service	Emma Wiggins
Lead Officer	Stephanie Curtis
Recommendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Cabinet approves the CCTV cameras recommended within Appendix I for decommissioning. 2. That the Cabinet Member discusses with the Community Safety Partnership the outcomes of this review including suggested new CCTV locations and development of a CCTV Communications Plan.

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report discusses the review that has been undertaken on CCTV effectiveness, including the findings from a consultation exercise; and makes proposals for the decommissioning or retention of specific cameras.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that all of its CCTV cameras are properly placed and their ongoing justification is reviewed. As a consequence of this duty, all 84 public space cameras within the borough were evaluated and 21 were identified as being ineffective. This assessment was based upon crime statistics and an evaluation of CCTV operator usage. Consultation with the community was undertaken to ascertain if further evidence to support their effectiveness existed. Following, the results from the consultation, it is recommended that 5 cameras be retained and a total of 16 decommissioned.
- 2.2 The consultation also welcomed comments on locations of where new CCTV cameras could be commissioned. Evidence put forward was limited, with 35% of sites suggested already having a camera in place. Five suggested sites, however are being investigated by the Community Safety Unit to determine if the deployment criteria are met for a CCTV camera to be deployed, in-line with existing CCTV commissioning processes.
- 2.3 In addition, the consultation highlighted that the public's knowledge of CCTV is limited, with feelings of indifference expressed and a limited number of consultation responses. For those that did respond, CCTV is felt to be a reassurance tool with respondents indicating that crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) would increase.

However, a lack of evidence was provided to support these claims This highlights a need for consideration of further communication, in partnership with the Police and other partners, to demonstrate the role of CCTV and its outcomes.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 That Cabinet approves that the CCTV cameras recommended are decommissioned.
- 3.2 That the Cabinet Member discusses with the Community Safety Partnership the outcomes of this review including suggested new CCTV locations and development of a CCTV Communications Plan.
- 3.3 5 cameras highlighted in the review will be retained. In total 68 cameras remain across Swale, and a commitment to continue to deploy mobile cameras in additional locations as required.
- 3.4 The 16 cameras recommended to be decommissioned are:

Sittingbourne –

- Albany Road Car Park
- ISP Centre 1, Church Street
- ISP Centre 2, Church Street
- Victoria Road/London Road

Faversham –

- Thomas Road Car Park
- Institute/St Marys Road Car Park
- BMM Weston

Isle of Sheppey –

- Rushenden Road
- Queenborough Causeway
- Minster High Street
- Minster Abbey
- The Glen, Minster
- Scrapesgate, Minster
- Blatcher Close, Minster
- White House, Minster
- Queens Road, Minster

4 Alternative Options

- 4.1 To retain CCTV cameras in their existing locations. This option is not recommended as the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice 2013 requires authorities to ensure all cameras are justified and any breach could result in the Council being fined. Evidence gathered as part of this review and consultation indicates those cameras recommended to be decommissioned do not comply with the Code of Practice and therefore cannot be justified.

5 Consultation Undertaken

- 5.1 A consultation was undertaken for the cameras that had initially been identified as low effectiveness. This included a direct mail-out to over 1,200 residents/businesses located within 100m of each camera, with the opportunity to complete either a paper or online questionnaire; direct email to parish/town councils, Kent Police, AmicusHorizon and SwaleSafe; direct letters to all borough and county councillors; multiple press releases; and promotion through social media.

- 5.2 The consultation ran from 14th January – 31 March 2016 through both an online and paper questionnaire. 162 responses were received, with an additional 31 email or telephone comments. A summary of the outcomes of the consultation are shown for each camera listed in Appendix I.
- 5.3 The consultation also suggested 31 sites for new CCTV cameras to be located, of which 11 already have CCTV in place.

6 Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	The proposals in this report delivers against the Corporate Priority ‘A Community to be proud of’
Financial, Resource and Property	<p>There would be financial implications for the decommissioning of any CCTV cameras.</p> <p>To remove those cameras recommended for decommissioning, there would be an approximate cost of £10,000, which would be offset by annual revenue savings for the fibre lines of approximately £8,500.</p> <p>Any decommissioning costs would be funded from reserves and any revenue savings would be considered for the 2017/18 budget onwards.</p> <p>Depending on the age of the camera equipment removed, it could be relocated elsewhere; used for parts to repair other cameras; or be considered to be provided to a local parish council if they have previously contributed to their installation or monitoring costs.</p>
Legal and Statutory	<p>The Council has a statutory requirement under the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice 2013 to ensure all CCTV Cameras have a legitimate aim and its continuing use remains justified. The two principles in particular that relate to this review are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use of a surveillance camera system must always be for a specified purpose which is in pursuit of a legitimate aim and necessary to meet an identified pressing need; and • the use of a surveillance camera system must take into account its effect on individuals and their privacy, with regular reviews to ensure its use remains justified. <p>Due to the personal information captured by CCTV, information must only be processed for specific purposes, and must be relevant and not excessive. Therefore, if any CCTV camera does not have a justifiable reason, this would be considered as a breach of the principles of the Data Protection Act 1998 which could result in the Council being fined up to £500,000.</p>
Crime and	The main objective of the CCTV service is to prevent and detect

Disorder	crime and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).
Sustainability	This report aims to increase the sustainability of the existing CCTV service by removing ineffective cameras from the system and ensuring that it is fit for purpose.
Health and Wellbeing	No health and wellbeing implications have been identified at this stage.
Risk Management and Health and Safety	There is a risk that the decommissioning of any CCTV cameras may result in increased crime or ASB occurring in that location. However, the review process has taken into account the volume of incidents reported and feedback from the community and we are satisfied that this risk is low.
Equality and Diversity	There were no responses to the consultation that indicated an equality or diversity implication in retention or decommissioning of cameras.

7 Appendices

7.1 The following document is to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix I: Low Effectiveness Cameras and Recommendations

8 Background Papers

8.1 Delegated Cabinet Member Decision – CCTV Effectiveness December 2015

Appendix I: Low Effectiveness Cameras and Recommendations

The original reporting period relates to 1 June 2014 – end May 2015. The revised reporting period relates to 1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016).

Camera	Summary of Findings	Recommendation
Sittingbourne		
<p>Albany Road Car Park</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera placed within carpark to prevent thefts from and of vehicles; however vehicle crime nationally has seen large reduction due to increased vehicle security.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 25 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased by 9 incidents to 34 for the revised reporting period. However, these incidents could be within the high street itself, rather than in the car park. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 5 responses were received for this camera. 0 responders indicated they had experienced crime/ASB within view of the camera. 3 felt ASB/crime would increase if camera was removed, but no evidence was provided as to why. Only 2 felt the camera was in the most effective location.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>ISP Centre 1, Church Street</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera was installed at request of ISP Centre in 2005.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 31 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 17 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 4 responses were received for this camera. 2 had experienced crime/ASB within view of the camera, but no sufficient evidence provided as to the outcome of CCTV use. 3 felt ASB/crime would increase if camera was removed due to area being dark and isolated. 2 felt the camera would be more effective elsewhere.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>ISP Centre 2, Church Street</p>	<p>Location: Camera was installed at request of ISP Centre in 2005. This camera is to the other side of the centre, overlooking the Dover Street Car Park,</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of</p>

<p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>which is due to have apartments built upon it.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 24 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 14 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 4 responses were received for this camera. Only 1 had experienced crime/ASB within view of this camera, but no evidence provided as to use of CCTV. 1 respondent felt crime/ASB would increase if CCTV removed, but no evidence provided as to why. 2 felt the camera would be more effective elsewhere.</p>	<p>actual incidents reported or further evidence from consultation findings, along with imminent removal of need to monitor car park.</p>
<p>Chalkwell Road Junction/ London Road</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera was installed in response to public concerns regarding an Asylum Rest Centre being built within vicinity. This never occurred.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 10 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 18 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report camera is frequently used to monitor movement out of the town at request of Police, along with monitoring nearby Tesco Express.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 15 responses were received for this camera. 4 had experienced crime/ASB within view of the camera, but no evidence provided for the outcome of CCTV usage. 9 felt ASB/crime would increase if CCTV removed with a number of reasons provided based upon previous incidents. 7 felt the camera was in the most effective location.</p>	<p>Retain the camera in this location to detect and deter crime and ASB relating exit from town centre, adjacent alleyway and nearby Tesco Express.</p>
<p>Victoria Road Junction/ London Road</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera was installed as of public concerns regarding an Asylum Rest Centre being built within vicinity. This never occurred.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 12 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 14 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 3 responses received for this camera. Only 1 responder experienced</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>

	crime/ASB within view of camera, with no evidence provided to outcome of the CCTV use. Only 1 felt ASB/crime would increase if the camera was removed with no quantifiable evidence provided.	
Isle of Sheppey		
Queenborough Railway Terrace PTZ Mercer (2005-10)	<p>Location: This camera has a good view of both directions of junction, nearby car park and play park. It also views the Trafalgar Bed and Breakfast. The view of the play park also enables the Council to meet its duties to keep children safe under the Children's Act. CCTV operators report they do review and check on more regular basis than at beginning of review.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 14 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 24 for the revised reporting period.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 3 responses were received for this camera. 2 had experienced crime/ASB within view of the camera, with CCTV having been used to deal with the incident for 1 responder. All felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but only due to its deterrent factor. 2 believed the camera was in the most effective location.</p>	Retain this camera due to increase in crime/ASB, to detect and deter further incidents within Railway Terrace, local play park and car park.
Queenborough Causeway PTZ Mercer (2005-10)	<p>Location: This camera views House and Home public house and Causeway.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 10 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 13 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera or tackle incidents relating to local pub.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 9 responses were received for this camera. 6 had experienced crime/ASB near the camera, with 3 believing CCTV had been used. 8 thought crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, due to noise from local pub. No responders felt camera was definitely in the most effective location.</p>	Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.
Rushenden Road	Location: This camera had monitored a parade of shops, which have now been demolished and being	Decommission this camera site due to

<p>PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>converted into homes. Camera is currently positioned within the plot of a new build as part of this development.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 12 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has not changed for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 2 responses received for this camera and none had experienced crime/ASB near camera, although both felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, with limited evidence provided as to why.</p>	<p>low number of actual incidents reported or further evidence from consultation findings to indicate impact it has had to date; along with removal of need to monitor shops in area.</p>
<p>Minster High Street PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera is situated along Minster High Street, with a view of two local public houses.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 15 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 10 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 4 responses received for this camera, with 3 having experienced crime/ASB near camera, but none having utilised CCTV. 3 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, with concerns regarding alleged incidents from nearby premises. Only 2 felt camera is most effective here.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>Minster Abbey PTZ Mercer (2005-10)</p>	<p>Location: Camera is situated outside Minster Abbey Gatehouse, with a view of the front of the Gatehouse.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 36 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 25 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera and that when it has been used, incidents are often displaced out of its view.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 8 responses were received for this camera, with 6 having experienced crime/ASB near camera, with none being sure CCTV had been utilised. 5 felt crime/ASB would increase if</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or further evidence from consultation findings to indicate impact it has had to date, or can have in the future.</p>

	<p>camera removed, with reasoning based upon previous historical incidents. 4 felt camera was in most effective location.</p>	
<p>The Glen, Minster</p> <p>Siemens Solaris (2012-2015)</p>	<p>Location: The camera views the play park within the Glen.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 0 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 2 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 8 responses received for this camera, with 3 having experienced crime/ASB near camera, but none being certain CCTV had been utilised. 5 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but no evidence provided other than concern based on previous historical incidents. Only 2 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or further evidence from consultation findings to indicate impact it has had to date, or further need for it.</p>
<p>Scrapes Gate, Minster</p> <p>Siemens Solaris (2012-2015)</p>	<p>Location: Camera views junction of Scrapesgate.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 21 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 8 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they do occasionally have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 8 responses received for camera, with 4 experiencing crime/ASB near camera, but no relevant evidence provided. 6 felt ASB/crime would increase if camera removed, but only based upon historical incidents. 6 felt camera better placed elsewhere.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact to date or further need for it.</p>
<p>White House, Minster</p> <p>Siemens Solaris (2012-2015)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors the Leas and Marine Parade.</p> <p>Report/operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 5 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 12 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 7 responses received, with 3 having experienced crime/ASB near camera,</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>

	<p>but no evidence provided of CCTV use. 3 felt ASB/crime would increase if camera removed; only based on historical issues prior to original camera's installation. Only 2 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	
<p>Blatcher Close, Minster</p> <p>Siemens Solaris (2012-2015)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors pathway between Blatcher Close and Minster Road.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 28 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 17 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 9 responses received, with 5 experiencing crime/ASB near camera, but no evidence of CCTV use being provided. 5 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but only due to its deterrent. Only 3 feel in most effective location. One responder discussed multiple incidents occurring over last 5+ years, which the CSU are aware of and CCTV has been limited in being able to resolve.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>Queens Road, Minster</p> <p>Siemens Solaris (2012-2015)</p>	<p>Location: Camera views the Co Op along Queens Road.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 17 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 21 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 12 responses received. 8 had experienced crime/ASB within view of camera, but no evidence provided of CCTV use. Issues referenced are parking obstruction related and not a main purpose of CCTV. 11 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but only due to parking obstruction concerns from local shop.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>Faversham</p>		
<p>99 West Street, Faversham</p> <p>PTX mercer</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors West Street/South Road junction.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 40 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has</p>	<p>Retain the camera to detect and deter crime and ASB arising on this route of the town</p>

(Pre 2000)	<p>reduced to 38 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 12 responses received with 11 having experienced crime/ASB near camera. An example provided of CCTV use. 10 felt crime/ASB would increase, with examples of recent incidents provided. 7 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	centre, particularly at night.
<p>Gatefield Lane, Faversham</p> <p>PTX mercer (Pre 2000)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors Gatefield lane entrance onto Preston Street.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 41 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 49 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they have been increasingly needing to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 15 responses received, with 8 experiencing crime/ASB near camera. Examples provided of recent incidents, but no firm evidence of CCTV use. 13 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, based upon recent incidents occurring. 7 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	Retain the camera to detect and deter crime and ASB arising on this route out of the town centre.
<p>Thomas Road Car Park, Faversham</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (Pre 2000)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors car park and adjacent alleyway.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 31 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 42 for the revised reporting period. However, these figures will include those in the wider town centre. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 9 responses received, with 2 experiencing crime/ASB near camera but no evidence provided of CCTV use. 8 felt crime/ASB would increase, but no specific reasoning provided. Only 2 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.
<p>St Marys Road/Institute Road Car Park, Faversham</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors car park and adjacent alleyway.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 22 incidents of</p>	Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from

<p>PTZ Mercer (Pre 2000)</p>	<p>crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 27 for the revised reporting period. However, these figures will include those in the wider town centre. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 6 responses received, with 3 experiencing crime/ASB near camera but no evidence provided of CCTV use. 2 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but only due to being a deterrent. 2 felt camera in most effective location.</p>	<p>further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>BMM Weston, Faversham</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (Pre 2000)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors footpath running alongside Creek and BMM factory entrance.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 38 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has reduced to 34 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they rarely have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 5 responses received, with none experiencing crime/ASB near camera. 2 felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, but no sufficient evidence put forward why. None felt camera most effective here.</p>	<p>Decommission this camera site due to low number of actual incidents reported or from further evidence from consultation findings to indicate its impact, or further need for it.</p>
<p>Faversham Station Car Park</p> <p>PTZ Mercer (Pre 2000)</p>	<p>Location: Camera monitors Faversham Station Car Park and Booking Hall entrance.</p> <p>Reports/Operator Assessment: For the original reporting period there had been 22 incidents of crime/ASB within 100m of this camera. This has increased to 25 for the revised reporting period. CCTV operators report they do have cause to review or check this camera.</p> <p>Outcome of the Consultation: 7 responses received, with examples provided by partner organisations of crime/ASB occurring in location and role of CCTV. 100% felt crime/ASB would increase if camera removed, with additional concern of loss of monitoring of movement of offenders via rail. 4 responders felt camera in most effective location.</p>	<p>Retain the camera to monitor entrance and exit onto train station to detect and deter crime and ASB.</p>