

Name of Authority	Number and Type of Cameras	Monitoring and Maintenance	Annual Amount Spent on CCTV
Mendip DC	30	The Council currently has responsibility for provision, maintenance and replacement of all hardware in the station whilst the monitoring is funded by the CCTV User Group.	The CCTV User Group is a partnership consisting of representatives from Wells, Glastonbury, Shepton Mallet and Frome Town Councils and Chambers of Commerce. Monitoring and staffing costs are currently being met by the CCTV User Group who fully fund the costs of active monitoring.
South Somerset	24 but with some other cameras maintained by Town Councils. The cameras are Surcha Dome cameras and the recording is via digital recorders.		The system is funded by the District Council via car park income and with a contribution from Yeovil Town Council The current annual budget is around £75k
Guildford	42 fixed cameras in the town and surrounding areas and six mobile cameras that provide temporary surveillance in areas where the fixed cameras cannot be used.		Monitored by Surrey Police's operators.

Poole BC	High quality Pan, Tilt and Zoom (PTZ) cameras are generally provided within the CCTV surveillance areas. Depending upon their location and purpose, these will be either pole or building mounted, high sensitivity, low light colour cameras with external quality housing and high quality 1:10 or 1:14 zoom lenses.		Monitored 24/7 by District Council operators
Ashfield BC	29 CCTV cameras	Monitored by Mansfield District Council	transmission, and maintenance was £133,000 during 2002-03. Contributions of £1,000 and £600 are received annually from Ashfield Community Hospital and Asda respectively. In terms of external income, Newark and Sherwood District Council and Chesterfield Borough Council received £65,000 and £25,000 towards the running of their CCTV schemes, and both authorities viewed generating greater external income as a key aim for the future. In one authority the control room handled all 'out of hours' Housing and Environmental Health calls
Birmingham CC	50 pan tilt and zoom colour cameras linked to a City Centre police station. There is also access to a further 200 cameras from the Bullring to the Mailbox.	Police monitor cameras 24 hours a day seven days a week.	Significant income is generated through a contract for the location of miniature cell phone transmitters alongside CCTV cameras. A ten year deal has provided £148,000 capital and a rental of £20,000 per annum.

Westminster CC	120 dome enclosed JVC cameras.	CCTV Partnership contract a security company to monitor CCTV 24/7 with four operators.	£800,000 per annum. Westminster CC £130,000. Local businesses and one off funding provide the bulk of the funding. The police fund projects rather than ongoing revenue.
Liverpool CC	220 cameras	Centre operated 24 hours a day.	£360,000 funding per annum provided by the City Council with some funding from police and local neighbourhood schemes. Cameras are required through S106 Agreements.
Plymouth CC	250 cameras	Monitored by Council and police.	£250,000 per annum funded by Council. Charges levied for monitoring private CCTV and charge levied to be member of a retail crime reduction initiative

Number of cameras	Average cost per camera	Total Running Cost	First Installation	Upgrade	Time Before Upgrade
520	£673	£350,000			
200	£1,250	£250,000	1995	2002	7
171	£1,466	£250,750	2001	2005	4
200	£1,500	£300,00			
128	£1,563	£200,000	1997	2005	8
160	£1,563	£250,000	1998	2004	6
113	£1,593	£180,000	1995		
601	£1,664	£1,000,000	1999	2006	7
204	£1,765	£360,000	1997	2004	7
20	£1,850	£37,000	1995/6		
130	£1,923	£250,000	2003		
48	£2,083	£100,000			
116	£2,155	£250,000	1997	2001	4
39	£2,227	£86,857	2003		
268	£2,269	£608,000	2001		
26	£2,308	£60,000	2006		
152	£2,557	£388,590	1998	2003	5
155	£2,581	£400,000	1995	2001	6
178	£2,584	£460,000	2001	2004	3
58	£2,586	£150,000	2004		
133	£2,632	£350,000	1997		
68	£2,647	£180,000	2000	2005	5
150	£2,667	£400,000	1995	2005	10
69	£2,899	£200,000	1998	2003	5
80	£3,125	£250,000	1994	2005	11
111	£3,153	£350,000	2001	2005	4
46	£3,261	£150,000	1998		
76	£3,289	£250,000	1999		
350	£3,429	£1,200,000	2000		
57	£3,509	£200,000	2005		
170	£3,529	£600,000	1996	2005	9
45	£3,600	£162,000	2003		
137	£3,650	£500,000	1997	2005	8
43	£3,721	£160,000	2003		
56	£3,929	£220,000	1998	2002	4
76	£3,947	£300,000	1999		
77	£4,156	£320,000	1995	2000	5
66	£4,167	£250,000	1995	2005	10
17	£4,412	£75,000	1996	2004	8
88	£4,545	£400,000	1996	2004	8
95	£4,737	£450,000	2002		
33	£5,152	£170,000	2003		
290	£5,172	£1,500,000	2002		
290	£5,172	£1,500,000	2002		
48	£5,208	£250,000	1995	2005	10
131	£5,344	£700,000	1998	2003	5
17	£5,706	£97,000	1998	2002	4
51	£5,882	£300,000	1994	2006	12
55	£6,909	£380,000	1994	2002	8
42	£7,857	£330,000	1996	2005	9
62	£8,871	£550,000	1996	2001	5
87	£9,195	£800,000	2004	2005	1
49	£3673.5 (Plus salaries)	£180,00	1995	2005	10

Plan to Upgrade To A Digital CCTV System

Based on the recommendations contained in the review:

Increased Income in First Year:

£15,000 from Police
£25,000 from City Precept/Town Councils (approximate figure)

Increased income £35,000

Savings In First Year:

£24,500 from co-location of CCTV and CareConnect
£5,000 on line to Police HQ in Devizes.
£2,573 from ceasing to transmit images from Five Rivers and the Depot.
£ To be determined - from the cessation of the Council's alarm service contract.
£ To be determined - from the cessation of the enhanced fault repair service.
£570 from the removal of Bourne Hill camera number 41.

Savings £32, 643

Total for the Council:

£67, 643

It is recommended that this be divided into £33, 821 for the Council's general fund to help meet the medium term financial strategy and that the remainder be put towards upgrading the CCTV service.

It is recommended that the priority of upgrades should be as follows:

6 cameras in Amesbury
4 cameras in Wilton
Park and Ride site cameras
Culver Street Car Park cameras (at the reduced number of 10).

By upgrading these cameras first, although they may not be the cameras most in need of upgrading, further revenue savings can be made in the order of:

£8,500 from the cameras in Amesbury
£4,000 from the cameras in Wilton
£3,700 from the cameras at the Park and Ride sites
£2,000 from the cameras at Culver Street

Total £18,200.

Total from year 2-3 = £85,843.

Should any of the other methods of generating revenue as recommended in the report come to fruition then it is recommended that the monies be split half into the Council's general fund and half towards completing the upgrade of the CCTV system.

**CCTV SCRUTINY REVIEW
NOTES OF A VISIT TO LIBERTY
MONDAY, 11TH APRIL 2005**

PRESENT: Councillors: Marisha Ray
Anna Berent
Sylvia Wright
Officers: Bram Kainth
Liberty: Gareth Crossman
Mike Anderson

During discussion the following main points were made –

- Liberty not opposed in principle to use of CCTV
- CCTV did have some crime detection uses but even the Government accepted that street lighting was a more effective method of reducing crime.
- Until recently there had been an assumption that CCTV had been regulated by the Data Protection Act but a recent ruling had stated that it would only be covered if targeted on a particular individual
- Liberty were of the view that primary legislation should be introduced by Government to cover CCTV
- 90% of privately owned systems did not comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act.
- To be effective CCTV cameras needed to be properly maintained and well placed and of a modern design – fewer cameras used in this way were more effective than many cameras that were poorly placed or of poor quality
- CCTV could only ever be used as an ancillary to policing
- It was important to ensure that anybody who had access to CCTV footage was properly trained on data protection principles
- Liberty did hear stories of CCTV footage being used for inappropriate purposes, however Liberty had only ever taken action in one case, the Peck case concerning inappropriate use of CCTV footage which had gone to the European Court of Human Rights
- Local authorities tended to have strict guidelines for the use of CCTV and used it responsibly – there were more problems with privately operated CCTV

- Most people would not be aware if there was inappropriate use of CCTV involving them
- There were 4.5 million CCTV cameras and most breaches of privacy were from private sector CCTV schemes
- Other European countries did not have as large a number of CCTV cameras as the UK – to have so many cameras could be seen in itself as a cause for concern but should not be regarded as living in a ‘police’ state.
- CCTV was not a ‘magic wand’ to reduce crime and tended to have to be self regulating as there was no organisation effectively regulating it
- Liberty were of the view that there should be a separation between operation and inspection and the more independent the inspection function was the better
 - Needed to be disciplinary measures in place to ensure action could be taken if staff abused CCTV footage
 - Noted that Liberty would shortly be introducing a book dealing with privacy issues and one section would be on CCTV and Liberty undertook to forward a copy when it was produced of an executive summary in advance of the section on CCTV
- Most privately operated CCTV tended to be used in shopping centres to ensure premises were secure, to detect shoplifting and to check up on employees – this could lead to abuse and a number of companies, including larger companies were not aware that their systems were not Data Protection compliant
 - Liberty were of the view that if private sector schemes were **willing to allow** Local Authority CCTV control centres to monitor their cameras **this would** be beneficial and be an improvement – it should be noted however **that** it would tend to be the more responsible private CCTV operators **who would** be willing to subscribe to a scheme of this nature
- Liberty were of the view that the use of RIPA’s may not always be necessary and that there may on occasions be misuse of RIPA’s although they had no proof of this
- Local authorities needed to analyse when planning to **introduce/increase** CCTV whether CCTV was more effective than other measures of crime reduction e.g. more police officers, community support officers
 - CCTV did have a role but there should not be cameras everywhere – CCTV did appear to reassure people even though the Home Office now accepted that street lighting was more effective.

-
-
-
-
- Liberty had no evidence to show that different methods of surveillance were being used together to invade privacy, however it was felt that there was a complacency about intrusive surveillance in Britain – this may have something to do with Britain never having been subjected to a dictatorship unlike many other European countries
- CCTV did not really act as a deterrent to reduce crime but did assist in improving detection rates
- Would be concerned if there was CCTV saturation coverage in a city centre unless there was a valid justification for doing so
- CCTV does cause a displacement of crime, however Liberty were of the view that CCTV did not dissuade people from committing crime
- CCTV considered to be of limited use for the war on terror apart from using cameras to track a vehicle – the Police and also the security services would have other more sophisticated measures of surveillance
- Supported the use of CCTV cameras for traffic enforcement and provided it could be justified the use of traffic enforcement cameras for community safety purposes
- There was a perception amongst businesses and residents that CCTV was necessary, but there was little real evidence or rationale to support this
- Liberty could not envisage circumstances in which CCTV could lead to a miscarriage of justice
- Noted that Liberty undertook to send a copy of the CCTV Code of Practice from the office of the Information Commissioner to the Committee as evidence for the CCTV scrutiny.

BT redcare reduces ongoing rental costs

BT **redcare** is introducing a new way to reward loyalty for customers who choose to use **redcare protect** (rs1000 or rs1000d) for their CCTV transmission needs over an extensive period of time.

As of 1 January 2006 **redcare** vision is introducing term discounts on new contracts. This means that customers who commit to a three- or five-year contract with us will be rewarded with a 5% or 10% discount respectively on the ongoing rental costs. Initially the discount will only be available to new contracts, but from 1 April 2006 the term discount will be offered to customers who apply to migrate their existing contracts.

For example, on schemes with 15 circuits, the savings could be as much as £1,500 per annum in rental charges. Contracts would exist on a rolling basis with a three-month notice period applicable at the end of the three- or five-year term.

For more information on how to reduce your ongoing rental costs, please contact your account manager or email redcare@bt.com with your details, including a phone number, and we will get back to you.