

# HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

---

**Scrutiny Board**

**Tuesday, 29 March 2016**

## **Review of Close Circuit Television (CCTV)**

**Report by the CCTV Scrutiny Board**

**FOR RECOMMENDATION**

**Cabinet Lead: Tony Briggs**

---

### **1.0 Purpose of Report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present a summary of the CCTV Panel's review of the Council's CCTV system.

### **2.0 Recommendations**

- (a) The Cabinet be advised that Scrutiny Board reluctantly, after much consideration, accepts that the current CCTV system no longer fulfils a majority of the original objectives, that some existing CCTV cameras may not meet the Surveillance Commissioner's 2013 code of practice and does not represent value for money for the residents of Havant Borough Council and should be discontinued..
- (b) Cabinet be recommended :
  - (i) To request the officers to investigate the feasibility of the Meridian Centre taking control of the Council's CCTV cameras currently attached to the outside of the Meridian Centre
  - (ii) To seek to ensure that the CCTV system's cameras at the bus station be incorporated into the bus station's CCTV system
  - (iii) To endorse a campaign to encourage business/shops to provide better coverage of their premises
  - (iv) To endorse a communication campaign to raise awareness of how safe it is to live in the Borough
  - (v) That in case crime and anti social behaviour in the town centres increases to a reasonable point in the future then alternative modern digital solutions be investigated forthwith
- (c) Council be recommended to

- (i) agree that in the future should a Office of Police and Crime Commissioner/Hampshire Constabulary generated requirement for a modern, digital, fully integrated, centrally monitored CCTV system seek financial support, Havant Borough Council would actively consider providing a financial contribution commensurate with other authorities
  - (ii) agree that developers and their architects be encouraged to provide for the security needs of future occupiers when designing a new building or altering a current building in Town Centres.
- (d) The Scrutiny Board be recommended to review the situation in June 2017

### **3.0 Dissenting Recommendation**

#### **Recommendation**

#### **3.1 The Cabinet be recommended to agree to:**

##### **3.1.1 the current system being continued until :**

- (a) alternative options can be explored with the incoming Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable.
- (b) traders associations are given time to consider whether they wish to fund provision for their areas and implement their plans.
- (c) a Hampshire-wide provision of CCTV is implemented.
- (d) new technology allows the cost of CCTV provision to be considerably reduced.

##### **3.1.2 A further review should be conducted in 18 months time to allow a decision to continue prior to setting the 2018/19 budget, by which time the above options should have been exhausted.**

#### **Supporting Statement**

- 3.2 CCTV is valued by the public, local businesses and the Police particularly in our town Centres.
- 3.3. The Panel has reviewed the impact of the Borough's CCTV provision, and believes it provides important community safety functions that cannot easily be met through other initiatives. As outlined in the 2013 survey, over 82% of residents feel happy to have CCTV, over 65% feel safer as a result of CCTV provision and 69% believe it should continue to be funded by the Council.
- 3.4 The first objective of the Council's CCTV system is to deter crime and anti-social behaviour. Whilst it is difficult to directly connect statistics relating to crime with the CCTV system, it is the case that crime has fallen in our town centres that are covered by CCTV.

- 3.5 The CCTV system is regularly used by the Police. It is considered important to helping with the detection and protection against crime and particularly with the deployment of resources. The Panel observed the police making effective use of the CCTV to make decisions about the deployment of officers to events. Therefore, the current CCTV system remains fit for this purpose
- 3.6 Whilst the police are unwilling to fund CCTV provision, there may be changes of approach with the upcoming election for Police and Crime Commissioner, and the appointment of a new Chief Constable. It would therefore be prudent to wait until these appointees are in place and are able to consider the possibility of police funding. It is also possible that a Hampshire-wide system may be created (possibly monitored at Netley or Winchester) – with the inherent cost savings possible through such an initiative. It would therefore be appropriate to continue local CCTV provision until these options have been exhausted.
- 3.7 Thriving town centres are vital to the future of the Borough, and evidence from businesses demonstrates the importance they give to prevention of crime and disorder. Businesses currently contribute £32.7M in business rates – with the Council retaining £3.3M. In order to build the night-time economy, CCTV has an important role to play in maintaining a safe environment for patrons. Maintaining effective CCTV provision would demonstrate the Council's support for business and growing the economy of our town centres.
- 3.8 Some town centres are supported by effective traders associations, which have the ability to bring together businesses with an interest in a thriving town centre economy. These associations could decide to provide an alternative to Council CCTV system. As there is no traders association for Havant town centre, it is not possible for an alternative funding provision from traders to be put in place at this time.
- 3.9 The Panel has also identified that some cameras outside of town centres do not comply with current regulations and will need to be decommissioned. This may result in some minor savings.

#### **4.0 Summary**

- 4.1 The Panel's deliberations have been hindered by time constraints which have not enabled the Panel to properly investigate the legal and financial aspects for alternative solutions to the current system before the existing operational contract notice period and funding for the entire system expires.
- 4.2 The Panel acknowledge that CCTV is valued by the public, local business and the Police. The Police (whom are the primary customers of the CCTV output) in particular use CCTV to obtain situational awareness of an incident enabling the efficient deployment of resources and to gather evidence.
- 4.3 However, CCTV can also be considered as invading a person's privacy, as it is capable of putting them under surveillance and recording their movements as they go about their day-to-day activities.

4.4 In the light of evidence and advice given to the Panel , a majority of the Panel accepted that the current system no longer fulfils a majority of the original objectives and does not represent value for money because:

- (1) the equipment is out of date;
- (2) a majority of the cameras are in the wrong locations and have a limited vision; and
- (3) Considered expensive when compared with other modern technologically advanced solutions

4.5 The majority of the Panel is of the view that a long term solution would be the provision of a County Wide CCTV system monitored by the Police, which has the political and financial support of all districts in the County.

4.6 A majority of the Panel would have liked to retain the existing system until alternatives to the current system could be fully investigated. However, this investigation would involve addressing complex technical, operational, financial and political issues which could not be undertaken in the short time and especially within the time constraints imposed by the Cabinet on 3 February 2016.

4.7 The majority of the Panel therefore, reluctantly, acknowledges that the current system is unfit for purpose, does not represent value for money and should be discontinued.

4.8 However, in the long term, the Panel also considers that the Council should commit itself to a County wide CCTV system to be monitored by the Police and financially supported by all districts in the County.

## **5.0 Introduction**

5.1 The Five Councils Procurement Scrutiny Panel on 20 January 2016 was given an opportunity to consider and comment upon the draft Revenue Budget for 2016/17. The Deputy Leader, Cabinet Lead for Marketing and Development, Chief Financial Officer, the Service Manager (Finance) and the Principal Accountant answered members' questions.

5.2 The key consideration of the Panel related to the retention of the CCTV system. The Panel was advised that in addition to the reasons given by the Cabinet for the removal of the system at the last meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Minute 45/1/2016), the Cabinet did not support the retention of the system because: The evidence submitted was not sufficient to justify claims that CCTV was or was not effective in preventing criminal activity;

- The angle of vision of the cameras was very limited
- A majority of cameras were located in areas which were no longer considered trouble spots.

5.3 The Panel questioned the robustness of the case for the removal of the CCTV system. The majority of the Panel considered that alternative ways of

maintaining a CCTV system at a lower cost had not been properly explored e.g. replacing a live monitoring service with a remote monitoring system or the use of a mobile remote CCTV system.

5.4 In response to these concerns the Cabinet invited Scrutiny to consider the alternative options available, for both the provision and funding, and report back to Cabinet on 1 April 2016

## **6.0 Membership of the Panel**

6.1 Councillors Branson (Scrutiny Board Chairman), Cousins, Hughes, Keast, Mackey, Lenaghan, Pike, Ponsonby, Shimbart, K Smith and Wade.

6.2 Cabinet Lead: Councillor Briggs

## **7.0 Panel's Brief**

7.1 On 3 February 2016, the Cabinet resolved that:

“on the basis that the current contract for CCTV shall not expire until 1 June 2016, Cabinet invites Scrutiny to consider the alternative options available, for both the provision and funding, and report back to Cabinet on 1 April 2016”:

## **8.0 Scope of the Review**

8.1 It was decided to undertake the review in two phases:

- Phase 1 – to ascertain whether the current system was fit for purpose and value for money; and
- Phase 2 – If Phase 1 demonstrated that the current system was not worthy of retention, to investigate alternatives to the system

## **9.0 Method of the Review**

9.1 The principle methods used to undertake the review were:

- Interviews with Council Officers, a representative of a business association, Chief Inspector Holdaway, and a Representative of the management Company of the Meridian
- Request for comments for local Business/Trader Associations
- Requests for Information from Councils who have discontinued their CCTV System
- A visit to the control centre
- Searches on the Internet of CCTV systems provided by other councils
- Advice from the Information Commissioner Office
- A survey undertaken by Big Brother Watch

## **10.0 Restraints**

10.1 The work of the Panel has been hampered by the following constraints:

## Legal

- 10.2 The contract came into effect from the 1st June 2012, for a year, with the option to extend for a further 3 years to the 1st June 2016. There is no provision for the contract to be extended beyond that date.
- 10.3 Notice has also been given to BT that the Council does not want to continue with the Redcare service for the cables connecting the CCTV System.

## Financial

- 10.4 The Budget 2016/17 does not include provision for CCTV or the funding of alternative systems.
- 10.5 The Council is expected to have an underspend £1,188m (including CIL money) in this financial year, which will be transferred into the Council's Reserves. The Chief Financial Officer had strongly advised the Scrutiny Board on 26 January 2016 that reserves should not be used to fund running costs of the CCTV system.

## Time

- 10.6 On 2 June 2015 the Scrutiny Board recommended the Cabinet to retain the current CCTV system in the budget for 2016/17. The Cabinet deferred consideration of the system until the budget process commenced for 2016/17. The Scrutiny Board was not formally notified of the Cabinet's decision to remove the CCTV system from the budget until a day before the Board was due to meet to discuss the budget for 2016/17. Although the Cabinet agreed to the Panel investigating alternatives to the system, it imposed an unrealistic time limit to properly consider alternatives and identify ways this could be funded.

## Havant Town Centre

- 10.7 Unfortunately the businesses in Havant Town Centre are not represented by a Business or Traders Association. It was therefore not possible to ascertain the view of businesses in this centre within the timescale of the review.

## 11.0 Witnesses

- 11.1 Witnesses who gave evidence to the Panel were:

- Mr Payne, Leigh Park Traders
- Mr Daniels, BTWShiels
- Chief Inspector Holdaway
- Tim Pointer, Neighbourhoods Development Team Leader

- 11.2 Mr Babb of Emsworth Business Association submitted written comments.

## 12.0 The Current System

- 12.1 The system comprises 46 active cameras, mainly town centre and transport hubs, covering in the main shops and licensed premises.

- 12.2 The CCTV control room staff of four provides 6188 hours of live monitoring per year on a 7 day per week 18 hours per day rota.
- 12.3 There is a direct radio link to Hampshire Police control room and three local Shop Watch schemes.
- 12.4 The current cost to Havant Borough of public space CCTV provision is £154,096.

	£
Staffing - Legion	78,500
Maintenance - Chroma	11,600
BT Redcare	52,496
Rent	3,500
Electricity	3,000
Other	5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>154,096</b>

Note – “other” includes parts not covered by maintenance contract, sundry items, air conditioning etc.

- 12.5 The Panel has been advised that the cameras and cables will be removed after the expiration of the Legion and Redcare contracts: the cameras may be sold to offset some of the decommissioning costs. The net costs of decommissioning of the system will be approximately £20,000.

### **13.0 Phase I – Is the Current CCTV System fit for Purpose and Value for Money**

- 13.1 The Panel initially directed its attention to whether the current system is fit for purpose by considering whether the current system met the following objectives set by the Council when it introduced the system in 1999:

- To tackle crime and anti-social behaviour
- To increase public reassurance by reducing the fear of crime
- To support the emergency planning process
- To inform the emergency services response to major incidents
- To assist in the security and management of the Council’s assets

- 13.2 The Panel also considered whether the current camera locations compliant with the Surveillance Commissioner’s 2013 code of practice.

#### **Does the System Tackle Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour?**

- 13.3 The existing system is only having a limited impact on crime and ASB as evidenced by the reduction of arrests attributed to the system. Although the Police advised that the loss of the CCTV system will have an impact on the Police, there is no data linking arrests with CCTV usage. The Panel was advised by Chief Inspector Holdaway that a change in policy has resulted in a reduction in the number of arrests.- the police now summons to court for such

offence as shoplifting when appropriate He therefore suggested that offences leading to an arrest were not a good performance indicator to use for the effectiveness of CCTV.

- 13.4 The Police advised that HBC's system was one of a number of CCTV footage sources used by the Police: CCTV footage from shop systems was also used. The Police also used body worn cameras.
- 13.5 The Police and Leigh Park Traders gave evidence that the current cameras were no longer in the right positions to be of use and the fields of vision were inadequate. There are also an insufficient number of cameras and fields of vision to enable the system to be used to track and apprehend persons suspected of having committed a crime.
- 13.6 The Leigh Traders relied upon their own CCTV systems and local Shopwatch: suspicious behaviour was mainly reported direct to the Police. Havant's Shop watch system was less developed than Leigh Park's scheme with only three business taking part in the scheme: unlike Leigh Park, Havant Town Centre did not have a Business or Traders Association. The Meridian Centre is well covered by its own CCTV system which is not linked to the police and covers only its own property.

#### **Does the System Increase Public Reassurance by Reducing Fear of Crime?**

- 13.7 The public generally like CCTV and feel safer because of it. A survey conducted in 2013, and evidence from the Police, the Meridian Centre property Management Company, the Emsworth Business Association and ward councillors indicated that there was clear support for the continuance of the CCTV system.
- 13.8 However, although the Leigh Traders Association acknowledged that the public considered that CCTV was a deterrent, it felt that the current system was unfit for purpose and was of little benefit to traders.

#### **Does the System Aid the Emergency Services?**

- 13.9 The location of the cameras has proved to be of little value to the emergency planning process or indeed to major incidents as the CCTV control room is potentially placed in the area of greatest threat and would therefore be evacuated if the Town Centre was at risk.

Since the introduction of the CCTV system, advances in mobile telecommunications systems allow the location of an individual calling the emergency services to be automatically displayed in Police Operations Centres. The Next Generation of 999 systems (NG999) is seeking to enable individuals to transmit live imagery direct to the operations centre from their handsets.

#### **Does the System Assist in the Security and Management of the Council's Assets?**



- 13.10 The main Council asset covered by the system is the Bus Station which could be provided with its own recording system.
- 13.11 Since the last control room upgrade technology has advanced and therefore the system is already dated. The actual cameras are dated and out of warranty, they are no longer supported by the manufacturer. The Panel was advised that current CCTV system used by some traders in Leigh Park were more effective and up to date than the Council's cameras.
- 13.12 The control room and cameras were upgraded in 2009/10 to enable digital recording. The cameras are of a type that is no longer supported by the manufacturer and therefore have a limited life. The control room and recording equipment is in relatively good condition but there is a growing need for maintenance of the air conditioning and display screens.

**Are the current camera locations compliant with the Surveillance Commissioner's 2013 code of practice?**

- 13.13 The code was developed to explain the legal requirements operators of surveillance cameras were required to meet under the Protection of Freedoms Act.

“Using surveillance systems can be privacy intrusive. They are capable of placing large numbers of law-abiding people under surveillance and recording their movements as they go about their day to day activities. You should therefore carefully consider whether or not to use a surveillance system. The fact that it is possible, affordable or has public support should not be the justification for processing personal data.....”

- 13.14 There is a requirement to undertake regular assessments of every single camera to ensure that they are a necessary and proportionate response to the problem that they had been placed to tackle. An evaluation and privacy impact assessment are therefore required for each existing camera.
- 13.15 An initial assessment of the usage/demand placed of the existing cameras has indicated that with the exception of the camera system in Havant Town Centre there is very little demand and therefore potentially justification for their continued usage.
- 13.16 The Panel noted two occasions where incidents of violence were alleged to have taken place in the proximity of council owned CCTV systems. On analysis, the position of the cameras (height, angle, distance from scene) resulted in the capture of inconclusive imagery that was unable to support the subsequent investigations. On the other hand, those who visited the control room were given very good examples of how cameras can assist the police in establishing the need to deploy officers to a site; Car number plate recognition was also demonstrably good.

Conclusion

- 13.17 The Current system is not fit for purpose for the following reasons

- With the exception of providing public reassurance and reducing the fear of crime the CCTV system no longer fulfils the Councils stated objectives.
- The system is already dated and likely to need remedial work to maintain in the future.
- With the possible exception of the cameras in the town centres there is a concern that very few of the remaining cameras would potentially meet the “necessary and proportionate” test as set by the Surveillance Commissioner’s Code of Practice and therefore their continued usage may not be justified.

#### **14.0 Does the current surveillance system represent value for money?**

- 14.1 Havant Borough Council is the sole provider of funds to the CCTV system yet it has been established that Hampshire Police are the main beneficiaries of the service. The Panel has been advised that attempts to raise funding for the CCTV system have unsuccessfully been sought from the Police and local business. In the case of the Police, Chief Inspector Holdaway confirmed previous advice, that if the Police funded HBC’s CCTV system it would be obliged to fund all the CCTV provided by the Council across the County, which the force could not afford.
- 14.2 The available data would indicate that there has been a sizeable reduction in arrests and incidents captured by the system.
- 14.3 The existing system relies on cameras at fixed locations established over ten years ago as being the most appropriate to address surveillance objectives. They do not afford any coverage outside of the immediate arc of vision and many are still located in areas where crime has dropped considerably and cannot be relocated to other areas where anti-social behaviour incidents have increased.

#### **Conclusion**

- 14.4 It is clear that the Police value the CCTV system as an effective resource as it enables them to scan an area before deploying officers to respond to issues especially in town centres.
- 14.5 However, the Council does not benefit substantially from the existing CCTV system. The system is also very limited in its scope as it is in fixed locations and therefore unable to respond to matters arising in other parts of the borough. It is questionable therefore as to whether the system therefore presents Havant Borough Council value for money.

#### **15.0 Experience of Council’s Who Have Discontinued CCTV**

- 15.1 The Big Brother Watch Report 2016 indicated that that the following Councils had ceased funding their CCTV systems:

- Ceredigion
- South Bucks
- Forest of Dean
- Craven
- Copeland
- Eden
- Tandridge
- Suffolk Coastal
- Rushcliffe

15.2 These Councils were requested to indicate whether there had been an effect on crime figures and whether the public have noticed the difference. To date the Councils have replied as follows:

*South Bucks District Council*

- 15.3 In April 2014 South Bucks District Council decided to switch off the CCTV cameras in their district. A decision was made to keep the cameras in situ as it would have cost more money to have removed the cameras and poles and there was always the possibility of them being switched on again in the future.
- 15.4 With regards to crime figures, there has been no notable increase in crime (although the cameras were installed primarily in town/ village centres where we tend to not see burglary dwelling offences and have very little violent crime linked to night-time economy).
- 15.5 Residents' Responses – A few residents who have complained that the loss of the CCTV cameras has denied them access to footage from the cameras on road traffic incidents. In all these cases the cameras, even if switched on would not have captured the incidents as they were pointing the opposite way.

*Cumbria Council*

- 15.6 The districts in Cumbria indicated they would no longer fund CCTV, so the Police and Crime commissioner stepped in with some funding to upgrade the system. It is now monitored from a central hub at Police headquarters.
- 15.7 Three other Councils, not mentioned in the report have discontinued CCTV:

*Weymouth and Portland District Council*

- 15.8 The Cabinet had reached the point where closure of their CCTV system was necessary to make service review savings. The Office of the Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner is leading a review and has proposed a pan Dorset CCTV system at a centralised location to incorporate a number of smaller systems this would result in considerable savings for the Council. The OPCC has also identified substantial capital funds to enable this proposal.

*Lancaster City Council*

15.9 Lancaster City Council (January 2016) the Councils budget proposals on the 19th January 2016 recommended that the Council no longer funds the public CCTV system from April 2017.

Carmarthenshire Council:

15.10 The Council requested Police & Crime Commissioner to utilise Police funding to maintain the CCTV service. He declined to do so the Council agreed to cease funding of live monitoring of CCTV (February 2015).

## **16.0 Phase 2 - Alternatives to the Current CCTV System**

16.1 The following options had been investigated by the Panel/Officers:

- (1) the viability of entering into a joint CCTV system with Gosport and Fareham Councils. However, the costs of £50,000 to £70,000 could not be justified;
- (2) using mobile cameras. A camera had been purchased. However, the costs of installing the cameras could not be justified and there were doubts whether their use would pass the privacy impact assessments;
- (3) Redeployable wireless CCTV

WCCCTV, who are a leading supplier of wireless CCTV, have advised that they provide a 4G system whereby cameras can be left recording and then subsequently viewed if an incident is reported within the cameras scope.

They are predominantly used in conjunction with a staffed CCTV control room but could be deployed separately.

The cost per camera over a three year period would be in the region of £10K but this would be dependent upon the actual wifi usage.

The most common usage of their cameras is to deploy to a particular area and monitor activity such a fly tipping.

- (4) CCTV Van

The Safer Havant Partnership had funded a mobile CCTV van that was capable of deployment to crime and anti social behaviour hotspots. The Panel could consider the costs and benefits of providing re-deployable surveillance equipment to the Police to enable them to combat crime and anti social behaviour. The Panel was advised by the Police that mobile vans had limited uses and were resource intensive.

An AS newly equipped CCTV van with tower would be in the region of £100K.

- (5) ARC

Two ARC providers of remote monitoring have been asked if they provide a public space CCTV delivery service. However there are concerns that this would represent monitoring from a control room and raises employment and TUPE issues.

“Secure it” who deliver such a service in Birmingham have advised that they can potentially utilise current or install new Cameras and then transmit the product to a Central hub which can in turn transmit images to a Police control room. The cost in Birmingham comes in at Circa £7,000 - £8,000 per camera per year once the initial capital payments have been made.

- (6) Encourage Shop Owners/Businesses to provide CCTV Coverage Of their Premises

If business/shops provided better coverage of their premises, this would make the shops/business more secure and at the same time enable the police to more effectively apprehend suspects across shopping centres/areas.

Mr Daniels of BTWShiels indicated that the centre might be prepared to take control of the cameras on the outside of the Meridian Centre.

The Panel noted that in the case of Hayling Island, community associations/halls had provided their own CCTV systems.

- (7) Direct control of the CCTV Cameras by the Police Control Room

Chief Inspector Holdaway indicated that the Police were willing to investigate the possibility of controlling the existing cameras from the Police Control Room

- (8) Purchase Mobile Cameras for Use by the Police

To Improve the Public's level of confidence in relation to crime and anti Social behaviour.

- (9) Consider a communication campaign to raise awareness of how safe it is to live in Havant.

- (10) Encourage Shop Owners/Businesses to provide CCTV Coverage Of their Premises

If business/shops provided better coverage of their premises, this would make the shops/business more secure and at the same time enable the police to more effectively apprehend suspects across shopping centres/areas

- (11) To Improve the Public's level of confidence in relation to crime and anti Social behaviour

Consider a communication campaign to raise awareness of how safe it is to live in Havant. Inform the public that while a small number of council-owned CCTV cameras were being switched off, there has been a significant increase in privately owned mobile video devices, including; private/business CCTV systems, vehicles having 'dashboard' cameras, all Hampshire Police Officers are equipped with 'body worn video' cameras and the majority of the general public have video recording capability integrated into their mobile phones, all of which would assist the Police in gathering evidence.

## **17.0 Implications**

- 17.1 **Resources:** There is no budgetary provision in the 2016/17 for CCTV. Continuing to provide a non-statutory service such as CCTV in future years must be viewed in the light of the wider budget position. The Council is working towards filling a £1.4m budget gap over the next 3 years and projects underway will not fill the whole budget gap. The new Government's plans for further austerity could increase the size of the gap through cuts in funding, additional responsibilities or potentially increased demand for statutory services following proposed legislation such as welfare reform and Right to Buy. Because the Council is required to set a balanced budget approving the continuation of CCTV at this time will limit the Council's options for meeting its strategic aims of continuing to provide key frontline services and not increase Council Tax.
- 17.2 **Legal:** In developing recommendations for CCTV, regard has been given to ensuring that these measures comply with all relevant legislation. The contract with Legion came into effect from the 1st June 2012, for a year, with the option to extend for a further 3 years to the 1st June 2016. There is no provision for the contract to be extended beyond that date.
- 17.3 **Strategy:** The employment of CCTV within the Borough directly impacts the perception of safety of Havant. This has an additional effect of our mission as a council, making Havant increasingly prosperous and putting customers at the centre of what Havant does.
- 17.4 **Risks:** the lack of CCTV within the Borough could contribute to levels of crime, both petty and serious.
- 17.5 **Communications:** Hampshire Constabulary have been contacted regarding the use of CCTV within the Borough.
- 17.6 **For the Community:** The active use of CCTV benefits community safety.
- 17.7 **Consultation**

Discussions regarding CCTV have been undertaken with Havant Borough Council officers and leading councillors.

## **Appendices:**

**None**

**Background Papers:**

Big Brother Watch Report – February 2016

Report by the Environment and Neighbourhood Quality Panel on a Review of CCTV (June 2015)

Details on the performance of the CCTV system and locations cameras (December 2015)

Responses to questions raised by the Panel relating to the location, operation and effectiveness of the current CCTV system

Costings of the current CCTV system

Contact: Councillor Branson

Title: Chairman of the Scrutiny Board

Telephone:

E-Mail: [Jackie.branson@havant.gov.uk](mailto:Jackie.branson@havant.gov.uk)