



|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Signed off by</b>    | Head of Community Partnerships  |
| <b>Author</b>           | Justine Chatfield, Head of Community Partnerships, Isabel Wootton, Partnerships Team Leader |
| <b>Telephone</b>        | Tel: 01737 276084, Tel: 01737 276333  |
| <b>Email</b>            | justine.chatfield@reigate-banstead.gov.uk, Isabel.Wootton@reigate-banstead.gov.uk           |
| <b>To</b>               | Council   |
| <b>Date</b>             | Thursday 18 January 2024  |
| <b>Executive Member</b> | Portfolio Holder for Communities, Leisure and Culture                                       |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Key Decision Required</b> | N  |
| <b>Wards Affected</b>        | Banstead Village; Horley Central and South; Redhill East; Redhill West and Wray Common; Reigate. |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>Subject</b> | Petition: Reinstate Monitored CCTV Cameras in our Town Centres |
|----------------|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Recommendations</b>   |
| (i) <b>That Council considers the petition received seeking to reinstate monitored CCTV cameras in town centres within Reigate and Banstead.</b>   |
| <b>Reasons for Recommendations</b>   |
| Under the Council's Petition Scheme, any petition with more than 400 signatures is referred to the Council for debate.<br>The Council has received a petition of 425 signatures calling on the Council to <i>'to reinstate monitored CCTV cameras in our Borough Town Centres'</i> |

## Statutory Powers

1. The Localism Act 2011 revoked requirements placed on Councils in relation to petitions, however, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council made the decision to retain its then existing Petition Scheme.
2. The Council's then existing Petition Scheme , dated 13 March 2019, sets out how the Council will respond to petitions, and the type of response the Council will provide, based on the number of signatories to the petition.
3. The table below summarises the Council's approach:

| Number of signatories | Response   |
|-----------------------|--|
| Less than 20          | Response from Officer (treated as standard correspondence) |
| 20 - 199              | Response from the relevant Member of the Executive         |
| At least 200          | Referred to the Executive                                  |
| At least 400          | Debated at a meeting of the Full Council                   |

4. Procedure Rules 2, 3, and 4 in the Constitution require adherence to the Petition Scheme.
5. There are no statutory powers requiring the Council to have any CCTV system in use but where it does have a system a council must comply with The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and the Data Protection Act 2018.

## Key Information

### The petition

6. A petition was accepted on 5th October 2023 which requests Reigate & Banstead Borough Council:  
*To reinstate monitored CCTV Cameras in our Borough Town Centres*
7. The petition contends that:  
*Following the response by the Executive Member for Communities, Leisure and Culture, Cllr Rod Ashford, to a question at full Council from Cllr Mark Smith on 21st September 2023 regarding the removal of monitored CCTV from our Town Centres, we insist that the decision made in December 2020 be reversed. Relying on private businesses and individuals to record and capture images and video in our town centres is not right or deterrent enough.*
8. The petition suggests that:  
*Over the last 3 years since the then Council Executive made their decision to remove town centre CCTV from our Borough towns, out of 3869 total reported crimes in Redhill*

Town, for example, 2119 of them were classed in the following categories: 'Investigation Complete: No suspect Identified' (1225) and 'Unable to prosecute suspect' (894). This means that 54.7% of reported crimes in Redhill Town alone HAVE NOT resulted in a prosecution. How many of these incidents would have resulted in a prosecution had there been evidence from monitored CCTV and how many of the 3869 reports of crime in Redhill Town Centre could have been dealt with quickly by Surrey Police if there had been an active system in place to deter, detect and gather evidence?

9. It goes on to call for:
  1. The Council reinstates monitored CCTV in our town centres and reverses this decision from 3 years ago based on the information that we have now, and not the information from December 2020 which was at the end of the Covid Lockdowns.
  2. The Council will insist that Surrey Police reinstate regular patrols around all our town centres.
  3. The Council, agrees to work with Police, local businesses, shop keepers and other stakeholders to set up and operate a form of Shopwatch as used to great effect in Guildford and Runnymede to deter, detect and gather evidence of anti-social behaviour, shop lifting and other unwanted behaviours in our Borough Town Centres.
10. At its close on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2023 the petition had received 425 signatures, meaning that the threshold of reporting to the Council (400) had been exceeded.
11. In line with the Petition Scheme, details of the petition have been published and are available from the Council's website along with the e-signatories. The Petition Scheme provides that the Council will decide how to respond to the petition.
12. Council may decide to support the action the petition requests, or not, or refer the matter to the Executive (or the Executive decision maker) for further consideration. The petition organiser will receive written confirmation of Council's decision.
13. Under the Petition Scheme, a spokesperson for the petitioners may present the petition and speak at the Council meeting for up to 5 minutes.
14. A representative of the Petitioners will be attending the meeting to address Council.

### **Background: Public Realm CCTV**

15. In December 2020 the Council's Executive agreed to rationalise public realm CCTV in the Borough. The rationalisation programme had two main elements:
  - a) Upgrade the CCTV cameras in Bancroft and Clarendon Road Car Parks as well as in Priory Park, Memorial Park and Lady Neville Park and put in place local recording; and
  - b) Decommission CCTV cameras elsewhere in the Borough.
16. The Executive's decision reflected a number of considerations:
  - a) In late 2018 Surrey Police announced to District and Boroughs that it no longer wanted to host and staff CCTV control rooms and that its reliance on public realm CCTV was very low. Surrey Police gave a 5-year timescale for councils affected by these changes to establish new CCTV arrangements. The Council worked closely with Surrey Police between the 2018 Police

announcement and the 2020 Executive decision to fully understand the Police's position on CCTV and to devise the proposals which were approved by Executive in December 2020.

- b) The CCTV system was based upon old technologies and needed upgrading for technological efficiency and resilience, and for consistency with current legislation. There is now a far wider proliferation of privately owned CCTV and image capturing capabilities than when the Council's public realm CCTV cameras were installed in 1995. In practice, nowadays, most images used by Police are from mobile phones and privately owned CCTV.
  - c) The CCTV system in place was expensive to maintain and would be very expensive to replace in full, with local monitoring being significantly more expensive if it was to be funded in full by the Council.
17. Whilst the Executive decision was taken during the Covid pandemic, the data that informed this decision pre-dated the pandemic. More recent crime data shows that there has been little change to the number of recorded incidents where CCTV was a detecting factor.
18. In light of the Executive decision, the Council procured a supplier to install the new cameras and local recording and decommission the remaining cameras. The new cameras were installed in Bancroft and Clarendon Road Car Parks as well as in Priory Park, Memorial Park and Lady Neville Park and local recording was put in place in the summer of 2023.
19. In 2021 the Council terminated its contracts with broadband providers for the cameras to be decommissioned. Despite this contract termination, the providers did not terminate the broadband feed, meaning that the majority of cameras have continued to be operational and monitored until October 2023. This continued broadband connection has not been at a cost to the Council.
20. In mid-October 2023 the police identified RAAC in Reigate Police station and as a result closed their CCTV control room at the end of October. All Reigate and Banstead public realm CCTV cameras that had been reviewed there until that point then ceased to operate.
21. Given the short notice of the closure of the CCTV control room and that this occurred in advance of the wider public realm cameras being decommissioned, the Council has put in place local recording for cameras in busy locations, initially on a 6 month basis. It will review the volume of requests and usage of the images requested in advance of recommencing the decommissioning work.
22. The cameras which are due to be decommissioned are at the end of their useful lives. Therefore, if a decision was taken to support the petitioner's request to reinstate monitored CCTV in our town centres, this would require:
- a) Circa 45 of the cameras that are currently scheduled to be removed to be replaced with cameras with appropriate modern technology and broadband connectivity. An indicative estimate of the capital cost of such works is in excess of £0.300m.
  - b) Arrangements to be put in place for live monitoring of these CCTV cameras. An indicative estimate of the revenue budget cost of live monitoring is in excess of £0.100m per annum if the Council outsourced this responsibility to a

third party, and would likely be more (plus additional capital set up costs) if the Council set up an in house CCTV monitoring function.

- c) Additional funds to be made available for the associated line rental costs, utility costs and maintenance of the cameras and associated equipment such as camera poles (and any RBBC owned monitoring equipment). An indicative estimated of these costs would be in excess of £0.050m per annum.

### **Background: Police patrols in town centres**

- 23. Reigate & Banstead Borough Council has a strong working relationship with Surrey Police, including through the Reigate & Banstead Community Safety Partnership. Our Joint Enforcement Team works closely with the Police's Safer Neighbourhoods Team to ensure a regular town centre presence. However, as a Council it is not appropriate for us to seek to direct the allocation of Police resources which is the responsibility of the Police's Borough Commander and ultimately the Police and Crime Commissioner.

### **Background: Shop Watch**

- 24. A Shop Watch scheme is a network of local businesses that come together to tackle the risks associated with business crime. They can operate in town or city centres or even out of town areas where a group of businesses have decided to work together. The scheme can provide a variety of services determined by the partners, from a radio communications network to a full suite of tools including app-based data sharing software.
- 25. In some areas local authorities and the police have partnered with local businesses to set these schemes up, including in Guildford and Horsham. These schemes often include a membership charge for the technology involved.
- 26. The Council continues to be open to discussions with local businesses, including local business guilds, and the police about the potential for such schemes.

### **Options**

- 27. The Petition Scheme provides that Council will decide how to respond to the petition at this meeting. The options for the Council in relation to the petition are:
  - Option 1:** To refer the petition to the Executive or Executive decision maker for consideration;
  - Option 2:** To support the action requested on the petition, noting that the action that would arise from the petition could not proceed until funding is budgeted for (as explained in this report); or
  - Option 3:** To note the request of the petitioners and take no further action.

## **Legal Implications**

28. The statutory implications are set out above.

## **Financial Implications**

29. There are no additional budget implications in respect of continuing with the public realm CCTV provision as approved by Executive in December 2020.

30. Reversing the December 2020 Executive decision regarding CCTV would have significant capital and revenue budget implications.

31. Most of the equipment that is scheduled to be decommissioned has been in use for many years and would need replacement. Any reinstatement of live monitoring would also incur a very significant ongoing revenue budget cost to the Council. The staffing element of these revenue costs were previously borne by Surrey Police.

32. As outlined in paragraph 22 (a-c), it is estimated that these costs would be in the region of the following:

- in excess of £0.300m of capital budget growth;
- in excess of £0.150m per annum of revenue budget growth to fund running costs.

These costs would be in addition to the cost of decommissioning the remaining non-town centre cameras which are due for removal.

33. Capital and revenue expenditure would be subject to approval of budget growth proposals as part of the annual service and financial planning process, or through a separate report to Council if approval is required outside the established budget-setting timetable. If approved outside the service and financial planning process, the revenue budget implications would require the identification of compensating budget savings to fund the growth.

## **Equalities Implications**

34. An Equalities Impact Assessment Part 1 Screening was undertaken in 2020 on the CCTV Executive recommended option. It is not considered that the existing CCTV provision disadvantages any equality groups.

## **Communication Implications**

35. The Communications team have responded to a number of enquiries and social media posts regarding CCTV and will continue to respond to future posts or enquiries.

36. There are no additional communications implications relating to the options arising from this petition.

## **Environmental Sustainability Implications**

37. Options 1 and 3 above do not have any direct environmental implications.

38. However, Option 2 would have environmental sustainability implications from increased electricity consumption, with associated carbon emissions, from

equipment use and from the handling and storage of the recorded data. There will also be implications from the production and ultimate disposal of the equipment.

### **Risk Management Considerations**

39. There are no additional risk management considerations relating to the options arising from this petition.

### **Policy Framework**

40. The Policy Framework position is set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this report.

### **Background Papers**

1. <https://reigate-banstead.moderngov.co.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=61&RPID=3638366&HPID=3638366>