



Reigate & Banstead
BOROUGH COUNCIL
Banstead | Horley | Redhill | Reigate

SIGNED OFF BY	Head of Community Partnerships
AUTHOR	Ross Spanton, Community Safety Officer
TELEPHONE	Tel: 01737 276122
EMAIL	Ross.Spanton@reigate-banstead.gov.uk
TO	Executive
DATE	Thursday, 17 December 2020
EXECUTIVE MEMBER	Cllr Rod Ashford, Executive Member for Community Partnerships

KEY DECISION REQUIRED	Y
WARDS AFFECTED	(All Wards);

SUBJECT	Rationalisation of Public Realm CCTV
----------------	--------------------------------------

RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>1. That the CCTV cameras at Bancroft and Clarendon Road Car Parks are upgraded and replaced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Upgrading cameras to digital technology replacing old analogue systemsb) Upgrading existing connections to fibre technology and enable Wi-Fi connectivity where possiblec) Undertaking local recording of images
<p>2. That the CCTV cameras within Priory Park, Memorial Park and Lady Neville Park are upgraded by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Upgrading cameras to digital technology replacing old analogue systemsb) Upgrading existing connections to fibre technology and enable Wi-Fi connectivity where possiblec) Undertaking local recording of images
<p>3. That all other Council owned public realm CCTV cameras be de-commissioned</p>

4. That the Head of Community Partnerships be authorised, in consultation with the Head of Finance and the Head of Legal and Governance, to undertake procurement and enter into contracts for the upgrade and decommissioning works, and for subsequent maintenance and running costs of the remaining CCTV cameras, with any significant variation in anticipated costs as a result of the procurement process being resolved in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Partnerships and the Head of Finance and Executive Member for Finance.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations offer a measured response to losing the current Police CCTV monitoring arrangements in the coming years. They will provide modern digital CCTV cameras in key locations in the borough.. The rationalisation recognises the developments in privately owned CCTV since the Council cameras were established and creates savings opportunities for the Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this report is to allow Members to decide on future CCTV options across the borough. It makes recommendations to retain CCTV in multi-storey car parks and in Priory, Memorial and Lady Neville Parks that have existing CCTV.
2. 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.
3. The current CCTV system is based upon old technologies and needs upgrading for technological efficiency and resilience, and for consistency with current legislation. There is now a far wider proliferation of 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.
4. The current CCTV system is expensive to maintain and would be very expensive to replace in full. In future monitoring costs would be substantial as they would have to be borne by the Council. The report presents options which consider the effectiveness of CCTV alongside the associated costs. The recommended option achieves a balance between these two considerations by proposing to retain CCTV in key locations and decommissioning the remainder, with images in future being recorded rather than directly monitored.
5. The recommended option requires an initial capital investment but is expected to deliver both a capital and a revenue budget saving over the medium term.

Executive has authority to approve the above recommendations.

STATUTORY POWERS

1. 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. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and CCTV Data Privacy Assessments were conducted on the current CCTV network in October 2019
2. The current review of public realm CCTV and the recommended options in this Executive report will ensure we implement the recommendations of the assessment and guarantee our compliance.

BACKGROUND

3. The Council currently owns a system of 111 cameras located in major town centres, multi-storey car parks, several shopping parades and parks. A further 10 cameras owned by The Holmethorpe Industrial Estate Association are powered and maintained by the Council and monitored at Reigate Police station.
4. Cameras were initially set up in Redhill, Reigate and Horley in 1996 with the system expanding over the years into Banstead, Merstham, Tadworth and Tattenhams.
5. Cameras are predominately based around an ageing analogue system that is slowly being withdrawn by communications companies.
6. The Council commissioned a CCTV consultancy company to undertake a review of our current CCTV system and to provide future options with indicative associated costs. Their advice is that ageing analogue systems will be phased out within 5 years by current network providers.
7. If the Council could move CCTV cameras to Wi-Fi connectivity this would reduce line rental costs. A full Wi-Fi survey would need to be undertaken in order to understand where current CCTV systems could be switched to Wi-Fi.
8. Surrey Police are withdrawing from hosting CCTV monitoring as part of its planned move out of Reigate Police Station.

KEY INFORMATION

Surrey Police Position

9. In 2018 Surrey Police announced that it will cease to monitor CCTV in the borough within 5 years. This has prompted us to review our commitment to CCTV, including identifying options for monitoring / recording, review the current suitability of cameras and their compliance with current legislation, ensure any upgrade options are fit for purpose and make the best use of modern technologies available and that we benefit from any return of investment in the future.

10. Surrey Police has indicated that it will provide a contribution towards the ongoing running costs of CCTV. The value of this contribution will be confirmed as part of a funding formula exercise that Surrey Police are currently undertaking with the affected Districts and Boroughs. It has also suggested that it may make a modest one-off contribution towards capital costs of transferring to a new CCTV system.
11. Surrey Police has provided the Council with feedback on the limitations of public realm CCTV in terms of the detection and prosecution of crime. Surrey Police provided data highlighting that only 1.4% (981) of all the 68,227 recorded incidents between Jan-June 2019 showed CCTV as a detecting factor. 100 of the 981 were dip checked and this showed that only 16 were attributed to public realm CCTV. Surrey Police has however recognised that there may be a benefit of public realm CCTV in certain night-time economy town centres but are not saying this is essential. It is worth noting that a significant number of privately-owned town centre premises have their own CCTV which cover the public realm. In practice, nowadays, most images used by Police are from mobile phones and private companies' CCTV. These cameras did not exist when the Council originally introduced public realm CCTV in 1995.
12. Surrey Police has a clear intention to engage a company, NICE, to licence and run a Digital Evidence Management System (DEMS). This demonstrates how it sees the best way of using CCTV imagery to support investigations. DEMS will enable members of the public and businesses to upload any mobile phone, dash cam, body worn, doorbell or business CCTV imagery to a secure site where it will be processed and assessed for future use in investigations and prosecutions. The use of this system saves time and money compared with current arrangements to secure imagery and allows for quicker investigations to take place.

Current Monitoring Arrangements

13. The current control room at Reigate Police station does not provide 24hr monitoring. It is staffed every weekday up to 10pm and at the weekends into the early hours of the morning by 1-2 staff per shift. The control room receives a total of 170 camera feeds, of which 114 are from cameras within Reigate & Banstead. The control room has 40 monitoring screens. Operators can review images by selecting a camera feed and placing it onto one of the monitors. If the camera is not being physically controlled by an operator, then it is left on a pre-set "tour" and images are recorded on a Video Management System. Image data is held for 28 days and then erased in accordance with current legislation. Control rooms must be a controlled entry dedicated space with restricted access to ensure data protection compliance and operated by appropriately trained and authorised staff.
14. A large majority of the cameras in the control room effectively operate as a remote recording system and will only become monitored if an incident is reported to the police or raised by an officer and an operator takes control of the camera.

OPTIONS

15. There are two key areas where decisions need to be made:

- What, if any, CCTV cameras to keep and upgrade
- What monitoring / recording systems to implement for these cameras

16. Table 1 identifies the primary options for cameras. It also sets out the capital financial implications of each option, namely for the initial upgrade / replacement / removal of cameras and for the ongoing capital costs, namely the capital (equipment) maintenance costs. It is important to note that these financial implications are indicative and are subject to the outcome of future procurement exercises. Table 2 sets out the options for the monitoring / recording of the images associated with the recommended camera option and the associated revenue costs, both of the monitoring / recording and of the operational costs of the CCTV network, namely the revenue (maintenance contract), broadband and electricity costs.

Table 1: CCTV Camera Options

CCTV Camera Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Forecast Budget Implications
<p>Cameras Option 1: Replace / upgrade cameras to maintain existing CCTV coverage in the multi-storey car parks, Priory, Memorial and Lady Neville Parks and remove remaining cameras.</p> <p>This is the recommended camera option.</p>	<p>This option would provide upgraded CCTV technology in key locations</p> <p>The reduced number of cameras would allow for a saving in ongoing capital and revenue costs, whilst also maintaining crime identification via CCTV in key areas in the borough, supporting public reassurance and ensuring legislative compliance.</p> <p>New equipment will have a guarantee period, limiting the short-term capital costs.</p>	<p>The Council would have reduced CCTV coverage across the borough</p> <p>Potential anxiety of residents / businesses in areas where CCTV is removed</p>	<p>Initial capital cost 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £8,000 technical consultancy incl WiFi survey • £23,000 car park upgrades • £33,000 park upgrades • £10,000 decommissioning costs <p>Total = £74,000</p> <p>Ongoing capital budget implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance (equipment) costs 2022/23 – 2024/25: £5,000 per annum (cameras in warranty) • Maintenance costs (equipment) 2025/26 onwards: £10,000 per annum (post-warranty)

CCTV Camera Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Forecast Budget Implications
<p>Cameras Option 2: Replace / upgrade cameras to maintain existing CCTV coverage in town centres, parks and multi-storey car parks and remove remaining cameras</p>	<p>Maintains and upgrades existing CCTV within town centres, parks and multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>New equipment will have a guarantee period, limiting the short-term capital costs.</p>	<p>The necessary upgrades would come at a significant cost, substantially in excess of existing capital budgets.</p> <p>Potential anxiety of residents / businesses in areas where CCTV is removed.</p> <p>High cost and resource implications in relation to public value</p>	<p>Initial capital cost 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £290,000 incl. technical consultancy and WiFi survey
<p>Cameras Option 3: Keep and upgrade all existing cameras</p>	<p>Maintains the current level of CCTV coverage and support this provides to Surrey Police</p> <p>Provides reassurance.</p>	<p>Cameras would need significant upgrades to be technologically future proofed for the analogue switch off, with costs substantially in excess of existing capital budgets.</p> <p>In a few locations legislative compliance could not be achieved.</p> <p>There would need to be a large monitoring programme established across this high number of cameras, at substantial cost to the Council, substantially in excess of existing revenue budgets.</p> <p>Capital and revenue costs would be disproportionate to public value.</p>	<p>Initial capital cost 2021/22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £640,000 incl. technical consultancy and WiFi survey

CCTV Camera Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Forecast Budget Implications
Cameras Option 4: Remove all cameras	Cost minimisation	<p>Does not provide public reassurance in key locations.</p> <p>This option would not provide any CCTV coverage in areas with existing public realm CCTV which we know are not covered by private CCTV.</p> <p>Potential anxiety of residents / businesses in areas where CCTV is removed.</p>	2021/22 one off capital cost: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £35,000 decommissioning costs
Cameras Option 5: Do nothing	We would maintain crime identification via CCTV in key areas in the borough and support public reassurance.	<p>Does not address cost, compliance or technological resilience issues.</p> <p>Does not resolve arrangements for CCTV monitoring once Reigate Police Station closes.</p> <p>This option would not be financially viable and would not provide future compliance of the CCTV equipment.</p>	<p>Retain existing annual capital programme budget of £30,000</p> <p>NB: In 2020/21 there is a further £48,000 carried forward from previous years which would be needed for extensive repair works.</p> <p>The budget would be utilised to undertake the basic maintenance and upkeep of the current large CCTV system but it would not resolve the issue of modernising the system and ensuring compliance</p>

Table 2: Monitoring / Recording Options for the Recommended Camera Option

Monitoring / Recording Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Forecast Revenue Budget Implications
<p>Monitoring / Recording Option 1: Local recording for all remaining CCTV cameras</p> <p>This is the recommended monitoring / recording option.</p>	<p>CCTV recording could be established at a main Council site and easily accessible when needed.</p> <p>Local recording would provide greater budget savings</p> <p>This option would provide savings whilst also allowing for opportunities to use CCTV footage in response to crime or ASB</p>	<p>Local recording would not provide the possibility to proactively identify or monitor crime and respond whilst it is happening</p>	<p>£25,000 per annum</p>
<p>Monitoring / Recording Option 2: Live monitoring for all remaining CCTV cameras</p>	<p>There is the potential to monitor a camera and identify a crime or ASB whilst it is happening and respond immediately.</p>	<p>In reality, live monitoring does not routinely result in crime being identified and responded to. Standard arrangements mean that cameras are only actively monitored when there is a Police report.</p> <p>There is an increased cost to 24hr live monitoring that is not proportionate to the level of crime prevention the cameras provide</p> <p>The cost of this option is not evidenced by the level of public value or public protection it would create.</p>	<p>£50,000 per annum</p>
<p>Monitoring / Recording Option 3: A combination of live monitoring and local recording for all remaining CCTV cameras</p>	<p>No significant advantages over option 2.</p>	<p>There would be a significant fixed minimum cost of live monitoring which would then increase more slowly if further cameras were included.</p> <p>Continues substantial costs of live monitoring which are not proportionate to the level of crime prevention the cameras can provide.</p>	<p>Expected to be approaching £50,000 per annum due to the significant fixed minimum cost of procuring a live monitoring service.</p>

17. The recommended actions are:

- a. To replace / upgrade CCTV cameras in the Council's multi-storey car parks and in Priory, Memorial and Lady Neville Parks
- b. That local recording arrangements are established for these cameras
- c. That remaining cameras are decommissioned.

18. These are set out as Option 1 in Table 1 and Table 2 above.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

19. The Council must comply with The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and the Data Protection Act 2018. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and CCTV Data Privacy Assessments were conducted on the current CCTV network in October 2019. These assessments highlighted a significant number of cameras where current legislation calls into question whether they have an identified pressing need. Under this legislation we should only have cameras with a clear identified pressing need. Non-compliance with the legislation could result in fines up to 4% of an organisation's turnover.

20. The recommendations put forth will ensure compliance with The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 and the Data Protection Act 2018 including the necessity and purpose of each camera installed within the Borough.

21. Further considerations have been given to Human Rights implications. Article 8 recognises the right to a private and family life. The images captured by the CCTV proposed will be purposed and necessary for the safety of those living within the Borough. This is a proportionate response in order to ensure the reduction of crime and disorder within the borough and protect the interests of public safety.

22. The 3rd Data Protection Principle within the Data Protection Act 2018: data minimalisation will be complied with, as only images required for the purpose of protecting public safety within the Borough will be obtained.

23. The 6th Data Protection Principle: appropriate technical and organisational security will be complied with, as the Council will be the sole data controllers following the cease of Police monitoring of CCTV in the public realm. THE COUNCIL will ensure the same level of data control security, as it does for all privately held information in line with Information Commissioner's Office guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

24. Building on the financial implications included as part of tables 1 and 2 in the options section above, table 3 below summarises the current budget for the CCTV service, the indicative costs for implementing the recommended options and indicative savings. It is important to note that these savings are subject to the outcome of both the WiFi survey and procurement exercises for the replacement / upgrading / removal works, as well as for the maintenance contract, the broadband contract and the electricity supply contract.

25. Surrey Police has indicated that it will provide a contribution towards ongoing running costs, the value of which will need to be confirmed with them. It is not expected that this would meet the full running costs but may reduce the call on this Council's budgets.

26. It is worth noting that only the recommended camera option combined with the recommended monitoring / recording option would allow camera upgrades to be achieved in key locations and achieve a financial saving. The other camera upgrade options would incur substantial additional capital costs beyond existing budgets. The alternative monitoring / recording options could both be delivered within the existing revenue budget, but without offering the same level of saving as the recommended monitoring / recording option, and without demonstrating a significant increase in public value or public protection.

Table 3: Indicative costs and savings from the recommended Option to (i) replace / upgrade CCTV cameras in the Council’s multi-storey car parks and in Priory, Memorial and Lady Neville Parks; (ii) that local recording arrangements are established for these cameras; and (iii) that remaining cameras are decommissioned.

		Current annual budget	2021/22	2022/23 to 2024/25	2025/26 onwards
Capital Programme	Annual Budget	£30,000 Plus additional £48,000 carried forward from previous financial years = £78,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £8,000 technical consultancy incl. WiFi survey • £23,000 car park upgrades • £33,000 park upgrades • £10,000 decommissioning costs Total: £74,000 – to be funded within existing capital programme allocation	Maintenance costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £5,000 per annum (cameras in warranty) 	Maintenance costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £10,000 per annum (post-warranty)
	Net (saving)	N/A	£34,000 saving – subject to confirmation when outcome of tendering is known	£25,000 per annum capital saving	£20,000 per annum capital saving
Revenue Budget	Budget	£88,300	£20,000 for transitional period as existing decommissions are implemented £25,000 new annual costs of maintenance, broadband and electricity	£25,000 per annum	£25,000 per annum
	Net (saving)	N/A	£43,400 saving – subject to confirmation when outcome of tendering is known	£63,000 saving – subject to confirmation when outcome of tendering is known	(£63,000) saving – subject to confirmation when outcome of tendering is known

- (i) In summary, the financial implications of the recommended option would provide savings compared to current capital and revenue budgets. These savings would increase after the initial capital investment in 2021/22.

EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

27. An Equalities Impact Assessment Part 1 Screening has been undertaken. The screening did not highlight that any particular protected characteristic was being treated less favourably by implementing the recommendations of this Executive paper.

COMMUNICATION IMPLICATIONS

27. Following the decision at Executive work will be undertaken to establish a Communication Plan jointly between the Council and Surrey Police.

28. The aims of the plan would be to update the public on the changes to CCTV and to explain what difference these changes might make. It will be important to dispel some of the common misconceptions regarding current CCTV coverage as well as promoting how the new digital systems will work to deter criminals or follow up on crime reports.

RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

29. Seen in isolation the removal of CCTV cameras could be a cause for concern amongst residents. It will be important to share clear and transparent information regarding the reasons for these changes and the ongoing CCTV that will still be in place within the new Council arrangement and via the proliferation of private CCTV in key areas of the borough.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

30. Implementing these recommendations will result in requests for appropriate Council officers to review CCTV images in relation to incidents at the camera locations. The current level of demand for review of CCTV footage is minimal and it would be anticipated that this could be incorporated into existing Council services.

CONSULTATION

31. We have consulted Surrey Police on its views of the merits of sustaining the current level of CCTV provision and the implications of a potential change to that provision.

32. We have discussed our plans with neighbouring districts and boroughs whose cameras are also controlled out of Reigate Police station.

33. Holmethorpe Estate Management Association have been made aware of the withdrawal of current control room facilities. They own 10 cameras on the system monitored out of Reigate. Once a decision has been made we will work with them as part of the decommissioning process.

POLICY FRAMEWORK
34. The recommendations of this paper align with People and Place priorities within the Council's Five Year Plan 2025.
ANNEXES
None
BACKGROUND PAPERS
None