



Report to: Cabinet Meeting - 19 December 2023
 Portfolio Holder: Paul Taylor, Public Protection & Community Relations
 Director Lead: Matthew Finch, Director - Communities & Environment
 Lead Officer: Jenny Walker, Business Manager - Public Protection, Ext. 5210

| Report Summary | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Type of Report | Open Report, Key Decision |
| Report Title | CCTV System Review |
| Purpose of Report | To seek the Cabinet’s approval on the recommendations proposed following a review of the Council’s CCTV systems. |
| Recommendations | <p>That Cabinet approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the CCTV replacement scheme as set out in Appendix 1; b) the recommendation for all CCTV cameras moving forward to become in the full ownership of NSDC as detailed in paragraph 2.2 of the report; c) the continuation of NSDC’s membership in the CCTV partnership; d) the creation of a CCTV Project to undertake a detailed feasibility exercise to provide a full business case on the possibility of bringing CCTV in house; and e) the allocation and draw down of £8,200 from the Capital Feasibilities Reserve to be allocated to the CCTV Revenue Cost Centre. |
| Alternative Options Considered | <p>Continue with the current CCTV partnership accepting that NSDC will continue to share Control Room resources with partners and the service level will remain as is.</p> <p>Delay the replacement programme until cameras fail beyond economic repair.</p> |
| Reason for Recommendations | To enhance the Council’s management of their CCTV systems in addition to improving and updating our coverage across the district in line with the Community Plan objective of maximise the use and effectiveness of CCTV to deter crime and bring offenders to justice. |

1.0 **Background**

1.1 In support of the Council's ongoing efforts to tackle issues surrounding Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) in the District, an ASB Policy & Performance Improvement Working Group was formed. The working group made several recommendations which were brought to Cabinet on 21 February 2023. (Full report available [here](#) at Pg 308). Cabinet supported the recommendations made by the working group.

1.2 There were several themes within the recommendations, one of those related to CCTV. This review focuses on the following recommendations:

- a. The location of CCTV cameras is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure they are located where they may have the greatest impact. Where appropriate acting to remove obstructions which may impair the visibility of specific cameras.
- b. Undertake further research on the viability of the use of facial recognition.
- c. ASB team to discuss with those in the CCTV partnership about how to make the control room more effective including making efforts to reduce the number of third-party events that take place, to ensure a tight focus on crime and ASB prevention.
- d. A further piece of work is commissioned to assess the feasibility of bringing the CCTV operation in house.

1.3 This report is aimed at building up a more detailed picture of what CCTV systems NSDC holds whilst making subsequent recommendations based on the findings.

1.4 **CCTV Review**

1.4.1 A detailed review has been undertaken of the current CCTV assets across the district that are managed by NSDC and are monitored via the partnership in the CCTV Control Room located at Police Headquarters, Sherwood Lodge. All town and parish councils have been contacted in relation to the CCTV review and to request their comments. These can be found in **Appendix 2**.

1.4.2 Camera ownership - the Council's network of CCTV comprises of 74 cameras, of which the Council wholly owns 60 cameras across the district with a further 14 of these being jointly owned/leased to other organisations (full details at section 1.4.9). All are monitored by the CCTV Partnership, which includes monitoring of cameras in Ashfield, Broxtowe and NSDC.

1.4.3 Serviceability – The CCTV cameras are maintained through the existing partnership as part of maintenance contract. When the CCTV control room notes that there is a fault with the camera feed, this is reported to the contractor Baydale. The contractor will then visit and determine what the issue is and whether it can be fixed or not. The review identified 10 cameras that were showing faults, these were in the process of being investigated by Baydale. It was determined that 6 cameras be replaced and 1 was repaired. Due to the demands of the maintenance contract and wider national demands, time availability is limited and therefore it is sometimes necessary to wait a number of weeks for replacements to be undertaken. The replacement scheme has taken this into account and is designed to replace around 10 cameras per year. This takes into account the date they were installed and looks to replace all cameras and reset the replacement scheme to cameras being replaced every 10 years unless breakdowns require earlier replacements.

1.4.4 The table below shows the camera locations where faults were identified, and the actions taken.

| Camera No | Location - Street Name | Area | Action taken |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| 12 | Market Place (NatWest) | Newark | Replaced |
| 25 | Castle Station Car Park | Newark | Ordered and awaiting replacement |
| 27 | Mather Road | Newark | Replaced |
| 28 | Mather Road Play Area | Newark | Replaced |
| 39 | Lakeside (London Road - Lidl) | Newark | Repaired |
| 60 | Southwell - Church Street | Southwell | Replaced |
| 61 | Southwell - Queens Street | Southwell | Replaced |
| 62 | Southwell - King Street Car Park | Southwell | Replaced |
| 63 | Southwell - Market Place/King Street | Southwell | Ordered and awaiting replacement |
| 67 | Southwell - Leisure Centre | Southwell | Ordered and awaiting replacement |
| 65 | Southwell - Church Street Car Park | Southwell | Replaced |

1.4.5 **Camera locations and right to remain** - The full list of camera locations can be found at **Appendix 3**.

1.4.6 Principle 1 of the Surveillance Camera Commissioner code of conduct states that '**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**'. By looking back at the camera data for the period of July 2021 – June 2023 we applied this principle to each camera group. Reviewing the number of incidents recorded and disclosure requests received from Nottinghamshire Police, it was determined from the review that all cameras retained the right to remain, however this will be reviewed regularly in line with the Surveillance commissioners code of conduct following reviewed internal processes to be utilise moving forward to ensure continued compliance.

1.4.7 Full details of the number of incidents and disclosures noted from each camera can be seen at appendix 4, however please note some key details below:

- There were a total of 9242 incidents recorded across the CCTV network during this period.
- In addition, there were a total of 1820 footage request disclosures requested. (Noting that a disclosure request may/may not be requested in response to a known incident)
- Cameras in the area around Cartergate showed the higher number of incidents with the camera at Boyes recording 678 incidents and receiving 148 disclosure requests and the Beaumont Inn recording a similar number (634/119)

- The range of incidents recorded is 10 (Southwell leisure centre) to 678 (Boyes, Carter Lane) with a mean average across the network of 136.
- The cameras at Castle House have captured 56 incidents. However, no disclosures have been noted.

1.4.8 Installation details – The review noted a wide range of data regarding the cameras. This included the make/model, installation date, circuit details and several other specifications which helped build a picture of the CCTV system. Key aspects to note include:

- We currently have 18 cameras that were installed in October 1999
- Whilst we have one camera that was installed in 2010, most of the Council's systems were installed prior to this with the period of 2000-2006 showing the most installations.
- We have 9 different make/model types across the network.
- The most represented is Bosch where we own 50 'Mic1 – 400' cameras.
- We hold 18 Mark Mercer cameras however it is noted that these have a poor reputation within the monitoring team and that replacement parts are no longer available.
- CCTV replacement scheme budget is in place (£140,500) we have ordered and replaced those found to be faulty and beyond repair reducing the budget to £112,086. The proposed replacement programme can be found in Appendix 1
- Safer Streets 4 project saw the replacement of 4 CCTV cameras and additional 3 cameras installed in Newark Town Centre outside of the existing CCTV Replacement Budget

1.4.9 Management and invoicing - The Council currently has 16 cameras which are partly owned by other organisations. Details of this ownership and payments associated can be seen in Table 2 below. Three of these cameras (25, 60 and 61) are being replaced imminently through the replacement programme.

1.4.10 The shared ownership/leasing of these cameras has a budgeted income of £30,850. There have been some disputes in relation to payments of some of the invoices and the reduction in income in those areas has been absorbed for a number of years due to the lack of formalised agreements in place. In addition to third party charges, the housing revenue account (HRA) is recharged at £19,170 per annum and interdepartmental recharges for the CCTV provisions for council facilities such as the lorry park, car parks, depots etc are also undertaken.

| Camera No. | Invoiced To | Frequency | Invoice Amount |
|------------|---------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 25 | NCHA (being replaced) | 6 Monthly | £2,680 (£5,360pa) |
| 35 | Reach Learning Disability | Annual | £2,430 |
| 39 | Lidl | Annual | £5,470 |
| 40 | Balderton Parish Council | Annual | £1,130 |
| 42 | Riverland (Newark) | Annual | £3,030 |
| 43 | Riverland (Newark) | Annual | |
| 44 | Riverland (Newark) | Annual | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------|-------------------------|
| 45 | Riverland (Newark) | Annual | |
| 62 | Southwell Town Council B | Annual | £10,560 |
| 65 | Southwell Town Council B | Annual | |
| 60 | Southwell Town Council A (being replaced) | Annual | |
| 61 | Southwell Town Council B (being replaced) | Annual | |
| 63 | Southwell Town Council A | Annual | |
| 66 | Southwell Town Council B | Annual | |
| 70 | NCHA | Annual | £560 |
| 80 | NHS Trust, Kings Mill | Annual | £2,310 |
| TOTAL THIRD PARTY INCOME GENERATED | | | £30,850 annually |

Table 2. – Cameras related to third parties

1.4.11 Due to the complexities of the CCTV scheme in its current form, the review has considered the most efficient way moving forward for the CCTV cameras in terms of ownership and maintenance. There is a legacy of ownership and agreement inaccuracies, which it has not been possible to resolve.

1.4.12 The CCTV replacement programme set out in Appendix 1 is looking to replace all cameras on the system, regardless of who may have contributed to the original installation. From this time, it is considered that all cameras should remain in NSDC control and ownership in the future, which will ensure a consistent approach to the system as a whole and will allow for a set process to be created to manage any future request for cameras to be added to the system. This would negate the need for complex service level agreements and contracts (a review of the position in relation to legal arrangements will be needed if this proposal is not approved) but will reduce the income received to the service.

1.4.13 Facial recognition cameras - Further research was conducted on the viability of the use of facial recognition in our network. It is recommended that this is NOT pursued due to the following reasons:

- **Privacy rights** - The threat to individual privacy is a significant downside of facial recognition technology.
- **GDPR implications** - When used for identification purposes, facial recognition data is considered as part of the 'special category' of personal data under the UK's implementation of the GDPR. This categorisation places additional requirements on the organisation to ensure data security is maintained. Further assessment would be required to ensure legal compliance is maintained with this type of processing. The main area of concern with this processing is the accuracy and potential bias and discrimination within the technology and how this could lead to misidentification and the damage or detriment that accompanies that. The ICO have highlighted additional concerns such as the justification for capturing and processing biometric data, the lack of choice to individuals, effectiveness and accuracy, processing children and vulnerable persons data.
- **Data vulnerabilities** - There is also concern about the storage of facial recognition data, as these databases have the potential to be breached.

- **The Technology is imperfect** - Facial recognition is far from perfect and cannot be relied upon to produce accurate results in place of human judgement. The technology depends upon algorithms to make facial matches. Those algorithms are more effective for some groups, such as white men than other groups such as women and people of colour due to lack of representation within the data set on which the algorithm was trained. This creates unintentional biases in the algorithms which could in turn translate to biases in whatever action the technology is informing, such as arrests.
- **Cost** – Installing such technology would come at considerable cost and risk. It is noted that previous trials conducted by the Metropolitan Police cost over £0.200m and resulted in no arrests.

1.4.14 CCTV Review Consultation

1.4.15 As part of the CCTV review process a consultation letter was sent to all Town and Parish Councils to advise that a review was taking place to be reported to Cabinet. The letter invited comments from the Town and Parish councils on the NSDC CCTV system as it currently stands. Some may have no involvement with the current service as they have no cameras located in their area, but they may have previously requested or looking to request for CCTV cameras to be installed and there are a number who do have cameras located in the area and it was important to seek their views on how the service works from their perspective.

1.4.16 There were limited responses to the consultation with only 3 being provided. These have been provided in Appendix 2. A key area to note in those responses provided relate to the view that the current service is a reactive one rather than proactive and the lack of wider transparency and promotion of the service.

1.5 Re-deployable CCTV Cameras

1.5.1 NSDC has 13 re-deployable CCTV cameras. These cameras are used in locations that do not have a permanent camera installed but where it is deemed necessary to install a CCTV camera to monitor a location. There is a set process in place for the deployment of these cameras to ensure compliance with the Surveillance Commissioner. The CCTV review undertaken highlighted those re-deployable cameras that are under regular review. The remaining cameras have been reviewed and will be removed in line with the requirements.

1.5.2 Any request for a siting of a re-deployable camera requires a site location to be undertaken to understand the locality, access to a suitable column to install the camera to, access to electricity, consideration of viewing capabilities and any image blockages such as buildings and trees and a localised consultation with surrounding neighbours. All cameras deployed are reviewed every three months in line with the requirements to determine if they should remain.

1.5.3 The table below shows the location of the current re-deployable cameras and how long they have been in situ.

| Camera No. | Camera Location | Duration (days) | Comments |
|------------|--|-----------------|---|
| 3001 | Blidworth skate park | 331 | Pending removal following review. |
| 3002 | Rowen Way, Balderton | 45239 | Further review required to establish ownership/retention/necessity of camera |
| 3003 | Fourth Avenue Edwinstowe | 282 | To be removed |
| 3004 | London Road Car Park/ Library | 136 | To remain in situ until next review |
| 3005 | Riverside Arena 1 | 1094 | Camera being replaced with a permanent camera – awaiting installation |
| 3006 | Riverside Arena 2 | 1094 | On loan to parking services. Pending removal once permanent replacement for 3005 installed. |
| 3007 | Gold Crest, Clipstone play park | 127 | To remain in situ until next review |
| 3008 | South View Court/Vessey Close, Balderton | 807 | To be removed |
| 3009 | Visitor Centre Edwinstowe | 254 | Protecting NSDC asset. Permanent solution being sourced. Remain until next review. |
| 3010 | Brunel Drive Depot, Newark | 345 | Protecting NSDC asset. Permanent solution being sourced. Remain until next review |
| 3011 | Storage | | Not in use |
| 3012 | Storage | | Not in use |
| 3013 | Wilson Street Newark | 311 | To be removed |

1.6 CCTV Partnership

1.6.1 The CCTV partnership is managed by Broxtowe Borough Council, on behalf of NSDC and Ashfield. The partnership is responsible for the following:

- **Provision of CCTV Control Room** – Location and equipment
- **Maintenance Contract** – All CCTV cameras in all partnership areas
- **Staffing Contract** – provision of staff within the control and control room manager
- **Out of hours function** – The CCTV control answers all out of hours calls for the partnership councils, in addition for NSDC they are responsible for the lorry park barriers and the bollards in town centre.

1.6.2 The partnership agreement was renewed on 1st April 2023 and continues thereafter for 3 years, unless terminated sooner by unanimous agreement of all parties. Any individual party may withdraw from the partnership by providing 24 months' notice in writing to the other members.

1.6.3 All partners contribute to the collective costs for the areas listed above. Any partner withdrawing would be liable for TUPE of one third. Charging is based on incidents and activities each month. It is important to note that the CCTV cameras from NSDC represent the highest percentage with 52% of the total cameras monitored in the control room. Detailed costs are provided in Appendix 5.

1.6.4 Costs of CCTV Partnership – As part of the partnership the annual costs relate to the following:

- **Lease of the control room** location at Police Headquarters, Sherwood Lodge including costs of the Police mast rental NSDC proportion of 52% is **£9,100**
- **CCTV Control Room Monitoring** (end date April 2026) NSDC proportion of 43% – Provision of 24-hour staffing of the control room and control room manager **£93,680.32**
- **Maintenance contract** (end date April 2026) NSDC Proportion 52% as we have the most CCTV cameras **£29,009.16**
- **Total costs = £131,787 per annum**

1.6.5 Consideration has been given to the suggestion to bring the CCTV operation in house and leave the partnership as requested through the ASB Working Group (recommendation d).

1.6.6 Continuation of the Partnership

1.6.7 The partnership has been in operation for a number of years and has developed good working relationships between the partners. The partnership has developed over the years and where improvements can be made for the benefit of all these have been progressed. There is limited scope to deliver further improvements in the current partnership arrangements. NSDC do have the majority share of the cameras monitored by the control room but time must also be allocated to the other areas and for the other elements the control room picks up such as help points, barriers, bollards and out of hours.

| Pro's | Con's |
|---|---|
| Current service level will continue as it currently stands. | <p>Service level falls below that expected of a standard operational CCTV control room in that most of the work undertaken is reactive and not proactive.</p> <p>Members and town and parish councils have expressed their concerns in relation to the need for proactive not reactive monitoring</p> |
| Control Room currently housed within Sherwood Lodge at Police Headquarters under a lease agreement. This is at cost to the partnership and poses a risk should the space be required by the Police and the lease terminated | <p>This location is out of the NSDC District and not easily accessed by local police officers or officers within NSDC requiring footage.</p> <p>The agreement for usage of the room at Sherwood Lodge expires on 31st March 2027. NSDC currently pays 52% of the rental costs for Sherwood Lodge</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Control Room is currently fully equipped and only necessary to repair/replace when required. This cost has been shared across the partnership.</p> | <p>The equipment in place has been in use for a number of years and is running Windows 7, which is now out of support and is no longer the best available technology. The maintenance contractors have advised that the system being dated is now affecting how well the new replacement cameras we are installing are operating. They have recommended a new synectics system be installed the costs of which would be split across the partners.</p> |
| <p>The ongoing costs for staffing, maintenance and any items requiring repair/replacement is shared between the Partnership</p> | <p>Due to how the staffing costs are calculated, NSDC pay around 43% of the monthly charge. This figure fluctuates depending on how many incidents take place on the cameras, the OOH service and the barriers, which are manually operated (NTC and Lorry Park)</p> <p>NSDC pays 52% of the maintenance costs as we own/operate the most cameras.</p> |
| <p>Broxtowe and NSDC take an active role in the partnership.</p> | <p>One of the partners may decide to discontinue the partnership in a time frame most suitable for them.</p> |
| <p>The CCTV provision is not a statutory function, but it does provide a service to the public increasing their feelings of safety and assists in the prevention and detection of crime.</p> <p>The increased feeling of safety is attractive to the current businesses and a consideration for any new businesses wishing to come to the district.</p> | <p>The provision of CCTV is a costly service for a non-statutory function. Although some funds have been obtained previously from Parishes and Town Councils, the largest benefactor, Nottinghamshire Police does not contribute</p> |
| <p>The Control Room is currently staffed 24/7</p> | <p>There could be a greater amount of CCTV viewing coverage if control room staff were not also engaged in other activities such as out of hours provisions</p> |

1.6.8 Bringing the CCTV Service Provision In-House.

1.6.9 Initial conversations have taken place with two external CCTV specialists to establish the costs for undertaking a feasibility study. This would include a review of the current CCTV system in place, for the creation of a business case to provide both revenue and capital cost implications of bringing the service in house, alongside setting out the detailed pros and cons for the options available.

- 1.6.10 Alongside the development of a detailed business case consideration on sources of funding would also be necessary. The Towns Fund could provide funding towards the capital costs due to the contribution the system would make to crime and anti-social behaviour. However, detailed revenue implications must also be understood in relation to the ongoing running costs.
- 1.6.11 Bringing CCTV in house provides an opportunity for NSDC to create a CCTV provision that seeks to meet the authority's objectives. The ASB Working Group requested that the ASB team discuss with the CCTV partnership how the control room could operate more effectively by reducing the number of third-party events and ensure a tight focus on crime and ASB prevention. The capacity within the control room operation does not have much wider scope for improvement. Where improvements could be made, they have but a more proactive rather than reactive approach would not be possible.
- 1.6.12 A CCTV control room run by NSDC, with dedicated officers, would enable a tighter focus and a more proactive approach to be taken. Control Room Operatives would only need to concentrate on one Police radio and would benefit from gathering intelligence, knowledge of local perpetrators and closer working with the Police for incidents in real time in locating and tracking offenders. When events are taking place proactive viewing can be undertaken to observe and communicate directly with staff and Police on the ground. In time the Control Operatives would become focussed on known perpetrators, can assist with those who may be wanted by the Police or those possibly breaching bail conditions and providing that intel in real time to the Police. The Control Room Operatives would still be required to provide Out for Hours support for NSDC including the activation of the lorry park barriers and the town centre bollards.

| Pro's | Con's |
|---|---|
| Control Room will be moved to a location within the district, providing easy access to local policing staff and officers within NSDC who need to view footage. However, this does not require a lot of space to provide a functioning control room. | Suitable accommodation will need to be sourced. Until a location is identified detailed budgets for moving the CCTV system cannot be identified as this will depend on the ICT infrastructure, data security, lease arrangements. Ideal location would be at Castle House; however, space is limited however there are other facilities within the ownership of NSDC that could be considered as a suitable location for a control room. |
| Provides an opportunity to upgrade the control room equipment to the latest standard and to furnish the room to the required standard. | The equipment within the Control Room is shared between the partnership therefore there will be a costly initial outlay. |
| Less cameras to be monitored allowing for greater local knowledge and proactive work. | |
| No out of hours commitment for other Districts allowing the operators to concentrate their efforts on the cameras | |

| | |
|---|--|
| and in the detection and prevention of crime. | |
| Only one police radio to be monitored allowing the operators to react quickly to incidents and enable the cameras to be utilised effectively in those incidents. | |
| Ability to employ staff directly and not through an agency provision. This prevents zero hours contracts and provides the operators with a sense of belonging to the authority along with the benefits that come as part of that package. | Time will be needed to create the new posts ensuring compliance with internal HR processes and determining the necessary salary grades. There would be an increase to NSDC establishment and revenue budgets. Recruitment to the posts of suitable candidates would be required prior to operational launch |
| Greater partnership working between the local police and ASB Officers allowing for the sharing of information/intelligence in the prevention and detection of crime and ASB. | |
| External specialists will be required to design and set up the new CCTV control room to ensure it is completed in a timely fashion | Until a location is determined it is impossible to estimate costs for the full project. |
| Development of new internal processes to include maintenance contracts for CCTV cameras and control room equipment, monitoring requirements, reporting processes, access request processes and CCTV Policy. This will include information on our website in relation to CCTV. | |

2.0 Proposal/Details of Options Considered

- 2.1 It is recommended that the CCTV Camera Replacement Scheme continue and progress through the remainder of 2023/2024 and carry forward the capital balance to 2024/2025 onwards to ensure the cameras are replaced in a timely manner based on age, faults and suitability as shown in the Appendix 1. Due to the number of cameras that require replacing and the total cost, it is necessary that this replacement is undertaken in line with procurement rules. A reserve budget is in place to contribute each year to budgets for ongoing repairs and future replacements.
- 2.2 It is further recommended that all CCTV cameras that are part of the system should, moving forward, remain in the ownership of NSDC. Where there is a future request from an external partner for additional CCTV cameras to be installed, this should be considered in line with the Surveillance Commissioner requirements and budget availability. Whilst this would result in a reduction in the income received, the total expected income versus the actual is decreasing and represents just under 12% of the CCTV service costs.

- 2.3 Section 1.6.6 sets out considerations for keeping the CCTV Service within the partnership and the pros and cons for remaining in the partnership. A key consideration on determining whether the CCTV Service should be brought in house is the outcomes NSDC want to see from the CCTV Service in the future. It is recommended that until such time as a detailed feasibility study can be undertaken and the options presented to members that we remain in the CCTV Partnership.
- 2.4 Consultation responses received have made valid points in relation to the service currently operating as a reactive one and that to have a more proactive system, that is directly aligned with NSDC outcomes and to contribute further to reducing crime and ASB that this could not be achieved within the current service provisions.
- 2.5 It is recommended that to progress this, a detailed feasibility project is set up, which will include a full review, consideration of costs and locations and timescales for delivery should approval be given. It is estimated that the feasibility costs would be around £8,200. This would be funded from the Capital Feasibilities Reserve.
- 2.6 The recommendations align with the following objectives listed within the Community Plan:
- Undertake a comprehensive review of public realm CCTV with a view to making recommendations for its future coverage, geographical locations and partnership arrangements.
 - Maximise the use and effectiveness of CCTV to deter crime and bring offenders to justice.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection, Digital and Cyber Security, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Resources, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Data Protection Implications

- 3.1 Any video footage capturing a living individual constitutes as personal data and is governed by UK Data Privacy legislation. Therefore, maintaining consistent and secure ways of working is essential to ensure the Council are compliant with the legal requirements. Information Governance, are in agreement with the considerations listed in the report in respect of the use of facial recognition and would second that it is not feasible at this time. There are ongoing concerns with the current status of the technology and the ICO has highlighted the risk of bias and discrimination, within the technology, see 1.4.12. Working in a partnership does present challenges for consistent governance and should be considered as part of the recommendations.

Digital and Cyber Security

- 3.2 Security risks and ethical considerations are noted with some CCTV manufacturers, this can be mitigated by replacement. Furthermore, live facial recognition surveillance using AI has been banned by the European Parliament due to bias.

- 3.3 If the service were to be brought in-house infrastructure and connectivity works will be required.

Human Resources

- 3.4 If the Service were to be brought in-house it is likely that TUPE will apply to any staff employed by the current contractor who are assigned to the service. It should be noted that any staff transferring to the Council would come across on their current salary and terms and conditions but the number of staff likely to be in scope for transfer is unknown and therefore the associated cost is unknown at this point.
- 3.5 As this is a 24-hour service, careful consideration will need to be given to the resources required to deliver the standard of service required by the Council. This is difficult to determine at this stage without knowing the number and job type of the staff likely to TUPE transfer in. Any additional staffing required above those transferring in would be employed on Council terms and conditions and would require new posts to be created and job evaluated. Associated costs for any new posts would not be unknown until the job evaluation process has taken place.

Financial implications FIN23-24/1895

- 3.6 The report suggests an initial outlay of Consultancy Feasibility costs which may qualify as capital if the project proposals are all met; however, until that point, they must be met from revenue. £8,200 is proposed and committed for the approval to be drawn down from the Capital Feasibilities Reserve to fund the initial consultancy fees and placed in the CCTV Cost Centre to be monitored.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

None.

Appendix 1 – CCTV Camera Replacement Scheme

| Camera Number | Camera Location | Installed Date | Replacement Year |
|---------------|--|----------------|------------------|
| 1 | Bargate | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 2 | Castle roundabout | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 4 | Castlegate/Millgate (Atrium) | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 5 | Potterdyke ASDA Car Park | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 7 | Carter Gate (Beaumont Cross) | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 16 | Stodman Street/Middle Gate | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 17 | Middle Gate opp Boar Lane | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 18 | Kirk Gate/Middle Gate | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 19 | Church Street | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 20 | Trent Bridge opp Tolney Lane | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 33 | Lorry Park | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 34 | Lorry Park | Oct-99 | 24-25 |
| 66 | Southwell - Bishops Drive | Jun-00 | 25-26 |
| 69 | Yorke Drive Shops | Jun-00 | 25-26 |
| 24 | Riverside Car Park II (static) | Oct-00 | 25-26 |
| 21 | Riverside Car Park/Play Area | May-01 | 25-26 |
| 22 | Riverside Park/Tolney Lane | Sep-01 | 25-26 |
| 23 | Riverside Car Park I (static) | Sep-01 | 25-26 |
| 26 | Waitrose Station Car Park | Nov-01 | 25-26 |
| 30 | Castle House Front | Nov-01 | 25-26 |
| 35 | Hawtonville Community Centre | Nov-01 | 25-26 |
| 36 | Eton Avenue | Nov-01 | 26-27 |
| 29 | Castle House (static) | Dec-01 | 26-27 |
| 8 | London Road Car Park | May-02 | 26-27 |
| 31 | Castle House Rear | Jun-02 | 26-27 |
| 39 | Lakeside (London Road - Lidl) | Oct-02 | 26-27 |
| 40 | Balderton Cricket Ground | Oct-02 | 26-27 |
| 42 | St Marks Lane | Oct-03 | 26-27 |
| 44 | St Marks Service Yard | Oct-03 | 26-27 |
| 41 | Cleveland Square | Feb-04 | 26-27 |
| 13 | Appleton Gate | May-04 | 26-27 |
| 14 | Sherwood Avenue Park | May-04 | 27-28 |
| 46 | Sconce Park | Oct-02 | 27-28 |
| 47 | Devon Park - Valley Prospect | Oct-02 | 27-28 |
| 15 | Brunel Drive NSDC Depot | May-05 | 27-28 |
| 71 | Clipstone - Mansfield Road/Davis Close | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 73 | Clipstone - Mansfield Road Shops | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 74 | Clipstone - Third Avenue | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 75 | Clipstone - Fifth Avenue | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 76 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, The Plough | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 77 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, Beech Ave | May-06 | 27-28 |
| 68 | Cnr jnct outside 372 Yorke Drive | Apr-07 | 28-29 |
| 78 | Ollerton - Forest Rd Shops | Jun-07 | 28-29 |
| 79 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, Briar Road | Jun-07 | 28-29 |
| 80 | Newark Hospital | Jun-07 | 28-29 |
| 81 | Chatham Court | Jun-07 | 28-29 |

| | | | |
|----|---|--------|-------|
| 70 | Clipstone - Greendale Crescent | Aug-07 | 28-29 |
| 88 | Fenton Close (Yorke Drive cctv/video/Yorke Dr) | Aug-07 | 28-29 |
| 72 | Clipstone - Woodland Close Industrial Estate | Aug-07 | 28-29 |
| 9 | Balderton Gate (Pratt and Gelsthorpe) | Dec-07 | 28-29 |
| 82 | Chatham Court | Jan-08 | 28-29 |
| 83 | Chatham Court | Apr-08 | 29-30 |
| 84 | Chatham Court | Apr-08 | 29-30 |
| 45 | St Marks Toilets | May-09 | 29-30 |
| 87 | Sconce Park II | Sep-10 | 29-30 |
| 89 | Bus Station | Oct-10 | 29-30 |
| 90 | Bus Station Internal | Oct-10 | 29-30 |
| 93 | Potterdyke ASDA | Oct-10 | 29-30 |
| 10 | Carter Gate (Boyes) | Mar-23 | 29-30 |
| 11 | Market Place (Toni and Guys) | Mar-23 | 29-30 |
| 12 | Market Place (Natwest) | Mar-23 | 29-30 |
| 43 | St Marks Lane (New Look) | Mar-23 | 30-31 |
| 3 | Castlegate (Corn Exchange) | May-23 | 30-31 |
| 6 | Lombard Street | Oct-23 | 30-31 |
| 27 | Mather Road | Oct-23 | 30-31 |
| 28 | Mather Road Play Area | Oct-23 | 30-31 |
| 60 | Southwell - Church Street | Jan-24 | 30-31 |
| 61 | Southwell - Queens Street | Jan-24 | 30-31 |
| 62 | Southwell - Kings Street Car Park | Jan-24 | 30-31 |
| 63 | Southwell - Market Place/King Street | Jan-24 | 30-31 |
| 67 | Southwell - Leisure Centre | Jan-24 | 30-31 |
| 25 | Castle Station Car Park | Jan-24 | 32-33 |

Appendix 2 – CCTV Review Consultation Responses

North Muskham Parish Council is appreciative of your consultation and wishes to respond to your request as follows:

Justification factors:

1. “Surveillance system still provides reassurance etc”. We suggest there is insufficient promotion of the system, and many people are now unaware of its existence and are not aware of its outcomes. More promotion of the system and information re: its performance in detecting crimes and ASB etc, e: the number of incidents recorded and number of incidents where CCTV enabled successful prosecution etc. More promotion of the system should lead to its greater deterrent value.
2. In areas where it is provided is there any comparisons of recorded crime/asb with other non CCTV areas of similar make up?
3. Presumably you will have number of incidents for each camera and can make a judgement as to whether such cameras are still required and necessary?
4. We suspect that there is insufficient monitoring capacity in the CCTV Control Room and as such the use of the system is largely reactive and proactive patrols are minimal. As such the true potential of the system and the return on the investment made is not being accomplished. We suggest that the monitoring capacity should be sufficient to undertake targeted camera patrols of key incident area, eg: Newark Town Centre at time of highest incidence. Is there a recommended monitoring capability appropriate to the number of cameras “monitored” in the control room. Its potential PROACTIVE use in assisting with ASB in Newark Town Centre appears high but the incidence of ASB suggest that proactive use of CCTV in identification of offenders and immediate response is minimal. This may just be a perception and again information of its value and use re ASB should be promoted. In addition, CCTV works well with the use of town centre radio systems involving retailers etc where retailers can highlight ASB and suspicious /criminal behaviour to the CCTV control room. We are unsure as to whether that is happening in Newark?
5. We are not aware of the costs associated with the system- where can we see these please?
6. A replacement and upgrade programme is to be supported but we suggest it is equally important to invest in adequate monitoring capability and an increased emphasis on proactive use of the system.
7. We suggest there should be an annual CCTV performance report that gives information on the assessment of the system as regards the factors listed and this report should be in the public domain

Blidworth Parish Council

Further to our email regarding the CCTV review, are the Parish council able to see the outcome of the review please and would they be invited to the site visit?

Councillors are keen to see what the CPS criteria are for evidential purposes.

East Stoke Parish Council:

This parish has its own CCTV Camera system, monitored and managed internally and is not linked to the NSDC system.

We are at the moment preparing a census for the village. NSDC will supply us with a sealed box to collect votes and then open it in public. As you know if the vote is positive we will then try and raise the money for project and own the system and monitor it ourselves with access to it when needed by police or yourselves. We would also like to keep in touch with yourselves with news views and updates

Appendix 3 – CCTV cameras locations

| Camera Number | Location | Area |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | Bargate | Newark |
| 2 | Castle roundabout | Newark |
| 3 | Castlegate (Corn Exchange) | Newark |
| 4 | Castlegate/Millgate (Atrium) | Newark |
| 5 | Potterdyke ASDA Car Park | Newark |
| 6 | Lombard Street | Newark |
| 7 | Carter Gate (Beaumont Cross) | Newark |
| 8 | London Road Car Park | Newark |
| 9 | Balderton Gate (Pratt and Gelsthorpe) | Newark |
| 10 | Carter Gate (Boyes) | Newark |
| 11 | Market Place (Toni and Guys) | Newark |
| 12 | Market Place (Natwest) | Newark |
| 13 | Appleton Gate | Newark |
| 14 | Sherwood Avenue Park | Newark |
| 15 | Brunel Drive NSDC Depot | Newark |
| 16 | Stodman Street/Middle Gate | Newark |
| 17 | Middle Gate opp Boar Lane | Newark |
| 18 | Kirk Gate/Middle Gate | Newark |
| 19 | Church Street | Newark |
| 20 | Trent Bridge opp Tolney Lane | Newark |
| 21 | Riverside Car Park/Play Area | Newark |
| 22 | Riverside Park/Tolney Lane | Newark |
| 23 | Riverside Car Park I (static) | Newark |
| 24 | Riverside Car Park II (static) | Newark |
| 25 | Castle Station Car Park | Newark |
| 26 | Waitrose Station Car Park | Newark |
| 27 | Mather Road | Newark |
| 28 | Mather Road Play Area | Newark |
| 29 | Castle House (static) | Newark |
| 30 | Castle House Front | Newark |
| 31 | Castle House Rear | Newark |
| 32 | Castle House Rear | Newark |
| 33 | Lorry Park | Newark |
| 34 | Lorry Park Entrance Cafe | Newark |
| 35 | Hawtonville Community Centre | Newark |
| 36 | Eton Avenue | Newark |
| 39 | Lakeside (London Road - Lidl) | Newark |
| 40 | Balderton Cricket Ground | Newark |
| 41 | Cleveland Square | Newark |
| 42 | St Marks Lane | Newark |
| 43 | St Marks Lane (New Look) | Newark |
| 44 | St Marks Service Yard | Newark |
| 45 | St Marks Toilets | Newark |
| 46 | Sconce Park | Newark |
| 47 | Devon Park - Valley Prospect | Newark |

| | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 60 | Southwell - Church Street | Southwell |
| 61 | Southwell - Queens Street | Southwell |
| 62 | Southwell - Kings Street Car Park | Southwell |
| 63 | Southwell - Market Place/King Street | Southwell |
| 65 | Southwell - Church Street Car Park | Southwell |
| 66 | Southwell - Bishops Drive | Southwell |
| 67 | Southwell - Leisure Centre | Southwell |
| 68 | Cnr jnct outside 372 Yorke Drive | Newark |
| 69 | Yorke Drive Shops | Newark |
| 70 | Clipstone - Greendale Crescent | Clipstone |
| 71 | Clipstone - Mansfield Road/Davis Close | Clipstone |
| 72 | Clipstone - Woodland Close Industrial Estate | Clipstone |
| 73 | Clipstone - Mansfield Road Shops | Clipstone |
| 74 | Clipstone - Third Avenue | Clipstone |
| 75 | Clipstone - Fifth Avenue | Clipstone |
| 76 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, The Plough | Ollerton |
| 77 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, Beech Ave | Ollerton |
| 78 | Ollerton - Forest Rd Shops | Ollerton |
| 79 | Ollerton - Forest Rd, Briar Road | Ollerton |
| 80 | Newark Hospital | Newark |
| 81 | Chatham Court | Newark |
| 82 | Chatham Court | Newark |
| 83 | Chatham Court | Newark |
| 84 | Chatham Court | Newark |
| 87 | Sconce Park II | Newark |
| 88 | Fenton Close (Yorke Drive cctv/video/Yorke Dr) | Newark |
| 89 | Bus Station | Newark |
| 90 | Bus Station Internal | Newark |
| 93 | Potterdyke ASDA | Newark |

Appendix 4 – CCTV Camera incident stats

| SUMMARY | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Proactive Patrol Time - Hrs | 323:13:00 | 392:36:00 | 465:44:00 | 372:43:00 | 447:43:00 | 453:46:00 | 400:44:00 | 362:13:00 | 347:52:00 | 299:20:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 3865:54:00 |
| Monitoring Priorities | 94:00:00 | 90:00:00 | 100:30:00 | 99:00:00 | 93:30:00 | 91:00:00 | 101:30:00 | 90:30:00 | 102:30:00 | 87:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 40 |
| Reactive incidents | 215 | 217 | 237 | 302 | 257 | 211 | 182 | 208 | 251 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 2264 |
| Proactive incidents | 63 | 48 | 46 | 56 | 55 | 71 | 56 | 67 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 561 |
| Total incidents | 278 | 265 | 283 | 358 | 312 | 282 | 238 | 275 | 301 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 2825 |
| Arrests | 20 | 19 | 32 | 35 | 24 | 18 | 35 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 245 |
| Viewings | 44 | 51 | 64 | 57 | 57 | 50 | 70 | 95 | 45 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 615 |
| Discs produced | 10 | 7 | 17 | 8 | 19 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| OOH calls taken | 281 | 230 | 224 | 203 | 215 | 244 | 242 | 176 | 195 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 2201 |
| Weighted Barrier-Bollard -Help Points | 44 | 32 | 19 | 26 | 39 | 31 | 32 | 46 | 29 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 346 |
| Total consolidated incidents | 657 | 585 | 607 | 652 | 642 | 613 | 597 | 613 | 575 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 6110 |
| Shifts available per Month | 93 | 84 | 93 | 90 | 93 | 90 | 93 | 93 | 90 | 93 | | | 912 |
| Dropped shifts | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 15 | | | 46 |
| | 92 | 84 | 93 | 89 | 91 | 86 | 83 | 85 | 85 | 78 | 0 | 0 | |

| Ashfield District Council | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | TOTAL |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|------------|
| Proactive Patrol Time - Hrs | 135:04:00 | 119:31:00 | 128:07:00 | 122:06:00 | 132:29:00 | 104:32:00 | 86:11:00 | 93:19:00 | 97:17:00 | 99:30:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 1118:06:00 |
| Monitoring Priorities | 46:00:00 | 42:00:00 | 46:30:00 | 45:00:00 | 45:30:00 | 43:00:00 | 41:30:00 | 42:30:00 | 42:30:00 | 39:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 433:30:00 |
| Reactive incidents | 81 | 70 | 98 | 112 | 101 | 69 | 48 | 58 | 94 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 790 |
| Proactive incidents | 22 | 24 | 17 | 11 | 21 | 31 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| Total incidents | 103 | 94 | 115 | 123 | 122 | 100 | 62 | 69 | 107 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 974 |
| Arrests | 5 | 8 | 18 | 12 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Viewings | 6 | 17 | 20 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| Discs produced | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| OOH calls taken | 79 | 77 | 70 | 97 | 110 | 110 | 88 | 66 | 83 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 839 |
| Weighted Barrier-Bollard -Help Points | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Consolidated incidents | 190 | 190 | 211 | 233 | 249 | 218 | 161 | 152 | 208 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 1982 |
| | 29% | 32% | 35% | 36% | 39% | 36% | 27% | 25% | 36% | 30% | 0% | 0% | 32% |

| Broxtowe Borough Council | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Proactive Patrol Time - Hrs | 84:36:00 | 117:31:00 | 137:56:00 | 101:12:00 | 124:35:00 | 137:30:00 | 115:20:00 | 92:01:00 | 107:12:00 | 69:07:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 1087:00:00 |
| Monitoring Priorities | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 | 0:00:00 |
| Reactive incidents | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 21 | 29 | 16 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Proactive incidents | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Total incidents | 27 | 26 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 36 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 269 |
| Arrests | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Viewings | 15 | 10 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Discs produced | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| OOH calls taken | 184 | 111 | 132 | 78 | 79 | 113 | 136 | 97 | 92 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 1136 |
| Consolidated incidents | 229 | 148 | 166 | 118 | 109 | 141 | 173 | 159 | 126 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 1522 |
| | 35% | 25% | 27% | 18% | 17% | 23% | 29% | 26% | 22% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 25% |

Appendix 5 – CCTV Partnership Costs

| Camera Maintenance - Baydale | | Ashfield | Broxtowe | Newark & Sherwood | |
|---|---|------------|------------|-------------------|---|
| Contract Prices | Split (based on camera numbers) | 23% | 25% | 52% | Invoicing Frequency |
| Annual maintenance charge | £51,051.00 | £11,741.73 | £12,762.75 | £26,546.52 | Paid monthly (1/12th) |
| Electrical testing | £4,732.00 | £1,088.36 | £1,183.00 | £2,460.64 | One off payment |
| | | | | | |
| Surveillance Monitoring - Enigma | | Ashfield | Broxtowe | Newark & Sherwood | |
| Contract Prices | Estimated split (based on incidents & general surveillance) | 32% | 25% | 43% | Invoicing Frequency |
| Estimated annual monitoring charge* 1 May 23 - 30 Apr 24 | £217,861.20 | £69,715.58 | £54,465.30 | £93,680.32 | *Based on 36 hrs per day @ £16.58 per hour x 365 days |
| | | | | | |
| CCTV Control Room Costs | | Ashfield | Broxtowe | Newark & Sherwood | |
| Costs | Split (based on camera numbers) | 23% | 25% | 52% | Invoicing Frequency |
| Police Mast rental | £4,000.00 | £920.00 | £1,000.00 | £2,080.00 | Annually |
| Control room rent & service costs | £13,500.00 | £3,105.00 | £3,375.00 | £7,020.00 | Annually |
| | | | | | |

| Summary of estimated annual costs | | Ashfield | Broxtowe | Newark & Sherwood | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|
| 1 May 2023 to 31 April 2024 | Camera maintenance | £11,741.73 | £12,762.75 | £26,546.52 | PLEASE NOTE: Costs shown for the monitoring & maintenance contracts are for a 12-month calendar period from 1st May to 30th April 2024 rather than a financial year as the contracts started on 1st May 2023. |
| | Electrical testing | £1,088.36 | £1,183.00 | £2,460.64 | |
| | Monitoring | £69,715.58 | £54,465.30 | £93,680.32 | |
| | Police mast rental | £920.00 | £1,000.00 | £2,080.00 | |
| | Control room | £3,105.00 | £3,375.00 | £7,020.00 | |
| | Total | £86,570.67 | £72,786.05 | £131,787.48 | |