



AGENDA FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee are summoned to a meeting, which will be held in Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on **24 May 2016 at 7.00 pm.**

John Lynch
Head of Democratic Services

Enquiries to : Zoe Lewis
Tel : 020 7527 3044
E-mail : democracy@islington.gov.uk
Despatched : 16 May 2016

Membership

Councillor James Court (Chair)
Councillor Diarmaid Ward (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Raphael Andrews
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche MBE
Councillor Gary Heather
Councillor Clare Jeapes
Councillor Caroline Russell
Councillor Rupert Perry

Substitute Members

Councillor Theresa Debono
Councillor Satnam Gill OBE
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Angela Picknell
Councillor Dave Poyser

Quorum is 4 members of the Sub-Committee



A. Formal Matters	Pages
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Substitute Members	
3. Declarations of Interest	

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest*** in an item of business:

- if it is not yet on the council's register, you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent;
- you may **choose** to declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is already in the register in the interests of openness and transparency.

In both the above cases, you **must** leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If you have a **personal** interest in an item of business **and** you intend to speak or vote on the item you **must** declare both the existence and details of it at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent but you **may** participate in the discussion and vote on the item.

***(a)Employment, etc** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.

(b) Sponsorship - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of your expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of your election; including from a trade union.

(c) Contracts - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between you or your partner (or a body in which one of you has a beneficial interest) and the council.

(d) Land - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.

(e) Licences- Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.

(f) Corporate tenancies - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which you or your partner have a beneficial interest.

(g) Securities - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

This applies to **all** members present at the meeting.

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting	1 - 4
5. Public Questions	
6. Chair's Report	
B. Items for Decision/Discussion	Pages
1. Arrangements and Terms of Reference	5 - 10
2. Air Quality Presentation	Verbal

Report

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 3. | Community Infrastructure Levy Presentation | Verbal Report |
| 4. | Smart Cities Scrutiny Report | 11 - 22 |
| 5. | CCTV Scrutiny Report | 23 - 32 |
| 6. | Scrutiny Topics - 2016/17 | |

C. Urgent non-exempt items (if any)

Any non-exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgent by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

D. Exclusion of press and public

To consider whether, in view of the nature of the remaining items on the agenda, it is likely to involve the disclosure of exempt or confidential information within the terms of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in the Constitution and, if so, whether to exclude the press and public during discussion thereof.

E. Confidential/exempt items

F. Urgent exempt items (if any)

Any exempt items which the Chair agrees should be considered urgently by reason of special circumstances. The reasons for urgency will be agreed by the Chair and recorded in the minutes.

The next meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee will be on 5 July 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Islington

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 25 April 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 25 April 2016 at 7.00 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** James Court (Chair), Diarmaid Ward (Vice-Chair),
Mouna Hamitouche, Gary Heather, Clare Jeapes and
Caroline Russell

Councillor James Court in the Chair

32 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)**

There were no apologies for absence.

33 **DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A2)**

There were no substitute members.

34 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A3)**

There were no declarations of interest.

35 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A4)**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee meeting on 1 March 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

36 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item A5)**

Public Questions would be taken during the relevant agenda items.

37 **CHAIR'S REPORT (Item A6)**

There was no chair's report.

38 **SMART CITIES SCRUTINY REVIEW - WITNESS EVIDENCE (Item B1)**

Dr Terry Norman, Wireless Explorers gave a presentation on the Internet Of Things.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The internet of things was the enabling technology of smart cities.
- In smart city designing, it was important to combine data, make it available to others, record times, places, locations, people and numbers to see how people were using the city.
- Assets could be put on a network with information being collected from each asset through the network and applications used to optimise performance by monitoring, controlling and enriching.
- The internet of things optimised business processes, led to efficiency improvements and cost savings. It also had the potential to improve the environment and could have health benefits.

- There was a need for a holistic approach to the internet of things to combine various types of data together. A technology strategy should straddle departments and bring about transformational change in procurement, business models and project approval – business case assessment.
- Concern was raised about councils selling WIFI as they would need street furniture for the internet of things in the future. It was important to protect the council's right to earn revenue from data and focus on long term rather than short term gain.
- Projects should be made Internet of Things Ready by:
 - 1) Aligning the project with the wider strategic objectives of the authority e.g. citizen engagement, management of the environment, sustainability etc.
 - 2) Establishing the project within a strong data management policy framework to ensure data integrity, protection of an individual's privacy and secure storage.
 - 3) Understanding the opportunity to effect transformational change upon existing business processes, e.g. choice of funding, procurement approach.
 - 4) Analysing the financial benefits in full, including indirect and long term benefits.
- It would be at least 5 years until the internet of things would be sufficiently mature to provide technology infrastructure. Currently data science and data management policies were immature.
- There was a need for a trusted organisation to take responsibility for individuals' data.
- In time, legislation would have to be updated to address privacy and security of data.
- In the long term technology would create employment although there could be a displacement from lower skilled jobs to higher skilled jobs. Technology would create training opportunities. Work was being done in schools to teach children coding which would help with technology in the future.
- The council had tight controls on personal data. A lot of organisations wanted data but monetising it had to be an opt in process for the individual.
- In the future CCTV analysis would become more advanced and would monitor road usage, cycle usage, HGV usage, the safest route to travel for cyclists etc.
- It was important to manage peoples' perceptions when managing data and ensuring it was made anonymous.
- Smart cities and the internet of things had three tangible benefits:
 - 1) It would help to deal with population growth and sustainability without additional resources.
 - 2) The cost of services would reduce.
 - 3) There would be a lot of new services required in the future.
- There was a need to engage with good quality engineers on the practicalities of smart cities.

RESOLVED:

That the evidence be noted.

39

EXECUTIVE MEMBER'S ANNUAL PRESENTATION (Item B2)

Councillor Webbe gave a presentation on the work of the Environment and Regeneration Directorate. A copy of the presentation would be interleaved with the agenda.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Fuel poverty was a key priority. Work was taking place to improve the energy efficiency of homes.
- An innovative high rise insulation project would be starting soon.
- SHINE (Seasonal Health Interventions Network) worked with the 2,475 vulnerable residents referred in 2015, each one being offered an average of four to five interventions.

Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee - 25 April 2016

- Energy Services had commenced work on Bunhill Heat and Power (phase 2) which would supply a further 500 council homes. Phase 2 involved extracting waste heat.
- The diesel surcharge had been implemented to improve air quality in Islington.
- Work was taking place with neighbouring boroughs and businesses to improve air quality.
- Four gyratory removal programmes were taking place and there had been a positive consultation response to their removal.
- There was £2m TfL funding to improve local cycling routes.
- Smart waste management systems were in place.
- Recycling rates remained a priority. The rate was currently 32.8% which was the third highest of the 12 inner London borough. The North London Waste Authority target was 50% by 2020.
- There had been a successful communal food and garden waste collections pilot in Tollington Ward.
- Islington had one of the lowest residual waste rates of the inner London boroughs. It was important to innovate to reduce this further.
- The Clean Islington app made it easier for people to report problems.
- Missed bin collections had halved since taking the service in house in 2013 and work would be undertaken to reduce this further.
- Islington had won Gold in “London in Bloom” and Borough of the Year with very few resources and a large voluntary effort.
- There were major projects to extend East Finchley Vaults and Mausolea and a scheme to increase Trent Park burial capacity would start in the summer.
- Concern was raised about inadequate bin storage on the Andover and Six Acres Estates. Some bins did not fit in the stores and were left outside. Councillor Webbe advised that where problems were identified, improvements were being made. Ward improvement money could be used. A member reported that some TRAs had concerns about a lack of engagement from the council. Concern was also raised that communal recycling bins could be difficult for older people to open. Councillor Webbe would ask officers to take action on the specific bin problems raised.
- The council was charging supermarkets to pick up and either return or dispose of abandoned shopping trolleys.
- A suggestion was made that more could be done to encourage cycling i.e. bicycle parking, a scheme to rent out cargo bikes. Councillor Webbe advised that secure cycle storage was provided on many estates and this would continue to be rolled out. Secure bicycle storage would be trialled in Tollington and St Georges. One would be a pavement build out and one would be on the road. Work would take place with TfL. TfL resources were required to improve cycle storage.
- Concern was raised about the lack of working electric vehicle charging points. As part of the preparations for the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), work was being undertaken and new innovations were being considered e.g. rapid charging points and a servicing model. As the council did not have funding for this, a Londonwide partnership approach would be required.
- Parks events income would be increased, both through ticketed events and also by considering income generating schemes on a case by case basis. Licensing, planning and the ethical agenda would all be considered. An example was given of a coffee hut in Fortune Street Park.
- The council already did much smart city work. It was important to innovate and find smarter more efficient ways to undertake tasks and reduce costs.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the report be noted.

- 2) That a session on communal recycling on estates, to include identified problems with bins and bin storage and the bespoke solutions put in place to address these, be arranged for a future meeting of the committee.

40 CCTV SCRUTINY REVIEW - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS (Item B3)

The Committee requested that Recommendation 1 be amended to refer to bush pruning and not just tree pruning, that Recommendation 2 be reworded to state that tree pruning and camera repositioning should take place rather than the removal of the trees and that it be clarified which service was responsible for Recommendations 3 and 4.

RESOLVED:

That the recommendations be agreed subject to the above amendments.

41 WORK PROGRAMME (Item B4)

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be noted.

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

CHAIR



Town Hall, Upper Street, London N1 2UD

Report of: **Assistant Chief Executive – Governance and HR**

Meeting of	Date	Agenda Item	Ward(s)
Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee	24 May 2016		All
Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt	

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION REVIEW COMMITTEE – MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Synopsis

1.1 The committee is asked, to note the Committee’s terms of reference and its meeting and working arrangements.

2. Recommendations

2.1. To note the membership appointed by Annual Council on 12 May 2016 and the terms of reference as set out at Appendix A.

3. Background

3.1. The Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee is established under the terms of the constitution of the London Borough of Islington. A copy of the current terms of reference is attached at Appendix A.

3.2. The membership of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee is attached at Appendix B. The quorum is four councillors.

4. Implications

4.1. Financial implications

The Corporate Director, Finance and Resources confirms that costs associated with the Scrutiny Committees have been budgeted for in the 2016/17 budget.

4.2. Legal Implications

The Council appoints Scrutiny Committees to discharge functions conferred by section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

4.3. Resident Impact Assessment

The council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations, between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it (section 149 Equality Act 2010). The council has a duty to have due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages, take steps to meet needs, in particular steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, and encourage people to participate in public life. The council must have due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding."

4.4. The scrutiny reviews nominated cover a wide range of services provided by the Council and other agencies which are important to the community. Effective scrutiny reviews can contribute to improving these services and help address any inequalities in terms of access and provision.

4.4 Environmental Implications

None.

5. Conclusion and reasons for recommendations

The Committee are asked to note their terms of reference and working arrangements.

Final Report Clearance

Signed by

.....

.....
Assistant Chief Executive - Governance and HR

Date

Received by

.....
Head of Democratic Services

.....

Date

Report author: Zoe Lewis

Tel: 020 7527 3044 E-mail: zoe.lewis@islington.gov.uk

Appendix A

ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE

Composition

Members of the Executive may not be members of the Scrutiny Committee.

No member may be involved in scrutinising a decision which he/she has been directly involved.

The Scrutiny Committee shall be entitled to appoint a number of people as non-voting co-optees.

Quorum

The quorum for a meeting of the committee shall be four members.

Terms of Reference

1. To carry out the functions of an overview and scrutiny committee in respect of matters relating to the Environment and Regeneration Directorate.
2. To scrutinise other sustainability and transport issues affecting the borough
3. To undertake, a scrutiny review of its own choosing and any further reviews as directed by the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee and, consulting all relevant sections of the community, to make recommendations to the Executive thereon.
4. To carry out any review referred to it by the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee following consideration of a Councillor Call for Action referral.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B

Membership of the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee for 2016/17

Members:

Councillor James Court (Chair)
Councillor Diarmaid Ward (Vice Chair)
Councillor Clare Jeapes
Councillor Mouna Hamitouche
Councillor Gary Heather
Councillor Rupert Perry
Councillor Raphael Andrews
Councillor Caroline Russell

Substitutes:

Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor David Poyser
Councillor Angela Picknell
Councillor Satnam Gill
Councillor Theresa Debono

This page is intentionally left blank



Smart Cities Scrutiny Review

REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

London Borough of Islington
May 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Smart Cities Scrutiny Review

Aim

To explore and understand the different approaches that Islington Council should consider to becoming a 'Smart City' and how new technologies can influence this.

Evidence

The review ran from July 2015 until April 2016 and evidence was received from a variety of sources:

1. Presentations from witnesses – Lean Doody and Amanda Bailey - Arup Consultants, Trevor Gibson - Opportunities Peterborough, Joe Dignan - Future Cities, Catapult and Dr Terry Norman - Wireless Explorers.
2. Presentations from council officers – Matthew Homer, Waste Strategy Manager and Sally Millett, Head of ICT Strategy and Transformation

Main Findings

1. Smart Cities meant many things to many people. Smart cities was about having smart and connected communities. The growth in local populations, the increase in visitor numbers and commuters meant that all urban areas faced a broad range of problems ranging from traffic management to pollution to rising energy costs. Pressure on council resources and increasing demand for public services meant that there was a need to redesign services and technology was a significant enabler in service transformation and improvement.
2. Islington was doing lots of Smart Cities work without thinking of it as Smart Cities work. This work could be used as a catalyst to learn across the wider remit of the council.
3. The Clean Islington App was a mobile app which enabled residents to easily report issues to the council. It was a good example of using mobile technology to improve services for residents. It was possible that in time this could be expanded to report issues to other services.
4. Smart Infrastructure work in Islington included street based WIFI. The council received £500,000 initially from the operator who would put boxes on lampposts free of charge and it was anticipated that when the revenue streams were in place, the council would receive £2million per year. Initially the WIFI would be on Holloway Road and Upper Street and would then be rolled out. Existing initiatives included smart bins and links with Future Cities Catapult. The registrars system was fully online, repairs was due online shortly, some non-office based officers had been given mobile devices to help them report issues and conduct more work whilst out of the office and smart technology was used to record carers' visits and timings.
5. The next step for Islington was to develop the Smart City Framework for Islington. This would include assigning leadership for the Digital Collaboration Strategy, engagement with communities, partners, private sector experts and technology providers, to review the strategic objectives and delivery principles as well as the opportunities and to create an action/delivery plan.
6. The council should consider internal challenge and think about what else could be done, how it could link up with other external initiatives and funding opportunities and how it could encourage local communities to participate towards making Islington digital.

7. The internet of things was the enabling technology of smart cities. The internet of things optimised business processes, led to efficiency improvements, and cost savings. It also had the potential to improve the environment and could have health benefits.
8. Smart cities and the internet of things had three tangible benefits:
 - 1) To help deal with population growth and sustainability without additional resources.
 - 2) To reduce the cost of services.
 - 3) To enable the introduction of new services in the future.

Conclusions

The Smart Cities Scrutiny Review heard evidence about a number of Smart City schemes across the country and smart city work that was being undertaken in Islington. The Committee heard about a number of ideas for becoming a Smart City in the future. The Committee hoped the recommendations would improve smart city work in the borough.

Recommendations

- 1) **That a senior officer be made responsible for promoting, coordinating and leading the Smart Cities work within the council ensuring the smart agenda is communicated and embedded to all areas of the council and its staff.**
- 2) **That consideration be given to whether the Clean Islington App could be expanded to other areas of the council.**
- 3) **That the Smart City Framework for Islington be developed to include assigning leadership for the Digital Collaboration Strategy, engagement with communities, partners, private sector experts and technology providers, to review the strategic objectives and delivery principles as well as the opportunities and to create a smart city action/delivery plan.**
- 4) **The council should undertake a ‘Smart Audit’ to ascertain what services could already be described as smart, and to look at what services could be delivered.**
- 5) **That the council should consider internal challenges and where smart cities work could be undertaken, how it could link up with other external initiatives and funding opportunities and how it could encourage local communities to participate toward making Islington digital.**
- 6) **That smart cities be considered when procuring services, including piloting new procurement processes.**
- 7) **That the Internet of Things (the enabling technology of smart cities) should be considered when undertaking smart cities work to ensure that systems were Internet of Things ready so once technology improved, outcomes could be maximised.**
- 8) **That the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee receive an annual report on Smart Cities.**
- 9) **The council should package our existing smart work better, actively promote this work and look to maximise the opportunities that exist in terms of funding and grants available.**

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

COUNCILLORS – 2015/16

Councillors:

Councillor Court (Chair)
Councillor Diarmaid Ward (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Debono
Councillor Doolan
Councillor Hamitouche
Councillor Heather
Councillor Jeapes
Councillor Russell
Councillor Spall

Substitutes:

Councillor Kay
Councillor Diner
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Poyser

Acknowledgements: The Committee would like to thank all the witnesses who gave evidence to the review.

Officer Support:

*Zoe Crane – Democratic Services
Anthony Akadiri – Digital Services*

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Smart Cities meant many things to many people. Smart cities was about having smart and connected communities. The growth in local populations, the increase in visitor numbers and commuters meant that all urban areas faced a broad range of problems ranging from traffic management to pollution to rising energy costs. Pressure on council resources and increasing demand for public services meant that there was a need to redesign services and technology was a significant enabler in service transformation and improvement.
- 1.2 BSI PAS 181 Smart City Framework defined a smart city as “the effective integration of physical, digital and human systems in the built environment to deliver a sustainable, prosperous and inclusive future for its citizens”.
- 1.3 ISO June 2015 stated that “A smart city dramatically increases the pace at which it improves its sustainability and resilience by fundamentally improving how it engages society, how it applies collaborative leadership methods, how it works across disciplines and city systems, and how it uses data and integrated technologies, in order to provide better services and quality of life to those in and involved with the city (residents, businesses, visitors)”.

2. Findings

The Smart City Approach

- 2.1 The Smart City Leadership Programme was developed in partnership with BSI and Urban DNA Ltd. It was built around the PAS 181 Smart City Framework. It was aimed at increasing the personal and collective knowledge of city leaders about the need for, and possibilities arising from, a smart city approach. It established the foundations to increase the pace at which cities responded to the Smart City opportunity.
- 2.2 Standards Based Assessment engaged city leadership in a simple assessment process (personal or small groups) that provided a snapshot of their city’s current state of ‘smartness’. It helped to reposition ‘standards’ in the eyes of city leaders. It directly related to the PAS 181 framework and added rapid value to the Smart City standards. The assessment approach was now included in the BSI Smart Cities Overview guide, PD8100:2015.
- 2.3 The smart city approach should accelerate the pace of change in addressing city challenges, framework guidance could help inform each area’s approach, there was no Smart City without Smart City leadership and engagement, collaboration and partnerships were the key starting point – Smart Cities was not just about technology or investing significant resources.
- 2.4 The Committee heard that technology allowed data to be collected and to connect systems together and that efficiencies could be made across many areas including transport, energy, waste, water and environmental efficiencies. Digital clusters were becoming more common and attracted investment and technology impacted upon people and the impacts could be positive or negative.
- 2.5 Arup was an independent firm of designers, planners, engineers, consultants and technical specialists had conducted a market opportunity study for the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS). Arup representatives advised that some people were reluctant to spend money on Smart Cities work but cities already spent a substantial amount of money on technology e.g. transport infrastructure, energy, logistics and waste management all used technology. Often though the technology was not joined up and was duplicated. Arup had produced a smart London plan and found if organisations such as the GLA, TfL, business start-ups, universities and local authorities brought budgets together, more could be achieved and relationships could be strengthened. Councils could enable this.

Work Being Done In Islington

- 2.6 Islington was doing lots of Smart Cities work without thinking of it as Smart Cities work. This work could be used as a catalyst to learn across the wider remit of the council. Publicising the Smart Cities work more would help the Smart Cities agenda, help with gaining feedback and technology providers who worked where there were opportunities, could see Islington as a good place to work.
- 2.7 The Clean Islington App was a mobile app which enabled residents to easily report issues to the council. It was a good example of using mobile technology to improve services for residents. It was possible that in time this could be expanded to report issues to other services.
- 2.8 Smart Infrastructure work in Islington included street based WIFI. The council received £500,000 initially from the operator who would put boxes on lampposts free of charge and it was anticipated that when the revenue streams were in place, the council would receive £2million per year. Initially the WIFI would be on Holloway Road and Upper Street and would then be rolled out. Existing initiatives included smart bins and links with Future Cities Catapult. The registrars system was fully online, repairs was due online shortly, some non-office based officers had been given mobile devices to help them report issues and conduct more work whilst out of the office and smart technology was used to record carers' visits and timings.
- 2.9 Smart recycling and waste measures improved efficiency and improved service. Recycling and waste sites were currently emptied on a regular weekly schedule irrespective of how full they were. Bins filled at different rates at different times of the year so a regular schedule was not always possible. Visiting a half empty bin was twice as expensive as visiting a full bin.
- 2.10 Dynamic scheduling meant emptying a bin when it needed to be emptied and finding the best route from site to site. This resulted in efficient collections, better customer service and improved monitoring.
- 2.11 A bin sensors trial was taking place. The sensors were fitted to recycling bins on one of the rounds. These measured hourly fill levels and reported back to a database. The sensors advised officers when each bin was full and also predicted when the bin would be full. Commercial bins and wheelie bins were currently excluded. Prison bins had been excluded pending prison security checks on the system. Potential uses for sensors were in the remaining recycling sites, communal waste bins, skips, grit bins and litter bins. Big Belly bins were litter bins with inbuilt sensors. They provided fill data and alerts.
- 2.12 Islington's digital strategy included four strands: 1) Digital Collaboration which involved data sharing; 2) Digital Place which was how citizens were involved in a digital way; 3) Digital Customers and 4) Digital Workforce.
- 2.13 In 2015 a joint workshop with Islington and Camden had been hosted by Catapult. A BT innovation event was held in November 2015. Spacehive was used for crowd sourcing for funding opportunities.
- 2.14 It was important to consider accessibility and inclusivity when becoming more digital. There were 154 computers in libraries that could be used by those without access to technology and there was mediated access where staff helped customers access services digitally.

Work Being Done Outside Islington

- 2.15 Arup representatives gave examples of projects they had been involved with across the world included: 1) Following the earthquake in Christchurch, infrastructure was reconfigured. Children were given portable sensors to monitor air and water quality. There was an open data platform and apps could be built from this. The system encouraged ownership of the area. 2) In Nigeria, there was a My Home is My Phone scheme. Many people did not have street addresses but could access services through their phones. 3) In Helsinki, there was an objective to have a car free city and so smart initiatives had been introduced. There was a bus which responded like a taxi if called and it could deviate from its route.
- 2.16 Peterborough was the UK's second fastest growing city. It had a population of over 188,400 people. It was one of four cities which received funding from the Technology Strategy Board to develop and test ideas for how smart, future-proofed cities could work. A requirement of the funding was that projects should be replicable and scalable.
- 2.17 The project was delivered by Opportunity Peterborough and Peterborough City Council. It received £3million to deliver a project over 3 years.
- 2.18 The principles of the Peterborough project were to focus on innovation, sustainability and growth, to provide a catalyst to change mind-sets towards an efficient and sustainable urban future and act as an enabler to delivering the city's vision. Transparency, participation, empowerment, collaboration, engagement and openness were important.
- 2.19 Peterborough was actively involved in national Smart City thinking and standards development and applying PAS 181 (the Smart City Framework) to systematically approach the challenge from strategy through to implementation.
- 2.20 Key Initiatives were 1) Digital Peterborough – having open data and becoming the first gigabit city with superfast broadband for businesses and residents; 2) Brainwave – a platform to facilitate immediate match-making between innovators and challenges; 3) Circular Peterborough – working demonstration projects were developed to improve resource efficiency; 4) Developing Skills for our Future through the Peterborough Graduate Scheme, bursaries and Smart Suppers in which young people pitched their solutions to city challenges and one was chosen and its development supported. There had been few problems with the installation of the super broadband other than many of the main roads being dug up. The broadband was working effectively and many businesses had relocated to where the superfast broadband was in place. The council had installed the superfast broadband in conjunction with City Fibre who had undertaken the work in a number of cities.
- 2.21 Peterborough was 2 ½ years into its Smart Cities work so was in the early stages of seeing benefits. It would be another 2-3 years before tangible benefits would be seen. Opportunity Peterborough had six members in the team; three of which were part time. It was well integrated with the council.
- 2.22 Peterborough was going to put sensors in the homes of vulnerable people who received social care in order to monitor temperature and movement. In addition 25 weather stations were being installed in schools. The data would be connected so that when temperatures were recorded as extreme, this would trigger support where necessary. It was anticipated that this project could build partnerships in the community, improve the quality of service and result in a corresponding reduction in the cost of service.
- 2.23 On a global perspective, India and China had infrastructure based plans, Singapore had the 'World's First Smart Nation Programme and Beijing's new 2025-2050 master plan based crowd funding community projects focussed on the everyday needs and challenges residents faced.

- 2.24 Milton Keynes was using smart technology in infrastructure and parking/traffic management, Glasgow was building a new university and had a Smart Campus, Bristol and Birmingham were working on infrastructure and open data, Manchester had done Smart Cities work in sustainability, EU partnering and funding and Leeds had a Data City Partnership.
- 2.25 In London, the Greater London Authority had the Smart London Plan and was looking to share data with communities, in Westminster, smart parking had been introduced. This involved having sensors in the parking bays. Economies of scale increased when the scale of the schemes did.
- 2.26 Bristol and Loughborough had appointed Smart Cities leaders. Leadership at a political and director level helped in building momentum for Smart Cities but as well as a top down approach, a bottom up approach was also required. Those who delivered the services knew where the challenges were.

Working Towards Smart Cities in Islington

- 2.27 The next step for Islington was to develop the Smart City Framework for Islington. This would include assigning leadership for the Digital Collaboration Strategy, engagement with communities, partners, private sector experts and technology providers, to review the strategic objectives and delivery principles as well as the opportunities and to create an action/delivery plan.
- 2.28 It was important to: 1) enable participation and involve communities e.g. young people, schools, residents, volunteers and local businesses; 2) collaborate with the private sector, funding bodies, industry experts and communities; 3) identify data sets and; 4) create a culture of open data to enable external partners/communities to create apps which delivered value for citizens.
- 2.29 The council should consider internal challenge and think about what else could be done, how it could link up with other external initiatives and funding opportunities and how it could encourage local communities to participate towards making Islington digital.
- 2.30 The Director, Public Realm stated that technology was necessary to deliver services in a more efficient way. It was hoped that in time 80-90% of people would self serve and then a dedicated service could be provided to the remaining 10-20%.
- 2.31 Smart Champions in the council could help to promote Smart Cities. Leadership and support from management was crucial.
- 2.32 Potential opportunities for the Waste and Recycling Service could include 1) the digitalisation of services e.g. digital back office systems, in cab devices for front line staff and vehicle technology (GPS tracking, bin weighing and cameras); 2) management and efficient services e.g. real time dynamic routing, GPS tracking, service productivity, resource allocation, reduced administration and health and safety implications; 3) customer and better services e.g. messaging to crews, better customer service information, more use of the web and phone app.

The Future of Smart Cities

- 2.33 There were many technological advances that would happen in the short, medium and long term future. These technological advances would drive Smart Cities. To be successful a Smart City required a focus on the citizens living in it and the challenges they faced.
- 2.34 Conceptually the possibilities associated with "Smart Cities" were endless and it provided one of the answers to enable the council to do more with less especially as urban data and technology could be used to make places healthier, safer and more efficient for citizens,

businesses and visitors. Homes, buildings and spaces would become significantly more intelligent. 1.6 billion connected things would be used by Smart Cities in 2016. This was a 39% increase on 2015.

- 2.35 The latest thinking on Smart Cities was that it addressed urban challenges by using digital technologies to engage and enable citizens, however it could be too concerned with hardware and technology and citizens should be put first and technology put second. “Collaborative technologies” offered cities another way to make smarter use of resources, smarter ways of collecting data and smarter ways to make decisions. Collaborative technologies could also help citizens themselves shape the future of the cities.
- 2.36 The charity NESTA had produced a report entitled “Rethinking Smart Cities from the Ground Up”. The policy recommendations included realigning the Smart Cities approach. This could involve:
1. Setting up a civic innovation lab to drive innovation.
 2. Using open data and open data platforms to mobilise collective knowledge.
 3. Taking human behaviour as serious as technology.
 4. Investing in smart people not just smart technology.
 5. Spreading the potential of collaborative technologies to all parts of society.
- 2.37 Local Communities engaging, mobilising and collaborating was the key to success. Connecting interlocking smart technologies was complex and exploiting the opportunities associated with making open non-personal, non-commercial data sets available for innovative purposes required careful and realistic consideration of issues such as information management, protection and security.
- 2.38 Future Cities Catapult was a not for profit organisation working with digital communities across the UK to drive innovation and accelerate growth for the UK’s digital economy. This represented £1bn funding over next 5 years.
- 2.39 There were opportunities to collaborate with the private sector. IT Vendors such as Cisco, BT and Arqiva were involved in Smart Cities work. London had a £100m annual fund for Smart Cities.
- 2.40 The internet of things was the enabling technology of smart cities. The internet of things optimised business processes, led to efficiency improvements, and cost savings. It also had the potential to improve the environment and could have health benefits. In smart city designing, it was important to combine data, make it available to others, record times, places, locations, people and numbers to see how people were using the city. Assets could be put on a network with information being collected from each asset through the network and applications used to optimise performance by monitoring, controlling and enriching.
- 2.41 There was a need for a holistic approach to the internet of things to combine various types of data together. A technology strategy should straddle departments and bring about transformational change in procurement, business models and project approval – business case assessment.
- 2.42 Concern was raised about councils selling WIFI as they would need street furniture for the internet of things in the future. It was important to protect the council’s right to earn revenue from data and focus on long term rather than short term gain and retain the ownership of data.

- 2.43 Data was produced by many organisations – e.g. councils, TfL, mobile phone companies and there were apps that assembled data from many data sources to give the user a range of relevant information e.g. how to travel from one place to another in a variety of ways. The telecommunications network and in particular a good broadband connection was important for Smart Cities.
- 2.44 At a time when council budgets were under significant pressure, it was important to think innovatively, see what was being done currently, address any gaps, consider the work of other boroughs and the GLA and look at barriers and outcomes. Working with others made smart working more achievable and effective. It was also important to ensure that the vulnerable were not excluded.
- 2.45 The way councils procured services was important. Pre-procurement mechanisms meant councils could procure research to work with a vendor. Doing collaborative work first could result in a better brief and this way of working encouraged innovation. Many boroughs were sharing resources and back office functions.
- 2.46 Having public health within local authorities created an opportunity to come to smart solutions. Arup was working with the NHS on a new towns initiative. Work would be undertaken to see the role technology could play in health outcomes for an area. It could help plan future services, identify vulnerable people and pilot projects would be taking place. Bristol was using control centre monitors to provide telecare. Technology did not replace healthcare professionals but would be an enabler.
- 2.47 Some councils appointed a chief officer to work across the council looking at data and infrastructure and joining it up. The committee was advised that there was a need to engage with good quality engineers on the practicalities of smart cities.
- 2.48 It would be at least 5 years until the internet of things would be sufficiently mature to provide technology infrastructure. Currently data science and data management policies were immature. Projects should be made Internet of Things Ready by:
- 1) Aligning the project with the wider strategic objectives of the authority e.g. citizen engagement, management of the environment, sustainability etc.
 - 2) Establishing the project within a strong data management policy framework to ensure data integrity, protection of an individual's privacy and secure storage.
 - 3) Understanding the opportunity to effect transformational change upon existing business processes, e.g. choice of funding, procurement approach.
 - 4) Analysing the financial benefits in full, including indirect and long term benefits.
- 2.49 There was a need for a trusted organisation to take responsibility for individuals' data. In time, legislation would have to be updated to address privacy and security of data. The council had tight controls on personal data. A lot of organisations wanted data but monetising it had to be an opt-in process for the individual. It was important to manage peoples' perceptions when managing data and ensuring it was made anonymous.
- 2.50 In the long term technology would create employment although there could be a displacement from lower skilled jobs to higher skilled jobs. Technology would create training opportunities. Work was being done in schools to teach children coding which would help with technology in the future.
- 2.51 In the future CCTV analysis would become more advanced and would monitor road usage, cycle usage, HGV usage, the safest route to travel for cyclists etc.
- 2.52 Smart cities and the internet of things had three tangible benefits:

- 1) It would help to deal with population growth and sustainability without additional resources.
- 2) The cost of services would reduce.
- 3) There would be a lot of new services required in the future.

3. Conclusion

The Smart Cities Scrutiny Review heard evidence about a number of Smart City schemes across the country and smart city work that was being undertaken in Islington. The Committee heard about a number of ideas for becoming a Smart City in the future.

The Committee hoped the recommendations would improve smart city work in the borough.

APPENDIX – SCRUTINY INITIATION DOCUMENT

SCRUTINY REVIEW INITIATION DOCUMENT (SID)
Review: Smart Cities
Scrutiny Review Committee: Environment and Regeneration
Director leading the Review: Bram Kainth
Lead Officer: Anthony Akadiri
Overall aim: To explore and understand the different approaches that Islington Council should consider to becoming a 'Smart City' and how new technologies can influence this.
Objectives of the review: We would like to develop a list of ideas for Smart City innovations that Islington should consider for development, based on advice from experts and other local authorities.
How is the review to be carried out: Scope of the Review Types of evidence will be assessed by the review: 2) Documentary submissions: Arup Consultants have submitted for 7 th September: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'Future Cities: UK Capabilities For Urban Innovation'• 'Delivering the Smart City: Governing Cities in the Digital Age'• Connecting Bristol, Bristol Council, Kevin O'Malley – Future Cities Team Manager – Documentary Evidence 3) It is proposed that witness evidence be taken from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Arup Consultants (Amanda Bailey, Associate & Lean Doody, Director) – Independent firm of designers, planners, engineers, consultants and technical specialists• London Borough of Islington (Adrian Gorst & Emma Marinos)• British Standards Institute• Digital Birmingham (Birmingham City Council) Greater London Authority 4) Visits – N/A
Additional Information: All witnesses have been asked to present an overview of different ideas for LBI to consider



CCTV Scrutiny Review

REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

London Borough of Islington
May 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CCTV Scrutiny Review

Aim

To consider the context for provision of CCTV on housing estates.

Evidence

The review ran from September 2015 until February 2016 and evidence was received from a variety of sources:

1. Presentations from council officers – Daniel Tomey, Concierge Service Manager and Garrett McEntee, Technical Services Manager
2. Visit to the CCTV Control Room, 222 Upper Street

Main Findings

1. The Housing CCTV Service had over 1,000 cameras and 12 concierge sites. 2 of the concierge sites were managed by the tenant management organisations (TMOs) and 10 were managed by the council. There were 6 roof access systems and these included 11 cameras. There were also new build entry systems in place.
2. When CCTV was being considered there had to be a clear stated purpose for its installation plus consultation and engagement with the public and partners. The solution had to be proportionate and have the potential to meet the stated purpose and there had to be a regard to privacy and family life.
3. Different sites required different solutions. When designing a scheme it was important to have a clear understanding of security concerns and the options available, the size of the site to have CCTV coverage, equipment specification (which was a changing field), an assessment of operational and managerial implications and clarification on objectives and outcomes to be achieved i.e. crowd control, theft reduction and unauthorised entry. Accessibility and amenity for residents was also an important consideration.
4. Alternative measures to CCTV included improving lighting and estate visibility, making better use of fences, pruning trees and removing hedge overgrowth, removing congregation focal points and addressing door entry failures.
5. Security Industry Authority (SIA) licensed officers actively viewed live camera streams. Their work included making statements, attending court, calling the emergency services or anti-social behaviour team when appropriate and writing reports to relevant council teams. The council also had unmonitored CCTV which was logged into each day by staff to ensure the cameras were working. If an incident was reported, the CCTV footage was obtained and sent to the police where appropriate.
6. Requests for assistance with CCTV came in from the police, anti-social behaviour team, shopping centres and neighbouring boroughs.
7. Some people were deterred from committing crime as they knew someone could be monitoring the CCTV. For CCTV to be a deterrent in the long term it required monitoring, immediate action, information sharing and third party action.

8. The council had a seven year capital improvement programme. Some projects were being funded by Section 106 money and CCTV priorities were identified in line with the asset strategy.

Conclusions

The committee heard evidence about CCTV provision across the borough, the roles of the Concierge Service, CCTV Control Room, Housing Repair Team and Capital Improvement Team, alternative security measures that could be used in conjunction with or instead of CCTV and future work that the services were planning.

The Committee hoped the scrutiny recommendations would improve the effectiveness of CCTV and alternative security measures across the borough to improve outcomes for residents.

Recommendations

- 1) That as part of the process to identify appropriate crime prevention measures (particularly in high risk congregation areas) CCTV be considered in conjunction with other security measures such as door entry, estate lighting, landscaping, tree and bush pruning and that these works also be considered in future CCTV capital projects to ensure a more holistic approach was adopted to CCTV security.
- 2) That following CCTV repair and maintenance works, a plan would be put in place to address other issues such as sightline interference, tree overgrowth and poor lighting in order to improve the CCTV footage. Consideration would be given to tree pruning or camera repositioning before any consideration was given to tree removal.
- 3) That the Mechanical and Engineering Service (in consultation with officers in Housing Operations, including the Public Protection Team, Housing Investment Team and the Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team) should continue to work closely with partners, to share information and to take appropriate action depending on funding availability where anti-social behaviour/criminal acts were taking place.
- 4) That the Resident Consultation team in Housing and Property Services and the Service Development Team in the Housing Needs and Strategy Team should work more closely to engage residents and be responsive to residents' comments.
- 5) That officers monitor technological advances in the area of CCTV and related equipment to ensure this technology was considered when there was a requirement to upgrade existing equipment.
- 6) That consideration be given to the greater use of mobile CCTV equipment to target problem areas for a specific period of time with the cameras then being removed when the problem had been addressed.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

COUNCILLORS – 2015/16

Councillors:

Councillor Court (Chair)
Councillor Diarmaid Ward (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Debono
Councillor Doolan
Councillor Hamitouche
Councillor Heather
Councillor Jeapes
Councillor Russell
Councillor Spall

Substitutes:

Councillor Kay
Councillor Diner
Councillor Alice Perry
Councillor Poyser

Acknowledgements: The Committee would like to thank all the witnesses who gave evidence to the review.

Officer Support:

Zoe Crane – Democratic Services

Lead officers – Garrett McEntee, Technical Services Manager and Daniel Tomey, Concierge Services Manager

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The committee heard that the Housing CCTV Service had over 1000 cameras and 12 concierge sites. 2 of the concierge sites were managed by tenant management organisations (TMOs) and 10 were managed by the council. They were open between 16-24 hours a day. There were 33 estates. There were 6 roof access systems and these included 11 cameras. There were also new build video entry systems in place.
- 1.2 CCTV could be a deterrent for a short time but to be effective it required monitoring, immediate action, information sharing and third party action. The number, location and quality of cameras was important as was lighting. It was also important to work closely with partners, and have visible cameras, signage and the concierge visible.
- 1.3 Maintaining CCTV helped to support crime prevention measures, helped to address anti-social behaviour, improved the quality of residents' lives, provided a crime and anti-social behaviour deterrent and assisted with crime investigation.
- 1.4 When CCTV was being considered there had to be a clear stated purpose for its installation plus consultation and engagement with the public and partners. The solution had to be proportionate and have the potential to meet the stated purpose and there had to be a regard to privacy and family life. Home office guidance stated that deployment should not continue for longer than necessary, however it was impractical to remove cameras and the problem could then return.
- 1.5 It was considered that there had to be a balance between public protection and individual privacy.

2. Findings

The Concierge Service

- 2.1 The committee was advised that in the last five years there had been a change of focus in the concierge service. The monitoring of CCTV in the borough and communications had been improved, concierges had been made responsible for their cameras, all housing cameras had been networked, office upgrades had been undertaken, performance indicators had been put in place and there was a focus on staff training. In this time the CCTV contract ended and the service was insourced.
- 2.2 In terms of monitored CCTV, (Security Industry Authority) SIA licensed officers actively viewed live camera streams. Complimentary systems such as PA, intercom and access control were used and officers undertook investigating and reporting. This included making statements and attending court, calling the emergency services or Anti Social Behaviour team etc. when appropriate and writing reports to the relevant council teams. One in five perpetrators was identified from CCTV. Taking action was a deterrent to those who committed crime and/or anti-social behaviour.
- 2.3 Unmonitored CCTV was logged into each day by staff to ensure the cameras were working. If an incident was reported, the CCTV footage was obtained and sent to the police where appropriate.
- 2.4 The committee was pleased to hear that customer satisfaction surveys had indicated that 87.5% of respondents considered the service provided to be good or very good, 88% of respondents were satisfied that the concierge service provided value for money and 94% of respondents considered that the introduction of the concierge service had reduced the number of incidents of crime and anti- social behaviour in their block/estate.
- 2.5 Performance monitoring included monitoring anti social behaviour, crime reports per office and per person, the number of incidents, where and when they occurred and the number of arrests as a consequence of concierge actions. Every time a request for CCTV was made, this was recorded and a report was entered into the database. The concierge service generated approximately 1,600 anti-social behaviour and crime reports each year.
- 2.6 Concierge staff built relationships with residents e.g. they took in parcels for residents and arranged repairs where necessary. They were often able to identify those involved in incidents using CCTV footage.
- 2.7 The sites managed by TMOs received the same funding as the council run sites did. They had chosen to run the sites themselves so the council did not usually get involved in their management.
- 2.8 Next steps included undertaking a consultation on a restructure, considering how the service engaged with residents which would include increasing the number of electronic noticeboards, more training for staff on anti-social behaviour legislation and information sharing, ensuring all capacity was used, considering the use of technology e.g. movement sensors which would mean not all camera footage would have to be shown on screens at one time, improving three of the offices and improving signage visibility.

The CCTV Control Room

- 2.9 On a visit to the CCTV Control Room, members heard that the team focussed on crime and disorder and the CCTV was not used to deal with driving offences. In addition there were cameras monitored by the concierge on housing estates and there were also parking enforcement cameras monitored by a separate team based at Old Street. Some of the

cameras were used by both the council's CCTV team and the Parking Enforcement team so there were instances where one team moved a camera when the other team was monitoring an incident. Scotland Yard could also move the cameras.

- 2.10 The CCTV team and individuals within the team had won a number of awards including an EPIC award and national awards.
- 2.11 Requests for assistance with CCTV came in from the police, the anti-social behaviour team, shopping centres and neighbouring boroughs. If road traffic accidents or other incidents occurred, the CCTV footage could be examined to work out what happened. CCTV footage was kept for 31 days unless it was saved in which case it would be saved for three months. If it was footage of a serious incident, a copy would be made.
- 2.12 Some people were deterred from committing crime if they thought someone was monitoring the CCTV. It was not possible for the service to provide meaningful crime data comparisons pre and post CCTV installation as the team mainly focussed on anti-social behaviour rather than other types of crime.
- 2.13 Trees often presented a problem when they were near to cameras as their leaves prevented the cameras from seeing the area it was meant to be focussed on. This was a particular problem in summer.

Housing Repairs Team and Capital Improvement Team

- 2.14 Officers advised that Capital Improvement Work involved maintaining the existing equipment rather than implementing new schemes.
- 2.15 CCTV repair works were carried out by the Housing Repairs Team. Maintenance works included a six monthly maintenance programme and an annual service. Responsive repairs were undertaken to address minor repair works i.e. breakdowns and equipment failure. When repairs work was undertaken, all the equipment was serviced and cleaned i.e. cameras, recording equipment and the PA systems. Breakdown information was recorded and sent to repair officers and data was uploaded into the maintenance programme.
- 2.16 The CCTV Capital Improvement Strategy considered capital investment availability, the forward improvement plan, any technical need for the proposed works, resident and stakeholder feedback, crime and anti-social behaviour, officer consultation feedback, other capital improvement projects and alternative security measures. The Capital Improvement Strategy allocated resources to the places it was most needed.
- 2.17 Different sites required different solutions. Scheme design considerations included a clear understanding of security concerns and the options available, the size of the site to have CCTV coverage, equipment specification (which was a changing field), assessment of operational issues, assessment of managerial implications and clarification on objectives and outcomes to be achieved i.e. crowd control, theft reduction and unauthorised entry.
- 2.18 An example of work undertaken was on the Elthorne Estate, where a wall which had been used by congregating youths linked to gangs had been removed and this had stopped them from congregating there.

- 2.19 Following a request from residents on one estate to install more CCTV, the Crime Prevention Officer put forward a number of recommendations which included a small increase in cameras plus a number of alternative security measures including an 'A' frame which would allow cyclists through but only if they dismounted. Pushchair and wheelchair access was more restricted but this could be alleviated by having the base a little wider. Another alternative measure was to fit bollards across footpaths which were wide enough to allow wheelchair access. Old fashioned paving stones were irregular and difficult to ride over quickly and helped to slow bikes down. Restrictive seating could act as alternative security measure. It could help to address youths congregating around seating and bin enclosures could be designed so it was not possible to hide. Ladder guards design could be improved to improve security and prevent access to restricted/less secure areas.
- 2.20 A CCTV dome camera could provide effective CCTV. People on the ground could not see in which direction the camera was pointing. Other ways to improve security included to improve lighting and estate visibility, make better use of fences, prune trees and remove hedge overgrowth, remove congregation focal points, remove non-illuminate areas, install suitable lighting where scaffolding was being used and address door entry failures. Work was being undertaken to categorise cameras with problems eg near trees or poor lighting so they could be managed as a group.
- 2.21 Concerns were raised that alternative security measures could affect accessibility and amenity for residents. It was important to consider the specifics of each site as well as alternative security measures and this was included in the stakeholder consultation process.
- 2.22 The council had a seven year capital investment programme, some projects were being funded by Section 106 money and CCTV priorities were being identified in line with the asset strategy. Depending on the specification, each camera cost approximately £3500 to install and there was an ongoing maintenance cost.
- 2.23 The project delivery process map involved a feasibility analysis/commissioning document, consultation with internal and external crime prevention bodies, a ballot/consultation requirement, scheme design, scheme procurement and scheme implementation.
- 2.24 Officers advised that more work could take place to make the service more responsive to residents' comments. The service was trying to work more closely with stakeholders, particularly when upgrading installations.
- 2.25 Some areas and estates had more CCTV than others. Work was taking place with the Geographic Information System (GIS) team to map every camera in the borough.
- 2.26 As technology improved, CCTV became smarter. More tracking was now taking place and equipment such as trip wires and motion sensors were being introduced. Sherlock was a new system that could search through historical data quickly. This would be an area for more development in the future.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The committee heard evidence about CCTV provision across the borough, the roles of the Concierge Service, CCTV Control Room, Housing Repair Team and Capital Improvement Team, alternative measures that could be used in conjunction with or instead of CCTV and future work that the services were planning.
- 3.2 The Committee hoped the scrutiny recommendations would improve the effectiveness of CCTV and alternative measures across the borough to improve outcomes for residents.

APPENDIX – SCRUTINY INITIATION DOCUMENT

SCRUTINY REVIEW INITIATION DOCUMENT (SID)
Review: CCTV
Scrutiny Review Committee: Environment Scrutiny Committee
Director leading the review: Simon Kwong
Lead Officers: Garrett McEntee and Daniel Tomey
Overall aim: To consider the context for provision of CCTV on housing estates
<p>Objectives of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand why we have CCTV on some estates and not others. • To consider works currently undertaken to maintain and upgrade CCTV systems and how these are planned and prioritised • To consider resident consultation around CCTV systems on housing estates • To consider available funding for CCTV.
<p>How is the review to be carried out:</p> <p>Scope of the Review</p> <p>The review will focus on:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Understanding how current CCTV systems are used and maintained</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Resident views on CCTV on housing estates</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Whether the installation of new CCTV schemes is feasible</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Whether mobile CCTV cameras are practicable and/or cost-effective.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Alternative measures to CCTV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The role of the concierge</p> <p>Types of evidence:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A presentation covering the above aspects will be given jointly by the Technical Services Manager and the Concierge Manager.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Statistics pre and post CCTV.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Visit to the Brewery Road Site to see the operation in progress (<i>optional</i>)</p>