



ISLINGTON

CCTV SCRUTINY REVIEW

REPORT OF REGENERATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

LONDON BOROUGH OF ISLINGTON

JULY 2005

CCTV SCRUTINY REVIEW

REPORT OF REGENERATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

FOREWORD FROM THE CHAIR

The role of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) in Britain today is one of the great unexamined features of our time. In recent years the number of CCTV schemes run by the police, councils, large private companies, and even individuals has exploded, to the point where Britain has more CCTV cameras per head than almost any other country in the world – and more than most of the rest of EU put together, for example.

Most Islington residents can expect to be captured on CCTV literally dozens of times every single day. But, despite a large number of people having a vague unease about this massive gathering of information about us by public and private organisations – and most of us have really no idea at all what happens to it – CCTV itself has to an extraordinary degree managed to avoid the kind of spotlight which it itself puts the rest of us under.

This inquiry was initiated to put CCTV under exactly this kind of scrutiny and to recommend how much we use it in future to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour.

Our conclusion is clear: Islington Council, in partnership with the police and others, already has several CCTV schemes. We recommend that, while continuing to maintain their present high standards of protection of the data they collect which already exist, that the council's CCTV programme be further developed.

We have collected a large amount of evidence from a wide range of different schemes from several different parts of the country and as with the best CCTV schemes, we have sorted this evidence carefully and make our recommendations for action by the council and others.

One of our first surprises was to discover the extraordinary lack of evidence which exists about CCTV, its effectiveness and its operation.

In collecting our own evidence, we established clearly that CCTV is a useful weapon for the police and others in catching those responsible for committing crimes. The introduction of CCTV cameras also significantly reduces the fear of crime, which independently of the actual level of crime itself, is a major factor in reducing the quality of life for many people, particularly the elderly. These are clear benefits which CCTV brings.

However it has also become clear that in most circumstances, CCTV on its own does not reduce crime. In particular circumstances, such as in confined areas, there is some evidence that it does. But in general, despite widespread belief to the contrary our exhaustive questioning failed to find any hard evidence that CCTV on its own was effective in reducing crime.

The attacks on London on 7th July 2005 and the investigation which followed have shown how CCTV is used to identify those who commit a crime, but cannot necessarily prevent the crime in the first place, even when the crimes are of the magnitude of those bombings.

We were also surprised by the lack of any significant opposition in principle to the use of CCTV. Again, we looked very hard for any opposition, including from civil liberties groups, but could not find any opposition to its use in principle. It is clear that for those who are concerned, their main worry is about the way in which data is held and the use to which it is put.

The collection of large amounts of CCTV information about each of us does represent a significant tilt towards the state in the relationship between state and individual. Appropriate safeguards are therefore essential. We were pleased to discover that Islington Council maintains very high standards in its management of images collected by CCTV. Not only does the Council comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act and relevant guidelines from the Home Office, but also with the best practice protocols of the national CCTV user group, from whose representatives we took evidence. We have made a number of recommendations for improving these still further.

A final major area of our work has been around the funding of CCTV schemes. CCTV systems, especially in the public sector, are often 'funded' by a one-off start-up grant to cover the cost of installing the cameras themselves, but with little or no funding for the ongoing revenue costs of monitoring the data collected. We recommend that both organisations bidding for funding to run CCTV schemes, and those providing funding, take a broad look at the overall lifecycle costs of the scheme when considering introducing them.

I would like to thank all the members of the Regeneration Review Committee who have taken part in this investigation, Graham Baker, Sylvia Wright, Anna Berent, Jonathan Dearth and Carol Powell, the Executive Member (Housing and Community Safety) Jyoti Vaja, our scrutiny officer Peter Moore, officers Kevin O'Leary, Bram Kainth, Gary Griffiths and George Heath, as well as all those we met and took evidence from. I am grateful also to the many other councillors and members of the public who contributed to our work through discussions at the Council's Area Committees.

We have learnt a lot about the advantages and operations of CCTV. We hope that our report will not only help to guide Islington's use of CCTV, but also be a useful addition to the still small body of evidence about its use.

**COUNCILLOR MARISHA RAY
CHAIR OF REGENERATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGENERATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

COUNCILLORS (2005/06)

Marisha Ray (Chair)
Graham Baker (Vice-Chair)
Anna Berent
James Blanchard
Carol Powell
Sylvia Wright
Lisa Spall
Richard Heseltine

(2004/05)

Marisha Ray (Chair)
Graham Baker (Vice-Chair)
Anna Berent
Jonathan Dearth
Carol Powell
Sylvia Wright
Richard Heseltine
Vacancy

SUBSTITUTE COUNCILLORS (2005/06)

Heather Johnson
Doreen Scott
Keith Sharp
Barbara Smith
Dorrie Valery
Lucy Watt
Adrian Pulham

(2004/05)

James Blanchard
Heather Johnson
Doreen Scott
Dorrie Valery
Keith Sharp
Barbara Smith
Lisa Spall

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Regeneration Review Committee would like to thank all the groups and individuals who have contributed to the scrutiny process and whose evidence has assisted in the compilation of the report. We particularly thank the other Local Authorities we visited in order to view their CCTV control rooms.

A full list of witnesses is detailed in Appendix 'B' to the report.

OFFICER SUPPORT

Scrutiny and Democratic Services: Peter Moore and Gareth Jenkins
Environment and Conservation Department: Kevin O'Leary, Bram Kainth, Gary Griffiths and George Heath
Law & Public Services: Louise Round

THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Council continue its programme of introducing CCTV schemes, where there is evidence they will be beneficial to the borough, working in close partnership with the Police and other agencies
2. That work towards developing a new CCTV control room continue, and this should be compatible with future joint working with the police and other organisations
3. That the Council should continue to maintain high standards for the management of data collected by CCTV, and that appropriate safeguards for its confidentiality are upheld and enforced
4. That the Council's Constitution be amended to clarify the specific responsibility of the Director of Environment & Regeneration to uphold the Council's CCTV Code of Practice
5. That other procedures and protocols relating to the management of CCTV data be updated to prevent their abuse; that all personnel handling CCTV be trained additionally in the use which the Police make of CCTV images which the Council may supply to them
6. That a multi-agency working group bring together officers from the Council, partners and emergency services, to promote a co-ordinated approach to CCTV in Islington
7. That the Council continue to keep under review evidence of the impact of CCTV on catching criminals and preventing crime under review; in particular any evidence about the cost-effectiveness of CCTV compared to other means; also any displacement effect
8. That when considering introducing new CCTV schemes careful assessment is made of the lifetime cost of managing the scheme, including staff costs of monitoring the data, and not merely the initial capital cost of installing the hardware
9. That the Council emphasize to organisations funding CCTV schemes, including the government, the importance of providing resources for monitoring the images collected by CCTV, as well as the initial capital costs of installing the cameras
10. That the Council use the range of its contacts with private sector organisations in the borough to actively promote high standards of CCTV data management by private organisations, where there are usually fewer controls on its use
11. That the Council specifically discuss with the Police mechanisms for more efficient management of CCTV; including the use of police radio links and the possible siting of police personnel in the control room
12. That the Council investigate whether statutory planning and licensing or any other processes can be used to encourage businesses to provide CCTV or other measures such as the provision of help points in identified anti-social behaviour hotspots
13. That the Council review the potential for savings on IT costs, such as fibre optic cabling

14. That the potential for further CCTV cameras in retail centres be investigated, and the agreement now secured from Transport for London to use their cameras for community safety purposes at certain times be pursued
15. That the success of the pilot scheme installing help and information points at the Nags Head be assessed, and its extension considered
16. That discussions take place with Homes for Islington, with regard to concierge and other CCTV schemes on estates, and whether it would be beneficial to link these with the new CCTV control room
17. That the Council examine the potential for developing mobile CCTV, in consultation with the Police and other partner organisations, targeting specific areas where CCTV would normally be prohibitively expensive, such as parks
18. That the success of trials currently taking place of relocatable CCTV cameras on housing estates be assessed and consideration be given to extending these
19. That CEA@Islington be asked to support schools in developing a safety and security plan
20. That the appropriate role for CCTV in the Council's routine monitoring of contractors be considered further

1. INTRODUCTION

The Regeneration Review Committee was tasked with undertaking a review considering all aspects of the current use of CCTV, including effectiveness, costs, reliability, data security, operation, location, management and functionality of the CCTV service in Islington and public perception of all of these shortly after installation and in the longer term.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

The objectives of the review agreed by the Committee were as follows –

- To review all aspects of the current and future scope of Islington's CCTV provision
- To assess the costs incurred in installation, maintenance, upgrading, obsolescence and staffing of CCTV
- To assess the effectiveness of CCTV in preventing crime in Islington.
- To assess local public confidence in CCTV, their attitude to it and their perception of its effect on community safety
- To consider the data protection and other legal and civil liberties implications relating to CCTV and the sharing of information gathered as a result of its use
- To examine the efficiency of Islington's CCTV implementation and whether improvements to this are possible
- To identify other measures which can enhance public confidence in community safety in a similar way and the effectiveness and costs of these measures.

3. METHODOLOGY AND TIMETABLING

3.1 Following the agreement of the Scrutiny Initiation Document (Appendix 'A' of the report) by the Regeneration Review Committee, officers devised a programme of work, taking into account relevant stakeholders and the evidence members wanted to consider.

3.2 The methodology undertaken in securing evidence from witnesses was varied and flexible in order to obtain the best information possible. A number of visits were arranged to other Local Authorities which was relayed to the Committee in papers and through the reporting of the Chair.

In addition to this, information regarding the review was posted on Areas Online, the Council website discussion forum and discussion took place at Area Committees.

3.3 The notes for all visits undertaken during the scrutiny are available on the Council's website, www.islington.gov.uk or from the scrutiny team at the Town Hall.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 The scrutiny on CCTV commenced on 11th October 2004.

4.2 The review particularly examined the need for CCTV in terms of community safety, crime and social disorder and looked at CCTV in partnership with other agencies, such as Transport for London (TfL) and the Police, the private sector and the use of CCTV by Arsenal Football Club in relation to its new stadium and the need for crowd control with 60/65,000 fans coming into Islington.

4.3 At present there is a CCTV control centre at King's Cross, which is operated by the Council but jointly funded by L.B. Camden with the Police providing the premises. The monitoring is provided by a contractor, the Corps of Commissionaires funded by the London Boroughs of Islington and Camden and the Finsbury Park Partnership. There was a need to assess whether the current facilities were adequate or whether they should be re-located with the CCTV control centre which currently operates from Old Street and monitors traffic enforcement. In addition individual housing estates operate concierge schemes with CCTV systems.

4.4 There are currently 40 cameras in the Kings Cross area, of which 10 are situated in Islington. There are also 11 cameras in the Finsbury Park area and one camera in the Archway area. Six cameras have recently been installed in the Nag's Head area.

4.5 A number of other issues had to be addressed by the scrutiny review – human rights issues, information sharing and data protocols, possible displacement of crime, the potential of mobile/relocatable CCTV, costs, comparisons with other crime reduction initiatives, traffic enforcement and other related issues.

4.6 CCTV has in the past few years been the subject of massive investment by Government, the Police and local authorities. However, when we began our scrutiny process there appeared to have been very few informative studies of how cost effective CCTV was or indeed whether CCTV had or had not reduced crime in general or had only been effective for certain types of crime.

4.7 Crime and the fear of crime is a very important issue for the residents of Islington. CCTV can be a powerful tool in combating crime but it has to be recognised that the context in which CCTV systems operate are variable as are the systems themselves. CCTV can appear to be a simple measure to implement but this is not necessarily the case, and the findings of the scrutiny address the complex issues involved and seek to provide a way forward that could assess the potential of the development of CCTV in Islington.

4.8 The CCTV initiative was set up under the Home Office Crime Reduction Programme announced in 1998, and £170 million was made available for the funding of a total of 684 CCTV projects nationwide. These have been installed in a wide range of locations, including car parks, town and city centres, and residential areas.

4.9 Closed Circuit Television Cameras (CCTV) have become known as an important crime prevention and security measure. CCTV images are recorded on tape and can be made available to be viewed or stored as appropriate. CCTV is a useful means **by** which a locality can be kept under surveillance remotely. This makes it possible for the Police,

and other law and regulatory agencies, such as private security companies, to respond to incidents when alerted, and to have information about what to look for when they arrive. The storing of images means that post-incident analysis helpful to an investigation can be facilitated. However, there are many different types of CCTV systems and they have different capacities to meet a variety of objectives.

4.10 Cameras can be static (focusing on a single view), or can pan, tilt and zoom (moved by operators, or be placed on 'tours' to survey a succession of scenes); they can be fixed (permanently installed in one location); redeployable (moved around power points within an area), or mobile (placed in vehicles and transported to where they are needed); they may transmit analogue or digital images, via cable or wireless links. The images can be recorded in different ways with different implications for quality. The many methods of storing and manipulating images have different implications as regards the type and speed of monitoring that can be carried out. The availability of specialised applications, such as number plate and facial recognition, has generated yet more potential uses of this flexible technology, though the latter is yet to reach maturity

4.11 Individual CCTV systems may employ several of these technical features. There are a number of points that need to be highlighted here. First, the technical specification of a system may well impact on its effectiveness. Second, this is emerging technology, and assessments at any particular point in time need to take account of this. Thirdly, technical considerations are an important element in the evaluation of systems. This does not mean that those evaluating CCTV need to be technical experts, but technical expertise does need to be consulted. In particular, it is ensure that the technical specification is consistent with the objectives set.

4.12 However, the technology is only one part of a CCTV system. No system can work without a control room, and there is wide variation in the way that these operate. They can be monitored full-time or for a limited number of hours a week, and by a dedicated operator or by one who has other duties besides CCTV monitoring. Staffing levels vary greatly, and so do the types of areas surveyed, including town centres, residential areas and car parks. There are also a range of control room cultures, management styles, and methods of communicating with the police. All of these factors, and others, influence the way the control room operates.

4.13 Many systems also incorporate the installation, or improvement, of street lighting in their design and often such improvements are made at the same time as the cameras are installed. These are then treated as part of the scheme design rather than as confounding factors.

4.14 Sometimes it may be better to look at design measures to stop crime in an area rather than use CCTV.

4.15 The scrutiny review therefore needed to be wide ranging in order to take account of the many aspects that needed investigation.

5. THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

5.1 The Police are strong advocates of CCTV and at our meeting on 6th December 2004 we received evidence from Chief Superintendent Barry Norman and P.C. Ian Gray of Islington Police.

5.2 The Committee were informed that L.B. Islington was the busiest borough in London in terms of crime per 1,000 residents and that the Government's PSA target was to reduce crime by 21-22% in the borough.

5.3 Chief Superintendent Norman stated that there was at present no strategic CCTV provision in the borough and that whilst CCTV on its own did not prevent crime it did help the Police in the prosecution of crimes which meant officers having to attend Court less often. CCTV was also effective in crime reduction in some areas such as car crime if CCTV was located in car parks, but tended to work less effectively in stopping crimes relating to anti-social behaviour, such as drunkenness in public places.

5.4 We were informed that in 2005 mobile CCTV would be introduced in the borough, funded by Neighbourhood Renewal monies and Chief Superintendent Norman stated that he hoped that a close partnership in this area could be developed with the Council.

5.5 Chief Superintendent Norman also informed the Committee that CCTV initially made the public feel safer and their fear of crime was reduced, however this may dissipate over time.

5.6 The Committee also received evidence that whilst unmonitored CCTV could be effective in certain initiatives around shop premises, CCTV needed to be part of other crime initiatives if it was to be effective, particularly when located in a public place.

5.7 Members were informed that whilst capital costs for the installation of CCTV were relatively easy to obtain it was the revenue costs, which were often fairly substantial, that were more difficult to fund.

5.8 Good CCTV systems had a 7-10 year life before needing replacement and there was a need to make provision for maintenance costs and for the staffing of a control room.

5.9 Chief Superintendent Norman was of the view that the introduction of CCTV in areas such as Upper Street and Nag's Head would be beneficial and would enable speedier responses from the Police and assist in prosecutions of more serious crimes.

5.10 The Angel/Upper Street area was now a 24 hour economy and the Police were not resourced to cope with this in the same way as areas such as Charing Cross and Covent Garden. The Nag's Head area had particular problems with robberies and illegal cigarette selling.

5.11 The Committee were informed that most contact crime such as muggings, occurred within 400 to 800 yards and burglaries within 1/3 mile of where criminals lived and therefore CCTV could assist in identifying and subsequently locating the perpetrator of a crime. In addition CCTV might also assist in the reduction of terrorism and in the detection of a perpetrator if terrorism did actually occur.

5.12 Chief Superintendent Norman stated that if effective CCTV was introduced in Islington, the Police would be willing to allow access to Police radio control systems.

5.13 At our meeting on 31st January 2005 the Committee heard from a number of witnesses focussing on the effectiveness of CCTV in and around shopping centres.

5.14 Bradley Cordez, Head of Security at the Business Design Centre (BDC) in Islington, referred to the fact that CCTV was used at the BDC to detect crime and it enabled them to employ less security staff.

5.15 Steve Collard, NI Town Centre Manager, stated that the NI Town Centre had its own control centre and CCTV system. He informed the Committee that the public did appear to get comfort from CCTV cameras being present and in his view there were a lot of open areas in Islington where CCTV would be beneficial, with support from the Police and good CCTV operators.

5.16 Christina Lovett, Angel Town Centre Manager, informed the Committee that the NI Town Centre had very large number of visitors per year and was one of the busiest shopping centres in London for its size.

5.17 Christina Lovett indicated that the perception of CCTV was that it reduced crime and the installation of CCTV had been included in the Angel Town Centre Business Plan.

5.18 Christina Lovett referred to the problems in the Angel area caused by the night time economy and said that CCTV would enable the Police to deal more speedily with incidents.

5.19 In addition Christina Lovett stated that businesses in the Angel area had expressed their concerns about the lack of CCTV and a number of businesses had indicated that they would like to enter into discussions about funding CCTV camera installation. Funding could also be made available from other sources such as the business improvement district, voluntary contributions from a business levy, or Section 106 monies. This appeared to the Committee to be an area that merited further investigation.

5.20 Clive Paul, Camden Town Centre Manager, gave evidence to the Committee concerning the CCTV system in Camden Town Centre and the remainder of the Camden area. He stated that in 2001, the first year of operation of CCTV, and in conjunction with street wardens and the Police, street crime had fallen by 23%.

5.21 Displacement of crime was another factor that concerned the Committee and a number of enquiries were made as to whether the installation of CCTV cameras displaced crime to adjoining areas.

5.22 Clive Paul, Camden Town Centre Manager, informed the Committee that in terms of the Kings Cross CCTV area, crime had not been displaced to the rest of Camden although there was a drug problem in Camden. There was evidence however that some prostitution had been displaced into Islington.

5.23 Whilst displacement was difficult to quantify there did appear to be evidence that certain types of crime were displaced. A number of authorities argued that if CCTV displaced crime out of the borough this was acceptable as it became somebody else's problem.

- 5.24 We also received written evidence from two Home Office research studies (Welsh/ Farrington and Gill) into the crime prevention effects of CCTV. The most recent study by David Gill appeared to show that some crimes were reduced more than others by the introduction of CCTV. This appeared to correspond to the evidence we heard from witnesses and when we visited other Local Authorities.
- 5.25 Impulsive crime, such as alcohol related offences, was less likely to be reduced than premeditated crime, such as theft of motor vehicles. There were also indications that CCTV was more effective in sites with limited and controlled access and exit points, which enabled CCTV to operate most effectively.
- 5.26 We also heard evidence from Michael Pollak, a CCTV consultant, that studies seemed to indicate that CCTV appeared to have had little if any affect on violent crime, but was effective if used in car parks and on targeted Police operations.
- 5.27 Michael Pollak referred to two studies that had been undertaken in Airdrie and Glasgow. In a defined area such as Airdrie crime had reduced by 21% with the installation of CCTV, but in a larger area such as Glasgow the reduction in crime had not been significant.
- 5.28 During our wide ranging investigation we visited a number of other local authorities to look at the effectiveness and costs of their CCTV operations.
- 5.29 L.B.Enfield had a purpose built CCTV control centre with over 180 cameras. Negotiations were currently taking place with TfL to access their network of enforcement cameras in the evening for community safety purposes.
- 5.30 The control centre dealt with enforcement and community safety and also monitored cameras sited in the nearby L.B.Waltham Forest. The centre had capacity to expand to take on additional monitoring such as libraries, schools, shopping centres, etc. and even had the capacity to take on business alarm systems.
- 5.31 L.B.Enfield control centre had used fibre optic cabling which was being added to and had saved significant sums on IT networking with British Telecommunications. Our visit to Warrington Council revealed that they too had made similar significant savings by the introduction of fibre optic cabling.
- 5.32 The Committee were informed that L.B.Enfield were trying to enter into an arrangement whereby a dedicated Police Officer could be present in the CCTV control centre with a terminal. The Police Officer could carry out monitoring and act as a dedicated expert witness in prosecutions which would save Police time.
- 5.33 As stated previously, fibre optic cabling was a feature that was mentioned in a number of our visits to other authorities; this could achieve substantial savings with British Telecom when used for IT networking. The Committee were of the view that if the opportunity presented itself the possibility of installing fibre optic cabling should be investigated.
- 5.34 Members of the Committee also undertook a visit to the parking enforcement team at Old Street, which dealt with parking and bus lane offences, and would from October deal with moving traffic contraventions.

5.35 The cameras were originally funded by TfL and the London Bus Initiative. This initial funding had allowed Islington to generate revenue to install additional cameras.

5.36 Cameras were originally put in place for enforcement purposes, but the opportunity did present itself of using them for community safety purposes in the evenings. The Committee were of the view that if the King's Cross Control Room relocated to Old Street then the traffic enforcement cameras could be used for such a purpose with the possibility of also using cameras for enforcement purposes against for instance graffiti and littering. In addition better facilities at Old Street Control Room would mean that more cameras could be added to the system if required.

5.37 We were of the view that the existing control room premises at King's Cross that we visited were not suitable for a co-ordinated CCTV operation that might require expansion in the future.

5.38 The premises at King's Cross provide particularly poor working conditions for the staff. The accommodation is cramped and there is no natural light. It appeared to the Committee that given the unsuitability of these premises and the benefits of co-locating the enforcement cameras which were currently based at Old Street together with the community safety cameras that there was a need to have a new control room to support co-ordinated CCTV operations.

5.39 A local control room would also mean that the CCTV service could take account of local needs and CCTV evidence could be used to enforce ASBO's and provide evidence for Police and customs investigations where feasible.

5.40 The Committee also discussed the issue of security in schools with Dr. Kirit Modi, Assistant Director, Head of Professional Services, CEA @ Islington.

5.41 Dr. Modi stated that everyone using a school should feel safe. Schools gave a high priority to the safety of pupils and adults in schools. A wide range of approaches were used from a strict entry arrangement to the use of CCTV cameras.

5.42 Dr. Modi indicated that there needed to be a balance between security of the school site and the school being 'open to parents' and the community. Each school established this balance within an individual context and 64% of schools used CCTV to monitor the front entrance of the school. Other methods to improve safety included intruder alarm systems, well lit pathways, secure exit doors etc.

5.43 Dr. Modi added that following the Dunblane massacre there had been a huge increase in security measures at schools but he felt that schools should not become fortresses. However, the move towards extended school provision meant that there was a need to improve security and the possibility of the creation of secure separate areas for extended school provision, such as the Platform One development at Elizabeth Garrett Anderson should be investigated.

5.44 Dr. Modi expressed the view that the use of CCTV cameras was now not unusual in schools and that it would be useful if schools could be provided with support and advice in the use of CCTV cameras, which would form an overall plan of security.

5.45 Dr. Modi also expressed the view that consideration should be given to providing targeted 'match funding' to schools to implement a security plan, including the use of CCTV cameras.

5.46 Despite our other attempts to investigate whether CCTV could be beneficial in schools the only borough that had had CCTV cameras monitored by a central control room was L.B.Newham. However we were informed that monitoring of CCTV cameras at schools no longer took place as schools were not willing to fund it after local delegation of budgets to schools.

5.47 CCTV in schools may well form part of an overall security plan and we considered that officers could investigate the feasibility of this at a later date if schools were willing to fund or contribute to funding it.

5.48 During our visits to a number of authorities we were also made aware that the Police made requests for CCTV to be used in connection with Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2002 (RIPA) enquiries relating to targeted surveillance enquiries where the Police were trying to collect information on people, especially relating to crime, after all other avenues had been exhausted.

5.49 There was a need for CCTV managers and operators to be aware of the protocols around the release of CCTV footage as there had been occasional instances where the Police had tried to obtain the release of CCTV footage, which they had not got the correct authority to obtain, and where it was felt that all other alternatives had not been looked at. CCTV managers needed to be aware and conversant with protocols around the release of information.

5.50 As Britain seemed to have more CCTV coverage than most other European countries, the Committee decided to make enquiries as to why this was the case and received evidence from the Norwegian Data Commissioner.

5.51 The Norwegian Data Commission referred to recent cases involving the use of CCTV on public buses and trains in Norway and that these had raised fundamental issues on the monitoring of CCTV. The Norwegian Data Inspectorate ruled that the data controllers in question could not use CCTV on either buses or trains, except exit areas and areas surrounding the driver of the vehicle. The rulings were based on a general balancing of interests, where data protection rights of travellers were weighed against specific interests in preventing crime on board.

5.52 On a general level, the Inspectorate has taken the view that although CCTV might be a useful tool in some contexts, the positive effects on the fight against everyday crime e.g. vandalism and street violence were generally very limited and in some cases virtually non-existent. The Norwegian Data Commissioner expressed the view that the use of CCTV merely moved the problem into non CCTV areas. In addition CCTV did not prevent mentally ill persons from carrying out criminal acts, nor acts undertaken by persons under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

5.53 Indeed the majority of serious criminal acts where the success of CCTV has been cited by its supporters in Norway had been carried out by mentally unstable persons or those under the influence of alcohol/drugs however whilst CCTV did not stop the crime being actually committed, it could claim to have a positive effect in the investigation process by the Police.

5.54 The Swedish Embassy informed us that in Sweden public CCTV was allowed if due consideration was given to individual personal integrity.

5.55 Information to the public regarding the CCTV has to be given either by clearly displayed notices or by other effective means. If sound is being recorded this has to be mentioned.

5.56 Permission for CCTV in a public place is given if the public interest is deemed to be stronger than the individual need not to be filmed and has to be applied for in writing to the local authority concerned and the local authority reserves the right to express their opinion.

5.57 In general pictures and sound from CCTV in a public place are allowed to be kept for the maximum period of a month. As few people as possible should have access to the material and misuse should be discouraged. A person dealing with CCTV material is not allowed to disclose any of the information except to authorised persons.

5.58 In Sweden the supervision of CCTV in a public place is undertaken by the relevant local authority and there is the right of appeal against the local authority and infringement of the law is an offence punishable by fine or prison.

5.59 The evidence from Sweden and Norway appear to support other evidence concerning the need for adequate protection to be put in place to protect the rights of individuals and any potential misuse of data.

5.60 The Committee also visited an extremely large, 24-hour monitored CCTV operation at Liverpool City Council which had 6 operators costing £180,000 per annum. During our visit to Liverpool we were informed that the CCTV control centre had been initiated by the Deputy Chief Constable who had recognised the potential benefits of CCTV and this initiative was a partnership between the City Council and the Police.

5.61 Liverpool control room had over 240 cameras and over 30 arrests were made per week due to CCTV.

5.62 CCTV was used in Police prosecutions and encouraged guilty pleas which on average resulted in cost savings of about €5,000 per case compared to a not guilty plea.

5.63 The centre had a direct link to the Police computer and there were 13 help points in the City where an alarm could be set off and the camera would focus on the area to ascertain if a person was being assaulted and if assistance was required. The visit to Plymouth also highlighted the introduction of help points in the City Centre which had proved beneficial.

5.64 Crime in Liverpool City Centre had reduced significantly since the introduction of CCTV and from an increased Police presence and businesses and the Chamber of Commerce were satisfied with CCTV as there had been a significant drop in crime and shoplifting. Residents in Manchester were now 3 times more likely to be victims of a crime attack than in Liverpool.

5.65 The Committee were of the view that the effect of the new licensing regulations may mean, at least initially, an increase in anti-social behaviour. We were of the view that it should be investigated whether section 106 monies could be utilised to enhance the street scene for residents, which could include the provision of CCTV or other measures in

identified anti-social behaviour hotspots. In addition we heard from a number of authorities that the CCTV control centre was linked up to clubs and their door staff and that Police carried store net radios and a radio link to the CCTV control centre. A number of authorities were also looking at offering CCTV monitoring to the private sector in order to increase revenue.

5.66 Our visit to Plymouth Council was primarily to view how the installation of help points, together with the use of CCTV, had had an impact on the public perception of crime.

5.67 There were 9 help points in the City Centre, a number of which were also information points which gave information on journey planning and Council services. The help points also had a button which residents could press if they were subjected to an assault in the City Centre and CCTV cameras could focus in and direct Police to make an appropriate response or assess whether it was a hoax call.

5.68 CCTV in Plymouth had proved extremely useful and by working very closely with the anti-social behaviour unit and the Police in providing evidence in relation to the issuing of anti-social behaviour orders (ASBO's), had resulted in 64 ASBO's being issued by the Police/Local Authority, although these were generally only used after other interventions had failed to protect the community.

5.69 Plymouth stressed the importance of the need to have a visible presence such as Police and street wardens, in addition to CCTV and ASBO's and that the combined use of these measures had resulted in a decrease in crime.

5.70 Plymouth also had used CCTV to address the problem of retail crime, as it was established that nearly all the offences of shoplifting were being committed by a small number of offenders; CCTV enabled the offenders to be identified and banned from all participating stores for 12 months. Businesses had to pay an annual fee to become a member of the scheme which had reduced crime by 20% in the City Centre.

5.71 Plymouth did stress however that the area should be assessed before CCTV was introduced as some areas could have crime designed out by using measures such as better street lighting, opening spaces up, making areas less attractive for youths to gather etc.

5.72 We also heard that CCTV could be extremely useful in conjunction with clubs in directing Police to assaults. Clubs would often ring the CCTV centre if there were altercations between customers. Clubs usually had their own CCTV systems but the CCTV control room could liaise with Police to ensure the correct level of response to the incident or to monitor the situation and provide evidence in prosecutions. In the event of the Police not being happy with CCTV systems installed by clubs they could report this and it would be raised as a licensing issue. CCTV could also be used to disprove offences, such as assault and allegations of robbery and to work with internal and external agencies such as the Benefits agency, to monitor if claimants were working, undertaking illegal trading etc.

5.73 The Committee also decided that, as part of the scrutiny, as the issue of crime was one of the most important issues for residents, that the Area Committees should be consulted on the CCTV scrutiny. A wide range of issues were raised in relation to CCTV by residents and Councillors at the Area Committee meetings, including displacement,

fake cameras not being a deterrent, as people quickly realised that they were fakes, the success of concierge schemes on certain estates and the fact that whilst it may be true that cameras did not deter those members of the public who were drunk or on drugs they did help to identify the guilty etc. The views expressed by Area Committees have been taken into account in drafting the recommendations to the report.

5.74 We also visited Finsbury Estate to see their concierge scheme which had been installed in 2002. Prior to this the estate had had problems with vandalism, suicides on the estate, pirate radio and other anti-social behaviour.

5.75 Residents were of the view that the CCTV cameras acted as a good deterrent and prevented people vandalising door locks and gaining access to the estate by this method. Vandals could also be more easily identified and charged for any damage they did.

5.76 CCTV had also had an impact on drugs being sold on the estates and discouraged drug users from coming on to the estate to use drugs. Cameras were also sited in the lifts which had also proved very effective in preventing vandalism.

5.77 Whilst residents were consulted before the concierge scheme went ahead the costs were quite expensive. The running costs were £4.59 a week and the capital cost was divided equally between tenants and leaseholders.

5.78 However, the concierge system and other improvements had meant that the value of the flats had increased and at Peregrine House CCTV had been used to gather evidence leading to the eviction of 2 residents for anti-social behaviour.

5.79 We were informed that expenditure on graffiti and vandalism had decreased and costs to the Council and Police had been reduced. In addition, prior to the installation of CCTV there had been 365 '999' calls per year, but only 30 in the year following installation of CCTV.

5.80 The Committee were of the view that CCTV and a concierge system should, if it resulted in fewer burglaries and reduced crime, result in lower insurance premiums for tenants. HFI have been requested to raise this issue with the Council's insurers at the earliest possible opportunity.

5.81 Following consideration of the CCTV report at North Area Committee the Brecknock Estate Tenants Association asked us to take evidence from them in connection with the possible use of CCTV on the estate.

5.82 The Chair of the Tenants Association informed us that the estate did suffer from minor vandalism and anti-social behaviour and that the addition of CCTV on the estate, even for a trial period would be beneficial and that the design of the estate with two main walkways made it ideal for the introduction of CCTV.

5.83 We were also informed that at present relocatable CCTV was being used on a trial basis on a number of estates and the Committee were of the view that following the present trials the results should be analysed to measure their effectiveness and if it had been successful, consideration should be given to extending the trial to other estates in the borough.

5.84 Relocatable and mobile CCTV can be particularly useful in targeting specific areas where fixed CCTV cameras would be prohibitively expensive, such as in parks.

5.85 The Committee were also of the view that officers should investigate the further other potential uses for mobile CCTV, which we understand the Police will shortly be introducing and relocatable CCTV, such as in alleviating instances of graffiti and fly-tipping.

5.86 The Committee did not take any evidence in relation to the installation of fake cameras but were of the view that these would not be effective and would reduce the public's perception of the effectiveness of CCTV.

5.87 Another area that we looked at was whether crime or the fear of crime would be reduced more effectively by the introduction of more Community Support Officers or Police Officers, rather than by the introduction of CCTV.

5.88 Committee Members, during the visit to Plymouth, were informed that they were of the view that CCTV was the best option for improved security in the City Centre, as it was the most cost effective method, given that only one extra Police Officer could be employed per shift for the additional costs of CCTV. We were of the view that further work needed to be undertaken to assess whether this was the case or a more visible presence would be more effective. It is worth emphasising that all the visits and evidence that were undertaken highlighted the need to view CCTV as a tool which had to be used in conjunction with other crime reduction initiatives.

5.89 At the Committee meeting on 7th March 2005 evidence was received from Mike Batchelor, Vice-Chair of the CCTV user group and CCTV control centre manager at Oxford.

5.90 Mike Batchelor referred to the use of RIPA's, mentioned earlier in the report, the purpose of which was to regulate the use of covert or directed surveillance when the Police were trying to collect information, especially relating to crime, after all other avenues had been exhausted.

5.91 Mike Batchelor informed the Committee that RIPA's should be used as a last resort for the purpose of collecting covert information. In addition the CCTV manager had to concur with any RIPA request from the Police, which did act as a check and balance within the system and that on occasions he had refused RIPA requests as he had not considered that all other alternatives had been looked at. Mike Batchelor informed us that an annual audit was also undertaken on RIPA requests, by both the Council's auditors and the Police, however there were not generally a large number of RIPA requests.

5.92 Mike Batchelor informed the Committee that information collected on CCTV footage was the largest amount of personal data collected in the country and it was important to ensure that data collected and the rights of individuals were protected.

5.93 Mike Batchelor indicated that the National CCTV user group had published a code of practice and there was a best practice guide designed to ensure that the principles enshrined within the day to day operation of CCTV systems were in practice and that information was collected for the express purposes set out in the Code of Practice. It was further stated that the model Code of Practice and the procedure manual were in operation in most public sector control rooms.

5.94 Mike Batchelor referred to the issue of the use of CCTV to monitor contractors and indicated that he could not see any reason why CCTV could not be used for the benefit of the community in order to monitor contractors provided the parameters were well defined and it was properly managed. However there was an obligation to inform contractors that CCTV monitoring would be used and that their staff should also be made aware of this.

5.95 Human rights and civil liberties were another area of concern that the Committee were keen to investigate in order that any increased use of CCTV surveillance did not impinge on residents' civil liberties. During visits to a number of local authorities we made enquires as to whether suitable safeguards were in place for the public to ensure they did not suffer undue harassment or intrusion by operators.

5.96 We were reassured to hear evidence that it was virtually impossible for an operator who focussed on somebody for too long or who used CCTV to look into residents windows to not get caught given the design of the systems and cameras and safeguards in place.

5.97 In addition most CCTV control centres had a privacy suite and CCTV footage was only looked at if there was a suspected offence.

5.98 We were informed during our many visits to CCTV control centres that very few, if any, human rights or civil liberties issues had been raised in connection with the use of CCTV, however we wished to establish whether the information we were given had been correct.

5.99 We visited Liberty, the leading human rights organisation to check on their view of the use of CCTV and they informed us that they were not opposed to the use of CCTV in principle, however, whilst it did have some crime detection uses, even the Government had now accepted that street lighting was a more effective method of reducing crime.

5.100 Liberty made the point that in order to be effective CCTV cameras needed to be properly maintained, well placed and of a modern design and it was important that even if there were fewer cameras used, this could well be more effective than many cameras that were poorly placed or of poor quality.

5.101 We questioned Liberty closely on whether they were aware of CCTV being used for inappropriate purposes and they stated that whilst they did hear some stories of CCTV footage being used inappropriately, they had only taken action in one particular case, the Peck case which had gone to the European Court of Human Rights.

5.102 Liberty were of the view that local authorities tended to have strict guidelines and use CCTV responsibly, however there tended to be more problems with privately operated CCTV.

5.103 Liberty reiterated the view that we had heard on many occasions during the scrutiny process, that CCTV needed to be used in conjunction with other methods of crime reduction, and was not a 'magic wand' to reduce crime.

5.104 Liberty also stressed the importance of the need for separation between the CCTV operation and the inspection process and the more independent the inspection process was the better.

5.105 Liberty were of the view that if private sector schemes were willing to enter into an arrangement for Local Authority CCTV centres to monitor their cameras this would be an improvement, however they expressed their concern that it would tend to be the more responsible private CCTV operators who would be willing to subscribe to a scheme of this nature, rather than the more irresponsible ones.

5.106 Liberty were not able to provide the Committee with evidence to show that different methods of surveillance were being used together to invade privacy, however they did feel that there was a complacency about intrusive surveillance in Britain, which may have something to do with Britain never having been subjected to a dictatorship, unlike many other European countries.

5.107 Liberty also indicated that they supported the use of CCTV cameras for traffic enforcement and provided it could be justified using them in the evenings and weekends for community safety purposes.

5.108 The Committee also sought the advice of Justice, another leading human rights organisation as to their views on CCTV. Justice were of the view that CCTV was more than a tool for reducing crime, and were concerned it also provided the ability to watch people in public places. In addition it raised the issue of privacy and less directly, the right to freedom of assembly and movement.

5.109 Justice were of the view however that at the same time there was the need for a degree of public surveillance in the fight against crime and that this was now generally accepted, however systems should not be abused, in terms of what was recorded and how the material was used.

5.110 During our visits to a number of other authorities we were anxious to ensure there were effective procedures in place to ensure that operators were not abusing the system such as by targeting certain ethnic groups or female members of the public.

5.111 The Committee questioned a number of operators and CCTV control centre managers concerning safeguards in place to stop abuses of the system. In many instances we were informed that operators had to fill in a tick box system under data protection requirements if they followed somebody for more than 30 seconds and had to sign an incident form, which detailed the camera used, time, date, etc., which was filed on to a database. In addition an independent person vetted by the Police could come into the CCTV office at any time to look at the tapes.

5.112 The Committee were of the view that measures should be put in place to ensure that the Council's CCTV Code of Practice was not abused and the Director of Environment and Regeneration should be given specific delegated authority in this regard.

5.113 During our visit to L.B.Enfield we were pleased to learn that operators had to be trained to BTEC standard and undertake refresher courses with regular on the job training.

5.114 The Committee were of the view that all L.B.Islington CCTV staff should be encouraged to undertake appropriate training, especially if they are not directly employed staff, as was the case with the Corps of Commissionaire staff who were employed as operators at the King's Cross CCTV control centre. Any such training should also include equal opportunities training.

5.115 The Committee felt it was important that there were opportunities for career advancement of staff and were pleased to note that there was currently an NVQ for parking attendants and it was anticipated that an element on CCTV would be added in the future.

5.116 In addition the Council were working with the ALG to improve career development in this area and we were informed that Parking Services employed a training and development officer to ensure that staff were adequately trained. It is hoped that a high standard of training provision could be developed in the borough, perhaps with staff from other Councils eventually coming to be trained in Islington.

5.117 The Committee also made enquiries about the possibilities of utilising the Arsenal CCTV when it was not in use on matchdays when it relocates to the new Ashburton Grove site in 2006/07.

5.118 We were informed that the Arsenal Safety Team had recently met and SDG, the clubs consultants, had identified a possible CCTV plan for the stadium and its environment.

5.119 A further meeting is to be convened shortly to discuss the subject of CCTV its co-ordination and protocols between the Council, the Metropolitan Police, Arsenal and other interested parties and this would include the use of the cameras for community safety purposes other than on matchdays. This could include the use of CCTV sited outside stations which would be extremely useful for community safety purposes.

5.120 The Committee also made a visit to the CCTV control room at L.B.Kingston where they were informed that they had installed CCTV cameras with a view to reducing the amount of anti-social behaviour. There had been very little evidence of displacement of crime following the introduction of CCTV in L.B.Kingston.

5.121 The experiences of the introduction of CCTV at L.B.Kingston highlighted similar issues to those raised during our other visits e.g. the need for other solutions to also be examined before introducing CCTV, public reassurance due to the installation of CCTV, assistance in the prosecution of crime, need for the adequate training of staff etc.

5.122 The Committee also had discussions with the Trade Unions, GMB and Unison as to their views on the use of CCTV. The Trade Unions referred to the fact that staff, such as parking attendant staff who faced a relatively high risk of being assaulted had unfortunately not been able so far to have been assisted by the use of CCTV in cases that they had dealt with.

5.123 Staff were also at risk of assault inside Council buildings and whilst cameras were used inside buildings to cover problem areas at present these tended to be of low quality. However if in future these were upgraded digital cameras could be linked into the Council's existing PC network.

5.124 As referred to earlier in the evidence from Mike Batchelor we were informed that CCTV could be used to monitor outside contractors in order to check that they were operating Council contracts awarded by the Council effectively. The Committee made enquiries of Council Trade Unions whether they had any views on CCTV being used to monitor contracts and they stated that they would not object to this, indeed it could prove useful to prove to a member of the public that a street had been swept etc. However before CCTV was installed there should be a proper risk assessment undertaken on the location, balancing risk against cost etc.

5.125 The Trade Unions also had no concerns about the use of CCTV in disciplinary cases, as long as they were given access to the tapes and other evidence and correct procedures were followed. Whilst the data protection act did not automatically cover CCTV images the Council had voluntarily agreed to be legally bound by the act. Cameras in the street were subject to the industry code of practice, the data protection act and a legal framework. Cameras in Council buildings were the responsibility of facilities management and not therefore subject to such stringent controls.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The scrutiny process for CCTV has been an extensive one and has involved taking evidence from a large number of witnesses, written evidence and visits to other local authorities.

6.2 The Committee were of the view that whilst CCTV could be a useful tool in reducing certain types of crime, there was little evidence to suggest it reduced violent crime or anti-social behaviour in public places. However it appears that the public did feel safer in an area when CCTV was installed and from the evidence we received CCTV footage did assist the Police in prosecutions and in apprehending offenders.

6.3 The Committee were keen to assess whether the use of CCTV had had an effect on human rights and civil liberties issues. Whilst there were a limited number of instances where these had been breached because of the use of CCTV, it was not a regular occurrence and we were reassured by both our visit to Liberty and other local authorities that there were controls in place in publicly operated CCTV systems which mitigated against potential abuse.

6.4 The Committee were concerned however at the poor working conditions of the staff at the King's Cross control centre and given that their current premises were unsuitable it appeared to be sensible to relocate the control room with the parking enforcement team at Old Street. This would enable control centre staff to be based together and to utilise, if possible, traffic enforcement cameras for community safety purposes in the evenings. The Committee hope that this recommendation will be adopted and that discussions can continue with businesses, local residents, the Police, TfL, Arsenal and other organisations as to how best existing cameras and any future extension of CCTV can benefit residents most effectively.

6.5 Once a new control room has been established it will be easier for staff training to be co-ordinated more effectively and to assess the benefits of CCTV to the local community before considering the use of CCTV more extensively.

6.6 The Committee also considered the effects of displacement of crime and concluded there was evidence that where CCTV was introduced this did tend to move crime into other areas that did not have CCTV. Displacement of crime was an area that should be kept under review if there were any plans at a future date to extend CCTV in the borough.

6.7 The Committee were also of the view that relocatable CCTV and mobile CCTV cameras could be used in particular areas to assist in preventing or reducing crime, graffiti/flytipping etc. and that this could be particularly useful in parks and housing estates.

6.8 The recommendations in the report are directed to the Executive, the Environment and Regeneration and Law & Public Services Departments.

6.9^a As is normal scrutiny practice the recommendations have not been costed at this stage but it is appreciated by members of the Committee that implementation of some of the recommendations will be subject to appropriate funding.

REVISED

CCTV Scrutiny Initiation Document

Scrutiny Initiation Document (SID)
Scrutiny Panel Reaeneration Review Committee
Portfolio Holders: Jyoti Vaja, George Allan
Assistant Director leading project: Bram Kainth
<p>Objectives of the Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To review all aspects of the current and future scope of Islington's CCTV provision. ● To assess the effectiveness of CCTV in preventing crime in Islington ● To assess the costs incurred in installation, maintenance, upgrading, obsolescence and staffing of CCTV. ● To assess local public confidence in CCTV, their attitude to it and their perception of its effect on community safety. ● To consider the data protection and other legal and civil liberties implications relating to CCTV and the sharing of information gathered as a result of its use. ● To examine the efficiency of Islington's CCTV implementation and whether improvements to this are possible ● To identify other measures which can enhance public confidence in community safety in a similar way and the effectiveness and costs of these measures.
<p>Scope of the Review</p> <p>The review will look at all aspects of the current use of CCTV including effectiveness, costs, reliability, data security, operation, location, management and functionality of the CCTV service in Islington, and public perception of all of these shortly after installation and in the longer term:</p>

- Explore the use of operating radio-link systems for businesses in the principal shopping/commercial districts in the borough
- To identify areas of possible displacement of crime both within, and outside, the Borough following CCTV installation
- To examine the potential use of mobile CCTV within the Borough
- To liaise with the Police, audit and map all private and public CCTV operational equipment within the Borough
- To monitor and establish the effectiveness of both active and passive CCTV within the Borough, including operational issues
- To liaise with neighbouring and other Boroughs on CCTV operations, protocols and Best Value
- Assess local public confidence in CCTV, and evaluate their attitude and perception towards the effect of CCTV on community safety
- Explore alternative measures, which can enhance public confidence in community safety in a similar way to CCTV.
- To investigate information sharing protocols

Operational Considerations

- Explore proposals to increase the number of cameras or CCTV systems operated by the control room and the marginal increase in cost and anticipated effectiveness
- Consider the cost and benefit of joint working with council enforcement services including environmental enforcement and other statutory enforcement officers working within the control room
- TO explore the use and effectiveness of CCTV signs

The re-location of the CCTV control room from King's Cross, including:

- Reviewing the capacity and infrastructure of the current accommodation to cope with the implementation of changes in the scope of the current CCTV service, outlined above, and the extension of the range of services and CCTV camera expansion
- The opportunities for introducing integrated supervision and management for both aspects of the CCTV service, on-street enforcement and community safety
- Other **24** hour service requirements that could be monitored within the CCTV control room

The opportunities for making financial savings by,

- Joint management and integration of the day-to-day operation of the enforcement and community safety control room
- Joint use of the community safety and on-street enforcement CCTV cameras and systems
- Expanding the scope of the contract integrating maintenance and procurement of all Council CCTV cameras and equipment
- The opportunities for partnership working and joint procurement with other services (e.g. Homes for Islington, Environment)

How the review is to be carried out.

1. Who is to be involved

- o Metropolitan Police
- o Parking Services
- o Homes for Islington - Eamon McGonigle, Roger Askill
- o Community safety partnership
- o Residents' Associations
- o Contractors
- o Members
- o Legal Department
- o Liberty
- o Legal professionals working locally on human rights and civil liberties
- o Arsenal Football Club
- o Transport for London
- o Neighbouring authorities
- o Social Services
- o Environment Department
- o Traders
- o Motorists' associations
- o NI retail centre management
- o CEA@Islington

2. Who is to be consulted

- All of the above

3. Who will give evidence

- **As** above as required. Evidence could be gathered from:
 - o Written reports
 - o Presentations
 - o Site visits to CCTV control centres in other local authorities such as Camden, Newham, Hackney

4. How will Area Committees be engaged?

- Options include:
 - o Identifying the most important concerns
 - o Consulting with relevant stakeholders
 - o Monitoring achievement of actions taken by Executive, Islington Police, TfL

Consultation and communications plan:

- Civil liberties
- Council environmental enforcement service
- Council parking service
- Homes for Islington
- Metropolitan Police Service
- Community safety partnership executive

- o All members
- o Transport for London (London Bus Initiative)
- o ALG (for moving traffic)
- o Private sector (e.g. NI)
- o Press office
- o Other statutory enforcement services: Customs and Excise, British Transport Police, Network Rail, Channel Tunnel Rail Link Engineering
- o Other Local Authorities including Camden, Newham and Hackney
- o Tenants and residents associations

Programme

Key output:	To be submitted to Committee on:
1. Scrutiny Initiation Document	11th October 2004
2. Timetable	October 2004-April 2005
3. Interim Report	7 th March 2005
4. Final Report	21 st April 2005

This SID has been approved by the Overview/Review Committee.

Signed:
Chair

Date:

CCTV Review

List of Background Papers

Crime Prevention Effects of Closed Circuit Television: A Systematic Review –
Brandon C. Walsh and David P. Farrington, Home Office Research, Development and
Statistics Directorate, August 2002

CCTV and Local Authority Partnerships – letter from Commander
Ronald S. E. McPherson, 20/12/04

Visits

L.B.Enfield CCTV Control Centre, 10/2/05 – Alan Gardner, L.B.Enfield
Warrington CCTV Control Room, 14/2/05
Liverpool City Council, 17/2/05 – Exec. Member Community Safety, Richard Marbrow
Michael Cliffe House, 25/1/05 – John Eustace, Aiden Stapleton, Danny Doyle – HFI
King's Cross CCTV Control Room, 25/1/05
Plymouth Council, 7/2/05 – Mike Atherton, CCTV Manager, Councillor Tom Wildy
L.B. Kingston
Parking Enforcement Centre, Old Street, 02/03/05
Brecknock Estate

Witnesses

Christina Lovett, Angel Town Centre Manager
Bradley Cordez, Business Design Centre
Clive Paul – Camden Town Centre Manager
Michael Pollak – CCTV Consultant
Steve Collard – NI Town Centre Manager

Gary Griffiths – L.B.I. – Parking Manager, Environment & Regeneration
George Heath – CCTV – Street Management, Environment & Regeneration

Residents, South Area Committee, 21/2/05
Residents, North Area Committee, 21/2/05
Residents, West Area Committee, 3/3/05
Residents, East Area Committee, 3/3/05

Swedish Embassy
Chief Superintendent Barry Norman
P.C. Ian Gray, Crime Reduction Officer
Councillor Jyoti Vaja, Executive Member Housing and Community Safety
Eamon McGoldrick, Chief Executive HFI

Liberty

Justice
Norwegian Data Commissioner
Trade Unions – Jane Doolan (UNISON), Vaughan West (GMB)