

# **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA**



**Thursday, 21 August 2008**

**at 2.00 pm**

**in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors R W Cook, S Cook, Gibbon, London, A Marshall, Morris, Richardson, Wright and Young.

Resident Representatives:

John Lynch, Brian McBean and Iris Ryder

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
3. **MINUTES**
  - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2008
4. **RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

None
5. **CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

None

6. **CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY  
FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

None

7. **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV  
Provision**

- 7.1 Evidence on the Transmission Service / Network
  - (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
  - (b) Verbal Evidence from the Electrical Engineering Team Leader
- 7.2 Evidence on the Location and Purpose of Community CCTV Cameras
  - (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
  - (b) Presentation by the Community Safety Officer
- 7.3 Evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
  - (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
  - (b) Written evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (*to follow*)
- 7.4 Feedback from View point Survey – *Head of Community Safety and Protection*
- 7.5 Feedback from Focus Group and Site Visits
  - (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
  - (b) Verbal feedback from Focus Group held on 30 July 2008
- 7.6 Report on Arrest Figures from Community CCTV Footage – *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- 7.7 Draft Final Report Recommendations – *Scrutiny Support Officer*

8. **ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN**

9. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

- i) **Date of Next Meeting 4 September 2008, commencing at 2.00 pm in  
Committee Room B**

# **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

## **MINUTES**

25 July 2008

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### **Present:**

Councillor: Shaun Cook (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob W Cook, Shaun Cook, Steve Gibbon, Frances  
London and Ann Marshall

Resident Representatives:  
John Lynch

Officers: Andrew Golightly, Senior Regeneration Officer  
Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration  
Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention  
Danny Dunleavy, Youth Offending Service Manager  
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer  
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also Present:  
Martin Booth, NDC  
Peter Knights, Cleveland Police  
Lol Craven, Cleveland Fire Brigade  
Andy Powell, Housing Hartlepool

## **12. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absences were received from Councillor Dr Morris and Resident Representative Brian McBean.

## **13. Declarations of interest by Members**

None.

## **14. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2008**

Confirmed.

**15. Portfolio Holder's Response – Seaton Carew – Regeneration Needs and Opportunities** *(Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability)*

The Head of Regeneration stated that Cabinet had approved the recommendations of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's investigation into Seaton Carew's Regeneration Needs and Opportunities with the exception of 2 of the recommendations. Cabinet had suggested that recommendation (i)

*"That based on the strength of feeling expressed throughout the investigation, the Council should not dispose of land on either side of the road to the north of Seaton Carew (up to, and including, the Coronation Drive/Warrior Park site) for the purpose of further development"*

should be reconsidered following completion and consideration of the report into the potential marketing of development sites in Seaton Carew and;

In relation to recommendation (b) Cabinet resolved that it could not 'ring fence' the investment of any future capital receipts gained from disposal of land in Seaton Carew back into the resort' as such a proposal would tie the hands of Cabinet when considering the best use of capital receipts. Cabinet agreed to an amended version of the proposal that allowed flexibility and was reflected in Appendix A to the report. Appendix A to the report set out the proposed actions to be taken in relation to each of the specific recommendations.

**Recommendation**

That the proposed actions, attached at Appendix A, be noted.

**16. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee**

None.

**17. Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan 2008/09**  
*(Head of Community Safety and Prevention)*

The Head of Community Safety and Prevention and Youth Offending Service Manager were in attendance at the meeting to inform Members on proposals for the development of the new Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan 2008/09 and issues for the Youth Offending Service (YOS) during 2008/09 and to provide Members with the opportunity to formulate any comments and observations to be fed back to Cabinet.

The report provided background information following the Government's

agreement to a new National Youth Justice Performance Framework for 2008/09 and beyond which was aligned to the new National Indicator set for local authorities and partnerships. There were 6 specific youth justice indicators.

- NI 111 – Number of first time entrants to youth justice system aged 10-17
- NI 19 - Rate of proven reoffending
- NI 43 – Rate of court convictions leading to custodial sentence
- NI 44 – Ethnic composition of offenders of youth justice disposals
- NI 45 – Engagement of education, training and development
- NI 46 – Suitable accommodation

The Youth Justice Board had produced a Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan template and guidance to serve as the format for the annual plan. Details of the sections to be covered were set out in the report which included:-

- The national and local context of youth justice
- Use of resources and value for money
- Capacity and capability
- Business change and innovation
- Risk of future delivery assessment summary

The Youth Justice (Capacity and Capability) Plan would provide data towards the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA). An Issues Paper, attached at Appendix 1, had been developed for consultation with users of the service, partners and for consideration by the Scrutiny Forum. This had been agreed by Cabinet on 9 June 2008.

Members were referred to Appendix 1 of the report which highlighted a number of questions which were designed to assist the Youth Offending Service, Management Board and Youth Justice Board to assess the Youth Offending Service performance against the principal aim of preventing offending and to identify risk to future delivery. There had been a 13% decrease in the number of first time entrants to the criminal justice system in 07/08 compared to the previous year, a reduction in the overall reoffending rate after 12 months year on year from 2002, further details of which were outlined in Appendix 1.

The Youth Offending Service Manager outlined a range of prevention activities and youth inclusion programmes and provided a recent example whereby an offender had made an apology to the victim.

Discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) In relation to the example referred to above regarding an offender apologising to the victim, a Member queried how often this occurred and what outcome was hoped to be achieved. Members were

advised that the Youth Offending Service worked in partnership with victims and facilitated mediation with the Children's Society. This provided the opportunity for victims to express their views to offenders. Members were of the view that there should be more support for victims as opposed to offenders. The role of Victim Support was also explained.

- (ii) In response to a Member's query on whether the Youth Justice team were happy with how youth crime was tackled in the area, the Youth Offending Service Manager advised that the North East region was the top performing area for tackling youth crime.
- (iii) Members raised concern regarding the problem of underage alcohol consumption, queried the measures that were in place to address this and the importance of parental responsibility. A representative from Cleveland Police reported that arrangements were in place to confiscate alcohol as well as target the people purchasing alcohol on behalf of young people. The Youth Offending Manager stated that instances of under age drinking, resulting in inappropriate behaviour, were referred to the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit by the police. The issue of false identification cards being used to purchase alcohol was also highlighted.
- (iv) The types of offences that warranted custodial sentences were discussed as well as the need to encourage enforcement and support.
- (v) In terms of prevention, a Member was of the view that additional resources should be allocated for youth activities, however, stronger sentences were required to reduce crime levels.

## **18. Report on CCTV (Closed Circuit Television) Running Costs** *(Head of Community Safety and Prevention)*

The Head of Community Safety and Prevention presented the report which provided information to Members of the Scrutiny Forum on the current revenue costs associated with running the town's CCTV system.

The town's CCTV system was established in the early 1990s with 8 black and white cameras in Church Street. Regeneration capital funding extended the early system to colour cameras at various sites across the town. The New Deal for Communities (NDC) initiative extended the number of sites in and around the town centre and Hartlepool Council capital funding had enabled cameras to be sited in car parks and other areas.

Monitoring of cameras had transferred from the police to the Council in the 1990s. In March 2004, a 5 year Service Level Agreement had been signed with Housing Hartlepool for them to provide the monitoring service.

The Council's community safety team was responsible for managing and developing the town's CCTV camera system. Technical advice was provided by the Technical Services division in Neighbourhood Services.

Members were advised that ageing cameras and monitoring equipment required increasing maintenance and repair. This had an impact on the annual budget and in 2008/09 the Council had allocated an additional £30,000 to the budget to accommodate these costs and those associated with increased transmission and power (electricity) charges. Cameras and monitoring equipment had been upgraded over the years but on a piecemeal basis, as capital funding became available. There was no capital investment programme to refurbish or replace this equipment.

A table showing the breakdown of expenditure and income for 2006/07, 2007/08 together with the budget allocation for 2008/09 and a projection for 2009/10 was attached at Appendix 1. The current budget provision included an allocation of nearly £50,000 in 2008/09 for income generated from NDC and a 'planning gain' (Section 106) Agreement. The income from NDC £42,710 in 2008/09 was a significant sum which would cease in 2010/11.

A discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) Current service provision and monitoring costs of cameras was discussed and queries were raised as to whether this represented value for money and if the service could be provided at a lower cost in-house. The Head of Community Safety and Prevention stated that monitoring costs provided value for money. Housing Hartlepool staff were employed on the same terms and conditions as Council staff. The Director of Housing Services, Housing Hartlepool referred to the results of a cost benefit analysis carried out in 2004 which concluded value for money and complimented some of the other services Housing Hartlepool carried out.
- (ii) Funding for CCTV provision, location of cameras and the benefits of transferring cameras to alternative locations was highlighted. Members suggested that contributions towards the replacement of ageing cameras, maintenance and running costs of the service be sought from local businesses to assist with future income generation.
- (iii) Members raised concerns regarding the lack of funding and, in particular, the impact the loss of future funding from NDC would have on the service. The need to invest in the service was emphasised and a Member queried whether funding provision had been allocated for CCTV cameras on the Marina in readiness for the Tall Ships event. In response, it was reported that CCTV requirements had been discussed with the Tall Ships Team. A representative from NDC agreed to look at the overall approach to funding and explore ways of continuing support by involving other parties.
- (iv) A resident representative sought clarification on the effectiveness of information from the monitoring centre and the number of arrests as a result of monitoring centre records to which the Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods from Cleveland Police reported that information was not available, however, a number of successful

convictions had been proved by CCTV evidence. The Scrutiny Support Officer provided statistics from the previous investigation, further details of which would be provided at a future meeting of the Forum.

### **Recommendation**

That the information given, be noted and the comments of the forum and other contributions be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

## **19. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Cleveland Police** *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Forum welcomed the Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods from Cleveland Police who had been invited to attend the meeting to provide evidence in relation to the Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

The Acting Chief Inspector reported that the benefits of CCTV for prevention and detection were immense. Reference was made to the key roles in which CCTV cameras assisted the police in ensuring that crime and the fear of crime were reduced. This included public safety issues, deployment of resources, evidence gathering for key criminal offences, detecting witnesses etc.

Discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) Would Cleveland Police have the capacity and interest in contributing financially towards the running costs of CCTV provision? The Acting Chief Inspector reported that he was not in a position to comment on budgets, however, during high profile events, staffing resources were allocated to support monitoring centre staff.
- (ii) With regard to terrorism issues, a Member asked if private businesses provided CCTV images to the monitoring centre to which the Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods advised that he was not aware of the provision of such images, however, CCTV images could be monitored from the control room at Ladgate Lane, Middlesbrough.
- (iii) In response to Member queries, the Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods outlined the benefits of community and private CCTV cameras in reducing crime at football games.



**Recommendation**

That the views of the Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods, the Forum and other contributors be noted and be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

**20. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade** *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer welcomed Lol Craven, representative from Cleveland Fire Brigade, who had been invited to attend the meeting to provide evidence in relation to the Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

Members were referred to written evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade, attached at Appendix A to the report. The Arson Task Force Manager reported on the following issues affecting the Fire Brigade at present and the importance of CCTV cameras in reducing crime:-

- attacks on fire fighters;
- CCTV evidence resulting in successful prosecutions; and
- fires in occupied premises

In response to concerns expressed regarding the attacks on fire fighters and safety issues generally, Members were advised that in known anti-social behaviour problem areas, police assistance was requested or two appliances attended call-outs as staff safety was of paramount importance. The success of mobile CCTV cameras in tackling fly tipping issues were referred to although it was acknowledged that where covert cameras were used these were provided by the Neighbourhood Services Department and were separate to the community CCTV camera system. Members also suggested that funding be explored through the Safer Hartlepool Partnership together with other funding streams.

**Recommendation**

That the views of Cleveland Fire Brigade, the Forum and other contributors be noted and be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

## **21. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Housing Hartlepool** (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer welcomed the Director of Housing Services from Housing Hartlepool who had been invited to attend the meeting to provide evidence in relation to the Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

The Director of Housing Services provided background information, as monitoring operator, of the Community Monitoring Centre. Information on the role of the monitoring centre was outlined together with the issues considered prior to the transfer of housing stock to Housing Hartlepool which included monitoring of CCTV, funding issues and Council priorities.

Members were advised that the Service Level Agreement for the operation of the Community Monitoring Centre was due to expire in March 2009 and Housing Hartlepool were keen to continue to provide this important strategic service on a long term basis, the details of which were currently being explored. It was pointed out that Housing Hartlepool recognised the Council's limited budget and income and wished to ensure that rent payers received value for money.

The Director of Housing Services stated that as owners of the building that housed the Community Monitoring Centre, there were no proposals to dispose of Richard Court, however, there had been discussions in relation to relocating the control room. Housing Hartlepool were keen to continue to provide the service and in the event that Richard Court was relocated, assurances were provided that any replacement facility would be as efficient as Richard Court.

### **Recommendation**

That the views of the Director of Housing Services, the Forum and other contributors be noted and be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

## **22. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Written Evidence from the Elected Mayor of Hartlepool**

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that due to conflicting priorities the Mayor was unable to attend the meeting to provide information in relation to the Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision. Members were referred to written information received from the Mayor in which a number of questions were raised, a copy of which was attached to the agenda papers.

Discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) Would it be more cost effective to employ more police officers than monitor crime through CCTV cameras? The Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods stated that it would be more expensive to employ additional police officers and commented on the benefits of monitoring CCTV footage.
- (ii) What is the public's opinion of CCTV? The Head of Community Safety and Prevention indicated that the results of a recent Viewpoint survey revealed that more than half of the people surveyed supported CCTV, further details of which would be provided at a future meeting of the Forum.
- (iii) The issue of talking cameras currently operating in Middlesbrough was considered and whether they would be appropriate for Hartlepool.

### **Recommendation**

That the information provided by the Mayor and views of the Forum and other contributors be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

## **23. Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Feedback from Site Visit – Covering Report** *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the evidence gathering process, the Chair and Members of the Forum provided verbal feedback on the following:-

- (i) Site visit to Hartlepool's Community Monitoring Centre and tour of Community CCTV cameras held on 21 July 08
- (ii) Site visit to Darlington Borough Council's CCTV Control Centre held on 24 July 2008.

Members who visited both the Community Monitoring Centre in Hartlepool and Darlington were of the view that Hartlepool's CCTV facility was excellent.

The feasibility of hosting public visits to the Community Monitoring Centre was discussed. It was noted that visits may not be appropriate for confidentiality and security reasons, however, the Director of Housing Services agreed to explore this suggestion further.

Following discussion in relation to funding issues and to ensure the public were aware of how this facility was funded, it was suggested that this information be rolled out to the Neighbourhood Forums.

In response to a Member's suggestion that a presentation of footage taken at the monitoring centre be provided for use at the Focus Group, the Head of Community Safety and Prevention agreed to facilitate this.

**Recommendation**

That feedback on the site visits and views of the Forum and other contributors be noted and be used to assist the Forum in undertaking the scrutiny investigation.

**24. Issues Identified from Forward Plan**

None

CHAIRMAN

**REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY  
FORUM**

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – EVIDENCE FROM ELECTRICAL  
ENGINEERING TEAM LEADER – COVERING  
REPORT

---

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that the Authority's Electrical Engineering Team Leader has been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently the Electrical Engineering Team Leader from Hartlepool Borough Council has agreed to attend this meeting to submit evidence in relation to the transmission service / network utilised by the community CCTV cameras in Hartlepool.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with the Electrical Engineering Team Leader it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) What are the current transmission arrangements to ensure that Hartlepool's community CCTV camera footage is received by the Community Monitoring Centre?

- b) This Forum understands that British Telecommunications (BT) are the current transmission service provider and would like to know:-
  - (i) Is the service provided of sufficient quality for the needs to the community CCTV monitoring system?
  - (ii) Are there other competitors in the market place who could provide a more cost effective service that was of sufficient or better quality, than the service currently provided by BT?
- c) Acknowledging that fibre optic cables are the most appropriate method for quality images CCTV images to be transferred from the camera to the Community Monitoring Centre in Hartlepool:-
  - (i) What plans are there to extend the fibre optic network in Hartlepool?
  - (ii) In relation to (i), to what extent is the Authority working with utilities and other authorised contractors who dig up roads, to ensure that fibre optic cables can be laid at the same time?
- d) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the Electrical Engineering Team Leader from Hartlepool Borough Council in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

**Contact Officer: -** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647  
Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.

## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – EVIDENCE ON THE LOCATION  
AND PURPOSE OF COMMUNITY CCTV  
CAMERAS – COVERING REPORT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that the Community Safety Officer has been invited to attend this meeting to provide a presentation in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum. Under those Terms of Reference item (c) proposed that there should be:-

*"[a] review [of] the current camera provision throughout Hartlepool to recommend if cameras should be decommissioned, relocated or new cameras commissioned"*

- 2.2 In October 2007 the Home Office produced the National CCTV Strategy with one of their recommendations being that owners of public CCTV systems should:-

*"Review the location and purpose of all CCTV cameras...detailing their purpose and establishing if they are fit for that purpose"<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Home Office – National CCTV Strategy, October 2007, p. 16

2.3 Consequently the Community Safety Officer will be in attendance at today's meeting to deliver a presentation as part of this Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision in relation to the following issues:-

- (i) The current capacity of the Community Monitoring Centre in Hartlepool; and
- (ii) A detailed summary of the operational purposes of each of the community CCTV cameras throughout Hartlepool.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the issues of capacity of the Community Monitoring Centre in relation to the possible decommissioning or relocation of existing CCTV cameras or the commissioning of new cameras.

**Contact Officer: -** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.
- (ii) Home Office – 'National CCTV Strategy' (October 2007).



## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – EVIDENCE FROM REDCAR AND  
CLEVELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL – COVERING  
REPORT

### 1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To consider written evidence submitted by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council in relation to the ongoing inquiry into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum. Under those Terms of Reference item (g) proposed that there should be an assessment of:

*“the current siting of the Community Monitoring Centre...”*

- 2.2 Consequently written evidence has been sought from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, in respect of their recent decision to take control of their CCTV system away from an external provider and back under the control of the Local Authority.
- 2.3 However, in accordance with the Authority's Access to Information Rules, it has not been possible to include Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council's written evidence within the statutory requirements for the despatch of the agenda and papers for this Forum's meeting. Although arrangements have been made for the written evidence from Redcar and

Cleveland Borough Council to be circulated under separate cover and in advance of this meeting.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum note the content of this report and the written evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.

**Contact Officer: -** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Scoping Report' Presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008.

**SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S  
COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION – RESPONSE BY REDCAR AND  
CLEVELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**

The CCTV system at Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council is currently in the process of relocating to a new monitoring centre after a decision was made to take the CCTV service back 'in-house' after it was carried out on the Council's behalf by Jarvis, an external provider.

The new CCTV monitoring centre is part Langbaugh Police's multi-million pound Headquarters on Kirkleatham Business Park, Redcar. The sharing of the building with Cleveland Police enhances our ability to work in partnership and ensures that every morning we have the option of a morning police briefing so we know their targets and can utilise this as part of our CCTV patrols. We also now have easier access to police intelligence and police officers have the ability to view footage via a dedicated monitor in the monitoring centre.

The rationale behind bringing the CCTV system 'in-house' was due to the long-term savings that could be made from withdrawing the contract from Jarvis. The contract with Jarvis cost the Local Authority £625,000 a year, although relocation costs have been in the region of £450,000 with a large proportion of this outlay being the costs for the BT lines / connections.

Another reasoning behind bringing the CCTV back 'in-house' was that our schools were paying £5,000 per year for alarm monitoring services. It was decided to launch Secure our Schools scheme (SoS), where we offered to monitor their alarms at a charge of £500 per annum, an overall revenue saving for the Local Authority.

The original purpose of the CCTV Cameras is still adhered to and that is to focus on the street scene, police responses and more recently the fire brigade. Our close partnership working has enabled us to use two of the police masts to 'bounce back' CCTV images where we have line of sight and to reduce our cabling costs. We also carry out some alarm monitoring and act as key holders for some key Borough Council buildings.

Currently we operate 157 cameras, but our new monitoring centre has increased the number of links we can bring in to 250. However, for effective and efficient use of the staff we are not looking at increasing the number of cameras and instead trying to relocate / decommission existing cameras that whose purpose is now obsolete.

The ethos behind the CCTV system in Redcar and Cleveland is not to make money, although we strive to ensure that we utilise the power of Section 106 planning applications and request that contributions are made towards the maintenance of the equipment. This is important as asking people for a

contribution towards the monitoring can be divisive as the monitoring can be beneficial for more than one group of people.

The decision to take the CCTV back under the direct control of the Local Authority started around September 2007, although it wasn't until February 2008 that premises were identified and the actual process for the relocation of the monitoring centre started. Although currently we are not yet fully operational in our new location, there has been no affect on the service we offer and no major pitfalls that have slowed progress.

**Kevan Taylor**  
**CCTV & Security Manager**  
**Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council**

## **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Head of Community Safety and Prevention

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – EVIDENCE FROM VIEWPOINT  
SURVEY

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To update the Forum on the results of the Viewpoint Survey into CCTV that was carried out in April 2008.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Viewpoint, Hartlepool Borough Council's Citizens' Panel, is one of the ways that the Council consults and involves local people in the governance of Hartlepool. It is a statistically balanced panel of local people who receive questionnaires at regular intervals through the year, asking for their views on a variety of local issues facing the Council and Hartlepool as a whole.
- 2.2 The aims of the survey are:-
- (i) To listen to the community;
  - (ii) To involve local people in the Council's decisions and in its policy, planning and reviews;
  - (iii) To consult the panel regularly on important local issues; and
  - (iv) To discover what are the community priorities for future Council activities
- 2.3 This report details the results for the latest questionnaire, which was distributed in April 2008 to all active panel members. A response rate of 67% (792 completed questions) was achieved.

- 2.4 The April 2008 (number 25) Viewpoint Survey also included questions on the night-time economy in town centre and perceptions of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).

### 3. SURVEY RESULTS

- 3.1 The following statement was included in the questionnaire, immediately before the questions on closed circuit television (CCTV), as an explanation:

*The aim of closed circuit television, or CCTV as it is more commonly known, is to deter criminal activity, to aid the detection of crime or anti-social behaviour, and to provide reassurance to the people who live, work or visit the places where cameras are. CCTV cameras help the Police and other partners, such as the Council and Fire Brigade, in their work to reduce and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour.*

- 3.2 10 questions were asked, the results of which are attached at **Appendix A**.
- 3.3 The vast majority (93%) of respondents are supportive of CCTV and 83% would support the installation of a camera near their home, but respondents were split almost equally on whether the presence of CCTV cameras has made them feel safer or makes no difference.
- 3.4 Nearly two-thirds of respondents feel that CCTV cameras have reduced crime in both the town centre and other areas with cameras.
- 3.5 Monitoring of the cameras is currently provided by Housing Hartlepool on behalf of the Council. One-quarter of respondents thought it should be provided by the Police, but over one-third stated they'd need more information to make a judgement.
- 3.6 When invited to indicate which organisations should contribute financially to the running costs, most respondents thought the Police and businesses should do so. When given choices about how else the Council could finance CCTV in areas with high levels of crime and ASB, nearly half (47%) of respondents agreed to existing cameras being moved to areas with higher levels of crime and ASB. Respondents (44%) also supported the idea of earning income from other organisation's cameras (eg. schools, hospitals and business sites). Only 6% supported reducing costs by reducing the number of CCTV cameras.

- 3.7 Two-thirds of respondents thought cameras should be sited in areas with high levels of crime or ASB, and town centre areas with pubs and clubs were more of a priority (61%) than town centre shopping areas (39%). The 'no answer' to this question was quite high (19%).
- 3.8 80% of respondents would support the introduction of 'talking cameras'.
- 3.9 34 people commented in the 'free text' box that they think cameras are an invasion of privacy (4% of respondents).

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 That Members consider the issues raised in the Viewpoint survey carried out in April 2008.

**Contact Officer:-** Alison Mawson  
Head of Community Safety and Protection

## Crime & Community Safety

The Council's Community Safety Team works closely with the Police and others, on a range of initiatives and problems, as well as delivering specific community safety services, such as CCTV, and security patrols. They also offer advice, staff a number of Community Police offices and manage a range of grant awarding schemes. We would like to find out your thoughts on community safety, including what you think about CCTV cameras, your perception of anti-social behaviour and your crime and community safety concerns.

**If you would like any further information on this topic please call Alison Mawson (01429) 284342 or e-mail [alison.mawson@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:alison.mawson@hartlepool.gov.uk).**

### Closed Circuit Television (CCTV)

The aim of Closed Circuit Television, or CCTV as it is more commonly known, is to deter criminal activity, to aid the detection of crime or anti-social behaviour, and to provide reassurance to the people who live, work or visit the places where cameras are. CCTV cameras help the Police and other partners, such as the Council and Fire Brigade, in their work to reduce and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour.

#### 14. Generally, do you support the idea of CCTV cameras? (PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY)

Yes	93%
No	7%
Don't know	*

#### 15. Would you support the installation of a CCTV camera near your home?

Yes	83%
No	17%
Don't know	*

#### 16. Have CCTV cameras made any difference as to how safe you feel when you are:

- a) In the town centre  
b) In other areas with CCTV (PLEASE TICK ONE BOX IN EACH COLUMN)

	a) In the town centre	b) In other areas with CCTV
Feel safer	53%	51%
Makes no difference at all	46%	48%
Feel less safe	1%	1%
Don't know	*	*

#### 17. Do you feel that CCTV cameras reduce the amount of crime in the following areas:

- a) In the town centre  
b) In other areas with CCTV (PLEASE TICK ONE BOX IN EACH COLUMN)

	a) In the town centre	b) In other areas with CCTV
Yes, reduces crime	62%	61%
No, does not reduce crime	38%	39%
Don't know	*	*



## Running CCTV Cameras

- 18. Do you believe that the CCTV monitoring service should continue to be provided by the Council or should another agency provide the service? (PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY)**

Yes, it should be provided by the local council	33%
No, it should be provided by the police	25%
No, it should be provided by a private agency	3%
Don't know, would need more information to make a judgement	38%
No answer	2%

Currently, Hartlepool Borough Council provides most of the money to run CCTV cameras in public places such as car parks and town centre areas.

- 19. Do you think any of the following organisations should contribute financially to help run CCTV cameras in Hartlepool? (PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY)**

Cleveland Police	58%
Fire Brigade	14%
Business in the area	55%
Environment Agency	26%
None of these	7%
Don't know	13%
Other (Please specify_____)	1%
Central Government	1%
No answer	3%

- 20. If the Council needed to find more money to help run CCTV cameras or provide more CCTV cameras in areas of Hartlepool with high levels of crime or anti-social behaviour, how do you think the Council should do this? (PLEASE TICK ALL THAT APPLY)**

Cut down on costs by reducing the number of CCTV cameras in Hartlepool	6%
Remove existing cameras from some areas and put them in areas with higher levels of crime or anti-social behaviour	47%
Earn income from running other organisation's cameras for them (e.g. schools, hospitals, & business sites)	44%
Earn income from car parking charges	13%
Increase Council Tax	2%
Ask local businesses and other organisations to contribute financially	60%
None of the above	3%
Don't know	5%
Other (Please specify_____)	3%
No answer	3%

**21. Where do you think CCTV cameras should be sited?**  
(PLEASE TICK UP TO FIVE BOXES)

Town centre shopping areas	39%
Town centre areas with pubs and clubs	61%
Car parks	46%
Out of town shopping parades (such as Catcote Road or King Oswy shops,)	38%
Residential streets	11%
Visitor attractions (e.g. Maritime experience)	6%
Areas with high crime levels	66%
Areas with high levels of nuisance and anti-social behaviour	66%
Public spaces such as parks, cemeteries and children's play areas	32%
Industrial estates	5%
Other (Please specify _____)	1%
No answer	19%

In Middlesbrough town centre, there are 'talking cameras', where the person monitoring a camera can inform a member of the public they have been recorded committing an illegal or anti-social act (e.g. dropping litter or allowing their dog to foul).

**22. Would you support the introduction of 'talking cameras' in Hartlepool?**

Yes	80%
No	20%
Don't know	*

**23. Please use the space below to let us know if you have any other thought or comments about CCTV cameras in Hartlepool. (No. of comments)**

CCTV is good/should be more	47
Ensure proper maintenance/make sure they all work	36
Think they are an invasion of privacy	34
Ensure that they are bring monitored	26
Only results in more problems where no CCTV	13
Should have more police on the streets	12
Make sure they are visible	11
Not sure whether they are worthwhile or not	11
Ensure they are used for crimes, not spying	7
Pointless/ don't do any good	7
Change their locations	5
Other	28

**Views on Anti-social Behaviour**

**24. How well informed do you feel you are about what is being done to tackle anti-social behaviour in your local area? (PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY)**

Very well informed	Fairly well informed	Not very well informed	Not at all well informed	Don't know
4%	26%	51%	19%	*

## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S  
COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION – FEEDBACK  
FROM FOCUS GROUP AND SITE VISITS –  
COVERING REPORT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to feedback received as a result of the Focus Group and Site Visits that have taken place.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently, in order to seek the views of residents on Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision a focus group session was held on the 30 July 2008 in the Council Chamber.
- 2.3 The issues raised / views expressed at the Focus Group are attached as **Appendix A** to this report.
- 2.4 Members will also recall that at the meeting of this Forum on the 25 July 2008, verbal feedback was received as a result of the two site visits that had taken place as part of this Forum's investigation into Community CCTV. Written evidence gathered from the site visit to the Community Monitoring Centre on the 21 July 2008 is attached to this report as **Appendix B**, whilst evidence gathered from the site visit to Darlington Borough Council on the 24 July 2008 is attached to this report as **Appendix C**.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That Members consider the issues raised at the Focus Group on the 30 July 2008 as detailed in Appendix A.
- 3.2 That Members note the written feedback from the site visits as detailed in Appendices B and C.

**Contact Officer:-** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647  
Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

**REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM FOCUS GROUP – HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION**

**30 July 2008**

**Notes**

**Present:**

Councillors: Rob Cook (Acting Chair), Steve Gibbon, Ann Marshall and Carl Richardson

Resident Representatives:

John Lynch, Brian McBean and Iris Ryder  
Members of the Public

Officers: Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention  
Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer  
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer

**Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision**

The Scrutiny Support Officer provided a presentation which included the following:-

- (i) The current democratic arrangements;
- (ii) Aim of the Focus Group; and
- (iii) Footage captured by the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool.

It was reported that this was an opportunity for everyone present to express their views and provide input to the scrutiny investigation into the community CCTV provision in Hartlepool. The Group's views were sought on the following questions:-

- (i) How much do you see the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool acting as a deterrent to theft, assault, anti-social behaviour, littering and car crime?
- (ii) What to you are the biggest issues that the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool should focus on?
- (iii) To what extent does the phrase 'Big Brother' impact on your perception of the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool?
- (iv) Do the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool make you feel safer and do they help combat your fear of crime?
- (v) Would you like to see the introduction of 'talking cameras' and/or greater use of redeployable CCTV cameras?

## APPENDIX A

Discussion ensued in which the following points / issues were raised:-

- Taxis – confirmation was provided that CCTV images have been used by the Licensing Committee to ensure that Taxi operators were adhering to their code of conduct.
- Spion Kop – due to the illegal removal of a CCTV camera in this area, discussions were still on-going whether to replace the camera at its original site or move it to a nearby location.
- Police conviction rates – although it was not possible to confirm how many of the 338 arrests (Jan-Dec 07) and 197 arrests (Jan-Jun 08) were turned into convictions, the group was informed that there had been no occasions where CCTV images had been the cause of an arrest not leading to a conviction.
- There was some concern that the CCTV camera operators and police resources were focussed too much on the 'night time economy' so increasing the fear of crime for people in other areas of the Town.
- Patrol of cameras – the rationale behind the patrol of the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool was based on intelligence from the police and through the knowledge and training of the camera operators. If groups of residents felt that cameras should be focussing on other areas, then this needed to be brought to the attention of the police.
- Licensing – support was voiced for funding to be sought towards CCTV cameras through the Chair of the Licensing Committee as part of licensing applications / conditions.
- Traffic Offences – recent press coverage had indicated that road traffic offences could be dealt with through CCTV footage, however, at present Central Government guidance was lacking in direction and operators would need to be specifically trained and authorised.
- Talking Cameras – the general view was that this would be a useful addition to the CCTV provision in the Town in order to help alleviate problems of littering and possible diffuser of violent behaviour.
- Mobile Cameras – currently there was only 3 redeployable cameras available for use in Hartlepool. The group agreed that this might be a more sensible area to look at increasing numbers, rather than having CCTV cameras on every street corner.
- Coastguards – the question was raised if the Coastguards ever utilised CCTV footage, in particular to combat the burning off oil offshore. The response was though the Coastguards had not approached the monitoring centre about the issue of oil being burnt offshore, there had been usage of footage during the search for Mr Darwin's missing canoe.
- Expense – it was noted that whatever the focus was for the CCTV cameras, this needed to be examined against the notion of financial viability, in that is the offence of sufficient nature for a CCTV camera (fixed or redeployable) to be cost effective. e.g. Using redeployable cameras to catch illegal parking outside of schools, though effective, could be prohibitively costly and other measures maybe more suitable.

In conclusion, the Acting Chair thanked all attendees for their input and ideas to the investigation and encouraged their attendance at the next meeting scheduled for Thursday 21 August at 2.00 pm.

**REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM FOCUS GROUP – SITE VISIT TO HARTLEPOOL'S COMMUNITY MONITORING CENTRE AND TOUR OF COMMUNITY CCTV CAMERAS**

**21 July 2008**

**Notes**

**Present:**

Councillors: Shaun Cook and Steve Gibbon

Resident Representatives:  
Iris Ryder

Officers: Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer  
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer

Also Present: Chris Mulgrew, Community Monitoring Centre Manager,  
Housing Hartlepool

**Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision**

As part of the evidence gathering process, Members of the Forum looked at Community CCTV Cameras in situ throughout Hartlepool and observed the monitoring of these cameras at the Community Monitoring Centre that is operated on behalf of Hartlepool Borough Council by Housing Hartlepool.

The findings of Members of the Forum who undertook the visit were as follows:-

- Spion Kop - it was suggested that there was a need to monitor scrap dealers after the previous CCTV camera on site had been cut down, presumably so that people taking scrap metal from the Steetly Site or removing metal placards from the graveyard on Cemetery Road went undetected.
- Brus Corner – that a 'slave' camera could be trained on the tunnel as a specific target whilst the pan tilt and zoom (PTZ) camera could focus on other areas.
- Clavering Shops – it was noted that in addition to the camera provided by HBC, the shops had their own internal CCTV system, but that police 'buy-in' was important to ensure that these were effective. The internal CCTV system often had a image retention limit of 14 days, rather than the 31 day cycle enjoyed by the Community CCTV Cameras.
- Grainger Street/Grey Street – that a mobile camera situated here had gathered sufficient evidence about the level of crime, for it to be financially viable to look at introducing a fixed camera. The problem with the mobile camera was that there was no 'live' link with the Community Monitoring

**APPENDIX B**

Centre and the images captured were transferred using radio links at a cost of £16,000.

- That it was important to ensure that revenue savings of installing cameras offset the maintenance / repair bill for installing any new CCTV cameras.
- The Community Monitoring Centre was an excellent facility with digital storage of CCTV footage, meaning playback was of high quality. It had been successful in tracking the vehicle utilised by the Glasgow bombers, although it was noted that footage could not be obtained without Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) authorisation.
- The Monitoring Centre also provided coverage of Housing Hartlepool's Homecall service, along with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) on behalf of the DVLA.
- Although Middleton Grange Shopping Centre was highlighted as an example of a business operating a CCTV system that could be 'picked-up' by the Community Monitoring Centre when necessary, Members were concerned that the Railway Station in Hartlepool did not have this link. With monitoring of their cameras taking place on site, this meant that any emergency requiring the evacuation of the railway station rendered the CCTV control centre at the Railway Station inaccessible.



**REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM FOCUS GROUP – SITE VISIT TO DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CCTV CONTROL CENTRE**

**24 July 2008**

**Notes**

**Present:**

Councillors: Shaun Cook

Resident Representatives:  
Iris Ryder

Officers: Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer  
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer

Also Present: Graham Putt, CCTV General Manager, Darlington Borough Council  
Peter Bowerbank, Control Room Co-ordinator, Darlington Borough Council

**Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision**

As part of the evidence gathering process, Members of the Forum visited the CCTV Control Centre at Darlington Borough Council.

The findings of Members of the Forum who undertook the visit were as follows:-

- CCTV is not the total / major focus of the monitoring centre, instead the 24:7 operation is utilised for coverage of the Warden link, various alarm installations, car parking and other contracted work, for example the monitoring of cameras for Wear Valley District Council. There is a sliding scale of importance with the personal alarm link taking priority over the CCTV surveillance.
- The package of commissioned work enables the Council to balance the books. Where more capital or staff are required, then the Council investigates if revenue can be drawn from services that maybe complementary to the 24:7 CCTV monitoring.
- Section 106 – the feedback was that any application for funding through planning gain should be done at the development stage of any planning application, as it was a lot more difficult to claim it back retrospectively.
- Maintenance – the maintenance of the CCTV cameras in Darlington is part of a fully contracted maintenance service. Each camera is inspected on a two yearly basis, whilst failure to maintain cameras within agreed time

## APPENDIX C

- period can result in fines.
- The commissioning of new CCTV cameras is carried out without the need for planning permission, so long as the site is Council owned or recognised as a public highway.
  - Talking Cameras – Darlington utilise their talking cameras to act as general public announcements and as an aid to diffuse potential violent flashpoints. Darlington feels that street wardens are more appropriate to tackle littering and dog fouling problems.
  - Traffic Enforcement – Darlington Borough Council are reluctant to utilise the CCTV system to capture traffic offences as this could lead to them losing public support for the CCTV system. Currently the public are happy that the main focus of cameras is for gathering intelligence for criminal acts rather than as a punitive measure.
  - Durham Police – as part of any investigation the police are required to check CCTV footage (if available) although the police retain the right not to check the footage if they do not feel it would aid an investigation. The police do not directly fund the CCTV provision, although they have agreed to pay for the Airwave radios that are located inside the CCTV control centre – a similar arrangement for the airwave radios exists throughout Cleveland.
  - Currently Darlington operates an analogue system and is hoping to move to a digital one, so putting them on par with Hartlepool.
  - Inspection – Darlington have a team of 8 Independent Inspectors who can visit the CCTV Control Room at anytime to assess the operation of the facility. In addition to this guided tours are arranged for certain groups with in the Town. Groups are asked to confirm the bona fide nature of the visitors and leaders are asked to feedback to their respective groups to aid in the dispelling of myths connected to CCTV cameras. In order to ensure that these visits take place on a regular basis they are built in as Performance Indicators.

**REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY  
FORUM**

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – REPORT ON ARREST FIGURES  
FROM COMMUNITY CCTV FOOTAGE

---

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide Members of this Forum with background information relating to the number of arrests resulting from footage captured by the Community CCTV Cameras in Hartlepool as part of their investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision'.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 25 July 2008, a request was made for information to be presented to this Forum relating to the number of arrests carried out by Cleveland Police as a result of footage captured by the Community CCTV system.
- 2.2 Consequently Members are asked to note the tables overleaf which detail the number of requests for CCTV footage, the number of arrests as a result of the CCTV footage:-

Table 1: January – December 2007

Month	Viewing Requests	Footage Copied	Arrests Recorded
January	16	12	21
February	17	10	27
March	24	17	24
April	26	19	28
May	18	13	21
June	30	24	29
July	18	11	33
August	35	23	36
September	28	14	29
October	39	23	37
November	9	13	24
December	24	26	29
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>338</b>

Table 2: January – June 2008

Month	Viewing Requests	Footage Copied	Arrests Recorded
January	30	19	37
February	28	13	29
March	30	8	32
April	54	20	38
May	44	23	28
June	36	20	33
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>197</b>

### 3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That Members of the Forum note the content of the report.

**Contact Officer: -** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers were used in the in the preparation of this report.

## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

21 August 2008



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY CCTV  
PROVISION – DRAFT FINAL REPORT  
RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion from Members of the Forum about the recommendations they want to include in the Forum's Draft Final Report on 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision'.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that the topic of 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision' originated as a referral from Cabinet made on the 28 April 2008, after the receipt of an interim report carried out by the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee. Cabinet recommended at their meeting of 28 April 2008 that the referral of this topic should be:

*"reported back to Cabinet by the end of September 2008, to enable any budgetary requirements to be considered as part of the budget setting process for 2009/10".<sup>1</sup>*

- 2.2 In order to ensure that the conclusion of the investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision' meets Cabinet's deadline, at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008 the Timetable for this scrutiny referral was approved by the Forum.
- 2.3 Consequently Members will be aware that the Draft Final Report is due to be considered by this Forum at their meeting of 4 September 2008. In

---

<sup>1</sup> Cabinet – Minutes and Decision Record – 28 April 2008

order to formulate conclusions and recommendations to be included in the Draft Final Report, Members are invited to present any conclusions or recommendations relating to the topic of 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision,' as a result of the evidence gathered by this Forum since the 19 June 2008.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum discuss conclusions and recommendations to be included in the Draft Final Report to be presented to Members at the meeting of this Forum on 4 September 2008.

**Contact Officer: -** James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: james.walsh@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Decision Record of the Cabinet Meeting held on 28 April 2008