

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Thursday, 4 September 2008

at 2.00 pm

in the Council Chamber

MEMBERS: 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 21 August 2008 (*to follow*)

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

- 7.1 Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Draft Final Report
– *Scrutiny Support Officer*
- 7.2 Scrutiny Investigation into the Marketing of Hartlepool – Scoping Report –
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 - Friday, 3 October 2008, commencing at 2.00 pm in
the Council Chamber**

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM MINUTES

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: S Cook (In the Chair)

Councillors: R W Cook, Gibbon, London, A Marshall, Richardson and Wright

Resident Representatives: John Lynch and Iris Ryder

Officers: Alison Mawson, Head of Community Safety and Prevention
Andrew Dent, Electrical Engineering Team Leader
Peter Gouldsbro, Community Safety Officer
James Walsh, Scrutiny Support Officer
Sarah Bird, Democratic Services Officer

25. Apologies for Absence

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

26. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

27. Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2008

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

28. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

None

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

None.

30. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents

None.

31. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's Community Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Provision – Evidence of the Transmission Service/Network *(Electrical Engineering Team Leader)*

The Electrical Engineering Team Leader informed Members how the cameras were networked to the Monitoring Centre. He said that the majority of CCTV cameras in the town utilised fibre-optic cables. The cameras in the town centre were serviced by cables owned by the Authority but those in outer areas of the town, used cables rented from British Telecom (BT). Other cameras including those on the Fens estate, utilised a radio link but these required a direct line of sight to a mast. There were also ten cameras in the town which used broadband. These recorded locally on site but operators were able to dial into them to retrieve information. Members were informed that the cost of renting hubs from BT for cameras was approximately £1,500. The Electrical Engineering Team Leader said that the fibre-optic cameras gave the best coverage but the wireless camera technology was becoming better all the time.

Discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- ❖ Would it not be cheaper to install our own cable rather than renting? The Electrical Engineering Team Leader said that the cost of installing ducting to house the cable was approximately £50 per metre, therefore it would be extremely expensive to run ducting to areas of the town such as Owton Manor or the Headland. However the Authority does own the ducting in the town centre.
- ❖ How many cameras used rented cables? Members were informed that there were approximately 20 cameras which came in this category.
- ❖ Do the wireless cameras record in real time? Members were informed that they did and that ongoing costs for wireless cameras were cheaper.
- ❖ Was the provision of cabling put out to tender? Members were informed that at the time the cameras and cabling were installed, BT was the only operator who was able to provide the service but now Virgin Media may be able to offer the service.

Recommendation

The evidence put forward be considered.

32. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Evidence on the Location and Purpose of Community CCTV Cameras *(Community Safety Officer)*

The Community Safety Officer informed Members that the Community CCTV Monitoring Centre was located in a secure access controlled building with a monitoring suite and a small viewing suite incorporating image recording equipment. There were 19 camera view quad screens plus the facility to drop down additional screens for individual camera monitoring. In addition the Automatic Numberplate Recognition (ANPR) equipment was monitored as well as alarm activation viewing facilities at locations such as Grayfields. Three new consoles were being installed to view the 11 cameras which were currently being installed in the Longhill Industrial Estate. The monitoring centre was reaching capacity and there was minimal room for expansion. The recording/image storing equipment was now working to almost maximum capacity and the Police viewing time for crime investigation purposes had increased. There were no criteria laid down on the number of cameras and screens an operator can monitor but this was balanced by Health and Safety considerations, incident response needs, log and information maintenance requirements and police enquiries. If camera numbers were increased a review of operator numbers would be required.

If there was to be a decommissioning or relocation of cameras a number of factors should be considered including

- ❖ Monitoring Centre capacity
- ❖ Crime Statistics within the location
- ❖ Age and cost profile of a camera
- ❖ Changes in local demographics
- ❖ Consultation with Council Officers, Police, Ward Members, Partnerships

The Community Safety Officer suggested that should a camera be considered for decommissioning then the cabling and transmission link be retained in case there was a need to return the camera to its original location.

Suggestions for the considerations for commissioning of new cameras included:-

- ❖ Evidence of deployable camera pre-assessment
- ❖ Crime statistics
- ❖ Other security arrangements in the locality
- ❖ Cost contribution

A map indicating the positions of camera in the town was handed to members

and the purposes of the cameras outlined e.g town centre sites; suburban sites covering strategic places, retail outlets, leisure areas or council locations; residential areas. There were also on this map details of cameras which may be a priority for relocation or a review of their location.

The Community Safety Officer informed Members that the CCTV Code of Practice required annual renewal of notification of use of CCTV to the Information Commissioners Office.

Members queries included:-

What is the ANPR used for? The Community Safety Officer stated that this was mainly for intelligence gathering as well as the detection of non licensed and uninsured vehicles.

As it appears that the Centre is nearing capacity who would fund any move to larger premises? Should the Police be asked to contribute as they were the main beneficiaries of using the system? The Chair pointed out that at the previous meeting, the Police had indicated that they would be unable to provide funds for this.

If a camera is decommissioned, won't crime/antisocial behaviour return to the area? The Community Safety Officer said that although permanent cameras provided live monitoring facilities, deployable cameras could be put into place from which footage could subsequently be retrieved.

Is there still a need for 5 cameras to be placed in Newholme Court? Could some of these cameras be re-sited in Clavering Park? The Community Safety Officer said that these were under review and if it was decided to remove these cameras, the wiring would remain. He said that discussions were ongoing regarding the exact location of CCTV camera(s) in Clavering Park.

Do the cameras sited at Tanfield Nursery cover the cemetery? The Community Safety Officer stated that the camera occasionally was pointed on the cemetery but a separate security system had been put in the cemetery approximately 18 months ago.

The camera sited on the Central Estate had been put in place after a robbery at the Post Office but the Post Office and another shop in the area had since closed.

Why, on the list of cameras in the town, were some numbers missing? The Community Safety Officer said that cameras in similar areas were numbered consecutively for ease of viewing at the Monitoring Centre and therefore a couple of numbers were kept spare after each sequence in case further cameras were added.

What is the line of site of the cameras at the Belle Vue Roundabout? Members were informed that the camera had a radius of B & Q, Stockton Road, Morrison's petrol station and Tesco.

Recommendations

The evidence given by the Community Safety Officer was noted.

33. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

A report had been received from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council giving details of their CCTV monitoring centre which is located in part of the Langbaugh Police premises in Kirkleatham and enhanced the ability to work in partnership with police. The CCTV monitoring used to be contracted out but has recently been brought back under Local Authority control. Schools alarms were now monitored by the CCTV centre. Members asked various questions about the report including:-

- ❖ If the Cleveland Police Headquarters moves to Wynyard Business Park, then perhaps the Hartlepool monitoring centre could be incorporated into their premises. The Scrutiny Support Officer stated that Redcar and Cleveland were working in partnership with the police but received no financial contribution from them and that we have a good working relationship with the police. The Head of Community Safety and Prevention clarified that it was the Police Headquarters which was considering relocation and not Hartlepool Police Office.
- ❖ Do Hartlepool schools have their alarms monitored by our CCTV centre. No as they have a contract with ADT for alarm monitoring but this could be an avenue to explore as a more cost effective method.
- ❖ If Police have plans to carry out an operation such as a drugs raid, is the CCTV centre made aware in order to monitor the situation? Yes as this can provide good evidence in criminal cases. The Community Safety Officer stated that it was interesting that defence barristers did not challenge the CCTV evidence, just the process on how it was obtained.
- ❖ Do we pay Housing Hartlepool to provide the monitoring contract? Yes the cost was approximately £76,000 per year, but this was a 24 hour, 365 day a year service and was cost effective. Members agreed that this was a fair figure although this was due to be reviewed in March 2009.

Recommendation

The evidence provided from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council was noted.

34. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough

Council's CCTV Provision – Feedback from Viewpoint Survey *(Head of Community Safety and Protection)*

A report was presented detailing the results of responses from residents regarding the CCTV provision in the town. The majority of respondents were supportive of CCTV and would support the installation of a camera near their home. The Head of Community Safety and Protection pointed out that a similar number of respondents had said that the CCTV cameras either made them feel safer or had made no difference at all. A quarter of those asked had agreed that the CCTV in the town should be provided by the Police. 80% of those who responded supported the introduction of talking cameras in the town.

Members agreed with the point made in the survey results that local businesses who benefited from CCTV e.g. takeaways should contribute towards the cost of running the system. The extra cameras which had been sited in the Longhill Industrial Estate were discussed and were informed that the cost of providing and monitoring these was incorporated into the business rates.

Recommendation

The feedback from the Viewpoint Survey was noted.

35. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Feedback from Focus Group and Site Visits *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

Members were invited to discuss feedback received as a result of the Focus Group and Site Visits which had taken place.

Points raised included:-

- ❖ Do we need more police officers or cameras? It was thought that members of the public would prefer a more visible police presence but it was pointed out that the running costs for a camera would be much lower. It was agreed that the costs per camera for each taxpayer should be highlighted.
- ❖ Part of fines against criminals sentenced should be put towards the running costs of cameras. The Forum felt that this was a good idea.
- ❖ The Forum thought that more cameras should be located but not on every street. It felt that elderly people felt safer when the area was monitored.
- ❖ Suggestions for organisations which should be asked to contribute towards running costs were discussed and it was felt that businesses in

busy areas such as Church Street and York Road as well as shopping parades which were monitored should assist. It was thought that the Police should also be asked to assist although at a previous meeting, it had been indicated that this would affect the Police Council Tax precept. It was suggested that bus companies should also be asked to contribute.

- ❖ How much more capacity can the monitoring centre take considering the 11 cameras which have been located at Longhill. Members were informed that the Longhill cameras were utilised mainly at off peak times so had not impacted strongly on staffing.
- ❖ A suggestion was made to adopt the system of Independent assessors who could call into the Monitoring Centre to inspect the operation of the facility as in the Darlington Centre. Darlington were regarded as a national benchmark and this was considered by the Forum as being an effective monitoring tool.

Recommendation

The evidence from the Focus Group and site visits was noted.

36. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Report on Arrest Figures from Community CCTV Footage *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

A report had been received setting out the viewing requests, footage copied and the number of arrests recorded. Members expressed disappointment that the number of convictions had not been supplied.

Recommendation

The report was noted.

37. Scrutiny Investigation in Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision – Draft Final Report Recommendations

Discussion took place and the following recommendations were put forward for inclusion in the draft final report:-

- ❖ Contributions should be gleaned from court costs
- ❖ Continuation of the contract with Housing Hartlepool or a similar partner
- ❖ Publicity for the cameras with an article in Hartbeat (including the cost per taxpayer)

- ❖ Possibility of putting a clause in planning consent for large new developments to include the placing of ducting suitable for carrying the camera cables
- ❖ Co-location with Police if a move was considered necessary in future
- ❖ Continued discussion with Police regarding a contribution towards the running costs of the cameras
- ❖ Businesses be asked to make a contribution e.g. on business rates as the safety of the public of Hartlepool is paramount.
- ❖ Consultation with residents, police and Community Safety staff prior to the decommissioning or relocation of cameras
- ❖ Refurbishment of Cameras
- ❖ Trial of talking cameras

Recommendation

The above items be included in the draft final report.

The meeting concluded at 4.00 pm.

SHAUN COOK

CHAIR

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

4 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S
COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION – DRAFT FINAL
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum that they will be presented with the draft findings of this Forum's investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 On 8 February 2008 the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee agreed to a referral from Cabinet on the topic of Hartlepool Borough Council's CCTV Provision. Due to the time constraints to complete the referral by the end of the 2007/08 Municipal Year, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee agreed to provide Cabinet with an Interim Report which would form the basis of an in-depth investigation to be undertaken by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum during the 2008/09 Municipal Year.
- 2.2 Cabinet considered the Interim Report from Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee at their meeting on the 28 April 2008 and agreed that the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum should undertake a detailed investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision and report their findings back to Cabinet by the end of September 2008.
- 2.3 At the time of writing this report, Members of this Forum at its meeting of 21 August 2008 are considering the conclusions and recommendations to be included in the Draft Final Report to be presented to Members of this Forum at today's meeting.
- 2.4 However, in accordance with the Authority's Access to Information Rules, it has not been possible to include this Forum's Draft Final Report into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision within the statutory

requirements for the despatch of the agenda and papers for this meeting, as the conclusions and recommendations are being considered by this Forum on the afternoon of the 21 August 2008. Although, arrangements have been made for the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Draft Final Report into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision to be circulated under separate cover and in advance of this meeting.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members note the content of this report and agree the Draft Final Report for presentation to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 19 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

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

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

4 September 2008



**Report of: Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny
 Forum**

**Subject: FINAL REPORT – HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH
 COUNCIL’S COMMUNITY CLOSED CIRCUIT
 TELEVISION (CCTV) PROVISION**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the findings of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum following its investigation into ‘Hartlepool Borough Council’s Community CCTV Provision’.

2. SETTING THE SCENE

- 2.1 On 22 January 2008, Cabinet gave consideration to a report of the Head of Community Safety and Prevention that outlined the progress made in the development of a CCTV Strategy for the town. Consequently it was agreed that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee be asked to undertake a scrutiny investigation into the appropriate CCTV camera system for Hartlepool with recommendation to be reported to Cabinet by the end of April 2008.
- 2.2 Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee met on the 8 February 2008 and agreed to the referral from Cabinet on the topic of Hartlepool Borough Council’s CCTV Provision. Due to the time constraints to complete the referral by the end of the 2007/08 Municipal Year, the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee agreed to provide Cabinet with an Interim Report which would form the basis of an in-depth investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council’s Community CCTV Provision to be undertaken by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum during the 2008/09 Municipal Year.
- 2.3 Cabinet considered the Interim Report from the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee at their meeting of 28 April 2008 and agreed that the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum should undertake a detailed investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council’s Community CCTV Provision and report their findings back to Cabinet by the end of September 2008.

- 2.4 As outlined within the Authority's Constitution, the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum (via the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee) has a mandatory obligation to consider referrals from Cabinet within Cabinet's prescribed timescale.
- 2.5 Subsequently, at the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008, Members agreed on the remit of the Forum to undertake the investigation into 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision'.
- 2.6 Hartlepool's CCTV system was established in the early 1990s with eight black and white imaging cameras in Church Street. Regeneration capital funding from City Challenge, Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and specific Home Office initiatives extended the system and introduced colour imaging cameras at various sites across the Town. The New Deal for Communities (NDC) initiative extended the number of sites covered with the Authority providing funding towards cameras covering car parks and other strategic sites.
- 2.7 Back in the early 1990s the CCTV cameras were monitored by the police, but control of these was handed over to the Council in the mid 1990s. In 2004 Hartlepool Borough Council transferred its housing stock, including the building housing the Community CCTV Monitoring Centre, to a new Registered Social Landlord, Housing Hartlepool. During this transfer of housing stock, Hartlepool Borough Council agreed a five year Service Level Agreement for the monitoring of the CCTV camera system to be undertaken by Housing Hartlepool.
- 2.8 Currently the CCTV coverage in Hartlepool is managed and operated by Hartlepool Borough Council and Housing Hartlepool on behalf of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership. The Community Monitoring Centre building, where the CCTV system is monitored 24 hours per day and 365 days a year, is owned and staffed by Housing Hartlepool. All equipment within the Community Monitoring Centre associated with CCTV monitoring is owned by Hartlepool Borough Council.

- 2.9 There are over 80 CCTV Camera positioned in over 70 community locations throughout Hartlepool. Some of these cameras have been in operation since 1995 and can be classified as either 'dome' or 'shoebox', with the latter being the majority classification for CCTV cameras in Hartlepool. Shoebox cameras (fig.1) have an oblong outer casing and often have a greater deterrent effect due to their visibility. Dome cameras (fig.2) have a semi-circular casing thus concealing the direction that the camera inside is pointing.



(fig.1)



(fig.2)

- 2.10 Many of the cameras are situated in strategic positions, covering the town centre streets, car parks and out of town shopping parades. Some cameras are also sited in residential streets and in / on Council assets, such as Mill House Leisure Centre, Rossmere Park and Newburn Bridge Industrial Estate.
- 2.11 The CCTV system in Hartlepool acts both as a deterrent to criminal and anti-social behaviour, but also as a provider of vital evidence for the Police and other enforcement agencies. CCTV cameras have also helped reduce the fear of crime amongst residents in Hartlepool.
- 2.12 There are a number of issues that have been identified in relation to the community CCTV provision in Hartlepool, that need addressing before a CCTV strategy for Hartlepool can be finalised. These issues are as follows:-
- (a) The ageing cameras require increasing maintenance and repairs, which has an impact on the annual revenue budget. A request for additional budget allocation was approved for 2008/09.
 - (b) The monitoring arrangements are subject to a Service Level Agreement with Housing Hartlepool, which ends in March 2009.
 - (c) The current staffing capacity in the Community Monitoring Centre will be less effective if further cameras are added to the system.
 - (d) Rather than continuing to add more cameras to the system, cameras could be decommissioned or relocated.
 - (e) Technology continues to develop and therefore opportunities for more efficient / effective methods of utilising the current CCTV system maybe available.

- (f) The monitoring of other organisation's camera system may reduce the cost to the Council of the current community CCTV provision. This option would, however, not be in line with the current Council policy of the CCTV system being maintained for the benefit of the community and not a generator of income.

3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 3.1 To determine the current overall purpose and objectives of the provision of CCTV cameras in Hartlepool and to formulate clear guidance on the rationale behind any future developments.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 4.1 The following Terms of Reference for the investigation were agreed by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 June 2008:-
 - (a) To consider the establishment of a fund for the repair, replacement, renewal and appropriate running costs of the community CCTV system, investigating with partner organisations (e.g. Cleveland Police, Cleveland Fire Brigade) for a financial contribution into this fund;
 - (b) To investigate the utilisation of planning gain to ensure that where appropriate, CCTV camera provision is built in, or where this is not viable then funding sought to add to the repair, replacement, renewal and running costs fund;
 - (c) To review the current camera provision throughout Hartlepool to recommend if cameras should be decommissioned, relocated or new cameras commissioned;
 - (d) To engage with all partners to ensure that CCTV cameras continue to contribute to combating crime and the fear of crime;
 - (e) To seek ways of partnership working with utilities and other authorised contractors who dig up the roads in Hartlepool, to ensure that fibre optic cables can be laid at the same time, therefore, improving the network;
 - (f) To investigate if the current transmission service provider, British Telecommunications, are providing a quality service or if other providers in the market place might exceed those standards; and
 - (g) To assess the current siting of the Community Monitoring Centre and engage with Housing Hartlepool to discuss future plans for the building, as well as the Service Level Agreement between the Council and Housing Hartlepool for the operation of the CCTV system that is due to expire in March 2009.

5. MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

- 5.1 The membership of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum for the 2008/09 Municipal Year was as detailed below:-

Councillors R Cook, S Cook (Chair), Gibbon, London, A Marshall, Morris, Richardson, Wright (Vice Chair), and Young

Resident Representatives:

John Lynch, Brian McBean and Iris Ryder

6. METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

- 6.1 Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum met formally from 19 June 2008 to 4 September 2008 to discuss and receive evidence relating to this investigation. A detailed record of the issues raised during these meetings is available from the Council's Democratic Services.

- 6.2 A brief summary of the methods of investigation are outlined below:-

- (a) Detailed presentations and reports from Hartlepool Borough Council Officers which was enhanced with verbal evidence;
- (b) Written evidence from the Authority's Elected Mayor in his role as Mayor and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability;
- (c) Site visit by Members to see community CCTV cameras in situ throughout Hartlepool and observation of the operation of these cameras by the Community Monitoring Centre;
- (d) Written and verbal evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade;
- (e) Verbal evidence from Cleveland Police;
- (f) Verbal evidence from Housing Hartlepool;
- (g) Written evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council;
- (h) Site visit to Darlington Borough Council to examine the good practice that exists in relation to community CCTV provision; and
- (i) Focus Group held with members of the public in the Council Chamber on 30 July 2008.

FINDINGS

7. CURRENT AND FUTURE BUDGETARY PRESSURES ON COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION

- 7.1 The Forum received a detailed breakdown of the income and expenditure relating to the Community CCTV Cameras by the Authority's Head of Community Safety and Protection. Table 1 (below) indicates the current and predicted future costs for the monitoring of the Community CCTV Cameras in Hartlepool:-

Table1. Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Camera Costs

	2007/08 Actual Spend	2008/09 Budget	2009/10 Projected Budget
Repairs / Maintenance (Contractor)	66,250	60,370	58,500
Maintenance (Electricals / Cables) – DSO	3,380	3,500	3,800
Power	4,400	5,150	5,500
Transmission (Fibre / Telephone)	37,040	44,800	45,000
Monitoring	73,230	76,090	79,130
Exceptional Items	0	0	4,500*
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	184,300	189,910	196,430
NDC	36,580	42,710	#
Section 106	7,000	7,000	7,000
TOTAL INCOME	43,580	49,710	#
OVERALL COST	140,720	140,200	#

* Security Industry Authority (SIA) Re-licence

To be finalised as NDC will cease to exist by the 2010/11 Budget.

- 7.2 Members were concerned that the New Deal for Communities (NDC) contribution would cease by the 2010/11 Budget and that increasing World energy prices would be likely to impact further on the budgetary requirements for the Community CCTV provision.

8. CONSIDERATION OF A FUND FOR REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, RENEWAL AND RUNNING COSTS OF COMMUNITY CCTV PROVISION

- 8.1 In relation to the consideration of the identification of a fund for the repair, replacement, renewal and running costs of the Community CCTV provision in Hartlepool, Members received evidence from a variety of witnesses as outlined underneath:-

Evidence from Cleveland Police

- 8.2 The Forum was pleased to receive information from Cleveland Police's Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods to their meeting of the 25 July 2008.
- 8.3 Whilst acknowledging that the Community CCTV cameras in Hartlepool were a major tool in the prevention and detection rates of crime, Cleveland Police felt that budgetary constraints would make it very difficult for them to contribute towards the running costs of the Community CCTV system in Hartlepool.
- 8.4 The Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods felt that the public in Hartlepool were the end users of the CCTV system and that Cleveland Police gathered images to counteract criminal activities on behalf of the people of Hartlepool. However, Members were pleased to hear that Cleveland Police would continue to deploy officers to the Community Monitoring Centre in times of high profile need. For example, major football matches in the Town or threats of terrorism.
- 8.5 Members raised the issue of generating income for the Community CCTV cameras from court cases where Cleveland Police convictions had been aided by the utilisation of images captured by Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV cameras. The Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods welcomed the suggestion and reported that currently no contributions were drawn from this possible funding resource.

Evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade

- 8.6 At the Forum's meeting of 25 July, Members received written evidence by the District Fire Manager and welcomed the Arson Task Force Manager to provide additional verbal evidence.

The Arson Task Force manager informed Members that Cleveland Fire Brigade only utilised CCTV images when one of three situations arose:

- (i) Risk of Attack;
 - (ii) Need for Evidence; and
 - (iii) Occupied Premises.
- 8.7 Members were saddened to learn that the Fire Brigade had been forced to fit their own vehicles with CCTV cameras as it was now not unusual for fire crews to be subjected to threatening behaviour. Where this could be anticipated in advance, Members learnt that the Fire Brigade often worked in partnership with the Police and the Community Monitoring Centre to ensure that Fire Officers could concentrate on the task of dealing with the emergency, whilst the CCTV cameras kept watch for possible actions that might result in the fire crews having to withdraw from the scene.

- 8.8 Although Cleveland Fire Brigade acknowledged the contribution of the Community CCTV cameras in contributing towards a safer Hartlepool and the benefits of the CCTV images for Cleveland Fire Brigade, due to budgetary constraints they currently felt unable to contribute towards the running costs.

9. THE UTILISATION OF PLANNING GAIN

- 9.1 Members were informed at their meeting of the 21 August 2008 that there was an annual income of £7,000 under a Section 106 planning obligation. This income was scheduled over a ten year period and the arrangement was currently in its fifth year. Members were encouraged by this example and agreed that where relevant, opportunities for income generation through Section 106 Agreements should be sought.
- 9.2 Members were also informed that eleven CCTV cameras are being installed on the Longhill Industrial Estate with a link back to the Community Monitoring Centre. The capital investment for this project had been provided by NDC and Hartlepool Borough Council, but the maintenance, upkeep, monitoring and running costs for the CCTV cameras were being financed through a successful Business Improvement District (BID) agreement for those businesses part of the Longhill and Sandgate Business Association. Members were informed that any business groups could make a BID application and that in the case of Longhill and Sandgate Business Association the BID would last for five years.
- 9.3 Members discussed their findings from their tour of the Community CCTV Cameras in situ in Hartlepool at the meeting of the Forum on 25 July 2008. It was agreed by Members that businesses should contribute towards the running cost for the Community CCTV cameras that benefitted their businesses.

10. COMISSIONING, DECOMISSIONING AND RELOCATION OF COMMUNITY CCTV CAMERAS

- 10.1 The Community Safety Officer provided members with a detailed breakdown of the location of the Community CCTV cameras throughout Hartlepool at the meeting of the Forum of 21 August. The Community CCTV cameras were classified for general operational purposes in five distinct areas:-
- (i) Town Centre – focus on business, retail and general public use;
 - (ii) Suburban – focus on strategic locations, out of town shopping arcades and leisure facilities;
 - (iii) Residential areas;

- (iv) Cameras under consideration for relocation; and
 - (v) Cameras whose purpose may now be obsolete.
- 10.2 Members were informed that the Community Monitoring Centre was almost running at full capacity and without a major overhaul of the facility and an increase in staffing numbers, it would prove to be very difficult to add more cameras to the current portfolio. The Community Safety Officer advised the Forum that the addition of eleven new cameras at Longhill Industrial Estate had only been achieved, as it had been agreed that these cameras were not going to be monitored 24:7; although images were constantly recorded.
- 10.3 Recently the Home Office had issued an update to their CCTV Code of Practice. Within their recommendations was that the location and purpose of all CCTV cameras should be notified annually to the Information Commissioner. Prior to this update only when new cameras were commissioned or relocated, was notification required to the Information Commissioner.
- 10.4 Members agreed that there could be occasions when CCTV cameras ceased to serve their purpose, although Members voiced some reluctance to remove cameras as their presence maybe having a deterrent effect. 'Dummy cameras' were suggested although this idea was rejected on the grounds that as the 'dummy cameras' could not capture images, public confidence in the CCTV system as a whole would be undermined if an incident had occurred but no images available despite the 'seeming' presence of a CCTV camera.
- 10.5 The Electrical Engineering Team Leader reported to Members that although there were occasions where cameras eventually became obsolete and unsuitable for redeployment, more often than not the lens in the fixed camera could be reused at a saving of £2,000, based on the cost of a new lens. It was also noted that other pieces of equipment from the cameras could also be reused.
- 10.6 Members were surprised to learn that Newholme Court currently sited five CCTV cameras and considered whether other areas in Hartlepool had CCTV coverage that seemed to be unjustifiably excessive. Members were advised that it would be sensible to decommission CCTV cameras that were no longer fit for purpose, by utilising redeployable CCTV cameras and leaving the pole and wiring in place as part of a phased withdrawal. Although satisfied with the proposed protocols surrounding the decommissioning of CCTV cameras that no longer served a purpose, Members emphasised the need to consult with local residents before any decommissioning exercise took place.

11. COMBATING CRIME AND THE FEAR OF CRIME

- 11.1 The Forum was interested to learn to what extent the Community CCTV cameras in Hartlepool contributed towards the detection, prevention and evidence gathering process for criminal activities and if the Community CCTV provision helped alleviate the fear of crime for residents in Hartlepool. Evidence gathered by Members is detailed below:-

Evidence from Cleveland Police

- 11.2 Members were encouraged to hear that Cleveland Police actively used the CCTV camera images to combat crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime in Hartlepool. Table 2 (below) was presented to Members demonstrating the number of times CCTV images had been used to assist in arrests.
- 11.3 The Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods informed Members that it was not possible to confirm how many of these arrests had led to convictions, the only figures available were for the number of convictions as a total and did not specify where CCTV evidence captured by the Community CCTV Cameras had been utilised. Members were, however, reassured that there were no occasions when the quality of the CCTV images captured were the cause of an arrest not leading to a conviction.

Table 2. Cleveland Police's Requests for CCTV Footage and Arrest Rates from these Images

January – December 2007	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
TOTALS	284	205	338
January – June 2008	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
TOTALS	222	103	197

Evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade

- 11.4 Written evidence presented by Cleveland Fire Brigade confirmed their long standing commitment to continue to work in partnership with all agencies to combat crime and the fear of crime. Members were encouraged to learn that Cleveland Fire Brigade attended bi-monthly meetings of the CCTV Management Group and supported the activities of the Safer Hartlepool Partnership Reassurance Task Group. Members were informed that this would continue in order that information and intelligence is shared.

Evidence from Members of the Public – Focus Group Event

- 11.5 The Forum was very keen to engage with members of the public to hear their views in relation to the Community CCTV provision within the Town.
- 11.6 As such, a Focus Group was held on 30 July 2008 in the Council Chamber. Whilst turnout from members of the public was low, the event was well publicised on the Council's website together with the distribution of leaflets / posters to libraries, community groups and venues throughout the Town.
- 11.7 Members of the public were given the opportunity to provide their views on their perception of the purpose of the CCTV cameras in Hartlepool and whether this purpose was reflective of their needs. The issues raised at the event were as summarised below:-
- (i) Concern over the CCTV focus (and subsequently police resources) being focussed on the 'night time economy', meaning that residents had a heightened 'fear of crime' in their local communities outside of the Town centre;
 - (ii) That where premises applied to the Licensing Committee for licenses that part of this application process should include a contribution towards the cost of the Community CCTV provision;
 - (iii) That as Hartlepool currently only had three redeployable CCTV cameras, investment should be sought to increase this number, to help combat crime / anti-social behaviour problems when they occurred for short-periods of time, as had recently been highlighted in the Greatham Ward;
 - (iv) With the general public being unable to influence the patrol / positioning of CCTV cameras, the public needed to know the channels of communication so that if there was a concern about anti-social behaviour or criminal activities, these could be brought to the attention of the relevant authorities. These concerns could then be considered in relation to a possible change in patrol or positioning of the Community CCTV cameras; and

- (v) That the public in Hartlepool would welcome the introduction of 'talking cameras' in the Town to aid dealing with the problems of littering and a possible catalyst towards the diffuser of violent behaviour.

Evidence from Viewpoint

11.8 At the meeting of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August, Members considered the results of the recent Viewpoint survey carried out by the Authority in April 2008. Members of the Viewpoint Panel had made a number of observations in relation to the Community CCTV provision throughout Hartlepool and these are summarised below:-

- (i) 93% of respondents were supportive of the current Community CCTV provision in Hartlepool;
- (ii) Over 50% of respondents said that the CCTV cameras made them feel safer in Hartlepool;
- (iii) 62% of respondents indicated that their feelings were that CCTV camera provision reduced crime in the Town;
- (iv) Nearly 60% of respondents felt that financial contributions towards the running costs of the Community CCTV cameras should come from Cleveland Police and local businesses;
- (v) 61% of the Viewpoint respondents felt that the CCTV cameras should be focussed on the Town Centre area and in particular the pubs and clubs in the Town;
- (vi) Outside of the Town Centre, 66% of respondents said that CCTV cameras should concentrate on areas of high crime or high levels of nuisance and anti-social behaviour; and
- (vii) 80% of respondents would welcome the introduction of 'talking cameras' into Hartlepool.

12. TRANSMISSION SERVICE, METHOD AND PROVISION

12.1 The Electrical Engineering Team Leader was present at the meeting of the Forum on 21 August, to provide evidence in relation to the methods of transmission utilised by the Community CCTV camera system in Hartlepool. This evidence gathered by Members is detailed below:-

Transmission Arrangements

12.2 Members were interested to learn that the CCTV images captured by the Community CCTV cameras are transmitted back to the Community Monitoring Centre via a number of different methods, which included fibre optic cable, broadband and radio communications.

- 12.3 The majority of the Community CCTV cameras had their images relayed back to the Community Monitoring Centre through fibre optic cables that are the property of Hartlepool Borough Council or rented from British Telecommunications (BT) and this was the preferred method of transmission.
- 12.4 Members heard that the major area of development for the transmission of CCTV camera images was via radio waves. However, Hartlepool suffered in that there was a lack of tall buildings to 'bounce' the radio waves off and onto the Community Monitoring Centre, although the Forum was informed that Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council had informally offered usage of police communication towers (subject to planning permission) situated across the bay.
- 12.5 The Forum discovered that no live link existed between the redeployable cameras and the Community Monitoring Centre and that images were recorded on site and then downloaded at a later date for viewing.

Transmission Service Provider

- 12.6 Members learnt that Hartlepool was restricted to a choice of two service providers for the transmission of services, one being BT the other being Virgin Media.
- 12.7 Historically BT was the only market player available to the Authority when looking at a service provider for the transmission of their CCTV images. Before the merger of ntl:Telewest with Virgin Mobile in 2006, there had been very little interest from ntl:Telewest towards providing a transmission service for CCTV images in Hartlepool. However, since the merger in 2006 Virgin Media are now beginning to provide a more competitive quota and Members were pleased to learn that the Authority was examining in detail which provider offered the best and most competitive service for the rate payers of Hartlepool.
- 12.8 Members were concerned to learn that around twenty community sites for CCTV cameras in Hartlepool were utilising BT fibre optic cables at a rental cost of between £1,000 and £1,500 per line per annum. Although this cost was fully inclusive of maintenance and in some cases included more than one camera 'sharing' a BT line, Members were disappointed that something in the region of £30,000 was being spent each year.
- 12.9 The Electrical Engineering Team Leader informed Members that the money spent on the rented BT lines was more cost effective to Hartlepool Borough Council than the installation of the Council's own ducting and fibre optic cable. It was estimated that ducting alone costs the Borough Council £50 per metre and that the Council was not able to simply place its cables into BT's ducting. It was hoped that developments in other forms of CCTV image transmission (e.g. radio waves) may in future reduce the need to utilise rented cables.

- 12.10 After receiving evidence from the Electrical Engineering Team Leader that ducting was already in place along Church Street and Victoria Road, Members suggested that where major developments took place in the town then ducting should be laid for usage by the Council should this ever become a necessity in the future.

13. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE RATIONALE BEHIND THE OPERATION OF THE COMMUNITY MONITORING CENTRE

- 13.1 The Director of Housing Services was welcomed by Members to the meeting of the Forum on 25 July, to provide evidence on the role of Housing Hartlepool as the current owners of the building housing the Community Monitoring Centre and the provider of the operational monitoring of the Community CCTV cameras. Members received evidence on two areas relating to Housing Hartlepool's role in the Community CCTV monitoring and these are detailed below:-

The Service Level Agreement for the Monitoring of Community CCTV Cameras

- 13.2 The Forum heard background evidence to the reasons behind Hartlepool Borough Council entering into a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the monitoring of the Community CCTV cameras with Housing Hartlepool (see sections 2.7 - 2.8). The cost of the SLA was in the opinion of both the Head of Community Safety and Protection and the Director of Housing Services very good value for money. There had been some small increases each year in line with inflation, but this was less than other Local Authorities were paying.
- 13.3 The Director of Housing Services confirmed to Members that Housing Hartlepool wished to continue with the monitoring of the Community CCTV cameras on behalf of Hartlepool Borough Council, although Members were warned that monitoring costs were likely to increase. There was, however, reassurance that the future increase in monitoring costs would happen with the realisation that the Council had a limited budget and that the tax payers of Hartlepool received value for money. Members acknowledged the excellent service provided by Housing Hartlepool, that the Authority would have to budget for.

The Community Monitoring Centre

- 13.4 Those Members who visited the Community Monitoring Centre on 21 July reported back to the Forum that the facility was excellent and compared very favourably to other CCTV monitoring systems that Members had visited. Digital storage of CCTV footage meant that the quality of playback was extremely high and cameras had captured images of the vehicle used by the Glasgow Bombers when it had passed through Hartlepool. Members were advised that the release of images from CCTV Cameras was strictly controlled under the Data Protection Act 1998.

- 13.5 Along with the monitoring of the Community CCTV cameras, Members noted that the Community Monitoring Centre also provide coverage of Housing Hartlepool's Homecall service, along with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) on behalf of the DVLA, although the Police had sometimes used the ANPR cameras for detection of non-licensed vehicles or vehicles used by known criminals.
- 13.6 At the Forum's meeting of 25 July, the Director of Housing Services informed Members that there may be future plans to relocate the Community Monitoring Centre from its current site to another location operated by Housing Hartlepool. The Director of Housing Services placed no timescales on any possible relocation, but reassurance was given that no relocation would be carried out without full consultation with Hartlepool Borough Council; as the equipment for the monitoring of the Community CCTV cameras was the property of Hartlepool Borough Council.

14. TO EXAMINE GOOD PRACTICE OF CCTV PROVISION AT A NEIGHBOURING LOCAL AUTHORITY

- 14.1 In order to further enhance their investigation into the provision of Community CCTV cameras in Hartlepool, Members sought evidence from local authority's who were considered to be demonstrating good practice. Evidence gathered by Members from these sources is detailed as follows:-

Visit to Darlington Borough Council

- 14.2 On 24 July 2008, Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum visited the CCTV Monitoring Centre at Darlington Borough Council. Darlington Borough Council were considered nationally to be a Local Authority who demonstrated good practice in the engagement of the local community to the CCTV provision in Darlington. The evidence gathered by Members who undertook the visit is detailed as follows:-
- (i) CCTV is not the total focus of the monitoring centre in Darlington, instead the 24:7 operation of the building is utilised to introduce other sources of funding such as coverage of Warden Link, alarm installations and contracted monitoring of CCTV cameras for the local Railway Station and Wear Valley District Council;
 - (ii) 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;
 - (iii) Talking Cameras – Darlington utilise their talking cameras to give general public announcements and as an aid to diffuse potential violent flashpoints. Darlington feels that street wardens are more appropriate to tackle littering (littering is the one of the rationales behind usage of 'Talking Cameras' in Middlesbrough) and dog fouling problems;

- (iv) 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; and
- (v) 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 within the Town. Groups are asked to confirm the bona fide nature of the visitors and group leaders are asked to feedback to their respective organisations to aid in the dispelling of myths connected to the CCTV cameras. In order to ensure that these visits take place on a regular basis they are built in as Performance Indicators.

Evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

14.3 At the meeting of the Forum on 21 August 2008, Members received written evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council's CCTV and Security Manager. Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council had recently brought their CCTV monitoring service 'in-house' from an external provider. The evidence submitted to Members is summarised as follows:-

- (i) 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;
- (ii) Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council were fortunate that at the time of bringing the CCTV provision 'in-house', Cleveland Police were developing a new multi-million pound police station at Redcar. This ensured that coterminosity could be achieved between the siting of the CCTV Monitoring Centre and the local Police district;
- (iii) 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 an external provider. The contract was costing the Local Authority £625,000 a year, which included CCTV;
- (iv) 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;
- (v) There is now greater partnership working between the Police and the CCTV system operated by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council. The major benefit is not increased funding, but better intelligence; and
- (v) By bringing the service 'back in-house' efficiencies have been made in other Council budgets. Previously schools in Redcar and Cleveland were paying £5,000 per annum to an external provider towards the

monitoring of their alarms; this facility has been picked up by the new Monitoring Centre in Redcar at a reduced cost of £500 per annum.

15. CONCLUSIONS

15.1 The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum concluded:-

- (a) That the Community CCTV provision in Hartlepool is positively received by the majority of residents of the Town;
- (b) That there is support amongst the residents of Hartlepool for expansion of the Community CCTV provision to combat crime and issues of anti-social behaviour, although this must be tempered so that the 'big brother' effect doesn't become a major issue;
- (c) That there it is important to engender public support for the purpose of the CCTV cameras in the Town;
- (d) That Cleveland Police continue to be the major users of the Community CCTV camera system;
- (e) That the Community Monitoring Centre is currently almost working at full capacity and that further expansion of the Community CCTV provision cannot be achieved at the current funding levels;
- (f) That expenditure on the monitoring and running costs of the Community Monitoring Centre is rising on a yearly basis, due to increasing utility and service costs;
- (g) That there is very little income being generated by the Community CCTV camera provision, although it is acknowledged that any future plans for income generation need to be carefully managed to avoid loss of public support for the system;
- (h) That the current Council policy is for the focus of the Community CCTV system be towards the benefit of the community and not as an income generating exercise;
- (i) To reduce overall costs for the Community CCTV system some income generation needs to be sought, however, it is easier to achieve greater sources of income generation if the CCTV system is 'in-house';
- (j) That although the cost of bringing the Community CCTV system under the control of Hartlepool Borough is currently not a cost effective exercise, no plans have been made to calculate when an 'in-house' provision might be beneficial to the Authority;

- (k) That there is major public support for 'talking cameras' to follow the examples of good practice demonstrated by other Local Authorities in the Cleveland area;
- (l) That Housing Hartlepool provide an excellent service, currently offers great value for money and arrangements for the extension of the Service Level Agreement should take place, however, there is still long-term uncertainty over the future of the Community Monitoring Centre at its current location and concerns over possible rises in the monitoring costs;
- (m) That there are a number of CCTV cameras in Hartlepool that are possible candidates for consideration to be decommissioned or relocated, but that dialogue with the local community needs to take place before this happens;
- (n) That a network of ducting throughout Hartlepool would be beneficial in ensuring that expansion or relocation of Community CCTV cameras does not impose greater pressure on expenditure costs;
- (o) That redeployable cameras are beneficial in demonstrating that the provision of CCTV cameras would have a sufficient deterrent or evidential effect to make the placement of a fixed camera financially viable;
- (p) That there are some myths surrounding the purpose and scope of the Community CCTV cameras and that this should be addressed by greater publicity of the activities at the Community Monitoring Centre; and
- (q) That Darlington Borough Council's CCTV provision is an example of a multi-functional monitoring centre, where the focus isn't just on CCTV and where income can be generated for a number of different sources to help finance the whole package and reduce expenditure for the Borough Council.

16. RECOMMENDATIONS

16.1 The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum has taken evidence from a wide range of sources to assist in the formulation of a balanced range of recommendations. The Forum's key recommendations to the Cabinet are as outlined below:-

- (a) That contributions to the operating costs of the Council's Community CCTV system be explored with:-
 - (i) Safer Hartlepool Partnership – Contribution towards the annual monitoring costs as part of their mission statement towards a safer Hartlepool;
 - (ii) Court Costs – Where Community CCTV cameras have provided evidence that has resulted in a conviction;

- (iii) Cleveland Police – As the major user of the Community CCTV system in Hartlepool; and
 - (iv) Local Businesses – Where cameras are in existence, a business case be presented highlighting the pre-emptive and reactive benefits of the CCTV cameras, value for money and the number of arrests achieved.
- (b) That a detailed exercise be undertaken to calculate the costs of bringing the monitoring provision 'in-house' together with the feasibility of co-location with Cleveland Police;
 - (c) That consideration be given to the future tendering for the monitoring of the Community CCTV camera system, to ensure that the Council continues to receive best value;
 - (d) That as major building developments take place in Hartlepool (e.g. Victoria Harbour), contractors be obligated to ensure that a network of ducting is laid, suitable to carry the Authority's fibre optic cables;
 - (e) That before Community CCTV cameras are commissioned, decommissioned or relocated, an assessment is made of the merits and appropriateness of the installation, by consulting local residents, police, Ward Councillors, community groups and utilising redeployable cameras to monitor crime levels;
 - (f) That a trial of 'Talking Cameras' in Church Street / York Road be explored;
 - (g) That a planned series of public events highlighting the importance of the Community CCTV Cameras be arranged;
 - (h) That following Cabinet's consideration of this Final Report, the Draft CCTV Strategy be re-submitted to the Cabinet incorporating the agreed recommendations from this enquiry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of our investigation. We would like to place on record our appreciation, in particular of the willingness and co-operation we have received from the below named:-

Hartlepool Borough Council:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond – Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability;

Alison Mawson – Head of Community Safety and Prevention;

Peter Gouldsbro – Community Safety Officer;

Brian Neale – Crime and Disorder Co-ordinator;

Andrew Dent – Electrical Engineering Team Leader

External Representatives:

Peter Knights – Acting Chief Inspector for Neighbourhoods, Cleveland Police;

Dave Turton – District Fire Manager, Cleveland Fire Brigade;

Lol Craven – Arson Task Force Manager, Cleveland Fire Brigade;

Andy Powell – Director of Housing Services, Housing Hartlepool;

Martin Booth – Assistant Programme Director, NDC;

Graham Putt – CCTV General Manager, Darlington Borough Council;

Peter Bowerbank – Control Room Co-ordinator, Darlington Borough Council;

Chris Mulgrew – Community Monitoring Centre Manager, Housing Hartlepool;

Kevan Taylor – CCTV and Security Manager, Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council;

Members of the public who participated throughout the investigation and at the Focus Group Event held on 30 July 2008.

**COUNCILLOR SHAUN COOK
CHAIR OF THE REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY
FORUM**

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 consulted or referred to in the preparation of this report:-

- (a) Decision Record of the Cabinet Meetings held on 22 January 2008 and 28 April 2008.
- (b) 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 of 19 June 2008.
- (c) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Setting the Scene Presentation: Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 June 2008.
- (d) Presentation of the Community Safety Officer entitled 'CCTV provision in Hartlepool' delivered to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 June 2008.
- (e) Report of the Head of Community Safety and Prevention entitled 'CCTV (Closed circuit television) – running costs' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (f) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Cleveland Police' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (g) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Cleveland Fire Brigade' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (h) Written Evidence of the District Fire Manager entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTC Provision – Response by Cleveland Fire Brigade' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (i) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Housing Hartlepool' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (j) Written Evidence of the Elected Mayor entitled 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTC Provision' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.

- (k) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision: Feedback from Site Visit – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 25 July 2008.
- (l) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Electrical Engineering Team Leader – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (m) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence on the Location and Purpose of Community CCTV Cameras – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (n) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (o) Report of the Head of Community Safety and Prevention entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Evidence from Viewpoint Survey' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (p) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Feedback from Focus Group and Site Visits – Covering Report' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (q) Report of the Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Report on Arrest Figures from Community CCTV Footage' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (r) Written Evidence of the CCTV and Security Manager entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool Borough Council's Community CCTV Provision – Response by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council' presented to the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 21 August 2008.
- (s) Minutes of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum of 19 June 2008, 25 July 2008 and 21 August 2008.
- (t) Viewpoint Survey – April 2008.
- (u) Minutes of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee of 8 February 2008.

REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

4 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO THE
MARKETING OF HARTLEPOOL – SCOPING
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To make proposals to Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum for their forthcoming investigation into 'The Marketing of Hartlepool'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 At the meeting of this Forum on 19 June 2008 Members determined their Work Programme for the 2008/09 Municipal Year. The topic of 'The Marketing of Hartlepool' was selected as the second Scrutiny topic for consideration during the current Municipal Year. Furthermore, Members suggested that this investigation should form the major in-depth Scrutiny Inquiry for the Forum's 2008/09 work programme.
- 2.2 Responsibility for the marketing and promotion of Hartlepool falls under the remit of the Economic Development Section which is part of the Regeneration and Planning Services Department.
- 2.3 Marketing and promotion are generally aimed at two particular audiences:
- (i) potential visitors; and
 - (ii) potential business investors interested in developing and / or establishing businesses.

The Tall Ships' Races provides a particular marketing / promotional opportunity. For the first time from 7-10 August 2010 the Tall Ships' Races will

be hosted by Hartlepool. It is estimated that over 1 million people¹ visited Liverpool during the weekend of 18-21 July 2008 to see the Tall Ships' Races injecting £30 million¹ into the local economy. As the Authority's Mayor said, the arrival of the Tall Ships' Races in 2010 gives Hartlepool a "tremendous opportunity to showcase the town"².

3. OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 3.1 To gain an understanding of how Hartlepool is marketed in terms of tourism and business and identify ways of further raising the profile of the Town.

4. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION/ENQUIRY

- 4.1 The following Terms of Reference for the investigation are proposed:-

- (a) To gain an understanding of the role and responsibility that Hartlepool Borough Council has towards the marketing of Hartlepool to attract visitors and encourage businesses to the town;
- (b) To review the role of Hartlepool at a local, sub-region and regional basis in relation to its profile and ensuring that at each level the requirements of the Town are being represented;
- (c) To examine the marketing and promotion of Tall Ships 2010 and ensure that the Town continues to benefit from the exposure post-2010;
- (d) To identify key partner bodies who engage and are responsible for helping to raise the profile of Hartlepool as a place to work and visit
- (e) To examine the changes in the provision of information used in the marketing to new businesses and visitors in light of the development of information technology

5. POTENTIAL AREAS OF ENQUIRY / SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

- 5.1 Members of the Forum can request a range of evidential and comparative information throughout the Scrutiny review.
- 5.2 The Forum can invite a variety of people to attend to assist in the forming of a balanced and focused range of recommendations as follows:-
- (a) Elected Mayor – Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability;
 - (b) Member of Parliament for Hartlepool;

¹ Liverpool Daily Post, 22 July 2008

² Hartlepool Borough Council, 28 June 2008

- (c) Portfolio Holder for Culture Leisure & Tourism;
- (d) Culture Leisure and Community Learning Theme Partnership;
- (e) Economic Forum;
- (f) Business & Tourism Network Groups;
- (g) One North East;
- (h) visitTeesvalley;
- (i) Tees Valley Regeneration; and
- (j) Other Local Authorities;

5.3 The Forum may also wish to refer to a variety of documentary / internet sources, key suggestions are as highlighted below:

(a) One NorthEast's North East England Tourism Strategy 2005-10:-
http://www.onenortheast.co.uk/lib/iiReport/983/ONE%20Report%2013454_01.pdf?CFID=1141270&CFTOKEN=41587073

(b) Hartlepool Borough Council's visitor and business websites:-
<http://www.destinationhartlepool.com/> and <http://www.investinhartlepool.com>

(c) Regional Image Strategy

(d) Economic Forum Protocol

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

6.1 Community engagement plays a crucial role in the Scrutiny process and paragraph 5.2, details who the Forum could involve. However, thought will need to be given to the structure in the way that the Forum wishes to encourage those views.

6.2 In addition, diversity issues have been considered in the background research for this enquiry under the Equality Standards for Local Government. As such the views of local diversity groups will be sought throughout the inquiry where felt appropriate and time allows. Consequently, consideration has been given as to how the views of people from minority communities of interest or heritage (for example, people with disabilities, people with learning disabilities, people with mental health problems, black and minority ethnic people, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender people), which may not be gathered through the usual community engagement routes, can be included over the course of the inquiry.

7. REQUEST FOR FUNDING FROM THE DEDICATED OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BUDGET

Option 1

- 7.1 Consideration has been given, through the background research for this scoping report, to the need to request funding from the dedicated Overview and Scrutiny budget to aid Members in their enquiry. At this stage no additional funding has been identified as being necessary to support Members in their investigation. Members, however, may wish to seek additional funding over the course of the investigation and the pro forma attached at **Appendix A** outlines the criteria on which a request to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee will be judged.
- 7.2 In addition, it is possible that over the course of this investigation some specialist research / advice may strengthen the Forum's findings and recommendations. The Scrutiny Support Officer will explore this in greater depth once the Forum has defined its terms of reference for the investigation and would bring a report to the Forum should a request for funding be deemed advantageous. Members' comments would be welcomed at this stage in relation to requests for additional funding from the dedicated Overview and Scrutiny Budget.

8. PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 8.1 Detailed below is the proposed timetable for the review to be undertaken, which may be changed at any stage:-

4 September 2008 – Consideration of the Scoping Report by the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

3 October 2008 – Formal meeting of the Forum to receive:-

- (i) A 'Setting the Scene' report from Regeneration and Planning Services Department; and
- (ii) Evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability (To be confirmed).

31 October 2008 – Formal meeting of the Forum to receive:-

- (i) Evidence on the presentation of Hartlepool at a local, sub-region and regional level in terms of the visitor and business sectors; and
- (ii) The promotion and marketing of Tall Ships 2010.

November / December – Visit(s) to Local Authority(ies) to draw on examples of good practice in relation to promotion and marketing of their Town.

20 February 2009 – Formal meeting of the Forum to receive:-

- (i) Feedback from site visit(s);
- (ii) Evidence from Local Businesses on the partnership approach to promotion and marketing of Hartlepool and opportunities where the Local Authority may encourage growth.
- (iii) Evidence of existing and potential partnership working on marketing and promotion.

9 April 2009 – Consideration of Draft Final Report by Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum.

24 April 2009 – Consideration of Final Report by the Scrutiny Coordinating Committee

TBC – Consideration of Final Report by the Cabinet

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Members are recommended to agree the Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Forum's remit of the Scrutiny investigation as outlined in paragraph 4.1.

Contact Officer: - James Walsh – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executives 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:-

Heward, J. (2008) 'Hartlepool to Host Tall Ships', *Hartlepool Borough Council*, 28th June, [online] Available from http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/site/scripts/news_article.php?newsID=233 (Accessed 19 August 2008)

Sharpe, L. (2008) 'Liverpool Waves off the Tall Ships', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 22nd July, [online] Available from <http://www.liverpooldailypost.co.uk/liverpool-news/regional-news/2008/07/22/liverpool-waves-off-the-tall-ships-64375-21380424/2/> (Accessed 19 August 2008)

APPENDIX A

**PRO-FORMA TO REQUEST FUNDING TO SUPPORT
CURRENT SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION**

Title of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
Title of the current scrutiny investigation for which funding is requested:
To clearly identify the purpose for which additional support is required:
To outline indicative costs to be incurred as a result of the additional support:
To outline any associated timescale implications:
To outline the 'added value' that may be achieved by utilising the additional support as part of the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:
To outline any requirements / processes to be adhered to in accordance with

the Council's Financial Procedure Rules / Standing Orders:

To outline the possible disadvantages of not utilising the additional support during the undertaking of the Scrutiny Investigation:

To outline any possible alternative means of additional support outside of this proposal: