

# AGENDA

## COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING (ACTING AS THE CRIME AND DISORDER OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE)



Overview and Scrutiny

Date: Tuesday 9 October 2012  
Time: 6.30 pm  
Venue: Town Hall, High Street,  
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors: Mrs Blackmore (Chairman), Brindle,  
Mrs Joy, D Mortimer, McLoughlin,  
Munford, Mrs Parvin, Vizzard and  
de Wiggondene

---

Page No.

1. **The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast.**
2. **Apologies.**
3. **Notification of Substitute Members.**
4. **Notification of Visiting Members.**

**Continued Over/:**

---

**Issued on 1 October 2012**

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact Orla Sweeney on 01622 602524**. To find out more about the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, please visit [www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc](http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/osc)

*Alison Broom*

**Alison Broom, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,  
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ**

**5. Disclosures by Members and Officers:**

- a) Disclosures of interest.
- b) Disclosures of lobbying.
- c) Disclosures of whipping.

**6. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.**

**7. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2012** **1 - 6**

**8. Update from the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership bodies on the Implementation of the CCTV Monitoring Service at the Medway Control Centre.** **7 - 32**

Interviews with:

- Chief Inspector Jon Bumpus, District Commander for Maidstone;
- Vikram Sahdev, Head of Business Development, Medway Council; and
- John Littlemore, Head of Housing and Community Services.

**9. INFORMATION ONLY: Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Protocols** **33 - 37**

## MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 14 FEBRUARY 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs Blackmore (Chairman)  
Councillors Brindle, Butler, Field, FitzGerald,  
D Mortimer, Mrs Parvin, Paterson and Mrs Stockell

**120. The Committee to consider whether all items on the agenda should be web-cast.**

**It was resolved** that all items on the agenda be webcast

**121. Apologies.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hinder and Yates

**122. Notification of Substitute Members.**

Councillors Brindle and Butler substituted for Councillors Yates and Hinder respectively.

**123. Notification of Visiting Members.**

There were no Visiting Members.

**124. Disclosures by Members and Officers:**

The following Members declared an interest in item 7, Safer Maidstone Partnership – Neighbourhood Action Planning:

- Councillor FitzGerald, Chairman of Fusion Healthy Living Centre;
- Councillor Mrs Stockell, Member of Kent Police Authority; and
- Councillors Mortimer, FitzGerald and Stockell and Members of the Locality Board.

**125. To consider whether any items should be taken in private because of the possible disclosure of exempt information.**

It was agreed that all items should be taken in public as proposed.

**126. Safer Maidstone Partnership - Neighbourhood Action Planning**

The Chairman welcomed Sarah Robson, Community Partnerships Manager, Jim Boot, Community Development Manager, Inspector Prodger, Kent Police, Ian Summer, Kick Kent and Charlie Beaumont, Youth Offending Service.

Sarah Robson, Community Partnerships Manager updated the Committee on the Safer Maidstone Partnership. She explained that the Local Strategic Partnership had dissolved in September 2011 and had been replaced with the Locality Board. The Locality Board would be reviewing and streamlining the thematic delivery groups which included the Safer Maidstone Partnership (SMP). They would develop action focused work plans against the priorities set and there would be an emphasis on a task and finish approach. The Committee were informed that the SMP's priorities remained the same:

- Anti Social Behaviour;
- Domestic Abuse;
- Substance Abuse; and
- Road Safety.

In April 2010 the SMP's statutory requirements were expanded to include the formulation and implementation of a strategy for reoffending. It was explained that reoffending would be considered in all work undertaken by the SMP and would become an adopted priority. The SMP were currently working on its Annual Strategic Assessment and a three year Partnership Plan which would establish the for the borough.

Inspector Prodger from Kent Police, described the changes to policing since November 2011. The Borough was now divided into three areas of command and Inspector Prodger was responsible for the western area of the borough which included Park Wood. There was a focus on neighbourhood policing with Sergeants and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) given ownership of specific areas. He informed Members that this provided Officers with the opportunity to liaise with partners and actively work with local residents to develop a local knowledge. He told Members that it was early days but he felt it was more effective approach. Statistically Crime was up on the same period the previous year but had gone down since November 2011. The Officer felt this was attributed to a combination of working with communities, intelligent units and reactive CID (Criminal Investigations Department). Members considered the impact of Neighbourhood Action Planning on crime. Inspector Prodger told the Committee that from a Police perspective it was important to know that diversionary activities existed as Officers had an opportunity to signpost young people to them. He felt that activities were helping and had a positive effect on crime and anti social behaviour. He explained that there had been a decrease in cases of criminal damage which was largely associated with anti social behaviour and an increase in violent crime that could be related to a rise in reported cases of Domestic Abuse which was seen as a positive outcome. The Committee felt that it would be beneficial to have a breakdown of crime figures across the borough included anti social behaviour.

Jim Boot, Community Development Officer informed Members on the Park Wood Neighbourhood Action Plan 2010-1015. He explained that it was a pilot scheme that had been developed with 600 residents. Approximately 2,800 issues had been raised, many of which were associated with

community safety and crime. The methodology used was 'Planning for Real' which involved creating a 3D model of the area with residents and wider engagement through road show events.

Members were informed that Kick Kent were commissioned by Maidstone Borough Council to deliver football sessions on a Wednesday evening in Park Wood, Coxheath and Shepway. This was a diversionary activity for young people. Kick Kent incorporated tackling difficult behaviours and the issues faced by young people into their sessions. Ian Summers from Kick Kent explained that the sessions had been running since September 2011 and were well attended.

The Committee were informed that boxing was a new activity to Park Wood and would be delivered jointly with the Police. Members observed that sports activities did not reach everyone and questioned whether there were any other types of interventions on offer such as arts and drama activities. Members were told that Eddie Walsh from Kent Youth Service had made a successful bid for funding to deliver arts activities at Fusion's Youth Cafe.

The Committee considered Fusion Healthy Living Centre and the Youth Cafe. Councillor FitzGerald, Chairman of Fusion, informed Members that funding was needed to keep the centre open. He explained that staffing the Youth Cafe on a Thursday evening was a problem as a minimum of two staff were required. It had been agreed that the staff would be provided by Kent Youth Service but this was not always possible due to their own staffing issues. It was highlighted that Kent Youth Service also provided detached Youth Workers in the area on a Wednesday evening but that better communication between partners was needed to as this was not widely known.

Charlie Beaumont from Youth Offending Service, explained that he dealt with young people from Shepway North and Park Wood. He told Members that he would like to see a more coordinated approach between partners in dealing with young people and was encouraged by the new requirements of the SMP to address reoffending. He explained that there would be a more joined up approach taken by Kent Youth Service and Youth Offending Service as the two areas were to be integrated. The services were going through a transformation and there would be some delay in service provision but the result would be a more co-ordinated approach. Mr Beaumont volunteered to take forward the issues raised regarding staffing at the Youth Cafe and detached youth work in the area. It was felt that especially where young people were concerned there was need to follow through on commitments made as they could become disenchanted very quickly. Mr Beaumont informed Members that he would supply further information on youth re offending detailing age, gender, offences and interventions via the Scrutiny Officer.

Members questioned the role of the mobile Gateway. The need for this had been identified as part of the engagement with residents in Neighbourhood Action Planning. The mobile Gateway was an events unit and was being used one day a month for six months on a trial basis.

Members were informed that there were on average thirty five detailed enquiries per day. The unit had Wi-Fi access which was used to demonstrate the Council's website and the services available to residents online. Detailed Benefits and Housing enquires were dealt with at the Fusion Healthy Living Centre as Wi-Fi could not be for accessing confidential information. Different venues for the mobile Gateway had been trialled including Bellwood School. It was found that the mobile Gateway was most successful when positioned at the Park Wood parade. There was involvement from a number of different agencies including Kent County Council, Golding Homes, Connexions, along with the Council's Gateway staff. At the end of the six month trial the success of the service would be evaluated. Officers explained that a consideration to be made was whether the mobile Gateway would be better used in more remote areas of the borough such as Marden and Staplehurst as Park Wood was situated close to the Town Centre. Some Members felt that 'financial ability' was part of the reason it was important to Park Wood. The return bus fare was in excess of £2 to the Town Centre which was felt to be a significant part of a resident's income.

Members queried the engagement with Housing providers such as Golding Homes in the pilot Neighbourhood Action Plan. The Committee were informed that Golding Homes held a drop-in session at Fusion Healthy Living Centre every Thursday. Mr Boot informed Members that Golding Homes had been supportive of the Park Wood Neighbourhood Action Plan and had made financial contributions. He explained that their staff were frequently involved with activities and there was already a strong level of engagement.

The Committee felt that it was important to have a representative from Golding Homes at its next meeting. Mr Summers told Members that Golding Homes had initially been involved with Kick Kent in Park Wood and had invested money in the project. He felt that it would be helpful to have their involvement with Kick Kent to provide background information on the young people involved which would assist their work.

It was felt that the issues raised by residents in the Park Wood Action Plan were problems that existed across the borough and it would remain a challenge for partners to maintain service provisions in the current economic climate. Members queried the effect of funding cuts. Mrs Robson explained that with such a significant reduction in the Home Office Grant (from £200,000 to approximately £47,000) which would impact on Kent Police, Maidstone Borough Council and Kent County Council which is why a partnership approach was important. She informed the Committee that the setting of priorities by the Locality Board was key to avoiding duplication. Members were informed that the Community Safety Unit met on a weekly basis to address issues but larger, priority issues would be addressed by the Locality Board at its March meeting and action plans would be devised.

Mr Boot informed Members that the Council were currently building the capacity of communities to access funding and training. A Health Champions training course was currently being offered which was as a

result of the consultation process with residents. Residents felt they would prefer to hear from someone they could relate to. Members felt that this example clearly demonstrated Maidstone Borough Council's role as a 'facilitator' and the Committee considered whether the Council should be developing this role further. Members were informed that part of the Council's Community Development Strategy was to build the capacity of communities. It was suggested that Fusion, for example, could in time be run by the local community.

The Committee questioned whether Neighbourhood Action Planning would be taken to other areas of the borough. The Officer explained that Park Wood was a pilot and in addition to this Parish plans offered an experience of resident led initiatives which could be translated into an urban setting. Within the Council's Strategic Plan was an ambition to develop Neighbourhood Action Plans in other areas.

Communication across the borough and the issue of the public's perception of Community Safety was discussed. Members were informed that the SMP were keen to improve public confidence through improved communication. Members felt that a communications plan was important and also commented on the 'You said, We did' update included in the Park Wood Action Plan update. It was felt that this approach could be used in a newsletter to residents as a means of letting them know what was being achieved.

Members were concerned that other areas of the borough could be overlooked with the focus on Park Wood. Mrs Robson informed Members that the Safer Maidstone Partnership responded to a variety of issues across the borough. The Officer highlighted Kent County Council wardens who were focused on the needs of rural communities. In addition to Neighbourhood Action Planning in Park Wood, youth activities were run in anti social behaviour hotspots across the borough in areas such as Headcorn and the Town Centre. They were described as responsive services that were commissioned and developed with the Community Safety Unit and Kent Police.

Members discussed communication channels. It was felt that information needed to be brought together and a collaborative approach taken. A Member highlighted Multi Agency Planning (MAPS) meetings that were taking place in Park Wood.

It was noted that the minutes of the previous Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting had not been included as an item on the agenda, having being approved by the Parent Committee at an earlier meeting. It was noted that the protocol should be that the minutes be agreed by the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee and included in its agenda.

**It was recommended that:**

- a) Clarification on the staffing commitment from Kent Youth Services to supply two volunteers to the Youth Cafe held at Fusion Healthy

Living Centre on a Thursday evening should be sought by the Scrutiny Officer and assurance that this requirement will be built into their future programme of services;

- b) Kent Youth Services should provide an update on detached Youth Work in Park Wood and other areas of the borough;
- c) Mr Beaumont, should supply the Committee with information on the intervention successes of Kent Youth Services and the Youth Offending Service;
- d) An analysis of the usage of the Mobile Gateway should be undertaken to help demine whether it should be used in other areas of the borough;
- e) A representative from Golding Homes should be invited to attend Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 13 March 2012 and feedback should be given to Kick Kent;
- f) Inspector Prodger should provide the Committee with crime data by ward that includes incidences of Anti Social Behaviour;
- g) Maidstone Borough Council should develop its role as 'facilitator' by encouraging and supporting community groups to access funding not available to the Council; and
- h) The Safer Maidstone Partnership should develop a communication plan to help raise the public perception of the successful way crime and other high priority issues are being dealt. This should include a 'You said, we did' style newsletter.

**127. INFORMATION ONLY: Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Protocols**

**128. Duration of the Meeting**

6.38 p.m. to 8.00 p.m.



## Maidstone Borough Council

### Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting as the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 9 October 2012

#### Update from the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership bodies on the Implementation of the CCTV Monitoring Service at the Medway Control Centre.

**Report of:** Overview & Scrutiny Officer

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee has a statutory role to act as the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee in line with Maidstone's protocols for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership Overview and Scrutiny. The protocols are based on clearly defined principles which include 'a focus on supporting the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour and reducing fear of crime and reducing fear of crime and anti social-behaviour in the Borough of Maidstone'.
- 1.2 Maidstone Borough Council took the decision in November 2011 to award the contract for the CCTV monitoring service to Medway Council Control Centre.
- 1.3 This decision was called in and considered by the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Committee resolved that the decision should stand but recommended that 'both the Cabinet and officers ensure that stakeholders are fully engaged throughout all stages of the transfer of the CCTV service and its continued ongoing operation.' It is on this basis that the Committee resolved that a review of the implementation of the CCTV monitoring service at the Medway Control Centre should be included in its work programme for the 2012/13 Municipal Year.
- 1.4 Meetings with CCTV stakeholders have taken place. Satisfaction surveys were conducted in March and June 2012. The minutes of the meetings and results of the surveys are attached at **Appendix A.**

#### **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Committee is recommended to interview:
  - Chief Inspector Jon Bumpus, District Commander for Maidstone;
  - Vikram Sahdev, Head of Business Development; and
  - John Littlemore, Head of Housing and Community Services

To provide an update on the implementation of the CCTV monitoring service at the Medway Control Centre and the partnership arrangements. The Committee should seek to establish the successes of the new partnership arrangement and identify any issues, seeking to make quality recommendations as appropriate.

2.2 Areas of questioning could include but are not limited to:

- The negative press and public opinion that dominated the Council's decision to award the contract for CCTV monitoring to Medway;
- Strategies and methods of communication that have been put in place by Kent Police, the Safer Maidstone Partnership (SMP) and Maidstone Borough Council to counteract the negativity surrounding the decision and address 'fear reduction' for the public and businesses in Maidstone;
- What part does CCTV play building positive public perception of Kent Police and the work of the SMP;
- Do current crime statistics substantiate claims that CCTV monitoring could be less effective when conducted from a remote control centre?
- Have stakeholder meetings helped maintain a level of local knowledge that has benefited the implementation of the monitoring service at Medway?
- What impact will the new Code of Practice and appointment of the surveillance camera commissioner have, if any, on current partnership arrangements and the service being delivered?

**3. CCTV**

3.1 CCTV and its impact on crime is a topic that is widely reported on and discussed in the press. A recent article in the Australian publication the Herald Sun on 28 September 2012 entitled 'CCTV: Do we need more? No, we should heed the example of Britain which spent billions on camera and still has highest crime rates' (**Appendix B**) examines its effectiveness and bases its argument on various studies including a British Home Office Review.

3.2 The general purpose of CCTV is commonly defined as a measure 'to prevent and reduce crime' because it achieves one or more of the following:

**A: Deterrence**

**B: Prosecution**

**C: Fear reduction**

**D: Monitoring and intervention**

- 3.3 The Medway news on Friday 2 November 2011 and in relation to the rioting across the UK, reported positively on Medway's CCTV Control Centre (**Appendix C**). The article describes the service as 'a state-of-the-art security operation'. The article also describes the part the Control Centre lays in the 'Lifeline' scheme, monitoring '3,250 alarms' and 'supporting around 4,000 vulnerable older people in their homes and in sheltered schemes'.
- 3.4 On 13 September 2012 the Government announced the creation of a Code of Practice for CCTV and automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) along with the appointment of its first surveillance camera commissioner (**Appendix D**). The Home Office press release states that the code of practice has been designed to encourage greater transparency in the use of CCTV and ANPR and, as well as ensuring these systems are being used proportionately, it will provide coherent guidance for police forces and local authorities to increase image quality and boost the chances of catching criminals."

#### **4. The CCTV Monitoring Service**

- 4.1 On 9 November 2011 Cabinet took a decision on the future provision of the CCTV Monitoring Service. The decision made was that the contract for the CCTV monitoring service be awarded to Medway Council Control Centre.
- 4.2 The record of decision provided the following background to the decision taken: "In December 2010 the Cabinet Member considered a proposal to enter into a local authority partnership to deliver the CCTV monitoring service." The decision at that time was to investigate the proposal further and to report back following consideration of stakeholder views.
- 4.3 Consultation with stakeholders was conducted, which included an opportunity for representatives to discuss the requirements of the CCTV service. In March 2011 the Cabinet Member for Community Services determined the previous offer did not meet the test for a local authority partnership, and in the interest of providing an environment of fair competition and to encourage innovation decided to tender for the service.
- 4.4 The tender approach would also provide a transparent, open and fair process in order to achieve best value for money. The report in March 2010 set out the procurement process together with the criteria and reasons for the chosen approach."
- 4.5 The decision was called-in utilising the scrutiny call-in function and a meeting was held on 30 November 2011. The following recommendations were made:

- (a) The committee agreed that the decision should stand without referral back to the Cabinet. The Committee recommended both the Cabinet and officers ensure that stakeholders are fully engaged throughout all stages of the transfer of the CCTV service and its continued ongoing operation; and
  - (b) CCTV should remain on the agenda for the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee. A written update should be provided for the Committee to consider at the beginning of the second quarter of 2012.
- 4.6 The CCTV user group ([www.cctvusergroup.com](http://www.cctvusergroup.com)) in its 2012 Management and Innovation Awards recognised Vikram Sahdev and Corinna Woolett for the Medway, Swale and Maidstone CCTV Partnership.

## **5. Safer Maidstone Partnership**

- 5.1 The Safer Maidstone Partnership (SMP) produce a rolling five year document which highlights how the Safer Maidstone Partnership plans to tackle Community Safety issues that matter to the local community.
- 5.2 The draft Community Safety Partnership Plan 2012-2017 is under consultation until 5 October 2012 and provides the following background to the SMP and its current position and outlook.
- 5.3 "In 2010, the Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government (IDeA) undertook a peer review of the SMP, the crime and disorder reduction partnership for the Maidstone borough. As a result of the review and its recommendations and to ensure compliance with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which directs that we must have community safety embedded into our planning, our policy and our operational day-to-day activity, the SMP structure was revised to ensure that there is a more robust intelligence-led business process.
- 5.4 The SMP brings together people from local government, the NHS, the police, the fire service, probation, local businesses, housing providers and voluntary and community organisations to work as a team to tackle issues such as crime, education, health, housing, unemployment and the environment in Maidstone Borough.
- 5.5 SMP membership is made up of the public sector agencies (Kent County Council, Maidstone Borough Council, Kent Police, Kent Police Authority, NHS, Kent Fire and Rescue Service, KDAAT, Kent Probation Service and Maidstone Prison) and also incorporates members from other key partners including Maidstone Mediation, The Kenward Trust, Golding Homes and Town Centre Management. The SMP is chaired by Martin Adams, Area Manager for the Kent Fire and Rescue Service."

## **6. Kent Police**

- 6.1 Chief Inspector Jon Bumpus is the District Commander for Maidstone. He is one of four district commanders in the West Division, part of a structure which replaced the previous six Basic Command Units (BSU). The Operational Policing Model came into effect at the end of 2011 and is based on the following:
- Neighbourhood Policy and alignment with Districts and Medway;
  - A broader role of frontline office duties to ensure ownership of local crime and ASB issues;
  - Savings from economies of scale of reducing from six BCUs to three Divisions;
  - Reinvestment in Neighbourhood Resources – Constable increase from 381 to 677 with extended availability; and
  - Retention and building of partnership arrangements.

## **7. Impact on Corporate Objectives**

- 7.1 The remit of Safer Maidstone Partnership has relevance to many of the Council's Priorities but relates specifically to the priority a place that has strong, healthy and safe communities which covers the majority of the delivery group's work and the MBC objective to make people feel safe where they live relates to the key priorities of the group.
- 7.2 There are no risks involved in considering the priorities and progress of the Safer Maidstone Partnership.

Attendees:

John Littlemore	MBC
Joanna Fathers	MBC
Paul Alcock	TCM
Bill Moss	TCM
Sue Bassett	Staplehurst Parish Council
Ivan White	Federation of Small Businesses
Stephen Dryden	Marks and Spencer
Mark Hutcheon	Town Centre Police
Andrew Simms	Boots
Cllr John Wilson	Cabinet Member

Apologies:

Rev Jackie Cray	Street Pastor
Loraine Hemphrey	Kent Police Neighbourhood Watch
Teresa Irving	Downswood Parish Council
Gordon Newton	Downswood Parish Council
Dennis Conyan	Taxi Services
Dennis Tree	Beluga Bar
Julie Lucas	Banks Bar

1. JL explained the purpose of the Stakeholder Group was to provide a conduit between the various stakeholders that benefit from CCTV, MBC and Medway Council. JL confirmed that future meetings would include a representative from Medway.
2. PA raised concerns over the terms and conditions the staff transferring from Profile Securities to Medway would be under. The TUPE regulations were outlined and PA asked that concerns were passed onto Medway.
3. If the Medway restructure results in the loss of transferring staff BM asked that the issue of cross training takes place sooner rather later.
4. JL updated the meeting the implementation date remained on course to commence on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012. Testing of the equipment was ongoing including the Maidsafe Radio network and Kent Police radios. PA reported some interference on the connection between Maidsafe and the Strood centre. JL confirmed that all cameras including those in the rural areas would be operational from Strood on the commencement date.
5. MN raised some operational concerns as to how evidence would be gathered and provided to Maidstone Police. This prompted a discussion around the issue of data control and

concluded with a commitment to find a solution that met all parties' requirements whilst remaining compliant with the appropriate regulations.

6. The recent survey of local businesses and other organisations benefiting from CCTV was shared. There was a discussion as to what the figures meant and the possible reasons for the answers. It was agreed that a similar survey would be conducted at 6 and 12 month intervals.
7. JL ran through the current method of performance monitoring for the CCTV operation. This was then compared with the information collated by Medway, which is a more detailed version of Maidstone's. This was agreed as a satisfactory method of data collection that would enable a comparison to be made with historic data. In addition information concerning any down-time and requests for evidence would also be monitored.
8. There was a discussion as to the most convenient time and day of the week for future meetings. The general consensus was for a Monday at 17:00 hrs. The next date to be confirmed.

Meeting closed.

**CCTV Stakeholder Meeting**

**14<sup>th</sup> May 2012**

**Record of Meeting**

**Attendees**

Joanna Fathers	MBC
John Littlemore	MBC
Cllr Fran Wilson	Ward Councillor
Paul Alcock	TCM
Bill Moss	TCM
Andrew Simms	Boots
Ivan White	Federation of Small Businesses
Stephen Dryden	Marks & Spencer
Insp. Mark Hutcheon	Police
Lynne Goodwin	Medway Council
Corinna Woollett	Medway Council

**Apologies**

Rev Jackie Cray	Street Pastor
Lorraine Hemphrey	Kent Police Neighbourhood Watch
Teresa Irving	Downswood Parish Council
Gordon Newton	Downswood Parish Council
Dennis Conyan	Taxi Services
Dennis Tree	Beluga Bar
Julie Lucas	Banks Bar
Sue Bassett	Staplehurst Parish Council

**1. Previous Minutes;**

Agreed as correct.

**2. Project Update from Lynne Goodwin;**

Operationally everything is in place, up and running and working well. All six of the operators have been TUPE'd across and are working well at Medway.

In response to a question concerning the operator hours it was confirmed there are currently two operators working on the busiest nights, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. These extra hours were determined to be the busiest by MBC and Medway CC having regard to intelligence and the views expressed at the various consultation events. JL confirmed this was within the original bid submitted by Medway CC.

PA suggested that Saturday during the day is an extremely busy time and Andrew confirms that up to 30% of business occurs in Boots on a Saturday during the day. LG confirmed that current resources were satisfactory to covering Saturday daytime and no member of the group reported any drop in service on a Saturday. JL confirmed the operation would be monitored and a review will be undertaken at 6 months. If there was evidence that extra hours were required for Saturday daytime



then a decision will be made as to how this would be met e.g. by moving the Friday night/Saturday morning cover, as stakeholders have advised this period is now much quieter.

LG confirmed that there has been no loss of CCTV images or recording since go live.

LG confirmed there are some issues with the Maidsafe Radio network. LG attended the Maidsafe Management meeting also this week and confirms that the issues are being worked on now. LG is in touch with Vikram and Medway CC will be obtaining an additional broadband connection to build in further resilience. LG advised that Virgin should have fitted this line within the next two weeks, so if both BT lines were to go down, the Virgin line will be there as back up.

LG discussed a few times where the line has gone down and affected the Maidsafe Radio. BM has recorded these incidents as TCM have been monitoring the service every 15 minutes since the 9th. BM has agreed to share this information so we can see when every incident has occurred.

LG confirmed that the Police radios are separate and have not been affected.

MH appraised the meeting of the matter concerning collection of evidence by Maidstone Police. A way forward in the short-term has been agreed that uses police civilian staff. A meeting has been arranged for 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 in order to find a long-term solution that complied with the regulations and makes best use of resources.

### **3. Performance Monitoring;**

JL distributed the figures collated for April 2012 by Medway CC. Attendees discussed the matter of comparing these figures with those previously recorded by MBC. It became evident that it might not be possible to make a direct comparison but MBC staff are reviewing how the original figures were calculated.

FW raised the issue that for Overview & Scrutiny Committee being able to make a comparison between the performance of the new and previous service was an important aspect of assessing whether the service has been maintained or improved upon.

LG and MH confirmed that there has been successful communication between the police and Medway control room and that to help recording data the operators will be informed whether an incident resulted in an arrest or not.

Stakeholders agreed that the performance monitoring figures provided by LG are certainly more in depth and give a much better picture of the incidents than previously.

BM highlighted the information provided regarding the 27 recorded missing persons within the last 4 weeks as demonstrating the service in provides more than a crime reduction benefit. Stakeholders agreed the performance monitoring demonstrated the service is performing very well and could be used towards a positive press release.

**4. Feedback from Stakeholders;**

LG advised that dates are currently being put in the diary for Medway CC staff to come to Maidstone to familiarise themselves with the town and the layout so that they can operate on the Maidstone Cameras. Cross training within the Control Centre is ongoing.

CW advised the wider partnership agreement is still with their Legal Team and after this it will be with Human Resources in Medway. Following a question concerning the staff who had transferred across from Profile Securities to Medway CC it was confirmed that until a review takes place at Medway Council their terms and conditions will be the same as those they transferred under. CW suggested that Medway are working to complete the agreement and enter in the Partnership during July.

LG confirms that the Urban Blue Bus has been given a direct line to contact the control centre in emergencies.

**Date of next meeting; Monday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2012 at 5.00pm, Maidstone House**

**CCTV Stakeholder Meeting**

**11<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

**Record of Meeting**

Attendees

Joanna Fathers	MBC
John Littlemore	MBC
Andrew Simms	Boots
Ivan White	Federation of Small Businesses
Insp. Mark Hutcheon	Police
Lynne Goodwin	Medway
Vikram Sahdev	Medway
Rev Jackie Cray	Street Pastor
Cllr Gordon Newton	Downswood Parish Council
Dennis Conyon	Taxi Services

Apologies

Paul Alcock	TCM
Bill Moss	TCM
Stephen Dryden	Marks and Spencer
Mick Westwood	Staplehurst Parish Council
Teresa Irving	Downswood Parish Council

1. Previous Minutes

Agreed as correct

VS confirmed an additional Virgin Broadband line will be installed to give further resilience to the Maidsafe radio link in case the BT lines go down. However for the time being there is an additional BT line so there are 2 set up in case one goes down.

2. Performance Monitoring and Feedback from Stakeholders

Medway supplied the activity figures for May and these were noted.

IW stated that (as discussed at the previous meeting) it is difficult to compare the performance monitoring figures pre and post switch over. This is due to the pre stats being focussed on all arrests and incidents, fixed penalty notices and reported shoplifters. This differs from the post transfer stats from Medway which show actual arrests.

MH asked whether the slight fall in overall incidents recorded in May was connected with the interruption in service to the Maidsafe Radio network?

VS confirmed that there was an interruption in the Maidsafe radio link. However he did not believe this had an impact on the number of details dealt with.

## Appendix A

VS explained the Maidsafe radio link is based in Maidstone. The Medway control centre plugs into TCM's hub. The loss of service across all of the network related to the hub rather than the link to Medway's control centre. TCM has confirmed outside of the meeting that this fault has now been rectified.

In response to GN, VS confirmed that at any one time in the Medway CCTV control centre there are 6 operators and 1 supervisor, and on busy nights there are extra operators. For Maidstone, there are 4 screens which the operator watches which can be split and configured in any way which the operator prefers.

VS and LG suggested that members of the CCTV stakeholder group can visit the control centre by prior appointment to see how it all works.

GN asked for confirmation that all coverage of every CCTV camera has gone across to Medway including the Parish cameras. VS confirmed that every CCTV camera is being monitored, including those from the Parishes and are being recorded in real time. IW stated that the image quality has improved post relocation.

JL confirmed that some of the mobile cameras that had been supplied to Parishes may have been removed. A number of these cameras are nearly 10 years old and were no longer serviceable. Unfortunately there was no contract set in place at the time for the repair or replacement of cameras.

JC asked why the Urban Blue bus has been given a direct line for contacting Medway while street pastors have not. JL confirmed that this was an 'in case of emergency' line after an incident which occurred. It will not be common practice for this line to be used.

JC stated that she has not heard any complaints about the system and that generally people have not noticed any difference or drop in performance.

DC asked if desks are manned at all times. VK confirmed that the desks are manned 24/7 365 days a year. He stated that because there are 6 or more operators plus a supervisor at any one time, + more during the busy times, this makes the monitoring more robust. The number of operators available means that if there is an incident in one area, and the police/maidsafe radios are being used at the same time, a supervisor or another operator will assist on Maidstone's desk. The operators have been cross trained so that if this happens, they are familiar with the area.

VK discussed the partnership model being put together. He hoped that this will all be in place by 1<sup>st</sup> August. VS confirmed that he hopes that all operators can remain employed in the partnership which will probably occur through the decline in hours, increase in wage and the availability of more overtime.

**Date of Next Meeting; Monday 9<sup>th</sup> July 2012 at 5.00pm, Maidstone House**

**CCTV Stakeholder Meeting**

**11<sup>th</sup> July 2012**

**Record of Meeting**

Attendees

Andrew Paterson	MBC
John Littlemore	MBC
Insp. Mark Hutcheon	Police
Lynne Goodwin	Medway
Vikram Sahdev	Medway
Rev Jackie Cray	Street Pastor
Dennis Conyon	Taxi Services
Bill Moss	TCM
Ivan White	Federation of Small Businesses

Apologies

Andrew Simms	Boots
Cllr Gordon Newton	Downswood Parish Council
Teresa Irving	Downswood Parish Council

1. Previous Minutes and Matters arising

BM paragraph 5 on page 2 – there is no repair/replace contract for cameras, is this still the case? The Chair stated that they are working around parishes to asses and that a better solution may be mobile recorders. A report is due before the Cabinet member by the end of August. It was highlighted that some parish councils may choose to use their budgets towards this activity.

VS added that additional cameras would not pose a difficulty for the current system. The Chair indicated that the sighting of cameras in rural areas must conform to the guidance on the placement of cameras, including the necessity of installations.

2. Performance Monitoring and Feedback from Stakeholders

Medway supplied the activity figures for June and these were noted.

IW queried the 'other' figure and how this was broken down. There is further analysis on the figures, however these no longer include FPN.

IW and BM requested that the figures were broken down using the method used when CCTV was based in Maidstone to provide a like for like comparison. Concern was expressed that using one set of figures within the table could suggest the move to Medway was not working. For example, only 1 arrest per day for shop theft.

VS stated that the figures provided from April comply with the current regulations on how the CCTV figures are reported and this has been audited in the past month by the Data Controller from the

Information Commissioner's Office. This means that they can only include instances where feedback has been provided, for example on the outcome of interventions by the police. Previously it appears that arrests figures were estimated based on the judgement of the operator rather than through actual confirmation.

Members agreed that the new data sets were better and more informative than the previously provided headline information. It was accepted that it may not be possible to make a like for like comparison with the previous data, as they were collated under different guidance.

JC asked if communication can be improved so feedback is provided and the figures are more accurate. VS said this can be difficult due to the time workload of Police Officers and CCTV operators but they will attempt this and that it is possible the disparity in the figures is due to assumptions made prior to the move.

MH said that he would do a compare of figures for arrests in High St ward and compare to the CCTV figures.

It was queried what exactly the observation figure was, VS clarified that this is when Officers request coverage from cameras due to the possibility of an incident.

The Chair requested that the instigator of a request was added e.g. whether this was police, Mailsafe member or operator instigated. VS also stated that they will discuss with the CCTV operators the differences in the way the figures are recorded and identify if there are any ways that this can be changed/improved.

ACTION – Medway to clarify with previous MBC operators to understand how the collection for figures differs.

### 3. Feedback from Stakeholders

JC said that CCTV had seemed to be more proactive the previous weekend. VS replied that this was due in part to the partnership response to the high profile event that weekend; DC said that there had also been an increased police presence. On the evening MH said that the weather had kept the volume of people lower over the period but that there had been 35 FPNs issued on the Saturday of the weekend.

BM highlighted concerns on the apparent failure of the radio and that he had staff check this every 15 minutes. There were isolated incidents when the TCM staff could not reach an operator over the days when the checks were carried out. VS confirmed that the desk is stationed by an operator at all times including comfort breaks. The Chair queried whether the system could handle more than one call at a time? It was confirmed that it could only respond to one call, so if the check had been made whilst an operator was dealing with another call it would appear as if there was no answer.

4. Satisfaction Survey

The chair stated that only 6 responses had been received. Whilst these were more positive than previously, it is difficult to draw conclusions from such low number of responses; although it was commented that of the service had been failing the responses were likely to be higher.

5. Any Other Business

VS stated that a backup line was being installed by Virgin to provide more resilience on the Maidsafe line. In 3 months there will be a review to see if this should become the primary line.

JC raised a query about CCTV Operator remuneration and comparatives to the remuneration at Maidstone. VS said that a combination of better pay per hour plus overtime are being looked at as a mechanism to reduce the gap in the likelihood that operators hours would be reduced. Some staff had indicated they would prefer to work fewer hours, so the position is not the same for every operator that transferred from Maidstone. Medway is working on a proposal that will be used to consult with staff and members accepted that it would be wrong to discuss this ahead of this being shared with the staff affected.

BM queried whether the next meeting should be in 6 months, the chair clarified that the next meeting would be 6 months from the point of transfer which will be October.

MH raised the issue of AMPR capability and that it would be useful to have it, however as KCC have responsibility for Highways, this is an issue that is being investigated.

JC raised the issue of confusing signage regarding the new High Street layout and BM added that the main issue is from Fairmeadow to the High Street. MH said that a mixture of enforcement and communications is required to get the message out. BM suggested that hiring a policeman to enforce would pay for itself.

The chair closed the meeting at 6pm

**Date of Next Meeting; Monday 8<sup>th</sup> October 2012 at 5.00pm, Maidstone House**

**Summary of Results of the CCTV Satisfaction Survey March 2012**

Survey sent to 85 people, only 22 responded, therefore this summary only represents 18.7%.

Q1. How satisfied are you with the current CCTV service?

<b>Very Satisfied</b>	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
<b>81.8%</b>	13.6%	4.5%	0%	0%

Q2. How responsive do you find the CCTV control room operators?

<b>Very responsive</b>	Responsive	Sometimes responsive	Non-responsive	Very non-responsive
<b>81.8%</b>	13.6%	4.5%	0%	0%

Q3. How well informed do you feel you are about the proposed move of the CCTV control room from Maidstone to Medway?

Very well informed	<b>Fairly well informed</b>	<b>Somewhat informed</b>	Not very well informed	Not well informed at all
13.6%	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	18.2%	4.5%

**KEY POINTS MADE; been informed at meetings but questions not always answered, hear more/conflicting info from the KM.**

Q4. How confident are you that Medway will deliver the same level of service?

Very confident	Fairly confident	Not very confident	<b>Not confident at all</b>	Don't know
0%	9.1%	31.8%	<b>50%</b>	9.1%

**KEY POINTS MADE; fear of loss of local working partnerships and local knowledge. Medway to only be using one operator. Annual amount of viewing hours will be decreasing. Loss of relationship with police officers. Fear that the service will become reactive.**

Q5. Are you a Maidsafe member?

Yes	<b>No</b>
10/22	<b>12/22</b>

If yes, are you considering leaving the Maidsafe service as a result of the changing service provision? If so, why? 7 answers received, 5 stated no and 2 unsure, they will wait to see if the service is upheld.

Q6. What aspects of the existing service do you find the most important?

- **Local knowledge of operators and the rapport between CCTV stakeholders and operators.**
- **24/7 monitoring and quick response time.**
- **Personal touch and good relationships.**
- **Accessibility and security**

Q7. What improvements would you like to see from the new CCTV service?

- **Would be happy if service in maintained.**
- **Will Downswood CCTV be monitored live in real time?**
- **People from Maidstone in charge of CCTV in Medway.**
- **Enhance image quality.**
- **More operators**
- **Usable CCTV in rural villages.**



Q8. Are you interested in being an active stakeholder for Maidstone's CCTV by being a representative for one of the voluntary sector, night time economy, day time economy, taxi services or parish councils?

**Mark Hutcheon**  
**PS Nick Sparkes**  
**Lorraine Hemphrey**  
**Ivan White**  
**Teresa Irving**  
**Cllr Gordon Newton**  
**Mrs J S Bassett**  
**Paul Alcock**  
**Dennis Tree**  
**Julie Lucas**  
**Rev Jackie Cray**  
**Stephen Dryden**  
**Andrew Simms**

**Police**  
**Police**  
**Kent Police Neighbourhood Watch**  
**Federation of Small Businesses**  
**Downswood Parish Council**  
**Downswood Parish Council**  
**Staplehurst Parish Council**  
**Manager of The Mall**  
**Beluga Bar**  
**Banks Bar**  
**Street Pastors**  
**Marks and Spencer**  
**Boots**

## Summary of Results from the CCTV Satisfaction Survey June 2012

### 1. How satisfied are you with the current CCTV service?

83.3% = Satisfied

16.7% = Very Satisfied

COMMENTS; Besides for a few communication signal problems the service appears to be operating satisfactorily. There is always room for improvement. With this being the first 3 months there was obviously a few teething problems at move over.

### 2. How responsive do you find the CCTV Control Room operators?

16.7% = Very responsive

66.7% = Responsive

16.7% = Sometimes Responsive

COMMENTS; Very responsive when manned by the Maidstone girls. Male operator can be unresponsive - sounds like lack of interest but may be uncertainty because of lack of local knowledge. Despite being told the desk is manned 24/7 and if there is an incident on there is available a 2nd operator not totally convinced this is happening. Not had to use them to any great degree but any query has been answered in a suitable time.

### 3. The new CCTV service has been operating for 3 months now, is your confidence in Medway delivering the service...

16.7% = Greatly improved

16.7% = Improved

50.0% = Somewhat Improved

16.7% = Not improved

0% = Not improved at all

COMMENTS; Initial disruption but seems to be resolved now

### 4. Are you a Maidsafe member?

66.7% = Yes

33.3% = No

If yes, has there been a change in the service provided that has affected your use of the system?

COMMENTS; Speed of pickup when not operated by the girls can be slower so confidence on those occasions dips. Not noticed any change to the worse. TCM have done well in not letting the

relocation of the CCTV control room operation not affect the Maidsafe service. Yes, remote location of CCTV Operators.

**5. Have you seen any change in the Maidsafe service?**

33.3% = Yes

66.7% = No

COMMENTS; Meetings are on hold because of poor attendance by subscribers. No change.

**6. Any other comments?**

COMENTS; Main reservation still if we lose some or most of the original operators as to how well the system will perform. Maidsafe members are perhaps the largest users and your best indicators as to how the system is performing. They are also the secondary part of the crime reduction we have with their input. Retail crime is still on the increase so it is imperative that the level of service is sustained, if not bettered.

## **CCTV: Do we need more? NO, we should heed the example of Britain which spent billions on cameras and still has highest crime rates**

- by: *James Campbell*
- From: [Herald Sun](#)
- September 28, 2012 12:00AM



James Campbell says we should take a page out of Britain's book where crime has not been reduced because of CCTV, before putting all of Melbourne under surveillance. Picture: Erinna Giblin, *Source: Herald Sun*

**THE mysterious disappearance - and feared abduction - of Jill Meagher from Sydney Rd, Brunswick, in the early hours of Saturday morning has inevitably led to calls for more closed-circuit television surveillance of our lives.**



Yesterday Melbourne Lord Mayor Robert Doyle said he would be happy to look at installing more CCTV, calling it one of the "great weapons for city safety".

It is not surprising that when emotions are running high, there should be a debate about installing more CCTV cameras because there is no doubt they are an invaluable tool to police investigating serious crimes.

But before we rush to put all of Melbourne under surveillance, we should heed the example of Britain, which, in the past 20 years has spent billions of dollars on more than a million CCTV cameras across its cities, yet still has one of the highest crime rates in Europe.

Indeed, four years ago the policeman in charge of monitoring London's massive CCTV network described it as "an utter fiasco" that was responsible for solving only 3 per cent of crimes.

Detective Chief Insp Mick Neville said that police often avoided trawling through CCTV images "because it's hard work" and he believed criminals had no fear of CCTV.

The marginal effectiveness of CCTV in preventing crime has been well known for at least a decade. In 2002 a British Home Office review of studies into the effectiveness of CCTV in preventing crime found the overall reduction in crime in areas with CCTV was only 4 per cent. Half the studies examined showed CCTV had no effect on crime at all, and all showed it had no effect on violent crime.

The only criminals who are deterred by CCTV, according to the study, are car thieves, who - unsurprisingly - are reluctant to ply their trade in carparks where they know they are on camera.

Several studies since then have confirmed these findings - one study even found that to the extent that CCTV cameras have any impact on crime, most of it happens before they are installed in an area but after it is announced they are going in.

Given the marginal effectiveness of CCTV, the question needs to be asked: is installing, maintaining and monitoring them a good use of the money we pay in taxes?

Asking this question when CCTV is obviously being used to good effect by police in their investigation of Ms Meagher's disappearance might seem inappropriate - even callous - but the reality is that our society's resources are not infinite.

And it is a fact that every police officer sitting behind a desk staring at a CCTV monitor is a police officer who is not out in the community being a visible presence deterring crime.

Britain's experience is instructive here, too.

It has been claimed there that in some cases towns that have invested heavily in CCTV cameras have found their police numbers were reduced. Another British study found increasing street lighting was four times as effective in deterring crime than CCTV cameras.

It isn't as though we aren't already spending a lot of money on CCTV cameras.

Since 1997 Melbourne City Council has installed 53 CCTV cameras in the CBD, cameras that cost the council roughly \$500,000 a year to run.

You would be hard-pressed to argue that street crime in the city has declined during that period.

If keeping CCTV running in an area as tiny - if densely populated - as the city costs that much money, think of the untold millions it would cost to roll out comprehensive CCTV coverage across all of Melbourne and the major regional cities.

The civil libertarian arguments against CCTV tend to be ignored at times like these, but they are far from trivial.

Of course, it is easy to argue that people who are doing no wrong have nothing to fear from being filmed.

But that ignores the fact that people ought to have the right to go about their business without being constantly monitored by the authorities.

You might say that this right to privacy is not as important as improvements in public safety that CCTV brings, but the sad fact is it does not increase public safety.

For these reasons, we would be foolish to put them at the centre of the fight against crime.

**James Campbell is the *Herald Sun* opinion editor**

# Surveillance hub is key to cutting crime



Friday, September 02, 2011



## [Medway News](#)

WE'VE got it covered. That's the message from Vikram Sahdev the man in charge of Medway's CCTV suite which has 456 cameras honing in on key spots in the Towns.

During the recent night of disorder, mirroring the riots throughout London and the UK, the hub housed in an annexe of the old Civic Centre played an integral part in catching offenders.



The team at the control centre use their newly-updated system to track the movements and catch culprits red-handed on screen.

With a hotline to police headquarters the hub led to 10 arrests within hours of the trail of criminal damage being committed.

A total of 1,300 arrests are made a year as a result of information received from the hub and newly-appointed Superintendent Rachel Adams was impressed when she paid her first visit to the control centre in the wake of the disturbances.

## Appendix C

Supt Adams said: "What it did was give us an early indication of what was happening and we were able to make arrests quickly.

"It also meant we could dismiss the misinformation coming from social media and deploy officers in the vulnerable areas."

The centre was set up under one roof in 1998 when Medway Council was made a unitary authority with just 32 black and white cameras.

Over the years the service has evolved into a state-of-the-art security operation manned 24 hours a day and 365 days of the year.

Last July Medway came to an agreement with Swale Council to take over its CCTV operation as part of its long term ambition for Medway to become a regional hub.

There are now 86 cameras monitoring the streets of Sittingbourne, Sheerness and Faversham.

The specialist engineers are currently fine tuning a system of 21 cameras being installed in the Medway Tunnel which is due to go live next month.

Head of council's business development, Vikram Sahdev, said: "Up to now if there has been an incident we have had to take action manually. Now we can close it [the tunnel] electronically from here. We are very proud of our technical expertise."

The team often focus on Rochester High Street with its large concentration of licensed premises.

One, whom we agreed not to name, said: "Friday and Saturday night can be like a war zone in Rochester. We have had up to 15 incidents in a night. With our direct line to the police it is quite satisfying seeing how quickly we can react and get results."

The service is also used to link up staff at clubs and pubs and shoplifting crime in the High Street is significantly down since more versatile cameras have been installed.

The Lifeline scheme also monitors about 3,250 alarms supporting around 4,000 vulnerable older people in their homes and in sheltered schemes.

It monitors the external cameras at Medway Maritime Hospital and the NHS healthy living centres throughout Medway.

Councillor Mike O'Brien, portfolio holder for community safety and enforcement, said the demand for CCTV is ever increasing, adding: "Every public meeting I attend, it's always what people want, particularly outside schools."

Responding to the claim the number of cameras is "Big Brotherish" he replied: "If you are a law-abiding citizen, you have nothing to fear."



Home Office Press Release (<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/media-centre/press-releases/surv-cam-comm-appt>)

# Surveillance camera commissioner appointed

[See other Press releases](#)

Thursday, 13 Sep 2012

**The public will be given more power to challenge the use of surveillance cameras by police and local authorities through the creation of a new code of practice, the government announced today.**

To oversee the code Andrew Rennison has been appointed as the first ever surveillance camera commissioner. He will report back to parliament on how CCTV and automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) systems are being used and raise any concerns through a report to parliament.

Mr Rennison has been chosen following the creation of the post by the protection of freedoms act earlier this year. The code of practice is designed to encourage greater transparency in the use of CCTV and ANPR and, as well as ensuring these systems are being used proportionately, it will provide coherent guidance for police forces and local authorities to increase image quality and boost the chances of catching criminals.

Mr Rennison will represent the interests of the public, ensuring police and local authorities use surveillance camera systems responsibly and follow the code of practice agreed by Parliament.

Minister for criminal information Lord Taylor of Holbeach said:

'Used properly CCTV and ANPR can be valuable tools in the fight against crime, but for too long these systems have grown and developed in the absence of any proper framework or oversight.

'Andrew Rennison has the experience and authority to hold the police and local authorities to account, empowering the public to shine a light on those who operate camera systems in public places, challenging them to show the use of these systems is justified, proportionate and effective.'

The commissioner will encourage operators to follow the code and will lay an annual report before parliament in which he can draw attention to any failings and make recommendations to improve how CCTV is used. He will help develop the code to ensure its continued impact and effectiveness and provide advice to users and the public.

Andrew Rennison, surveillance camera commissioner, said:

'I am very pleased to be taking on this important role. CCTV has proved hugely valuable in public safety and catching criminals but a balance must be struck between keeping people safe and protecting privacy.

'Through the code I believe we can greatly increase the public's awareness of the type of surveillance taking place around them every day and encourage greater openness among those operating CCTV and ANPR systems. At the same time we want to set robust standards for surveillance systems, to increase image quality so the police can catch more criminals.

'I am now in the process of putting together a good team to help me achieve this goal and support the government in the development of the codes of practice.'

The voluntary code is expected to come into effect from April 2013 and, as well as setting the general principals for the operation of surveillance camera systems, will promote technical and occupational standards to make them more effective.

## **MAIDSTONE PROTOCOLS FOR CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

- 1.** These protocols assume:
  - The continued operation of the Police and Justice Act 2006;
  - The continued existence of a Crime and Disorder Committee within the Overview and Scrutiny Function at Maidstone Borough Council (currently the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee);
  - The existence of a Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership for the Borough of Maidstone (currently the Safer Maidstone Partnership);
  - A partnership approach, working with responsible authorities within the Borough (and, where appropriate, beyond) as a "critical friend".
  
- 2.** The purpose of this protocol is to ensure effective interaction between the Safer Maidstone Partnership and the Crime and Disorder Committee to:
  - Enhance the public accountability of the Safer Maidstone Partnership;
  - Establish acceptable and appropriate ways of working between the two bodies; and
  - Develop and maintain a positive working relationship for the benefit of the residents of the Borough of Maidstone.
  
- 3.** The protocols are based on the following principles:
  - Overview and Scrutiny of the Safer Maidstone Partnership should focus on supporting the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour and reducing fear of crime and anti-social behaviour in the Borough of Maidstone.
  - Safer Maidstone Partnership Overview and Scrutiny should seek to minimise any unnecessary additional administrative burdens on responsible authorities.
  - Crime and Disorder Committee agendas need to be developed in conjunction with the Safer Maidstone Partnership.
  - It is the intention of the Crime and Disorder Committee to require the Safer Maidstone Partnership to demonstrate added value in the work it does.
  
- 4.** The Crime and Disorder Committee has the statutory power to:
  - Consider Councillor Calls for Action made in relation to community safety matters;
  - Review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder functions; and
  - Make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions.
  - "The responsible authorities" means the bodies and persons who are responsible authorities within the meaning given by section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (c.37) (authorities responsible for

crime and disorder strategies) in relation to the local authority's area.

5. Maidstone Borough Council has a responsibility to work with Kent County Council and other district councils on the scrutiny of community safety issues where this is possible, for example through joint development of work programmes. The Overview and Scrutiny Team will seek to identify opportunities for joint working through the Kent and Medway Overview and Scrutiny Officer Network and present proposals to the Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership as these develop.

## **6. Communication**

- 6.1 The Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership will each nominate a named officer to be the main point of contact. That officer will direct all correspondence to the appropriate person.
- 6.2 The Overview and Scrutiny function will inform the Safer Maidstone Partnership of all Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programmes on a six monthly basis to give Partners the opportunity to comment on any items that they feel appropriate to their own work. The Safer Maidstone Partnership will also be invited to propose future work items for the Crime and Disorder Committee where it wishes to do so, though the Committee is under no obligation to take these on.
- 6.3 The Safer Maidstone Partnership will inform the Crime and Disorder Committee of its forthcoming work on a six monthly basis and consult the Committee on its work where appropriate. In particular, the Safer Maidstone Partnership should consult the Crime and Disorder Committee on its Partnership Plan.
- 6.4 Both parties will inform the other of structure changes and significant changes to priorities or future plans to ensure accuracy of information.

## **7. Information Sharing**

- 7.1 The Safer Maidstone Partnership will distribute public minutes of full Partnership, Policy group and Strategy group meetings to members of the Crime and Disorder Committee as soon as these are agreed.
- 7.2 The Crime and Disorder Committee may also request informal notes of delivery group meetings where this is relevant to work being carried out by the Committee.
- 7.3 The Safer Maidstone Partnership is required to respond to requests for information by the Crime and Disorder Committee "as soon as reasonably possible". These requests from councillors should be well focussed and thought through.
- 7.4 Information provided to the Crime and Disorder Committee by responsible authorities should be depersonalised and should not include any

information that would be reasonably likely to prejudice legal proceedings or current or future operations of the responsible authority. These requirements cannot be bypassed by Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 i.e. by putting an item onto Part II of a committee agenda.

## **8. Meeting Protocols**

- 8.1 The Committee has a duty to meet at least once a year and is recommended to meet at 6 monthly intervals to ensure the ongoing building and maintenance of knowledge. Review task and finish groups may meet outside of these formal meetings with the requirement to report findings in full at a Crime and Disorder designated meeting.
- 8.2 Officers or employees of responsible authorities or of co-operating persons or bodies are required to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder Committee to answer questions or provide information. The Committee will endeavour to give at least one month's notice to persons requested to attend. The person required must attend on the specified date unless they have a reasonable excuse not too.
- 8.3 Prior to meetings between the Crime and Disorder Committee and the Safer Maidstone Partnership, the Overview and Scrutiny function will:
- Agree meeting dates as far in advance as possible;
  - Provide meeting paperwork at least 5 working days prior to the meeting;
  - Provide the Safer Maidstone Partnership with a list of proposed questions or key areas of inquiry.
- 8.4 When representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership are invited to attend meetings of the Crime and Disorder Committee, the following protocols will apply:
- Committee Members should endeavour not to request detailed information from representatives of the Safer Maidstone partnership at meetings of the Committee, unless they have given prior notice through the appropriate officer. If, in the course of question and answer at a meeting of the Committee, it becomes apparent that further information would be useful, the representative being questioned may be required to submit it in writing to members of the Committee through the appropriate officer.
  - In the course of questioning at meetings, representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership may decline to give information or respond to questions on the ground that it is more appropriate that the question be directed to a more senior representative.
  - Representatives of the Safer Maidstone Partnership may decline to answer questions in an open session of the Committee on the grounds that the answer might disclose information which would be exempt or confidential as defined in the Access to Information Act 1985. In that event, the Committee may resolve to exclude the

media and public in order that the question may be answered in private sessions.

- Committee members may not criticise or adversely comment on any individual representative of the Safer Maidstone Partnership by name.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, as published in the Maidstone Borough Council Constitution, will apply to all meetings.

8.5 A record will be made of the main statements of witnesses appearing before the Committee and agreed with the witness prior to publication or use by the Committee. Committee meetings may be electronically recorded and web-cast.

## **9. Reporting and Recommendations**

9.1 Section 19(2) of the Police and Justice Act 2006 states that where the Crime and Disorder Committee makes a report or recommendations, a copy shall be provided to each of the responsible authorities.

9.2 In accordance with Section 19(8) of the Police and Justice Act, the authority, person or body to which a copy of the report or recommendations is passed shall:

- a) Consider the report or recommendations;
- b) Respond to the Crime and Disorder Committee indicating what (if any) action it proposes to take; and
- c) Have regard to the report or recommendations in exercising its functions.

9.3 The relevant partner (or partners, including the full Safer Maidstone Partnership) will have 28 days to formally respond to any recommendations made by the Committee, or if this is not possible as soon as reasonably possible thereafter. The relevant partner(s) will inform the Crime and Disorder Committee Chairman if delays are expected.

9.4 The Overview and Scrutiny function will ensure that drafts of Committee reports are made available for comment by the Safer Maidstone Partnership Strategy Group and any adverse comments or concerns reported to the Committee before the final report is published.

9.5 The Chairmen of the Safer Maidstone Partnership will be given advance notice of the date of publication of the report and consulted on the text of any accompanying press release.

## **10. Co-option**

10.1 The Crime and Disorder Committee may co-opt additional members as it sees appropriate. These co-optees:

- Have the same entitlement to vote as any other member;

- May not be co-opted where the committee is considering a decision or action for which that person was wholly or partly responsible, or otherwise directly involved;
- May not out-number the permanent committee members;
- Must be an employee or officer of a responsible authority or co-operating person or body; and
- Cannot be a member of the Executive.

The relevant responsible authority will be consulted as to the most suitable person prior to co-option, and the membership of the co-optee can be withdrawn at any time.

- 10.2 Home Office guidance for the scrutiny of crime and disorder matters, states that "local authorities should, in all instances, presume that the police authority should play an active part at committee when community safety matters are being discussed – and particularly when the police are to be present". In light of this guidance, Kent Police Authority will be invited to propose a member for co-option onto the committee when community safety matters are being considered.
- 11.** These protocols will be reviewed after every third meeting of the Crime and Disorder Committee by the Committee Chairman and the Safer Maidstone Partnership Chairmen to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.