

**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

## Appendix A

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.

## Appendix A

### 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**