CCTV WORKING GROUP

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to update Members on the initial findings of the CCTV Working group and whether there is a case for the introduction of a publicly monitored system in locations across the Rochford District.

2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 CCTV is a situational crime prevention technique based on rational choice theory that suggests that potential offenders are less likely to commit crime if they believe they are being watched or have a greater likelihood of being apprehended.
- 2.2 CCTV systems are widely used across the UK and elsewhere. The installation of such systems generally falls into three broad categories:
 - a) The reduction of crime and disorder:
 - b) The detection of crime and disorder; and
 - c) Public perceptions of personal safety.
- 2.3 The Police Foundation reported in January 2014 that estimates of the number of CCTV cameras in the UK ranged from 1.85 million to 5.9 million. It reports that "the 1990s saw unprecedented investment in CCTV and that during the latter half of the 1990s, almost two fifths of the entire Home Office crime prevention budget was spent on it. The Home Office funded the Crime Reduction Programme, which resulted in an investment of £170m in CCTV. Following that, 684 CCTV schemes were installed in town centres and other public spaces".

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Data

- 2.4 Levels of recorded crime are frequently expressed as offences per 1000 population. This allows for a comparative analysis between local authority wards and Districts. Nationally, there are 89 offences per 1000 population (excluding fraud and computer-based offences). Data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) indicates that the current offence rate for the Rochford District is 52.49 offences per 1000 population.
- 2.5 In terms of comparable local authorities, the Rochford District is mid table.

Most Similar Group average 52.69 Lower bound 46.88 Area Crime rate Wealden 38.97 Broadland 40.90 East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Data bounds	Crime rate
Lower bound 46.88 Area Crime rate Wealden 38.97 Broadland 40.90 East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Upper bound	59.22
Area Crime rate Wealden 38.97 Broadland 40.90 East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.63 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Most Similar Group average	52.69
Wealden 38.97 Broadland 40.90 East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.50 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Lower bound	46.88
Broadland 40.90 East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Area	Crime rate
East Cambridgeshire 42.45 South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Wealden	38.97
South Derbyshire 44.14 Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Broadland	40.90
Chiltern 46.23 South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	East Cambridgeshire	42.45
South Staffordshire 48.63 East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	South Derbyshire	44.14
East Hampshire 51.61 Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Chiltern	46.23
Rochford 52.49 Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	South Staffordshire	48.63
Maldon 55.13 Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	East Hampshire	51.61
Fareham 57.53 Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Rochford	52.49
Lichfield 58.99 Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Maldon	55.13
Hinckley & Bosworth 60.49 Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Fareham	57.53
Blaby 60.50 Tandridge 63.29	Lichfield	58.99
Tandridge 63.29	Hinckley & Bosworth	60.49
	Blaby	60.50
Castle Point 69.02	Tandridge	63.29
	Castle Point	69.02

2.6 Within Essex, the Rochford District has the lowest levels of recorded crime.

This chart compares the crime rate in your local area to the average crime rate across the force area. It shows the total number of crimes over a twelve month period per thousand residents, for the crime type selected.

Area	Crime rate
Rochford	52.49
Maldon	55.13
Uttlesford	67.49
Braintree	67.52
Castle Point	69.02
Brentwood	78.65
Epping Forest	84.47
Chelmsford	88.23
Colchester	95.40
Tendring	96.66
Basildon	99.95
Thurrock	103.12
Harlow	112.60
Southend-on-Sea	112.72
Force average	88.64

- 2.7 Similar offence rate statistics are available at ward level where Police "beat" boundaries are aligned to local authority wards. Prior to electoral ward boundary changes across the Rochford District that took effect in May 2016, the Police "beat" boundaries were aligned to the existing ward structure. However, the Essex Police "beat" boundaries were not amended to reflect the revised electoral wards and as such the Essex Police "beat" structure reflects the pre-May 2016 position.
- 2.8 Acknowledging the limitations that this restriction imposes, it is possible to derive an indication of where recorded crime levels are highest across the District. The following analysis has been undertaken using Police recorded crime figures and ONS population estimates from 2011. The figures indicate that the wards with the highest level of recorded crime per 1000 head of population are Rochford Ward (131.8 offences per 1000 head of population) and Wheatley Ward (109 offences per 1000 head of population). These findings could be used as a basis of identifying those wards where CCTV should be positioned.
- 2.9 An analysis of the recorded crimes (for Nov 2018 to Oct 2019) in the Wheatley ward shows that 176 offences (38.5% of all crimes) are recorded as having occurred in the High Street, Rayleigh. A further 97 offences (21.2% of

- all crimes) are recorded as having occurred in London Road, Hockley Road, London Hill, Crown Hill, Eastwood Road, or Bellingham Lane, Rayleigh.
- 2.10 In terms of locations identified within the Rochford ward, the identification of a core area is less specific. Of 1014 recorded crimes (for Nov 2018 to Oct 2019), the highest "repeat location" is Southend Airport with 86 reported offences. However, 46.5 % of these offences relate to reports of theft (including theft from vehicle and shoplifting). It is known that Southend Airport already benefits from its own CCTV system. In terms of Rochford town centre, 79 crimes (7.8% of all crimes) are recorded as occurring in either Market Square, East Street, South Street, North Street, or Back Lane, Rochford.

	Nov 2016 to Oct 2017 (Yr 1)	Nov 2017 to Oct 2018 (Yr 2)	Nov 2018 to Oct 2019 (Yr3)	% change Yr 1 to Yr 2	% change Yr2 to Yr3	Residents 2011	Crimes per 1000 pop (Yr 3 figures)
Ward name							
Whitehouse	198	237	276	19.7	16.4	4048	68.2
Lodge	88	126	178	43.2	41.3	4088	43.5
Wheatley	353	411	457	16.4	11.2	4191	109
Grange	94	121	142	28.7	17.3	3739	38
Sweyne Park	152	201	260	32.2	29.3	4415	58.9
Downhall & Rawreth	241	241	247	0	2.5	4843	51
Trinity	92	94	127	2.2	29.7	3697	34.3
Rayleigh Central	120	111	175	-7.5	57.6	4255	41.1
Rochford	731	1001	1014	37	1.3	7695	131.8
Hawkwell North	94	139	127	47.8	-8.6	4536	28
Hawkwell South	244	244	218	0	-10.6	4249	51.3
Hawkwell West	120	119	246	-0.8	106.7	4134	59.5
Hockley West	54	61	73	13	19.7	2096	34.8
Hockley North	63	69	90	9.5	30.4	2120	42.4
Hockley Central	197	168	227	-14.7	35.1	6526	34.8
Hullbridge	178	230	178	29.2	-22.6	6527	27.3
Ashingdon & Canewdon	165	198	220	20	11.1	4514	48.7
Barling and Sutton	85	70	117	-17.6	67.1	1876	62.4
Foulness and Great Wakering	204	243	268	19.1	10.3	5738	46.7
	3473	4084	4640	17.6	13.6		

Anti-Social Behaviour incidents recorded by the Police fall into three categories. These are:

- ASB P anti social behaviour that is targeted towards an individual.
- ASB E anti social behaviour that impacts the environment such as instances
 of fly tipping.
- ASB N anti social behaviour that amounts to a nuisance such as rowdy behaviour or drunkenness in public spaces.

The vast majority of recorded ASB amounts to nuisance (ASB - N) with 77.8% of recorded ASB between Nov 2018 and October 2019 falling into this category, with personal ASB (ASB - P) amounting to 5.1% of all reports. Numerically, the highest reports of ASB fall within the Rochford Ward and Wheatley Ward.

Consultation

- 2.11 Between 10 February 2020 and 9 March 2020, public consultation was undertaken by way of an online residents' survey. In total, the survey received 650 responses. This represents approximately 0.93% of the 18+ population of the Rochford District. In terms of outcomes, the key findings are:
 - 91.5% of respondents felt that the presence of a public CCTV system would make their town's safer.
 - 50.3% of respondents indicated that Rayleigh was their nearest town centre, followed by 27.8% who indicated that Rochford was their nearest town centre. Hockley accounted for 12.8% of responses and Great Wakering 3.8% of responses.
 - 91.2% of respondents felt that CCTV is a deterrent for crime and antisocial behaviour
 - 11% of respondents indicated that would feel uncomfortable being in a public place under the watch of CCTV cameras
 - 90.3% of respondents felt that CCTV represented a good use of public money to reduce crime and improve public safety.

2.12 Responses by Ward

Ward	No. of responses	Ward Responses as a % of total responses
Downhall & Rawreth	41	6.3%
Foulness and The Wakerings	57	8.8%
Hawkwell East	38	5.8%
Hawkwell West	23	3.5%
Hockley & Ashingdon	48	7.4%
Hockley	47	7.2%
Hullbridge	8	1.2%
Lodge	48	7.4%
Roche North and Rural	62	9.5%

Roche South	58	8.9%
Sweyne Park and Grange	42	6.5%
Trinity	67	10.3%
Wheatley	99	15.2%
No ward specified/error	12	1.8%

2.13 Responses by gender:

Female – 369 (56.7%)

Male - 256 (39.4%)

Prefer not to say -21 (3.2%)

2.14 Responses by age range:

Age range	No. of responses	Responses by age as a % of total responses
Under 25	17	2.6%
26 to 35	42	6.5%
36 to 45	106	16.3%
46 to 55	165	25.4%
56 to 65	137	21.1%
66 to 75	129	19.8%
Over 76	32	4.9%
No age range recorded	22	3.4%

2.15 Responses by question.

Q1. Do you feel that the presence of a public CCTV system in your town would make the area safer?

	Percentage responses by Ward	
	Yes	No
Downhall & Rawreth	92.70%	7.30%
Foulness and The Wakerings	86%	14%
Hawkwell East	94.70%	5.30%
Hawkwell West	85%	15%
Hockley & Ashingdon	85.40%	14.60%
Hockley	93.60%	6.40%
Hullbridge	75%	25%
Lodge	93.80%	6.20%
Roche North and Rural	95.20%	4.80%
Roche South	86.20%	13.80%
Sweyne Park and Grange	85.70%	14.30%
Trinity	97%	3%
Wheatley	99%	1%

Q2. Within the Rochford District, what is the nearest town centre or locality centre (such as a location that you regularly visit to shop) to where you live?

Rayleigh 327 responses amounting to 50.3% of total respondents)	Rochford (181 responses amounting to 27.8% of total respondents)	Hockley (83 responses amounting a to 12.8% of total respondents)	Great Wakering 3 (25 responses amounting 4 to 3.8% of total respondents)
Number	Number	Number	Number

Downhall & Rawreth	41	0	0	0
Foulness and The Wakerings	4	16	0	25
Hawkwell East	2	33	2	0
Hawkwell West	2	8	10	0
Hockley & Ashingdon	5	17	24	0
Hockley	4	0	43	0
Hullbridge	3	1	1	0
Lodge	43	0	0	0
Roche North and Rural	5	49	2	0
Roche South	5	53	0	0
Sweyne Park and Grange	41	0	0	0
Trinity	66	0	1	0
Wheatley	95	0	0	0
No ward specified/other error	11	4	0	0

Q3. Do you feel that the presence of CCTV is a deterrent for crime and anti social behaviour?

	Percentage responses by Ward	
	Yes	No
Downhall & Rawreth	90.20%	9.80%
Foulness and The Wakerings	84.20%	15.80%
Hawkwell East	92.10%	7.90%

Hawkwell West	87%	13%
Hockley & Ashingdon	87.50%	12.50%
Hockley	91.50%	8.50%
Hullbridge	75%	25%
Lodge	93.80%	6.20%
Roche North and Rural	98.40%	1.60%
Roche South	84.50%	15.50%
Sweyne Park and Grange	83.30%	16.70%
Trinity	95.50%	4.50%
Wheatley	98%	2%

Q4. Would you feel uncomfortable being in a public place under the watch of CCTV cameras?

	Percentage responses by Ward	
	Yes	No
Downhall & Rawreth	12.2%	87.8%
Foulness and The Wakerings	14.0%	86.0%
Hawkwell East	2.6%	97.4%
Hawkwell West	13.0%	87.0%
Hockley & Ashingdon	10.4%	89.6%
Hockley	17.0%	83.0%
Hullbridge	12.5%	87.5%
Lodge	8.3%	91.7%
Roche North and Rural	14.5%	85.5%

Roche South	15.5%	84.5%
Sweyne Park and Grange	11.9%	88.1%
Trinity	13.4%	86.6%
Wheatley	4.0%	96.0%

Q5. The installation of a CCTV system which is 'fit for purpose' is a costly undertaking by the council. Do you feel that this is good use of public money in our efforts to reduce crime and improve public safety?

	Percentage responses by Ward	
	Yes	No
Downhall & Rawreth	92.7%	7.3%
Foulness and The Wakerings	82.5%	17.5%
Hawkwell East	94.7%	5.3%
Hawkwell West	87.0%	13.0%
Hockley & Ashingdon	85.4%	14.6%
Hockley	87.2%	12.8%
Hullbridge	75.0%	25.0%
Lodge	93.8%	6.2%
Roche North and Rural	95.2%	4.8%
Roche South	88.0%	12.0%
Sweyne Park and Grange	81.0%	19.0%
Trinity	95.5%	4.5%
Wheatley	97.0%	3.0%

- 2.16 Consultation has been undertaken with those comparable authorities, as detailed in 2.5 of this report, to determine the level of public open space CCTV provision. Two authorities did not have any CCTV provision, whilst within those that did have some provision, the scope and functionality varied widely.
- 2.17 In response to an invitation to comment on the need for a district wide CCTV system (or indeed a system that is not district wide but located a number of identifiable sites), Chief Inspector David Miles, District Commander for Castle Point and Rochford responded that "In terms of the need for CCTV in the district, I would welcome any initiative that may help to protect the public and prevent/solve crime".
- 2.18 Representations were invited from the Rochford Hundred Association of Local Councils. Response have been received from some Parish Councils, but some have not responded due to their inability to hold full council meetings due to COVID 19 restrictions. Some Parish Councils have indication a willingness to enter into part funding arrangements with the District Council in the event that CCTV is sited in their respective Parish.
- 2.19 In summary, there is minimal evidence to suggest that CCTV effectively deters crime, and in cases where crime does appear to be deterred, this effect is generally short lived.
- 2.20 There is a repeated finding that CCTV may be more effective in deterring crime in smaller and less complex areas such as car parks
- 2.21 The opinions of convicted offenders largely suggest that cameras are not perceived as a threat, particularly in situations fuelled with alcohol.
- 2.22 There is some evidence to suggest that crime displacement may occur on a small scale within the local (CCTV targeted) area itself.
- 2.23 Full realisation of the potential benefits of increased crime detection depends on a wide range of factors beyond the quality of the CCTV system itself CCTV schemes have been found to be most effective with high coverage and when other interventions are used such as improved lighting and/or increased security guards
- 2.24 The extent to which CCTV improves public feelings of safety remains unclear.

3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 It is known that conservation areas exist in both the Wheatley Ward and Roche South Ward and any CCTV cameras will need to be of a good design and sensitive to the area.

4 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no resource implications arising at this stage, since further work is required to scope the location/number/specification of any proposed cameras and their associated cost before a decision can be recommended to Council.
- 4.2 The financial cost implications, both capital and revenue, will need to be carefully considered as part of the decision-making process, as there is no budget currently identified for CCTV within the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy. Any proposal to install cameras will increase the Council's budget gap unless offsetting savings can be identified.
- 4.3 An estimated cost has been obtained from an established CCTV provider who has previously installed systems in a neighbouring local authority. Based on a Wi-Fi solution covering two sites, consisting of ten wall mounted cameras, the initial costs are estimated at c£35,000. Costs will increase if a wall mounted solution is not viable. If re-deployable mobile cameras are also deemed desirable, the same provider has indicated that each unit would cost £4,200 in addition to installation fees. Consideration must also be given to future upgrade/replacement costs.
- 4.4 In addition, annual monitoring fees and a maintenance budget will be applicable. Annual monitoring fees in relation to the solution outlined above would be approximately £10,000 and an annual maintenance budget of c.£3,000 would be required.
- 4.5 These costs should be regarded as indicative only at this stage and any purchases would need to be in line with the Council's procurement regulations to ensure value for money is achieved.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The statutory duties imposed on Rochford District Council in respect of crime and disorder reduction are set out under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (CADA).
- 5.2 Sec 5 CADA 1998 sets out the bodies (known as "responsible authorities") who are charged with the creation of a crime and disorder reduction strategy. The responsible authorities (as applicable to this authority area) are Essex Police, Rochford District Council, Essex County Council, Essex County Fire and Rescue Service, the National Probation Service and Castle Point and Rochford Clinical Commissioning Group.
- 5.3 Sec 6 CADA 1998 imposes a duty for the "responsible authorities" to formulate a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder (including antisocial behaviour).
- 5.4 Sec 17 CADA 1998 establishes a duty on a local authority in the exercise of its various functions to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

- 5.5 The legislation is not prescriptive in terms of what measures should be considered to reduce crime and disorder.
- 5.6 Should a public CCTV system be introduced in locations across the District (and dependent on how images are stored and processed) Rochford District Council would be classified as a Data Controller and would have to comply to the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).

6 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been completed and found there to be no impacts (either positive or negative) on protected groups as defined under the Equality Act 2010.

7 RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES**
 - (1) That the work undertaken by the CCTV working group to date be noted.
 - (2) That it be noted that further work is required to scope the location/number/specification of any proposed cameras and their associated cost.

Assistant Director, People and Communities

Background Papers:-

None.

For further information please contact Andy Parkman on:-

Phone: 01702 318103

Email: Andy.Parkman@rochford.gov.uk

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.