

**HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**CCTV PARTNERSHIP JOINT EXECUTIVE**

**Minutes of the meeting held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices,  
Elstree Way, Borehamwood**

22 January 2019

**Present:**

**Voting Members:**

Councillors Choudhury and Wayne	Hertsmere Borough Council
Councillor Needham	N Hertfordshire District Council
Councillors Andrews, McAndrew and Stevenson	E Hertfordshire District Council
Councillor Henry	Stevenage Borough Council

**Officers:**

V Kane	Community Safety Manager	Hertsmere Borough Council
J Smith	Principal Democratic Services Officer	Hertsmere borough Council
J Geall	Head of Housing and Health	E Hertfordshire District Council
R Gregory	Assistant Director Communities & Neighbourhoods	Stevenage Borough Council
M Read	CCTV Operations Manager	Stevenage Borough Council

1. **ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Councillor Choudhury was nominated, duly seconded and appointed as Chair of the meeting.

(Councillor Choudhury in the Chair)

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wayne (Hertsmere Borough Council), Councillor Cunningham (North Hertfordshire District Council), Councillor Lloyd (Stevenage Borough Council) and Williamson (East Hertfordshire District Council) who was replaced this evening by Councillor Andrews.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

4. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting of the CCTV Partnership Joint Committee held on 4 October 2018 were circulated at the meeting and were approved as a correct record.

Matters Arising from the Minutes

Copies of the responses to questions raised at the previous meeting under this regular item were tabled at the meeting (points 1 to 11 of Minute 6 refer). See Appendix to these Minutes for the full responses.

During discussion the following points were highlighted:

- Point 5 (activations) - The CCTV Operations Manager (SBC) clarified that an activation was generated on an alarm system to which cameras were attached. These took about 10 seconds and were sparked by small movements in the majority of cases, such as rats etc, and took about 20 minutes to close.
- Points 6 and 10 (decreasing number of incidents/non-attendance by Police Officers) – Responding to concerns about the working relationship between the CCTV system and the Police, Members were assured that there was a very healthy relationship with the Police throughout Hertfordshire. The Operations Manager acknowledged, however, that non-attendance by Police Officers had resulted in the suite not being fully utilised. He confirmed that operation of the downloading suite did need to be undertaken by the Police although, with the Committee’s support, he could look into the possibility of the Partnership downloading footage if the Police were unavailable. He suggested that the recent deployment of an officer to the downloading suite was not regarded by the Chief Constable at Stevenage as a full time position and that further discussions should be held with a view to procuring further support. Members and Officers expressed disappointment that the system was not given greater value.
- Point 8 (installation/utilisation of new technology in the control centre)
  - The Committee found the response provided to be unsatisfactory.

5. **OPERATIONS REPORT**

The CCTV Operations Manager presented the quarterly management report which provided details of progress with the operational effectiveness of the Hertfordshire CCTV Partnership control room and cameras.

Responding to questions, the Operations Manager advised that the move of the control room was planned for June or July 2019.

Further to the information provided in report Appendix A regarding the lighting columns, the Operations Manager advised that the managing company, Ringway, had ordered the removal of all control room cameras in July 2018. He said that the cameras had been taken down, following which immediate discussions had been held, resulting in a resolution of the issues. In response to Members' questions, he confirmed that the columns belonged to the County Council and that Three Rivers District Council had written to HCC regarding similar frustrations.

**RESOLVED** that the CCTV Quarterly Management Report and its appendices be noted.

6. **UPDATE FROM OFFICER MANAGEMENT BOARD**

The Assistant Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods (SBC) presented the report, the purpose of which was to update the Partnership on progress to date and planned future activities and to act as a support mechanism.

He reported that the Officer Management Board had met on a monthly basis since the last meeting in October 2018 and had concentrated mainly on addressing two of the recommendations of the SIAS (Shared Internal Audit Service) audit covered later on the agenda. This had involved looking at how the financial information was being shared (November meeting) with the provision of regular updates and a quarterly report by the Group Accountant from Stevenage Borough Council. The second target was to have the new Operations Control Room in action by July 2018, the last service to be operating out of Swingate House.

**RESOLVED** that the work carried out by the CCTV Officer Management Board since the last meeting of the CCTV Executive be noted.

7. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW - NEXT STEPS**

The Assistant Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods (SBC) introduced the report which outlined the suggested next steps in the CCTV governance review in order to ensure that the current CCTV arrangements provided the most cost effective options for the partner councils.

He said that Members needed to consider the best form and function for the CCTV arrangements and whether the individual partners were getting good value if the cameras were purchased through the Hertfordshire CCTV Company Ltd (the Company) rather than through the Partnership. He suggested that the next logical step in the governance review was to ask what it would look like financially if the Partnership were to remove all cameras from the Company and he advised that legal advice had

been taken on this, including looking at whether the current trading requirements would still apply. The Officer Board had suggested modelling the finances of all four councils on the basis of them taking on contracts and looking at whether the Partnership could trade with other companies. He said that there were a number of options for Members to consider and that the Chairman of the Company had offered to attend a future Partnership meeting to talk about their business plan.

A Member from Stevenage pointed out that the existing Company needed to be able to sell as, if they were not investing, there was a danger of running out of equipment. His view was supported by the North Hertfordshire District Council Member.

The Assistant Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods emphasised the importance of looking at the Company's business plan. He added that the existing shareholder agreement required updating as the auditor had identified an anomaly whereby the Company could not be financed by public funds which posed the question of whether the councils' purchase of cameras and equipment fell into that category.

During further discussion, the NHDC Member commented that the CCTV Partnership had been set up with the prime intention of protecting residents and that this would inevitably involve an expense at some point. The meeting agreed on the importance of establishing the best, most cost effective mechanism for the Partnership.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. the proposed next steps of the Governance Review, as recommended by the Officer Management Board, be considered;
2. it be approved in principle that the monitoring of partner-owned cameras, currently managed through Hertfordshire CCTV Company Ltd, be reassigned to the Hertfordshire CCTV Joint Partnership, subject to a detailed cost benefit analysis; and
3. a further report on future governance and trading options be presented at the meeting of the CCTV Partnership Joint Executive in April 2019.

8. **UPDATE ON WORK STEMMING FROM SIAS GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

The Head of Housing and Health (East Herts Council) presented the report which outlined progress made with the SIAS recommendations following the SIAS review conducted in August 2018 and resulting report.

He reported that the majority of the recommendations were on schedule with two recommendations now completed. Members' particular

attention was drawn to report paragraph 3.6 which detailed the numbers of cameras acquired by each of the four local authorities since the inception of the Partnership's wholly-owned company and currently managed and accounted for within the company. He also highlighted SIAS recommendations 6 and 7 in Appendix A. The first concerned the drawing up of a new five-year business plan for the overall Partnership which it was recommended should be monitored, as a minimum, on a monthly basis rather than quarterly. Management action was on track for this recommendation. Recommendation 7 involved a review and formal confirmation of the role and responsibilities of the SBC Group Accountant in respect of the Partnership which had been achieved and was now complete.

Members were advised of a typo in recommendation 1.3 whereby "31 May 2018" should read "31 May 2019" in respect of the deadline for SIAS recommendation 1 - the review and confirmation of the governance framework for the CCTV Partnership. Concern was expressed, however, that the revised deadline was too tight to consider the actions arising out of the next Partnership meeting on 10 April 2019. The Assistant Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods (SBC) informed Members of two further CCTV Officer Management Board dates on 5 February and 6 March 2019. He offered to circulate the outcomes as soon as possible to enable Officers to brief their own Members on the options available, allowing the reports to be produced in good time for the April meeting. A suggestion was also made to consider holding daytime meetings of the CCTV Partnership Joint Executive.

With reservations, it was agreed that the deadline in recommendation 1 should be amended from 1 December 2018 to 31 May 2019.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. the work carried out to date by the CCTV Officer Management Board to address the recommendations made by the Shared Internal Audit Service (SIAS) in their report published in August 2018, including completion of the actions against two of the nine recommendations, be considered and noted;
2. the deadline for the SIAS recommendation to "*review the governance framework for the overall CCTV Partnership and confirm it as being fit for purpose*" be amended from 1 December 2018 to 31 May 2018 to enable (a) members to fully consider, at their meeting in April 2019, the legal review of partnership and trading options commissioned by officers and (b) officers to act on members' decisions made in April 2019; and
3. a potential issue be noted in relation to the implementation of SIAS recommendation 1 (the review and confirmation of the governance framework for the CCTV Partnership) due to the short timescale between the next meeting on 10 April 2019 and the deadline of 31 May 2019.

9. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the next meeting of the CCTV Partnership Joint Committee would be held at 6pm on Wednesday 10 April 2019 at East Hertfordshire District Council.

**Appendix: Operations Report - Responses to questions raised at previous meeting**

**CLOSURE: 7.28 pm (having commenced at 6.07pm)**

**CHAIR**

**Appendix:**                    **Questions raised at CCTV Partnership Joint Executive Meeting on 4 October 2018**

Operations Report – Questions

Audio recording – Start of Item – 6 minutes 14 seconds

1. What is ADPRO Fastrace 2

Answer provided: It is an operating system associated with the CCTV system  
More detail required.

***The Fastrace 2 is a broadband based Camera and Loud speaker system used almost exclusively in Schools. The new version allows us to paint out certain items which can create false alarms, but it is basically a motion detection alarm system. We utilise the free Schools 'Network For Learning' to provide this service. The Network for Learning is a free broadband network provided for all Schools across the country.***

2. When considering the number of incidents, a large proportion were initiated by either the Police or Airwaves. Therefore, was the control room proactive or reactive and what role did ADPRO play in this.

***Adpro is a Schools based CCTV Alarm, so very little Police involvement until and unless the alarm escalates. We find that approximately 50% of our incidents are generated by 'Airwaves' the Police Radio System and 50% proactive.***

3. Was the increase in the number of cameras deployed, and other statistics included in the report, due to new contracts to the company, or purely an increase for the Partnership.

***The increases in the report are as a consequence company growth. New cameras are currently commissioned via the company, not the partnership. The financial benefit of continuing this model should be reviewed as part of the governance review.***

4. In respect of re-deployable cameras, please provide more information about Rapid Vision, such as who they are, what they do and why this has changed.

***Rapid Vision cameras are a rugged cost effective camera we are using to replace our 'shoebox' cameras. We are currently sourcing these at a cost of 3 for £5,000.00 which is a sixth of the cost of the original cameras. These units are more reliable and the image quality better.***

5. Concern was expressed regarding the number of activations at schools and that 250,000 activations with 39 incidents raised questions about what was happening and was this cost effective.

***We have an issue with the older Adpro units that generate alarms from pedestrian walkways near to our sensors and both wildlife and tree movement. We are risk managing this by auditing high activation sites and deploying engineers to reposition sensors. This is on-going.***

6. Concern was expressed that the lower number of incidents did not tally with the information being provided by the Police. Therefore, did this mean the system was effective in preventing incidents or had something else changed.

Answer provided:

***The Police have changed the way they log incidents. We are quite clear in our interpretation of what qualifies as an incident. A detailed report on this will be provided at the next Joint Executive meeting.***

7. Did we only supply evidence in DVD format, or in other formats in order to take advantage of high definition. We have invested in high definition cameras and courts now had the capability to view in other high definition formats so providing evidence on DVD only did not take advantage of those capabilities.

Answer provided: Currently provided on DVD. Other opportunities regarding how data might be transferred and shared had been explored.

***We have specified the ability to stream HD video from our new control room to any location including the Police Stations, County Operations Rooms and Courts. The success of this will depend on the adoption of the system by the Courts and Police, but we are ensuring the new control room has that capability.***

8. Would the new technology mentioned in question 7 be installed and utilised in the new control centre?

Answer provided: We would not wish to install equipment in the new control centre that was not in line with the ambitions of the Partnership regarding sharing information but we need to make sur this was something that could be done and how it could be done.

9. In respect of Control Room Performance and the statement that “this service has been used by solicitors in private complaints”, was RIPA Policy being referred to and adhered to.

Answer provided: Those kinds of viewing requests have to go through a particular approval protocol and third-party viewing went through these protocols.

10. Concern was expressed that the reason for the low number is the infrequency of the officer’s attendance which has on occasion resulted in footage requests falling outside of our 28 day storage limit. This was not an inexpensive operation, that seemed to be driven by the Police. Did we keep statistics on the number of occasions non-attendance by the Police resulted in footage falling outside of the time limits in order to provide evidence to Police of the effect of non-attendance

Answer provided: These frustrations have been shared with the local Police Forces. The reasons given for non-attendance included that officers were not being available, due to being redeployed. The download suite had been provided for this purpose and it was frustrating when, despite repeated reminders, Offices did not attend to view the evidence and therefore the suite was not being fully utilised. This was something that, with the guidance of the Executive, further action could be discussed with the Police.

11. Had training been put in place to enable the Inspectors to be able to keep up with the modern technology and were there plans in place to provided the equipment and space required for the Inspectors

Answer provided: Discussions were taking place about not only about refresher training for Inspectors, but also how to recruit new Inspectors across the Districts as there was a need to increase the number of Inspectors coming into the control room. There was an opportunity, particularly with a new control room, for all of this to be built in as part of the induction programme for new Inspectors, particularly taking on board the need for new equipment to be available

Audio recording – End of Item – 28 minutes 14 seconds