

CABINET

Community Safety 2012/13 17th January 2012

Report of Head of Property Services / Environmental Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT				
To provide information to allow consideration of priorities for the Council's contribution to community safety in 2012/13.				
Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Referral from Officers
				X
Date Included in Forward Plan	NA			
This report is public				

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

That within the context of statutory responsibilities, the corporate plan, Cabinet priorities and the available budget Cabinet recommends:-

- 1) Council priorities for community safety in 2012/13
- 2) How much budgetary provision should be proposed for such priorities

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Council's Corporate Plan 2011-14 includes the priority of fulfilling our minimum statutory duties with a focus on keeping the streets clean and safe.
- 1.2 The Council has a statutory requirement to contribute to community safety and there is statutory duty for a community safety partnership.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 4th October 2011 Cabinet considered a report, 'Maintaining the Public Realm'. Cabinet's recommendations from this report provided clear direction on its focus for the future.
- 1.4 Of particular relevance to this report was Cabinet's recommendation with regard to PCSOs.
- 1.5 Cabinet had requested had requested further information on the position with regards to funding of PCSOs in 2012/13 and clearly PCSOs do make a contribution towards maintenance of the public realm.
- 1.6 In 2011 The Home Office agreed that they would for the next two years continue to provide the 2/3 funding that they currently contribute towards PCSOs if someone else contributed the other 1/3. No further information is available as to the detail of PCSO funding beyond April

2013. And by that stage the new Police Commissioners will be in place which could alter matters further. For 2011/12 the LDLSP has provided the majority of the contribution to 9 PCSOs within this District. In order to maintain the level of PCSOs currently funded by the LDLSP a contribution of £99,000 would be required in 2012/13.

1.7 Cabinet therefore resolved –

That Cabinet notes the information with regard to PCSOs and confirms that consideration should be given to the funding aspect as part of the development of the 2012/13 budget.

1.8 This report is provided to present Cabinet with information on the extent that the Council and wider partnerships currently contribute to the safety of the District. In so doing it will enable Cabinet to consider within the context of statutory responsibilities, the corporate plan, Cabinet priorities and the available budget Cabinet what the Council's priorities for community safety in 2012/13 are and how much funding should be allocated to them.-

1.9 The report will cover the specific areas of –

- CCTV
- PCSOs
- Other contributions to safety

2.0 CCTV

2.1 The City Council currently has budgetary responsibility for operating the public space CCTV system in the Lancaster district. The CCTV system was initially installed in 1996 and has been subsequently expanded to be now based on 42 cameras in Lancaster and Morecambe – largely based in the town centres, with some in the West End of Morecambe, and on the Ryelands and Ridge housing estates. The cameras are largely column mounted, although 4 are situated within buildings (Lancaster and Morecambe bus stations and the Festival Market) and there are 4 on building frontages. Each camera is connected to a mains electricity supply and individual cameras, or groups of cameras are connected to the BT fibre optic network which transmits signals and images. The control room is located in Lancaster Police station where all the base equipment is located including a substantial BT box with all the fibre connections and the display screens and control points for daily use by the CCTV operators.

2.2 The system is owned by the City Council, with initial capital funding supplied mainly by the Home Office and other funders such as ERDF. Most operating costs fall to the council, although the police meet the costs incurred in the control room eg heating, lighting, cleaning. All of the Council's costs fall to the General Fund; none are treated as a landlord cost, i.e. charged to the Housing Revenue Account.

2.3 The Draft 2011/12 Revised Budget and projected 2012/13 Estimate (including notional capital and internal recharges) shows the following in terms of CCTV:

	2011/12	2012/13

	Revised £	Estimate £
Insurance Costs	1,300	1,300
Office Equipment	2,500	2,600
Hire of Equipment (<i>BT rentals etc</i>)	31,500	32,300
Contracted Services (<i>staff cost</i>)	121,000	124,100
Equipment Maintenance (<i>cameras etc</i>)	44,000	45,100
Total Direct Costs	200,300	205,400
Support Recharge from Property Services*	68,700	69,000
Support recharge from other Services*	96,300	97,000
Capital Charges (Notional)	5,100	5,100
Total Estimated Expenditure	370,400	376,500

* Note that all recharges are currently being updated and the figures shown above will change

- 2.4 The budget table above identifies that there are 3 main external costs to operate the system which comprise Hire of Equipment, Contracted Services and Equipment Maintenance, which together total £201.5K for the current year.
- 2.5 The greatest area of expenditure is the contracted services element which covers the payments made to Remploy who are the council's provider of trained CCTV operators. The current contract is in need of renewal but has been extended on a month to month basis in view of the budget issues at the present time to allow the council greater flexibility.
- 2.6 The second greatest expenditure is the contract for maintenance of the cameras by Chubb Electronic Security whilst the third element, hire of equipment relates to the hire of fibre optic transmission fibres from BT which controls the system and relay the images to the control centre.
- 2.7 In considering options for the future operation of the CCTV system, the options would be:
- No change
 - Reduction in the number of operating cameras
 - Reduction in the number of operating hours
 - Reductions in both camera numbers and operating hours
 - Closure of the system
- 2.8 Section 4 below identifies these options in greater detail.
- 2.9 Separately it is also worth noting that a recent independent survey of over 1000 adults (albeit commissioned by the CCTV User Group) identified that:
- 90% support the use of public area CCTV
 - 82% believe CCTV saves money and court time
 - 80% believe that public area CCTV does not infringe on their right to privacy
 - 76% believe that there are the right amount or too few public area CCTV cameras
 - 71% believe CCTV in public areas makes them feel safer and reduces crime

- 70% are against any removal of public area CCTV
- 61% are against any reduction in monitoring.

3.0 PCSOs

- 3.1 Currently the CSP / LDLSP contribute to the funding of nine additional PCSOs in this District. Besides their core work these PCSOs also deliver a range of tasks agreed by partners within the CSP/ LDLSP.
- 3.2 Recent consultations with the community demonstrated that the work of the PCSOs was valued.
- 3.3 There is much evidence to demonstrate that besides their obvious contribution to community safety PCSOs also contribute to maintenance of the public realm.
- 3.4 It is clear that the funding provided by the CSP/ LDLSP will not be available in 2012/13.
- 3.5 The contribution required to maintain the current level of PCSOs in the District in 2012/13 is £99,000.
- 3.6 In simple terms the contribution required per PCSO is £11,000.
- 3.7 Were none of this contribution to be made there would still be a PCSO presence in the District but it would be nine less than now. The PCSOs that remained would be entirely responsible to the Police and would definitely not have the positive community impact that they do now.
- 3.8 If the City Council decided to directly contribute to PCSO provision in 2012/13 it would then draw up a service level agreement with the Police to ensure that the priorities for the Council were being delivered.
- 3.9 At this stage it is not clear how the Home Office intends to fund PCSOs beyond 2012/13.

4.0 Other Contributions to Safety

- 4.1 The Council's use of the Community Payback scheme to improve the appearance of the District has to date worked well. Currently the Council contribute £24,000 per annum to the Probation Service to part fund the cost of a Probation Service supervisor, vehicle and tools. In turn the Probation Service undertakes a list of environmental works provided by the Council. Cabinet (4th October 2011) resolved –
- “that the City Council continues to work in partnership with the Probation Service and that a list of environmental improvement works for 2012/13 is developed by officers and agreed with the relevant Cabinet portfolio holder.”*
- 4.2 The Council's Street Pride initiative has been a further success in terms of working with partners and improving the appearance of the District. Cabinet (4th October 2011) resolved –
- that in preparing the Street Pride programme for 2012/13 officers also ask for areas of open space to be nominated*

4.3 Members and Officers from across the Council contribute to the safety of the District by working with relevant partners at strategic, tactical and operational levels on a wide range of subjects and issues.

4.4 In 2011/12 the LDLSP contributed towards the following community safety activities-

- PCSO salaries (part of £99,000 required to support 9 'at risk' PCSO posts): **£37,458**
- Positive Activities for Young People (provided by Lancaster City Council and other partners): **£10,000**
- Safety Matters project: installation of safety equipment (such as fire alarms, stairgates, etc) into the homes of vulnerable families): **£21,093**

The LDLSP has also agreed to allocate £50,000 of Performance Reward Grant to tackle domestic violence but this is unlikely to be spent before 2012/13 - it is planned to go towards extending the IDVA (Independent Domestic Violence Advocate) service to cover weekends and public holidays.

4.5 In 2011/12 the CSP allocated all of its 2011/12 budget of **£161,000** to community safety activities, including:

- PCSO salaries (part of £99,000 required to support 9 'at risk' PCSO posts): **£61,542**
- IDVA Service: **£20,000**
- Positive activities for young people: **£15,000**
- Domestic Violence Outreach Service (provided by Lancaster District Womens Aid): **£17,580**
- "Target hardening" of the properties of those at risk from antisocial behaviour: **£9000**
- Street Pride events: **£8000** (£2000 of this to be carried forward into 2011/12)
- LDAAT Funding to tackle PPO (Priority and Prolific Offenders): **£6000**
- LDAAT Funding to address substance misuse issues: **£10,000**
- Arrest Referral Scheme: **£6294**
- Plus other smaller initiatives (path 23, LANPAC subscription, small projects budget including Heysham playground): **£1800**

The funding for this came from the main areas of-

- Safer Lancashire Board grants: **£49,580**
- Lancashire Police Authority grants: **£42,000**
- Lancaster City Council: **£32,300**
- LDAAT: **£16,000**
- Fire Service: **£13,500**
- Police: **£3000**

5.0 Details of Consultation

5.1 Consultation has taken place with communities, businesses and partners and this has already been reported to Cabinet.

6.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

6.1 It is clear that greatly reduced budgets available to the public sector will have an impact on the amount that the Council and its partners are able to deliver.

- 6.2 The report clearly sets out that with regard to community safety there a number of conflicting priorities. The information in the report is provided to help Cabinet decide which activities are the ones which will have the greatest impact on the Corporate Plan and Cabinet's priorities.
- 6.3 Once that has been determined Cabinet can then determine within the context of statutory responsibilities, the Corporate Plan, Cabinet's priorities and the Council's budget what level of resources to allocate to them
- 6.4 Because the CCTV system is directly provided and managed by the Council the report details very specific options for future provision which are set out below.

Specific Options for CCTV

- 6.5 **No change** – this would result in the budget remaining the same for the time being. There would be a need to enter a tender process for the staffing and maintenance functions of the operation and depending on the specification set out, the costs may or may not vary. For the purposes of this report, it has been assumed that costs for this option would remain static and that the contractual obligation for the tender would be three years.
- 6.6 There are no specific advantages, disadvantages or risks associated with this option as it retains the status quo.
- 6.7 **Reduction in the number of operating cameras** – to achieve this, a view would have to be taken on the areas that would have fewer cameras. This could be based on consultation with the police about those areas that have least crimes and it could for example be geographically based or perhaps based on the cover provided for certain types of property, for example car parks or shopping streets as opposed to residential areas.
- 6.8 Reducing camera numbers would not result in a reduction of staffing unless the cameras which were to be removed were in the busiest urban areas which may therefore reduce the need for double manning on Friday/Saturday evenings, but it would result in a reduction of the maintenance costs. At present this is based on approximately £1,000 per camera and is based on a new for old replacement basis if it is not possible to repair the cameras. Each camera removed from the system would therefore result in a saving of approximately £1,000.
- 6.9 However, it should be noted that the existing maintenance contract is due for immediate renewal if the council decides to retain the system. This may lead to a variation of the contract terms and prices.
- 6.10 Each camera has to be connected to the BT fibre optic network to enable the camera to operate and transmit pictures and in that respect the council is committed to the existing BT contract which runs to 31 March 2013. Even if cameras are taken out of the system, or the system is used less frequently, the contract cost remains payable at the sum of £31,250pa until 31 March 2013.
- 6.11 The advantage of this option is that there could be a small reduction in the council's costs. However, the potential disadvantage would be that there would be a perception that the fear of crime could increase. It is also possible that crime rates could increase once the knowledge is spread that there are no longer CCTV cameras in the vicinity. A further disadvantage is that detection

rates would fall in those areas where cameras are no longer to be in operation.

6.12 The risks associated with this option are largely as set out in the above paragraph relating to a potential increase in crime rates and a reduction in detection rates.

6.13 **Reduction in operating hours** – the current system is operated every day of the year from 8.00a.m. each day until 3.00a.m. Working with the police, an analysis of crime patterns in the areas covered by CCTV has been undertaken, and it has been identified that the following hours could be considered for future staffing of the control room:

Monday 12 noon - 8 pm
Tuesday 12 noon - 8 pm
Wednesday 12 noon - 4 am
Thursday 12 noon - 4 am
Friday 12 noon - 4 am
Saturday 9 am - 4 am
Sunday 9 am - 1 am

It should be noted that this is based on single manning of the system at all times rather than having double staff at peak times on Friday/Saturday evenings.

6.14 Such a change in working hours would result in potential cost reductions from the current budget of £121,000pa to approximately £74,500pa. This figure could rise to approximately £84,500pa if the view is taken that there should be double staffing at the peak times on Friday/Saturday evenings. In addition to this annual figure, the reduction in staff would also result in potential one-off redundancy costs of between £6K and £27K over the life of any contract. (The variation in redundancy costs would depend upon which operators are made redundant reflecting that we cannot pre-select who would be chosen and therefore the best and worst case scenarios have been identified by Remploy).

6.15 In considering this proposal, it is likely that there could be some operational problems identified which could result in the need for operators to be called in to allow police to access information in emergency situations. If that had to be covered by CCTV operators, it is estimated that the additional costs would be approximately £25 per required day plus £21/hr actual call out with a minimum of 4 hours.

6.16 The advantages of this option are that the geographic coverage of the CCTV operation remains and the hours of operation are focussed on the main times that crimes are currently committed. The disadvantages are that there could be an increase in crime rates in those hours when the CCTV system is not manned. Similarly detection rates could fall.

6.17 The risks associated with this option will again relate to the potential for crime increases and detection rate decreases.

6.18 **Reduction in camera numbers and operating hours** – this option would draw together the detail set out above. The actual savings made would largely depend on the number of hours for which the system operated.

6.19 The advantages, disadvantages and risks are as set out in the individual

options for reducing camera numbers and reducing operating hours.

6.20 **Closure of the system** – This would result in the termination of all three contracts referred to in the budget.

6.21 In terms of the BT contract, as indicated previously, the council would be committed to the payments due until 31 March 2013. In terms of the maintenance contract, it is anticipated that this could be terminated at the end of the financial year or such date that the council determined.

6.22 The staffing contract with Remploy could also be terminated at the end of the year provided sufficient notice was given. In this situation, Remploy would be responsible for meeting the entire costs of the redundancies.

6.23 However, it would not be possible to leave the cameras “in situ” as the public would be given a false sense of security with the expectation that the cameras were operating when in reality they were not. The cost of camera removal has been estimated at approximately £200 per camera which includes disconnection costs and reinstatement of the surface, provided that there are no unforeseen issues underground. In addition, the entire control room would require dismantling and the space returning to the police for their use. It is estimated that this could cost in the region of £3K. Total costs of this aspect would therefore be £11,400.

6.24 The advantages of this option are that there would be a budget saving for the council. However, it should be noted that there would be some ongoing costs due to the timing of the BT contract as referred to above.

6.25 The risks of this option are higher than other options which involve a reduction in the operation of the system, but are still related to the potential for crime increases and reductions in crime detections.

7.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

7.1 The purpose of this report is to provide information to allow consideration of priorities for the Council’s contribution to community safety in 2012/13. Therefore, there are no officer preferred options.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

As outlined within the report

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT
--

(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

As outlined within the report

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications directly arising from this report.
--

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Details of the financial implications are set out within the body of this report. Current revenue budgetary provision for direct costs associated with community safety can be summarised as follows:

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
	£'000	£'000	£'000
CCTV (excluding recharges etc)	205	210	214
Contribution to Community Safety Partnership (CSP)	33	13	13
TOTAL	238	223	227

The City Council makes no direct contribution to the PSCOs, as they are currently funded via the CSP and the LDLSP. The City Council makes an annual contribution to the CSP and the amount is listed in the table above.

In addition, the Council's approved capital programme still has a match funding contribution of £25K to CCTV in Carnforth in 2012/13. This has been rolled forward over many years, however, and therefore it is appropriate that the need for this provision is reviewed.

With regard to existing CCTV equipment, it is considered that there is no real risk of any clawback liabilities arising should there be changes to the function. This is because the initial purchases took place over 15 years ago.

OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Human Resources:

None

Information Services:

None

Property:

There are no specific property issues referred to in this report but Property Services have prepared the report

Open Spaces:

As outlined within the report

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

Members are advised to identify their community safety proposals and the level of resource to be allocated in context of their overall priorities and the Council's financial prospects, as well as service objectives and value for money.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Contact Officer: Graham Cox / Mark Davies

Telephone: 01524 582504

E-mail: gcox/mdavies@lancaster.gov.uk