

Record of Cabinet portfolio holder decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Decision made by	Councillor Elizabeth Gillespie
Key decision?	Yes
Date of decision (same as date signed)	
Name and job title of officer requesting the decision	Karen Brown, Community Safety Team Leader, Community Safety
Officer contact details	Tel: 01235 422592 Email: karen.brown@southandvale.gov.uk
Decision	To remove four CCTV cameras from two of our town centre schemes that do not meet principle one of the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice; that the cameras are for specified purposes, which are in pursuit of legitimate aims and necessary to meet identified pressing needs.
Reasons for decision	<p>We carry out an annual review of the CCTV cameras to ensure that they are compliant i.e. meet the criteria of the surveillance camera commissioner. This is the primary reason for the review, it was also supported by the TVP strategic review which was designed to reduce costs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Thames Valley Police (TVP) is currently carrying out a strategic review of CCTV across the Thames Valley. As part of this review they commissioned an independent report into current CCTV arrangements and one of the recommendations was to review each camera against the Surveillance Camera Commissioner's 'pressing need' criteria to identify possible savings. Rather than wait until the outcome of the TVP review, the Community Safety Team decided to carry out our own in-depth review of our cameras to ensure they were still meeting the pressing need criteria and to identify any possible savings. 2) The review, led by our CCTV supervisor and our community safety team leaders and supported by TVP involved assessing each camera in every town in terms of:

- the number of times it was required to help monitor incidents across a three-year period (2014/15, 2015/16 and 2017)
- how many (if any) of the Commissioner's 'pressing need' criteria it met
- anecdotal evidence about how the camera contributes towards issues like the night time economy, key access routes within the town, whether other cameras are located nearby.

Following this review officers are recommending removing the four cameras below due to their low usage and given the nature of the incidents they were used to monitor, which related to minor issues such as vehicle damage, fireworks and alarms. We have consulted TVP and the town councils on these proposals and received no objections to us removing these cameras - three of which are already out of action:

Camera number	Town and location	Number of monitored incidents between June 2014 and December 2017	Recommendation
137	Wallingford – Goldsmith Lane (car park) (faulty – irreparable)	9	Decommission/remove
138	Wallingford – Goldsmith Lane (car park) (temporarily disconnected due to building works)	20	Decommission/remove
142	Wallingford – Wood Street (car park) (this camera has been re-located within the town centre due to a camera being irreparably damaged)	11	Decommission/remove
157	Didcot – Edinburgh Drive (car park)	38	Decommission/remove

Alternative options rejected: To leave the cameras in place but this would not be following best practice as there is no pressing need to justify their presence and there's a small saving we can make by removing them.

Legal implications: None

Financial implications: The cost to remove the cameras is approximately £300 this will be met by existing budget. There will also be a saving of

	approximately £240 each year in electricity costs.																											
Other implications	None – none of the cameras in the district council car parks hold Park Mark status.																											
Background papers	N/A																											
Declarations /conflict of interest? Declaration of other councillor/officialer consulted by the Cabinet member?																												
List consultees	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>Outcome</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ward councillors</td> <td>Consulted</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local Police Area Commander</td> <td>Approved</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town Councils</td> <td>Approved</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Legal</td> <td>Approved</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finance</td> <td>Approved</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sustainability</td> <td>N/A</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diversity and equality Communications</td> <td>N/A</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strategic Management Board</td> <td>Approved</td> <td>28/2/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Outcome	Date	Ward councillors	Consulted		Local Police Area Commander	Approved		Town Councils	Approved		Legal	Approved		Finance	Approved		Sustainability	N/A		Diversity and equality Communications	N/A		Strategic Management Board	Approved	28/2/2018
Name	Outcome	Date																										
Ward councillors	Consulted																											
Local Police Area Commander	Approved																											
Town Councils	Approved																											
Legal	Approved																											
Finance	Approved																											
Sustainability	N/A																											
Diversity and equality Communications	N/A																											
Strategic Management Board	Approved	28/2/2018																										
Confidential decision? If so, under which exempt category?	No																											
Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee	No																											

chairman?	
Has this been discussed by Cabinet members?	Yes, Cllr Gillespie.
Cabinet portfolio holder's signature To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	<p>Signature: <i>Elizabeth Gillespie</i></p> <p>Date: <i>05/04/18</i></p>

ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.

For Democratic Services office use only	
Form received	Date: <i>6-4-18</i> Time: <i>9:15</i>
Date published to all councillors	Date: <i>6-4-18</i>
Call-in deadline	Date: <i>13-4-18</i> Time: <i>17:00</i>