

**NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CCTV PARTNERSHIP JOINT EXECUTIVE**

**MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,  
GERNON ROAD, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY SG6 3JF  
ON THURSDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 2018 AT 6.00 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** *Councillors Choudhury, Julian Cunningham, Henry, Holywell, Lloyd, McAndrew, Lynda Needham and Stevenson*

**In Attendance:** *Ian Couper (Service Director - Resources), Jonathan Geall, Rob Gregory and Hilary Dineen (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager)*

**1 ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN**

*Audio recording 00.28*

The Joint Committee was asked for nominations for a Councillor to Chair the meeting.

It was moved, seconded and

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor Lynda Needham be elected as Chairman of the meeting.

Councillor Lynda Needham took the Chair.

**a) COUNCILLOR MANDY PERKINS - LEADER OF WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL**

*Audio recording 00.50*

The Chairman advised that this was the first meeting held at North Hertfordshire District Council since the sad loss of Councillor Mandy Perkins, Leader of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council. She therefore asked those present to stand for one minute silence in her memory.

**2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

*Audio recording 2.00*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Richard Henry (SBC), Jean Heywood (HBC) and Peter Wayne (HBC).

**3 MINUTES - 29 MARCH 2018**

*Audio recording 2.33*

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meeting of the CCTV Partnership Joint Executive held on 29 March 2018 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.

#### 4 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Audio recording 3mins 12secs*

##### **Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest in respect of any business set out on the Agenda that evening should be declared either as disclosable pecuniary interest or declarable interest and members were required to notify the chairman of the interest declared at immediately prior to the item in question.

#### 5 CCTV CODE OF PRACTICE AMENDMENTS

*Audio recording 4.02*

In the absence of the CCTV Group Leader, Mr Gregory thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee. He explained that the annual meeting of the CCTV Partnership looked at any changes to the Code of Practice in accordance with GDPR requirements and drew the Committees attention to the highlighted changes within the document.

The Committee were content with the highlighted amendments within the Officer's report and it was

**RESOLVED:** That the proposed amendments to the Code of Practice shown in yellow as set out on Appendix A of the report be approved.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** To ensure that Hertfordshire CCTV Partnership is fully compliant with the legal requirements pertaining to the operation of public realm CCTV.

#### 6 OPERATIONS REPORT

*Audio recording 6.13*

The Committee considered the Annual report presented by Mr Gregory who explained that the 2017/18 Operations Report had included an independent Inspector's Report, which had confirmed a "good bill of health" in terms of the CCTV network, that had met all requirements.

Questions were raised by Members following this report, for which some were answered. The CCTV Partnership Joint Executive would be provided with further detail to any queries remaining unanswered:-

1. What is ADPRO?

*Answer provided:* It is an operating system associated with the CCTV system, more detail on this will be provided at the next Committee Meeting.

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

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?
6. Concern was expressed that the pleasing lower number of incidents did not appear to 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:* Will ask for analysis to be undertaken to explain the trend.

7. With investment in high definition cameras, 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. Did we only supply evidence in DVD format, or in other formats in order to take advantage of high definition?

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

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 sure this was something that could be done, but assurance of viability would be paramount.

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:* Yes, 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 in the infrequency of the officer's attendance, which has on occasion resulted in footage requests falling outside of the 28 day storage limit. This was not an inexpensive operation, that seemed to be driven by the Police. Were statistics on the number of occasions where non-attendance by the Police resulted in footage falling outside of the time limit 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 provide 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.

In view of the large amount of queries and responses raised it was

**RESOLVED:** That the CCTV Joint Executive “Exchange to Note” the 2017/18 Annual Operations Report.

**REASON FOR DECISION:** In order that the Annual Operations Report provides an overview of Hertfordshire CCTV performance over a 12 month period and provides the necessary quality assurance around the operation of a CCTV Network.

## 7 CCTV OFFICER MANAGEMENT BOARD

*Audio recording 28.24*

The Committee considered the officer report that outlined proposals. The Officer, Mr Gregory, reported to the Committee that since the last Joint Executive meeting, two key recommendations had been resolved:

- (1) Further technical assessment had been carried out in light of the members questions relating to the re-location of the CCTV Control Room the Officer; and
- (2) The start of a governance review with an audit into the governance of the Partnership.

The Officer Management Board had been resurrected and now included officers of four councils:

Ian Couper	North Herts
Jonathan Geall	East Herts
Rob Gregory	Stevenage
Valerie Kane	Hertsmere

It was confirmed that the Officer Management Board had met three times since April and worked closely on re-location options and going forward would meet quarterly. As per the report, Mr Gregory clarified that a number of technical points in relation to specification and high level criteria had been considered and undertaken by the CCTV Officer Management Board which had focussed on the successful, no interruptions to service, re-location of the CCTV Control Room to Cavendish House.

Following a few brief questions and answers, and upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED:**

- (2.1) That the Joint Executive noted the work undertaken by the Officer Management Board; and
- (2.2) That the Joint Executive receives regular updates of the Risk Register

**REASON FOR DECISION:** Enables relevant information to be provided to the CCTV Joint Executive

## 8 GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE HERTFORDSHIRE CCTV PARTNERSHIP

*Audio recording 38.53*

Mr Cooper thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee and explained that had identified a few concerns with the governance arrangements for the CCTV Partnership and CCTV Company. He confirmed that Stevenage Borough Council had undertaken a review and added it to their SIAS Audit Plan with an allocation of 10 days. This had strayed into the arrangements of the CCTV Company for whom the Chair had been consulted and was in full agreement.

Mr Cooper stated that this was the starting point of the work involved to resolve serious governance issues arising and that further work in terms of specific recommendations arising from the SIAS review would be undertaken.

The SIAS Audit Manager addressed the Committee focussing on the recommendations within the report stating that a continuance of monitoring by the CCTV Joint Executive Committee was required. That this was also in the Stevenage Audit Plan and had also been reported to the Audit Committees of the respective partners. He raised the question of how the recommendations would be monitored going forward, and stated that he felt greater clarity was required on all of the governance arrangements.

The SIAS Audit Manager for clarification, explained that he ultimate oversight, ownership and monitoring of the recommendation made, given the priority level, had been assigned to Stevenage Audit Committee.

Following a brief debate, further explanation of the table contents within the report and upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Audit Report received by the Joint Executive be commented on and noted;
- (2) That the Officer Management Board would continue to undertake more detailed governance review work, and that some of this is likely to impact on the CCTV company;
- (3) The Joint Executive becomes the Audit Oversight Committee;
- (4) The Joint Executive agree to meet quarterly and will continue with the rotation of meeting venues; and
- (5) If an extra SIAS input was required in the future, that individual authorities would share the costs incurred.

**9 URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business was considered.

**10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that once individual authorities had consulted their diaries and provided four available dates, the date of the next meeting would be announced.