

COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 17 JANUARY 2019 - 4.00 PM



PRESENT: Councillor Mrs K Mayor (Chairman), Councillor Mrs M Davis (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Mrs S Bligh, Councillor G Booth, Councillor M Bucknor, Councillor Mrs V Bucknor, Councillor M Buckton, Councillor R Butcher, Councillor J Clark, Councillor S Count, Councillor S Court, Councillor Mrs C Cox, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor A Hay, Councillor D Hodgson, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor D Mason, Councillor A Miscandlon, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F Newell, Councillor D Oliver, Councillor K Owen, Councillor A Pugh, Councillor C Seaton, Councillor R Skoulding, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor S Tierney and Councillor F Yeulett

APOLOGIES: Councillor Benney, Councillor C Boden, Councillor S Clark, Councillor D Connor, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor S Garratt, Councillor M Humphrey, Councillor S King, Councillor M Tanfield and Councillor G Tibbs

C53/18 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 13 December 2018 were confirmed and signed.

C54/18 COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW (CSR) - CCTV SHARED SERVICE PROPOSAL

Members considered the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) – CCTV shared service proposal, presented by Councillor Oliver, which proposed a shared service for CCTV delivery with Peterborough City Council (PCC).

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that she has received a number of questions raised by residents which she hoped would be addressed. She added that she had noted from Councillor Oliver's report that there appeared to be no comments received from Wisbech Town Council and although a synopsis had been provided to them by the Town Clerk and two Councillors had commented, there is no mention in Councillor Oliver's report as to whether the Town Council support the proposal. Councillor Oliver responded that the details are contained within Appendix A and Wisbech Town Council have stated that they will keep a 'watching brief' on the proposal, but did not provide an indication as to whether they would support it.
- Councillor Booth asked Councillor Oliver for an update with regard to the use of mobile CCTV in rural areas, which is a subject which has been raised before, but due to the associated costs for installation it was deemed as not being cost effective. He asked that now there is mobile WIFI could this subject be explored further.? Councillor Oliver responded that if today's proposal moves forward, there is the possibility that this can be reviewed with the technology that is available.
- Councillor Booth has a concern over a comment in the report which mentions that the equipment would be replaced when it came to the end of its serviceable life and, in his opinion, the replacement equipment should not be sourced just on the manufacturers'

advice as it may still be perfectly usable. Councillor Oliver stated that this will be reviewed, as the equipment that Peterborough City Council use is digital as opposed to Fenlands which is out dated and, therefore, if the proposal is approved moving forward, upgrading to digital equipment would be a consideration.

- Councillor Tierney stated that Councillor Oliver did present to Wisbech Town Council, with the proposal sounding very positive, but the Town Council had some concerns over Fenland not becoming a junior partner to Peterborough, secondly that the service that the residents of Fenland received would be as good or better than it was before and finally that the staff based at the CCTV office in Wisbech would be treated fairly and be content with the new arrangements. He added that Councillor Oliver gave strong reassurances about the concerns and the Town Council have concluded that they would continue to review the proposal as it progresses.
- Councillor Booth asked for clarification with regard to staffing and asked whether the staff based at both authorities will all take part in a consultation exercise to apply for the available positions. Councillor Oliver confirmed that this will be the case.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor questioned the statement contained in the report which mentions that the proposal has to be realistic and satisfy achievable savings which should be the key determining factor. She stated that, in her opinion, the council's objective is to keep people safe and the priority should not to be about saving money.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked whether there had been engagement and consultation with the Police. She added that some of her questions had been answered and were contained within the report, however she asked for clarification with regard to the concern she had raised surrounding Police officers having to travel from Kings Lynn Police Station to Peterborough, to view the CCTV following an arrest if required. Councillor Oliver referred Councillor Mrs Bucknor to Appendix A, which answered her question.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked for clarification with regard to staffing and a reduction in staff should the proposal go ahead. She asked whether there will be 2 members of staff plus a Police Officer in the CCTV control room?. Councillor Oliver stated that this information was provided at the All Member Seminar and has also been circulated. He explained that the Police Liaison Officer will be present and the office will either be single crewed or double crewed.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked for confirmation that single crew means 1 person managing the whole of Peterborough and Fenland and Councillor Oliver confirmed that would be the case. Councillor Mrs Bucknor made the point that this means that there will be a 50% reduction in the support that Fenland is currently receiving. Councillor Oliver stated that there will be a single person plus a Police Liaison Officer who will at times be used to monitor the CCTV if required.
- Councillor Oliver advised members that there is not a specific amount of CCTV cameras a particular person can monitor at any one time and the CCTV operators working for both Fenland and Peterborough are very professional and feel that they can maintain the service without any problems.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked Councillor Oliver to confirm how many CCTV screens the one operator will be managing at any one time?. Councillor Oliver stated he did not know the exact amount of screens in total, but added that a review has taken place by a consultant who has concluded that the amount of cameras and screens can be monitored by the amount of staff in the control room.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked what experience the temporary staff will have when they are covering during periods of absence? She questioned why the control room needs to be in Peterborough and added that the staff based at Peterborough will not have the same knowledge as those based currently at Fenland. Councillor Mrs Bucknor expressed the view that although there will be initial savings made, she still has concerns over the safety of the residents of Fenland. Councillor Oliver stated that as a professional CCTV operator you become familiar with the area you monitor, therefore, between now and November 2019 both Fenland and Peterborough staff will be taking part in training to become knowledgeable in both areas.

- Councillor Mrs Bucknor questioned how the upgrade of the system to a digital one will be funded and she expressed the view as to whether it would not be better to upgrade the Fenland system in the first instance so that there is no money wasted by connecting Fenlands older system to Peterborough.? Councillor Oliver added that within the report it states that some of the money which has been set aside for the upgrading of the system will be used, so some of the cameras will be upgraded as and when they need to be. Currently the system that Peterborough is using can accommodate both digital and analogue.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked for the definitive date when Fenland will be upgrading from analogue to digital and asked for clarification as to what date the handover will occur.? Councillor Oliver confirmed that the anticipated implementation date will be November 2019.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked for clarification with regard to Fenland and Peterborough not being accredited alarm monitoring sites, adding that the Peterborough control room does not have the standard required to be an accredited alarm monitoring site. Councillor Oliver stated that contained within the report it mentions that the monitoring which currently takes place is for Fenland District Council properties, and, therefore, the accreditation is not currently required, however, looking forward this may change.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor questioned the report stating that part of the role of the CCTV manager will be to source future business, however, if the control room is not an accredited site, surely that cannot happen. Councillor Oliver stated that the manager is qualified to go out and advise on CCTV matters and asked Councillor Mrs Bucknor for further clarification on her question.
- Councillor Mrs French expressed the view that Councillor Mrs Bucknor was referring to the All Member Seminar where it had been explained that new business could be explored with regard to new building sites where CCTV could monitor the area to help with the security aspect.
- Councillor Booth asked for clarification with regard to the alarm monitoring and CCTV monitoring contracts?. Councillor Oliver stated there is a difference between alarm monitoring and CCTV monitoring and the contracts that Fenland currently have are for CCTV, which will continue.
- Councillor Sutton expressed the view that this subject has been mentioned as being in the Comprehensive Spending Review, with Councillor Mrs French raising it at the All Member Seminar and being assured it did feature in the review, however, it does not. He added that the report states that there will be a need to keep a small server room at the Fenland control room to enable the cameras to be viewed at the control room in Peterborough and the rest of the facility will be empty, which could be rented to a business as a further revenue stream. He would have hoped that the statement had read that it 'will' be rented out and he asked, therefore, whether the spare office space can be added to the Economic Review Group for consideration. Councillor Oliver responded that the area currently being used by CCTV at Fenland will remain because of the servers and until such time when they become redundant that site cannot be rented out to anybody, due to the security of the servers, however, this is something that can be reviewed going forward.
- Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that she cannot support the proposal when as Councillors one of the top objectives is to keep Fenland residents safe and whilst she appreciates that the system needs to be upgraded and could make savings of £68,000, she does not feel that giving one person the responsibility of monitoring all of Peterborough and Fenland provides the safety that residents currently have.
- Councillor Booth added that he is surprised that the actual servers cannot be moved to the new facility as, in his view, servers can be based at any location as long as the connection is in place. He questioned the security of the servers that are being left in the room. Councillor Oliver responded that they are part of the system that Fenland currently has and in the future that may change.
- Councillor Hoy stated that the re-siting of the servers is not a quick task to be carried out and with regard to the sale of the building this cannot be guaranteed. Whilst she hopes that the proposal succeeds, if for whatever reason it did not and the building had already been sold, then the Council would need to source a new site to move the CCTV operation back

again to Fenland.

- Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she thinks Councillor Mrs Bucknor is under the impression that there will only be one employee operating the cameras for 24/7, where it clearly states in the report, that there is double operator presence in peak periods.
- Councillor Booth made the point that he did not say that moving the servers would be achieved quickly, but he had mentioned it was possible.

Proposed by Councillor Seaton, seconded by Councillor Yeulett and AGREED;

- **To approve the implementation of a CCTV shared service with Peterborough City Council as set out in the report and in accordance with the CSR decision.**
- **To delegate approval of the final shared service agreement to both the Corporate Director and Corporate Director and Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Heritage.**
- **Authorise entry into a Section 113 (of the Local Government Act 1972). Agreement to enable each Council to place at the disposal of the other such staff as may be necessary to give effect to the shared CCTV Service and to delegate approval of that agreement to the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety.**

4.37 pm

Chairman