

Agenda Item No:	<b>3</b>	
Committee:	<b>Full Council</b>	
Date:	<b>17/01/19</b>	
Report Title:	<b>Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) - CCTV shared service proposal</b>	

## 1 Cover sheet:

### 11 **Purpose / Summary**

To consider a proposal to set up a shared service for CCTV delivery with Peterborough City Council (PCC)

### 12 **Key issues**

- CCTV has been part of the Fenland community since the 1990's
- In 2009 the monitoring was transferred in to FDC from a private provider.
- In 2015 the service was asked by members to undertake the following actions as part of the CSR decisions made:
  - Wireless upgrade
  - Increase income from business / properties
  - Consider alternative service delivery i.e. external service provision / shared service

### **CSR progress**

- Through capital investment of circa £210,000, the Council has made savings of circa £49,000 per annum through the wireless upgrade and bringing alarm monitoring into the CCTV control room (Table 1 refers).
- The Council has also secured £30,500 per annum through new income streams (table 2 refers).
- Finally it has secured further efficiencies of circa £8,000 through undertaking the 'out of hours' homeless triage at the CCTV control room.

### **Alternative service delivery**

- This report sets out a proposal for an alternative service delivery through a shared service arrangement with PCC
- Both Councils have common interests and issues with the service including:
  - Need to save more and increase CCTV income for what is a non-statutory service.
  - Issues with business continuity for 24/7/365 delivery.
  - Biggest cost for CCTV is staffing / technology infrastructure and maintenance and building assets.

- Commercialisation expertise and the ability to focus time and effort in securing new business was lacking in both authorities
- Therefore a service redesign has been undertaken to see what the potential is for a shared service. Throughout a check has been made to ensure the following design principles are retained or enhanced:
  - The service is resilient to unforeseen circumstances.
  - Community see no change.
  - 24/7/365 service is delivered with an operator presence.
  - Honours our contractual arrangements with our funding partners.
  - Realistic and achievable savings should be the key determining factor for initial business case. Future new commercial revenue should not be estimated.
  - A 50/50 partnership with equal decision making i.e. no takeover from one organisation.
- Four work streams have therefore been explored with the following findings:
  - Significant management and staff savings can be achieved through sharing management and staff alongside merging into one control room.
  - An increase in service resilience from the existing FDC operating model through double operator cover at peak periods and use of external contract resource to cover for holiday and sickness.
  - No effect on funding partner commitments with the 24/7/365 service retained.
  - It is much cheaper to relocate the existing FDC control room into the existing PCC control room. The cost from moving the FDC control room to PCC is £75,800 as opposed to £185,000.
  - The existing capital programme had £110,000 in 2019/20 for recording systems upgrade and this therefore represents a saving to the capital programme by diverting capital costs for the move to PCC from which PCC will also contribute money towards.
  - The proposed structure would allow more capacity to find new commercial opportunities.
  - Proportionality splits for savings and costs have been agreed to reflect the use of the service by both LA's. Peterborough has two thirds of the infrastructure and this is reflected in the splits agreed.
  - There may be further advantages from the setting up of a Local Authority Trading Company (LATCO) but much more work is needed on this so it is proposed to deliver the shared service first and bring a report back to members at a later date for consideration regarding the LATCO.
  - Although the proposed model ensures there is no change in the way the service can support the Police, ongoing dialogue will take place to ensure the Police can consider how it can contribute to or utilise more efficiently the CCTV service.
  - Table 4 sets out the financial impact which shows full year savings of circa £65,000 per annum from 2020/21.
  - Table 5 shows the proposed proportionality across both Local Authorities for costs and income (both existing and into the future) recognising that PCC are the greater service user.

- Table 6 sets out the proposed timetable with a phased implementation of the management by April 2019 and the staff by November 2019.
- The feasibility work undertaken has recommended a proposed staffing structure, but that any change would be subject to a process of staff consultation before and final structure is implemented.
- The affected staff have been engaged throughout the development of the proposal and will continue to receive the support required throughout the restructure process in accordance with relevant policy through Staff Committee.
- Following an All Member Seminar in November a consultation with funding partners and operational Police commenced ending January 2019. This included a stakeholder letter and a presentation evening to the 4 town councils'. The feedback received is shown in Appendix A with a response to the points made. As well as this the Council has provided some responses to some other feedback that has been raised during the development of the proposal.

### 13 Recommendations

- It is recommended that Full Council:
  - Approve the implementation of a CCTV shared service with Peterborough City Council as set out in this report and in accordance with the CSR decision.
  - Delegate approval of the final shared service agreement to both the Corporate Director and Corporate Director & 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.

<b>Wards Affected</b>	4 Market Towns
<b>Forward Plan Reference</b>	
<b>Portfolio Holder(s)</b>	Councillor Anne Hay, Councillor David Oliver
<b>Report Originator(s)</b>	Dan Horn, Head of Housing & Community Support, 01354 622470, <a href="mailto:dhorn@fenland.gov.uk">dhorn@fenland.gov.uk</a>
<b>Contact Officer(s)</b>	Dan Horn, as above Richard Cassidy, Corporate Director, 01354 622300, <a href="mailto:richardcassidy@fenland.gov.uk">richardcassidy@fenland.gov.uk</a> Kamal Mehta, Interim Corporate Director and Chief Finance Officer, 01354 622201, <a href="mailto:kamalmehta@fenland.gov.uk">kamalmehta@fenland.gov.uk</a>
<b>Background Paper(s)</b>	



## Background / introduction

- 3.1 CCTV was installed within the Fenland district in the 1990's to originally protect Council Assets and Infrastructure.
- 3.2 In 2002 further funding was secured to introduce CCTV to the 4 market towns as a community safety measure both in terms of reducing the fear of crime which was much higher than reality and to act as a deterrent to criminals contemplating criminal action.
- 3.3 CCTV monitoring was delivered through a private provider until 2009. At that point CCTV was brought in house.
- 3.4 CCTV is not a statutory service but supports the Council in delivering its priorities around making Fenland a safer place as well as providing the out of hours' services for the Council along with lone working services.
- 3.5 The ability to continue with this non statutory service during the period of austerity has been achievable as a result of running cost contribution from partners such as:
  - Cambridgeshire County Council
  - Chatteris Town Council
  - Clarion Housing
  - March Town Council
  - Whittlesey Town Council
  - Wisbech Town Council
- 3.6 The CCTV supported detection and reporting of 1958 incidents in 2017/18 leading to action taken in 907 incidents:
  - Arrests and fines = 272
  - Alcohol confiscated = 14 incidents
  - Ambulance attended = 29 incidents
  - Details taken by Police = 42 incidents
  - Drugs confiscated = 2 incidents
  - Intelligence taken by Police = 250 incidents
  - Person(s) dispersed = 5 incidents
  - Persons located by CCTV (Missing from home/vulnerable persons) = 17 incidents
  - Persons taken to hospital = 9 incidents
  - Police attended = 125 incidents
  - Restorative justice = 5 incidents
  - Vehicle recovered = 4 incidents
  - Words of advice by Police = 133 incidents
- 3.7 This relates to action taken at the time of the incident. There will be other outcomes from the CCTV work that took place in subsequent days, weeks and months, which will remain unknown to the Council.
- 3.8 There is also an unknown of the impact of having CCTV and the crimes that are deterred just by its presence.
- 3.9 During the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) members in recognising that the service was not statutory agreed that the service should work to reduce its running costs further.

3.10 Members in 2015 considered the following during CSR:

- Reduce CCTV active monitoring hours
- Alternative service delivery i.e. external service provision / shared service
- Reduce fibre optic line rental costs through wireless upgrade / alarm monitoring
- Increase income from businesses / properties covered by cameras

3.11 Members approved for CSR implementation:

- Wireless upgrade
- Increase income from business / properties
- Consider alternative service delivery

3.12 A key consideration was that to reduce the active monitoring hours would affect the income currently secured through the funding partner agreements and the ability to secure future new income streams.

#### 14 CSR progress to date

4.1 Table 1 sets out the capital projects implemented to make revenue savings:

**Table 1**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Capital cost</b>	<b>Annual revenue savings</b>
Wireless project	£181,610	£44,000
Alarm Monitoring	£29,061	£4,508

4.2 Table 2 sets out new commercial income secured since CSR recommendation:

**Table 2**

<b>Customer</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Revenue per annum</b>
North Cambs Hospital	Camera Monitoring	£10,000
Doddington Hospital	Camera Monitoring	£10,000
Wisbech Cemetery	Camera Monitoring	£2,500
East Cambs District Council	Lone Working	£8,000

4.3 Alongside that the 4 Town Councils' agreed new 3 year SLA's commencing this financial year.

4.4 Finally a further saving of £8,000 has been secured through the delivery of the emergency homeless out of hours triage assessment through the CCTV service.

4.5 Moving forward there remains the following investment challenges such as:

- Replacing operating hardware that is reaching the end of recommended operating life. This includes recording systems and the analogue command and control system.

- The 75 analogue cameras will require replacing to digital cameras over the medium financial term period.
  - The hard drive capacity of the servers will require increasing in the next few years to accommodate this replacement
  - Ongoing maintenance of the existing infrastructure.
- 4.6 In light of paragraph 2.5 there remains a need to explore further efficiencies via:
- External service delivery i.e external service provision or shared service.
  - New commercial income generating business
- 4.7 Historically the Council has explored initial discussions with:
- Borough Council Kings Lynn & West Norfolk (BCKL&WN)
  - Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC)

The discussions have not progressed as it was felt that there would always remain significant costs to the Council as there was reluctance for FDC to be an equal partner.

## **15 A shared service with Peterborough City Council**

- 5.1 A further discussion with PCC has taken place. As part of those discussions it was found that both PCC and FDC had the following common interests:
- Need to save more and increase CCTV income for what is a non-statutory service with both Councils continuing to face financial challenges into the medium financial term.
  - Issues with business continuity for 24/7/365 delivery, for example the FDC control room has at times experienced problems maintaining the presence of an operator as a result of unforeseen staffing sickness.
  - Biggest cost for CCTV is staffing / technology infrastructure and maintenance and building assets.
  - Commercialisation expertise and the ability to focus time and effort in securing new business was lacking in both authorities.
- 5.2 Therefore 4 work streams have been explored:
- Shared management
  - Shared staff and control room
  - Commercial marketing delivery
  - Review of delivery model
- 5.3 The 4 work streams were appraised and designed against the following overarching principles that had to be fulfilled:
- The service is resilient to unforeseen circumstances
  - Community see no change
  - 24/7/365 service is delivered with an operator presence
  - Honours our contractual arrangements with our funding partners
  - Realistic and achievable savings should be the key determining factor for initial business case. Future new commercial revenue should not be estimated
  - A 50/50 partnership with equal decision making i.e. no take over from one organisation.

## **16 Shared Management**

6.1 The analysis has concluded:

- There is the ability to reduce management costs for both Councils through sharing the CCTV manager post across both Local Authorities. This saving would lead to other community safety responsibilities undertaken by the FDC CCTV manager being realigned within existing resources elsewhere in the Council.
- Along with this there is the ability to not have a supervisor post for the service for a further management saving

## **17 Shared Staff and Control Room**

7.1 Proposed operating model delivers:

- 24/7/365 operator presence.
- Double operator presence for peak demand periods. Demand analysis has looked at incidents and calls by year, month, day and hour across both PCC and FDC areas. This outlines that a double operator will be needed:
  - 16:00 - 00:00 - Monday - Thursday
  - 17:00 - 01:00 - Friday, Saturday and Sunday
  - 10:00 - 16:00 - Saturday and Sunday
  - Fenland's current operator model is single crewed only 24/7/365.
- The model proposes that holiday and sickness is met by an external procured pool of selected and inducted operators. This ensures:
  - Strong service resilience
  - It supports the health and well-being of the core operator staff through not having to chop and change shifts.
  - It offers advantages in recruiting future vacancies as external contracted operators who cover core team holiday and sickness have the opportunity to apply and if successful will be aware of systems and processes to speed up induction.
  - The service can react quickly to commercial growth i.e. new commercial business.

7.2 A further advantage with a shared service with Peterborough is that they have the benefit of a paid Police employee who is based in the control room Monday - Friday. The post undertakes retrospective reviews for evidence. At FDC control room this is undertaken through a volunteer.

7.3 A technology assessment by an external specialist has been undertaken to assess the costs that would be incurred to:

- Locate both PCC and FDC CCTV service from the existing FDC control room.
- Locate both PCC and FDC CCTV service from the existing PCC control room.

7.4 The outcome of the assessment is it would cost a lot more for the PCC service to be delivered from the FDC control room in comparison with the FDC service to be delivered in PCC control room. It would cost £185,000 for PCC to move to FDC as against a cost of £75,800 for FDC to move to PCC control room.

- A key reason for the cost increase for the Fenland control room solution is PCC have upgraded their recording and front end operating systems whereas FDC have not done so yet. FDC have allocated £110,000 from next year's capital programme to upgrade the recording systems. This would not be needed through



this proposal and an element of the costs for this could then be diverted to help fund the costs of moving to PCC control room.

- PCC area has two thirds of the total number of cameras across both authorities and the costs are therefore greater to move the viewing of those cameras to FDC control room than the other way.
- Both assessments have additional technological link requirements of £16,200 per annum. This will be a shared cost between both Local Authorities.
- There will be a need to keep a small server room at the FDC control room to enable the cameras to be viewed at PCC control room. However the rest of the facility will be vacant with a view that this could be hired to another business as a further revenue stream.

## 18 Commercial Marketing Delivery

- 8.1 A product and market analysis has been undertaken to understand the future potential for new commercial opportunities.
- 8.2 Table 3 below sets out the initial conclusions from which a detailed marketing plan will be developed.

**Table 3**

<b>Good potential</b>	<b>Maybe potential</b>	<b>Less potential</b>
Lone worker services	Out of hours Housing Association emergencies	Care line pendant
CCTV monitoring	Key holding provision	Intruder and fire alarm response
Rapid Camera Deployment		Highways enforcement

- 8.3 It is proposed that the CCTV manager would spend a proportion of each week marketing the CCTV service to new commercial opportunities utilising the analysis undertaken to help prioritise best opportunities first.

## 19 Review of delivery model

- 9.1 In developing this shared service proposal both Local Authorities believe there could be benefits from moving to a Local Authority Trading Company (LATCO).
- 9.2 However it is clear that there is a lot more work needed to understand the benefits / risks associated with this.
- 9.3 Therefore due to the financial advantages for both Councils it is proposed to implement the shared service first to capture those benefits then undertake the detailed feasibility work for a trading company to bring back to members for further consideration in the future.
- 9.4 As part of the LATCO feasibility work consideration will include:
- Whether the server room at the FDC existing control room could be re-located elsewhere.
  - Whether there is interest and value potential to include other Council areas for example HDC.

## 110 The Police

- 10.1 The proposed model ensures there is no change in the way in which we can support the Police. The police take 51% of the current demand for the service across both areas.
- 10.2 However there will be the need for ongoing conversations with the Police to explore how the partnership can be developed including:
- The use of the existing PCC resource highlighted above.
  - The future role the Police could play in resourcing the service particularly at peak periods.
  - How technology could be invested by the Police to enable them to have remote access to the images from CCTV cameras at the control room.
  - A review of the Police's current operating procedures to ensure that the way the Police utilise the service is in a way that is most efficient for all partners.

## 111 Financial impact

- 11.1 The financial assessment undertaken for this shared service proposal has been validated by the Council's own financial team.
- 11.2 Table 4 sets out the savings that is forecast to be achieved mostly from reduced staff costs (£229,230) and are based on what is realistic and achievable and does not factor in future growth and new business estimates. It also factors in the additional revenue costs for the technology link required to receive FDC camera pictures at the PCC control room (£16,200 per annum) and an increase in building costs relocating to PCC control room whilst for needing to retain the FDC server room (£2,369). However the building costs could potentially be mitigated if a business tenant is found for the vacated space at the FDC control room. The figures are based on FDC receiving 33.3 % of the total savings achieved as PCC service has two thirds the total infrastructure for both Local Authorities.

**Table 4**

<b>Year</b>	<b>FDC Revenue Savings from current net service cost</b>
2019/20	£40,000 (part year)
2020/21	£65,000 (full year)

- 11.3 Table 5 sets out the proposed proportionality splits for other cost and income elements between both Local Authorities moving forward.

**Table 5**

<b>Budget type</b>	<b>FDC</b>	<b>PCC</b>
Capital costs to relocate FDC to PCC	66%	33%
Yearly revenue costs for technology link	50%	50%
Savings apportionment for new model (as table 4)	33%	66%
Legacy commercial revenue	100%	0%

FDC		
Legacy commercial revenue PCC	0	100%
FDC camera upgrade (phased)	100%	0%
New commercial revenue and relevant set up costs	50%	50%
On-going maintenance contract (once contract alignment is possible).	33%	66%
Annual revenue building costs	33%	66%
Further efficiencies for other budget heads within PCC	0%	100%
Further efficiencies for other budget heads within FDC	100%	0%

11.4 As highlighted above the capital costs for moving to one control room at PCC is £75,800. The proportioned cost for FDC is £50,483. This represents a further capital saving as the Council will not need to invest the £110,000 set aside in the capital programme for 2019/20 to replace the recording systems that has reached the manufacturers end of life. PCC has already undertaken this investment.

11.5 Over the medium term there will be a need to replace the analogue cameras on the FDC network with digital cameras and also increase the hard drive capacity to store data. This can be done in a phased way and would be a requirement with both a shared service and status quo.

11.6 Costs of implementation and if required existing FDC redundancies to be funded from the management of change reserve.

## 112 Funding partners and operational police consultation

12.1 Following an All Member Seminar in November a consultation with funding partners and operational Police commenced ending January 2019. This included a stakeholder letter and a presentation evening to the 4 town councils'. The feedback received is shown in Appendix A with a response to the points made. As well as this the Council has provided some responses to some other feedback that has been raised during the development of the proposal.

## 113 Timetable

13.1 Table 6 sets out the timetable.

Date	Action	Progress
November 2018	Informal Cabinet	Completed
November 2018	All Member Seminar	Completed
November 2018	Management, Trade Union, Staff Partnership (MTSP)	Completed
December /	Funding Partners	Completed

January 2018	Engagement & Operational Police	
January 2018	Cabinet	
January 2018	Full Council	
January 2019	Restructure process of PCC and FDC CCTV teams	
February 2019	Technology procurement and implementation	
February 2019	3rd Party resource provider procurement	
April 2019	CCTV manager merges	
November 2019	CCTV control room merges and new structure is live.	
TBA	LATCO feasibility and subject to future member decision implementation.	

13.2 The proposal has a significant impact on staff at both Councils with the potential for redundancies across both organisations. MTSP have been updated on this proposal in November and the CCTV team have also been made aware. The proposed restructure process will commence in January 2019 in accordance with approved policy. The process includes consultation with MTSP, teams affected, all employees with staff committee making the final decision. Throughout all staff will be offered support needed as required.

#### **114 Effect on corporate objectives**

14.1 CCTV fits under the Environment priority:

- Work with partners to keep people safe in their neighbourhoods by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and promoting social cohesion:

#### **115 Conclusions**

15.1 A shared service with PCC:

- Protects and maintains the service delivery to the public and our funding partners
- Reduces management and staffing costs
- Improves the service resilience from the current Fenland operating model.

- Increases capacity to build new revenue streams
- Ensures the Council is an equal partner in the future delivery of the service

15.2 There will be a separate consideration and decision making process by members once the LATCO feasibility work has concluded.

## Appendix A

Stakeholder	Stakeholder Response	FDC response
Clarion Housing	<p>Thanks for your letter regarding the relocation and upgrading of the CCTV system and centre. This e-mail is to confirm on behalf of Clarion that it all seems to be perfectly sensible and with the increased surveillance hours and police representative in attendance, we have no objections at all. We do not have any questions and I don't feel the need to attend the meeting about it.</p> <p>Please would you let me know what date the new service and re-location will be effective from and I will pass the information on to the team.</p> <p>Housing Services Manager – Eastern region Clarion Housing</p>	<p>Thank for your feedback. Your comments are noted. Subject to the proposal progressing we will keep you updated through the implementation phase on relevant dates and progress.</p>
Cambridgeshire Police (Fenland Operations)	<p>Having sat down with you today and having been taken through the shared services proposal I have no concerns around it having a negative operational impact on Fenland officers. The Force has recently been through a restructure as part of the local policing review and this saw Fenland and Peterborough merged into a northern district and this proposal follows that format. We discussed the possibility of officers having to travel from the Police Investigation centre (PIC) through to the Peterborough control room to collect CCTV and I confirmed that there could be occasions where this might be required but I could see this being the exception rather than the normal practise.</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback and your comments are noted. Subject to the proposal progressing we will be in regular contact with the Police during the implementation phase to agree processes for the new shared service</p>

## Appendix A

	<p>Also with officers having access to the Police liaison officer permanently located in the Peterborough control room and with the implementation of the new data file sharing procedure you highlighted I can see how the occasions an officer has to make a trip from the PIC to Peterborough will easily be countered by the reduction in routine visits that officers need to make to review footage as part of an investigation.</p> <p>My view is that under this proposal officers will still have access to the full service that is currently provided and if fully realised then the proposal could actual bring some benefits via better use of technology and also having access to a dedicated police resource within the control room.</p> <p>Fenland Inspector</p>	
Chatteris Town Council	Meeting 8 <sup>th</sup> January – advised response on the 9 <sup>th</sup>	
Horsefair Shopping Centre	<p>I fully appreciate the reasons for bringing together the two systems together, in order to not only reduce costs, but also to provide an enhanced sustainable service. Following the presentation I'm happy to endorse the shared service proposal.</p> <p>Centre Manager – Horsefair Shopping Centre</p>	<p>Many thanks for your feedback and your comments are noted. Subject to the proposal progressing we will keep you updated through the implementation phase.</p>
March Town Council	Chased 4 <sup>th</sup> January	
NHS – NCH & Doddington Hospital	<p>Please find below our feedback on behalf of CCSNHST in relation to the shared service proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are very happy with the existing service delivery from FDC and</li> </ul>	<p>Many thanks for your feedback and your comments are noted. Subject to the proposal progressing we will keep you updated through the implementation phase.</p>

## Appendix A

	<p>satisfied that under the new proposal, service delivery will be maintained and possibly even enhanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We understand the sustainability issues with the delivery of CCTV services and are supportive of the proposal.</li> <li>• We believe that this proposal offers a solution to the future cost pressures associated with upgrading FDC's Server, Control System &amp; Memory Capacity.</li> <li>• We have no concerns regarding the move of the monitoring suite to Peterborough.</li> </ul> <p>Estates Area Manager (Fenland)</p>	
Whittlesey Town Council	Meeting 9 <sup>th</sup> January – FDC Officers asked to attend	
Wisbech Town Council	<p><b><u>Proposed shared CCTV service between Fenland District Council and Peterborough City Council</u></b></p> <p>Members considered Fenland District Council's proposal to enter into a shared CCTV service with Peterborough City Council. The Clerk had forwarded to members, in advance of the meeting, a copy of the consultation letter from Fenland District Council (FDC) and a copy of the presentation which had been delivered to attendees by representatives of FDC at a consultation meeting (the invitees had been members and officers of the</p>	<p>The feedback and thoughts given by the town council is very much appreciated and if the proposal is approved by the Council regular updates will be given by the Council through the quarterly meeting updates and other communications as required.</p>



## Appendix A

---

	<p>Town Councils within Fenland) held at Fenland Hall on 12 December 2018. The consultation exercise in relation to this proposal closes on 4 January 2019.</p> <p>The Clerk explained to members of the rationale for this proposal, i.e. for FDC to be able to address the actions within its Comprehensive Spending Review of 2015 whilst continuing to deliver an efficient and effective CCTV service for the District.</p> <p>Under the proposed shared CCTV service there would be: (1) a shared control room, including shared management; (2) a commercial delivery approach; (3) a delivery model for a shared service. It would operate on the basis of a shared 50/50 partnership; it would not be a takeover of one service by another.</p> <p>Fenland District Council has stated that, through any shared partnership, the service delivery and commitment to Fenland District Council's existing stakeholders (which includes the Town Councils within Fenland) and customers' service level arrangements would continue and, where possible, service delivery would be enhanced.</p> <p>As Peterborough City Council (PCC) possesses more modern back office systems at this time, the cost of delivering the service from Fenland District Council's current control room would be far greater than the costs of re-locating Fenland</p>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

---

	<p>District Council's control room to Peterborough City Council's control room. Therefore, the proposal includes the shared service being delivered from the PCC control room. The total level of staffing at the shared service control room would increase.</p> <p>Fenland District Council summarises the benefits of a shared CCTV service as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· provision of a greater service resilience in maintaining 24/7 delivery without incurring additional costs to customers and funding partners<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• provision of enhanced monitoring levels during peak demands, without incurring additional costs for customers or stakeholders</li><li>• the service would be more flexible to respond to service change needs</li><li>• service delivery would be designed around commercial response and key community safety needs</li><li>• systems are being designed to be a single operating platform, which helps ensure consistency in service delivery by staff, improved training delivery and allowing future growth to be integrated with ease</li><li>• systems would also allow for performance monitoring of all connected services to be delivered as per the needs of agreed SLAs and to allow full</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

---

	<p>customer insight in to services delivered and received. This would be a significant improvement upon existing delivery methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• re-locating the FDC monitoring to PCC removes the need for investment within the FDC control room. PCC has recently invested in modernising its control room; this has led to an enhanced video wall, command and control systems and will also allow for the digitalisation and replacement of the Fenland recording systems, which would be required in the next financial year</li><li>• a shared service provides the foundation and platform to grow commercial revenue and customer contracts due to added geographical coverage.</li></ul> <p>The Clerk commented that Fenland District Council states that the proposed shared service approach would help secure the CCTV service going forward and help mitigate against additional costs to stakeholders to bring about change and future ongoing capital investment for technology.</p> <p>Following the Clerk's initial reporting on this matter, the Mayor invited Councillor Oliver, in his capacity as Fenland District Council Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Safety (which</p>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

---

	<p>includes the Fenland CCTV service), to speak on this matter.</p> <p>Councillor Oliver informed members that Fenland District Council (FDC) had operated a CCTV service in Fenland since 1990 and that it had been decided, as part of the Comprehensive Service Review (CSR) in 2015, that the system would be upgraded to wireless technology; following completion of that work, it had been possible to attract commercial customers (and associated income) to the service. Another outcome of the CSR had been a decision that a shared service option would be explored.</p> <p>Councillor Oliver expressed the opinion that the proposed shared service proposal (with a 50/50 partnership) is a good one, both for the District Council and the community of Fenland. The fact that Peterborough City Council had already upgraded its control room avoids the need for Fenland District Council to spend £150,000 on upgrading its control room; if there were no re-location of the Fenland CCTV service to the control room at Peterborough, Fenland District Council would incur its own upgrading costs; this would result in Fenland District Council needing to increase its charges to the Town Councils in the District. He explained the financial impact for Fenland District Council of not proceeding with a shared service arrangement.</p> <p>Members were informed by</p>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

---

	<p>Councillor Oliver of the key benefits of the proposed shared CCTV service, as had been articulated by the Clerk earlier in the meeting. In addition, he mentioned that the proposal is supported by the Police (which currently generate 51% of the service demand). In addition, Councillor Oliver mentioned that Wisbech Town Council has the opportunity to monitor the situation for the remainder of the term of its current Service Level Agreement with Fenland District Council (which is in force until 31 March 2021). If implemented, the shared CCTV service would be fully operational in November 2019.</p> <p>At the invitation of the Mayor, Councillor Oliver responded to members' questions.</p> <p>Councillor Wing commented that he could see many positives to the proposed shared CCTV service but expressed his concern regarding the possibility of job losses in Wisbech as a result; he asked what action would be taken to minimise local job losses. In response, Councillor Oliver made the point that a change to any service delivery arrangement could result in the need for fewer staff; in this case, all of the current CCTV staff at Peterborough City Council and Fenland District Council (FDC) would have the opportunity apply for jobs within the shared CCTV team; in addition, any of the staff who are employed by FDC currently and who are appointed to a similar role within the new team would benefit from a higher rate</p>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

---

	<p>of pay (as the salaries paid by PCC are higher than those paid by FDC).</p> <p>Councillor Tierney expressed concerns as to the loss of local knowledge in the case of the Fenland CCTV cameras being monitored by current PCC staff and also whether, given that Fenland District Council is a smaller council than Peterborough City Council, the proposed partnership would, in reality, operate on a 50/50 basis. He stated, however, that he has every confidence Councillor Oliver would do his best to ensure that the proposed CCTV shared service arrangement would work well for the people of Fenland.</p> <p>In response to a request from Councillor Lynn for detailed statistics in relation to the CCTV service, Councillor Oliver drew his attention to the fact that information is provided by Fenland District Council to each Town Council on a monthly basis (and which the Clerk forwards to councillors) and mentioned that additional information is provided quarterly to the council's representatives at the CCTV Partner Liaison meetings (Wisbech Town Council is currently represented at these meetings by Councillors Oliver and Wing and the Clerk). Councillor Oliver undertook to discuss with the relevant officer at Fenland District Council whether that information could be made available more widely.</p> <p>Members decided that</p>	
--	--	--

## Appendix A

	<p>(1) the information presented by the Clerk and Councillor Oliver and the comments made and questions asked by members be noted;</p> <p>(2) this minute be forwarded to Fenland District Council as Wisbech Town Council's consultation response in relation to the District Council's proposal to enter into a shared CCTV service with Peterborough City Council.</p>	
--	---	--

### Other feedback received during the proposal development

Issue	Response
<p>Co-locating – through a shared service knowledge of geographical area will be lost?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Through any service delivery model, both current and proposed, will have points where new staff or added areas will bring about new learning for the team. This is experienced currently at FDC control room with using external support staff to provide resilience to the CCTV team during times of leave and sickness. This is mitigated against by delivering comprehensive training prior to operators taking control of the system.</li> <li>○ If this proposal goes ahead, then all operators will be provided with opportunities for 'swap' days between the two control rooms to allow for the team to get to understand each area and learn from each respective area the pattern of life and the locations covered. Both teams of operators will share the skillset needed to be an effective operator and this will allow each member to learn and adapt to the new areas covered by each respective area.</li> <li>○ There will be a full training package developed and delivered prior to any shared control room going live to ensure that the team is fully integrated and working towards single operating procedures within the shared control room including local knowledge.</li> <li>○ The potential benefit by sharing monitoring across a broader geographical area will be around knowledge on perpetrators. As you will know offending does not respect district council boundaries and through this proposal will naturally</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

	<p>allow for improved understanding and knowledge on offenders that will and do crime across both areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All the FDC operators will be able to apply for the Operator posts available in the revised structure in accordance with FDC restructure policy.</li> </ul>
<p>Police – through a shared control room will mean police will struggle to attend Peterborough to access CCTV data?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Police operational model covers both Fenland and Peterborough under the Northern division. The shared control room proposal is mirroring the Police operational model. This should bring about some form of efficiencies and conversations will be had with the Police to understand ways in which data can be accessed in a more efficient manner. There are opportunities to make use of technology to allow front line officers to access data without attending the control room. This will be explored with policing leads to ascertain if this is an option to progress.</li> <li>○ There is also a full time Police Liaison Officer (PLO) within Peterborough control room who conducts police reviews and provides a single point of contact for CCTV. It is likely that this role would also then help cover Fenland requests thereby helping to improve and enhance current work practices in Fenland which is currently carried out by a volunteer on a part time approach.</li> </ul>
<p>Town Councils – have they been consulted?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All our contributing partners and stakeholders will be informed of the proposal when any decision is likely to be made. It is important to note that from the proposal presented that there will be no change in the commitments or the services detailed within the Service Level Agreements we have with each Town Council.</li> <li>○ In fact, the proposal will support going forward the Council to maintain service continuity through improved resilience and to help continuously improve services we deliver locally. This is a key principle of the proposal.</li> <li>○ Consultation for all contributing partners including the Town Councils will commence from the 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018 to 4<sup>th</sup> January 2019 with a partner meeting being held on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2018.</li> </ul>
<p>The number of staff managing the CCTV has already been reduced by around 50% some time ago. (I am deliberately not mentioning the actual number of staff that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is not correct. In 2009, the monitoring operation was taken in-house with 5 members of staff (4 x 1FTE and 1 x 0.75FTE). In 2010, a further two operators, which were part time roles were recruited.</li> <li>○ Over time and through natural staff turnover the part time roles were removed and instead</li> </ul>



## Appendix A

<p>currently operate there)!</p>	<p>replaced with a full time supervisor role in 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This lead to 5 FTE (5 heads) to deliver the monitoring service as opposed to the previous 5.5 FTE (6 heads).</li> <li>○ An external contractor is also utilised to support service resilience during any planned leaved and pinch points.</li> </ul>
<p>When someone is arrested in Fenland, they are usually taken to the police operation in King's Lynn. If they require evidence, they then need to visit the existing CCTV office in Fenland and identify what they need, a copy is then made in order to provide evidence. If the CCTV service is moved to Peterborough, the Police will be required to travel there instead.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is correct; however the proposal now follows the Policing operational model under the Northern Division. If the proposal is approved then discussions will be held with key policing personal to understand the impact that this may have and to discuss if there are efficient ways to obtain CCTV data as compared as to what they do now. There are options with technology to provide police with CCTV access without the need to attend any control room. This would be an investment option that they may take forward with support from the council. There is also the use of the PLO that could be used.</li> </ul>
<p>We understand the proposal to move the CCTV from Fenland to Peterborough has already been raised with our CCTV staff. Has this also been discussed with the police?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That is correct. Staff have been advised of the exploration work and that there is a proposal being put forward to members for consideration. Staff have been advised of likely timescales but also advised that no decision has been made on this.</li> <li>○ Police do not fund FDC CCTV service at all but will be consulted with during the process if the proposal is approved along the lines mentioned above.</li> </ul>
<p>Since the inception of CCTV into Fenland around 1996, we believe this important safety service, whilst virtually invisible, is appreciated by our residents, the police and our Fenland businesses. It's also recognised that it does need upgrading.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That is another benefit of this proposal as the customer, funding partners and businesses see no change at all to the service, the CCTV deterrent remains.</li> <li>○ That is an important point that the service has significant costs and needs ongoing upgrade. Ongoing infrastructure costs will be needed. So again this proposal helps protects what is a non-statutory service by sharing costs wherever possible across 2 geographical areas. As an example there is £110,000 needed for Capital to upgrade the recording system that if the proposal was agreed would not be needed as this has been done at PCC.</li> </ul>
<p>We will no doubt be told that "we are required to make savings". You all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This is not true in this proposal, in fact it enhances the service as the staff resource will be much more robust and resilient than what we currently</li> </ul>

## Appendix A

<p>know that this actually means cutting services. even though we have increased council tax yet again.</p>	<p>offer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The service has been one area where there has been significant investment in recent years (210,000)</li> <li>○ In designing the proposal one of the design principles was that there was to be no change in what service is given to our funding partners and community.</li> <li>○ The proposal does reduce costs but does not cut the service at all.</li> </ul>
<p>The emphasis over to commercialisation will very much hinder the ability of CCTV to provide any effective Public Safety role.</p> <p>It will indeed lead to the problems you indicated and all in the name of making a profit through commercialisation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The current service has already followed a commercial approach for many years to help improve the service and to offset running costs. This has been carefully considered and in fact has enhanced services that are delivered to the local community. This can be seen through improved out of hours servicing for key areas such as homelessness and environmental nuisance as well as the recent delivery of CCTV monitoring to the local hospitals which are attended by our local community. All this adds to providing and enhancing our public safety.</li> <li>○ Commercialisation will help support and protect services going forward. CCTV is a non-statutory service so we must diversify the costs for this service to ensure it continues through future financial pressures.</li> <li>○ This is not a profit making exercise but instead is about protecting this service for the council, its partners and the community.</li> </ul>
<p>It is hard to imagine that any business will consider paying for cameras.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposed business case commercial options has a very diverse model covering a number of areas which are either already proven and tested or been checked against other commercial expertise who have also validated what has been put forward could be successful. Some suggested options were removed as part of the process.</li> <li>○ However, the business case savings are not hinged on this area and any predicted income or savings has not been projected for this.</li> </ul>