



**Chilwell West
Community Action Team
Minutes of Meeting
Chilwell Community Centre
Thursday 27 September 2018**



Present:

Councillor E Atherton	Broxtowe Borough Council	EA
Councillor G Harvey	Broxtowe Borough Council	GH
Councillor E Kerry	Broxtowe Borough Council	EK
A McLeish	Broxtowe Borough Council	AM
J Hughes	Nottinghamshire Police	JH
C Tideswell	Neighbourhood Forum	CT

Apologies:

Cllr T Brindley Broxtowe Borough Council

Residents:

8 residents attended.

1. Minutes of Meeting held 22 March

Minutes agreed.

2. PCSO J Hughes

Residents described various anti-social behaviour incidents that are occurring in the park. JH was aware and confirmed that Acceptable Behaviour Contracts had been issued – a first step in controlling the situation but further action can be taken if needed.

JH advised residents to be vigilant with the darker nights drawing in and brought some home safety, purple bells window alarms and stickers with him for residents.

EK discussed a recent community safety meeting where he spoke with Paddy Tipping to increase police funding for beat managers and PCSOs and therefore pleased to see police presence at CAT meetings.

Always phone 101 to report incidents as this can be used to track patterns of behaviour. However, if it is an emergency/imminent risk or danger then use 999.

To contact the police at Beeston for beat teams dial 101

101 Ext: 3189980

101 Ext: 3189983

3. Residents' Issues

- a. Need to get a camera connecting fixture on the lamp post – children need protecting. GH explained that the camera fixture at the community centre belongs to Nottinghamshire County Council and therefore cannot be used and that currently did not meet the criteria for a camera as yet. Resident expressed that the rules needed changing. EK recommended that the CAT meeting send a message to the Council, supported by the Police, such that the issue is looked at. JH will take this message back to the Inspector.

EK happy to progress this issue and have a meeting to discuss. Residents to let him know.

- b. The allotments need better fencing. Resident advised to get the allotment committee to write to Tim Crawford at the Council.
- c. Resident described frustration at getting a clear answer as to who should clear up the fallen tree part on Valley Road. EK explained that due to the high winds that the council was very busy with similar issues.
- d. Residents expressed disappointment in the quality of gardening completed on Ghost House Lane. Other issues included the poppies being cut by the tram and grass cuttings being left all over the place.

The Environment section at the Council is to be invited to the next meeting to discuss further.

Contact the telephone number on the Tenancy Agreement. EK explained that a consultation is currently running on the refresh / review of tenancy agreements.

- e. Repeated fly tipping - report fly tipping on line or by phone. Resident suggested leaving a permanent skip. It was suggested that removal costs for sofas/fridges etc was too high. The revised tenancy agreement will recognise those caught fly tipping and affect the tenancy.

A "Clean Up Day" was suggested

Councillors to take idea to the Environment Committee to consider clean-up costs/discuss options

- f. GH will look into why some Ribblesdale flats do not have recycle bins.
- g. EK explained to a resident that a housing needs assessment has been conducted.
- h. EK explained to a resident that evicting people for their behaviour is difficult and that a better way forward would be to encourage people to change their behaviour in the first instance.
- i. EK explained to residents that Broxtowe Borough Council has recruited a Tenancy Sustainment Officer and a Financial Inclusion Officer to assist tenants and to aid reducing the risk of eviction.
- j. Resident raised awareness of another resident's issue - that recently moved into one of BBC's houses in that the house is alleged to have been in disrepair when they moved in. EK explained that vouchers to decorate are available and asked resident to pass on his details should the other resident need to discuss with him.
- k. GH to send information/link about CCTV with the minutes

Please see email to Cllr Harvey at the end of the minutes from CCTV manager below.

4. Neighbourhood Forum

The MOD will be meeting Councillors on the 8 October to discuss the Barracks. Councillors are independent of the Forum and therefore need to meet to discuss options. The Forum would like everything completed at the same time but the MOD would like a staged approach and it is this that they wish to explain to Councillors.

Councillors cannot influence anything but influence can be achieved by residents and for this reason Chilwell West residents are strongly encouraged to take an active part in the Forum.

5. Date of Next Meeting - TBC

The date of the next meeting is to be confirmed.

Residents do not need to wait until the next meeting to raise concerns. Please contact the councillors, office hours preferably.

“Dear Cllr Harvey

Unfortunately the council is not able to just install surveillance equipment in a reactive response to dealing with antisocial behaviour or increase crime levels. Surveillance cameras are considered extremely intrusive and consideration should be given to human rights and Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, respecting the rights of individuals that do not want their lives intruded upon unnecessarily. The surveillance camera commissioner is encouraging councils to look at less intrusive alternatives and these should have been exhausted before considering surveillance cameras as an alternative to reducing or preventing crime for example.

- Neighbourhood watch schemes
- Increased police patrols
- Private security patrols
- Designing out crime – improved building security etc
- Re-educating persons in the value of improved property security

CCTV surveillance cameras are not as effective as most people may think in dealing with crime and whilst they can act as a deterrent, therefore reduces the fear of crime, in reality most cases where criminals know CCTV is present they also know of the CCTV camera limitations and obscure themselves from identification accordingly, in which case any surveillance system may not meet expectations. Surveillance cameras are not always the answer to increased crime levels and may not solve the problem.

If surveillance cameras are considered appropriate and are deemed justifiable to help resolve the problem (this must be evidenced). The council are obliged to act in accordance with the camera surveillance commissioner’s code of practice and can only install surveillances cameras where there is a pressing need and this has been justified by the public protection section of the council and the police, justified by analysing

intelligence, there may be other areas within the borough of greater need. If there was a justified pressing need identified and all other methods of control had been considered/explored (must be evidenced), then the council would have to first carry out privacy impact assessments to establish the level of intrusion on others and conduct a public consultation with the general public and visitors to the area to establish who may be affected/subjected by surveillance. The council/property owner would have to give consideration to the following and demonstrate justification in relation to proportionality.

- **What is the council's purpose for using the surveillance camera system and what are the issues that the system aims to address.**
- **Can a surveillance camera technology realistically deliver these benefits.**
- **What are the views of those who will be under surveillance.**
- **Have other less privacy-intrusive solutions such as improved lighting been considered.**
- **What are the benefits to be gained from using surveillance cameras.**
- **What are the privacy issues arising from this surveillance camera system.**
- **Have any privacy by design features been adopted to reduce privacy intrusion? Could any features be introduced as enhancements.**
- **What organisations will be using the CCTV images and where is data controller responsibility under the Data Protection Act 1998.**
- **Will the surveillance camera equipment being installed and the system of work being adopted be sustainable? Is there sufficient funding for the scheme.**
- **What future demands may arise for wider use of images and how will these be addressed**
- **Will the particular system/equipment being considered deliver the desired benefit now and in the future**
- **Is the system established on a proper legal basis and is it operated in accordance with the law**
- **Is the system necessary to address a pressing need, such as public safety, crime prevention or national security**
- **Is it justified in the circumstances**
- **Is it proportionate to the problem that it is designed to deal with**
- **Do any of these measures discriminate against any particular sections of the community**

If any of these conditions have not been fully satisfied, then the use of camera surveillance is not appropriate.

There is currently no budget available for any additional surveillance equipment (a compliant wireless CCTV camera compliant with legal standards would cost approximately £10,000 capital and £1500.00 revenue cost per unit per year depending on whether 24 hour monitoring is required). There is also no Broxtowe owned infrastructure to mount surveillance equipment to , other than the building, which would involve the authority installing infrastructure (CCTV column or affixing to the building) and establish a power supply which could cost between £2000.00 and £6000.00 depending requirements, civil works required and location of the electricity board connection. Not only has funding to be provided for installation, monitoring and on-going maintenance there is a requirement to meet the aforementioned legal conditions mentioned above.

There are cheaper systems on the market and a cloud view system installed locally providing remote access may be more suitable to the community centres needs and requirements, these typically cost between £2000.00 and £4000.00 for installation depending on the number of cameras and data used. There would also be a revenue cost for airtime, cloud storage and secure VPN remote access. First however the reasons and justification requirements must be satisfied as detailed above.

Unfortunately the council can no longer just use the County Council infrastructure (street lighting columns) to accommodate surveillance equipment; the County Council have a strict policy prohibiting Borough/Town Councils from using this equipment.

If you require further clarification on these matters, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

CCTV, Security and Parking Manager
Broxtowe and Rushcliffe Borough Council

If you have any issues regarding the minutes or if you require them in large print or in audio format please contact Alex McLeish - Broxtowe Borough Council, Communities on 0115 917 3431

These minutes can be downloaded at
www.broxtowepartnership.org.uk

नेकर उमीं एच लीडसेट विमी रोत उम्र नं डेरमैट दिंच लैरा सरुंसे रो उं बिप बतवे 0115 9177777 उे
मडे नल मीपतव बते ।

如果你需要此傳單用其他的形式或文字寫成，請撥電話 0115 917 7777 與我們
聯絡。

اگر آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ یہ لیف لیٹ آپ کو اردو زبان میں مہیا کیا جائے
تو براہ مہربانی فون نمبر:- 0115 9177777 پر رابطہ کریں -

If you need this leaflet in other formats or
languages contact us on 0115 917 7777
