

Meeting Date: Tuesday 10 June 2014
Location: Council Chambers, Level 6, Civic Centre, 1 Devlin Street, Ryde
Time: 7.30pm

Council Meetings will be recorded on audio tape for minute-taking purposes as authorised by the Local Government Act 1993. Council Meetings will also be webcast.

NOTICE OF BUSINESS

Item	Page
------	------

LATE ITEMS

12 CCTV CAMERAS IN EASTWOOD	1
-----------------------------------	---

LATE ITEMS

12 CCTV CAMERAS IN EASTWOOD

Report prepared by: Community Projects Officer – Roads and Community Safety
File No.: GRP/09/4/10 - BP14/667

REPORT SUMMARY

This is a Late Report and this matter is presented for Council's consideration as to whether Council should accept an invitation to apply for funding under the Safer Streets Program, which closes on 12 June.

At its meeting on 22 April 2014, Council resolved that a report be prepared assessing the feasibility and benefits of CCTV cameras in Eastwood Plaza in response to an invitation by Mr John Alexander OAM MP to apply for a grant under the Safer Streets Program.

Council also discussed an incident in the vicinity of Glen Reserve and requested that the report consider relevant crime prevention options in that area. The discussion also noted a previous decision by Council in 2011, which was supported by the NSW Police Local Area Command (LAC) to not pursue installation of CCTV cameras in Eastwood Town Centre.

Council staff undertook an assessment in conjunction with officers from Ryde Local Area Command of safety issues and the concern leading to the Korean Chamber of Commerce's request for CCTV in Eastwood Town Centre, including the costs for CCTV installation, maintenance and operation. Staff also reviewed recent research published as a result of a national survey of CCTV experience by local government; its effectiveness and related costs (**ATTACHED**).

This report presents the outcomes of safety audits, crime data analysis, assessments of other relevant crime prevention measures, and the evaluation of CCTV as an effective solution to both specific safety issues and the perception of safety in Eastwood.

Analysis of the above research does not support the installation of CCTV in Eastwood Town Centre as a crime prevention measure. However the report recommends that Council accept the invitation to apply for funding under the Safer Streets Program for improvement and installation of lighting and selective installation of CCTV in Glen Street Carpark in Eastwood as identified by Police and Council staff and outlined in the body of this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) That Council accept the invitation to apply for funding under the Safer Streets Program to provide lighting and CCTV in Eastwood in the vicinity of Glen Reserve, Eastwood Plaza and Glen Street Carpark as outlined in the body of this report.

ITEM 12 (continued)

- (b) That Council work with Ryde LAC and the Chambers of Commerce and other community leaders to conduct a program of safety audits and education for local retailers.
- (c) That Council endorse the proposed works at Glen Street and Rowe Street Carparks and Glen Reserve Eastwood as outlined in this report.

ATTACHMENTS**1 Surveillance Politics and Local Government**

Report Prepared By:

Lisa Pears**Community Projects Officer – Roads and Community Safety**

Report Approved By:

Derek McCarthy**Manager - Community Capacity and Events****Baharak Sahebekhtiari****Acting Group Manager - Community Life**

ITEM 12 (continued)**Background**

Council resolved, at its meeting held 22 April 2014:

(a) That Council staff prepare a report for Council's consideration on 27 May 2014, on the cost of CCTV installation and maintenance including possible ongoing maintenance funding from any level of Government. The report should include details of previous investigations into the provision of CCTV cameras.

(b) That the report be considered by Council prior to further consideration of the offer by Federal Member for Bennelong Mr Alexander OAM MP.

The offer referred to is the invitation from the Attorney General's Department for the City of Ryde to apply for \$200,000 of Federal funding through the Safer Streets Program for the purpose of installing CCTV in Eastwood. This round of funding is available by invitation only to nominated Councils to implement commitments announced during the 2013 election campaign.

History

Council allocated \$100,000 in the 2008/2009 Management Plan for the installation of CCTV cameras in 'hot spot' locations across the City, as identified by Council in consultation with Police. CCTV was installed in a number of Council buildings and parks to deter anti-social behaviour and protect Council property. Ongoing safety concerns around the pedestrian subway at Eastwood station resulted in the installation of seven cameras and lighting upgrades.

In 2011 Council received a request from the Korean Chamber of Commerce (KCC) to install CCTV in Eastwood to prevent crimes against shops and offices, specifically along the eastern side of Rowe Street and around Eastwood Shopping Centre due to an increase in shop-related crime. Advice and an assessment of crime data was sought from Police in addition to conducting a review of costs and relevant research on the application of CCTV.

Council also received a request from Eastwood Local Area Command to undertake a safety audit at Glen Street Carpark in order to assess the suitability of installing CCTV, lighting and other safety measures following a number of armed robberies and assaults in the car park and surrounding streets.

Both requests were considered by the Crime Prevention Advisory Committee, and it was recommended that CCTV not be installed in Eastwood Town Centre, and that a safety audit of Glen Street Carpark be undertaken by Council and Eastwood LAC. This audit resulted in a number of recommendations including improved lighting, signage and painting.

ITEM 12 (continued)

Discussion

Council staff undertook an assessment in conjunction with Ryde LAC of safety issues and the concern leading to the Korean Chamber of Commerce's request for CCTV in Eastwood Town Centre, including the costs for CCTV installation, maintenance and operation. Staff also reviewed recent research published as a result of a national survey of CCTV experience by local government; its effectiveness and related costs. Staff also took into account assessment by three other Councils that are considering whether to make application under the Safer Streets Program 2014.

This process involved:

- Understanding the nature of the community concerns driving requests for CCTV in Eastwood.
- Conducting safety audits of areas identified for CCTV by the community.
- Compiling and analysing crime data over the past two years.
- Identifying the current scope and operation of Council owned CCTV and the annual cost of maintenance.
- Reviewing the latest available research on the use of CCTV as a crime prevention tool.

Current Community Concerns

Community concern in relation to the retail part of the Town Centre stems from stealing crimes taking place within shops, a lack of reporting attributed to cultural differences as well as the length of time a retailer would have to dedicate to make a report. There is a belief that CCTV presence may improve confidence for reporting and / or be a deterrent. A petition was presented to Council signed by business owners and residents in Eastwood urging Council to apply for the allocated funding from the Safer Streets Program.

A serious assault in May 2014 in the vicinity of Glen Reserve led to requests for consideration of CCTV in that area as a deterrent and assistance to police in apprehending the offender.

There has been an underlying assumption that the installation of CCTV would include monitoring and hence improve safety.

Results of Safety Audits and Crime Data Review

The Ryde Local Government Area has a relatively low crime rate for almost every major offence as reported in the March 2014 update of NSW Recorded Crime Statistics. City of Ryde's ratio to NSW rate of recorded incidents per 100,000 population for *assault, break and enter non-dwelling* and *motor vehicle theft* for the past 12 months is in the lowest band. In 2013 Ryde ranked 30 out of the 140 LGAs with populations greater than 3,000 for recorded incidents of *steal from retail store*, which is higher than most Lower Northern Sydney LGAs except for Willoughby, ranked 6 in 2013. Note that compared to Hunters Hill, Lane Cove, North Sydney and

ITEM 12 (continued)

Mosman, both Ryde and Willoughby have both major retail and commercial centres. Ryde's recorded incidents of *malicious damage* have consistently decreased since 2009 and in 2013 Ryde is ranked lower than both Hunters Hill and North Sydney.

Council staff and Ryde LAC Crime Prevention Officers conducted safety audits of Rowe Street east, Eastwood Plaza and Glen Street Carpark (including Glen Reserve) on 3 June 2014. Police also reviewed crime data for Eastwood from January 2012 to June 2014 and compared data from four areas within Eastwood being;

1. Rowe Street east (bound by Blaxland Road and Railway Parade)
2. Glen Street Carpark and Glen Reserve (bounded by Glen Street, Hillview Lane, Lakeside Street and Shaftsbury Road)
3. Rowe Street west (bounded by West Parade and Shaftsbury Road – includes Eastwood Plaza)
4. All other surrounding streets within Eastwood.

The subsequent report did not support the installation of CCTV in Rowe Street east for the same reasons cited in previous reviews:

- Crime data shows this area to have the lowest rate of reported crime in Eastwood, and while reporting levels may be low in the community, both crime data and non-reported incidents cited in correspondence to Council indicate that the key concern is robbery from retail stores, and is occurring inside stores on private property.
- The most effective use of CCTV to target this kind of crime is placement inside the store to cover the entry/exit points and cash counters. This is the best way to capture footage of the offender's face that can be used for identification.
- As the Council system of CCTV is not monitored, the main purpose of CCTV is to assist with the identification of offenders. Installing cameras on the street will not provide the coverage required to capture usable footage of entry/exit points at each shop. Cameras would be too high and encounter too many obstructions from awnings and signage. Only placement of a camera at virtually every shop entrance would provide the best chance of capturing viable footage.

While police regularly distribute information on safety and security for retail stores in the area, they have noted that there are still many shop owners who are not aware of measures that can be taken to reduce the risk of robbery and retail theft.

The main safety concern identified was the maintenance of the Council car park in Rowe Street east and a recommendation for review of plantings, signage and lighting.

It is also recommended that Council and Ryde LAC work together with the KCC to develop and deliver information and resources in Korean that will encourage shop owners to review safety measures in their stores, and to report crime to police. The most recent reported incidences in that area have involved theft of staff bags from inside a number of stores – all have been left unattended behind the counter.

ITEM 12 (continued)Eastwood Plaza and the western end of Rowe Street

While this area has the highest reported numbers of crimes involving stealing, it is also predominantly retail theft, and the same concerns around the effectiveness of CCTV apply as above.

The audit did recommend a lighting review be undertaken in the plaza.

Glen Street Carpark and Glen Reserve

This area was found to be one that would benefit most from crime prevention works. As a result of the safety audit undertaken in 2011, a number of improvements were made by Council to address the increasing incidences of assault, armed robbery and stealing from cars. These included installation of lighting in Glen Reserve, pruning of bushes, Park Smarter signage in the car park and the removal of the picnic setting from the isolated section of the park behind the car park to the vicinity of the playground and has been successful in reducing the number of serious incidences since implementation.

Police noted that assaults and robberies have dropped since the works were undertaken, however there are a number of risk areas that Police believe need to be prioritised for action.

Police recommended improved lighting, pruning and removal of high-growing shrubs, cleaning and rubbish removal as needed in the area of the car park and along the pathway between the canal and the car park and Glen Reserve. The Police also recommended that placement of CCTV at the entrance and exits to the car park could potentially enhance the other measures recommended.

While police advised that the assault at Hillview Lane/Glen Reserve was an isolated incident, it is recommended that lighting in the entire area of Glen Reserve, Hillview Lane and Glen Street be reviewed.

Council Operated CCTV

Council currently owns and operates 162 CCTV cameras in the City of Ryde. The main purpose for the installation and enhancement of CCTV around council property and parks is to deter anti-social behaviour in an effort to protect council property, including offices, libraries, venues, parks and assets. Council also operates seven cameras located in the pedestrian underpass at Eastwood Train Station. All CCTV equipment is managed by a specialist contractor that provides scheduled servicing, required maintenance and repairs and the retrieval of footage as required.

It is important to note that City of Ryde does not operate a CCTV network. CCTV cameras are not part of a wireless network that can be monitored and checked remotely. Without this infrastructure, Council operated CCTV cannot be used to detect crimes in progress.

ITEM 12 (continued)

The lack of monitoring limits the scope for CCTV to be used as an effective deterrent. If community expectations are that Council operated CCTV has been installed in the public domain specifically to address safety concerns and will provide a level of assured security and the prompt response to a crime in progress, there are liability risks for Council, as noted in the *NSW Government Policy Statement and Guidelines for the Establishment and Implementation of CCTV in Public Places*.

CCTV as a Crime Prevention Tool

Research has consistently found that use of surveillance cameras as a criminal deterrent is most likely to succeed as part of a broader crime reduction strategy with active monitoring and where police are able to respond quickly to a developing incident. As noted in the *NSW Government Policy Statement and Guidelines for the Establishment and Implementation of CCTV in Public Places*:

“One of the premises behind the use of CCTV as a crime prevention strategy is that police can be alerted to incidents as they emerge or occur. This allows for early response by police. CCTV is also used for detection and conviction of offenders. It is noted that for a crime prevention strategy to have any deterrence value, potential offenders must perceive a real threat of detection and apprehension.”

A more effective measure, one that has consistently found to have an impact on the incidence of crime, is the installation of targeted street lighting. Improved street lighting assists natural surveillance and can help to activate spaces that may previously have been avoided due to real and perceived safety risks.

Costs

Current annual maintenance costs for Council’s 162 cameras is \$162,000 in service charges (\$250 per camera per quarter) plus 10% sundries and parts (repairs, replacements etc) for a total of approximately \$180,000 per year.

Currently Council’s Property staff responds to 1-2 requests for footage per week, spending on average two hours per request. Any additional cameras will lead to an increase in requests for footage, requiring more reliance on contractors at a call out fee.

Costs associated with the installation of CCTV are variable depending on infrastructure and works required at each location.

Installation costs (at a minimum, in line with Council’s existing operations) would be:

- \$45,000 for cabling, purchase of the video recording box (to allow 30 days recording) and power connection works per camera cluster.
- Approximately \$3,500 per camera.
- Approximately \$10,000 per pole – where there is no suitable structure available on which cameras can be mounted.

ITEM 12 (continued)

Additional installation costs include:

- Production and installation of signage as per legislation.
- Project management.
- Site audit by contractors.
- Clearing site obstructions to enable sightlines for cameras, including pruning, relocation or removal works.
- Installation of additional lighting to enable the recording of useable footage.
- As technology changes there will be further costs associated with updating systems.

Ongoing maintenance costs include:

- Approximately \$1100 per camera, per year in servicing costs.
- Allocation of additional staff resources to conduct evaluation and review processes and reporting.

Enabling a Monitoring System

Establishing a wireless network is significantly more expensive to purchase and install and is essential to provide monitoring.

Estimates have put this at an investment of around \$500,000 to secure suitable premises, install infrastructure, purchase and install hardware and train staff. The annual cost of maintaining this facility will vary according to the level of monitoring undertaken. The City of Sydney currently spends almost \$1.7m per year to operate and monitor a network of 87 cameras 24/7 with maintenance and upgrades costs on top of that.

The City of Joondalup (WA) received \$150,000 funding through the Safer Streets Program in 2007 to install 37 cameras and annual maintenance and monitoring costs are around \$200,000.

There is no existing funding available from State or Federal Government for the ongoing maintenance of CCTV operated by local Councils.

The most common source of ongoing funding is through the general Council revenue.

An increasing number of Councils are funding CCTV networks via a levy on businesses or through some form of business funding. Three councils (Brisbane, Gold Coast and Logan) fund the ongoing operation of the camera system entirely through a business levy.

Cost is primarily dependent upon the level of monitoring and maintenance costs. Monitoring is however clearly the most significant expense.

ITEM 12 (continued)

The following is extracted from the report; *Surveillance politics and local government: A national survey of federal funding for CCTV in Australia*- authored by Robert Carr, University of Wollongong. The report relied on a survey of local councils who received funding from the Federal Government between 2004 and 2012 through the National Community Crime Prevention Program for installation of CCTV.

The survey revealed that the technology has become a financial burden for local governments and their ratepayers. CCTV has been an expensive cost-shifting exercise for local councils. As one respondent stated, 'The shortcomings of CCTV are many and do not match the cost to install, monitor and maintain'.

Almost all councils surveyed stated that while the costs for installing CCTV were covered by federal funding, it was local government and their ratepayers that absorbed ongoing running costs, repairs, staffing to monitor screens and other operational aspects including upgrades.

Significantly, none of the survey respondents indicated that installing more CCTV cameras was the answer to existing operational financial burdens. More cameras would 'lock' councils into increased financial pressures and over-extending council resources, creating inefficiency and a decreased capacity to staff and maintain community safety programmes.

Conclusion

There is currently no evidence that Eastwood Town Centre would benefit from CCTV and according to the attached report, the usefulness of CCTV in Eastwood is limited due to the type of crime that is most prevalent.

As the Safer Street Program grants are a significant but irregular opportunity for Council to secure funding for crime prevention works, it is imperative that Council's application and any subsequent funds address the solutions as highlighted by the safety audit.

It is recommended that Council accept the invitation from the Attorney General's Department to apply for funding for crime prevention works as outlined below.

It is further recommended that Council in conjunction with the Police and the community undertake some work (as outlined below) to address some of the other issues identified.

Rowe Street East:

- No action to be taken in relation to CCTV.
- Develop a program in conjunction with the Police, Chambers of Commerce and other community leaders to deliver safety awareness resources and training to retailers including retail safety audits, advice on installation of CCTV and the implementation of other safety measures to reduce the risk of crime, and reinforcing the importance of reporting crime.

ITEM 12 (continued)

- Undertake pruning of plantation and signage to improve sightlines and review the existing lighting in the Council car park.

Western Side of Rowe Street and Plaza:

- Review lighting in the plaza to ensure adequate coverage
- Offer the program in conjunction with the Police, Chambers of Commerce and other community leaders to deliver safety awareness resources and training to retailers including retail safety audits, advice on installation of CCTV and the implementation of other safety measures to reduce the risk of crime, and reinforcing the importance of reporting crime.

Glen Street Carpark and Glen Reserve

- Seek funding for increased lighting around Glen Reserve and review the need for additional lighting along Hillview Lane to address any dark spots as per police recommendation.
- Seek funding to improve lighting, signage and selective painting in the Glen Street Carpark.
- Seek funding to place CCTV at the entrance and exits to the car park.
- Undertake pruning and removal of high-growing shrubs, cleaning of existing lighting and rubbish removal as needed in the area of the car park and along the pathway between the canal and the car park and Glen Reserve.

Options

Aside from the proposed action recommended in this report Council could apply for funding to install additional CCTV cameras in the Eastwood Town Centre. This option is not recommended because the strategy would not address identified issues, is not recommended by the Police and would create a significant ongoing cost to Council.

Financial Implications

Should Council resolve to accept the recommendation of this report there will be costs associated with the pruning and removal of obstructing shrubbery, and the cleaning of the Council car parks in Glen Street and Rowe Street. The cost of these works can be met within the relevant operational budgets already approved by Council.

The proposal for lighting upgrade and improvement as well as placement of CCTV camera in Glen Street Carpark will be subject of the funding application and the associated cost met from grant funds.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Original Article

Surveillance politics and local government: A national survey of federal funding for CCTV in Australia

Robert Carr

Department of History and Politics, University of Wollongong, Australia.

E-mail: robert.carr.research@gmail.com

Abstract Closed-circuit Television (CCTV) is increasingly utilised by local councils across Australia. Local government CCTV operated in conjunction with police has brought about new challenges for democracy. This article explores survey results regarding the provision of federal funding to 18 local councils to install CCTV. The costs to councils of operating CCTV have been largely unforeseen. This article examines the contemporary political context in Australia to illuminate reasons why funding is allocated to local councils. CCTV funding is driven by populism and political pressure rather than a more objective rationale. This article suggests the need for new directions in local council CCTV evaluations, and for *critical evaluations* that take into account not just the financial and social costs of CCTV but also political trends. Critical evaluations have the potential to strengthen the capacity of local councils to make more empowered and informed decisions about the costs and implications of operating CCTV.

Security Journal advance online publication, 10 March 2014; doi:10.1057/sj.2014.12

Keywords: CCTV; public surveillance; local government; funding; Australian politics

Introduction

Closed-circuit Television (CCTV) is increasingly utilised by local councils across Australia. Pressures from police, media and the community to enhance community safety have contributed to this growth. In 2002 there were at least 33 'open-street' CCTV camera systems in Australia, which are those systems operating in local malls, streets and thoroughfares (Wilson and Sutton, 2003; Wilson, 2005, p. 43). Since 2004 the Australian Federal Government has granted funding to more than 100 local city councils to install and operate CCTV systems under a range of schemes (Australian Government, 2012; Australian Government, n.d., b, c). This article explores the provision of federal funding to 18 local councils to install and operate CCTV in public places such as parks, squares, malls and buses.

This article investigates the costs to councils of operating CCTV, which have been largely unforeseen. To contextualise these costs I will first discuss international scholarship on CCTV, followed by an analysis of the political context for contemporary use of the technology. This is followed by an examination of more specific implications of CCTV funding for local councils with a view towards implementing more effective evaluations. Local government CCTV is usually operated in conjunction with police and business chambers. These arrangements have brought about new challenges for local councils in both policy and practice. In scrutinising the

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



federal funding programme this article undertakes a literature review of scholarship concerning CCTV and examines the contemporary political context in Australia. In conjunction with a survey this article is intended to illuminate some of the reasons why funding is allocated to local councils. A qualitative and quantitative assessment is offered in this article discussing the results of a local government survey conducted in 2012 entitled 'National Inquiry into Federal Funding for Local Government CCTV Systems in Australia'. These practitioners indicate the successes and limitations they have experienced with funding arrangements.

Although there are crossovers, this article does not engage specifically with the ways in which CCTV has been used in response to retail crime, school or classroom behaviour, or vehicular crime (Welsh and Farrington, 2003; Taylor, 2010; Hayes and Downs, 2011; Taylor, 2013). Nor does it specifically examine control room conditions, monitoring, technological issues or camera placement. Scholars elsewhere have explored these facets as part of an ongoing debate about whether CCTV is an effective crime prevention measure (Poyser, 2004; Gill and Spriggs, 2005; Walby, 2005; Keval and Sasse, 2010). This article does, however, build on scholarship concerning the politics of CCTV and its impacts on local government in Australia (Sutton and Wilson, 2003). It further suggests new directions for local council CCTV evaluations. This article elaborates on the need for *critical evaluations* that take into account not just the financial or social costs of CCTV but also political trends as a mechanism for better and more informed decisions. Critical evaluations will enable practitioners to gain a fuller picture of the kinds of commitments councils can expect to make in undertaking surveillance initiatives.


Literature Review

Before undertaking an exploration of the survey results I will provide a brief literature review of international scholarship concerning CCTV. Germain (2013, p. 135) asks a crucial question: 'how is it that the "CCTV business" continues to do so well?' One explanation within the Australian context is that funding outcomes are yet to be thoroughly evaluated by the Federal Government. Instead, the Federal Government has devolved its responsibilities for evaluating CCTV funding to local governments. Quality assurance on CCTV programmes has been decentralised as local communities have been charged with maintaining their own community safety. As Germain says (2013, p. 141), in relation to a similar scenario in the United Kingdom, 'Encouraged by the central Government, who offered them security partnerships, and called upon to act by their communities, local governments took hold of security issues – all the more willingly on account of their greater powers brought about by decentralization – and made an attempt to develop their own Policy tools, among which included open-street CCTV'.

International studies on CCTV render it difficult to extol the popularly cited virtues of public surveillance. The Australian Government's Institute of Criminology concedes that CCTV is limited as a mechanism for reducing crime or as a tool for crime prevention (Anderson and McAtamney, 2011, p. 421). A frequently cited study produced in 2005 by the British Home Office found that only one out of 14 CCTV systems demonstrated a significant reduction in crime (Gill and Spriggs, 2005). There are 'volumes' of academic studies that dispute the effectiveness of CCTV (Fussey, 2008). Yet 'CCTV has become a *fait accompli*' irrespective of these findings (Taylor, 2010).

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Surveillance politics and local government 

The context for this article is both global and Australian CCTV initiatives. The Australian Government's external focus on global security and the 'War on Terror' coincided with popularly perceived internal threats to law and order. There has been growing acceptance of 'maximum surveillance' and what amounts to the policing of every citizen as though they were criminals-in-waiting (Norris and Armstrong, 1999a). In Australia the ideology of maximum surveillance is not merely unfolding in the literal form with growing numbers of CCTV systems. 'Cultural surveillance' and moral panics have emerged to deal with ethnic minorities and asylum seekers – who perceivably threaten the spatial integrity and the borders of the nation-state as well as hegemonic cultural norms (Tascon, 2004; Poynting and Morgan, 2007). Popular panics have occurred alongside more traditional categories of criminality as well, with particular emphasis on youth 'out of control' in urban spaces (Collins *et al.*, 2000).

Within such a context city planning and design can be viewed as an extension of the hegemonic norms that surround maximum surveillance (Germain, 2013, p. 138). Urban makeover programmes in Australian cities – often dubbed 'revitalisation' by local councils – affirm hegemonic interests. Planners have heeded calls from business to redevelop and enhance spaces for consumption while undertaking to displace social groups that purportedly do not fit within the parameters of the re-design project. Coleman (2004) suggests that the proliferation of CCTV at the level of local government is grounded in hegemonic neoliberalisation of public space and the stratification of the social order to the advantage of free market practitioners committed to increasing urban consumption (Jessop, 2005). The increasing use of CCTV can be explained as:

a reassertion of a class-based discourse on crime, fear and insecurity [which] has been reflected and reinforced by camera networks and the process of local governing more generally. Since the early 1990s, many localities [in the UK] have engaged in competitive bidding for the money to establish surveillance systems The end of the cold war and the buttressing of military-come-surveillance industries with public money have enabled the camera surveillance industry to turn its expertise towards the high street and those 'responsible partners' concerned with its regulation who, as willing exponents of the surveillance 'revolution', have been most vocal in terms of its benefits. (Coleman, 2004, p. 200)

Coleman further argues, 'street cameras do not exist in spatial vacuum. Far from cameras being merely crime prevention devices, what CCTV seems more geared towards is a normative strategy of spatial ordering' (Coleman, 2004, p. 200). Government ideology about CCTV in contemporary society 'can be read as part of an attempt to "hide" some of the consequences of neoliberal entrepreneurialism' such as social inequality, as 'an exercise aimed at local populations towards cultivating consent for entrepreneurial leadership' (Katz, 2001; Coleman, 2004, p. 204). Coleman states, 'numerous references can be found to the idealised neoliberal cityscape of service-led economics, consumption and tourism that sits alongside promises of clean and safer streets' (Coleman, 2004, p. 204).

The Contemporary Political Context for CCTV Funding

An analysis of the political context for CCTV funding is offered in this section, which will assist in highlighting the significance of the survey results. This is particularly applicable to

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



explaining why some responses have indicated the erosion of local government autonomy owing to populism and media pressure to operate CCTV. The national context for CCTV funding in Australia is highly politicised. For politicians, CCTV footage provides the perfect set of images for showcasing just how tough on crime they can be. Detractors of CCTV in Australia have been publicly scorned, and crime captured on CCTV in Australia has become so politicised that supporters of civil liberties have been described as ‘dangerous’ by the media (ABC, 2013). There is media hostility and suspicion towards those who refer to due process and the law in questioning the media’s titillating use of CCTV footage to sell copy (*Illawarra Mercury*, 2013a, b). The mass media frequently receives CCTV footage to publish and there appears to be an expectation that media has an automatic right or obligation to access it regardless of privacy (Wachsmuth, 2013; *Illawarra Mercury*, 2013b).


There are several case studies of note that provide pertinent context for this discussion on the politics of funding CCTV. First, New South Wales (NSW) police have dabbled in surveillance politics and have achieved some success in this area. On 18 February 2011, the NSW Police Association (a police union) used a 5-min tape of Wollongong City Council’s CCTV footage to publicise the notion that street violence was ‘out of control’ in Wollongong and the city’s night space users in a state of lawlessness. Taken from the Council’s federally funded surveillance network – despite a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Wollongong Council – the original 2 years’ worth of footage had been edited, spliced and sequenced into a 5-min compilation by an individual or individuals whose identity remains unknown to the public. The tape was uploaded to YouTube by the Police Association’s publicity contractor and distributed to the media (Essential Media Communications, 2011). The timing of the leaked tape was just a month and a half from the NSW State election. The electoral impact was a widespread sense of urgency to deal with an ‘immediate’ or ‘imminent’ danger to public order. This was despite a 30.4 per cent drop in non-domestic violence in the central Wollongong postcode area 2500 in the 4 years leading up to the leak (New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, 2010) and anecdotal evidence by local police and staff at Wollongong Council to this effect.

The video and associated media coverage produced broad political solidarity. Local political leaders rallied to support police and the need to deal with the city’s ‘out of control’ youth (Tonkin, 2011a, b; Weber, 2011; Webster, 2011a). The campaign stigmatised the city’s young people and fanned moral panic in both local and national media (Channel Ten News, 2011). Local police were shortly after given extra powers, including having their demands for earlier closing times met as well as limits on drinks. The Keneally Labor Government was resoundingly defeated in the election following a major swing towards the NSW Liberal Party. The leak was part of a well-planned, organised and executed publicity campaign conducted by the NSW Police Association. It also tested public trust in Wollongong Council’s CCTV system. The council has since attempted to strengthen its CCTV policy with increased limitations placed on police access and more stringent controls on media gaining copies of footage.¹ This has included inserting a ‘false association’ clause (Wollongong City Council, 2013).

A second case study of note is the politicisation of Jill Meagher’s murder in Melbourne in September 2012. The murder case was purportedly solved because a private storeowner’s CCTV footage contributed evidence, and significant pressure was placed on some councils by police to install more CCTV cameras (SBS World News Australia, 2013; Smethurst, 2013). At the time Tony Abbott announced that if the Liberal-National Coalition won the

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Surveillance politics and local government 

2013 federal election he would re-establish the previous Howard Government's funding scheme for local councils across Australia to install CCTV systems. John Howard spent \$65.5 million of taxpayer money on this programme. Abbott promised to spend \$50 million more (*The Australian*, 2012). In April 2013 Labor Prime Minister Julia Gillard announced that \$40 million would be spent on the National Crime Prevention Fund to support CCTV systems and lighting (Taylor, 2012). This is despite there having been no in-depth scrutiny of the effectiveness, cost-efficiency and usefulness of the CCTV funding scheme by governments as a crime prevention measure adopted by local councils. To date there has been a 'no questions asked' approach to funding CCTV by the Federal Government – no questions coming from federal policy makers about how the funding is measured against objective and critical evaluations of crime in local government areas, and whether CCTV is a measured, practical response that is suited to the role of local councils.

Third, the 'Bonner Case' in 2013 provides crucial insights into the politics surrounding CCTV in Australia at the levels of state and national government. The Administrative Decisions Tribunal (ADT) in the Shoalhaven Local Government Area in NSW on 2 May 2013 ruled that Shoalhaven Council had been operating its federally funded CCTV network illegally. It was a hearing brought about by Shoalhaven resident Adam Bonner. The decision led to the Council unplugging its network even though the ADT ruling was a recommendation and not legally binding. Prime Minister Julia Gillard weighed in on the implications stating, 'No one thing fixes every issue but I do believe CCTV has a role to play in community safety and that's why we support it through federal government money and will continue to do so' (Bigpond News, 2013). NSW Premier Barry O'Farrell quickly went into political spin mode, promulgating a panic: 'I want to see these cameras switched back on in the Shoalhaven as soon as possible' (Bigpond News, 2013). The Member for Kiama Gareth Ward – who was also the former Deputy Mayor of Shoalhaven responsible for installing the CCTV network in Nowra – made his intentions clear to change the law in NSW to accommodate what he and the Premier say is a fundamental need for police to access and monitor local government CCTV.

Perhaps baffling for politicians and other supporters of the technology is that crime rates overall actually went *up* in the Nowra Central Business District (CBD) in the surveillance locations after cameras were installed – only slightly, but they did go up. These statistics were collected by the Council itself (Shoalhaven City Council, 2012). Bonner was threatened with violence and bashing upon the ADT verdict in online forums (Illawarra News, 2013). Internet forums² and the 'victory' declared by the O'Farrell Government after changing the law following the Bonner case reveal the irrelevance of CCTV evaluations to politicians (Carr, 2013). These changes to the *Privacy & Personal Information Protection (PPIP) Act 1998 NSW*, while paraded by O'Farrell and Ward as a political victory, were a façade considering the changes did not render it significantly any easier for CCTV to be operated by local councils lawfully. Shoalhaven City Council had violated Sections 10, 11 and 12 of the PPIP Act according to the ADT decision. The O'Farrell Government amended Section 11 of the PPIP Act, leaving Sections 10 and 12 unchanged (Carr, 2013). The Government's legal changes amount to very little as far as the ADT decision is concerned. The changes only effect 'live transmissions', which can still be regulated by councils through the enforcement of their CCTV policies and MOU with police. Nevertheless, the O'Farrell Government's response received great public fanfare in much of the local media. Populism clearly underpins NSW government support for CCTV. Populism also explains the main urge to deliver spending on CCTV at a federal level and provides an explanation as to why no formal

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



enquiries have been undertaken by the NSW government about the extent of its costs to local governments.

Where questions were raised about the costs of CCTV for government, the O'Farrell Government was quick to backtrack. As noted by the *South Coast Register* shortly after the ADT ruling on the Bonner case, the O'Farrell Government's 'Parliamentary Secretary for Justice David Clarke MLC, who wrote on behalf of the Attorney General Greg Smith to Member for Wagga Daryl McGuire, revealed that the government had refused to fund cameras because "there is limited evidence to support CCTV as an effective crime prevention tool"' (Crawford, 2013). The Member for Kiama contradicted Clarke, insisting that he was 'wrong, wrong, wrong' (Crawford, 2013). Such developments provide insight into the contemporary political context for a policy area that exists alongside a void of critical knowledge and scrutiny regarding the funding of CCTV by government.

National Survey into Federal Funding for Local Government CCTV


Throughout the remainder of this article I explore the results of my survey and conduct a qualitative analysis of the responses. First, I outline the parameters of the survey including the time frame, method, respondents, survey questions and variables. The time frame for this article is limited to funding received by local councils from the Federal Government between 2004 and 2012. The \$65.5 million Howard Government funding scheme dubbed 'The National Community Crime Prevention Programme' (NCCPP) was a major initiative that began in 2004 and ended in 2008 after five rounds of funding. More rounds have since been offered under successive governments (Australian Government, 2012; Australian Government, n.d.b,c). In October 2012 survey responses were sought from all local governments in Australia who have received Federal Government funding for the installation of CCTV systems since grants for the technology were first provided by the Howard Government in 2004. Surveys were sent to 79 local councils directly via the generic email address for public contact rather than a specific department, though in one case an online enquiry form was utilised. Surveys were emailed to a further 15 business chambers or security contractors operating CCTV on behalf of or in conjunction with councils.

A potential hurdle was discovered following correspondence with councils wherein it was found that most CCTV systems are operated by police and not by the councils, which received federal funding. Many of the councils that were the recipients of the grants were not involved in CCTV operation, or occasionally they were involved in a shared operational arrangement between council security contractors and police. For the most part the first scenario predominates. The ability of councils to respond to the survey was limited in regard to offering insights about aspects of council CCTV programmes, particularly by way of providing crime statistics and evaluation reports.

There were 18 councils from across Australia that responded to the survey within the allocated time frame, though none of the business chambers or private contractors responded to the survey. There were four councils that responded in each of the states of NSW and Western Australia: three each from Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia; and one from Queensland. These are, namely, City of Ballarat (VIC), City of Greater Geraldton (WA), City of Joondalup (WA), City of Rockingham (WA), Clarence City Council (TAS),³ Geelong City Council (VIC), Glenorchy City Council (TAS), Gosford City Council (NSW),

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Surveillance politics and local government 

Launceston City Council (TAS), Mildura Rural City Council (VIC), Moreton Bay Regional Council (Qld), Orange City Council (NSW), Port Augusta City Council (SA), Rural City of Murray Bridge (SA), Shoalhaven City Council (NSW), Town of Gawler (SA), Town of Victoria Park (WA) and Tweed Heads Council (NSW).

By participating in the survey, council staff – who had been delegated to respond by their own council – were given the opportunity to write as much or as little as they chose in response to six open-ended questions (see Appendix). The questions requested information about the number of CCTV cameras operating in a Local Government Area; crime statistics; the amount of Federal Government funding received for operating CCTV; the amount of financial costs absorbed by the local council; a summary of the benefits and shortcomings of the street camera programme; and whether more funding from the Federal Government would assist in running CCTV programmes. The method I employed ensured self-allocation of the survey, recognising pre-established mechanisms created by local councils to handle information enquiries. By doing so local councils retained the capacity to distribute the survey to an appropriate staff member and a sense of autonomy in responding to it. In conjunction with open-ended questions, the self-allocation method minimised interference and the mediating of responses by the researcher. It was hypothesised, furthermore, that self-allocation would offer evidence about the formal processes surrounding CCTV, including how bureaucracy is organised in responding to community safety issues and the extent to which bureaucracy mediates discourse on CCTV. It was anticipated that the language of bureaucracy would reveal details about the ways in which the hegemonic discourses surrounding CCTV are politicised, institutionalised and internalised by local government, as well as how these discourses are iterated in the official responses of local councils across Australia (Briggs and Dearman, 2005).

The survey found that federal funding has produced or exacerbated a range of problems for local councils. In trialing the survey it was evident how the changing political debate on CCTV is used and legitimated. In recent years political discourse in Australia has shifted in response to the lack of hard evidence that shows that CCTV reduces crime, and more frequently has begun to suggest that the reason for the rollout of CCTV is to act as a tool for crime *detection* and for evidentiary purposes after the fact. As Taylor (2012) says, ‘When people talk about the “effectiveness” of CCTV they are really referring to two quite distinct processes – deterrence and detection. Deterrence refers to their preventing a would-be offender from committing a crime’. This is indicated in the survey results. Nevertheless, federal funding to date including the NCCPP has been premised on an overarching commitment by the Federal Government to crime *prevention* rather than detection. The latter is arguably a secondary outcome that has purportedly resulted from crime prevention funding.

Survey Findings

I will now explore the findings of the survey by presenting a qualitative analysis of the following implications: attrition of council resources arising from CCTV operation; results of existing (which numbered very few) local council CCTV evaluations; impacts of populism on the operation of CCTV; oppositional discourses concerning CCTV programmes within local council bureaucracies; emergence of a police ‘power creep’ and the

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



implications for civil liberties; details of CCTV system size and scale; detailed financial costs; effectiveness, benefits and drawbacks of operating CCTV; the need for critical evaluations to empower local governments in relation to decisions concerning CCTV; and the ways in which more funding was desired by local councils operating CCTV.

Attrition

The survey revealed that the technology has become a financial burden – a resource of ‘attrition’ – for local governments and their ratepayers. CCTV has been an expensive cost-shifting exercise for local councils. As one respondent stated, ‘The shortcomings of CCTV are many and do not match the cost to install, monitor and maintain’. Almost all councils surveyed stated that while the costs for *installing* CCTV were covered by federal funding, it was local government and their ratepayers that absorbed ongoing running costs, repairs, staffing to monitor screens and other operational aspects including upgrades. While Tony Abbott promised \$50 million more funding for councils to operate more CCTV cameras, such a pledge seems disproportionate to existing infrastructure demands. Significantly, none of the survey respondents indicated that installing more CCTV cameras was the answer to existing operational financial burdens. More cameras would ‘lock’ councils into increased financial pressures and over-extending council resources, creating inefficiency and a decreased capacity to staff and maintain community safety programmes (Taylor, 2012).

Evaluations and statistical evidence

In most cases no statistical evidence was collected by local governments. No council had collected statistics on crime before installing CCTV, indicating an over-reliance on anecdotal evidence supplied by police and media reports. Statistical evidence indicating crime rates is important as an objective benchmark for evaluation. In NSW local councils are expected to collect statistics in the surveillance area under the NSW state government’s operating policy for evaluation (NSW Attorney General’s Department, 2000). Only Shoalhaven and Clarence City Councils collected their own statistics post-installation. As noted earlier, Shoalhaven Council actually found that crime rates went up overall in the surveillance area after CCTV had been installed (Shoalhaven City Council, 2012).⁴ The Shoalhaven respondent stated that the Council has attempted to obtain from police historical statistics for the area but has been unsuccessful to date.

The inability of councils to conduct effective and regular evaluations of their CCTV systems has been identified elsewhere. Little has changed since Pawson and Tilley (1994) identified ‘post hoc shoestring efforts by the untrained and self interested practitioner’ in the United Kingdom. In regard to Australia, Anderson and McAtamney (2011) stated, ‘it is unlikely that most local agencies will have the capacity to undertake extensive and rigorous experimental evaluations into the effectiveness of their CCTV systems’. The implications are such that, within the political context, the lack of evaluations has placed councils in an unnecessarily vulnerable position. One council manager from NSW noted concerns over police withholding information about the effectiveness of the CCTV system: ‘[an] issue is the lack of feedback from the police. This feedback is important publicly and privately’. Tweed Heads had collected general but not CCTV site-specific statistics from the NSW

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOCSAR): ‘Council does not keep crime statistics resulting from its CCTV systems. Previously crime statistics have been sourced from the NSW [BOCSAR]’. Similarly, Moreton Bay’s respondent notes that crime statistics are only available via the Queensland Police Service: ‘Council does not have access to them other than the Annual Statistical Reviews i.e. general state-wide statistics QPS make publicly available which do not drill down to specific suburbs and locations/precincts’.

Clarence City Council forwarded its evaluation of the ‘Safety First at Rosny Park’ Project instead of responding directly to the survey. The evaluation is inconclusive on whether CCTV was effective in reducing crime because of the lack of data pre- and post-installation. Ballarat’s respondent deferred this question to Local Government Area (LGA)-wide statistics collated by Victoria Police (2012). A considerable amount of this City’s budget was allocated to scoping/planning and evaluation of the CCTV programme. While the precise cost of its evaluation is unclear, the Council made a \$200 000 contribution in Stage Three to project planning, evaluation and infrastructure delivery. The outcome of the evaluations was decisive: according to the respondent, ‘we feel that opportunities for CCTV in the area it has been deployed has been exhausted Would support the use of CCTV in setting where evidence suggests that it is effective’.

Respondents almost always deferred to anecdotal evidence on crime from police. The situation benefits councils as a cost-saving measure but also brings considerable potential risks. Wilson noted how police have in some cases undertaken monitoring duties ‘on a “no responsibility” basis. In Bendigo, for example, police only monitor cameras and do not collect statistics for the programme. This can have a detrimental impact on subsequent efforts to evaluate a system’ (Wilson, 2005, p. 48). The situation significantly favours anecdotal reports of police whose demands on councils for CCTV systems appear to have often been met without any independent statistical evidence to support funding applications for either installation or expansion. Wilson (2005) noted similar concerns – and made some astounding predictions – about police control and operating of council CCTV systems: ‘Policy makers have generally discouraged the use of police personnel to monitor CCTV cameras. It is worth considering why this is the case: if the purpose of a CCTV system is to assist policing, then perhaps police are the best people both to operate and respond to cameras. The arguments against police monitoring may be summarised as follows: engaging police operators will lead the public to believe that the system is a police rather than local government one; monitoring cameras is not a proper task for sworn police personnel and will divert police resources from core policing duties; using police operators will lead to “function creep”, as police will utilise the cameras for general intelligence-gathering; and, police will view the system as “their property”, with councils meeting costs but having little control over the ways the system is utilised’ (Wilson, 2005, p. 48).

Police operating CCTV networks on behalf of or in conjunction with local councils provides some advantages to both parties. One advantage is that ‘problems of communications between the police and operators can be minimised In theory this enhances the efficiency of the CCTV system, as response to incidents is more effectively directed’ (Wilson, 2005, p. 48). However, this situation would only be practical if the costs for operation, upgrades and expansion were more equitably distributed between police and local councils (Germain, 2013, p. 143). On balance Wilson (2005, p. 49) found that ‘From the point of view of local government, the main advantages of police operators are cost-effectiveness and the potential for clear communications between police and operators. Some

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



potential disadvantages are police assuming “ownership” of the system; confusion amongst the public as to whether the CCTV scheme is a police or local authority initiative; and diminished council control over operator work practices’. Similar conclusions can be drawn from this survey and that for shared arrangements to work there needs to be ‘an unambiguous commitment in terms of time and resources from the police’ (Wilson, 2005, p. 48).

Populism and the ‘fear of crime’

In the absence of crime statistics in areas under surveillance by local councils it has largely come down to populism to legitimise the use of CCTV. Local councils employ a populist rationale typified in the oft-cited phrase ‘fear of crime’ as a major reason for installing CCTV. The phrase appears in the NSW CCTV policy (NSW Attorney General’s Department, 2000) and in the Federal Government’s Crime Prevention funding documentation as well (Australian Government, n.d.a). It is evident from the survey results that the ‘fear of crime’ is utilised in conjunction with a lack of hard, objective knowledge about local conditions, including a lack of stringent and regular evaluations by the councils that use the technology. Arguably, deferring to a ‘fear of crime’ is a very unreliable premise for CCTV funding – one that is susceptible to moral panics facilitated by the mass media and to the ongoing politicisation of the technology. The ‘fear of crime’ also explains an inherent instability underpinning supply and demand within the funding environment. This instability is articulated by a project officer from one NSW council who says, ‘The problem with obtaining funding is that it is generally to provide additional systems at the request of the community’. Studies in the United Kingdom indicate that while the public claims to feel safer in streets with CCTV cameras, people do not measurably change their behaviour, and any increased use of camera-‘protected’ areas is short lived. There ‘is little substantive research evidence to suggest that CCTV works’ (NACRO, 2002, p. 6) either in a ‘crime prevention or a public anxiety-reducing capacity’ (Coleman, 2004, p. 200). The evidence suggests that cameras do not objectively reduce fear of crime, and do not measurably lead individuals to ‘reclaim’ public space.

Oppositional tensions

In the survey oppositional tensions emerged: ordinary council staff were much more critical of the effectiveness and usefulness of CCTV, whereas council management almost unanimously expressed a supportive view. Five out of eight practitioners working in community safety or non-managerial roles questioned the use of CCTV as a crime prevention measure or for enhancing community safety. Table 1 indicates the level (or tier) of the local council at which survey respondents were employed. For the purposes of this analysis, I identified five tiers within the council bureaucratic structure: Tier 1 Executive Director/CEO/General Manager; Tier 2 Executive Manager or Executive Services or Executive Assistant; Tier 3 Departmental Manager; Tier 4 Sub-departmental Manager; and Tier 5 Departmental Staff that included Community Safety Officers. In descending order, the Tier:staff number ratios are: T1 = 0; T2 = 4; T3 = 2; T4 = 4; and T5 = 8 (Total: 18 council staff). Table 1 shows that there were at least eight *direct* negative or critical descriptors (not including references to technological shortcomings) used in relation to CCTV systems

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0953-1662 Security Journal 1-27 11

Table 1: Direct⁹ negative and positive descriptors of CCTV by staff at each tier of local government

Tier	Negative descriptors in relation to CCTV system	Positive descriptors in relation to CCTV system
Tier 5 (8 respondents) Departmental staff, eg community safety officers	We feel that opportunities for CCTV in the area it has been deployed have been exhausted (although this will not be the politically correct view). I don't believe that the use [of] CCTV deters or prevents crimes occurring or should I say, I don't think it is possible to quantify deterrence or prevention by the use of CCTV. It is questionable if [more funding] would be effective and efficient. There is a public perception that the cameras have improved personal safety however the cameras actively monitored by the local police station have poor image quality and are not effective at night. CCTV is not an effective method for crime prevention on its own and even when integrated with other crime prevention programmes its effectiveness is minor at best. The shortcomings of CCTV are many and do not match the cost to install, monitor and maintain. Federal funding would better be spent assisting crime prevention organisations to target the root causes of crime.	The cameras provide vigilance. A significant reduction in [graffiti].
Tier 4 (4 respondents) Sub-departmental managers	N/A	The City acknowledges the CCTV effectiveness and has committed additional funding. The system has proved useful.
Tier 3 (2 respondents) Departmental managers	N/A	N/A
Tier 2 (4 respondents) Executive manager or executive services or executive assistant	The current funding arrangement constitutes cost shifting by the state government.	There have been significant benefits. ... the value of the network in assisting [police] in responding to crime [is] demonstrated in positive outcomes.
Tier 1 (0 respondents) Executive Director/CEO/General Manager	N/A	N/A

⁹Excluding commentary about technological shortcomings.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



by lower-level staff from five different councils. Criticism was more forthcoming from lower staff than senior staff, with only one *direct* criticism offered by a senior manager at the Tier 2 level. *Direct* praiseworthy descriptors (discounting feedback about technological issues) were fewer in number at all levels combined. Positive descriptors numbered at least six (from across six different councils) though these were much sparser in detail.

A community safety officer commented in the survey, 'Federal funding would better be spent assisting crime prevention organisations to target the root causes of crime and antisocial behaviour'. Another Tier 5 staff member from a Victorian council states: 'I don't believe that the use of CCTV deters or prevents crimes occurring or should I say, I don't think it is possible to quantify deterrence or prevention by the use of CCTV'. A community safety officer from a Victorian council says, 'opportunities for CCTV in the area it has been deployed has been exhausted (although this will not be the politically correct view)'. This bureaucratic dynamic may reflect how CCTV is often readily taken up as a kind of 'automatic' solution to crime by those with power and in positions of authority while 'on the ground' knowledge and critical expertise is disregarded.

The context within which city managers more frequently champion CCTV is the desire to legitimate development, urban renewal and the commodification of public space. Coleman critiques the political economy of CCTV at the level of local government, suggesting that CCTV is 'tied more generally to a wider spatial ordering project. Thus, developments around CCTV are taking place within an ideologically vociferous and politicised urban restructuring programme that is profoundly impacting on the spatialisation of wealth and poverty and the representation of "the city"' (Coleman, 2004, p. 201). He says, 'social control of the streets in urban centres is galvanising the architects of the transition to urban entrepreneurialism. Partnerships between City Centre Managers, chief executives, developers, and senior police and growth spokespeople have heralded the ascendancy of new urban primary definers who articulate obstacles to regeneration and the meaning of a "safer city" CCTV stands inside these processes' (Coleman, 2004, p. 201). The language is symptomatic of hegemonic neoliberalism as it 'masks a post welfare politics and landscape, as well as authoritarian tendencies in the state. In promoting ideas around self-responsibility and self-reliance, this form of newspeak is juxtaposed with the "deviant other" in the public sphere. Within the shift to neoliberal management processes, a climate of moral indifference to patterns of inequality has been encouraged, not least through the propagation of discourses that have the effect of stigmatising and criminalizing the poor' (Wacquant, 1999; Coleman, 2004, pp. 201–202).


Police power 'creep' and implications for civil liberties

Perhaps most startling is that the existing policy and legislative regime has facilitated the emergence of a police 'power creep'. In most local government areas, police have been able to acquire CCTV systems more or less for their own use despite being prevented from doing so under policy and funding restrictions. To quote a senior planner from one NSW council who completed the survey:

Council considers that the area of crime prevention is not a part of its core function but their development by councils has come about through a lack of willingness by higher levels of government to undertake this function. This position of the NSW Government

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Surveillance politics and local government 

has been formally expressed in a state policy excluding the NSW Police from funding or monitoring CCTV systems in public places. However the Police in our case are the one and only customer of the system. In essence this constitutes cost shifting by the State Government.

To restate and emphasise an astounding part of this quote, 'a state policy excluding the NSW police from funding or monitoring CCTV systems in public space'. Certainly in NSW these circumstances are a clear contradiction between policy and practice (NSW Attorney General's Department, 2000). A picture is becoming clearer that this is more than merely cost-shifting; it is an example of power creep where police have, by working with councils, gained access through a 'back-door' and acquired CCTV systems for their own use despite being restricted from doing so under state policy. At present, no policy makers, legislators or civil liberties organisations have raised concerns about this phenomenon.

Council CCTV systems scale and size

System size is vital in evaluating funding outcomes and recommendations for further financial assistance from government. Wilson (2005) makes a crucial observation regarding the monitoring of CCTV systems, saying that a 'practical question related to monitoring is the number of screens an operator can reasonably be expected to observe. At what point does the volume of images on the monitors become too great for a single operator to process?' (Wilson, 2005, p. 44). CCTV coverage varied, and the size of each council's system reflected specifically identified needs (mainly to assist with policing) at the level of local government (refer to Table 2). Moreton Bay Regional Council has the highest number of cameras installed at 520. Clarence City Council has the lowest number of cameras at just six, with the council's respondent stating that the cameras provided a surveillance function to deter antisocial behaviour at identified trouble spots in the Rosny Park Transit Bus Mall and on buses serving Rosny Park and surrounding suburbs. The average number of cameras in each council within the sample is approximately 62.⁵

No councils expressed concern directly that their systems were too large to manage, although this was occasionally inferred when it came to monitoring. Monitoring was rarely done by councils themselves. The vast majority of councils deferred to police, saying that council employees or contractors had little or no role in the actual monitoring of the live stream. Launceston City Council, which has the second highest number of CCTV cameras at 126, responded, 'We provide, install and maintain the system for the Tasmania Police here in Launceston. We have no exposure to what the police may be viewing'. The overarching question here for councils to consider is the camera:operator ratio. Wilson noted (2005, pp. 44–45) concerns about the increased workload for operators caused by the expansion of the system despite there being no current benchmark ratio. He suggests that the reason for the 'absence of an unequivocal benchmark for operator:cameras:monitor ratios is not surprising: clearly, these issues are location-specific ... no general benchmark for the optimum number of cameras and monitors to be observed by operators can be applied across all locations' (Wilson, 2005, p. 45). Nevertheless, most survey responses indicated that councils are seeking to overcome the passive operation of their CCTV networks to increase vigilance capacity. Wilson suggests (2005, p. 45) that 'Seven-day, 24-hour active monitoring would self-evidently provide the greatest efficiency in terms of detecting incidents'.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



Table 2: Number of CCTV cameras operated by each council surveyed (highest to lowest)

<i>Council</i>	<i>Number of cameras in operation</i>
Moreton Bay Regionancil (Qld)	520
Launceston City Council (TAS)	126
City of Rockingham (WA)	95
Gosford City Council (NSW)	47 ^a
Geraldton Council (WA)	42
City of Joondalup (WA)	37
Town of Victoria Park (WA)	37
Tweed Heads Council (NSW)	36
City of Ballarat (VIC)	33 ^b
Geelong Council (VIC)	30
Orange City Council (NSW)	22
Mildura Rural City Council (VIC)	21
Shoalhaven City Council (NSW)	18
Glenorchy City Council (TAS)	16 ^c
City of Port Augusta (SA)	11
Town of Gawler (SA)	9
Rural City of Murray Bridge (SA)	7
Clarence City Council (TAS)	6
Average number of cameras per council	61.83
Total number of cameras	1113

^aRespondent says 'plus a large amount of additional cameras attached to Council buildings (being both internal and external)'.
^bPlus pending integration of a further 48 cameras from Bridge Mall Trader CCTV system.
^cYet to be installed.

Discussion of financial costs

One survey respondent remarked that there is misunderstanding about the 'true cost of implementing a CCTV system (e.g. a common media question is "what is the cost per camera and why is it so high") [and] a lack of understanding about the costs associated with transmission of high bandwidth signal transmission through either radio or cable'. The survey asked councils to outline their internal expenses for operating CCTV (see results in Tables 3 and 4). Eleven councils provided figures revealing their annual operational expenses. Referring to Table 4, the following indicates costs on a per camera/per annum basis. The highest and lowest costs incurred *per annum* by these 11 councils were:

- Highest: City of Joondalup, 37 cameras at \$5405.41 per camera.
- Lowest: Glenorchy City Council, 16 cameras at \$187.50 per camera.⁶

Tables 3 and 4 further allow comparisons with the level of federal funding investment at each local council on a per camera basis. The highest and lowest costs to the Federal Government on a per council/per camera basis were:

- Highest: Clarence City Council, six cameras; \$83 055 of federal funding per camera.
- Lowest: Moreton Bay Regional Council, 520 cameras; \$1923.08 of federal funding per camera.⁷

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0953-1662 Security Journal 1-27 15

Table 3: Federal funding allocated to local councils compared with internal council expenses for CCTV

Council	Amount of federal funding allocated	Internal council expenses	Year/federal grant received
City of Ballarat (VIC)	\$250 000 ^a	\$600 000 (stages 1-3); plus up to approximately \$70 000	2007, Round 4, NCCPP 2010, Safer Suburbs Program
City of Joondalup (WA)	\$150 000	\$200 000 (approximate for the year 2011-2012)	2007, Round 4, NCCPP
Clarence City Council (TAS)	\$498 330	N/A ^b	2008, Round 5, NCCPP
Geelong Council (VIC)	\$300 000 ^c	Approximately \$80 000 <i>per annum</i>	2007, Safer Suburbs Plan
Geraldton Council (WA)	\$414 220	\$27 000 <i>per annum</i> for CCTV Cleaning and Licences; in 2012 the City has a budget of \$30 000 for renewal and expansion and \$100 000 for new network at Mallewa (former shire now amalgamated).	2007, Round 4, NCCPP
Glenorchy City Council (TAS)	\$123 687	As the camera system was yet to be installed, none to date but will allocate \$3000 <i>per annum</i> for maintenance costs.	2012, Graffiti Prevention Reduction and/or Removal Funding
Gosford City Council (NSW)	\$872 585	Exact figure not given. Council pays costs associated with implementation and ongoing operation of the CCTV network. Council absorbs administration including customer service relating to the system. Council also provides \$200 per annum to owners of properties where cameras have been attached.	2007, Safer Suburbs Plan 2010, Safer Suburbs Program
Lanueshion City Council (TAS)	\$555 920 ^d	\$50 000 <i>per annum</i> over the past 10 years	2008, Round 5, NCCPP
Mildura Rural City Council (VIC)	\$543 400	Between \$20 000 and \$50 000 <i>per annum</i>	2007, Round 4, NCCPP
Moreton Bay Regional Council (Qld)	\$10 000 000	\$165 000 plus a salary Band 6 for programme development and supervision role.	2007, Safer Suburbs Plan
Orange City Council (NSW)	\$150 000	Exact figure not given, but stated that the Council pays all costs associated in running the CCTV network	2008, Round 5, NCCPP
City of Port Augusta (SA)	\$136 820	Approximately \$15 000 <i>per annum</i> for the ongoing operational costs, excluding maintenance and repairs for failures.	2007, Round 4, NCCPP
City of Rockingham (WA)	\$135 846 plus \$150 000 ^e	Expenditure differs year to year but currently comes from a total budget of \$97 344.	2006, Round 3, NCCPP

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Table 3 continued

Council	Amount of federal funding allocated	Internal council expenses	Year/federal grant received
Rural City of Murray Bridge (SA)	\$150 000	N/A ^f	2007, Round 4, NCCPP
Shoalhaven City Council (NSW)	\$150 000	\$163 502 ^g	2008, Round 5, NCCPP
Town of Gawler (SA)	\$75 000	Unplanned and planned maintenance budget \$5000 (2011–2012); \$6000 (2012–2013)	2007, Safer Suburbs Plan
Tweed Heads Council (NSW)	\$310 000 ^h	\$20 000 per annum	2010, Safer Suburbs Program
Town of Victoria Park (WA)	\$100 000	The town budgets for the maintenance and upkeep of its CCTV cameras via its building maintenance budget. There is no direct amount allocated to CCTV.	2008, Round 5, NCCPP

^aCity of Ballarat also received \$200 000 infrastructure delivery (but no funding for evaluation) from Victorian State Government's Department of Justice.

^bClarence City Council did not provide a response to this question.

^cCouncil respondent stated that the council had only received \$150 000. \$300 000 is the figure that appears on the Federal Government's website under the Safer Suburbs Program at Australian Government (n.d.b).

^dInclusive of figures given at Australian Government (2012) and Round 5 of NCCPP as outlined in Australian Government (n.d.c).

^eFigures given at Australian Government (n.d.e). Survey respondent states, 'OCP (SCPD) have funded through grants \$10K for additional beachfront cameras and upgrade'; 'OCP (SCPD) have funded a grant of \$25K for the production of 4X Mobile cameras'. It is unclear whether this is inclusive of grants listed under the NCCPP scheme online. Rural City of Murray Bridge did not provide a response to this question.

^fThese figures cover the financial years 2009/2010 – current, and include (at least) \$105 997 spent by the Council for legal costs inclusive of the Bonner ADT case.

^g\$90 000 of this was initial funding given to the Murwillumbath & District Chamber of Commerce system handed over to Council in 2010.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0953-1662 Security Journal 1-27 17

Table 4: Costs of CCTV to Federal Government and local councils on a per camera basis

Council	Number of council cameras in operation	Federal funding total divided by number of cameras = revealing <i>Cost per camera</i>	Internal council expenses per annum ^a divided by number of cameras = Revealing <i>cost per camera</i>
City of Ballarat (VIC)	33	\$250,000/33 = 7575.76	N/A
City of Joondalup (WA)	37	\$150,000/37 = 4054.05	\$200,000 (2011-12)/37 = 5405.41
Clarence City Council (TAS)	6	\$498,330/6 = 83,055	N/A
Geelong Council (VIC)	30	\$300,000/30 = 10,000	\$80,000/30 = 2666.67
Geraldton Council (WA)	42	\$414,220/42 = 9862.38	\$57,000 (total for 2012) ^b /42 = 1357.14
Glenorchy City Council (TAS)	16	\$123,687/16 = 7730.44	\$3000/16 = 187.50
Gosford City Council (NSW)	47	\$872,585/47 = 18,565.64	N/A
Launceston City Council (TAS)	126	\$555,920/126 = 4412.06	\$50,000/126 = 396.83
Mildura Rural City Council (VIC)	21	\$543,400/21 = 25,876.19	\$35,000 (average)/21 = 1666.67
Moreton Bay Regional Council (Qld)	520	\$10,000,000/520 = 1923.08	N/A
Orange City Council (NSW)	22	\$150,000/22 = 6818.18	N/A
City of Port Augusta (SA)	11	\$136,820/11 = 12,438.19	\$15,000/11 = 1363.64
City of Rockingham (WA)	95	[\$135,846+\$150,000]/95 = 3008.91	\$97,344/95 = 1024.67
Rural City of Murray Bridge (SA)	7	\$150,000/7 = 21,428.57	N/A
Shoalhaven City Council (NSW)	18	\$150,000/18 = 8333.33	\$54,500.67 ^c /18 = 3027.81
Town of Gawler (SA)	9	\$75,000/9 = 8333.33	\$5500 (average)/9 = 611.11
Town of Victoria Park (WA)	37	\$100,000/37 = 2702.70	N/A
Tweed Heads Council (NSW)	36	\$310,000/36 = 8611.11	\$20,000/36 = 555.56

^aWhere the council provided a *per annum* figure only.

^bNot including \$100,000 for new network at Mullewa (former shire now amalgamated).

^cFigure is the average annual cost over 3 years for 2009-2010; 2010-2011; and 2011-2012.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



In terms of variables, ascertaining the cost of a CCTV network by the number of cameras a council operates should be considered with caution. The context for each local council's operating system is paramount to ascertaining a qualitative and hence more accurate understanding of financial costs. There are also social costs such as the loss of privacy (Taylor, 2012). From a critical perspective, another cost to councils has been the erosion of autonomy because of the current political climate and significant pressures from public expectations to install CCTV, which cannot be quantified.

Is CCTV effective for local council crime prevention? Benefits and drawbacks

The drawbacks of CCTV identified by local councils were mostly concerned with cost and the lack of evidence that CCTV 'works' as a crime prevention measure, while the benefits of CCTV to local councils include the fact that it services the community's desire to feel safe and assists with evidence after the fact (see Table 5). Some respondents were starker than others in drawing attention to the shortcomings. Victoria Park's respondent says, 'The shortcomings of CCTV are many and do not match the cost to install, monitor and maintain'. The respondent from Gosford City Council says, 'CCTV Camera systems have a relatively short life cycle and require replacement and upgrading. External funding is limited to new systems and the replacement costs of these systems is an impost on the Capital Works Budget at the expense of other priority works'. Generally the survey responses were not 'black and white' on the question of effectiveness. Town of Gawler's respondent states, 'There is a public perception that the cameras have improved personal safety however the cameras are not actively monitored by the local police station, have poor image quality and are not effective at night'. The respondent from Geelong says, 'I don't believe that the use of CCTV deters or prevents crimes occurring'. The respondent from Victoria Park stated, 'even when integrated with other crime prevention programmes its effectiveness is minor at best'.

Monitoring is crucial to determining effectiveness. Most councils surveyed appeared to presume that CCTV had been effective without active monitoring. Wilson suggests that this is problematic, noting how active 'camera monitoring is a crucial aspect of CCTV operation. While monitoring is fundamental to ensuring CCTV's "effectiveness", it also raises crucial questions about the public accountability of CCTV systems' (Norris and Armstrong, 1999b; Wilson, 2005, p. 44). An interesting admonition came from Tweed Head's respondent who says that the success of the system is to be measured by the *public*, as opposed to council evaluations: 'Public feedback through the media is also important in establishing the success of a system. Press covering successful convictions and arrests that have involved a CCTV system can fall into obscurity by the public and its success go unrecognised'. By contrast, Moreton Bay's respondent says that the effectiveness of the system is measured by the level of demand from *police*: 'Increasing demand for footage indicates that the CCTV network continues to demonstrate its effectiveness and value in responding to crime incidents across [the] LGA. Demand is driven by police and also on a proactive basis by Council'. The evidence suggests that further research would be a worthy exercise, particularly the undertaking of a cost benefit analysis, which would be of significant benefit to local councils considering alternative strategies to enhancing community safety other than CCTV.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0955-1662 Security Journal 1-27 19

Table 5: Summary of benefits and drawbacks of CCTV systems as identified by local councils

Council	Summary of benefits identified	Summary of drawbacks identified
City of Ballarat (VIC)	N/A	Opportunities for CCTV in the area it has been deployed have been exhausted. Respondent says they would support the use of CCTV in setting where evidence suggests that it is effective.
City of Joondalup (WA)	A flexible and useful tool. Identifying damage to public assets, dangerous parking, abandoned shopping trolleys, graffiti, street lamps not working, hazards to the public and antisocial behaviour. Capturing and recording useable images of criminal and suspicious activity in progress. Supporting police investigations. Assisting with the management of factors that create a fear of crime. Assisting with the management of events and markets in public space.	Does not always result in high-quality recorded images that should be but are not framed perfectly and recorded. A challenge is managing public expectations; explaining to stakeholders and public that cameras will not necessarily always be pointing in right direction with the relevant field of view/range to capture all details of any given incident. No dedicated or ongoing funding for operational/system staffing. This may be severely restricting the number or quality of outcomes the Council is getting from its CCTV system as there is no capacity of live control, camera targeting and response activation.
Clarence City Council (TAS)	'May' have reduced property crime, assaults, and offences in public places, supermarkets and vehicles. 'May' have reduced inappropriate behaviour on the buses. 'May' be effective in increasing detection of offences in buses generally, and detection of misbehaviour on school buses more specifically. 'May' have had a deterrent effect on antisocial behaviour and crime on buses.	80% of Council survey respondents pre-CCTV believed cameras would reduce the incidence of antisocial or criminal behaviour. This had reduced to 68% of respondents post-CCTV. Anecdotal evidence of crime displacement, particularly with respect to graffiti. No live monitoring of camera footage; some evidence to suggest that the cameras could be used more effectively as investigative/intelligence tools.
Geelong Council (VIC)	Ability to intervene in events of minor antisocial behaviour before escalating into serious incidents; to monitor any or all activity visually; to identify persons after the fact; and to track individuals who have carried out a crime leading to arrest. Provides Police or security staff with information on what is happening live.	Respondent does not believe CCTV deters or prevents crimes occurring. Respondent does not think it is possible to quantify deterrence or prevention by the use of CCTV.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

20

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0953-1662 Security Journal 1-27

Table 5 continued

<i>Council</i>	<i>Summary of benefits identified</i>	<i>Summary of drawbacks identified</i>
<i>Geraldton Council (WA)</i>	Reduction in vandalism in the vicinity of cameras. Police have said system is useful for investigating offences and attending to matters (in particular around the nightclubs) before getting out of hand.	System needs ongoing maintenance. Effective management is required following installation. CCTV only intermittently monitored by Police and no person is allocated to this task 24 hours a day.
<i>Glenorchy City Council (TAS)</i>	N/A	N/A
<i>Gosford City Council (NSW)</i>	Provide vigilance of areas in which the cameras are situated. Provide an assumed deterrent to would-be criminals/vandals.	Picture quality is an issue. No ongoing funds provided to maintain the systems, resulting in funding being reallocated from other works to ensure camera system is maintained. System is reactive. Police say that the lack of resources means the cameras cannot be monitored continually therefore are used after a crime has occurred or reactively upon notification that a crime is occurring. Systems have a relatively short life cycle, require replacement and upgrading. External funding is limited to new systems and replacement costs is an impost on the Capital Works Budget at the expense of other priority works.
<i>Launceston City Council (TAS)</i>	Bus and bus stop cameras have reduced antisocial behaviour to a point where it is no longer a real problem.	Lack of modern technology has impeded the quality of evidential images that can be used to prosecute by the Police.
<i>Mildara Rural City Council (VIC)</i>	System is valued by Police to follow up crime and general surveillance.	Extreme heat has caused faults in the system; failure of system components. Maintaining and monitoring of the CCTV network; ageing system.
<i>Moreton Bay Regional Council (Qld)</i>	Assisting police in responding to crime.	Network is operated as essentially a passive system, with active monitoring on a part-time basis only. Challenge to bring old analogue systems across to a single operating platform and to upgrade to IP/digital type.



ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

© 2014 Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 0953-1662 Security Journal 1-27 21

<i>Orange City Council (NSW)</i>	The cameras appear to assist Police in the apprehension of persons that commit crimes. Identifying the person in the footage has also reduced the number of convictions.	Regular maintenance of CCTV network is required with storage being the least reliable. System is complex requiring skilled technicians' assistance when things go wrong, which are not available locally. The system is limited as to the location of cameras with only one camera for a particular location so lighting can be a problem in seeing what happened day and night.
<i>City of Port Augusta (SA)</i>	Having surveillance available for Police to use when incidents occur.	The shortcomings include continual breakdowns of equipment. Hard-drive has had to be replaced as it operates 24/7 and this equipment only lasts for a certain period of time. CCTV system does not handle extreme hot weather conditions leading to continual operational problems.
<i>City of Rockingham (WA)</i>	(Not outlined in response)	CCTV can gain better use and results from having a system permanently monitored by trained staff.
<i>Rural City of Murray Bridge (SA)⁸</i>	N/A	N/A
<i>Shoalhaven City Council (NSW)</i>	Provides some confidence in the community that the area is safe as reflected in anecdotal discussions and survey being undertaken at present. Proved useful to police in investigating a number of assaults and other criminal incidents.	Technological shortcomings including signal failure, computer failure. Natural damage from birds eating through cable, lightning strike. Some vandalism with three cameras destroyed by vandals. In one incident vandals turned off power to the system. System is not monitored live, relies on officers from the Police station viewing a live feed. Monitoring relies on time and capacity at the police station. This limits the success of the system in preventing incidents. Technical problems not observed immediately and reported to Council. Cameras are ageing and their capacity for night vision is limited.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Table 5 continued

Council	Summary of benefits identified	Summary of drawbacks identified
Town of Gawler (SA)	A public perception that the cameras have improved personal safety.	Cameras are not actively monitored by the local police station, have poor image quality and are not effective at night.
Tweed Heads Council (NSW)	Increase in public safety (actual/perceived). Protection of Council assets (an unintended consequence assisting insurance). Provide evidence to Police resulting in arrest/conviction (includes car theft, armed robberies, assaults, antisocial behaviour).	Limited technical support from the Police or other government agencies in establishing the system or providing technical specifications or advice to assist inexperienced Councils in developing appropriate, practical and useable systems. Recommended that Police develop guidelines to assist councils in the fundamentals of CCTV systems, hotspot locations, minimal level of usability, fundamentals of their use as evidence and police procedures.
Town of Victoria Park (WA)	(Not outlined in response)	Lack of feedback from the police. Respondent says feedback is important publically and privately. Privately, technical and procedural feedback is critical to establishing a successful system. Public feedback through the media is also important in establishing the success of a system. Press covering successful convictions and arrests that have involved a CCTV system can fall into obscurity by the public and its success go unrecognised. This also impedes the deterrent effect of the system, the respondent says.
		The Town engages in crime prevention methods that promote individual responsibility, social connectedness and neighbourhood safety rather than direct service provision such as CCTV. The shortcomings of CCTV are many and do not match the cost to install, monitor and maintain. Federal funding would better be spent assisting crime prevention organisations to target the root causes of crime and antisocial behaviour such as low socio-economic status, low education, mental health issues, substance abuse, crime prevention through environmental design, poor impulse control and community awareness of crime and antisocial behaviour.

^aThe council did not provide a response to this question.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Broadening the scope: 'Critical' evaluations

Anderson and McAtamney (2011) note, 'When [CCTV has] shown to be effective, it is often dependent upon the context in which it has been applied' (2011, p. 421; Keval and Sasse, 2010, p. 152). International studies on CCTV have undertaken a 'turn' towards *context* as the primary focus of evaluation (Germain, 2013, p. 135). Likewise, the survey utilised for this article provided a contextual view of the effectiveness of CCTV. The results incorporate each council's (very limited) knowledge of local conditions, crime rates, demands of police and media coverage. With regard to the limitations of this survey, in order to ascertain a clearer view of effectiveness, further analysis is required on a council-by-council basis. A much more in-depth view of on-the-ground conditions could be ascertained through further qualitative interviews with stakeholders. Furthermore, economic factors including affluence and employment levels need to be taken into account in each local government area before decisions are made about further funding for CCTV (Anderson and McAtamney, 2011).

What can be deduced from the survey results, however, is that a more practical method of evaluation can be undertaken by councils whose intention is to gain a greater sense of autonomy in responding to political and populist pressures. Councils can engage more critical perspectives on the effectiveness and appropriateness of CCTV within their communities. They can do this by undertaking evaluations that review not only budgeting issues, crime statistics and anecdotal evidence, but also analyses of the political context and a critical understanding of funding discourse. This approach would be a *critical evaluation* rather than being cost- or police-centred and a mechanism for better and more informed decisions. Broadening the scope for evaluation in this way would provide councils with a much clearer view of community needs and not just popular desires. It would assist councils in moving beyond the populism surrounding the 'fear of crime' with a view to a more stable and rational approach to community safety. A critical reporting and evaluation process would also be of significant benefit in reviewing police demands for CCTV. Previously there has been a desire expressed for local councils to attain greater independence within the policy context because of political sensitivity (Sutton and Wilson, 2003; Wilson, 2005). In this light, critical evaluations have the potential to strengthen the capacity of local councils to make more empowered and informed decisions about the costs and implications of operating CCTV.

Was more federal funding desired by local councils?

Funding was broadly desired to upgrade existing systems to the latest software and hardware formats. Geraldton identified five areas in which further federal funding could be utilised: expansion of the network, ongoing maintenance, system upgrades, employment of a manager to ensure that the cameras are operational and matters of concern are attended to, and increased monitoring. Only Ballarat indicated that further funding could be used for evaluations. The respondent from Victoria Park stated bluntly that federal funding would be better spent assisting crime prevention organisations to target the root causes of crime and antisocial behaviour. Ballarat's respondent felt that opportunities for CCTV in the area it has been deployed have been exhausted. Orange City Council's respondent stated, 'Of course more funding from the Federal Government would assist in the operation of the street camera

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1



program, but it is questionable if it would be effective and efficient'. Tweed Head's respondent said that Federal Government support is critical for councils to implement CCTV systems 'which Council resources are stretched to provide'. The respondent added that there was a pressing need for state governments to implement state-wide standardised 'best practice guidelines' for technical specifications and training in technical and procedural aspects of CCTV.

Conclusion

Local governments continue to face immense public pressure and expectations to operate CCTV. However, operating CCTV is a significant burden on the resources and finances available to local councils. They have been impacted by a lessening of their independence as a result of working alongside law enforcement agencies. Police frequently call on local governments to establish CCTV systems for them by proxy (SBS World News Australia, 2013; Smethurst, 2013). Probably the most striking finding of the survey was a police power creep in NSW facilitated by the current policy and legislative environment. These issues require further review at the levels of state and federal government. Their implications accentuate emerging issues for Australian democracy, the increasing power of policing in contemporary society and the erosion of the autonomy of local government. Local councils continue to struggle with these issues while pressure from police takes precedence and CCTV is promulgated by politicians to be the 'Holy Grail' of crime prevention (Taylor, 2010).

The survey results discussed in this article revealed many nuanced aspects of how funding is allocated to councils for CCTV systems, particularly the contested discourses that underpin funding arrangements. The results do not support indiscriminate allocation of taxpayer funding to councils for the installation and operation of CCTV systems. The study supports the need for a more critical evaluation method to be adopted by councils. Councils should not merely defer to police or media coverage in assessing whether CCTV is appropriate for their communities. By undertaking critical evaluations and considering the political context councils will be in a more autonomous position in considering whether to operate or to continue operating CCTV systems.

Notes

- 1 The author was an independent Advisor to Wollongong City Council during its CCTV Policy review in 2012.
- 2 See Facebook group 'Turn the CCTV Cameras Back on in the Nowra CBD', <https://www.facebook.com/TurnTheCctvCamerasBackOnInTheNowraCbd>, accessed 27 July 2013.
- 3 Clarence City Council did not respond to the survey questions. Instead the Council forwarded its official 2009 Evaluation. See Julian and Mason, 2009.
- 4 The crime types measured by Shoalhaven Council were assault, malicious damage, breaking and entering, and street offences. The findings were that while crime incidents were very few, assault went up by more than double overall; breaking and entering went up for the final half of the trial period; malicious damage went down but finished higher in the trial period; and street offences went up overall though finished down.
- 5 Notwithstanding the variable that Moreton Bay received a much higher level of funding than other councils at \$1 million and installed by comparison an exponentially much larger system than all other councils. The lowest half of councils on the scale (ranging from 6 to 30 cameras) averages at 15.56 cameras per council.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

- The highest-ranking councils on the upper half of the scale – excluding the highest variable of Moreton Bay to give a more representative indication of the sample – average at 56.625 cameras per council.
- 6 A variable here is that Glenorchy’s cameras had yet to be installed, which could be the reason that the annual average internal cost for councils is skewed down.
 - 7 A variable to consider here is that these averages are skewed owing to the unusually large size of Moreton Bay’s system numbering 520 cameras. Caution should be exercised in reading the figures because Moreton Bay had the highest level of federal funding at \$10 000 000 while all other councils received less than half of this amount. Further, the second highest amount of funding was given to Launceston Council at \$555 920.

References

Anderson, J. and McAtamney, A. (2011) Considering local context when evaluating a closed circuit television system in public spaces. In: *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice No.430*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, October, pp. 421–440.

The Australian. (2012) Abbott promises \$50m in CCTV blitz. 8 October, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/breaking-news/abbott-promises-50m-in-cctv-blitz/story-fn3dxiwe-1226490423706>, accessed 17 August 2013.

Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). (2013) News – New South Wales. 7 pm edition, 4 May.

Australian Government. (2012) Graffiti prevention, reduction and/or removal funding 2012. Canberra, <http://www.crimeprevention.gov.au/POCAfundingfornongovernmentagencies/Pages/default.aspx>, accessed 29 July 2013.

Australian Government. (n.d.a) National Community Crime Prevention Programme, http://www.ema.gov.au/agd/WWW/ncphome.nsf/Page/National_Community_Crime_Prevention_Programme, accessed 3 August 2013.

Australian Government. (n.d.b) Organisations Funded under the 2007 Safer Suburbs Program, http://www.crimeprevention.gov.au/Documents/Organisations_Funded_under_the_Safer_Suburbs_Program.pdf, accessed 29 July 2013.

Australian Government. (n.d.c) Recipients of grants under the National Community Crime Prevention Programme (NCCPP), [http://www.ema.gov.au/agd/WWW/rwpattach.nsf/VAP/\(8AB0BDE05570AAD0EF9C283AA8F533E3\)~NCCPPRounds1to5.pdf/\\$file/NCCPPRounds1to5.pdf](http://www.ema.gov.au/agd/WWW/rwpattach.nsf/VAP/(8AB0BDE05570AAD0EF9C283AA8F533E3)~NCCPPRounds1to5.pdf/$file/NCCPPRounds1to5.pdf), accessed 29 July 2013.

Bigpond News. (2013) Politicians argue over CCTV shutdown. 4 May, http://bigpondnews.com/articles/TopStories/2013/05/04/Politicians_argue_over_CCTV_shutdown_869293.html, accessed 27 July 2013.

Briggs, R. and Dearman, P. (2005) The question of consent today. *Southern Review* 37(3): 1–7.

Carr, R. (2013) O’Farrell’s CCTV/privacy changes – A dark victory which is really about ‘big government’. *Illawarra News*. 27 May, <http://illawarranews.blogspot.com/2013/05/ofarrells-cctvprivacy-changes-dark.html>, accessed 27 July 2013.

Channel Ten News. (2011) Out of control. 17 February, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=19IKCHQhEMQ&feature=related>, accessed 8 August 2013.

Coleman, R. (2004) Watching the degenerate: Street camera surveillance and urban regeneration. *Local Economy* 19(3): 199–211.

Collins, J., Noble, G., Poynting, S. and Tabar, P. (2000) *Kebabs, Kids, Cops and Crime; Youth, Ethnicity and Crime*. Annandale: Pluto Press.

Crawford, R. (2013) Ward says colleague is ‘wrong, wrong, wrong’. *South Coast Register*. 15 May, <http://www.southcoastregister.com.au/story/1502580/ward-says-colleague-is-wrong-wrong-wrong/?cs=203>, accessed 27 July 2013.

Essential Media Communications. (2011) Wollongong alcohol-fuelled violence (CCTV). Youtube. 17 February, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R4RO0m_AvLA&feature=player_embedded, accessed 4 December 2011.

Fussey, P. (2008) Beyond liberty, beyond security: The politics of public surveillance. *British Politics* 3(1): 120–135.

Germain, S. (2013) A prosperous ‘business’: The success of CCTV through the eyes of international literature. *Surveillance & Society* 11(1/2): 134–147.

Gill, M. and Spriggs, A. (2005) Assessing the impact of CCTV. Home Office Research Study 292, London, Home Office.

Hayes, R. and Downs, D.M. (2011) Controlling retail theft with CCTV domes, CCTV public view monitors, and protective containers: A randomized controlled trial. *Security Journal* 24(July): 237–250.

Illawarra Mercury. (2013a) Debate rages over council CCTV footage. 13 February, <http://www.illawarramercury.com.au/story/1297159/debate-rages-over-council-cctv-footage/>, accessed 6 August 2013.

ITEM 12 (continued)


ATTACHMENT 1



- Illawarra Mercury*. (2013b) OPINION: Vandals should not be allowed privacy; Response to Dr Carr's letter. 13 February, <http://www.illawarramercury.com.au/story/1297158/vandals-should-not-be-allowed-privacy/?cs=300>, accessed 6 August 2013.
- Illawarra News. (2013) Editorial – CCTV McCarthyism disproportionate to reality. 13 May, <http://illawarranews.blogspot.com/2013/05/editorial-cctv-mccarthyism.html>, accessed 27 July 2013.
- Jessop, B. (2005) Gramsci as a spatial theorist. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 8(4): 421–437.
- Julian, R. and Mason, R. (2009) Evaluation of the 'Safety First at Rosny Park' Project, Report for Clarence City Council. Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies, University of Tasmania, Sandy Bay, November.
- Katz, C. (2001) Hiding the target: Social reproduction in privatised urban environment. In: C. Minca (ed.) *Postmodern Geography: Theory and Praxis*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 93–110.
- Keval, H. and Sasse, M.A. (2010) 'Not the usual suspects': A study of factors reducing the effectiveness of CCTV. *Security Journal* 23(2): 134–154.
- NACRO. (2002) *To CCTV or Not to CCTV? Current Review of Research into the Effectives of CCTV Systems in Reducing Crime*. London: NACRO, May.
- New South Wales Attorney General's Department, Crime Prevention Division. (2000) NSW government policy statement and guidelines for the establishment and implementation of closed circuit television (CCTV) in public places. Sydney, [http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/cpd/ll_cpd.nsf/vwFiles/cctv.pdf/\\$file/cctv.pdf](http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/cpd/ll_cpd.nsf/vwFiles/cctv.pdf/$file/cctv.pdf), accessed 8 March 2012.
- New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. (2010) Wollongong LGA Crime Rate Map 2010, [http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/Rates_2010_Wollongong.pdf/\\$file/Rates_2010_Wollongong.pdf](http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/Rates_2010_Wollongong.pdf/$file/Rates_2010_Wollongong.pdf), accessed 20 December 2011.
- New South Wales State Government. (1998) Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 No 133. <http://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/fullhtml/inforce/act+133+1998+FIRST+0+N>, accessed 8 March 2012.
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999a) *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg.
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G. (1999b) CCTV and the social structuring of surveillance. In: K. Painter and N. Tilley (eds.) *Surveillance of Public Space: CCTV, Street Lighting and Crime Prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Pawson, R. and Tilley, N. (1994) What works in evaluation research? *British Journal of Criminology* 34(3): 391–306.
- Poynting, S. and Morgan, G. (eds.) (2007) *Outrages! Moral Panics in Australia*. Hobart, Australia: ACYS Publishing, University of Tasmania.
- Poyser, S. (2004) Does the effectiveness of CCTV as a crime prevention strategy outweigh the threat to civil liberties? *Police Journal* 77(2): 120–134.
- SBS World News Australia. (2013) Police push for CCTV after Meagher case. 12 June, <http://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/1777347/Police-push-for-CCTV-after-Meagher-case>, accessed 9 August 2013.
- Shoalhaven City Council. (2012) Nowra CBD Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Project – Nowra CBD CCTV Audit Report September 2012. September, <http://doc.shoalhaven.nsw.gov.au/Displaydoc.aspx?Record=D12/241799>, accessed 27 July 2013.
- Smethurst, A. (2013) Moreland council yet to accept \$250 000 grant to install CCTV cameras in area where Jill Meagher was murdered. *Herald Sun* 25 April, <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/moreland-council-yet-to-accept-250000-grant-to-install-cctv-cameras-in-area-where-jill-meagher-was-murdered/story-fnat79vb-1226629442108>, accessed 9 August 2013.
- Sutton, A. and Wilson, D. (2003) Open-street CCTV in Australia: The politics of resistance and expansion. In: C. Norris, M. McCahill and D. Wood (eds.). *Surveillance & Society; CCTV Special*. 2 (2/3): 310–322, [http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles2\(2\)/australia.pdf](http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles2(2)/australia.pdf), accessed 16 August 2013.
- Tascon, S. (2004) Refugees and the coloniality of power: Border-crossers of postcolonial whiteness. In: A. Moreton-Robinson (ed.) *Whitening Race: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, pp. 239–253.
- Taylor, E. (2010) Evaluating CCTV: Why the findings are inconsistent, inconclusive and ultimately irrelevant. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 12(4): 209–232.
- Taylor, E. (2012) The real cost of CCTV might stop you smiling. *Sydney Morning Herald* 10 October, <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-opinion/the-real-cost-of-cctv-might-stop-you-smiling-20121009-27b4m.html>, accessed 10 August 2013.
- Taylor, E. (2013) *Surveillance Schools; A New Era in Education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

ITEM 12 (continued)

ATTACHMENT 1

Surveillance politics and local government 

- Tonkin, S. (2011a) Graphic scenes reveal region's dangerous underbelly after dark. *Illawarra Mercury* 19 February: 5.
- Tonkin, S. (2011b) Police union 'are playing politics close to election'. *Illawarra Mercury* 21 February: 3.
- Victoria Police. (2012) Crime statistics by LGA 2010/2011–2011/2012. http://www.police.vic.gov.au/content.asp?a=internetBridgingPage&Media_ID=72178, accessed 10 August 2013.
- Wachsmuth, L. (2013) Film you won't see. *Illawarra Mercury* 11 February, <http://www.illawarramercury.com.au/story/1294489/film-you-wont-see/?cs=300>, accessed 6 August 2013.
- Wacquant, L. (1999) How penal common sense comes to Europeans: Notes on the transatlantic diffusion of the neoliberal doxa. *European Societies* 1(3): 319–352.
- Walby, K. (2005) How closed-circuit television surveillance organizes the social: An institutional ethnography. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(2): 189–214.
- Weber, S. (2011) A night out in Wollongong (media statement by the Police Association of New South Wales). *Better State*. 18 February, <http://betterstate.org.au/communitysafety/2011/02/18/a-night-out-in-wollongong/>, accessed 10 March 2012.
- Webster, M. (2011a) Violence erupts in our city streets. *Illawarra Mercury* 19 February: 4.
- Welsh, B.C. and Farrington, D.P. (2003) Effects of closed-circuit television on crime. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587(1): 110–135.
- Wilson, D. (2005) Behind the cameras: Monitoring and open-street CCTV surveillance in Australia. *Security Journal* 18(1): 43–54.
- Wilson, D. and Sutton, A. (2003) *Open-street CCTV in Australia: A Comparative Study of Establishment and Operation*. Canberra: Criminology Research Council.
- Wollongong City Council. (2013) CCTV policy & code of practice. 8 April, <http://www.wollongong.nsw.gov.au/council/governance/Policies/CCTV%20Policy%20and%20Code%20of%20Practice.pdf>, accessed 6 August 2013.

Appendix

Survey questions sent to local councils, business chambers and private contractors operating CCTV funded by Federal Government schemes

There are six questions for this survey:

- (a) The number of CCTV cameras operating in your Local Government Area (or in the area for which the organisation is responsible for managing CCTV).
- (b) Crime statistics for the areas in which your CCTV system is operating, including before and since the CCTV cameras were installed. (Please state whether the figures are postcode-wide statistics or specific to the area of operation. The latter is most desirable if available. Feel free to attach statistics as part of your reply in Table form or other.)
- (c) A breakdown of how Federal Government funding has been allocated as part of the CCTV programme.
- (d) Direct financial costs absorbed by the Council/organisation for operational, technological and administrative aspects of the street camera programme.
- (e) A brief summary of the benefits and shortcomings of the street camera programme.
- (f) Briefly, would more funding from the Federal Government assist in the operation of your street camera programme? Elaborate.