March 2019

Guildford Borough Council CCTV Project: *report on evidence gathered from academic research*

Jonathan Allen
University of Surrey

1.0   Introduction:

Closed-circuit television (CCTV) has become a prominent part of everyday life within the United Kingdom. With significant funding from the government throughout the 1990's into the 2000's fuelling its expansion, CCTV has conjured much commentary. This report will look into the academic research associated with CCTV, in an attempt to answer a range of different questions, surrounding the efficacy of CCTV in relation to crime prevention and detection of offenders. In addition, it will assess the impact of reduced monitoring of CCTV, re-deployable capabilities and the public value of CCTV (as set out in the terms of reference, see Annex A). This report is solely for informative purposes, it does not intend to provide a comprehensive review of all relevant literature, but the most significant academic research related to the topic/sub-topic. Moreover, some pieces of research which could have contributed to this report are unavailable, although attempts were made to access these texts (see section 9.0 for requested documents). Overall, the picture of CCTV presented is mixed, in terms of prevention, usage and public opinion, among others. The importance of context will be stressed throughout this report, especially in terms of situational crime prevention.

2.0   What does the evidence say about the efficacy of CCTV in terms of crime prevention?

The crime prevention impact of CCTV is arguably the most covered topic within the literature. Within this section we will look at the sub-topic of crime prevention in different ways and from different perspectives, before summarising.

Welsh and Farrington (2002) conducted a systematic review for the Home Office into the effects of CCTV in crime prevention. The report aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of CCTV in preventing crime. In essence systematic reviews are used in order to "locate, appraise and synthesise evidence from prior evaluation studies" (Welsh & Farrington, 2002: p.3), through the use of strict and rigorous methods (i.e. direct objectives, specific criteria for the inclusion/exclusion of studies, 'extensive' searches for eligible studies etc.). Systematic reviews can be useful in separating the 'good' evaluation from the 'bad', in a methodological sense and summarising the overall findings in an area. Many evaluations carried out on CCTV may not be robust as they do not have certain features (i.e. at least one control area to be used for comparison) expected from a more methodologically sound piece of work.

Their criteria for inclusion within the review included: CCTV being the focus of the intervention; there was an outcome measure of crime; the evaluation was of high methodological quality, including before and after measures of crime in an experimental and control area; there was at least one experimental and one control area; the total number of crimes in each area before the implementation of the intervention was at least 20. With searches for evaluations utilising databases, inspecting literature reviews on effectiveness of CCTV, bibliography searches of CCTV reports and contacts with leading researchers. Twenty-two CCTV evaluations met the criteria for inclusion within this review, reflecting research known up to the end of December 2000. The main research areas were city centres and public housing (council housing), car parks and public transport. Half of the evaluations found a desirable effect on crime (meaning that crime

reduced), whilst five had an undesirable effect and another five had no effect, with the one remaining evaluation having an uncertain effect on crime (unclear evidence). Results from the meta-analysis (18 studies were included from the 22, as the rest did not contain the information needed) showed that CCTV had a very small but significant effect on crime. All evaluations were either from the UK or North America. Of the 18 studies, half that had a desirable effect on crime were conducted within the UK, for the 9 other studies showing an undesirable effect on crime, all 5 North American studies were in this category.

In terms of the different settings there were mixed results of effectiveness, car parks displayed evidence of a significant reduction in crime, although all studies included other interventions along with CCTV. Public transportation presented conflicting evidence of effectiveness, ultimately giving a non-significant reduction. For city centres and public housing there was a very small reduction in crime, but this was dependent on the country. Within the UK CCTV showed a significant effect. Displacement or diffusion of benefits are often discussed in relation to crime prevention initiatives. However, in terms of CCTV, there is great variation in both cases and producing a conclusive result would be extremely difficult. Overall, the review suggests that CCTV is most effective at reducing crime in car parks, but as mentioned, other interventions were used as well (i.e. improved lighting, notices etc.). Therefore, it is difficult to know the impact of stand-a-lone CCTV as other interventions may have contributed to the reduction of crime.

Following on from their research for the Home Office, Welsh and Farrington (2009) conducted an updated systematic review, including new research that had been undertaken since their first review. This research focused on public area surveillance (for example: city/town centres, car parks, public transportation). Their criteria for inclusion follows that of their 2002 study, and the same search strategies were used. In this review, 44 evaluations met the criteria to be included within the systematic review, with 41 studies being used in the meta-analysis. Overall, their results suggest consistency with the first review, in that CCTV is most effective in reducing crime in car parks and with vehicle related crime. Moreover, CCTV is more effective in reducing crime within the UK than within other countries. However, this may be due to the abundance of evaluations carried out within the UK (n=34). Furthermore, the evaluations based within city/town centres, along with public transport, suggest no significant effect on crime. Welsh and Farrington (2009, p.741) note the need for research in order to help identify the 'ingredients of effective CCTV programmes' in order to show casual mechanisms linking CCTV to the reduction of crime. Nineteen of the 44 studies included other interventions, therefore there is difficulty understanding the independent effects of each of the components.

Welsh and Farrington then conducted another systematic review on the topic, along with two other academics (see Piza, Welsh, Farrington and Thomas, 2018). They note that their findings reflect and build upon those included within the previous reviews. Again, the research method followed the same criteria, however, the search strategy was slightly different compared to the others. Eighty evaluations were included within this review, with 76 providing data for the meta-analysis. CCTV is associated with a modest, but significant decrease in crime. Once again, crime in car parks showed to have the biggest preventative effect and the UK had the strongest effectiveness rates. Interestingly, significant crime reductions were seen within residential areas. Moreover,

the way in which agencies use CCTV is an important consideration – active monitoring systems and using CCTV in conjunction with other interventions generate larger effect sizes. Meaning that the presence of the camera alone may not be a deterrent effect. Thus, supporting the notion that CCTV shouldn't be used as a panacea, but a single component to a 'comprehensive strategy involving multiple interventions' (Piza, Welsh, Farrington, Thomas, 2018: p.6). The authors still state that further research needs to aim to investigate active 'ingredients' associated with effects. This mirrors the point that context is highly important in terms of situational crime prevention.

Diverting away from the more scientific method that we have seen, Taylor (2010) looks at evaluations from a qualitative perspective, suggesting several problems relating to the evidence base. First and on an important note, Taylor suggests that many authors do not explain what CCTV is, instead they rely on assumptions of the reader. However, this notion implicitly assumes we all have the same idea of CCTV, when as noted, "the uses and application of CCTV is varied" (Taylor, 2010: p.211). There is no such thing as a typical CCTV system. Relating back to the concept of context, Taylor notes "what 'works' in one context, for one group, is not necessarily the right solution to another group in a different environment despite demonstrating the same symptoms. Context is the key." (Taylor, 2010: p.214).

Second, it is suggested that within the evaluations put forward by Welsh and Farrington, specifically in reference to 'qualifying' for inclusion, that it was impossible for them to identify truly whether CCTV was the main intervention. Even within their reviews they note the number of studies where CCTV was not the only intervention used. Moreover, there is obvious scepticism needed when using police recorded crime as the main data source. If crime recording does increase alongside the intervention of CCTV, this does not necessarily show a negative impact, as it *could* show an increase in the *detection* of crime. Moreover, the use of experimental and control areas cannot fully account and control for the differences in variables between places: "It is doubtful that institutions, town centres, shopping centres, and so on can be equated." (Taylor, 2010: p.218).

Webster (2009) also puts forward a different viewpoint on CCTV evaluations, as he suggests that although CCTV still remains popular, 'myths' raise concern for the evidence base that policy is built on - suggesting that it is 'un-reliable and ill-informed'. Throughout his article he tackles different 'myths' related to CCTV, of particular importance are the discussions around that myth that CCTV 'works', citizens' perceptions of CCTV and CCTV's function of reducing crime. In terms of CCTV 'working' it is suggested that evidence is inconclusive and disputed, noting that systematic reviews of CCTV suggest that it can 'work' but only in certain circumstances and its effectiveness is overplayed. Furthermore, Webster later goes on to suggest that CCTV is more effective in reducing unwanted behaviour (anti-social behaviour) than reducing crime.

Overall, the literature included here suggests that CCTV can be effective in terms of prevention of certain crimes in certain places. However, there is complexity here. Qualitative understandings allow for a multi-layered outlook of CCTV efficacy, in terms of context, increased recordings, and evidence base. Although, these considerations consequently may present an obscured understanding of crime prevention effectiveness.

3.0   What does the evidence say about the efficacy of CCTV in terms of detection of offenders?

Overall, it seems from much of the literature available that the detection or increased detection of crimes or offenders is often taken for granted as an inevitable effect of CCTV. However, this shouldn't be assumed. It is difficult to find literature specifically on the efficacy relating to the detection of specific offenders, as it is most likely to focus on different types of offences, for instance drug crimes or assault. However, even in the latter case, literature is sparse.

Gill and Spriggs (2005: p.30) touch upon the detection of offenders within car parks in their evaluation. They suggest that CCTV allowed for the provision of additional evidence of the offenders (in this case, prolific offenders) resulting in an increase in detection rate for criminal offences.

Piza, Caplin & Kennedy (2014) looked to see whether CCTV detections, when compared against 911 calls, lead to increased enforcement action by police. This study occurred in Newark, New Jersey, USA and was conducted over a period of three years. A total of 8,115 incidents were included in their analysis, with 1,385 CCTV detections and 6,730 calls. Their findings suggest that crime incidents that were detected and reported by CCTV resulted in higher enforcement actions, when compared to 911 calls.

Although these two brief pieces of research demonstrate increased detection, there is not enough literature to comment on the overall effectiveness in terms of detection of offenders. Piza et al (2014) note that offenders were likely to take risks and offend within sight of CCTV as it wasn't perceived as a serious threat. Only offenders previously caught through CCTV were more likely to suggest that cameras increase the likelihood of detection.

4.0   Is there any evidence that has looked at the impact of reduced response to CCTV?

The literature on the topic of reduced monitoring is sparse. However, it is clear to see that in some studies, the focus is not on 24/7 coverage, but only on peak times (i.e. times when criminal/anti-social behaviour is thought to most likely take place). This limited coverage, in combination with 'active' monitoring, allows operators to 'look out' for suspicious or criminal behaviour over a shortened period of time.

For example, Piza, Caplin, Kennedy & Gilchrist (2015) looked to test whether proactive CCTV monitoring could impact on increased enforcement actions. In relation to violent offences, social disorder and drug offences, within Newark, New Jersey, USA. Throughout their literature review, they note that the exact relationship between proactive policing and CCTV remains 'elusive' (Piza, Caplin, Kennedy & Gilchrist, 2015: p.46). They used an experimental design in the form of an extra officer monitoring specific CCTV cameras, as well as two patrol cars designated to responding to reported

incidents of 'concern'. Although these conditions do not reflect the 'typical' (typical conditions in this case refer to CCTV operators looking at more screens, for a longer duration, as well as not having police officers designated to only responding to observations) and limitations were noted, it is important to discuss their findings. They suggest that there were 'sizeable' and 'meaningful' reductions in relation to violent crime and social disorder. However, they found that drug offences didn't decrease throughout the period of experiment, most likely due these kind of crimes being 'immune' to street level policing (Piza, Caplin, Kennedy & Gilchrist, 2015: p.62), or the ability of offences to occur in other near-by areas, out of CCTV range. They conclude by stating:

"…this experiment produced meaningful results with relatively minimal personnel resources. Only two patrol cars and one CCTV operator were needed for this 4-h per day, 4-days per week, 11- week intervention to achieve sizable reductions in street crime…findings add support to the hypothesis that the integration of CCTV with proactive, focused police activity generates a crime control benefit greater than…is achievable via stand-alone camera deployment." (Piza, Caplin, Kennedy & Gilchrist, 2015: p.64)

Gerell (2016) looked to evaluate the impact of actively monitored CCTV in order to assist in crime prevention with the police for areas deemed to be hot-spots for assaults. This study was conducted in Malmö, Sweden. They found that there was no effect between actively monitored CCTV and directed police patrol in terms of significant reductions of assaults. There was a reduction of assaults in the period of treatments, however, the author notes that violent crime within the town dropped dramatically prior to the beginning of this study. Therefore, it was not known whether the slight reduction was following the trend of the downward spells of assaults, or whether CCTV directed policing did have an impact.

Although these results differ from that of Piza et al (2015), it was important to include within this topic area as another example of CCTV monitoring over a certain time period. However, whilst both studies here generally follow some similar experimental methods, the context differs in a range of factors including: public perception of CCTV, prior crime rates etc. Replication of methods within different contexts results in variance.

In terms of Guildford, the impact of reduced monitoring will not be known until the changes come into force. Although, the issue of reduced monitoring through lack of resources also brings into question the effectiveness of said monitoring. Studies have previously identified different aspects of this (see Smith, 2004). For example, Keval and Sasse (2010) looked into thirteen different control rooms within London, either managed by police, local authority or private security. They found that camera position issues, workstation set-up, and communication difficulties (i.e. noise levels within the control room) all had the ability to hinder effectiveness of monitoring performance.

5.0 Is there academic research looking at the mobile capability of CCTV?

In terms of the literature, the majority of studies have focused on static CCTV. Limitations often cited include: type of camera (for example: shoebox, or dome), image

quality, lines of sight etc. (Gill, Rose & Collins, 2005). Therefore, in theory mobile/re-deployable CCTV (RCCTV) should be able to overcome some barriers, providing targeted responses in crime hot-spot areas. They are said to be flexible, as they can be attached to lamp posts, operated via computer, control room or briefcase, as well as pictures being monitored live or reviewed at a later time (Gill et al, 2006). However, the literature on re-deployable CCTV is very small.

In a report put forward by the Home Office into the effectiveness of CCTV, two schemes included RCCTV (Gill et al, 2005). In the first case 'Borough' (Gill et al, 2005: p.28) eight cameras could be installed in a location anywhere within the borough and there were 22 deployments throughout the evaluation period. Cameras were deployed singularly, but sometimes twice at a time. It was noted that there were many technical and monitoring issues throughout the period. For example, issues included: time lag between the capture of images, difficulty in controlling of the cameras, reactive monitoring, as well as limited police usage. The results showed that the aim of tackling crime within hot spot areas was not achieved. Moreover, whilst public support of residents began as positive, this decreased when "youths realised…that police were not responding to the images" (Gill et al, 2005: p.30).

The second scheme evaluated was labelled as 'Deploy Estate' (Gill et al, 2005: p.30), where eleven cameras were used across five different areas. This case resulted in an increase of crime, including that of criminal damage to the cameras themselves, mirroring the risk of damage that permanent CCTV holds. Issues within this scheme included: wrong monitoring of the system; no interlink between cameras; operators had little knowledge of the camera placements, along with the types of crimes occurring within the area; cameras would only move if operated; and only day-time footage was useful due to quality issues.

Moreover, Gill et al (2006) looked into RCCTV within three different locations within England, with two sites being managed through the local council and the other, through the police. The study was originally designed as two-fold, one in terms of evaluation in order to produce a best practice guide for RCCTV and the other, was focused on the impact of tackling drug crime. However, due to the various number of difficulties faced during the research, the study morphed to solely being focused on the evaluation. Faults were apparent at all stages from planning right through to implementation, which they break down five categories: "(1) the lack of thought concerning how the equipment would be used; (2) inadequate staff preparation and training prior to receiving and using the equipment; (3) the misunderstanding of the cost and resource implications required to implement a RCCTV scheme; (4) issues over partnership collaboration between and within organizations; and (5) technical difficulties with the equipment." (Gill et al, 2006: p.453), with technical difficulties proving the biggest challenge of all. Cameras often needed to be returned for technical repair, leaving the sites with no CCTV. Along with issues of camera failure, condensation in the camera housing, and weak transmissions and signal. Despite the failures, it was noted that the site managed by the police had the most deployments out of the three schemes, resulting in several arrests for drug-related crimes. They conclude by stating that: "RCCTV brings its own pitfalls and even greater

care must be taken in the planning and implementation of RCCTV systems if they are to have the desired, or indeed any, impact.' (Gill et al, 2006: p.458). And go onto state: "RCCTV systems are more sensitive than static systems to wrong choices being made. Their flexibility and portability can be at once advantageous and problematic. Constantly moving the cameras may make them susceptible to developing technical faults." (Gill et al, 2006: p.459).

Although there are only three examples of studies, it is clear to see that not only static CCTV will be affected by problems relating to planning, implementation and technology. RCCTV must be well thought through, with extensive planning prior to concluding its use for deployment and thereafter, technical issues may interfere anyway. Many limitations were noted throughout this section, therefore careful thought and consideration is needed in regard to RCCTV.

6.0 What does the evidence say about the public value of CCTV?

Without too broad generalisations, it is clear from the literature that support from the public in terms of CCTV yields mixed but reasonably favourable results. This will be dependent on many contextual factors. In terms of the public valuing CCTV, the term value will have different meanings to individuals. Whether this means the public think CCTV is effective in crime prevention and detection, or whether they feel increased safety within an area covered by CCTV, or whether they feel it breaches their own privacy. 'Value' is open to interpretation on many parts, therefore, when looking at studies, it is important to note they are context dependent.

Gill, Bryan and Allen (2007) looked into the views of individuals within residential areas in terms of support for CCTV. They found that although overall support for CCTV is generally positive, a post survey questionnaire found that this support was reduced after its implementation. Moreover, previous victimization affected the levels of worry of crime and feelings of being unsafe within the area. Although support reduced with time, they conclude by adding that the largely positive results seen here were 'unsurprising' considering that there is a "wealth of positive publicity that CCTV receives in local and national news." (Gill, Bryan and Allen, 2007: p.322).

Research conducted for Cambridge City Council looked to determine the levels of support in installing CCTV within the city centre. Bennett & Gelsthorpe (1996) used structured interviews in order to collect the data and used the sample based on that of the census at the time. They found that large majorities of the sample thought that CCTV was effective in terms of detection, deterrence and fear reduction (three-quarters of the sample for detection and fear reduction effectiveness and two-thirds for deterrence). Overall, support for the use of CCTV was found to be 64% of the 713 sampled, with differences highlighted between genders, and more support found in females compared to males. Among other analysis, they suggest that CCTV might offer a sense of 'protection' to individuals in areas they may have avoided previously. However, it must be noted that whether the answers given by respondents would turn into reality is difficult to know.

Brands, Schwanen & Van Aalst (2016) looked to investigate experiences of perceived safety in relation to CCTV within the night-time economy. They do this in a different way to most studies, as they approached individuals in the 'midst of a situation'. This meaning that participants were approached at specific locations within the cities (Rotterdam and Utrecht, The Netherlands) at night, between the hours of 22:00 – 02:00 on a Thursday, Friday and Saturday in June and July of 2010. They conducted very short interviews with individuals, lasting around 5 minutes and a total of 84 participants were achieved. They found that greater awareness of CCTV in the immediate area may result in increased perceptions of personal safety within individuals at night. However, it is suggested that there are limitations in actual perceived safety, as CCTV proves more useful after an incident than in the moment and this was noted in the participants' responses. Conversely, differing from some literature on gender and ethnicity differences, they found only small differences in terms of evaluation and awareness, not enough to be significant.

Webster (2009) argues that perception is based on the belief that CCTV works in reducing crime, but suggests that public support may diminish in light of the limitations of CCTV. Furthermore, it is suggested that the public base is misunderstood in terms of the actions of CCTV, thinking that control rooms are continuously monitored and that if an incident were to occur, those 'watching' would provide a suitable response.

This range of different studies, along with their results, demonstrate the difficulty in generalising public opinion. The value placed in CCTV will vary considerably. The 'likely impact' on the public within Guildford is outside of the scope of this project, but could be seen to be dependent on a number of factors. For example: how widely shared the information is on the changes occurring with CCTV in Guildford, how much information individuals know/have about the current system in place, whether the times not be actively monitored now were producing great enough results to warrant keeping staff on at those times, as well as if there is an increase in crime within those times after the adjustments have taken place etc.

7.0   Is there any evidence relating to reassurance value for partner agencies who are able utilise and access the CCTV networks?

A number of different terms were used when searching for material within this area, however, it proved very difficult to find any literature on. Therefore, this is an area that needs further research.

8.0   Conclusion

This report has attempted to address several different questions of areas within CCTV. It is clear to see that within academic research there is much discussion and debate. Many of the areas covered still need further research, in order to provide valuable insight into the different aspects of CCTV. CCTV's effectiveness in crime prevention has shown that car parks produce the most significant results, along with residential areas. It will be interesting to see if this trend continues in an upcoming piece of research (Piza, Welsh, Farrington & Thomas, 2019). Effectiveness of detection is often taken as a guaranteed result of installing CCTV and public support is often thought of as being exclusively in

favour of CCTV. However, what all of these points have in common is being context dependent. The reason for stressing context within this report is that it plays such a big role in determining the results of research. An almost endless list of factors interplay with CCTV research, from the place to people, objectives, crime rates, monitoring, camera set-up etc. The concept of context should be at the forefront of thought when considering research on CCTV.

9.0   Observations from Guildford CCTV Control Room Visit

A visit to the CCTV Control Room within Surrey Police Station was conducted on 16th April 2019 at 13:00. The intention of the visit was to observe the working environment, and if allowed, for open conversation to flow. It must be noted that this was only a brief visit, lasting for just under 40 minutes, therefore, the reflections presented should be considered in this light. Detailed understandings of control rooms would require in-depth field research, carried out over a prolonged period of time. Moreover, this would allow for understandings of all benefits and problems associated with the control room. However, this is out of the scope of the research at hand.

As previously acknowledged (section 4.0, para 6), research on control room dynamics often focuses on the social processes between 'the watchers and those watched', understanding control room practices, or issues affecting monitoring performance. Due to the nature of the visit, the most practical research to focus on is the latter. For example, Keval and Sasse (2006) conducted field visits to 5 different control rooms within London boroughs. One part of their study looked into problems faced by operators when conducting different tasks. Issues included low operator to camera ratio, difficulty processing large amounts of information, and problematic equipment. Moreover, similar findings were found in an earlier study by Keval (2005).

In terms of the Guildford Control Room, usually one operator would be looking at over 30 different cameras at any one time. Although, this is in addition to the multiple screens and computers located on the desk in front of the operator. It was clear that operators within the control room are usually working alone, although overlaps occur due to shift patterns. A mixture of proactive and reactive surveillance work takes place. It was suggested that within certain instances, multiple streams of communication could become difficult to manage. Therefore, as operators were working alone, if multiple incidents occurred at the same time, issues would need to be prioritised.

During brief conversation with the operator on duty, issues hindering the effectiveness of tasks were made clear. It was suggested that the operation of two different systems (analogue and digital [Internet Protocol a.k.a. IP]) running concurrently was a hindrance, as two different camera control systems were being used. This also touches on the issue of having too much equipment and not enough room. Desks contained a large variety of different artefacts including radios, keyboards, control systems for operating cameras, etc. The older equipment for controlling cameras generated a sense of unease, as it was suggested that if equipment failed, replacements could not be found due to the age of the technology.

Electronic and hard-copies of camera locations were said to be used – however, developed knowledge of the area proved highly beneficial. The operator was asked if they had any suggestions for locations not currently covered by CCTV and subsequently recommended three locations within Guildford which could use greater coverage, they included:

- Guildford Park Road
- Tesco, Park Barn Road
- Sydenham Road

Interestingly, the operator discussed a different benefit to CCTV, of keeping a 'watchful eye' over individuals. For instance, it was suggested that cameras have been used to track individuals that were in a vulnerable state until they reached places of safety. This brief insight provides a different dimension on the public value of CCTV, as the general public would be unaware of this.

Overall, this visit can be seen to add more context within Guildford, rather than relying on more abstract research findings in different settings. Issues identified through this brief visit were: the use of two different camera systems, the age of equipment, and three locations where CCTV could be beneficial within Guildford.

10.0   References:

Bennett, T., & Gelsthorpe, L. (1996). Public attitudes towards CCTV in public places. *Studies on crime and crime prevention*, 5(1), 72-90.

Brands, J., Schwanen, T., & Van Aalst, I. (2016). What are you looking at? Visitors' perspectives on CCTV in the night-time economy. *European urban and regional studies*, 23(1), 23-39.

Gerell, M. (2016). Hot spot policing with actively monitored CCTV cameras: Does it reduce assaults in public places?. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 26(2), 187-201.

Gill, M., & Spriggs, A. (2005). *Assessing the impact of CCTV*. London, England: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Gill, M., Bryan, J., & Allen, J. (2007). Public Perceptions of CCTV in Residential Areas: "It Is Not As Good As We Thought It Would Be.". *International Criminal Justice Review*, 17(4), 304-324.

Gill, M., Rose, A., & Collins, K. (2005) *A good practice guide for the implementation of redeployable CCTV.* [Online]. Available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.486.7408&rep=rep1&type=pdf. (Accessed: 10 March 2018).

Gill, M., Rose, A., Collins, K., & Hemming, M. (2006). Redeployable CCTV and drug-related crime: A case of implementation failure. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 13(5), 451-460.

Gill, M., Spriggs, A., Allen, J., Argomaniz, J., Bryan, J., Hemming, M., Jessiman, P., Kara, D., Kilworth, J., Little, R., Swain, D. and Waples, S. (2005): *The Impact of CCTV: Fourteen Case Studies*, Home Office Online Report, London: Home Office.

Keval, H. (2006). CCTV control room collaboration and communication: does it work?. In *Proceedings of human centred technology workshop* (pp. 45-48).

Keval, H., & Sasse, M. A. (2010). "Not the Usual Suspects": a study of factors reducing the effectiveness of CCTV. *Security Journal*, 23(2), 134-154.

Keval, H., & Sasse, M. A. (2006). Man or gorilla? Performance issues with CCTV technology in security control rooms. In *16th World Congress on Ergonomics Conference, International Ergonomics Association* (pp. 10-14).

Piza, E. L., Caplan, J. M., Kennedy, L. W. (2014) Is the Punishment More Certain? An Analysis of CCTV Detections and Enforcement, *Justice Quarterly*, 31(6), 1015-1043

Piza, E. L., Caplan, J. M., Kennedy, L. W., & Gilchrist, A. M. (2015). The effects of merging proactive CCTV monitoring with directed police patrol: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(1), 43-69.

Piza, E.L., Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. and Thomas, A.L. (2018) *CCTV and Crime Prevention: A New Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.* Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention. Available at: http://mws-73973.mws3.csx.cam.ac.uk/people/academic_research/david_farrington/cctv18.pdf (Accessed 20/02/2019)

Piza, E.L., Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. and Thomas, A.L. (2019) CCTV surveillance for crime prevention: A 40-year systematic review with meta-analysis. *Criminology and Public Policy*, in press. (forthcoming).

Scottish Government (2009). *The Effectiveness of Public Space CCTV: A review of recent published evidence regarding the impact of CCTV on crime.* [Online] Available at: https://www2.gov.scot/resource/doc/294462/0090979.pdf. (Accessed 01/03/2019).

Smith, G. J. (2004). Behind the screens: Examining constructions of deviance and informal practices among CCTV control room operators in the UK. *Surveillance & Society*, 2(2/3).

Spriggs, A., Argomaniz, J., Gill, M., & Bryan, J. (2005). *Public attitudes towards CCTV: results from the Pre-intervention Public Attitude Survey carried out in areas implementing CCTV.* Home Office Online Report, 10(05).

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., Gill, M. (2014) CCTV: "Reflections on Its Use, Abuse and Effectiveness" In: *The Handbook of Security.* Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 705-726. (access issue)

Waples, S., Gill, M. (2006) The effectiveness of redeployable CCTV. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 8(1), 1–16. (requested)

Webster, C.W.R. (2009). CCTV policy in the UK: reconsidering the evidence base. *Surveillance and Society*, 6(1), pp.10-22. Available at:https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/1798/1/SurveillanceSociety%2009.pdf. (Accessed 08/03/2019).

Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. (2002). *Crime prevention effects of closed-circuit television: a systematic review* (Vol. 252). London: Home Office. Available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.321.6121&rep=rep1&type=pdf. (Accessed 05/03/2019).

Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. (2004). Evidence-based crime prevention: The effectiveness of CCTV. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 6(2), pp.21-33. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8140184. (requested)

Welsh, B.C., Farrington, D.P. (2009). Public area CCTV and crime prevention: an updated systematic review and meta- analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 26(4), pp.716-745.

Research Terms of Reference
Guildford Borough Council CCTV project

Context

Guildford Borough Council and Surrey Police have a shared CCTV system in place which consists of numerous static cameras around the area. The Control room is sited at Guildford Police Station with police staff on duty throughout the 24 hour period each day.

Resource constraints have now meant that police need to pare back staffing in the control room and this has resulted in discussions as to how to mitigate any risk created by having a room that is not staffed throughout the night.

A mapping exercise establishing where all cameras are in the Borough is underway to capture all those on private premises such as the University and an options review is being commenced.

As part of that work, we would like some academic research undertaken into what works in respect of CCTV and what the emerging good practice is in this regard.

Areas of interest

What does the evidence say about the efficacy of CCTV in terms of crime prevention and detection of offenders?

Is there any evidence that has looked at the impact of reduced response to CCTV i.e. reduced resource controlling cameras, that is not being 24/7 operator coverage?

Is static camera coverage the best way to go? Are there other options that have been evaluated to an academic level? Is a mobile capability that can be dropped into a problem area an option?

What evidence is there that the public value CCTV? What is likely impact on them if we have less coverage in the control room or that we change the setup or configuration of our systems?

Is there any evidence relating to reassurance value for partner agencies who are able utilise and access the CCTV networks, such as wardens and pub watch etc.

<u>Work required</u>

The group requests a report that covers the key points above to inform our considerations around this topic.

This work will be used to inform decision making and the management of risk for the community whilst helping to shape the future in the Borough as regards community safety.

<u>Timescale</u>

We would like to be in a position to make decisions in April/May 2019.

Summary of Camera Locations *Date: 16th May 2019*

Number	Location	Camera Model	Year First Installed	Principal Reasons for Use*
1	High Street op. Friary Street.	Redvision RVX18	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
2	High Street op. Quarry Street.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
3	High Street junc. Chapel Street.	Mic-400	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
4	High Street op. Market Street.	Mic-400	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
5	High Street op. Tunsgate.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
6	High Street op. Jeffries Passage.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
7	High Street Junc. North Street.	Mic-400	1995	Town centre. Retail/business & violent crime.
8	High Street next to R.G.S.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
9	High Street cnr. Pizza Express.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
10	High Street op. Alexander Terrace.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
11	North Street op. Dolphin House.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business & violent crime.
12	Walnut Tree Close junc. Bridge Street.	Hikvision Dark Fighter PTZ	1995	Town centre. Business & violent crime & anti-social behaviour.
13	North Street op. Ward Street.	Mic-400	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
14	North Street op. Market Street.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
15	North Street op. Leapale Road.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
16	North Street junc. Swan Lane.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Business & anti-social behaviour.
17	North Street op Commercial Road.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Business & anti-social behaviour.
18	North Street op Friary Street.	Mic-400	1995	Town centre. Business & anti-social behaviour.
19	Onslow Street op. Electric Theatre.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Business & anti-social behaviour.
20	Onslow Street op. Bedford Road.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Business & anti-social behaviour.
21	Leapale Lane junc. Woodbridge Road.	Surcha	1995	Town centre. Retail/business crime & anti-social behaviour.
22	Woodbridge Road op. Bojangles.	Hikvision	1995	Town centre, business & violent crime. Opposite "Guildford Village" development.
23	Bedford Road junc. Laundry Road.	Surcha	1995	Overlooks Crown Court. Also near car park – vehicle crime.
24	Bedford Road op. Odeon Cinema.	Surcha	2000	Anti-social behaviour. Safety of pedestrian route from station.

25	Woodbridge Rd. junc. Ladymead Retail Park.	Mic-400	2000	Strategic route to town. Business crime, vehicle crime & monitoring suspect vehicles.
26	Stoke Interchange.	Surcha	2000	Strategic route. Vehicle crime & monitoring suspect vehicles.
27	Guildford Police Station	Surcha	2000	Good overview of Woodbridge Rd., York Rd, & Onslow Street.
28	Onslow Street junc. Bridge Street	Surcha	2000	Town centre. Business, violent crime and anti-social behaviour.
29	Aldershot Road junc. Worplesdon Rd.	Surcha	2001	Strategic route. Vehicle crime & monitoring suspect vehicles.
30	Walnut Tree Close op. University Footbridge.	Hikvision Dark Fighter PTZ	2001	Anti-social behaviour. Safety of pedestrian route to University.
31	Portsmouth Road Car Park	Surcha	2001	Overlooks Friary Passage. Anti-social behaviour & vehicle crime. Strategic route - monitoring of suspect vehicles. Flood monitoring
32	Haydon Place junc. Leapale Lane	Mic-400	2001	Residential area near town centre. Anti-social behaviour & reassurance.
33	Millmead Car Park op. Porridge Pot Alley	Surcha	2001	Anti-social behaviour & reassurance. Vehicle crime. Flood monitoring.
34	York Road junc. Stoke Road	Surcha	2001	Strategic route near school. Vehicle crime & reassurance.
35	Millbrook adj. Millbrook Car Park	Surcha	2001	Anti-social behaviour, reassurance and vehicle crime.
36	Ash Street junc. Star Lane	Surcha	2001	Business & vehicle crime. Reassurance.
37	Ash Hill Road junc. Shawfield Road & Wharf Road	Mic-400	2003	Business crime & anti-social behaviour.
38	Moorfield Road junc. Woking Road	Surcha	2003	Strategic route. Business & vehicle crime. Monitor suspect vehicles.
39	Moorfield Road op. Unit 24	Surcha	2003	Business crime & reassurance.
40	Epsom Road, Merrow, junc. Bushy Hill Drive	Mic-400	2004	Strategic route. Business & vehicle crime. Monitor suspect vehicles.
41	Horsham Road, Shalford, junc. With King's Road	Surcha	2004	Strategic route. Monitor suspect vehicles. Reassurance.
42	Stoughton Road junc. with Manor Road	Mic-400	2004	Burglaries and vehicle crime. Reassurance.
43	Southway, near subway under A3	Hikvision Dark Fighter PTZ	2005	Safety of pedestrians using subway. Reassurance.
44	Portsmouth Road Car Park opposite Town Wharf.	Hic Vision PTZ	2017	Anti-social behaviour and reassurance at Town Wharf on other river bank.
61	Egerton Road Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Pedestrian safety, anti-social behaviour, reassurance.

62	Egerton Road Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Pedestrian safety, anti-social behaviour, reassurance.
63	Egerton Road Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Pedestrian safety, anti-social behaviour, reassurance.
64	Egerton Road Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Pedestrian safety, anti-social behaviour, reassurance.
45	Cathedral Roundabout	Mic-400	2007	Strategic Route (linked to 44), monitor suspect vehicles, anti-social behaviour and reassurance
46	Dover Arms Roundabout, Ash	Mic-400	2008	Strategic route, reassurance - view of level crossing.
47	Southway Subway	Mic-400	2008	Safety of pedestrians using subway. Reassurance.
48	Southway Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Safety of pedestrians using subway. Reassurance.
51	Southway Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Safety of pedestrians using subway. Reassurance.
52	Southway Subway	Fixed, vandal resistant.	2008	Safety of pedestrians using subway. Reassurance.
49	London Road junction with York Road	Mic-400	2011	Strategic route, anti-social behaviour and reassurance.
50	Millbrook (Town Mill).	Mic-400	2010	Retail, strategic route, anti-social behaviour.
51	*London Rd. oppp G-Live.*	-	-	*Proposed.*
52	*Dene Rd junc with Denmark Rd*	-	-	*Proposed.*
53	Woodbridge Rd. junc. Leas Rd.	Mic-400	2016	Strategic route, anti-social behaviour and reassurance.
54	Waitrose/Haydon Place opp No. 62	Hikvision PTZ Dome	2017	Anti-social behaviour and reassurance.
55	Woodbridge Road Cricket Ground footpath (Woodbridge Rd end).	Hikvision PTZ Dome	2016	Pedestrian safety and reassurance.
56	Woodbridge Road Cricket Ground footpath (Woodbridge Rd end).	Hikvision Fixed Dome	2016	Pedestrian safety and reassurance.
57	Woodbridge Road Cricket Ground footpath (Woodbridge Meadows end).	Hikvision PTZ Dome	2016	Pedestrian safety and reassurance.
58	Woodbridge Road Cricket Ground footpath (Woodbridge Meadows end).	Hikvision Fixed Dome	2016	Pedestrian safety and reassurance.
59	Control room door.	-	-	
60	*No allocation.*	-	-	