



Big Brother Is Watching

The first comprehensive analysis of the number of CCTV cameras controlled by local authorities in Britain in 2009¹

Key Findings

- There are currently at least **59,753 CCTV cameras** controlled by 418 local authorities in Britain
- This equates to **1 council-owned CCTV camera for every 1000 people** in the country
- **Portsmouth** and **Nottinghamshire** Councils are in control of the **most cameras with a total of 1,454** each; with **Fife** Council a close third controlling **1,350 cameras**.
- The **Outer Hebrides** (*Comhairle nan Eilean Siar*) has the highest number of CCTV cameras per 1000 people with a total of **8.3 cameras for every 1000 residents** in the borough; **Portsmouth** is second, controlling **7.8 CCTV cameras per 1000 people**.

Executive Summary

The Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) camera has become a ubiquitous feature on Britain's streets. The most frequently quoted figure for the number of CCTV cameras in the UK (c.4 million) is based on a loose estimate generated by a walk taken down a single street over a decade ago.

Whilst virtually impossible to count the precise number of privately owned CCTV cameras, this report seeks to establish the full extent of Britain's local authority-controlled surveillance. This report does not therefore include the many cameras controlled by private individuals and companies, by central government, on our nation's motorways, or those controlled solely by Transport for London and situated on the bus, tube and tram network.

Big Brother Is Watching is the first report to bring together the various arguments against CCTV and place them alongside a definitive list of the number of CCTV cameras operated by Britain's 428 local authorities. Through Freedom of Information requests sent to every single local council in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Big Brother Watch has arrived at a figure of 59,753 CCTV cameras controlled by councils in the UK – up from 21,000 ten years ago.

¹ *Big Brother Is Watching* is the first report by Big Brother Watch, a new non-partisan grassroots campaign fighting intrusions on our privacy and civil liberties. The paper was written by Big Brother Watch Director Alex Deane, and Campaign Director Dylan Sharpe. With thanks to James Stannard for invaluable assistance with the research.



CCTV requires scrutiny for the following reasons:

1. CCTV has been viewed by those controlling expenditure as a cheap alternative to conventional policing, with no demonstrable equivalent success in reducing crime.
2. The efficacy of CCTV is open to challenge, with cameras regularly turned off, footage being deleted before it can be used and pictures of insufficient quality for court purposes.
3. Local authorities have spent an unprecedented amount of money to make the United Kingdom the most watched nation of people anywhere in the world. That amount of spending on CCTV is steadily increasing, with funds being diverted from conventional policing budgets to pay for the new technology.
4. CCTV serves as a placebo for many local authorities designed to appease neighbourhoods suffering from anti-social behaviour problems.
5. As the number of CCTV cameras increases, so does the potential number of people being watched and the number of council officers watching – with implications for personal privacy and data security.

Notwithstanding all of the expenditure on surveillance in our country to date, another wave of CCTV spending is now taking place despite the straitened economic climate. This is therefore an important time to debate these issues. Big Brother Watch intends to produce *Big Brother Is Watching* yearly to keep an annual check on the proliferation of CCTV cameras in the UK.

Alex Deane, Director of Big Brother Watch, said:

“Local councils across Britain are creating enormous networks of CCTV surveillance at great expense, but the evidence for the ability of CCTV to deter or solve crimes is sketchy at best. The quality of footage is frequently too poor to be used in courts, the cameras are often turned off to save money and control rooms are rarely manned 24-hours-a-day. With crime on the increase, it is understandable that some people want more CCTV, but we would all feel safer with more police on the beat, there would be fewer crimes and those crimes that do occur would be solved faster.”

To arrange broadcast interviews or discuss the research, please contact:

Dylan Sharpe, Campaign Director, Big Brother Watch

dylan.sharpe@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk

Mob: 07538 28 00 41 | Tel: 020 3170 82 84



What's wrong with CCTV?

The first national survey of existing and planned local authority CCTV systems, conducted in 1999, showed that 86 per cent of local authorities had installed a CCTV system and that in total there were approximately 21,000 cameras.² A similar study was conducted on behalf of BBC's Newsnight programme earlier this year, although this study only sent Freedom of Information requests to 100 local authorities. Where appropriate we have made comparisons with these studies.

Our research shows that in less than 10 years, the number of CCTV cameras controlled by local authorities has almost trebled. To evaluate this increase, it is necessary set out the problem posed by the rise of the use of closed-circuit surveillance.

We are not Luddites. There is obviously a role to play for technology in general, and CCTV in particular, in law enforcement and we are not opposed to CCTV *per se*. But the extent of our commitment to CCTV - to the exclusion of other forms of crime prevention - is remarkable. We ought to learn from the fact that we're the only country that has gone so far. The Shetland Islands have more CCTV cameras than the San Francisco Police Department. The public purse offers finite resources, and money spent on CCTV installation, maintenance, monitoring and imagery storage is money that cannot be spent on other forms of policing, such as officers on the street. A balance needs to be struck.

Over-reliance

CCTV has long been a key part of the government's overall strategy on public protection. It warranted its own national strategy document, published in 2007, in which Tony McNulty, then Minister of State for Security, said:

"I see CCTV as an important tool in the Government's crime-fighting strategy."³

Yet the rise of CCTV, to the detriment of other methods of crime prevention, has occurred without any real proof of CCTV providing a similar level of deterrent or success rates in convictions.

According to a 2002 National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) study into CCTV:

"Three quarters of the Home Office Crime Prevention budget was spent on CCTV between 1996 and 1998, yet a comprehensive review has revealed the overall reduction in crime was only five per cent. A parallel systematic review carried out by the Home Office that looked at street lighting, however, found a highly significant reduction in crime of 20 per cent."⁴ [Emphasis added]

² Webster, C.W.R. 1999. Cyber society or surveillance society? Findings from a national survey on closed circuit television in the UK. In *Exploring Cyber Society: Social, Political and Cultural Issues*, Proceedings of the Conference, Vol.2, 5-7 July, ed. J. Armitage, and J. Roberts,. Newcastle UK: University of Northumbria.

³ Home Office, [National CCTV Strategy](#), (Oct 2007), p.4

⁴ Armitage, R. [To CCTV or not to CCTV?](#), (Nacro, May 2002), p.6



In 2005 the Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate published an extensive review, *'Assessing the impact of CCTV'*.⁵ It set out to evaluate 13 of the 352 CCTV projects set up under the 1999-2003 round of the Prevention Budget, and it found that **CCTV had a negligible effect on crime rates** in the areas they monitored.

The Home Office concluded that the reason for the expansion of CCTV was that:

*"[CCTV] was oversold – by successive governments – as the answer to crime problems. Few seeking a share of the available funding saw it as necessary to demonstrate CCTV's effectiveness. After all, why would the government be giving out money for this and not other measures if it did not work? Yet it was rarely obvious why CCTV was the best response to crime in particular circumstances."*⁶

Having read this report and seen the resources placed by the government in the CCTV network, the House of Lords Constitutional Select Committee said:

*"Where previously this money might have been spent on street lighting and supporting neighbourhood crime prevention initiatives, it is now used to maintain and expand the network of police and local authority cameras."*⁷

The Government has itself admitted that there are no definitive national studies that find a positive deterrent effect of CCTV. Indeed, Tony McNulty, weeks after writing his positive foreword to the national strategy document, admitted to the Home Affairs Select Committee:

*"Can I point to a definitive national study that quantifies in any way its (CCTV's) success as a deterrent? No, I cannot..."*⁸

From the front line, the figures on the success rates of CCTV look even worse. In 2008, Detective Chief Inspector Mick Neville, the head of the Metropolitan Police's Visual Images, Identifications and Detections Office (VIIDO), described the system as an *"utter fiasco"* - with only 3% of London's street robberies solved using security cameras.⁹

In August 2009, in an internal report written by Neville and released by the Metropolitan Police under a Freedom of Information request, it was revealed that for every 1,000 cameras in London, less than one crime is solved per year.¹⁰

⁵ Gill and Spriggs, *Assessing the Impact of CCTV* (London: Home Office Research, Developments and Statistics Directorate, 2005)

⁶ Op Cit, p.116

⁷ House of Lords Select Committee on the Constitution, *Surveillance: Citizens and the State*, Volume I: Report (February 2009) p.20

⁸ Minister of State for Security, Counter-terrorism, Crime and Policing, Rt Hon Tony McNulty MP, Home Affairs Select Committee, *Surveillance Society?* Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1, p.65

⁹ BBC News, 6 May 2008 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7384843.stm>

¹⁰ Hope, C. [1,000 CCTV cameras to solve just one crime, Met Police admits](#), (Daily Telegraph, 25th August 2009)



There is no doubt that CCTV has been heavily supported by the Home Office with significant resources placed behind the spread of the technology. Yet this support does not appear, at least from the research commissioned in its aftermath, to be commensurate with its success in reducing crime.

a) Efficacy

The most enduring problem with CCTV is also, in theory, the most easily rectifiable – councils and police forces failing to use these complex systems properly, and investing in the wrong technology.

Studies have suggested that in only 15-30 per cent of cases CCTV images actually enable the police to identify alleged criminals.¹¹ In early 2009, Mike Milks, Chief Executive of Scyron – which helps police analyse CCTV images – said:

“We estimate that about half of the CCTV cameras in the country are next to useless when it comes to safeguarding the public against crime and assisting the police to secure convictions.”¹²

In the same report, John Bromley-Davenport QC pointed to the case of Wayne Redfern, who was kicked to death by a gang outside a pub in Kirkham, Lancashire three years ago, saying:

“Although much of the action was captured on film, the quality was not sufficiently good for the purpose of identification and the presence of the cameras was no deterrent to those involved.”¹³

The men were eventually jailed after they were arrested, based on evidence supplied by eye-witnesses - not the CCTV cameras.

The other issue is the operation of the cameras themselves. First, due to budgetary constraints within councils, public-facing cameras are often left switched off. In October 2009, a 60 year-old man was brutally assaulted by thugs at a train station. Despite the presence of several CCTV cameras on the platform, the British Transport Police had to drop the case when it was revealed the cameras had been turned off at the time of his attack.

Secondly, CCTV is compromised by poor operation of camera control rooms. A 2005 study by Gill and Spriggs found that six of the 13 control rooms they looked at were staffed for less than 24 hours a day:

“The control rooms relied on intelligence and communication from the public about incidents in progress in order to direct surveillance. In practice, levels of incoming and outgoing communication were low.”¹⁴

¹¹ Davies, G. and S. Thasen (2000) ‘Closed-circuit television: How effective an identification aid?’ *British Journal of Psychology*, 91: 411-426

¹² Hope, C. ‘Worthless’ CCTV camera footage is not good enough to fight crime, leading QC warns, (Daily Telegraph, 26th August 2009)

¹³ Op Cit

¹⁴ Gill and Spriggs, *Assessing the Impact of CCTV* (London: Home Office Research, Developments and Statistics Directorate, 2005), p.xii



These issues result in part from the cost of maintaining a camera network after the initial expenditure. Others, though, result simply from mismanagement. Control room can only process footage of an incident if the camera is pointing in the right direction – and not, as the residents of Woodford Green recently found, when the camera is placed facing the wall upon which it is mounted.¹⁵

b) Cost

This report does not include a comparable list of the amounts spent by local authorities on their CCTV systems. In 2010 Big Brother Watch will compile a companion research project into the cost of CCTV. However, there is little doubt that, there has been a significant outlay on CCTV systems in the past decade, commensurate with it being a key part of the Government's crime prevention strategy.

According to the National CCTV Strategy, between 1999 and 2003, major investment was made in public space CCTV through the Home Office-funded Crime Reduction Programme (CRP). A total of £170 million of capital funding was made available to local authorities following a bidding process. This programme is the largest ever state sponsored increase in CCTV in Britain and resulted in more than 680 CCTV schemes being installed in town centres and other public spaces across the country. Today, the government no longer provides direct investment to local authorities to purchase CCTV systems. Instead, local councils have had to locate the money for such schemes in their yearly budgets.

Five Case Studies in 2009

According to the Local Government Association, local council income is projected to fall by £2.5 billion this year, with 78% of councils having to revise their overall budget positions because of the recession.¹⁶ Under such circumstances, it might be thought reasonable to expect that systems with only part-proven effectiveness would be the first to be cut. However this does not appear to be the case, with many councils having further increased spending on installing, supplementing or improving surveillance systems.

In mid-2009, Staffordshire Moorlands spent £500,000 implementing a new CCTV system which will cost £20,000 a year to maintain. The council were keen to highlight a £47,000 'saving' they would make over five years by contracting the monitoring of the cameras to High Peak Borough Council as part of its strategic alliance with the authority.¹⁷ The £500,000 would have funded 22 new police officers.¹⁸

¹⁵ Sam Adams *Estate CCTV concerns raised again after camera found pointing against wall* (Wanstead and Woodford Guardian, 26 November 2009: http://www.guardian-series.co.uk/news/4762078.WOODFORD_GREEN_Estate_CCTV_concerns_raised_again_after_camera_found_pointing_against_wall/)

¹⁶ <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelId=1645241>

¹⁷ *Revamped CCTV system 'will be worth the wait'*, (Staffordshire Sentinel, 1st Oct 2009)

¹⁸ Starting salary of a Police Constable in 2009: 22,680 (Police Federation <http://www.polfed.org/constables/571D5E8256C3465494EBBA41D69E1C85.asp>)



Weymouth and Portland Council (population c.60,000) spent £60,000 on the installation of three new CCTV cameras. The £20,000 per-camera cost representing the price of the installation and equipment alone, without reflecting the maintenance or monitoring costs.¹⁹

Breckland Council (which covers a population of 121,000 people) invested £3.5 million of the council budget on a “state of the art” surveillance system.²⁰ This represents 154 new police officers. The people of Breckland probably favoured the introduction of the cameras. Had they been offered the choice of the new police officers instead, what might they have said?

In November 2009, Hertsmere Council commissioned a £300,000 upgrade to their existing CCTV system with half the money coming from the community safety budget and the other half coming from capital reserves, usually reserved for crises.²¹

Finally, it was announced that due to revenue shortfalls, Worcester City Council needed to save a total of £4.5million over the next few years. The Council announced a plan to cease live monitoring of their CCTV system in a bid to save thousands of pounds, but the plan was annulled at the eleventh hour after a deal was struck with the surrounding, equally cash-strapped borough councils to subsidise the scheme. The move will save Worcester (but cost other councils) £90,000 - reducing maintenance and other costs to a still-sizeable £50,000.²²

c) The Placebo Effect

The proliferation of CCTV is due in part to its popularity among the majority of British citizens. Successive opinion polls have shown that public opinion is generally in support of CCTV cameras. The National Strategy document notes:

“CCTV in the UK enjoys significant public support and year on year fear of crime surveys states that the public feels safer due to the presence of CCTV.”²³

However, the reason for this support in the face of unsupportive evidence was queried by the House of Lords Select Committee on the Constitution:

“Some critical academic research suggests that policy “marketing” by vested interests, rather than informed and thorough local debate, results in unwarranted support for CCTV. The House of Lords Science and Technology Committee’s 1998 report on Digital Images as Evidence referred to evidence from John Burrow, the then Chief Constable of Essex:

¹⁹ Kitching, L. [Portland Welcomes CCTV Cameras](#) (Dorset Echo, 19th Nov 2009)

²⁰ Last, M. [Swafham set to get new cameras](#) (Lynn News, 20th Nov 2009)

²¹ Binnie, A. [Hertsmere Borough Council are entering an agreement with Hertfordshire CCTV partnership](#) (Watford Observer, 12th Nov 2009)

²² Smee, G. [City CCTV saved after deal is thrashed out](#) (Worcester Standard, 26th Nov 2009)

²³ Home Office, [National CCTV Strategy](#), (Oct 2007), p.5



'He believes that when public ignorance of the capabilities and intrusions of CCTV is replaced by awareness, then it 'may well be that there will be a falling off of public confidence in the authorities having control of such systems.'"

Similarly, speaking to the Home Affairs Select Committee, Professor Ross Anderson of the Foundation for Information Policy Research (FIPR), in reference to work undertaken with the Information Commissioner on children's databases, said there was a:

*"placebo effect from having large numbers of closed circuit television cameras around, but the analysis of the crime statistics which we cite tends to show that although they are good at reducing crime in car parks they are not so good at reducing crime in town centres."*²⁴

d) Privacy

The final argument against the rise of CCTV in Britain, the invasion of personal privacy, is often dismissed because of the presumed safety benefits. However, if, as the arguments above have shown, the safety benefits can only be partially proven, the dual problems of who is watching and where the data is being stored become more pertinent.

The most often quoted figure suggests that the average British citizen is captured on CCTV 300 times a day.²⁵ When the figure was first revealed, the Information Commissioner was prompted to draw up a code of practice for the use of CCTV designed to help organisations comply with the Data Protection Act and to help them assure the public that they were using CCTV responsibly.

However, Dr Ian Forbes of the Royal Academy of Engineering told the Home Affairs Select Committee in 2007 that camera surveillance was used principally by those who want to "prevent, monitor and sometimes punish certain behaviours". This led, he believed, to "serious concerns", both about general invasions of privacy, and about the specific problems associated with predictive profiling of some sectors of the community.²⁶

As the number of cameras on Britain's streets multiplies, the potential for abuse of the system also grows. In 2006, two CCTV camera operators from Sefton Council, Merseyside, were jailed after they trained a street camera into a woman's flat.²⁷

Technology is making this potential abuse ever more intrusive. For instance, the Surveillance Studies Network in 2006, noted that several British cities were already moving towards:

²⁴ Home Affairs Select Committee, *Surveillance Society?* Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1, p.64

²⁵ Norris, C and Armstrong, G. *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of Closed Circuit Television*, (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1999) p.42; Bowditch, G. [Big Brother is not earning his keep](#) (The Times, 15th Feb 2009)

²⁶ Home Affairs Select Committee, *Surveillance Society?* Fifth Report of Session 2006-2007, Volume 1, p.63

²⁷ [Peeping tom CCTV workers jailed](#), (BBC News, 13th Jan 2006). It should also be noted that Big Brother Watch has received reports from several individuals with similar concerns about their privacy having been invaded by CCTV (<http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2009/12/are-you-being-watched.html>)



“digital CCTV systems which use computer algorithms to search automatically for stipulated people or behaviours. Face recognition, and other biometric CCTV systems, still face major technical obstacles in operating outdoors on city streets. However, considerable research and development investment is rapidly addressing these.”²⁸

We must be careful about assembling the tools of the police state, even if we trust those in whose hands the tools currently reside.

Methodology

- Freedom of Information requests were used to obtain these figures. Every local authority in Britain was sent a request asking for the total number of CCTV cameras controlled by their council and its executive agencies on Monday 9th November 2009. The full text of the Freedom of Information request submitted is included in Appendix 3.
- This report does not and cannot include the many cameras controlled by private individuals and companies, by central government, on our nation’s motorways, or those controlled solely by Transport for London and situated on the bus, tube and tram network. Importantly, it also emerged in the course of our research that some authorities have devolved control of their CCTV network to town councils. These have also not been included but their existence would point to the true figure being even higher than that of this report. To give this context, the towns of Calne, Chippenham, Trowbridge and Warminster have a total of 68 CCTV cameras between them but do not appear in the figure for Wiltshire Council.
- Where the council has disclosed the number of “internal” (or “non-public facing” cameras) they control, we have included those but reflected those in a separate column in the appendices. Internal CCTV cameras are included in this report as those who work in public buildings have privacy rights too, as do the many council residents who visit council buildings for help and advice.
- Of the 428 councils in the UK, 418 provided usable information. 4 councils either refused to disclose any information or did not disclose adequate information to be included in this report. No council failed to respond to our request, however 6 councils did not provide the information requested despite repeated phone calls, emails and, in some cases, having 28 working days to do so – over a week more than the statutory limit of 20 working days. Other councils are excluded from the main table for various other reasons, which are laid out below.

Reasons for exclusion 1: Councils that did not provide a response within the time limit²⁹

Local Authority	Reason for exclusion
Allerdale	Council was the victim of flooding at the end of November and therefore failed to respond in time
Derbyshire	Failed to respond despite having over 20 days to do so

²⁸ Surveillance Studies Network, *A Report on the Surveillance Society*, (September 2006), p.24

²⁹ In any revised version of this report, information supplied by these councils will be incorporated



Hackney	Requested clarification therefore delaying answer
North Kesteven	Failed to respond despite having over 20 days to do so
Shropshire	Failed to respond despite having over 20 days to do so
Southend-on-Sea	Failed to respond despite having over 20 days to do so

Reasons for exclusion 2: Councils that claimed not to hold the relevant data and refused to gather it on the basis that collating it would exceed the statutory limit of 18 hours/£450

Local Authority	Reason for exclusion
Lancashire	Lancashire does not hold any centralised record of CCTV systems in operation across the County. Although the County Council does operate CCTV to maintain security of their buildings they do not maintain a central record of all CCTV cameras in operation and therefore estimated that finding the information would exceed the statutory limit
Northamptonshire	Northamptonshire does not hold a central record of what CCTV systems/cameras are in place due to the devolution of budgets to departments. Accordingly it would be necessary to contact all departments within the Council who would then filter down to each specific site to obtain details of whether there is a CCTV system and if so the number of cameras within the system. Doing this, they said, would exceed the statutory limit
Surrey	Following discussions with the Council's property department, Surrey insisted that they did not currently hold details of the number of CCTV cameras on the Council's properties. They therefore refused on grounds that collating the information would exceed the statutory limit
Warwickshire	There are currently CCTV cameras controlled by Warwickshire at 152 different locations in the county. To provide the actual number of CCTV cameras across Warwickshire would involve each location being contacted to identify and ascertain exactly how many cameras were at that specific location and as such, providing the information would exceed the statutory limit

Reasons for exclusion 3: Councils that responded claiming that they control no CCTV cameras or County councils whose cameras are controlled by the county's District councils (which are therefore reflected elsewhere in the report)

Local Authority	Reason for exclusion
Angus	No cameras controlled
Cumbria	All CCTV controlled by District councils
Eden	No cameras controlled
Gloucestershire	All CCTV controlled by District councils
Isle of Scilly	No cameras controlled
Malvern Hills	No cameras controlled
North Dorset	All CCTV controlled by District councils
Rochford	No cameras controlled
South Somerset	No cameras controlled
West Dorset	All CCTV controlled by District councils



Reasons for exclusion 4: Councils whose CCTV cameras are operated by another local authority (which are therefore reflected elsewhere in the report)

Local Authority	Reason for exclusion
Bracknell Forest	22 cameras in Borough controlled by Windsor and Maidenhead Council
Epsom and Ewell	All CCTV operated by Elmbridge Borough Council
Forest Heath	24 CCTV cameras controlled by St Edmundsbury Council
Hyndburn	27 CCTV cameras in operation controlled by Blackburn and Darwen Council
North East Derbyshire	32 CCTV cameras operated by Chesterfield Council
North Hertfordshire	Operate a joint CCTV service in partnership with Stevenage Borough Council
South Bucks	CCTV cameras are part of a joint initiative with Wycombe District Council
South Oxfordshire	CCTV cameras are operated by the Vale of White Horse District council

Sources and method of calculation

1. *Big Brother Is Watching* was compiled from responses to Freedom of Information Act (2000) requests submitted in November 2009 to the 428 local authorities in the United Kingdom.
2. All the data on the number of CCTV cameras controlled by local councils on 1st October 2009 is sourced from these responses to our Freedom of Information requests.
3. Any response which pointed us towards the Council constitution was rejected and a follow-up request made to specify the precise number of cameras on the date specified.
4. We specified a single date so as to provide us with a snapshot with which to compare answers from various local authorities and to allow respondents to answer with greater precision.
5. The number of CCTV cameras was compared to the daytime populations of all councils that provided data. Daytime population (rather than residence) statistics were used because it gives a more accurate representation of the number of people who are most likely to be captured on camera in each authority. The dataset for daytime population was obtained from Neighbourhood Statistics for England and Wales,³⁰ from Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency for Northern Ireland,³¹ and from Scotland census results online for Scotland.³²

According to Neighbourhood Statistics, daytime population is defined as ‘people aged 16 to 74, as those people who live and work in the area (or do not work) and those people who live outside the area and work inside the area.’³³

³⁰ Neighbourhood Statistics, 2001 Census: Census Area Statistics, Method of Travel to Work - Daytime Population UV37.

³¹ Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, Northern Ireland Census 2001 Output, Method of Travel to Work (Daytime Population) Table UV086.

³² Scotland’s Census Results Online, Method of Travel to Work - daytime population UV38.

³³ Neighbourhood Statistics, 2001 Census: Census Area Statistics, Method of Travel to Work - Daytime Population UV37



6. To arrive at a figure for the average number of people per camera, the 2001 populations of those councils that failed to respond were removed from the total 2001 population for the United Kingdom which was then divided by the total number of external and internal CCTV cameras.

Guide to the Appendices

The Appendices to this note contain further details of *Big Brother Is Watching*:

- A table of the 10 councils with the highest number of CCTV cameras per 1000 people is found in Appendix 1
- The full list of the number of CCTV cameras controlled by local councils matched to the controlling council is found in Appendix 2
- The original FOI request as sent to all 428 local authorities in the UK is found in Appendix 3

Appendix 1

Local Authority	Total number of CCTV cameras controlled	Daytime population ³⁴ (2001 Census)	Number of CCTV cameras per 1000 people
Eilean Siar	214	26502	8.3
Portsmouth	1454	186701	7.8
Dundee City	893	145663	6.1
Woking	528	89840	5.9
South Lanarkshire	106	302216	5.6
Shetland Islands	117	21988	5.3
Nottingham	1326	266988	5.0
Leicester	1252	279921	4.5
Rugby	389	87453	4.4
Wandsworth	1113	260380	4.3

³⁴ Table only includes authorities with over 10,000 residents (excludes City of London)



Appendix 2

Local Authority	CCTV cameras controlled		Daytime population (2001 Census)	Number of CCTV cameras per 1000 people
	Public facing CCTV cameras	Internal CCTV cameras		
Aberdeen City	396		212125	1.9
Aberdeenshire	30		226871	0.1
Adur	25		59627	0.4
Amber Valley	68		116471	0.6
Antrim	95		48366	2.0
Ards	80		73244	1.1
Argyll and Bute	40		91306	0.4
Armagh	8		54263	0.1
Arun	108	24	140759	0.9
Ashfield	29		111387	0.3
Ashford	78		102661	0.8
Aylesbury Vale	184		165748	1.1
Babergh	26		83461	0.3
Ballymena	22		58610	0.4
Ballymoney	76		26894	2.8
Banbridge		50	41392	1.2
Barking and Dagenham	91		163944	0.6
Barnet	127		314564	0.4
Barnsley	55		218063	0.3
Barrow-in-Furness	51		71980	0.7
Basildon	97		165668	0.6
Basingstoke and Deane ³⁵	264	9	152573	1.8
Bassetlaw	91		107713	0.8
Bath and North East Somerset	88		169040	0.5
Belfast	400		277391	1.4
Bexley	240		218307	1.1
Birmingham	627		977087	0.6
Blaby	51		90252	0.6
Blackburn with Darwen	139		137470	1.0
Blackpool	171		142283	1.2
Blaenau Gwent	140		70064	2.0
Bolsover	50		71766	0.7
Bolton	229		261037	0.9
Boston	69		55750	1.2
Bournemouth	146		163444	0.9
Bradford	201		467665	0.4
Braintree	9		132179	0.1

³⁵ 250 cameras are taken from 2005 FOI (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/hampshire/4282962.stm>), 14 from 2009 FOI – CCTV cameras sold by council to private company



Breckland	58		121418	0.5
Brent	169		263464	0.6
Brentwood	27	17	68456	0.6
Bridgend	144		128645	1.1
Brighton and Hove	59		247817	0.2
Broadland	2		118513	0.0
Bromley	165		295532	0.6
Bromsgrove	120		87837	1.4
Broxbourne	22		87054	0.3
Broxtowe	181		107570	1.7
Buckinghamshire	48		479026	0.1
Burnley	86		89542	1.0
Bury	79		180608	0.4
Caerphilly	138		169519	0.8
Calderdale	48		192405	0.2
Cambridge	183		108863	1.7
Cambridgeshire	65		552658	0.1
Camden	488		198020	2.5
Cannock Chase	104		92126	1.1
Canterbury	312		135278	2.3
Cardiff	260		305353	0.9
Carlisle	53		100739	0.5
Carmarthenshire	87		172842	0.5
Carrickfergus	59		37659	1.6
Castle Point	29		86608	0.3
Castlereagh	59		66488	0.9
Ceredigion	21		74941	0.3
Charnwood	42	52	153462	0.6
Chelmsford	260		157072	1.7
Cheltenham	149		110013	1.4
Cherwell	52		131785	0.4
Chesterfield ³⁶	120		98845	1.2
Chichester	73		106450	0.7
Chiltern	48		89228	0.5
Chorley	44		100449	0.4
Christchurch	36		44865	0.8
City of Bristol	722		380615	1.9
City of Edinburgh	446		448624	1.0
City of London	619		7185	86.2
City of Kingston upon Hull	524		243589	2.1
Clackmannanshire	73		48077	1.5
Colchester	141		155796	0.9
Coleraine		6	56315	0.1
Conwy	112		109596	1.0

³⁶ Operates 32 cameras of the 120 for NE Derbyshire



Cookstown		86	32581	2.6
Copeland	34		69318	0.5
Corby	79		53174	1.5
Cotswold	21		80376	0.3
Coventry	531		300848	1.8
Craigavon	7		80671	0.1
Craven	8		53620	0.1
Crawley	42		99744	0.4
Croydon	103		330587	0.3
Dacorum	71		137799	0.5
Darlington	131		97838	1.3
Dartford	52		85911	0.6
Daventry	35		71838	0.5
Denbighshire	74		93065	0.8
Derby	161		221708	0.7
Derbyshire Dales	55		69469	0.8
Derry	125		105066	1.2
Devon	440		704493	0.6
Doncaster	113		286866	0.4
Dorset	169	3	390980	0.4
Dover	47	1	104566	0.5
Down	21		63828	0.3
Dudley	78		305155	0.3
Dumfries and Galloway	58		147765	0.4
Dundee	893		145663	6.1
Dungannon	12	3	47735	0.3
Ealing	394		300948	1.3
East Ayrshire	52		120235	0.4
East Cambridgeshire	35		73214	0.5
East Devon	32		125520	0.3
East Dorset	10	13	83786	0.3
East Dunbartonshire	53		108243	0.5
East Hampshire	6	3	109274	0.1
East Hertfordshire ³⁷	36		128919	0.3
East Lindsey	113		130447	0.9
East Lothian	61		90088	0.7
East Northamptonshire ³⁸	11	2	76550	0.2
East Renfrewshire	142		89311	1.6
East Riding of Yorkshire	15		314113	0.0
East Staffordshire	70		103770	0.7
East Sussex	108		492324	0.2
Eastbourne	15		89667	0.2
Eastleigh	74		116169	0.6

³⁷ Operate a Joint CCTV Service in partnership with Stevenage Borough Council and North Hertfordshire District Council

³⁸ 24 further cameras are operated by Kettering Borough Council



Eilean Siar	214	7	26502	8.3
Elmbridge ³⁹	67		121936	0.5
Enfield	135		273559	0.5
Epping Forest	207		120896	1.7
Erewash	80		110099	0.7
Essex	167		1310835	0.1
Exeter	130		111076	1.2
Falkirk	451		145191	3.1
Fareham	75		107977	0.7
Fenland	55		83519	0.7
Fermanagh	108		57527	1.9
Fife	1350		349429	3.9
Flintshire	117		148594	0.8
Forest of Dean	23		79982	0.3
Fylde	28		73217	0.4
Gateshead	44		191151	0.2
Gedling	25		111787	0.2
Glasgow City	567	223	577869	1.4
Gloucester	67	2	109885	0.6
Gosport	42		76415	0.5
Gravesham	69		95717	0.7
Great Yarmouth	6		90810	0.1
Greenwich	159		214403	0.7
Guildford	356		129701	2.7
Gwynedd	313		116843	2.7
Halton	68		118208	0.6
Hambleton	44		84111	0.5
Hammersmith and Fulham	161		165242	1.0
Hampshire	27		1240103	0.0
Harborough	20		76559	0.3
Haringey	857		216507	4.0
Harlow	61		78768	0.8
Harrogate	67	111	151336	1.2
Harrow	61		206814	0.3
Hart	60		83505	0.7
Hartlepool	82		88611	0.9
Hastings	91	8	85029	1.2
Havant	73		116849	0.6
Havering	186		224248	0.8
Herefordshire	37		174871	0.2
Hertfordshire	116		1033977	0.1
Hertsmere	39		94450	0.4
High Peak	31		89433	0.3
Highland	106		208914	0.5

³⁹ Operate 18 cameras for Epsom and Ewell



Hillingdon	160		243006	0.7
Hinckley and Bosworth	73		100141	0.7
Horsham	53		122088	0.4
Hounslow	52		212341	0.2
Huntingdonshire	114		156954	0.7
Inverclyde	49		84203	0.6
Ipswich	28		117069	0.2
Isle of Anglesey	143		66829	2.1
Isle of Wight	74		132731	0.6
Islington	167		175797	0.9
Kensington and Chelsea	62		158919	0.4
Kent	296	51	1329718	0.3
Kettering ⁴⁰	87		81844	1.1
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	201		135345	1.5
Kingston upon Thames	128		147273	0.9
Kirklees	155		388567	0.4
Knowsley	555		150459	3.6
Lambeth	344		266169	1.3
Lancaster	60	40	133914	0.7
Larne	14		30832	0.5
Leeds	385		715402	0.5
Leicester	1252		279921	4.5
Leicestershire	27	10	609578	0.1
Lewes	6		92177	0.0
Lewisham	167		248922	0.7
Lichfield	99		93232	1.1
Limavady	52		32422	1.6
Lincoln	126		85595	1.5
Lincolnshire	27		646645	0.0
Lisburn	149		108694	1.4
Liverpool	310		439473	0.7
Luton	113		184371	0.6
Magherafelt	9		39780	0.2
Maidstone	116		138948	0.8
Maldon	49		59418	0.8
Manchester	236		392819	0.6
Mansfield	200		98181	2.0
Medway	437		249488	1.8
Melton	16		47866	0.3
Mendip	66		103869	0.6
Merthyr Tydfil	69		55981	1.2
Merton	135		187908	0.7
Mid Devon	95		69774	1.4

⁴⁰ Also operate CCTV cameras for East Northants



Mid Suffolk	2	13	86837	0.2
Mid Sussex	37		127378	0.3
Middlesbrough	167		134855	1.2
Midlothian	53		80941	0.7
Milton Keynes	53		207057	0.3
Mole Valley	34		80287	0.4
Monmouthshire	29		84885	0.3
Moray	38		86940	0.4
Moyle	33		15933	2.1
Neath Port Talbot	98		134468	0.7
New Forest	41		169331	0.2
Newark and Sherwood	84		106273	0.8
Newcastle upon Tyne	650		259536	2.5
Newcastle-under-Lyme	47		122030	0.4
Newham	204		243891	0.8
Newport	123		137011	0.9
Newry and Mourne	187		87058	2.1
Newtownabbey	9	150	79995	2.0
Norfolk	233		796728	0.3
North Ayrshire	232		135817	1.7
North Devon	46		87508	0.5
North Down	17		76323	0.2
North East Lincolnshire	111		157979	0.7
North Lanarkshire	268		321067	0.8
North Lincolnshire	191	202	152849	2.6
North Norfolk	44		98382	0.4
North Somerset	69		188564	0.4
North Tyneside	212		191659	1.1
North Warwickshire	35		61860	0.6
North West Leicestershire	32	3	85503	0.4
North Yorkshire	25		569660	0.0
Northampton	606		194458	3.1
Norwich	180		121550	1.5
Nottingham	1326		266988	5.0
Nottinghamshire	1454		748510	1.9
Nuneaton and Bedworth	115		119132	1.0
Oadby and Wigston	9		55795	0.2
Oldham	78		217273	0.4
Omagh	67		47952	1.4
Orkney Islands	14		19245	0.7
Oxford	51		134248	0.4
Oxfordshire	120		605488	0.2
Pembrokeshire	103	1	114131	0.9
Pendle	62		89248	0.7
Perth and Kinross	35		134949	0.3
Peterborough	145		156061	0.9



Plymouth	174		240720	0.7
Poole	125		138288	0.9
Portsmouth	1454		186701	7.8
Powys	13		126354	0.1
Preston	136		129633	1.0
Purbeck	8		44416	0.2
Rayleigh	27		91474	0.3
Reading	7		143096	0.0
Redbridge	668		238635	2.8
Redcar and Cleveland	169		139132	1.2
Redditch	53		78807	0.7
Reigate and Banstead	114		126523	0.9
Renfrewshire	458		172867	2.6
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff	228		231946	1.0
Ribble Valley	30		53960	0.6
Richmond upon Thames	70		172335	0.4
Richmondshire	25		47010	0.5
Rochdale	170		205357	0.8
Rossendale	1	1	65652	0.0
Rother	10	12	85428	0.3
Rotherham	233	4	248175	1.0
Rugby	389		87453	4.4
Runnymede	50		78033	0.6
Rushcliffe	5		105599	0.0
Rushmoor	74		90987	0.8
Rutland	13		34563	0.4
Ryedale	5		50872	0.1
Salford	136		216103	1.6
Sandwell	181		282904	0.6
Scarborough	54		106243	0.5
Scottish Borders	60		106764	0.6
Sedgemoor ⁴¹	160		105881	1.5
Sefton	98		282958	0.3
Selby	37		76468	0.5
Sevenoaks	96		109305	0.9
Sheffield	377		513234	0.7
Shepway	50		96238	0.5
Shetland Islands	117		21988	5.3
Slough	77		119067	0.6
Somerset	133		498093	0.3
Solihull	235	411	199517	3.2
South Ayrshire	105		112097	0.9

⁴¹ Operate 71 cameras on behalf of Taunton Deane Borough Council) and a further 36 cameras in Yeovil on behalf of South Somerset District Council



South Cambridgeshire	8	11	130108	0.1
South Derbyshire	4		81562	0.0
South Gloucestershire	51		245641	0.2
South Hams		11	81849	0.1
South Holland	28		76522	0.4
South Kesteven	67		124792	0.5
South Lakeland	20		102301	0.2
South Lanarkshire	106	1577	302216	5.6
South Norfolk	55		110710	0.5
South Northamptonshire		32	79293	0.4
South Ribble	41		103867	0.4
South Staffordshire	32		105896	0.3
South Tyneside	93		152785	0.6
Southampton	339		217445	1.6
Southwark	160		244866	0.7
Spelthorne	76		90390	0.8
St Albans	81		129005	0.6
St Edmundsbury ⁴²	120		98193	1.2
St. Helens	91		176843	0.5
Stafford	59		120670	0.5
Staffordshire	220		806744	0.3
Staffordshire Moorlands	40		94489	0.4
Stevenage ⁴³	150		79715	1.9
Stirling	59		86212	0.7
Stockport	83		284528	0.3
Stockton-on-Tees	491		178408	2.8
Stoke-on-Trent	207		240636	0.9
Strabane	97		38248	2.5
Stratford-on-Avon	93		111484	0.8
Stroud	47	16	107898	0.6
Suffolk	146		668553	0.2
Suffolk Coastal	11		115141	0.1
Sunderland	28		280807	0.1
Surrey Heath	31		80314	0.4
Sutton	73		179768	0.4
Swale	77		122801	0.6
Swansea	326		223301	1.5
Swindon	447		180051	2.5
Tameside	142		213043	0.7
Tamworth	60		74531	0.8
Tandridge	15		79267	0.2
Taunton Deane	63		102299	0.6
Teignbridge	56		120958	0.5

⁴² Operate 24 cameras for Forest Heath and 12 for Stowmarket

⁴³ Operate a Joint CCTV Service in partnership with North Hertfordshire District Council and East Hertfordshire District Council



Telford and Wrekin	101		158325	0.6
Tendring	106		138539	0.8
Test Valley	53		109801	0.5
Tewkesbury	33		76405	0.4
Thanet	97		126702	0.8
The Vale of Glamorgan	48		119292	0.4
Three Rivers	37		82848	0.4
Thurrock	233		143128	1.6
Tonbridge and Malling	100		107561	0.9
Torbay	224		129706	1.7
Torfaen	65		90949	0.7
Torridge	17		58965	0.3
Tower Hamlets	280		196106	1.4
Trafford	270		210145	1.3
Tunbridge Wells	127		104030	1.2
Uttlesford	7		68946	0.1
Vale of White Horse ⁴⁴	93		115627	0.8
Wakefield	163		315172	0.5
Walsall	99		253499	0.4
Waltham Forest	74		218341	0.3
Wandsworth	1113		260380	4.3
Warrington	33		191080	0.2
Warwick	178		125931	1.4
Watford	136		79726	1.7
Waveney	32		112342	0.3
Wealden	34		140023	0.2
Wellingborough	17		72519	0.2
Welwyn Hatfield	170		97553	1.7
West Berkshire	90		144483	0.6
West Devon	19		48843	0.4
West Dunbartonshire	224	175	93378	4.3
West Lancashire	52		108378	0.5
West Lindsey	29		79515	0.4
West Lothian	88		158714	0.6
West Oxfordshire	24		95640	0.3
West Somerset	15		35075	0.4
West Sussex	570		753614	0.8
Westminster	310		181286	1.7
Weymouth and Portland	105		63648	1.6
Wigan	446		301415	1.5
Wiltshire	148		125372	1.2
Winchester	104		107222	1.0
Windsor and Maidenhead	134		133626	1.0
Wirral	110		312293	0.4

⁴⁴ 62 cameras situated in South Oxfordshire. 31 in Vale of White Horse



Woking	528		89840	5.9
Wokingham	25		150229	0.2
Wolverhampton	92	36	236582	0.5
Worcester	122		93353	1.3
Worcestershire	185		542107	0.3
Worthing	42		97568	0.4
Wrexham	92		128476	0.7
Wychavon	35		112957	0.3
Wycombe ⁴⁵	215		162105	1.3
Wyre	29		105618	0.3
Wyre Forest	17		96981	0.2
York	73		181094	0.4
Total number of CCTV cameras controlled by local authorities / people per camera in the UK	(Public) 56,377	(Internal) 3,376	-	1.0 ⁴⁶
	Combined Total: 59,753			

Appendix 3

Freedom of information request for details of CCTV cameras controlled by your council

Dear Sir/Madam,

Freedom of information request for details of Closed Circuit Television

I am writing to obtain information about Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) controlled by (your) Council.

To outline my query as clearly as possible, I am requesting:

1. The **total number** of cameras controlled by (your) Council, on **1 October 2009**.
2. If it exists, a copy of any internal guidance on CCTV usage

My preferred format to receive this information is electronically, but if that is not possible I will gladly accept hard copies. I understand that under the Freedom of Information Act, I am entitled to a response within 20 working days. I would be grateful if you could confirm in writing that you have received this request as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Big Brother Watch

⁴⁵ The cameras are part of a joint initiative between South Bucks District Council Wycombe District Council

⁴⁶ This figure is reached by dividing the total number of CCTV cameras by the total population (at 2001 census) minus those councils which either did not respond or who did not control any CCTV cameras