



The Price of Privacy:

How local authorities spent £515m on CCTV in four years

A Big Brother Watch report

February 2012

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Key findings..... | 3 |
| Key policy recommendations | 4 |
| Introduction..... | 5 |
| Areas where CCTV requires scrutiny..... | 6 |
| Big Brother Watch’s position | 7 |
| Policy recommendations..... | 9 |
| Highest spenders on CCTV (2007-2011) | 12 |
| Lowest spenders on CCTV (2007-2011) | 13 |
| Highest number of CCTV cameras..... | 14 |
| Lowest number of CCTV cameras..... | 14 |
| Academic Research on CCTV Cameras | 15 |
| The ineffective nature of CCTV | 16 |
| Putting CCTV spending in context..... | 18 |
| Appendix 1: Total number of CCTV cameras and total spend per Local Authority | 19 |
| Appendix 2 – Numbers of Police per Police Force | 31 |
| Methodology | 33 |
| FOI request | 34 |
| About Big Brother Watch..... | 36 |

For media enquiries relating to this report and you would like to contact Big Brother Watch, including outside office hours, please call +44 (0) 7505 448925 (24hrs) You can also email press@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk for written enquiries.

Key findings

- There are currently at least **51,600** CCTV cameras controlled by 428 local authorities in Britain
- The total cost of installing, operating and maintaining CCTV cameras between 2007 and 2011 was **£515 million**. This could pay for **4,121 Police Constables** or **5,894 PCSO's**.¹
- **Birmingham** has the highest total expenditure on CCTV cameras with a total spend of over **£14 million**, while **Leicester** has the highest number of CCTV cameras with **2,083** in total.
- Two authorities have **spent more than £10m**
 - Birmingham - £14,293,060.00
 - Westminster - £11,831,554.00
- 18 authorities have **spent more than £1m per year**
 - Birmingham, Westminster, Leeds, City of Edinburgh, Croydon, Enfield, Cambridge, Wandsworth, Leicester, Barnet, Nottingham, Hounslow, Knowsley, Barking and Dagenham, City of Bristol, Caerphilly, Wakefield, Lambeth
- Five authorities now have **more than 1,000 CCTV cameras**
 - Leicester, Fife, Wandsworth, Nottingham, Southampton
- Seven local authorities now have **more CCTV cameras than Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds combined**.
 - Leicester, Fife, Wandsworth, Nottingham, Southampton, Aberdeen City, Cardiff

¹ Figures based on average/mid-point level of pay. Policy Exchange, *Cost of the Cops: Manpower and deployment in policing*, (2011), p.35.

Police Constables: average salary £31,341 x 4 years = £124,964 / £515,000,000 = 4,121
 PCSO's: average salary £21,844 x 4 years = £87,376 / £515,000,000 = 5,894

Key policy recommendations

The Protection of Freedoms Bill proposes a national CCTV Code of Practice, to be enforced by a national CCTV regulator. This is an important step to properly regulating CCTV and must not be a symbolic gesture.

We believe to restore public faith in CCTV, better inform debate and to strengthen the protections afforded to our privacy; the Government should adopt the following five policy objectives.

- 1. Give the CCTV regulator the powers to enforce the code of practice**
- 2. Any publicly funded CCTV installation should have to refer to crime statistics or demonstrate a significant risk of harm before being commenced**
- 3. Public bodies should publish the instances where their CCTV cameras have been used in securing a conviction, and for what offences.**
- 4. Public bodies should be required (save for those used in direct protection of sites at risk of terrorism) to publish in a standardised format the locations of their cameras**
- 5. The Government should begin a consultation on regulating private CCTV cameras, both those operated by commercial companies and by private individuals**

Introduction

The effectiveness of CCTV systems varies significantly across the country and there is a wide variance in terms of coverage, monitoring, quality of images, uses and therefore the impact that CCTV can have on local crime and disorder. Similarly, there is considerable variance in the way police forces utilize CCTV and whether the product of surveillance cameras is effectively integrated into the policing function.

UK National CCTV Strategy, October 2007

The Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) camera has become a ubiquitous feature on Britain's streets. Hanging from walls, positioned atop lampposts, and hidden behind blacked-out glass; cash-strapped local authorities have spent unprecedented amounts of taxpayers' money making the United Kingdom the most watched nation of people anywhere in the world. In the past decade alone, the number of CCTV cameras surveying town centre shopping precincts, parks and other public places has increased tenfold².

Some reports have estimated that Britain is home to as many of 20% of the world's total CCTV cameras. One study in 2002 put the total number of CCTV cameras in the UK at around 4.2 million cameras³. In London, it is estimated that on average, an individual may be recorded by over 300 different cameras during a single day. The Metropolitan Police's own research found how less than one crime was solved by every 1,000 cameras in the capital.

In this report, Big Brother Watch outlines the financial cost of CCTV schemes over the past three years; from Birmingham City Council with the largest expenditure on the technology (£14,293,060) to the smallest spender, Arun District Council (£250).

We go on to propose a series of criteria for the new CCTV Code of Practice, which is proposed by the Protection of Freedoms Bill, and highlight relevant academic research and areas of concern that relate to the continued increase in CCTV use.

² <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/1789157.stm>

³ 'CCTV in Britain,' McCahill and Norris (2002)

Areas where CCTV requires scrutiny

- CCTV has been viewed by those controlling expenditure as a cheap alternative to conventional policing, with no demonstrable equivalent success in reducing crime.
- The efficiency of CCTV varies hugely across the country, with cameras regularly not working or turned off, footage being deleted before it can be used and pictures of insufficient quality for court purposes.
- 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.
- CCTV serves as a costly placebo for many local authorities designed to appease neighbourhoods suffering from anti-social behaviour problems.
- As the number of CCTV cameras increases, so does the potential number of people being watched and the number of council officers watching – with worrying implications for personal privacy and data security.
- The lack of enforceable regulation means that more intrusive use of CCTV – for example, in public toilets, schools or with audio recording capability – can only be challenged in the courts by way of judicial review.

Big Brother Watch's position

In the current financial climate, sustaining the level of investment in CCTV is impossible to justify. The surveillance British citizens are now subjected to continues to increase, despite being at a level that makes many other democratic countries recoil in horror.

CCTV does not have a significant deterrent effect on crime, and is not a substitute for police. Yet it continues to be claimed – without evidence – that more CCTV improves public safety.

Big Brother Watch accepts CCTV has a role to play in tackling crime, but the current state of affairs is based not upon evidence but hearsay and conjecture, with reasonable concerns about privacy and civic society brushed aside with little regard.

It is not unreasonable, for example, to ask councils to use crime data to decide on where cameras are positioned, and use non-fixed cameras as part of an operation to tackle the root cause of the problem. However, this will only work if cameras are *part* of the police's action, rather than being used *instead* of police action.

The public's perception of CCTV is based on a widespread misconception that cameras are monitored, and in the event of an incident an operator would be able to send help. This is not true, with the overwhelming majority of cameras only used after an event has been reported – with many either not functioning or able to provide an image of sufficient quality. As a result, the public debate about CCTV has been skewed, something we hope to address.

There remains little evidence that suggests further investment in CCTV will directly reduce crime, in particular crimes against people. Equally, retaining the current level of surveillance directs resources away from alternatives could have a greater impact on both preventing and solving crime.

The 2007 CCTV Strategy recognised how Britain's CCTV infrastructure had been *“developed in a piecemeal fashion with little strategic direction, control or regulation.”*

The huge variation between local authorities' highlights how this remains the case and we believe is something that urgently requires attention. In the same way that speed cameras cannot be installed on a whim, but require a process of establishing what the root causes of the problem are and the evidential evidence of the scale of the problem, we believe CCTV should be subject to a similar process.

Furthermore, we believe that councils should undertake a review of how their own cameras have been used in recent years and identify those that are not being used either to protect infrastructure or solve crimes. Where the camera has not solved a single crime in the past three years, we believe the camera should be turned off.

Policy recommendations

The Protection of Freedoms Bill proposes a national CCTV Code of Practice, to be enforced by a national CCTV regulator. This is an important step to properly regulating CCTV and must not be a symbolic gesture.

We believe to restore public faith in CCTV, better inform debate and to strengthen the protections afforded to our privacy; the Government should adopt the following five policy objectives.

1. Give the CCTV regulator the powers to enforce the code of practice

The situation in Oxford and Southampton highlights the ineffectiveness of the current regulatory structure. The Information Commissioner's Office Code of Practice for CCTV makes clear CCTV should only be used to record video **and audio** in very rare and extreme circumstances. Both these local authorities have decided that as a condition of their license, taxis should record both audio and video, but the only recourse to challenge their policies – in effect to enforce the existing code of practice – is for private citizens to mount a judicial review.

The regulator should have powers to order the cessation of policies that contravene the Code of Practice, and the power to inspect equipment to ensure it is compliant.

2. Any publicly funded CCTV installation should have to refer to crime statistics or demonstrate a significant risk of harm before being commenced

Prior to installation, this would require councils to publish an evidential basis for camera installation, and also raise strategic questions before a decision has been taken. It would also highlight situations where temporary, non-fixed cameras would be a better solution than inflexible, fixed

The availability of crime maps enables this to be delivered without significant administrative burdens and would restore trust in the use of CCTV. Where

residents suspect that surveillance is designed to, for example, the number of monetary penalties issued for parking offences, this process would improve transparency and better inform debate.

3. Public bodies should publish the instances where their CCTV cameras have been used in securing a conviction, and for what offences.

This simple statistic would enable the public to see the true impact of CCTV, and ensure that multi-function cameras continue to be used for the reasons stated when they were installed.

The debate around CCTV lacks any real measurement of effectiveness, and despite academic research highlighting the weak deterrent effect of CCTV, statements alluding to the effectiveness of CCTV continue to be made based on personal beliefs instead of evidence.

4. Public bodies should be required (save for those used in direct protection of sites at risk of terrorism) to publish in a standardised format the locations of their cameras

Despite the advances made in open data and transparency, particularly the publication of crime statistics in crime maps, it is still difficult for any meaningful research to take place around the impact of CCTV on crime. This is largely down to the huge variations between different authorities in both how the location of cameras is recorded and what information is made public.

A simple, standardised location publication scheme would not be a significant administrative burden, as demonstrated by those authorities who already make available the Ordinance Survey or GPS location of their cameras. We believe this would then allow people to make an informed decision about whether the level of surveillance is having an impact on crime and to expose the patterns in camera deployment that currently exist.

5. The Government should begin a consultation on regulating private CCTV cameras, both those operated by commercial companies and by private individuals

Clearly, as this research highlights, the overwhelming majority of CCTV cameras are privately operated. However, many of the same issues arise when considering how they are used, the risk of misuse and the wider implications for privacy. Therefore, we believe there needs to be consideration about the wider regulation of private CCTV to address the concerns that exist, and to assist in the development of the code of practice.

Furthermore, the continued growth in private individuals installing CCTV cameras raises new questions not addressed by existing regulation, with private CCTV specifically exempted from the Data Protection Act, for example. The consultation should evaluate the scale of the use of private CCTV and the growing sense of frustration that there is no redress against those abusing their ability to install cameras.

Highest spenders on CCTV (2007-2011)⁴

| | Local Authority | Number of CCTV cameras | Total cost |
|----|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Birmingham | 636 | £14,293,060.00 |
| 2 | Westminster | 153 | £11,831,554.00 |
| 3 | Leeds | 253 | £8,762,292.00 |
| 4 | City of Edinburgh | 232 | £6,211,425.30 |
| 5 | Croydon | 84 | £5,329,589.00 |
| 6 | Enfield | 169 | £4,996,900.00 |
| 7 | Cambridge | 141 | £4,973,984.00 |
| 8 | Wandsworth | 1158 | £4,711,080.14 |
| 9 | Leicester | 2083 | £4,762,729.94 |
| 10 | Barnet | 141 | £4,690,742.29 |
| 11 | Nottingham | 1120 | £4,666,827.83 |
| 12 | Hounslow | Unstated | £4,597,163.37 |
| 13 | Knowsley | 548 | £4,558,481.51 |
| 14 | Barking and Dagenham | 115 | £4,518,500.00 |
| 15 | Bristol, City of | 786 | £4,220,268.85 |
| 16 | Caerphilly | 146 | £4,111,747.00 |
| 17 | Wakefield | 177 | £4,110,740.00 |
| 18 | Lambeth | 348 | £4,099,625.02 |

- There is one CCTV camera per 1,600 people in Birmingham⁵
- It is no surprise that Birmingham has topped the table. Until 2011 'Project Champion'⁶ was in motion, one of the most outrageous abuses of surveillance equipment in modern times.⁷
- Birmingham City Council themselves admit to the fact that **"It's not surprising" if you move around Birmingham and feel "like you're being watched"**.⁸ **The Birmingham Control Centre:** "one of Europe's leading centres for CCTV monitoring". Some of the £14 million spent by Birmingham City Council has been used to pay for high-tech CCTV cameras that will monitor your movements and then will allow the CCTV monitors to warn you about your behaviour over a loud speaker.⁹
- Leicester has approximately **one CCTV camera for every 145 people**.

⁴ The table includes Local Authorities that spent a million pounds or more a year on CCTV cameras

⁵ Population of Birmingham 1,028,000 (2009 figure)

⁶ <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2012/07/police-back-down-over-spy-cameras-an-amazing-result-in-birmingham.html>

⁷ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-birmingham-13331161>

⁸ Birmingham City Council, *Control Centre: CCTV*,

⁹ Birmingham City Council, *Control Centre: Remote CCTV*

Lowest spenders on CCTV (2007-2011)

| | Local Authority | Number of CCTV cameras | Total cost |
|----|-----------------|------------------------|------------|
| 1 | Arun | 0 | £250.00 |
| 2 | Mid Sussex | 0 | £462.00 |
| 3 | West Devon | 15 | £737.21 |
| 4 | Waverley | 19 | £1,079.00 |
| 5 | Rutland | 0 | £1,381.00 |
| 6 | Derbyshire | 9 | £1,600.00 |
| 7 | Rushcliffe | 7 | £2,028.00 |
| 8 | Castlereagh | 56 | £2,149.00 |
| 9 | South Hams | 20 | £3,054.00 |
| 10 | Devon | 43 | £7,405.00 |

Highest number of CCTV cameras

| | Local Authority | Number of CCTV cameras |
|----|------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Leicester | 2,083 |
| 2 | Fife | 1,420 |
| 3 | Wandsworth | 1,158 |
| 4 | Nottingham | 1,120 |
| 5 | Southampton | 1,030 |
| 6 | Aberdeen City | 942 |
| 7 | Cardiff | 860 |
| 8 | Wigan | 823 |
| 9 | Camden | 794 |
| 10 | Bristol, City of | 786 |

- Leicester has nearly **three times the amount** of CCTV cameras than **Manchester, a city with 2 premiership football clubs.**¹⁰
- Leicester has more than **twice the number** of CCTV cameras **than Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester combined.**

Lowest number of CCTV cameras¹¹

| | Local Authority | Number of CCTV cameras |
|----|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | East Northamptonshire | 1 |
| 2 | Hounslow | 1 |
| 3 | Warwickshire | 1 |
| 4 | Broadland | 2 |
| 5 | Chiltern | 2 |
| 6 | North Dorset | 2 |
| 7 | East Staffordshire | 3 |
| 8 | Oadby and Wigston | 4 |
| 9 | Pembrokeshire | 4 |
| 10 | Chelmsford | 5 |

¹⁰ Manchester has 281 CCTV cameras

¹¹ Lowest number of CCTV cameras does not include the Local Authorities with zero CCTV cameras

Academic Research on CCTV Cameras

There have been a number of comprehensive academic studies on the impact of CCTV cameras on crime figures.¹² The following academic studies conclude that CCTV cameras only produce a small decrease in crime, with a large proportion of the reduction being associated with crimes in car parks. A study commissioned by the Home Office acknowledges **“that the belief that CCTV alone can counter complex social problems is unrealistic in the extreme”**

1. The Campbell Collaboration

The Campbell Collaboration “produces reviews of the effects of social intervention”¹³ and in 2008 published a review examining research from around the world in an attempt to assess the impact of CCTV on crime.¹⁴ The synopsis states:

- ‘CCTV has a modest but significant desirable effect on crime. It is most effective in reducing crime in car parks, especially effective when targeted at vehicle crimes (largely a function of the successful car park schemes)’.
- ‘These results lend support for the continued use of CCTV to prevent crime in public space, but suggest that it be more narrowly targeted than its present use would indicate’.¹⁵

2. Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention

In 2007 the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention published a review of the impact of CCTV on crime prevention.¹⁶ The report noted:

- ‘The results suggest that CCTV caused a small (16%) but significant decrease in crime in experimental areas compared with comparable control areas. However, this overall result was largely driven by the effectiveness of CCTV schemes in car parks, which caused a 51% decrease in crime. Schemes in

¹² As referred to in ‘CCTV and its effectiveness in tackling crime’, HoC report

¹³ Campbell Collaboration Website

¹⁴ Campbell Systematic reviews, *Effects of Closed Circuit Television Surveillance on Crime*, December 2008

¹⁵ Ibid, p.2

¹⁶ Bardon C. Welsh David P. Farrington, *Closed Circuit Television Surveillance and Crime Prevention A Systematic Review*, Report prepared for The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, 2007

most other setting had small and non-significant effects on crime: a 7% decrease in city and town centres'.

- 'CCTV schemes in car parks could have been the most effective for a variety of reasons. First, in all the schemes CCTV combined with other interventions such as improved lighting, fencing, and security personnel. Second, camera coverage was high, and this factor is related to effectiveness. Third, vehicle crimes were targeted, and it may be that such crimes are easier to detect than violent crimes for example'.¹⁷

The ineffective nature of CCTV

'Overall, the impact of CCTV has been variable ... the belief that CCTV alone can counter complex social problems is unrealistic in the extreme. At best CCTV can work alongside other measures to generate some changes, but it is no easy panacea, and there is still a lot to be learnt about how to use it to best effect'.¹⁸

Home Office report, 2005.

Big Brother Watch is strongly of the opinion that CCTV has an important role to play in ensuring security in areas such as airports, sea ports or in proximity to sites of military importance.

Quite apart from the negative implications for civil liberties of the expansion of this technology into neighbourhoods and the workplace, CCTV has often proved to be a costly and ineffective white elephant.

Indeed, figures published by the Metropolitan Police indicate that only one crime was solved in the capital in the whole of 2008 for each of the 1,000 cameras¹⁹.

It should be noted that the entirety of this expenditure has been incurred without once asking residents if they prefer this method of law enforcement to any alternative.

¹⁷ Ibid, p.7-8

¹⁸ Gill Martin et al, *The impact of CCTV fourteen case studies*, 2005 p.36

¹⁹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8219022.stm>

As this report demonstrates, the provision of CCTV monitoring is vastly expensive and, in some cases, comes at a detriment to the funding of other law enforcement services. Indeed, if the entire budget currently dedicated to CCTV cameras was diverted to police staffing budgets, enough financial resources would be available to increase the size of the British police force by 3.4% (from 175,248 to 181,141).

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 criminals²⁰.

²⁰ Davies, G. and S. Thasen (2000) 'Closed-circuit television: How effective an identification aid?' *British Journal of Psychology*, H 91: 411-426

Putting CCTV spending in context

The total cost of council provision of CCTV can be compared to the following positions in other policing services:²¹

| Position | Average/midpoint level of pay | Total number funded for cost of CCTV |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Chief Inspector | £54,321 | 2,370 |
| Inspector | £49,803 | 2,585 |
| Sergeant | £38,780 | 3,320 |
| Constable | £31,241 | 4,121 |
| PCSO | £21,844 | 5,893 |

(See Appendix 2 for full details of UK police forces)

Big Brother Watch believe that CCTV is not a substitute for policing. The significant resources being spent on surveillance are diverting money away from policing methods that could prevent crime and protect the public.

By using the same money that is currently being allocated to CCTV cameras there could be a significant increase in the numbers of police on the street preventing crimes from happening in the first place.

An increase of PCSO's of 5,893 is the equivalent of the whole West Yorkshire Police force. An increase of Constables is the equivalent of the whole of Northumbria Police force.²²

²¹ Figures based on average/mid-point level of pay. Policy Exchange, *Cost of the Cops: Manpower and deployment in policing*, (2011), p.35

²² See Appendix 2 for full Police Force breakdown

Appendix 1: Total number of CCTV cameras and total spend per Local Authority

| Rank ²³ | Council | Total Spend | Number of CCTV cameras |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 107 | Aberdeen City | £1,779,558.00 | 942 |
| 321 | Aberdeenshire | £193,000.00 | Operated by police |
| 417 | Adur | No Response | No Response |
| 199 | Allerdale | £840,165.50 | 33 |
| 274 | Amber Valley | £382,137.00 | 68 |
| 142 | Angus | £1,426,316.13 | 54 |
| 408 | Antrim | £0.00 | 0 |
| 338 | Ards | £107,165.66 | 106 |
| 341 | Argyll and Bute | £94,770.57 | 45 |
| 363 | Armagh | £47,053.78 | 8 |
| 398 | Arun | £250.00 | 0 |
| 238 | Ashfield | £576,280.23 | Cameras operated by Mansfield Council |
| 257 | Ashford | £449,279.82 | Unknown ²⁴ |
| 214 | Aylesbury Vale | £721,018.02 | 183 |
| 326 | Babergh | £169,520.00 | 24 |
| 272 | Ballymena | £388,131.00 | 47 |
| 379 | Ballymoney | £22,828.04 | 38 |
| 358 | Banbridge | £55,450.74 | 9 |
| 14 | Barking and Dagenham | £4,518,500.00 | 115 |
| 10 | Barnet | £4,690,742.29 | 141 |
| 344 | Barnsley | £84,220.05 | 140 |
| 253 | Barrow-in-Furness | £476,885.68 | 40 |
| 280 | Basildon | £355,725.41 | 93 |
| 331 | Basingstoke and Deane | £137,700.00 | 61 |
| 194 | Bassetlaw | £859,385.00 | 52 |
| 141 | Bath and North East Somerset | £1,440,482.00 | 94 |
| 152 | Bedford Borough | £1,356,447.18 | 76 |

²³ Ranked according to total spend on CCTV cameras

²⁴ 'Unknown' refers to councils responding to our 2010 FOI, which asked for details of spend but not cameras, but not providing data for our 2011 FOI, which asked for camera details

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------|
| 65 | Belfast | £2,430,522.48 | 591 |
| 70 | Bexley | £2,365,999.00 | 247 |
| 1 | Birmingham | £14,293,060.00 | 636 |
| 367 | Blaby | £39,979.52 | 56 |
| 229 | Blackburn with Darwen | £633,292.91 | 83 |
| 164 | Blackpool | £1,195,127.00 | 223 |
| 287 | Blaenau Gwent | £319,537.00 | 145 |
| 327 | Bolsover | £166,390.68 | 101 |
| 225 | Bolton | £645,737.47 | 104 |
| 170 | Boston | £1,107,034.26 | 72 |
| 81 | Bournemouth | £2,172,321.73 | 144 |
| 258 | Bracknell Forest | £448,517.00 | Unstated |
| 26 | Bradford | £3,607,300.00 | 271 |
| 302 | Braintree | £258,721.73 | 19 |
| 91 | Breckland | £2,004,444.20 | 70 |
| 64 | Brent | £2,470,299.00 | 215 |
| 243 | Brentwood | £541,918.94 | 31 |
| 137 | Bridgend | £1,466,733.00 | 144 |
| 235 | Brighton and Hove | £592,385.90 | 73 |
| 15 | Bristol, City of | £4,220,268.85 | 786 |
| 418 | Broadland | £0.00 | 2 |
| 35 | Bromley | £3,165,340.00 | 170 |
| 108 | Bromsgrove | £1,770,694.00 | 94 |
| 293 | Broxbourne | £306,420.00 | Unknown |
| 210 | Broxtowe | £745,628.31 | 148 |
| 291 | Buckinghamshire | £308,445.00 | 29 |
| 109 | Burnley | £1,763,484.00 | 80 |
| 128 | Bury | £1,522,607.00 | 84 |
| 16 | Caerphilly | £4,111,747.00 | 146 |
| 163 | Calderdale | £1,222,486.65 | 51 |
| 7 | Cambridge | £4,973,984.00 | 141 |
| 247 | Cambridgeshire | £518,378.90 | 273 |
| 23 | Camden | £3,709,816.73 | 794 |
| 122 | Cannock Chase | £1,587,729.89 | Unstated |
| 90 | Canterbury | £2,034,945.00 | 134 |
| 307 | Cardiff | £242,680.00 | 860 |
| 87 | Carlisle | £2,085,030.00 | 92 |
| 182 | Carmarthenshire | £945,229.97 | 70 |
| 409 | Carrickfergus | £0.00 | 0 |
| 308 | Castle Point | £242,245.13 | 25 |
| 391 | Castlereagh | £2,149.60 | 56 |
| 161 | Central Bedfordshire | £1,263,667.00 | 94 |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|
| 201 | Ceredigion | £824,041.95 | 23 |
| 172 | Charnwood | £1,044,167.00 | 55 |
| 126 | Chelmsford | £1,547,180.00 | 5 |
| 234 | Cheltenham | £601,456.00 | Operated by police |
| 208 | Cherwell | £780,551.00 | 50 |
| 54 | Cheshire East | £2,581,395.00 | 269 |
| 50 | Cheshire West and Chester | £2,650,676.00 | 185 |
| 135 | Chesterfield | £1,494,664.00 | 126 |
| 218 | Chichester | £698,095.00 | 74 |
| 271 | Chiltern | £396,771.00 | 2 (Some cameras operated by Wycombe Council) |
| 213 | Chorley | £722,618.12 | 48 |
| 180 | Christchurch | £960,928.00 | 36 |
| 4 | City of Edinburgh | £6,211,425.30 | 232 |
| - | City of London | Not Stated | 649 |
| 185 | Clackmannanshire | £933,965.00 | 56 |
| 47 | Colchester | £2,730,894.00 | 124 |
| 310 | Coleraine | £237,949.57 | 14 |
| 250 | Conwy | £482,670.77 | Unknown |
| 410 | Cookstown | £0.00 | 0 |
| 347 | Copeland | £72,715.00 | Unknown |
| 190 | Corby | £890,217.00 | 91 |
| 360 | Cornwall | £53,174.00 | Unstated |
| 300 | Cotswold | £263,898.63 | 20 |
| 305 | Coventry | £250,846.00 | Unknown |
| 355 | Craigavon | £58,269.00 | 11 |
| 333 | Craven | £123,577.00 | Cameras decommissioned 2009 |
| 277 | Crawley | £377,719.82 | 47 |
| 5 | Croydon | £5,329,589.00 | 84 |
| - | Cumbria | £0.00 | 0 |
| 38 | Dacorum | £3,134,654.48 | 74 |
| 57 | Darlington | £2,536,081.00 | 154 |
| 159 | Dartford | £1,268,078.70 | 57 |
| 264 | Daventry | £420,000.00 | Cameras controlled by neighbouring authority |
| 130 | Denbighshire | £1,522,095.00 | 94 |
| 72 | Derby | £2,338,200.00 | 125 |
| 393 | Derbyshire | £1,600.00 | 9 |
| 419 | Derbyshire Dales | £0.00 | 0 |
| 309 | Derry City | £239,000.00 | 46 |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|
| 389 | Devon | £7,405.00 | 43 |
| 120 | Doncaster | £1,606,167.10 | 122 |
| 389 | Dorset | £9,321.00 | 14 |
| 84 | Dover | £2,132,548.00 | 49 |
| 292 | Down | £306,744.00 | 21 |
| 198 | Dudley | £848,455.81 | 127 |
| 206 | Dumfries and Galloway | £784,939.73 | 73 |
| 283 | Dundee City | £339,540.88 | Refused |
| 411 | Dungannon | £0.00 | 0 |
| 30 | Durham | £3,370,441.00 | 392 |
| 27 | Ealing | £3,547,000.00 | 392 |
| 37 | East Ayrshire | £3,139,587.84 | 59 |
| 197 | East Cambridgeshire | £850,141.97 | 35 |
| 349 | East Devon | £72,497.00 | 16 |
| 356 | East Dorset | £57,308.24 | Cameras not controlled by council |
| 146 | East Dunbartonshire | £1,406,145.60 | 53 |
| 420 | East Hampshire | Not Stated | 20 |
| 252 | East Hertfordshire | £478,567.00 | 60 |
| 123 | East Lindsey | £1,576,339.86 | 125 |
| 45 | East Lothian | £2,851,106.00 | 82 |
| 202 | East Northamptonshire | £818,523.00 | 1 (Some cameras controlled by Kettering Council) |
| 86 | East Renfrewshire | £2,101,244.00 | 67 |
| 105 | East Riding of Yorkshire | £786,723.00 | 40 |
| 173 | East Staffordshire | £1,043,914.96 | 68 |
| 369 | East Sussex | £32,334.75 | 56 |
| 365 | Eastbourne | £40,930.89 | 17 |
| 219 | Eastleigh | £697,136.80 | 158 |
| 352 | Eden | £64,436.58 | 17 |
| 375 | Eilean Siar | £27,998.21 | 210 |
| 59 | Elmbridge | £2,517,306.00 | 69 |
| 6 | Enfield | £4,996,900.00 | 169 |
| 304 | Epping Forest | £251,238.00 | 291 |
| 246 | Epsom and Ewell | £527,413.92 | 20 |
| 299 | Erewash | £277,397.59 | 80 |
| 132 | Essex | £1,515,906.00 | 167 |
| 134 | Exeter | £1,495,098.00 | 129 |
| 165 | Falkirk | £1,187,880.00 | 93 |
| 176 | Fareham | £1,005,808.00 | 41 |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------|--|-------------|
| 151 | Fenland | £1,365,315.00 | 109 |
| 336 | Fermanagh | £108,364.27 | 37 |
| 181 | Fife | £948,347.12 | 1,420 |
| 133 | Flintshire | £1,499,558.45 | 120 |
| 282 | Forest Heath | £340,493.48 | 24 |
| 329 | Forest of Dean | £144,336.98 | 28 |
| 348 | Fylde | £72,533.09 | 33 |
| 124 | Gateshead | £1,571,353.91 | 76 |
| 242 | Gedling | £556,725.74 | 46 |
| 413 | Glasgow City | Unstated | 574 |
| 275 | Gloucester | £378,641.54 | 67 |
| - | Gloucestershire | Refused under grounds of cost and time | 333 |
| 191 | Gosport | £889,777.12 | 41 |
| 200 | Gravesham | £826,203.00 | 48 |
| 267 | Great Yarmouth | £412,389.00 | 8 |
| 77 | Greenwich | £2,200,154.00 | 173 |
| 231 | Guildford | £621,221.35 | 231 |
| 80 | Gwynedd | £2,186,245.55 | 367 |
| - | Hackney | Refused under grounds of cost and time | |
| 406 | Halton | No Response | No Response |
| 175 | Hambleton | £1,017,107.00 | 47 |
| 22 | Hammersmith and Fulham | £3,716,427.00 | 452 |
| 400 | Hampshire | £0.00 | 0 |
| 290 | Harborough | £309,249.25 | 24 |
| 21 | Haringey | £3,726,673.40 | 102 |
| 319 | Harlow | £201,327.38 | 77 |
| 145 | Harrogate | £1,407,034.00 | 189 |
| 100 | Harrow | £1,863,547.00 | 130 |
| 276 | Hart | £377,893.57 | Unknown |
| 303 | Hartlepool | £251,602.00 | Unknown |
| 248 | Hastings | £487,002.00 | 96 |
| 110 | Havant | £1,733,641.86 | 45 |
| 118 | Havering | £1,618,482.00 | 86 |
| 127 | Herefordshire | £1,543,261.62 | 40 |
| 377 | Hertfordshire | £24,275.00 | 110 |
| 169 | Hertsmere | £1,111,202.00 | 23 |
| 266 | High Peak | £417,832.00 | 33 |
| 112 | Highland | £1,683,000.00 | 122 |
| 41 | Hillingdon | £3,025,168.00 | 722 |
| 256 | Hinckley and Bosworth | £452,303.00 | 73 |
| 281 | Horsham | £355,056.18 | 43 |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 12 | Hounslow | £4,597,163.37 | 1 (at least; total unstated) |
| 25 | Huntingdonshire | £3,624,729.14 | 92 |
| 251 | Hyndburn | £478,943.64 | Cameras operated by Blackburn Council |
| 224 | Inverclyde | £652,246.00 | 49 |
| 238 | Ipswich | £574,048.65 | 195 |
| 245 | Isle of Anglesey | £533,000.00 | 56 |
| 82 | Isle of Wight | £2,147,780.00 | 106 |
| 421 | Isles of Scilly | £0.00 | 0 |
| 99 | Islington | £1,880,566.93 | 163 |
| 129 | Kensington and Chelsea | £1,522,578.00 | 58 |
| 244 | Kent | £533,618.00 | 170 |
| 188 | Kettering | £906,000.00 | 67 |
| 144 | King's Lynn and West Norfolk | £1,418,093.85 | 277 |
| 255 | Kingston upon Hull, City of | £457,898.00 | 470 |
| 314 | Kingston upon Thames | £220,200.00 | 120 |
| 48 | Kirklees | £2,725,000.00 | 163 |
| 13 | Knowsley | £4,558,481.51 | 548 |
| 18 | Lambeth | £4,099,625.02 | 348 |
| 381 | Lancashire | £15,026.00 | 21 |
| 96 | Lancaster | £1,923,167.00 | 42 |
| 412 | Larne | £21,750.00 | Cameras operated by PSNI |
| 3 | Leeds | £8,762,292.00 | 253 |
| 9 | Leicester | £4,762,729.94 | 2,083 |
| 322 | Leicestershire | £178,500.00 | 168 |
| 422 | Lewes | £0.00 | 0 |
| 71 | Lewisham | £2,348,746.69 | 170 |
| 269 | Lichfield | £406,363.00 | 81 |
| 380 | Limavady | £21,642.00 | 30 |
| 61 | Lincoln | £2,489,150.75 | 141 |
| 401 | Lincolnshire | £0.00 | 0 |
| 240 | Lisburn | £571,366.00 | Cameras operated by 'Lisburn Commerce Against Crime' |
| 19 | Liverpool | £3,875,751.00 | 326 |
| 89 | Luton | £2,060,625.00 | 142 |
| 316 | Magherafelt | £215,510.47 | 66 |
| 69 | Maidstone | £2,379,997.00 | 136 |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 361 | Maldon | £51,370.00 | 51 |
| 315 | Malvern Hills | £219,976.22 | 5 |
| 29 | Manchester | £3,423,511.00 | 281 |
| 85 | Mansfield | £2,124,266.32 | 167 |
| 42 | Medway | £3,022,285.74 | 443 |
| 359 | Melton | £54,569.00 | 16 |
| 156 | Mendip | £1,321,652.11 | 61 |
| 236 | Merthyr Tydfil | £587,806.00 | 70 |
| 24 | Merton | £3,683,702.00 | 150 |
| 345 | Mid Devon | £79,544.94 | 28 |
| 330 | Mid Suffolk | £142,435.00 | 17 |
| 397 | Mid Sussex | £462.00 | 0 |
| 147 | Middlesbrough | £1,403,549.00 | 191 |
| 289 | Midlothian | £309,766.07 | 65 |
| 273 | Milton Keynes | £384,170.20 | 70 |
| 285 | Mole Valley | £327,364.74 | 35 |
| 279 | Monmouthshire | £370,618.62 | 28 |
| 311 | Moray | £236,588.00 | 40 |
| 373 | Moyle | £29,190.56 | 5 |
| 111 | Neath Port Talbot | £1,732,120.00 | 124 |
| 53 | New Forest | £2,585,915.00 | 81 |
| 157 | Newark and Sherwood | £1,303,547.00 | 100 |
| 415 | Newcastle upon Tyne | No Response | No Response |
| 353 | Newcastle-under-Lyme | £60,685.00 | 19 |
| 270 | Newham | £398,000.00 | 226 |
| 56 | Newport | £2,552,917.00 | 55 |
| 364 | Newry and Mourne | £41,000.00 | 0 |
| 284 | Newtownabbey | £335,818.00 | 9 |
| 354 | Norfolk | £60,580.00 | 0 |
| 168 | North Ayrshire | £1,114,184.13 | 727 |
| 216 | North Devon | £701,882.75 | 38 |
| 423 | North Dorset | £0.00 | 2 |
| 298 | North Down | £285,741.00 | 18 |
| 286 | North East Derbyshire | £324,450.24 | Cameras operated by Chamber of Trade |
| 140 | North East Lincolnshire | £1,442,018.99 | 156 |
| 162 | North Hertfordshire | £1,231,886.00 | 53 |
| 195 | North Kesteven | £858,700.89 | 11 |
| 414 | North Lanarkshire | £0.00 | 0 |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| 237 | North Lincolnshire | £577,665.00 | 200 |
| 186 | North Norfolk | £927,232.80 | 48 |
| 114 | North Somerset | £1,654,020.09 | 73 |
| 92 | North Tyneside | £1,988,504.86 | 315 |
| 183 | North Warwickshire | £944,644.57 | 35 |
| 226 | North West Leicestershire | £642,527.75 | 31 |
| 402 | North Yorkshire | £0.00 | 0 |
| 46 | Northampton | £2,748,260.70 | 555 |
| 166 | Northamptonshire | £1,147,493.97 | 30 |
| 217 | Northumberland | £701,590.57 | 85 |
| 43 | Norwich | £2,898,628.50 | 114 |
| 11 | Nottingham | £4,666,827.83 | 1,120 |
| 403 | Nottinghamshire | £0.00 | 0 |
| 75 | Nuneaton and Bedworth | £2,282,340.22 | 130 |
| 378 | Oadby and Wigston | £24,245.95 | 4 |
| 117 | Oldham | £1,635,747.57 | 94 |
| 340 | Omagh | £95,000.00 | 68 |
| 371 | Orkney Islands | £30,147.05 | 14 |
| 233 | Oxford | £613,650.36 | 53 |
| 265 | Oxfordshire | £418,614.09 | 193 |
| 370 | Pembrokeshire | £31,415.00 | 4 |
| 324 | Pendle | £172,915.00 | Unknown |
| 295 | Perth and Kinross | £300,074.00 | 35 |
| 39 | Peterborough | £3,104,289.00 | 149 |
| 102 | Plymouth | £1,832,471.64 | 189 |
| 63 | Poole | £2,473,725.00 | 129 |
| 58 | Portsmouth | £2,522,877.37 | 143 |
| 357 | Powys | £56,518.89 | 17 |
| 220 | Preston | £691,000.00 | 196 |
| 424 | Purbeck | £0.00 | 0 |
| 106 | Reading | £1,782,259.00 | 48 |
| 40 | Redbridge | £3,082,916.46 | 239 |
| 20 | Redcar and Cleveland | £3,794,484.00 | 125 |
| 148 | Redditch | £1,382,768.00 | 54 |
| 178 | Reigate and Banstead | £969,105.00 | 124 |
| 388 | Renfrewshire | £7,736.23 | 420 |
| 55 | Rhondda, Cynon, Taff | £2,580,615.00 | 268 |
| 228 | Ribble Valley | £639,440.00 | 28 |
| 227 | Richmond upon Thames | £639,898.00 | 78 |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 268 | Richmondshire | £406,947.00 | 12 |
| 131 | Rochdale | £1,518,608.00 | 125 |
| 425 | Rochford | £0.00 | 0 |
| 263 | Rossendale | £420,295.55 | 24 |
| 368 | Rother | £37,008.87 | 10 |
| 153 | Rotherham | £1,331,399.16 | 110 |
| 184 | Rugby | £940,608.76 | 55 |
| 223 | Runnymede | £653,583.00 | 205 |
| 392 | Rushcliffe | £2,028.20 | 7 |
| 73 | Rushmoor | £2,303,771.00 | 63 |
| 394 | Rutland | £1,381.00 | 0 |
| 332 | Ryedale | £135,329.79 | 14 |
| 416 | Salford | No Response | No Response |
| 116 | Sandwell | £1,640,842.00 | Unknown |
| 32 | Scarborough | £3,312,406.00 | 64 |
| 230 | Scottish Borders | £626,441.00 | 0 |
| 74 | Sedgemoor | £2,293,475.00 | 158 |
| 343 | Sefton | £90,000.00 | Unknown |
| 306 | Selby | £250,000.00 | 37 |
| 139 | Sevenoaks | £1,451,682.00 | 96 |
| 49 | Sheffield | £2,719,358.94 | 144 |
| 103 | Shepway | £1,823,768.07 | 54 |
| 328 | Shetland Islands | £158,397.48 | 210 |
| 342 | Shropshire | £93,308.00 | 123 |
| 51 | Slough | £2,638,146.10 | 82 |
| 160 | Solihull | £1,263,858.00 | 132 |
| 404 | Somerset | £0.00 | 0 |
| 101 | South Ayrshire | £1,853,666.00 | 83 |
| 323 | South Bucks | £173,476.79 | 5 |
| 426 | South Cambridgeshire | £0.00 | 0 |
| 351 | South Derbyshire | £68,639.00 | Unstated |
| 189 | South Gloucestershire | £905,828.00 | 50 |
| 390 | South Hams | £3,054.00 | 20 |
| 427 | South Holland | £0.00 | 0 |
| 79 | South Kesteven | £2,191,589.79 | 68 |
| 317 | South Lakeland | £208,031.20 | 20 |
| 62 | South Lanarkshire | £2,479,080.00 | 111 |
| 428 | South Norfolk | Information not held | 38 |
| 362 | South Northamptonshire | £48,092.87 | 46 |
| 262 | South Oxfordshire | £429,158.00 | 62 |
| 339 | South Ribble | £105,796.00 | 15 |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| 259 | South Somerset | £439,752.00 | 38 |
| 212 | South Staffordshire | £740,000.00 | 32 |
| 67 | South Tyneside | £2,423,029.19 | 93 |
| 68 | Southampton | £2,417,726.12 | 1,030 |
| 36 | Southend-on-Sea | £3,164,844.94 | 235 |
| 93 | Southwark | £1,967,781.00 | 164 |
| 249 | Spelthorne | £483,580.00 | 72 |
| 177 | St Albans | £969,889.00 | 142 |
| 167 | St Edmundsbury | £1,124,064.73 | 143 |
| 318 | St. Helens | £202,122.49 | Unknown |
| 260 | Stafford | £435,458.23 | 45 |
| - | Staffordshire | No Response | No Response |
| 154 | Staffordshire Moorlands | £1,329,289.00 | 40 |
| 143 | Stevenage | £1,420,653.00 | 62 |
| 325 | Stirling | £171,662.23 | 182 |
| 193 | Stockport | £874,208.36 | Unstated |
| 196 | Stockton-on-Tees | £855,358.00 | 210 |
| 28 | Stoke-on-Trent | £3,459,000.00 | 228 |
| 376 | Strabane | £26,010.46 | Unknown |
| 113 | Stratford-on-Avon | £1,672,113.77 | 87 |
| 312 | Stroud | £235,837.80 | 84 |
| 221 | Suffolk | £684,003.21 | 313 |
| 386 | Suffolk Coastal | £8,969.00 | 5 |
| 204 | Sunderland | £793,303.00 | 63 |
| 374 | Surrey | £28,160.00 | 150 |
| 294 | Surrey Heath | £304,470.00 | Cameras operated by Woking Council and Surrey Police |
| 88 | Sutton | £2,063,590.08 | 85 |
| 174 | Swale | £1,027,645.10 | 89 |
| 407 | Swansea | No Response | No Response |
| 158 | Swindon | £1,271,725.00 | 414 |
| 66 | Tameside | £2,424,681.00 | 116 |
| 34 | Tamworth | £3,286,026.00 | 78 |
| 384 | Tandridge | £12,295.00 | 21 |
| 313 | Taunton Deane | £230,000.00 | 65 |
| 296 | Teignbridge | £298,165.56 | 58 |
| 241 | Telford and Wrekin | £563,401.13 | 272 |
| 320 | Tendring | £196,874.96 | 114 |
| 254 | Test Valley | £464,899.00 | 17 |
| 387 | Tewkesbury | £8,668.00 | 27 |
| 76 | Thanet | £2,275,398.34 | 98 |
| 155 | The Vale of | £1,322,889.00 | 69 |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|
| | Glamorgan | | |
| 366 | Three Rivers | £40,225.82 | 41 |
| 52 | Thurrock | £2,631,305.09 | 235 |
| 95 | Tonbridge and Malling | £1,943,103.00 | 155 |
| 105 | Torbay | £1,787,969.00 | 164 |
| 207 | Torfaen | £783,828.00 | 70 |
| 232 | Torrige | £614,838.96 | 17 |
| 44 | Tower Hamlets | £2,897,000.00 | 280 |
| 209 | Trafford | £770,000.00 | 244 |
| 150 | Tunbridge Wells | £1,365,916.00 | 103 |
| 346 | Uttlesford | £74,137.30 | 7 |
| 149 | Vale of White Horse | £1,371,121.00 | 31 |
| 17 | Wakefield | £4,110,740.00 | 177 |
| 98 | Walsall | £1,880,742.47 | 130 |
| 138 | Waltham Forest | £1,457,000.00 | 71 |
| 8 | Wandsworth | £4,771,080.14 | 1,158 |
| 203 | Warrington | £812,541.00 | 39 |
| 60 | Warwick | £2,508,365.09 | 162 |
| 337 | Warwickshire | £108,122.00 | 1 (at least) |
| 119 | Watford | £1,610,500.00 | 77 |
| 136 | Waveney | £1,467,242.00 | 40 |
| 395 | Waverley | £1,079.00 | 19 |
| 382 | Wealden | £13,622.00 | 34 |
| 297 | Wellingborough | £289,542.13 | Cameras operated by Northampton Council |
| 278 | Welwyn Hatfield | £376,664.00 | 37 |
| 125 | West Berkshire | £1,571,031.58 | 40 |
| 396 | West Devon | £737.21 | 15 |
| 97 | West Dorset | £1,884,369.66 | 127 |
| 399 | West Dunbartonshire | £0.00 | 396 |
| 171 | West Lancashire | £1,061,324.00 | 69 |
| 187 | West Lindsey | £908,233.58 | 35 |
| 372 | West Lothian | £30,000.00 | Unknown |
| 261 | West Oxfordshire | £431,037.45 | 37 |
| 335 | West Somerset | £109,341.18 | 17 |
| 405 | West Sussex | Not Stated | 230 |
| 2 | Westminster | £11,831,554.00 | 153 |
| 78 | Weymouth and Portland | £2,195,530.44 | 127 |
| 211 | Wigan | £740,000.00 | 823 |
| 94 | Wiltshire | £1,956,301.06 | 137 |
| 121 | Winchester | £1,602,505.74 | Unstated |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 31 | Windsor and Maidenhead | £3,318,359.00 | 126 |
| 222 | Wirral | £678,000.00 | 59 |
| 104 | Woking | £1,801,930.12 | 531 |
| 301 | Wokingham | £259,616.00 | 25 |
| 115 | Wolverhampton | £1,652,470.52 | 244 |
| 215 | Worcester | £707,683.16 | 126 |
| 383 | Worcestershire | £12,417.67 | 63 |
| 350 | Worthing | £72,140.51 | 17 |
| 83 | Wrexham | £2,147,422.24 | 124 |
| 179 | Wychavon | £965,400.00 | 105 |
| 33 | Wycombe | £3,303,601.91 | 161 |
| 288 | Wyre | £310,466.58 | Cameras operated by police |
| 334 | Wyre Forest | £118,860.00 | 19 |
| 192 | York | £885,000.00 | 78 |
| Total | | £514,995,790.71 | 51,655 |

Appendix 2 – Numbers of Police per Police Force²⁵

| Force | Officers | Budget (millions) | Area Size (km ²) |
|------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Avon and Somerset Constabulary | 3,302 | 248.9 | 4777 |
| Bedfordshire Police | 1,207 | 91.2 | 1246 |
| British Transport Police | 2,835 | 187.7 | - |
| Cambridge Constabulary | 1,471 | 116 | 3389 |
| Central Scotland Police | 836 | 53.6 | 2643 |
| Cheshire Constabulary | 2,181 | 157.4 | 2155 |
| City of London Police | 852 | 62.9 | 2.6 |
| Civil Nuclear Constabulary | 774 | 51 | - |
| Cleveland Police | 1,724 | 119.7 | 597 |
| Cumbria Constabulary | 1,238 | 94 | 6768 |
| Derbyshire Constabulary | 2,074 | 151.6 | 2625 |
| Devon and Cornwall Constabulary | 3,556 | 256.8 | 10270 |
| Dorset Police | 1,486 | 107.8 | 2653 |
| Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary | 517 | 34.9 | 6426 |
| Durham Constabulary | 1,507 | 112.3 | 2676 |
| Dyfed - Powys Police | 1,195 | 83.6 | 10976 |
| Essex Police | 3,606 | 242.2 | 3670 |
| Fife Constabulary | 1,066 | 74.4 | 1325 |
| Gloucestershire Constabulary | 1,309 | 95.7 | 3150 |
| Grampian Police | 1,483 | 91.5 | 8737 |
| Greater Manchester Police | 8,148 | 524.1 | 1276 |
| Gwent Police | 1,437 | 110.7 | 1555 |
| Hampshire Constabulary | 3,748 | 281.9 | 4149 |
| Hertfordshire Constabulary | 2,130 | 171.4 | 1643 |
| Humberside Police | 2,058 | 164.9 | 3517 |
| Kent Police | 3,787 | 257.9 | 3736 |
| Lancashire Constabulary | 3,649 | 252.6 | 3075 |
| Leicestershire Constabulary | 2,317 | 154.7 | 2538 |

²⁵ English and Welsh forces from

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs10/hosb1410.pdf>; Scottish forces from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/262428/0078464.pdf>; Northern Ireland from http://www.psni.police.uk/index/updates/updates_statistics/updates_strength_of_police_service_statistics.htm

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| Lincolnshire Police | 1,206 | 90.4 | 5921 |
| Lothian and Borders Police | 2,891 | 207 | 6456 |
| Merseyside Police | 4,516 | 307.3 | 645 |
| Metropolitan Police Service | 33,367 | 2532.7 | 1578 |
| Ministry of Defence Police | 3,513 | 363.4 | - |
| Norfolk Constabulary | 1,662 | 131.3 | 5371 |
| Northern Constabulary | 747 | 35.5 | 31186 |
| North Wales Police | 1,590 | 124.8 | 6172 |
| Northamptonshire | 1,343 | 110.3 | 2364 |
| Northumbria | 4,187 | 270.1 | 5553 |
| North Yorkshire Police | 1,486 | 127.6 | 8310 |
| Nottinghamshire Police | 2,409 | 177.6 | 2160 |
| Police Service of Northern Ireland | 7,410 | 962.7 | 13843 |
| SCDEA | 319 | 21.1 | - |
| South Wales Police | 3,148 | 232.1 | 2074 |
| South Yorkshire Police | 2,953 | 239.6 | 1552 |
| Staffordshire Police | 2,161 | 170.9 | 2713 |
| Strathclyde Police | 7,955 | 511.7 | 13624 |
| Suffolk Constabulary | 1,246 | 101.9 | 3801 |
| Surrey Police | 1,890 | 180.6 | 1663 |
| Sussex Police | 3,213 | 237.1 | 3783 |
| Tayside Police | 1,180 | 83.6 | 7528 |
| Thames Valley Police | 4,434 | 344.4 | 5742 |
| Warwickshire Police | 973 | 80.1 | 1975 |
| West Mercia Police | 2,391 | 184.3 | 7408 |
| West Midlands Police | 8,626 | 521.8 | 902 |
| West Yorkshire Police | 5,758 | 396 | 2029 |
| Wiltshire Police | 1,181 | 108 | 3485 |
| Total | 175,248 | 13205.3 | - |

Methodology

Starting on the 3rd November 2011, the following Freedom of Information request was sent to 434 local authorities across the United Kingdom. In this request we asked for the cost of CCTV installation, operation and maintenance and the salary costs of CCTV operators, broken down into fixed and mobile cameras. A copy of this FOI can be found in Appendix 3. We received at least partial responses from 407 authorities.

In order to arrive at a figure for four years, data from the previous Big Brother Watch report 'The Price is Wrong' was incorporated in our analysis. This data covered the council spend for the financial year 2007-2008 and the relevant Freedom of Information request can be found in the original report. (Available on request). When this data is combined with the request above, the partial response rate rises to 428 local authorities or ninety nine per cent.

For the purposes of this report we included all responses received up to and including the 25th January 2012.

Establishing an accurate figure for the vast number of CCTV cameras operated by private owners is extremely difficult, verging on impossible.²⁶ This report seeks to provide details of CCTV operated by local authorities and does not therefore include details of the many cameras controlled by private individuals or companies, by central government, the motorway system, Transport for London²⁷ and by the wider transport network.

²⁶ A recent attempt placed the total figure at 1.85 million cameras
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/mar/02/cctv-cameras-watching-surveillance>

²⁷ A recent Big Brother Watch report, *Signal Failure?*, provides further detailed information about CCTV cameras used by Transport for London <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2011/12/ten-tfl-cctv-cameras-fail-solve.html>

FOI request

FOI request pertaining to the council's spend on CCTV

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to obtain information about the amount your authority has spent on its CCTV network in the past three years. I also wish to find out how many mobile and fixed surveillance cameras are controlled by your authority.

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

- 1) The amount spent by your authority on the installation of public-facing CCTV cameras and the purchase or lease of recording equipment and premises in the financial years:

a) April 1st 2010 – March 31st 2011

b) April 1st 2009 – March 31st 2010

c) April 1st 2008 – March 31st 2009

If any of this spend was provided by a central Government grant or PFI, please make clear how much of the total cost was provided. I would like this information broken down into fixed and mobile camera devices. I have included a model table for clarity:

| Council | Financial Year | Amount spent on fixed public facing cameras | Amount spent on mobile public facing cameras | Central Government grant or PFI | Total council spend on cameras |
|---------|----------------|---|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Council | 2010-2011 | £100 | £100 | No | £200 |
| Council | 2009-2010 | £100 | £100 | Yes - £50 | £250 |

- 2) The annual cost of your authority's public-facing CCTV operation and maintenance in the financial years:

a) April 1st 2010 – March 31st 2011

b) April 1st 2009 – March 31st 2010

c) April 1st 2008 – March 31st 2009

I would like this information broken down into fixed and mobile camera devices. I have included a model table for clarity:

| Council | Financial Year | Annual cost of CCTV operation and maintenance for fixed cameras | Annual cost of CCTV operation and maintenance for mobile cameras | Total council spend on CCTV operation and maintenance |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Council | 2010-2011 | £100 | £100 | £200 |

3) The annual wage and salary cost of CCTV operators including pension liabilities to your authority in the financial years:

- a) April 1st 2010 – March 31st 2011
- b) April 1st 2009 – March 31st 2010
- c) April 1st 2008 – March 31st 2009

4) The total number of cameras:

- a.) controlled by your authority on 31st August 2011
- b.) controlled by your authority, broken down into mobile and fixed devices, on 31st August 2011
- c.) If it exists, a copy of any internal guidance on CCTV usage

If your authority's public-facing CCTV operation is operated by either the local police or another council, or on behalf of another authority, please make this clear and provide any details of the annual cost of the lease or annual stipend paid to (or received from) these organisations for the operation of the CCTV network.

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.

About Big Brother Watch

Big Brother Watch was set up to challenge policies that threaten our privacy, our freedoms and our civil liberties, and to expose the true scale of the surveillance state.

Founded in 2009, we have produced unique research exposing the erosion of civil liberties in the UK, looking at the dramatic expansion of surveillance powers, the growth of the database state and the misuse of personal information.

We campaign to give individuals more control over their personal data, and hold to account those who fail to respect our privacy, whether private companies, government departments or local authorities.

Protecting individual privacy and defending civil liberties, Big Brother Watch is a campaign group for the digital age.

Financial support for this research paper was provided by the Politics and Economics Research Trust (charity number 1121849). Any views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not those of the research trust or of its trustees

If you are a journalist and you would like to contact Big Brother Watch, including outside office hours, please call +44 (0) 7505 448925 (24hrs) You can also email press@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk for written enquiries.

E-mail: info@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk

Mail:

Big Brother Watch
55 Tufon Street
London
SW1P 3QL

www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk