



# Traffic Spies

How local authorities raised £312 million from the use of static CCTV and CCTV cars

**A Big Brother Watch report**

April 2014

## Contents

Foreword from Nick de Bois MP .....	3
Key Findings.....	4
Table 1: Top Twenty Highest Revenue Raisers .....	5
Executive Summary.....	6
Policy Recommendations .....	8
2013 CCTV Code of Practice .....	9
CCTV Cars and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.....	12
DCLG and DfT Consultation .....	14
Table 2: Local Authority data.....	17
Appendix 1: Methodology.....	39
Appendix 2: FOI request .....	42
Appendix 3: CCTV Code of Practice Guiding Principles .....	43
About Big Brother Watch.....	45

**For media enquiries relating to this report, including outside office hours, please call Big Brother Watch on +44 (0) 7505 448925 (24hrs). You can also email [press@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](mailto:press@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk) for written enquiries,**

## Foreword from Nick de Bois MP

Following pledges made by the Conservatives in Opposition, the Coalition Agreement committed the Government to increase the regulation and oversight of CCTV cameras. CCTV should only ever be used in exceptional circumstances, and therefore I agree with the government that local authority use of CCTV for parking enforcement should be banned.

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 prepared a surveillance camera code of practice, which sets out guidelines for CCTV encouraging transparency in their use and ensuring public bodies consider whether they are proportionate before erecting new cameras. The Act also created a new position of Surveillance Camera Commissioner, whose role it is to encourage all operators to comply with the code, review how the code is used in practice and provide advice and information about it.

I welcome this research by Big Brother Watch, which highlights that despite this guidance and additional oversight, local authorities are continuing to use CCTV cameras for means other than public safety. This research highlights the £312m in revenue that has been raised by local authorities across the country by issuing fixed penalty notices, making it clear that many hard-pressed drivers are unfairly being hit with arbitrary fines.

It is important that the public can have faith that CCTV is being used only in those situations where public safety is at risk and there are no less intrusive alternative routes of investigation. That is why it is important to scrutinise when local authorities are using CCTV cameras without it being necessary and proportionate, and I welcome Big Brother Watch's continuing scrutiny and challenge in the use of surveillance tools.

## Key Findings

The following information relates to local authority use of static CCTV and CCTV cars to issue traffic and parking contravention notices (Fixed Penalty Notices). The findings in this research are for the dates 1 March 2008 – 1 March 2013. **A full table of local authorities is available on page 17.**

### Cameras

- There are at least **71** local authorities that have used static CCTV and/or CCTV cars to capture traffic offences
  - There are at least **36 local authorities are using static CCTV** to capture traffic offences
  - There are at least **59 local authorities are using CCTV cars** to capture traffic offences.
    - This is a percentage **increase of 87%** since 2009<sup>1</sup>
    - There are at least **106 CCTV cars** being used by local authorities.

### Revenue

- The **total revenue** that has been generated between 1 March 2008 and 1 March 2013 is at least **£312,014,707.83**
  - The amount raised by **static CCTV** cameras is at least **£197,020,561.53**.
  - The amount raised by **CCTV cars** is at least **£43,644,493.84**
  - **£71,349,652.46** was **not broken down** by councils in their responses.
- The majority of the revenue generated through CCTV (**90%**) is from the **London Boroughs** (See Table 1):
  - London income: **£285,421,211.72**
  - Rest of the UK: **£26,353,545.51**

### Contraventions

- At least **6,661,359** contraventions were captured by static CCTV and CCTV cars
  - Static CCTV: **5,615,832**
  - CCTV cars: **1,045,527**

<sup>1</sup> There were 31 councils using CCTV cars in 2009.

<http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2010/07/driveby-spies-cctv-cars-issue-8-million-in-fines-in-just-12-months.html>

**Table 1: Top Twenty Highest Revenue Raisers**

	Council	Income from Fixed Penalty Notices		
		Smart Car	Static	Total
1	<b>Camden</b>	£1,724,001	£34,604,320	£36,328,321.00
2	<b>Ealing<sup>2</sup></b>	Information not broken down		£24,119,590.00
3	<b>Lambeth</b>	£2,174,728	£20,390,452	£22,565,180.00
4	<b>Westminster</b>	£3,130,975.15	£17,588,677.53	£20,719,652.68
5	<b>Harrow</b>	£0	£20,165,870.81	£20,165,870.81
6	<b>Hammersmith and Fulham</b>	£0	£18,526,797	£18,526,797.00
7	<b>Barking and Dagenham</b>	£3,456,682.00	£11,696,527	£15,153,209.00
8	<b>Newham</b>	£2,914,760.70	£11,360,873.32	£14,275,634.02
9	<b>Islington</b>	Information not broken down		£12,840,131.40
10	<b>Hounslow</b>	£478,806.44	£9,884,137.31	£10,362,943.75
11	<b>Wandsworth</b>	£1,710,039	£8,250,633	£9,960,672.00
12	<b>Havering</b>	£9,059,671	£0.00	£9,059,671.00
13	<b>Southwark</b>	Information not broken down		£8,496,760.14
14	<b>Waltham Forest</b>	Information not broken down		£7,450,274.10
15	<b>Hackney</b>	£1,336,671.59	£5,579,361.56	£6,916,033.15
16	<b>Merton</b>	£1,404,180	£4,539,690	£5,943,870.00
17	<b>Brent</b>	Information not broken down		£5,717,852.92
18	<b>Redbridge</b>	Information not broken down		£5,663,929.00
19	<b>Tower Hamlets</b>	£131,219.00	£3,862,337.93	£3,993,556.93
20	<b>Croydon</b>	Information not broken down		£3,916,248.00

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 1 for the methodology in ascertaining figures for Ealing.

## Executive Summary

CCTV has become a seemingly ever-present part of everyday life in the UK, with the public being told that it is integral to help keep them safe. Yet, it has become clear that local authorities have taken advantage of the technology to raise millions in revenue. *Traffic Spies* highlights that more than 70 local authorities have used CCTV as a means of raising £312m in revenue by issuing fixed penalty notices (FPN) for traffic violations.

The question must therefore be asked, if CCTV cameras are about public safety, why are local authorities able to use them to raise revenue? Furthermore, why are local authorities publishing no meaningful information about their use of CCTV for parking enforcement?

Our concerns about the use of CCTV cars were initially raised in the 2009 report *Drive by Spies*, which warned about the over-reliance on CCTV enforcement and the problems that emerge from removing the law enforcement process from traffic wardens and police officers.<sup>3</sup> For example, the use of CCTV in issuing FPN's has resulted in a 20% increase in the number of people successfully appealing their tickets alongside a 10% increase in parking fines.<sup>4,5</sup>

This report outlines the clear case for a ban on the use of CCTV cameras and CCTV cars for traffic enforcement. Serious problems should be tackled by the police and traffic wardens, not unfocussed and revenue-led surveillance.

Furthermore, the absence of proper transparency around the use of CCTV cameras in general, and the scale of fixed penalty notice use, is a fundamental problem and one that undermines trust and confidence in legitimate, targeted surveillance. It should be addressed urgently.

The Traffic Penalty Tribunal has also been very clear that CCTV cars should only be used when “*enforcement is difficult, sensitive or enforcement by wardens is not practical*”, yet our research highlights that there has been an 87% increase in local authorities' use of CCTV cars over a five year period.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/drive-byspies.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> *Annual Statistics of the Traffic Penalty Tribunal 2010/11*

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

This further reinforces the need for the Surveillance Camera Commissioner to be given powers to enforce the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice. Currently the position has no powers to compel councils to obey the code.

The Secretary of State for DCLG, Eric Pickles MP also announced that he would act to *“rein in these over-zealous and unfair rules on parking enforcement”*<sup>6</sup>, leading to a joint DCLG and DfT consultation on whether to outlaw this practice. We have outlined the purpose of the consultation and our response on page 11.

Finally, the report addresses the use of fixed CCTV cameras without authorisation under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA). Where a camera is re-directed and focussed on a specific vehicle, capturing information about the vehicle as well as potentially images of people travelling in the vehicle, we outline why this constitutes directed surveillance under RIPA. We argue that if CCTV is to be used to issue tickets by an operator (as opposed to an automatic system) then as the law stands this should require a RIPA authorisation and any surveillance undertaken without a RIPA authorisation is therefore unlawful.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Telegraph, Councils using CCTV cameras to fine motorists to be made illegal within months, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/transport/10337749/Councils-using-CCTV-cameras-to-fine-motorists-to-be-made-illegal-within-months.html>

## Policy Recommendations

### **1. Local authority use of CCTV smart cars, as well as the use of static CCTV for parking enforcement, should be banned**

CCTV should only ever be used in exceptional circumstances, for example when the safety of staff is threatened or it is not technically possible for a traffic warden to operate in a specific area.

CCTV should also only be used when all alternatives have been exhausted and when it is used, it should be subject to a regular review. This will ensure that the use of CCTV is in pursuit of a legitimate aim, is necessary to meet a pressing need and is actually effective in tackling the identified need. These results should then be proactively published.

### **2. The Surveillance Camera Commissioner should be given powers of enforcement, inspection and investigation**

The role of the Surveillance Camera Commissioner should be a single, straightforward point of contact to make and resolve complaints about CCTV cameras. In order to achieve this the Commissioner should be given powers of enforcement and inspection, as well as a statutory role in the investigation or resolution of complaints.

### **3. Full transparency by local authorities on how many tickets they issue, why and how much revenue is raised**

Local authorities should proactively publish details of the number of CCTV cameras in operation, the amount of revenue raised through fixed penalty notices issued via CCTV, the number and types of contraventions that fines have been issued for, and the location of the camera



## 2013 CCTV Code of Practice

### About the code

The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 (POFA) stipulated that new guidance would be issued on the appropriate and effective use of surveillance camera systems in England and Wales. The POFA also created a new role of the Surveillance Camera Commissioner (SCC), with the first Commissioner, Andrew Rennison, starting in September 2012. On 12 August 2013 the CCTV Code of Practice came into force.<sup>7</sup> The 12 guiding principles of the code are included in Appendix 3.

### Can CCTV be used for traffic enforcement?

The code makes it very clear that in order to avoid motorists regarding traffic enforcement by CCTV as “over-zealous”, authorities should use the cameras “sparingly”. As a result:

*“Such systems should only be deployed where other means of enforcement are not practical and their effectiveness in achieving this purpose is subject to regular review.”<sup>8</sup>*

In order to achieve this, the code states that CCTV must only be installed for a “specified purpose” which is in pursuit of a “legitimate aim” and necessary to meet an “identified pressing need” (Principle 1).

### Transparency

Principle 3 of the code states that:

*“There must be as much transparency in the use of a surveillance camera system as possible, including a published contact point for access to information and complaints.”<sup>9</sup>*

---

<sup>7</sup>[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/204775/Surveillance\\_Camera\\_Code\\_of\\_Practice\\_WEB.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/204775/Surveillance_Camera_Code_of_Practice_WEB.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p.6

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, p.13

The code also recommends that in developing or reviewing surveillance camera systems, consultation and engagement with the public and partners (including the police) will be an important part of assessing whether there is a “legitimate aim and a pressing need, and whether the system itself is a proportionate response.”

## **Accountability**

Principle 4 of the code states that:

*“There must be clear responsibility and accountability for all surveillance camera system activities including images and information collected, held and used.”<sup>10</sup>*

If CCTV cameras are to be used for multiple purposes, for example the camera was initially installed for “crime prevention and detection” but then is also used for “traffic management”, the code states that it is good practice for the governance arrangements to include those “accountable for each purpose and facilitate joint working, review and audit, decision making and public engagement.”

## **Failures of the code**

The code was a step in the right direction towards bringing proper oversight to millions of cameras that capture our movements every day. However, as only five per cent of cameras in England and Wales are covered by the code (local authorities and police forces), and without any penalties available if the code is broken, there is much more that could be done to protect people's privacy from unjustified or excessive surveillance.

The SCC has no powers of inspection or enforcement, nor does he have any statutory role in the investigation and resolution of complaints, meaning the Information Commissioner remains responsible for these areas. As such, we have repeatedly questioned what benefit is gained from duplicating the code and creating a new Commissioner.

The SCC needs real powers to enforce the rules and the code should apply to every CCTV camera, irrespective of who is operating it. We have seen cases of cameras in

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p.15

school toilets, neighbours involving the police because of cameras on private property and concerns about new marketing technology, yet the code does not apply to any of these situations.

The broader issue is that the code tries to draw a distinction between “regulated surveillance” and surveillance that falls outside regulation. Yet the Data Protection Act – the primary legislation in this area – does not draw such a distinction. Whatever technologies emerge, or new ways of using existing technologies, the law is already in place – the question is whether it is enforced equally or not. We remain deeply concerned that this framework undermines enforcement in areas where the relevant activity falls between the Surveillance and Information Commissioners immediate responsibilities.

As Big Brother Watch told representatives of the Home Office prior to the code being produced, we believed there were some simple criteria that would ensure a regulatory framework would have public confidence. They were:

- 1) A single, straightforward point of contact to make and resolve complaints about CCTV cameras
- 2) A comprehensive code that covers cameras irrespective of their owner and is more focused on the purpose and operation of cameras
- 3) Clear, robust guidance on the information public authorities should be required to publish and have regard to when making decisions and during on-going operation

In our opinion the code fails on each of these points.

## CCTV Cars and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000

If the cameras on CCTV cars are not clearly visible and because there is no signage in a particular parking bay or area under surveillance, then it could be argued that local authorities are using covert surveillance techniques. As a result, this could fall within the definition of “directed surveillance” under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA).

The *Covert Surveillance and Property Interference: Revised Code of Practice* published by the Home Office, states that:

*“The use of overt CCTV cameras by public authorities does not normally require an authorisation under the 2000 Act. Members of the public will be aware that such systems are in use”. A footnote adds “for example, **by virtue of cameras or signage being clearly visible**”. See the *CCTV Code of Practice 2008* for full guidance on establishing and operating overt CCTV systems”<sup>11</sup>*

The same Code of Practice states that three tests should be applied if any planned directed surveillance is subject to RIPA. The surveillance has to be: “covert”; “conducted for the purposes of a specific investigation or operation”; and “is likely to result in the obtaining of private information about a person (whether or not one specifically identified for the purposes of the investigation or operation)”.

Under this test, it is therefore arguable that CCTV cars’ surveillance is “covert”. The regular and routine surveillance of a parking bay or specific area could constitute “an operation” as it occurs regularly over a specific time frame.

It could be argued that no private information is “likely” to be obtained as the surveillance is of a public highway parking bay. However, the test is that “**private information is likely to be obtained**”, not that “**private information is actually obtained**”. So even if “private information” in my particular case is not obtained, there is no guarantee that private information will not be obtained during the operation as a whole. It is after all possible for the CCTV the operator to zoom in, at

<sup>11</sup> Code of practice for covert surveillance and property interference  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-practice-for-covert-surveillance-and-property-interference>

will, to record details of what individuals are doing by the car. Therefore, it is not possible for a local authority to guarantee that it won't obtain "private" information during its long surveillance operation.

Local authorities should therefore anticipate that, because the operation is continuous (regularly being conducted) and that it is likely to obtain "private information" at some time (e.g. by zooming in), RIPA is likely to be engaged and the directed surveillance is unauthorised/unlawful (as it does not meet RIPA's requirements).

(Source: Amberhawk, data protection and information law specialists)<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://amberhawk.typepad.com/amberhawk/2012/10/mobile-cctv-cars-used-by-councils-can-breach-data-protection-law-and-ripa.html>

## DCLG and DfT Consultation

In September 2013, the government announced a series of proposals for consultation to reform parking rules. The Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department for Transport invited views on current local authority parking strategies and on options the government are considering to change the balance of how parking is enforced.

Eric Pickles, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, said:

*“Excessive parking charges and unfair parking fines push up the cost of living, and undermine local high streets and shopping parades. We want to rein over-zealous parking enforcement, so it focuses on supporting high streets and motorists, not raising money. Parking spy cars are just 1 example of this and a step too far. Public confidence is strengthened in CCTV if it is used to tackle crime, not to raise money for council coffers.”*

The significant elements of the local authority parking policy for amendment include:

- how to limit the use of CCTV for on-street parking enforcement in some or all circumstances
- whether local communities and businesses should be given the right to require authorities to review aspects of their parking strategies including the level of parking charges, whether parking should be free for a time, and whether double yellow lines are appropriate and necessary at particular locations
- whether there should be a statutory requirement for local authorities to allow a 'grace period' where a driver has over-stayed in a paid for parking place for a short period before issuing a parking ticket

- updating parking enforcement guidance to emphasise a less heavy-handed approach to parking enforcement and that parking charges and fines should not be used to subsidise other areas of local government spending

### **Big Brother Watch's response**

This consultation goes to the heart of what Big Brother Watch campaigns on – the public were never told that CCTV would be used for issuing fixed penalty notices when they accepted greater CCTV surveillance. The rhetoric has always focused on violent crime, anti-social behaviour and catching criminals. The results from the consultation will be revealing as to whether the public are willing to accept yet more cameras for purposes other than public safety.

In 2009 our research highlighted that 31 councils were operating CCTV cars, that number has now risen by 87 per cent. That is why, with every report that we have published in recent years on CCTV, as well as our submissions to the consultation on the CCTV code of practice, we have argued that local authorities, indeed all CCTV operators, should publish statistics on how many cameras are used, how many arrests and convictions they have led to and for what offences. If the public had the full facts about CCTV, perhaps the Government wouldn't need to act because people would express their views at the ballot box.

In the absence of such transparency, we welcome and support the Government's plans to stop local authorities using CCTV for parking enforcement.

Equally, the move to allow compensation to be awarded where unreasonable tickets have been issued should help to restore some common sense to the system.

This is important because there's the obvious question about whether the fines are issued because someone is causing an actual obstruction, or if they are simply contravening a strict interpretation of the rules. For instance, there have been occasions where tickets have been issued where the CCTV footage shows the car wasn't stationary long enough for another vehicle to even come into shot. Another example shows that a driver was issued with a box junction infringement ticket for being stationary for only two seconds.

This isn't just a question of money. The legal basis for some types of CCTV being used as parking enforcement has long been dubious. If someone is using a camera to scan a street, then zooms in on an individual with the intent of monitoring them and potentially issuing a ticket, there are obvious questions about whether that constitutes directed surveillance, which requires a magistrate's warrant under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. Equally, if a camera has been installed for the purposes of 'the prevention and detection of crime' then is it legally acceptable for the data to be re-used for the purpose of traffic enforcement?

Ultimately, CCTV will never solve the fundamental problem of there not being enough parking in town centres, and using cameras intended to catch criminals to issue parking tickets only undermines public trust in the surveillance they've been told to accept to protect their own safety, not to fill council coffers and justify expensive CCTV systems.



**Table 2: Local Authority data**

Council	No. of CCTV Smart Cars	Total no. of Contraventions captured by CCTV smart cars			Total no. of Contraventions captured by public space CCTV cameras			Income from Fixed Penalty Notices		
		Parking	Moving Traffic	Total	Parking	Moving Traffic	Total	Smart Car	Static	Total
<b>Greater London Authority</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>City of London and London boroughs</b>										
<b>City of London</b>	1 <sup>13</sup>	0	3,999	3,999	58,583	0	58,583	Information not broken down		£3,144,866.90
<b>Barking and Dagenham</b>	2	Information not broken down		68,093	Information not provided		234,623 <sup>14</sup>	£3,456,682.00	£11,696,527 <sup>15</sup>	£15,153,209.00
<b>Barnet</b>	Does not operate mobile enforcement									
<b>Bexley</b>	2	22,058	0	22,058	0	0	0	£1,889,622.66	£0	£1,889,622.66
<b>Brent</b>	4	20,952	9,353	30,305	30,536	61,032	91,568	Information not broken down		£5,717,852.92
<b>Bromley</b>	4	13,937	0	13,937	48,963	0	48,963	£733,045	£2,711,979	£3,445,024
<b>Camden</b>	2 <sup>16</sup>	Information not		26,645	201,927	415,690	617,617	£1,724	£34,60	£36,328,321.

<sup>13</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>14</sup> Includes figures from LaneWatch

<sup>15</sup> Includes figures from LaneWatch

<sup>16</sup> Run by NSL

		broken down			<sup>17</sup>	<sup>18</sup>		,001	4,320	00	
<b>Croydon<sup>19</sup></b>	1	Information not broken down			16,875	Information not provided		136,948	Information not broken down		£3,916,248.00
<b>Ealing<sup>20</sup></b>	0	0	0	0	Information not provided		482,340	Information not broken down		£24,119,590.00	
<b>Enfield</b>	2	Information not broken down			4266	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Greenwich</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Hackney</b>	3	Information not broken down			23,873	53,010	50,533	103,543	£1,336,671.59	£5,579,361.56	£6,916,033.15
<b>Hammersmith and Fulham</b>	0	0	0	0	58,716	236,508 <sup>21</sup>	388,486 <sup>22</sup>	£0	£18,526,797.00	£18,526,797.00 <sup>23</sup>	
<b>Haringey</b>	2	29,962	6,716	36,678 <sup>24</sup>	163,499	45,815	209,314 <sup>25</sup>	£341,970	£2,502,581	£2,844,551.00 <sup>26</sup>	
<b>Harrow</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not broken down		346,318	£0	£20,165,870.81	£20,165,870.81	

<sup>17</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013 only.

<sup>18</sup> Includes bus lane contraventions

<sup>19</sup> Figures for April 2009 to February 2013 only

<sup>20</sup> See Appendix 1 for the methodology in ascertaining figures for Ealing.

<sup>21</sup> Include bus lane contraventions

<sup>22</sup> Includes 93,262 PCNs which weren't broken down for the 2012/13 financial year

<sup>23</sup> Includes £6,221,357 from the 2012/13 financial year

<sup>24</sup> Figures for February 2010 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

<sup>25</sup> Figures from February 2010 to 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013.

<sup>26</sup> Figures for 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2012-1<sup>st</sup> March 2013 only

<b>Havering</b>	2	109,298	0	109,298	0	0	0	£9,059,671	£0.00	£9,059,671
<b>Hillingdon</b>	1 <sup>27</sup>	0	0	0	Information not provided		62,677	£0	£3,459,254.20	£3,459,254.20
<b>Hounslow<sup>28</sup></b>	1 <sup>29</sup>	Information not broken down		8900	Information not broken down		182,804	£478,806.44	£9,884,137.31	£10,362,943.75
<b>Islington<sup>30</sup></b>	2	Information not broken down								12,840,131.40
<b>Kensington and Chelsea</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Kingston upon Thames</b>	2	Information not broken down		33,230	0	0	0	£1,775,878.06	£0	£1,775,878.06
<b>Lambeth</b>	3	Information not broken down		44,659	Information not broken down		427,946	£2,174,728	£20,390,452	£22,565,180.00
<b>Lewisham</b>	1 <sup>31</sup>	Information not broken down		22,686	0	0	0	£1,329,375	£0	£1,329,375
<b>Merton</b>	5 <sup>32</sup>	Information not broken down		25,167	Information not broken down		77,003	£1,404,180	£4,539,690	£5,943,870.00
<b>Newham</b>	4 <sup>33</sup>	24,204	34,799	59,003	231,696	23,211	254,907	£2,914,760.70	£11,360,873.32	£14,275,634.02

<sup>27</sup> Used to monitor anti-social behaviour

<sup>28</sup> Figures are for 2010 onwards

<sup>29</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>30</sup> See Appendix 1 for the methodology in ascertaining figures for Islington.

<sup>31</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>32</sup> Not smart cars

<sup>33</sup> 2 capture both moving and parking offences and 2 are equipped to capture only moving traffic contraventions.

<b>Redbridge</b>	2	44,507	3933	48,443 <sup>34</sup>	110,043	48,593	158,708 <sup>35</sup>	Information not broken down		£5,663,929
<b>Richmond upon Thames</b>	0	38,602	32 <sup>36</sup>	38,634	26,680	27,644 <sup>37</sup>	54,324	£983,723	£2,895,509	£3,879,232
<b>Southwark</b>	5 <sup>38</sup>	Information not broken down		26,253	Information not broken down		171,952	Information not broken down		£8,496,760.14
<b>Sutton</b>	2	32,589	0	32,589	0	0	0	£1,477,211	£0	£1,477,211.00
<b>Tower Hamlets</b>	2	0	2,157	2,157	Information not broken down		72,206	£131,219.00	£3,862,337.93	£3,993,556.93
<b>Waltham Forest<sup>39</sup></b>	0	0	0	0	157,508	129,160	286,668	£0		£7,450,274.10
<b>Wandsworth</b>	1 <sup>40</sup>	Information not broken down		28,759	Information not broken down		138,511	£1,710,039	£8,250,633	£9,960,672
<b>Westminster</b>	4 <sup>41</sup>	Information not broken down		51,229	Information not broken down		312,579	£3,130,975.15	£17,588,677.53	£20,719,652.68
<b>English County Councils</b>										
<b>Buckinghamshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cambridgeshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Cumbria</b>	Information not held									
<b>Derbyshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0

<sup>34</sup> Includes 3 classified as 'others'

<sup>35</sup> Includes 72 classified as 'others'

<sup>36</sup> Includes bus lane contraventions

<sup>37</sup> Includes bus lane contraventions

<sup>38</sup> Not smart cars

<sup>39</sup> See Appendix 1 for the methodology in ascertaining figures for Waltham Forest.

<sup>40</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>41</sup> Not smart cars

<b>Devon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Dorset</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Sussex</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Essex</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gloucestershire</b>	Information not held									
<b>Hampshire</b>	Information not held									
<b>Hertfordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Kent</b>	Information not held									
<b>Lancashire</b>	Information not held									
<b>Leicestershire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Lincolnshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Norfolk</b>	Information not held									
<b>Northamptonshire</b>	Information not held									
<b>North Yorkshire</b>	Information not held									
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Oxfordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not broken down		94,217	£0	£3,314,000	£3,314,000.00
<b>Somerset</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Staffordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Suffolk</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Surrey</b>	Information not held									
<b>Warwickshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>West Sussex</b>	Does not issue traffic contravention and/or parking contravention notices									
<b>Worcestershire</b>	Information not held									
<b>English Unitary Authorities</b>										
<b>Bath and North</b>	1 <sup>42</sup>	0	0	0	Information not		142,679	£0	£3,802,	£3,802,854.5

<sup>42</sup> Purchased in Feb 2013

<b>East Somerset</b>					broken down			854.54	4	
<b>Bedford Borough</b>	<b>2</b>	7,715	0	7,715	CCTV not used for this purpose			£303,488.60	£0	£303,488.60
<b>Blackburn with Darwen</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Blackpool</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Bournemouth</b>	<b>1</b>	13,716	0	13,716	Information not broken down		4706 <sup>43</sup>	£417,357.39	£109,018	£526,375.39
<b>Bracknell Forest</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Brighton and Hove</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	7,548	33,016 <sup>44</sup>	40,564	£0	£1,137,260	£1,137,260.00
<b>Bristol, City of</b>	<b>2</b>	Information not broken down		28,705	Information not broken down		25,675	£564,494	£952,913	£1,517,407.00
<b>Central Bedfordshire</b>	<b>3<sup>45</sup></b>	10,599	0	10,599	0	0	0	£221,885.70	£0	£221,885.70
<b>Cheshire East</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cheshire West and Chester</b>	<b>3</b>	1445	0	1445	0	0	0	£51,025	£0	£51,025.00
<b>Cornwall</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Darlington</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Derby</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Durham</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Riding of Yorkshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Halton</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hartlepool</b>	<b>1</b>	3420	0	3420	0	0	0	£82,61	£0	£82,614

<sup>43</sup> Bus lane contraventions

<sup>44</sup> Bus lane contraventions

<sup>45</sup> Not smart cars

								4		
<b>Herefordshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Isle of Wight</b>	<b>Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement</b>									
<b>Kingston upon Hull, City of</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Leicester</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Luton</b>	<b>1</b>	Information not broken down		1454	6599	26,787 <sup>46</sup>	33,386	£39,370	£627,106	£666,476.00
<b>Medway</b>	<b>2</b>	58,548	0	58,548		Does not utilise Public Space CCTV for this purpose		£1,739,838.21	£0	£1,739,838.21
<b>Middlesbrough</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Milton Keynes</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North East Lincolnshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Lincolnshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Somerset</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Northumberland</b>	<b>Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement</b>									
<b>Nottingham</b>	<b>1</b>	349	327	676 <sup>47</sup>	0	0	0	£20,423	£0	£20,423.00
<b>Peterborough</b>	<b>1</b>	Information not broken down		7,026	0	0	0	£199,158.30	£0	£199,158.30
<b>Plymouth</b>	<b>1<sup>48</sup></b>	Information not broken down		18,021	0	0	0	£724,129.65	£0	£724,129.65
<b>Poole</b>	<b>1</b>	2426	Information not	2426	0	0	0	£66,428.50	£0	£66,428.50

<sup>46</sup> Bus lane contraventions

<sup>47</sup> Bus lane contraventions

<sup>48</sup> Not a smart car

			provide d							
<b>Portsmouth</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Reading</b>	<b>1<sup>49</sup></b>	2,005	0	2,005	Does not use CCTV for this			Refused	£0	Unknown
<b>Redcar and Cleveland</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Rutland</b>	<b>Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices</b>									
<b>Shropshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Slough</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>South Gloucestershire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Southampton</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Southend-on-Sea</b>	<b>2</b>	Information not provided		15,254	Does not use static CCTV to enforce traffic violations			£455,775	£0	£455,775
<b>Stockton-on-Tees</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Stoke-on-Trent</b>	<b>1</b>	2,467	13,807	16,274	0	0	0	£457,856.49	£0	£457,856.49
<b>Swindon</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Telford and Wrekin</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Thurrock</b>	<b>Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices</b>									
<b>Torbay</b>	<b>1<sup>50</sup></b>	Information not broken down		2410	0	0	0	£67,211.44	£0	£67,211.44
<b>Warrington</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Berkshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	Information not broken down		7610	£0	£202,624	£202,624.00

<sup>49</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>50</sup> Not a smart car



<b>Wiltshire</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Windsor and Maidenhead</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Wokingham</b>	<b>Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices</b>									
<b>York</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Welsh Unitary Authorities</b>										
<b>Blaenau Gwent</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Bridgend</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Caerphilly</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cardiff</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Carmarthenshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Ceredigion</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Conwy</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Denbighshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Flintshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gwynedd</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Isle of Anglesey</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Merthyr Tydfil</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Monmouthshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Neath Port Talbot</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Newport</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Pembrokeshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Powys</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Rhondda, Cynon, Taff</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Swansea</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>The Vale of Glamorgan</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									

[www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)

55 Tufton Street, London, SW1P 3QL

020 7340 6030 (office hours) 07505448925 (Media – 24 hours)

<b>Torfaen</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Wrexham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Northern Irish District Council Areas</b>										
<b>Antrim</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Ards</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Armagh</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Ballymena</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Ballymoney</b>	Does not issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Banbridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Belfast</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Carrickfergus</b>	Does not issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Castlereagh</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Coleraine</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Cookstown</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Craigavon</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Derry City</b>	Not responsible for traffic contraventions and parking									
<b>Down</b>	Not responsible for traffic contraventions and parking									
<b>Dungannon</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Fermanagh</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Larne</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Limavady</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Lisburn</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Magherafelt</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Moyle</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Newry and Mourne</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Newtownabbey</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>North Down</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									

<b>Omagh</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement										
<b>Strabane</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement										
<b>Scottish Council Areas</b>											
<b>Aberdeen City</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement										
<b>Aberdeenshire</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement										
<b>Angus</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Argyll and Bute</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Clackmannanshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Dumfries and Galloway</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Dundee City</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Ayrshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Dunbartonshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Lothian</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Renfrewshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>City of Edinburgh</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Eilean Siar</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Falkirk</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Fife</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Glasgow City</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Highland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Inverclyde</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Midlothian</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Moray</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Ayrshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Lanarkshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Orkney Islands</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0

[www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)

55 Tufton Street, London, SW1P 3QL  
020 7340 6030 (office hours) 07505448925 (Media – 24 hours)

<b>Perth and Kinross</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Renfrewshire</b>	2 <sup>51</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Scottish Borders</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Shetland Islands</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>South Ayrshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>South Lanarkshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Stirling</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Dunbartonshire</b>	Not responsible for fixed penalty notices									
<b>West Lothian</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>English Metropolitan Councils</b>										
<b>Barnsley</b>	1	1730 <sup>52</sup>	0	1730	0	0	0	Information not found		
<b>Birmingham</b>	1	8518	0	8518	0	0	0	£241,984	£0	£241,984.00
<b>Bolton</b>	1	14,652	0	14,652	0	0	0	£476,541.74	£0	£476,541.74
<b>Bradford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	109,238 <sup>53</sup>	109,238	£0	£2,687,173	£2,687,173.00
<b>Bury</b>	1 <sup>54</sup>	0	20,484	20,484	0	0	0	£651,000	£0	£651,000.00
<b>Calderdale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Coventry</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not broken down		22,344	£0	£579,614	£579,614.00
<b>Doncaster</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0

<sup>51</sup> Only used for environmental crime

<sup>52</sup> Refers to 'stationary offences'

<sup>53</sup> Bus lane contraventions

<sup>54</sup> Responsibility of NSL

<b>Dudley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gateshead</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0.00
<b>Kirklees</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Knowsley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Leeds</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not provided		86,115	£0	£2,517,170.98	£2,517,170.98
<b>Liverpool</b>	1	Information not broken down		2,354	0	0	0	£11,475	£0	£11,475.00
<b>Manchester</b>	2	258	0	258	0	0	0	£9,051	£0	£9,051.00
<b>Newcastle upon Tyne</b>	1	Information not broken down		1424	0	0	0	£39,918.22	£0	£39,918.22
<b>North Tyneside</b>	1	3531	0	3531	Information not held					
<b>Oldham</b>	1	1384	0	1384	0	0	0	Refused: cost and time limit		£0
<b>Rochdale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Rotherham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Salford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Sandwell</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Sefton</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Sheffield</b>	1 <sup>55</sup>	Information not broken down		14	Information not broken down		122,408 <sup>56</sup>	£280	£2,808,122	£2,808,402.00
<b>Solihull</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>South Tyneside</b>	1	Information not		3873	0	0	0	£156,3	£0	£156,380.00

<sup>55</sup> Not a smart car

<sup>56</sup> Bus lane contraventions

		broken down						80			
<b>St. Helens</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Stockport</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Sunderland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Tameside</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Trafford</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Wakefield</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Walsall</b>	1 <sup>57</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Wigan</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Wirral</b>	1	Information not broken down		7513	0	0	0	£239,951	£0	£239,951	
<b>Wolverhampton</b>	1	Information not broken down		51	Public space CCTV is not used for parking enforcement			£1,750	£0	£1,750	
<b>English Non-Metropolitan Districts</b>											
<b>Adur</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Allerdale</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Amber Valley</b>		Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Arun</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Ashfield</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Ashford</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Aylesbury Vale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Babergh</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Barrow-in-Furness</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Basildon</b>		Authority passed to Chelmsford as the lead council in the partnership									
<b>Basingstoke and</b>		Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									

<sup>57</sup> Being prepared

<b>Deane</b>										
<b>Bassetlaw</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Blaby</b>	Information not held									
<b>Bolsover</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Boston</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Braintree</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Breckland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Brentwood</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Broadland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Bromsgrove</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Broxbourne</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Broxtowe</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Burnley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cambridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cannock Chase</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Canterbury</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Carlisle</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Castle Point</b>	Information not held									
<b>Charnwood</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Chelmsford<sup>58</sup></b>	1	Information not broken down		12,311	Not responsible for this function			£352,549	£0	£352,549.00
<b>Cheltenham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Cherwell</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Chesterfield</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Chichester</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Chiltern</b>	0	Information not held								

<sup>58</sup> Information from 2009

<b>Chorley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Christchurch</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Colchester</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Copeland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Corby</b>	Information not held									
<b>Cotswold</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Craven</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Crawley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Dacorum</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Dartford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Daventry</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Derbyshire Dales</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Dover</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>East Cambridgeshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Devon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Dorset</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>East Hampshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>East Hertfordshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>East Lindsey</b>	Information not held									
<b>East Northamptonshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>East Staffordshire</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Eastbourne</b>	Not responsible for CCTV and CCTV smart cars									
<b>Eastleigh</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Eden</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Elmbridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0



<b>Epping Forest</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Epsom and Ewell</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Erewash</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Exeter</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Fareham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Fenland</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not broken down		76	£0	£4,160	£4,160
<b>Forest Heath</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Forest of Dean</b>	Not responsible for issuing fixed penalty notices									
<b>Fylde</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gedling</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gloucester</b>	Information not held									
<b>Gosport</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Gravesham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Great Yarmouth</b>	Information not held									
<b>Guildford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hambleton</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Harborough</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Harlow</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Harrogate</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hart</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hastings</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Havant</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Hertsmere</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>High Peak</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hinckley and Bosworth</b>	Information not held									
<b>Horsham</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0

[www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)

55 Tufton Street, London, SW1P 3QL  
020 7340 6030 (office hours) 07505448925 (Media – 24 hours)

<b>Huntingdonshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Hyndburn</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Ipswich</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Isles of Scilly</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Kettering</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>King's Lynn and West Norfolk</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Lancaster</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Lewes</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Lichfield</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Lincoln</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Maidstone</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Maldon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Malvern Hills</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Mansfield</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Melton</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Mendip</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Mid Devon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Mid Suffolk</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Mid Sussex</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Mole Valley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>New Forest</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Newark and Sherwood</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Newcastle-under-Lyme</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>North Devon</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>North Dorset</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									

<b>North East Derbyshire</b>	Information not held										
<b>North Hertfordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Kesteven</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Norfolk</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North Warwickshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>North West Leicestershire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Northampton</b>	Information not held										
<b>Norwich</b>	Does not operate static or Smart Car CCTV										
<b>Nuneaton and Bedworth</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices										
<b>Oadby and Wigston</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>Oxford</b>	1 <sup>59</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Pendle</b>	Not responsible for highways function										
<b>Preston</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>Purbeck</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Redditch</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Reigate and Banstead</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Ribble Valley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Richmondshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Rochford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Rossendale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Rother</b>	Not responsible for moving traffic or on-street parking contraventions										
<b>Rugby</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0

<sup>59</sup> From March 2013

<b>Runnymede</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices										
<b>Rushcliffe</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>Rushmoor</b>	0	0	0	0	Information not broken down		8226	£0	£259,545.35	£259,545.35	
<b>Ryedale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Scarborough</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Sedgemoor</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Selby</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Sevenoaks</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Shepway</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Bucks</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>South Cambridgeshire</b>	Does not operate CCTV smart cars										
<b>South Derbyshire</b>	Not responsible for issuing fixed penalty notices										
<b>South Hams</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>South Holland</b>	Information not held										
<b>South Kesteven</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Lakeland</b>	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Norfolk</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement										
<b>South Northamptonshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Oxfordshire</b>	Does not issue fixed penalty notices										
<b>South Ribble</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Somerset</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>South Staffordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0	
<b>Spelthorne</b>	0	0	0	0	Cameras do not cover traffic offences		0	£0	£0	£0	

<b>St Albans</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>St Edmundsbury</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Stafford</b>	0 - one on trial	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Staffordshire Moorlands</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Stevenage</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Stratford-on-Avon</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Stroud</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Suffolk Coastal</b>	Not responsible for CCTV									
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Swale</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Tamworth</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Tandridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Taunton Deane</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Teignbridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Tendring</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Test Valley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Tewkesbury</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Thanet</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Three Rivers</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Tonbridge and Malling</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Torridge</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Tunbridge Wells</b>	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Uttlesford</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Vale of White Horse</b>	Does not issue fixed penalty notices									

<b>Warwick</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Watford</b>	Do not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue penalty notices									
<b>Waveney</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Waverley</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Wealden</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement to issue fixed penalty notices									
<b>Wellingborough</b>	Information not held									
<b>Welwyn Hatfield</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Devon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Dorset</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Lancashire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Lindsey</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Oxfordshire</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>West Somerset</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Weymouth and Portland</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Winchester</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Woking</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Worcester</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Worthing</b>	Does not use static or smart car CCTV enforcement									
<b>Wychavon</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Wycombe</b>	Information not held									
<b>Wyre</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Wyre Forest</b>	Not responsible for CCTV enforcement									
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>484,147</b>	<b>95,607</b>	<b>1,038,014</b>	<b>1,155,308</b>	<b>1,207,227</b>	<b>5,615,832</b>	<b>£43,404,542.84</b>	<b>£197,020,561.53</b>	<b>£311,774,756.83</b>

## Appendix 1: Methodology

Beginning on the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013 a Freedom of Information request was sent to 443 local authorities across the United Kingdom. In this request we asked for the number of CCTV Smart Cars the council operated, the number of moving traffic and parking contraventions that had been captured by the vehicle(s) as well as the total income that was obtained through those penalties. We also asked for the same information relating to static CCTV cameras. A copy of this FOI can be found in Appendix 3. We received at least partial responses from 431 councils; this gives a response rate of 99 per cent.

From the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2013 we sent the same Freedom of Information request to the UK's 43 Police Authorities. This was after several councils indicated that the responsibility for traffic enforcement lay with the police. Only one police force, Northumbria, responded stating they raised revenue from CCTV cameras (£140,000 via static cameras), however this revenue went directly to the Home Office. We therefore decided to not directly include these results in the report.

For the purposes of this report we included all responses received up to and including the 14 October 2013.

We have not included information relating to cameras operated and maintained by central government, the motorway system, Transport for London and by the wider transport network.

Three local authorities were unable to provide us with information requested in our Freedom of Information Request, however they do publish similar figures relating to the number of fixed penalty notices handed out due to CCTV. The figures presented in the report have therefore been ascertained as follows:

### Edling

Edling Council provided Big Brother Watch with evidence, in the form of parking services annual reports, which shows what proportion of PCNs have been issued by CCTV.

The format for this information differs between reports. In the reports for the financial years 2008-11 this was in the form of a pie chart with the percentage explicitly shown. In the reports for the financial years 2011-13 this information was in the form of a table, and was therefore ascertained by dividing the number of CCTV PCNs from the total number of PCNs. Once the percentage was determined, that same percentage of the total revenue raised through PCNs was deduced (e.g. in 2012/13: 46% of PCNs were issued through CCTV. The total revenue raised for that financial year through PCN's was £9,020,000 of which 46% is £4,149,200.00)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Percentage of PCN's</b>	<b>Revenue</b>
2008-09	56%	£6,293,400.00
2009-10	43%	£3,833,880.00
2010-11	52%	£5,230,160.00
2011-12	45%	£4,513,950.00
2012-13	46%	£4,149,200.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£24,169,590.00</b>

### Islington

Islington Council did not provide Big Brother Watch with evidence that shows what proportion of PCNs that had been issued by CCTV.

However, an FOI response from Islington Council that had been published in December 2010 shows that in the **2009-2010** financial year **30%** (rounded off from 29.7) of the PCNs that had been paid were originally issued by CCTV<sup>60</sup>. The figures for 2010-11 are not included as the FOI response from Islington for that year does not break down its income between PCNs and other forms of enforcement.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Percentage of PCN's</b>	<b>Revenue</b>
2008-09	30%	£3,211,888.50
2009-10	30%	£3,263,599.20
2010-11	/	/
2011-12	30%	£3,360,443.70
2012-13	30%	£3,004,200.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	/	<b>£12,840,131.40</b>

### Waltham Forest

<sup>60</sup> Final piece of correspondence, dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010:

[https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/breakdown\\_of\\_recorded\\_contravent\\_15](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/breakdown_of_recorded_contravent_15)

[www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)

55 Tufton Street, London, SW1P 3QL

020 7340 6030 (office hours) 07505448925 (Media – 24 hours)



Waltham Forest did not provide Big Brother Watch with evidence that shows what proportion of PCNs that had been issued by CCTV. Therefore, the Borough's parking accounts have been obtained by an earlier Freedom of Information request in October 2012.<sup>61</sup>

The level of CCTV PCNs has been estimated at **30%**. The rationale for this is that, compared to Islington, Waltham Forest has a larger population and contains a greater number of people. The methodology for finding a figure was therefore the same as the system used in the case of Islington.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Percentage of PCN's</b>	<b>Revenue</b>
2008-09	/	/
2009-10	30%	£1,682,241.00
2010-11	30%	£1,676,406.30
2011-12	30%	£2,060,813.40
2012-13	30%	£2,060,813.40
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£7,480,274.10</b>

---

<sup>61</sup><https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/132033/response/327043/attach/4/Scan%20to%20Me%20from%2010.144.12.221%202012%2011%2001%20083127.pdf>

## Appendix 2: FOI request

I am writing to obtain information about your authority's use of CCTV and CCTV "smart cars" to issue moving traffic contraventions and parking contraventions notices (sometimes called Fixed Penalty Notices).

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

- 1) How many CCTV Smart cars does your authority currently own and/or operate?
- 2) A total number of the moving traffic contraventions and parking contraventions captured by the authority's CCTV Smart car(s) in the period 1 March 2008 – 1st March 2013?
- 3) The total income obtained through fixed penalty notices resulting from the above penalties captured by X council's CCTV Smart car(s) in the period 1 March 2008 – 1st March 2013?
- 4) A total number of the moving traffic contraventions and parking contraventions captured by the your authority's public space CCTV cameras in the period 1 March 2008 – 1st March 2013?
- 5) The total income obtained through fixed penalty notices resulting from the above penalties captured by your authority's public space CCTV cameras in the period 1 March 2008 – 1st March 2013?

Please note I am not asking for details of any individual cases.

## Appendix 3: CCTV Code of Practice Guiding Principles

System operators should adopt the following 12 guiding principles:

1. Use of a surveillance camera system must always be for a specified purpose which is in pursuit of a legitimate aim and necessary to meet an identified pressing need
2. The use of a surveillance camera system must take into account its effect on individuals and their privacy, with regular reviews to ensure its use remains justified
3. There must be as much transparency in the use of a surveillance camera system as possible including a published contact point for access to information and complaints
4. There must be clear responsibility and accountability for all surveillance camera system activities including images and information collected, held and used
5. Clear rules, policies and procedures must be in place before a surveillance camera system is used, and these must be communicated to all who need to comply with them
6. No more images and information should be stored than that which is strictly required for the stated purpose of a surveillance camera system, and such images and information should be deleted once their purposes have been discharged
7. Access to retained images and information should be restricted and there must be clearly defined rules on who can gain access and for what purpose access is granted; the disclosure of images and information should only take place when it is necessary for such a purpose for law enforcement purposes
8. Surveillance camera system operators should consider any approved operational, technical and competency standards relevant to a

- system and its purpose and work to meet and maintain those standards
9. Surveillance camera system images and information should be subject to appropriate security measures to safeguard against unauthorised access and use
  10. There should be effective review and audit mechanisms to ensure legal requirements, policies and standards are complied with in practice, and regular reports should be published
  11. When the use of surveillance camera systems is in pursuit of a legitimate aim, and there is a pressing need for its use, it should be used in the most effective way to support public safety and law enforcement with the aim of processing images and information of evidential value
  12. Any information used to support a surveillance camera system which compares against a database for matching purposes should be accurate and kept up to date

## 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.

**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](mailto:press@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk) for written enquiries.

**E-mail:** [info@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](mailto:info@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)

**Mail:**

Big Brother Watch

55 Tufon Street

London

SW1P 3QL

[www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk](http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk)