

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The cost of CCTV surveillance in the United Kingdom¹

To arrange broadcast interviews or discuss the research, please contact:
Daniel Hamilton, Campaign Director, Big Brother Watch

Daniel.Hamilton@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk
Mob (24 hrs): **07538 28 00 41** | Tel: **020 7340 6030**

■ Toplines

- The 336 authorities who responded to Big Brother Watch's Freedom of Information request spent **£314,835,170.39** on installing and operating CCTV cameras.

The authorities that spent the most on CCTV cameras in the 2007 to 2010 period are:

Rank	Council	Total Spend
1	Birmingham	£10,476,874.00
2	Sandwell	£5,355,744.00
3	Leeds	£3,839,675.00
4	City of Edinburgh	£3,600,560.00
5	Hounslow	£3,573,186.45
6	Lambeth	£3,431,301.00
7	Manchester	£3,347,310.00
8	Enfield	£3,141,295.00
9	Barnet	£3,119,020.00
10	Barking and Dagenham	£3,090,000.00

- It is no coincidence that this table is topped by Birmingham Council, scene of the most outrageous abuse of surveillance equipment in modern times, the so-called 'Project Champion'².
- Commenting on the £314 million cost of CCTV, Big Brother Watch Director Alex Deane said:

"This is a shocking figure. Public money is being wasted on snooping surveillance that does next to nothing to prevent or solve crime. We are being watched more than ever before, and we're being ripped off into the bargain. British taxpayers will be scandalised to see their money being thrown away like this in the current economic climate."

¹ This report is by Alex Deane and Daniel Hamilton and is based on research by Dylan Sharpe. Previous Big Brother Watch reports can be found at <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk>.

² <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2010/07/police-back-down-over-spy-cameras-an-amazing-result-in-birmingham.html>

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

Position	Average starting salary	Total number funded for cost of CCTV
Nurse	£20,710 ³	15,202
Fireman	£21,157 ⁴	14,880
Teacher	£21,588 ⁵	14,584
Police constable	£23,259 ⁶	13,536
Doctor	£29,705 ⁷	10,599

NB: Big Brother Watch provides these figures for information purposes only.

- The UK spends more per head on CCTV coverage than 38 countries do on defence.
- The UK spends more on CCTV than the entire annual budgets of eight independent nations.

(Further comparisons can be found on page 10)

Defenders of CCTV always like to point out that these costs are from installation and that costs reduce over time but when the costs of maintenance, repair and upkeep are taken into consideration alongside the costs of monitoring, retaining and reviewing footage the ongoing costs are considerable. Furthermore, the “initial” costs of CCTV are effectively recurring as new technology or at least new expenditure is constantly incurred.

■ Introduction

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 tenfold⁸.

There are currently at least 59,753 CCTV cameras controlled by 418 local authorities in Britain, up from 21,000 in 1999⁹. This equates to 1 council owned CCTV camera for every 1000 people in the country. This is a trebling of council-run surveillance and that is working

³ http://www.rcn.org.uk/support/pay_and_conditions/pay_rates_2009_-_2010

⁴ http://ww2.prospects.ac.uk/p/types_of_job/firefighter_salary.jsp

⁵ <http://www.tda.gov.uk/get-into-teaching/faqs/becoming-a-teacher.aspx>

⁶ <http://www.police-information.co.uk/policepay.htm#constables>

⁷ <http://www.nhscareers.nhs.uk/details/Default.aspx?Id=553>

⁸ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/1789157.stm>

⁹ <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/cctvreport.pdf>

off a high base – a decade ago were already among the most watched peoples on earth and now local authorities spy on us three times as much.

The most often quoted figure suggests that the average British citizen is captured on CCTV 300 times a day. Whether this is accurate or not, the current economic climate should demand a reconsideration of the enormous spending on surveillance, an important issue which councils currently seem determined to ignore.

Individual local government authorities are the largest operators of CCTV systems in the United Kingdom. Indeed, such is the UK's obsession with CCTV, the Shetland Islands (population: 22,000) is home to more cameras than the entire San Francisco Police Department - the 11th largest force in the United States, covering a population of more than 1.2 million¹⁰.

In many cases, such CCTV systems are operated under the auspices of 'Community Safety Partnerships' and in partnership with local Police forces. While, in many cases, an element of the funding for these cameras is provided by Police Authorities or county councils CCTV cameras are largely funded out of the general revenue funds of local authorities. As the provision of CCTV is a discretionary service, which councils choose to provide, as opposed to a non-discretionary service such as street-cleaning or rubbish collection, each CCTV camera puts an additional burden on the taxpayer.

CCTV requires scrutiny for the following reasons:

- CCTV has been viewed by those controlling expenditure as a cheap alternative to conventional policing, with no demonstrable equivalent success in reducing crime.
- The efficacy of CCTV is open to challenge, 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 implications for personal privacy and data security.

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 (£10,476,874) to the smallest spender, Arun District Council (£995).

¹⁰ <http://www.thesun.co.uk/scotsol/homepage/news/2677993/Shocking-rise-in-the-use-of-CCTV-cameras-in-Scotland.html>

Notwithstanding all of the expenditure on surveillance in our country to date, another wave of CCTV spending is now taking place despite the straitened economic climate. This is therefore an important time to highlight the enormous cost of these schemes.

■ **Highest spenders on new CCTV (2007-2010)**

Rank	Council	Total Spend
1	Hounslow	£2,238,709
2	Birmingham	£1,911,000
3	Bournemouth	£1,508,449
4	Enfield	£1,444,147
5	Woking	£1,381,643
6	Tower Hamlets	£1,361,000
7	Camden	£1,260,976
8	Wakefield	£1,228,030
9	Breckland	£962,477
10	City of Edinburgh	£914,320

The highest spender on CCTV camera technology between 2007 and 2010 was the London Borough of Hounslow (population: 222,600) which extends from the prosperous Chiswick area in the west to Feltham in the east, a key logistical centre for businesses relying on the nearby Heathrow Airport. Hounslow's total spend was £2,238,709.

Most strikingly, however, is the £1,444,147 spent by Working Borough Council on the operation of its CCTV cameras. The total population of the Woking area – which includes the commuter town of Woking itself and a scattering of well-heeled villages on its periphery – has a total population of around 92,000. In contrast, Birmingham – who exceeded Woking's spending by only £530,000 –, has a resident population of almost ten times that, at 1,016,800.

Similarly, it appears inexplicable that the suburban Breckland Borough Council in central Norfolk (population: 131,800) has spent more on CCTV in the past three years than the entire City of Edinburgh with a population roughly three times higher at 471,700.

The top ten highest spending councils spent a total of £14,210,751 on their CCTV camera technology.

■ Highest spenders on the maintenance of CCTV

Rank	Council	Total Spend
1	Birmingham	5,364,000
2	Lambeth	3,242,815
3	Barnet	2,742,020
4	Westminster	2,696,900
5	Bradford	2,340,000
6	Manchester	2,327,000
7	Cambridge	2,225,299
8	Cheshire East	2,073,176
9	Cheshire West and Chester	2,060,000
10	Nottingham	1,955,695

By a considerable distance, the council to have spent the most money on the maintenance of their CCTV cameras over the past three years is Birmingham City Council. The City Council's total spend was £5,364,000, some £2,121,185 ahead of the South London borough of Lambeth.

While the majority of the areas listed as among the top ten spenders on CCTV are amongst the UK's largest local authorities, the clear exception to this is Cambridge whose have spent £2,225,299 on the technology in the past three years. With a population of only 122,800, this is less than half that of Nottingham who, with a population of 292,400, have spent £269,604 less.

Much spending on CCTV is made up of the replacement of old cameras with new cameras. This process takes place automatically in many authorities, without the council taking the opportunity to consider whether the camera is actually needed there in the first place any longer. It should be noted that those responsible for operating CCTV have an ongoing obligation under the Data Protection Act to consider whether their surveillance equipment is still required and proportionate – an obligation almost all authorities ignore.

The top ten highest spending councils spent a total of £27,026,905 on the maintenance of their CCTV camera technology.

■ Highest spenders on CCTV-related staffing costs

Rank	Council	Total Spend
1	Sandwell	£4,008,091
2	Birmingham	£3,201,874
3	Leeds	£2,639,108
4	Croydon	£2,168,724
5	Barnet	£2,048,581
6	City of Bristol	£1,927,174
7	City of Edinburgh	£1,888,177
8	Hillingdon	£1,693,000
9	Ealing	£1,680,000
10	East Ayrshire	£1,665,002

By some way, the council with the highest CCTV-related staffing costs is Sandwell, a West Midlands borough centred on the town of West Bromwich. Sandwell Borough Council spent a total of £4,008,091, almost £800,000 more than the second largest spender Birmingham.

It is fitting that Sandwell tops this table, as the authority has a woeful track record of bullying its residents. Indeed, Big Brother Watch has been moved to criticise the authority's overbearing, punitive and bullying approach to enforcement many times over the past. Notable examples include the case of the young mother Vanessa Kelly¹¹ who was fined after feeding ducks in her local park, the pensioner fined £75 for allowing their cigarette ash to go on the floor¹² and the fining of Kerrie-Ann Hickin when a tissue blew out of her pocket in high winds¹³. Sandwell MBC handing out 2,200 penalty fines in 2009, compared to just 336 in neighbouring Dudley.

While nine of the top ten highest spending councils are either located in London or in densely-populated urban areas, there is one exception: East Ayrshire. While the authority's area does contain the medium sized town of Kilmarnock, a considerable portion of the seat is rural.

The top ten highest spending councils spent a total of £22,919,731 on the maintenance of their CCTV camera technology.

■ **The ineffective nature of CCTV**

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 cameras¹⁴.

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.

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

¹¹ <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2009/11/fined-75-for-feeding-the-ducks.html>

¹² <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/howaboutthat/7946788/Elderly-widow-threatened-with-2500-fine-for-dropping-cigarette-ash.html>

¹³ <http://www.bigbrotherwatch.org.uk/home/2009/11/sandwell-council-are-at-it-again-mother-fined-when-tissue-blows-out-of-her-hand.html>

¹⁴ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8219022.stm>

budgets, enough financial resources would be available to increase the size of the British police force by 8.6% (from 143,770¹⁵ to 157,306).

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 criminals¹⁶.

Examples of failure

Examples of the technology failing – or indeed simply not being turned on, despite being installed at a significant cost are numerous:

Weston-Super-Mare, Somerset

In October 2009, an elderly man was brutally attacked by a group of youths while attempting to stop them vandalising a ticket machine at Worle Parkway station. According to the Weston Mercury the gentleman was “*left with fractured cheek bone, broken nose, split lip and serious cuts to his face after the youths finished their vicious onslaught*”¹⁷. The area in which the attack took place fell under the local council’s CCTV surveillance zone, yet the cameras were switched off. As a result, the perpetrators of the attack have never been apprehended.

Southeastern Trains

Following enquiries by a regular user of Hollingbourne station in Kent, it transpired that the cameras in the station’s car park were never actually turned. A spokesman for the train company said that they “*would like to provide CCTV at all its stations but do not have the money to have working cameras at every station in Kent*”¹⁸. Instead, the operator monitors crime trend statistics compiled by the British Transport Police in order to identify possible crime black-spots.

West Lindsay District Council

West Lindsay Council, which takes in the towns of Gainsborough, Market Rasen, Saxilby and Nettleham, has admitted that a quarter of the twenty-nine CCTV cameras it operates are broken and are currently not in use. A spokesman or the council said: “*we can confirm that seven cameras are not working and we are urgently looking at the best way to deal with a number of CCTV issues throughout West Lindsey*”¹⁹.

Edinburgh City Council

¹⁵ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8165217.stm>

¹⁶ Davies, G. and S. Thasen (2000) ‘Closed-circuit television: How effective an identification aid?’ *British Journal of Psychology*, 91: 411-426

¹⁷ http://www.thewestonmercury.co.uk/news/cctv_switched_off_during_attack_1_334680

¹⁸ http://www.kentonline.co.uk/kentonline/news/2009/november/20/cctv_not_working_at_all_statio.aspx

¹⁹ <http://www.thisislincolnshire.co.uk/news/Quarter-council-s-CCTV-cameras-working/article-1650901-detail/article.html>

Investigators tracking the disappearance of Edinburgh woman Suzanne Pilley have confirmed their efforts to find her have been retarded by a broken CCTV camera. Pilley, who was last seen in the area where the CCTV camera has been installed, was not detected on camera due to the "*device's wiper being broken so dust, grit or rain could not be removed from its lens*" and its lack of "*tele-metry.. so it is stuck facing in one direction*"²⁰. Quite apart from the Pilley case, a Freedom of Information request lodged with the City Council confirmed that there are a total of 100 broken or damaged CCTV cameras in Edinburgh.

Cambridgeshire Police

A rape victim has accepted £3,500 in damages following a Police administrative error which resulted in CCTV footage crucial to the prosecution of her attacker being lost. Due to the failure of Police to properly record her attack as a crime, the time period during which CCTV videos were retained expired and thus rendered a successful prosecution impossible²¹.

Tewkesbury

When vandals attacked a carpet showroom in Tewkesbury, the shop-owner Barry Clayton hoped that the CCTV camera across the road would have captured images of the vandals. This was not to be, however, as the camera were inoperable as a result of the communications mast at the local Police station being damaged²².

Bristol

A particularly unpleasant case illustrating the failure of CCTV to capture images of crimes being committed occurred in Bristol where a young woman was raped at the foot of the camera. As a result of the angle of the lens not being sufficient to survey the area below where it was stationed, the attack was not filmed²³.

Ballymena

A homeless man drowned in a river after CCTV cameras which were supposed to monitor safety along the river's bank was not functioning correctly as a result of a problem with its circuits and wiring²⁴. A spokesman for the Police Service of Northern Ireland was not able, however, to confirm that the camera being switched on would have saved the man's life, telling the coroner: "I honestly don't know if the camera had been working, what height it was recording at and whether he would have been visible".

²⁰ <http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/crime-courts/pilley-hunt-cctv-camera-was-broken-1.1035080>

²¹ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2009/dec/01/rape-case-cctv-footage-destroyed>

²² <http://www.thisisgloucestershire.co.uk/news/Broken-CCTV-missed-vandal-attack/article-1806261-detail/article.html>

²³ <http://www.thisisbristol.co.uk/courts/Woman-raped-CCTV-camera-near-busy-road/article-2361082-detail/article.html>

²⁴ <http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/local-national/police-cctv-at-ballymena-death-scene-not-working-14778476.html>

Walthamstow

An investigation into the murder of a man at Wood Street tube railway station in Walthamstow stalled as a result of a faulty CCTV system. A spokesman for OneRail who operate the tube station blamed a "problem with the recording equipment"²⁵ rather than the cameras for the failure to record footage of the crime.

Ulster Prison Service

According to figures obtained by Northern Ireland Assembly Member Tommy Burns, CCTV cameras in Northern Ireland's prisons have developed faults 738 times in the last five years. According to a spokesman for the prison service, "faults generally involve loss of focus, reduced movement or loss of picture. It does not mean that cameras are broken down"²⁶. Reassuring.

While the examples listed above document the failings of CCTV from a practical and technical perspective, there are further cases of areas opting to cease using the technology altogether.

In the United States, the recently-elected Mayor of New Orleans Mitch Landrieu recently announced that his office would no longer provide funding for the city's CCTV network, citing its ineffectiveness in reducing crime. Specifically, in the seven years since the network was installed at a cost of around \$10 million, the cameras have yielded only six prosecutions - three for crimes recorded on camera and three "for bribes and kickbacks a vendor is accused of paying a former city official to sell the cameras to City Hall"²⁷!

²⁵ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/3634438.stm>

²⁶ <http://www.u.tv/news/Alarm-over-738-prison-CCTV-failures/8a0803ca-6bf2-4c3f-aca5-b377682ba81b>

²⁷ http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2010/10/new_orleans_crime_camera_progr.html

■ **Putting Britain’s CCTV spending in context²⁸**

With the cost of in excess of £314 million, it is clear that CCTV surveillance places a considerable financial burden upon local councils.

Indeed, if the financial resources dedicated to CCTV were diverted to other areas of the public services, the following positions could be funded:

Position	Average starting salary	Total number funded for cost of CCTV
Nurse	£20,710 ²⁹	15,202
Fireman	£21,157 ³⁰	14,880
Teacher	£21,588 ³¹	14,584
Police constable	£23,259 ³²	13,536
Doctor	£29,705 ³³	10,599

Furthermore, there are many prescient examples of the excessive financial cost of CCTV:

- The UK spends more per capita (US\$8.06) on CCTV coverage than 38 countries do on defence³⁴.
- The UK spends more on CCTV than the entire annual GDP of eight independent nations (Samoa, Domenica, Tonga, Micronesia, Sao Tome and Principe, Palau, Marshall Islands, Kiribati)³⁵
- The total spend on CCTV in the United Kingdom is six times³⁶ greater than the amount of aid the United Kingdom government provided to the Pakistan flood appeal and fifteen times³⁷ greater than that sent to Haiti.
- Total spending on CCTV in the UK is greater than the entire budgets of the Avon and Somerset (5996 employees, £260m), City of London (1839 employees, £61.2m), Kent (6,602 employees, £257.9m), Merseyside (7,087 employees, £307.3m), Hampshire (6,768 employees, £281.9m) and Devon and Cornwall (6,067 employees, £256.8m) constabularies³⁸.
- The UK spends roughly five times more on CCTV than the entire annual Ugandan health budget of US\$112m³⁹

²⁸ All US\$ calculations are valid as of 17:23 GMT on 16th November 2010

²⁹ http://www.rcn.org.uk/support/pay_and_conditions/pay_rates_2009_-_2010

³⁰ http://ww2.prospects.ac.uk/p/types_of_job/firefighter_salary.jsp

³¹ <http://www.tda.gov.uk/get-into-teaching/fags/becoming-a-teacher.aspx>

³² <http://www.police-information.co.uk/policepay.htm#constables>

³³ <http://www.nhscareers.nhs.uk/details/Default.aspx?id=553>

³⁴ http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/mil_exp_dol_fig_percap-expenditures-dollar-figure-per-capita

³⁵ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf>

³⁶ <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/uk-doubles-pakistan-flood-aid-to-16360m-2057399.html>

³⁷ <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Media-Room/Case-Studies/2010/Haiti-six-months-on-from-disaster/How-emergency-support-funding-was-allocated-in-Haiti/>

³⁸ Home Office Performance Assessments 2007/8

³⁹ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/oct/25/aids-hiv-africa-aid-scientists>

- The UK spends twice as much on CCTV as the entire annual Rwandan education budget of £150 million and more than three times what the country spends on health (£92 million per year)⁴⁰.
- The total cost of CCTV is equivalent to four times the running costs of the Scottish Parliament (£72 million)⁴¹.
- The total cost of CCTV is equivalent to roughly 3% of the UK's total annual international aid budget of £9.1 billion⁴².
- The total cost of CCTV is equivalent to a fifth of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport's annual budget⁴³.

■ Methodology

In seeking to arrive at a figure which reflects the total cost to the taxpayer of CCTV coverage over the past three years, local authorities were asked to provide statistics outlining:

- The amount spent by their authority on the installation of public-facing CCTV cameras and the purchase or lease of recording equipment and premises in the financial years specified.
- The annual cost of the operation and maintenance of their authority's public-facing CCTV cameras.
- The annual wage and salary costs associated with the operation of CCTV cameras, including pension liabilities and benefits.

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

■ Total council spend on CCTV in 2007-10 (£)

Local authorities are presented in order of the size of their total spending on CCTV technology between 2007 and 2010. Of the 336 local authorities who responded to the study, 329 (97.9%) confirmed that they operated public-facing CCTV cameras.

A full list of the responses of each authority, including any relevant notes, is available in the appendix.

⁴⁰ <http://allafrica.com/stories/200906120008.html>

⁴¹ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/politics/scotland/6990218/Scottish-Parliament-costs-taxpayers-72-million-per-year.html>

⁴² <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/jan/01/development-international-aid-and-development>

⁴³ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-11569160>

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

RANK	LOCAL AUTHORITY	TOTAL SPEND
1	Birmingham	£10,476,874.00
2	Sandwell	£5,355,744.00
3	Leeds	£3,839,675.00
4	City of Edinburgh	£3,600,560.00
5	Hounslow	£3,573,186.45
6	Lambeth	£3,431,301.00
7	Manchester	£3,347,310.00
8	Enfield	£3,141,295.00
9	Barnet	£3,119,020.00
10	Barking and Dagenham	£3,090,000.00
11	Cheshire East <i>Legacy authorities*: Crewe and Nantwich Congleton, Macclesfield and Cheshire</i>	£3,041,044.00
12	Bournemouth	£2,934,396.12
13	Tower Hamlets	£2,897,000.00
14	Ealing	£2,724,000.00
15	Westminster	£2,696,900.00
16	Stoke-on-Trent	£2,682,000.00
17	Nottingham	£2,607,695.00
18	Leicester	£2,590,489.00
19	Cheshire West and Chester	£2,577,000.00
20	City of Bristol	£2,547,436.00
21	Merton	£2,544,713.00
22	Haringey	£2,541,501.00
24	Croydon	£2,517,887.00
25	Windsor and Maidenhead	£2,475,261.00
26	Hillingdon	£2,423,000.00
27	Bradford	£2,391,300.00
28	Wrexham	£2,369,941.00
29	Peterborough	£2,363,206.00
30	Camden	£2,341,555.58
31	Cambridge	£2,225,299.00
32	East Ayrshire	£2,073,027.00
33	Woking	£2,064,128.49
34	Redbridge	£2,048,000.00
35	Sheffield	£1,982,509.00
36	Northampton	£1,972,274.41
37	Conwy	£1,961,643.02
38	Redcar and Cleveland	£1,956,879.00
39	Dacorum	£1,940,017.00
40	Darlington	£1,934,616.00
41	Portsmouth	£1,919,479.27
42	Mansfield	£1,876,337.00

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

43	Sedgemoor	£1,871,845.00
44	North Lincolnshire	£1,845,946.00
45	Brent	£1,824,897.00
46	Thurrock	£1,799,262.00
47	Torbay	£1,787,970.00
48	Rhondda, Cynon, Taff	£1,767,256.00
49	South Ayrshire	£1,764,183.00
50	Greenwich	£1,735,978.00
51	Nuneaton and Bedworth	£1,702,141.00
52	South Kesteven	£1,686,697.00
53	Norwich	£1,680,304.00
54	Aberdeen City	£1,661,457.00
55	Stratford-on-Avon	£1,637,374.72
56	Caerphilly	£1,636,671.00
57	Luton	£1,635,642.00
58	Bromley	£1,628,783.00
59	Scarborough	£1,589,577.00
60	Belfast	£1,569,470.21
61	Breckland	£1,540,366.00
62	New Forest	£1,533,677.00
63	Tamworth	£1,528,538.00
64	Slough	£1,525,210.00
65	Isle of Wight	£1,483,729.00
66	Southampton	£1,477,154.34
67	Runnymede	£1,476,300.00
68	Isle of Anglesey	£1,464,000.00
69	North Tyneside	£1,463,908.00
70	South Lanarkshire	£1,452,739.00
71	Huntingdonshire	£1,452,270.00
72	Canterbury	£1,445,345.00
73	Islington	£1,440,281.00
74	Neath Port Talbot	£1,436,683.00
75	Tameside	£1,434,875.00
76	Hammersmith and Fulham	£1,433,985.00
77	Colchester	£1,427,379.00
78	Bromsgrove	£1,418,926.00
79	Gateshead	£1,413,529.00
80	Thanet	£1,403,401.75
81	Oldham	£1,400,970.00
82	South Tyneside	£1,399,568.76
83	Lincoln	£1,317,799.00
84	Lewisham	£1,312,327.23
85	Sutton	£1,277,224.84
86	Elmbridge	£1,240,300.00

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

87	Rushmoor	£1,237,200.00
88	West Berkshire	£1,234,000.00
89	Wakefield	£1,228,030.00
90	Medway	£1,223,460.00
91	East Lindsey	£1,203,218.00
92	Denbighshire	£1,197,571.00
93	Newport	£1,191,514.00
94	Tonbridge and Malling	£1,186,250.00
95	Derby	£1,184,000.00
96	Harrow	£1,160,880.00
97	Lancaster	£1,159,222.00
98	Sevenoaks	£1,150,021.00
99	Kensington and Chelsea	£1,143,810.00
100	Bridgend	£1,141,988.00
101	Exeter	£1,123,888.00
102	Dover	£1,107,213.00
103	Weymouth and Portland	£1,106,701.00
104	Harrogate	£1,104,419.00
105	Ipswich	£1,096,642.23
106	Staffordshire Moorlands	£1,087,322.00
107	Carlisle	£1,086,000.00
108	Warwick	£1,085,850.00
109	East Dunbartonshire	£1,079,957.00
110	Chichester	£1,074,052.00
111	Rotherham	£1,070,368.43
112	Cardiff	£1,058,097.00
113	Calderdale	£1,057,392.00
114	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	£1,045,028.85
115	Bexley	£1,031,000.00
116	East Renfrewshire	£1,031,000.00
117	Middlesbrough	£1,026,763.00
118	Bath and North East Somerset	£1,023,318.00
119	Solihull	£1,019,001.00
120	Charnwood	£1,014,681.00
121	Shepway	£1,009,394.84
122	Chelmsford	£1,004,540.00
124	Newark and Sherwood	£990,986.00
125	Gwynedd	£986,877.42
126	Swale	£982,034.00
127	Maidstone	£975,309.00
128	North Somerset	£955,334.00
129	North Hertfordshire	£951,229.00
130	Blackburn with Darwen	£946,396.00
131	Blaenau Gwent	£944,505.00

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

132	Waveney	£930,000.00
133	Mendip	£928,275.74
134	Ashford	£917,357.00
135	Watford	£910,000.00
136	North Ayrshire	£893,465.00
137	Vale of White Horse	£885,138.00
138	Dartford	£875,432.00
139	Bedford Borough	£874,700.00
140	Fareham	£873,626.00
141	Bury	£864,310.00
142	Herefordshire	£861,613.00
143	Waltham Forest	£858,858.03
144	Havant	£852,295.00
145	Reigate and Banstead	£845,471.00
146	Hart	£833,259.70
147	Eastleigh	£814,957.00
148	St Edmundsbury	£807,347.00
149	Dudley	£806,355.47
150	East Staffordshire	£796,251.50
151	Hertsmere	£787,093.00
152	Burnley	£786,000.00
153	Highland	£782,500.00
154	North East Lincolnshire	£764,722.67
155	Swindon	£744,420.00
156	South Gloucestershire	£736,699.00
157	West Lindsey	£734,179.21
158	Tunbridge Wells	£731,866.00
159	Corby	£725,568.00
160	North Warwickshire	£724,095.54
161	Coventry	£722,990.00
162	Rugby	£719,730.00
163	Cherwell	£719,262.00
164	Wychavon	£716,300.00
165	Dundee City	£713,499.00
166	St Albans	£709,342.00
167	Allerdale	£709,212.00
168	Taunton Deane	£704,000.00
169	Kettering	£702,000.00
170	Bassetlaw	£699,402.00
171	Northumberland <i>Include legacy authorities* in request:</i> Alnwick, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Blyth Valley, Castle Morpeth, Northumberland County, Tynedale and Wansbeck	£692,424.49

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

172	Fenland	£684,055.00
173	Vale of Glamorgan	£679,609.00
174	Reading	£676,269.00
175	West Lancashire	£674,710.00
176	Oxford	£669,879.00
177	Hartlepool	£660,614.00
178	Dumfries and Galloway	£655,437.44
179	Guildford	£650,683.00
180	York	£649,500.00
181	Plymouth	£634,706.56
182	Winchester	£626,764.28
183	North Norfolk	£621,359.00
184	Wigan	£620,000.00
185	Angus	£619,278.00
186	Hyndburn	£606,119.05
187	Hambleton	£605,476.00
188	Stockport	£605,395.36
189	Gosport	£601,419.00
190	Worcester	£589,240.06
191	North Devon	£585,021.00
192	South Staffordshire	£578,000.00
193	Gravesham	£577,940.00
194	Redditch	£577,460.00
195	Trafford	£576,000.00
196	Wycombe	£575,493.00
197	Carmarthenshire	£575,018.01
198	Preston	£572,000.00
199	Wolverhampton	£564,890.00
200	East Lothian	£559,572.00
201	Chorley	£555,120.00
201	Christchurch	£553,120.00
202	Broxtowe	£552,905.22
203	Aberdeenshire	£546,000.00
204	Bolton	£542,762.90
205	Falkirk	£522,161.00
206	Warrington	£521,750.00
207	Doncaster	£514,439.00
208	Ribble Valley	£512,720.00
209	Aylesbury Vale	£505,487.82
210	Brighton and Hove	£492,593.44
211	Cheltenham	£492,511.00
212	South Oxfordshire	£489,181.00
213	East Hertfordshire	£488,000.00
214	Stevenage	£488,000.00

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

215	Scottish Borders	£480,403.00
216	Hastings	£479,129.00
217	Ashfield	£474,247.52
218	Spelthorne	£471,350.00
219	Bracknell Forest	£469,783.00
220	Inverclyde	£453,778.00
221	Cannock Chase	£445,724.00
222	Stockton-on-Tees	£443,461.00
224	Merthyr Tydfil	£440,326.00
225	Ceredigion	£438,316.05
226	Pendle	£429,684.00
227	Richmond upon Thames	£426,000.00
228	Sunderland	£425,331.00
229	West Oxfordshire	£421,700.00
230	Gedling	£414,613.00
231	East Cambridgeshire	£409,000.00
232	Surrey Heath	£406,000.00
233	Brentwood	£399,879.58
234	Telford and Wrekin	£397,129.06
235	East Riding of Yorkshire	£392,000.00
236	North West Leicestershire	£369,194.00
237	Central Bedfordshire <i>Including legacy authorities*: Bedfordshire County, Mid Bedfordshire and South Bedfordshire</i>	£368,600.00
238	Test Valley	£368,106.00
239	Epsom and Ewell	£365,018.00
240	Amber Valley	£358,282.00
241	Torfaen	£357,646.00
242	Hinckley and Bosworth	£356,726.00
243	Barrow-in-Furness	£354,361.00
244	Knowsley	£353,612.75
245	Wirral	£351,000.00
246	Rossendale	£346,776.55
247	Mole Valley	£326,633.46
248	East Northamptonshire	£326,098.68
249	Wellingborough	£316,647.52
250	Shetland Islands	£314,763.01
251	Daventry	£314,000.00
252	Gloucester	£313,661.00
253	Wyre Forest	£309,320.00
254	Harborough	£304,518.73
255	Selby	£300,000.00
256	Ballymena	£299,986.00
257	Tendring	£294,730.62

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

258	Buckinghamshire	£292,114.00
259	Horsham	£290,676.00
260	Erewash	£284,457.80
261	Suffolk	£262,930.00
262	Monmouthshire	£246,978.00
263	Basildon	£246,300.00
264	North East Derbyshire	£245,900.00
265	South Lakeland	£241,864.00
266	Broxbourne	£236,000.00
267	Chiltern	£233,504.00
268	South Somerset	£228,590.00
269	Flintshire	£224,168.25
270	Perth and Kinross	£223,174.00
271	Copeland	£216,428.00
272	Braintree	£215,656.83
273	Midlothian	£215,450.00
274	Cotswold	£212,592.00
275	Wokingham	£207,456.00
276	Kingston upon Hull, City of	£205,500.00
277	Crawley	£189,360.47
278	North Kesteven	£183,836.88
279	North Down	£182,898.00
280	Teignbridge	£180,763.00
281	Stroud	£172,497.00
282	Magherafelt	£168,082.42
283	Babergh	£164,390.00
284	Newtownabbey	£162,123.00
285	Milton Keynes	£162,000.00
286	Moray	£158,360.49
287	Epping Forest	£156,874.00
288	Forest Heath	£155,403.00
289	Ards	£146,739.68
290	West Dorset	£136,835.23
291	Bolsover	£127,147.00
292	Fylde	£126,123.00
293	Malvern Hills	£124,693.40
294	Newry and Mourne	£123,000.00
295	South Bucks	£120,660.00
296	Fife	£118,125.00
297	Craven	£115,408.00
298	Pembrokeshire	£104,099.00
299	Richmondshire	£103,785.53
300	East Devon	£103,528.00
301	Castle Point	£98,036.87

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

302	Harlow	£92,934.67
303	West Lothian	£90,000.00
304	South Ribble	£84,251.00
305	Ryedale	£82,370.00
306	Mid Suffolk	£75,000.00
307	Mid Devon	£73,163.00
308	Omagh	£70,000.00
309	Rutland	£59,936.00
310	South Northamptonshire	£58,965.57
311	Powys	£54,068.89
312	Maldon	£52,300.00
313	Orkney Islands	£48,355.18
314	Strabane	£48,273.00
315	Eden	£44,077.00
316	Cambridgeshire	£42,494.00
317	East Dorset	£42,482.23
318	Craigavon	£41,618.00
319	Tewkesbury	£39,760.91
320	Armagh	£35,409.00
321	Eastbourne	£30,346.53
322	Eilean Siar	£27,998.21
323	Three Rivers	£21,940.00
324	Moyle	£17,382.89
325	Uttlesford	£15,431.25
326	Blaby	£15,121.00
327	Rother	£10,349.00
328	Larne	£8,405.00
329	Renfrewshire	£7,736.23
330	Mid Sussex	£1,386.00
331	Arun	£995.00
332 =	Antrim	£0.00
332 =	Argyll and Bute	£0.00
332 =	Ballymoney	£0.00
332 =	Barnsley	£0.00
332 =	Derbyshire Dales	£0.00
332 =	East Hampshire	£0.00
332 =	East Sussex	£0.00

* The term "legacy authorities" refers to those local councils abolished and merged into larger conglomerates as part of the 2009 structural changes to local government in England.

The following local authorities replied stating that they do not operate any public-facing CCTV cameras:

- Isles of Scilly
- Lewes
- Limavady
- Norfolk
- North Dorset
- Purbeck
- South Cambridgeshire
- South Derbyshire
- South Hams
- South Holland
- South Norfolk
- Suffolk Coastal
- Tandridge
- Waverley
- West Somerset

The following local authorities failed to reply to our request for information, violating their obligations under the Freedom of Information Act:

- Adur
- Banbridge
- Ballymoney
- Basingstoke and Deane
- Blackpool
- Boston
- Broadland
- Carrickfergus
- Castlereagh
- Chesterfield
- City of London
- Clackmannanshire
- Coleraine
- Cookstown
- Cumbria
- Derbyshire
- Derry City
- Devon
- Dorset
- Down
- Dungannon
- Essex
- Fermanagh
- Forest of Dean
- Glasgow City
- Gloucestershire
- Great Yarmouth

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

- Hackney
- Halton
- Hampshire
- Havering
- Hertfordshire
- High Peak
- Kent
- Kingston upon Thames
- Kirklees
- Lancashire
- Leicestershire
- Lichfield
- Lincolnshire
- Lisburn
- Liverpool
- Melton
- Newcastle upon Tyne
- Newcastle-under-Lyme
- Newham
- North Lanarkshire
- North Yorkshire
- Northamptonshire
- Nottinghamshire
- Oadby and Wigston
- Oxfordshire
- Poole
- Rochdale
- Rochford
- Rushcliffe
- Salford
- Sefton
- Somerset
- South Cambridgeshire
- South Derbyshire
- Southend-on-Sea
- Southwark
- St. Helens
- Stafford
- Staffordshire
- Stirling
- Surrey
- Swansea
- Torridge
- Walsall

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

- Wandsworth
- Warwickshire
- Wealden
- Welwyn Hatfield
- West Devon
- West Dunbartonshire
- West Sussex
- Wiltshire
- Worcestershire
- Worthing
- Wyre

■ **About Big Brother Watch**

EMBARGOED UNTIL 00:01 ON 30th NOVEMBER

Big Brother Watch is a campaign from the founders of the TaxPayers' Alliance, fighting intrusions on privacy and protecting liberties.

Big Brother Watch produces regular investigative research papers on the erosion of civil liberties in the UK.

Whether it be by placing microchips in rubbish bins or snooping on your family using covert surveillance, we will name and shame the local authorities most prone to authoritarian abuse.

We champion individual cases. We want to use the legal system to help the man in the street fight injustice and regain his personal freedom; we are building up a legal fund to back such cases.

We will help you use the Freedom of Information Act to demand to see data held about yourself by the authorities, to extend our right to government information and to unearth the reality of the Big Brother state.

We want Big Brother Watch to become the central hub for the latest news and debates on personal freedom and civil liberty — a forum for information and discussion on something that directly affects British citizens in their everyday lives.

Big Brother Watch also aims to expose the extent to which the web has become the first line in state surveillance. The floodgates for the co-opting of internet activity into the state's control have opened, as companies are leant on to release online personal data. Safeguards are needed before it's too late.

We hope Big Brother Watch will become the gadfly of the ruling class, a champion for civil liberties and personal freedom — and a force to help a future government roll back a decade of state interference in our lives.

To arrange broadcast interviews or discuss the research, please contact:
Daniel Hamilton, Campaign Director, Big Brother Watch

Daniel.Hamilton@bigbrotherwatch.org.uk
Mob (24 hrs): **07538 28 00 41** | Tel: **020 7340 6030**