

RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION / CASE STUDY

Flexible security during residential rehabilitation

Visible, adaptable surveillance for an occupied residential property during onsite improvements.

THE CHALLENGE

Rehabilitation work created changing security needs. Management reported concerns about groups gathering outside the building and sought continued surveillance during onsite improvements.

THE DEPLOYMENT

Three mobile solar-powered towers were initially deployed. The tower count was later reduced as site requirements changed. Coverage remained in place during parcel-locker construction.



CAPABILITIES

Remote live and recorded video access, AI-assisted detection, and audible/visual deterrence. The mobile system required no permanent site power or internet connection.

Actual project photo: close crop of the tower-mounted camera assembly. Property context has been excluded.

RECORDED CALLS / MATCHED COMPARISON

What the records show

Two matched 244-day observation windows. Values describe recorded calls for service; they are not counts of confirmed crimes.

Period 1: the 244 days before the towers arrived.

Period 2: the first 244 days with towers on site.

Exact dates are withheld to protect the client's confidentiality.

CALL CLASSIFICATION	BEFORE	WITH TOWERS	CHANGE
Security-related calls*	367	342	-6.81%
Disorderly conduct	73	46	-36.99%
Assault-classified calls	8	2	-75%
Overall recorded calls	767	771	+0.52%

*Security-related subtotal: alleged offense, public-order, and investigation/security-response classifications. These groups are analytical classifications, not verified criminal findings.

THE FULL PICTURE

Overall calls increased slightly, from 767 to 771. Some categories increased. The selected decreases do not establish that the towers caused a reduction.

Percentage change = (Period 2 - Period 1) / Period 1 x 100. Category counts are part of the overall total and should not be added to it.

OPERATIONAL VALUE / EVIDENCE AND LIMITATIONS

Adaptable coverage. Careful interpretation.



Project photo with background removed for privacy. Full tower shown; background digitally edited.

OPERATIONAL VALUE

Relocatable equipment, solar-powered deployment, detection alerts, and live or recorded video access supported changing needs during rehabilitation and onsite improvements.

COMPARISON METHOD

The comparison counts unique police-blatter incident numbers from supplied public records in two matched 244-day periods. Repeated incident numbers were checked; distinct numbers can still relate to the same underlying event.

Medical/welfare, fire/building-safety, traffic/administrative, proactive-policing and indeterminate calls sit outside the security subtotal.

EVIDENCE AND LIMITATIONS

Call classifications are not confirmed crimes. The records do not establish whether an incident was prevented, where within the property it occurred, or whether towers caused any change. Occupancy, rehabilitation, policing practices, reporting behavior and other security measures may influence the counts. This is an observational comparison without a control group.

Client and property identifiers, exact dates and location details are withheld in this Public Edition. Source records are not reproduced to protect anonymity.