

## City Centre Security

### ATTRO Meeting

Attendees			
Lynda Deane	B&NES	Jo-Anne Johnson Taylor	A & S Police
Simon Thomas	B&NES	Vaughan Thompson	B&NES
Paul Garrod	B&NES	Annemarie Strong	B&NES
Pete Naish	A & S Police		
Wendy Linham	A & S Police		

### Agenda

#### 1. ATTRO Extent and Schedules

- PN's previous suggestion of using a model based upon the Manchester ATTRO, where we would have an wider city extent (defined as schedule 1) and inner core (defined as schedule 2) outlined separately by plans. AS suggests that this would be more appropriate, as it is consistent with map based TRO's the Council has recently moved to.
- Require a series of defined locations on the outer area extent, where a hard stop can be established if an incident occurs. How is this managed and by whom? Unlikely Police, as resource not available, more likely term contractor under emergency response.
- Subject to Chief Constable Agreement, ATTRO can be introduced immediately, waiving the requirement to publically consult under the Counter Terrorism and Border Security Act. Would look to comply with the standard TRO advertising period of 21 day for the wider city extent element.
- Advertising separately would make more sense, so if one gets caught up in a Public Inquiry or Judicial Review, it would not affect programme of implementation of the other.
- Advertisement of city wide ATTRO now to justify Council and Police intention and continued improvement for security in city, in advance or in tandem with the impending consultation on access restriction.

#### 2. Avon & Somerset Police Sign-off

- PN/ JJT to discuss further with Chief Constable regarding suggestion of a two stage ATTRO (i.e. wider city and central core).

### 3. Access Restrictions (Central Core)

- For the central core element of the ATTRO, impact rated bollards will be in place 24 hours/ 7 days per week, where all drivers must announce themselves at the prescribed vehicle access points, before being allowed into the pedestrianised area. Limited access will be permitted to certain user groups at periods of the day, where footfall is lowest e.g. 12am – 10am. Yet to be determined, but will be based footfall figures.
- Require justification of decision for specific hours of allowance into the restricted area. Comparison to be made against footfall figures for known crowded spaces in the city centre. No parameters for crowded space stipulating when measures should be considered, nor hours of operation, therefore to be set as reasonable response.
- Hours of operation to be outlined on the schedule.
- AS highlights that GDPR compliance required for access restriction vetting by CCTV staff and as part of the protocols.
- ST runs through revised protocols/ mitigation document with the group.
- Can cash-in-transit operatives take off helmets? Not sure, best speak to banks and building societies as part of the engagement process.
- Private Ocado/ Tesco deliveries. Will they be allowed in?
- What about carer requirement to pick up infirm persons? Have discussed this with Mental Health and Care Provider Team Manager Caryn Yee-King. Need to understand how many vulnerable persons reside within the central core. Considerations if not covered that may require minor changes to the ATTRO in the future. Leg-room to be built into the design of the document.
- Provide revised protocols/ mitigation document to ASP for comment.

### 4. Physical Measure Locations

- Placement of bollards under S92 of the RTRA 1984 will need to be identified within the access restriction order. Whilst a dimension will need to identify their chosen position, there is some latitude which allows for technical adjustment, ground conditions and other unforeseen constraints, but doesn't say by how much. The test is therefore what is considered reasonable. AS to advise.

### 5. Parking Enforcement

- Parking enforcement TRO elements required for access restriction ATTRO. Require separate discussion with Andrew Dunn.
- Vehicle towaway system in the event vehicle left within the central core restriction for more than the allotted time period for delivery. Further discussion on how to manage, as well as safety management protocol

## 6. Access Restriction Signage

- Insufficient time to consider within meeting. To be considered further with Andrew Dunn and Paul Garrod and brought up in future meetings.

## 7. Access Restrictions – Advanced Site Investigation

- Discussion of undertaking SI's whilst undertaking consultation. The importance of delivering HVM in the central core is recognised, but advanced investigative works could be deemed pre-emptive and could trigger a judicial review.
- Decision to continue with SI's would need to be taken by senior management – Mandy Bishop. Would require assessment of risk and full EQIA to ensure properly considered. Possible programme for consultation could be 9 weeks – consultation; 1-2 weeks – report to cabinet; 3 weeks – advertisement.