

Report of the Assistant Director Neighbourhoods and Customer Services to the meeting of Regulatory and Appeals Committee to be held on 29th September 2016

Z

Subject:

Proposed Public Space Protection Order Bradford City Centre and surrounding area.

Summary statement:

This report provides a summary of the responses from the statutory consultation on the proposed Public Space Protection Order for Bradford City Centre and submission of the proposed Order for this Committee's approval.

Steve Hartley
Strategic Director
Environment & Sport

Report Contact: Rebecca Trueman
Community Safety Co-ordinator
Phone: (01274) 431364
E-mail: Rebecca.trueman@bradford.gov.uk

Portfolio:

Neighbourhoods & Community Safety

Overview & Scrutiny Area:

Environment & Waste Management

1.0 SUMMARY STATEMENT

- 1.1 This report provides a summary of the responses from the statutory consultation on the proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for Bradford City Centre and surrounding area and submission of the proposed Order for this Committee's approval.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This report is submitted in compliance with the decision of this Committee of the 17th February 2016:

(1) That the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport be authorised to undertake the required (minimum 6 week) consultation exercise to implement a Public Space Protection Order for Bradford City Centre, in the area shown in Appendix A and subject to the terms set out in Paragraph 4.8 of the report.

(2) That, further to the completion of the necessary consultation process, the proposed Order be submitted to this Committee for approval.

(Regulatory and Appeals Committee Document 'AS' and Minute 90 17 February 2016).

2.2 Consultation methodology

- 2.2.1 The consultation was carried out in accordance with legal requirements as described in section 72 Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2014 (later referred to as ' the Act')
- 2.2.2 Appendix A contains the list of statutory consultees.
- 2.2.3 Letters were sent to all businesses, landowners and residents and other organisations within the boundary of the proposed PSPO for which a postal address was identified. In accordance with legal requirements letters were also sent to local Police Divisions, West Yorkshire Police Service, West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service. Appendix A contains copies of the consultation letters.
- 2.2.4 The letters provided information about the consultation and how to participate. This included all residents, businesses, landowners and other organisations within the boundary of the proposed PSPO. Appendix A contains a map showing the boundary of the proposed PSPO.
- 2.2.5 Where possible representative bodies, such as the Bradford Chamber of Trade, were also contacted and encouraged to participate in the consultation.
- 2.2.6 Information about the consultation and links to the consultation documents, including the online survey, were posted on the front page of the Council's website.

2.2.7 An article about the consultation was published in the local Telegraph and Argus. Appendix A contains this article.

2.3 Consultation summary findings

2.3.1 The summary of the findings are as follows:-

- a) 170 submissions were made via the online survey or via telephone. Whilst this response rate was disappointing, the overwhelming majority of respondents were supportive of the introduction of the PSPO in the area shown on the map and the prohibitions within it.
- b) The number of respondents was fairly balanced across local residents and people who work in the area. The business response rate was somewhat lower but the Bradford Chamber of Trade did submit a composite response from its members as detailed below at 2.3.5.
- c) Most responders visited the area of the proposed PSPO every day. Visits by the responders to the area mainly occurred from Monday to Friday and between 12 noon and 6pm, although a sizable number were present from 7am – 12 noon and after 6pm.
- d) 51% of respondents felt fairly or very unsafe in the area shown on the map. Of these respondents, 71% were aged 18-24 and 57% were aged 40-59. Males and females were equal in feeling fairly or very unsafe in the area.
- e) Additionally, 66% of all respondents stated they felt less safe in some places on the map than in others.
- f) Business owners who responded to the consultation were more likely than others responding in other groups to feel fairly or very unsafe in the area contained within the map.

A list of the places where people felt most unsafe is provided at Appendix B - PSPO Consultation Survey Data

- g) 45% of those responding stated that they felt less safe in the area from 6 pm until 12 midnight compared with 20% feeling less safe between 12 noon and 6 pm. 14% felt less safe from midnight to 7am.
- h) Some of the comments made by those responding to feeling safe or not in the area covered by the proposed PSPO were about being verbally abused and intimidated by those drinking or taking drugs in the area, a lack of Police patrols, begging and intimidation by large groups of intoxicated people loitering in the area.
- i) When asked what they felt were the anti-social issues occurring in the area, respondents stated that the biggest problems in the area were with people behaving as if they were intoxicated and the drinking of alcohol in the street. This supports the prohibitions within the PSPO.

- j) Respondents who commented about the problems in the area contained within the map were mainly concerned about drug dealing and taking, problem alcohol consumption and drunken people.
- k) Begging and aggressive begging was also considered to be a big problem in the area of the map. Some respondents also cited charity collectors as an issue.
- l) Other concerns cited included: Homelessness, intimidating groups of young people, riding bikes in City Park, use of quad bikes, speeding drivers, prostitution and racism.
- m) 84% of respondents were supportive of the use of the PSPO to stop people using intoxicating substances in the area shown on the map. 9% of respondents were opposed to this.
- n) 85% of respondents supported the use of a PSPO to stop people continuing to drink alcohol when asked to stop drinking by an authorised officer in the area shown on the map. 9% of respondents were opposed to this.
- o) 86% of respondents supported the use of a PSPO to require a person to surrender alcohol at the request of an authorised officer in the area shown on the map. 8% of respondents were opposed to this.
- p) Those who supported the introduction of the PSPO with its stated prohibitions and who commented felt that the PSPO was needed to improve the situation and improve Bradford's image.
- q) Some respondents wanted the area of the PSPO extended to include the following places:
- University accommodation
 - New Dixon's School (Dixon's Trinity Academy)
 - Boundary to extend from Laisterdyke Lane towards All Saints' Road and include Grantham Road and Spring Place (Dirkhill area)
 - Dirkhill Road
- r) Some of the comments made by those who did not support the introduction of the PSPO in the area were that the measures restricted individual liberties, there were problem drinkers using the licenced premises, that it will drive the problem out of the City Centre and into other areas, the measures would criminalise certain activities, drinking in licenced premises costs more. There were also comments that the measures would be antagonistic. Several stated that alcohol was legal to buy and consume.
- s) A few respondents felt the area to be protected by the PSPO was too big.
- t) The majority of those providing a response to these questions were local residents.
- u) Other comments made by respondents included:

- extending the PSPO to cover Dirkhill Road, Spring Place, Grantham Road, Rand Street, Rand Place, Alexandra Place, more of Great Horton Road, Retford Place, Grantham Place, St Luke's Hospital, to include the City Centre swimming pool. (Please note that there cannot be a recommendation to extend the PSPO exclusion zone to include the area of the proposed new City Centre Sports Centre as there is no evidence of issues of ASB, as described in the proposed PSPO, currently taking place at this location).
 - Putting more resources into services to help people with alcohol and substance misuse issues, conditional cautioning intervention could be a method to use
 - Issue is with drivers
 - Not a reasonable or proportionate response to the issues
 - Needs to be enforced well
 - Will help our vulnerable adults
 - Move the chemist next to the Oastler Centre
 - Feel the issue is having insufficient officers to enforce it
 - Bikes and football should not be allowed in the City Pool area
 - Bizarre that the order specifies 'legal highs' when illegal drugs are also being taken
 - PSPO may just displace people out of the bounded area into other areas
 - Stop drug dealers and others causing problems too
 - Too many off-licenses within the proposed protected area.
 - Police and Council will not have the resources to manage it effectively.
- v) In summary, most respondents agreed with the proposed PSPO and some wanted the area it covered extending. The majority of respondents felt the PSPO would improve the City Centre and reduce anti-social behaviour caused by the use of intoxicating substances.
- w) Those that disagreed with the PSPO were concerned with a reduction in civil liberties, the targeting of particular groups and criminalisation of individuals penalised by the measures.

2.3.2 The report of findings from the online consultation is attached at Appendix B.

2.3.3 Bradford College would like the boundary (of the PSPO) extended to include the Trinity Green campus.

2.3.4 Grantham Residents Association commented that the Grantham Rd area should be included within the area protected by the PSPO.

2.3.5 Horton Housing Association's respondent suggested that it would be more useful to intervene and assist people to address their behaviour.

2.3.6 West Yorkshire Police Service, Bradford Police Senior Leadership Team and the Police and Crime Commissioner provided a written submission. Appendix B contains a copy of this response. These statutory consultees were supportive of the proposed PSPO. These are some of the suggestions they made about the PSPO:

- a) The Safer & Stronger Communities Partnership Board has recently agreed to a new district wide approach to ensure appropriate support and intervention is offered on a partnership level to anyone who is visibly begging or rough sleeping in Bradford. This is a stepped approach for dealing with those individuals who refuse support and intervention and persistently continue to beg. It is felt that one area for consideration, at the six month review, would be whether 'persistent begging' could be included within the PSPO if partnership intelligence supports this.
 - b) A further consideration for inclusion within the PSPO would be inclusion of a power for an **authorised person** to dispose of any item that has been surrendered. This prevents the logistical concerns of having to store prohibited items or potentially return at a future date alcohol to persons suffering from alcohol addiction. This suggestion has been raised previously for inclusion by the partnerships Inspector, but does not feature within the draft order circulated.
 - c) It is felt that the Bradford City Centre ASB Partnership would be the group best placed to consider and review any amendments at the six monthly juncture.
- 2.3.7 Bradford Chamber of Trade, following discussion at their executive meeting of the 13 June 2016, provided a written submission. Appendix B contains a copy of the Chamber's response. The Chamber was fully supportive of the Council obtaining a PSPO to combat anti-social activities and behaviour as set out in the proposed PSPO.

3. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Not applicable.

4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Public Space Protection Orders

- 4.1 A Public Space Protection Order is an order that identifies the space to which it applies and can make requirements, or prohibitions within the area. This means that the local authority can, require people to do specific things in a particular area or not to do specific things in a particular area. The local authority can grant the prohibitions/requirements where it believes that they are reasonable in order to prevent or reduce the detrimental impact. The order can be made so as to apply to specific people within an area, or to everybody within that area. It can also apply at all times, or within specified times and equally to all circumstances, or specific circumstances. The order can apply for a maximum of three years upon which the process of reviews and consultation must be repeated to ensure the issues is still occurring and the order is having the required effect. Thereafter it can be extended for a further three years and, upon the reviews and consultation taking place, can be extended more than once for further periods of three years.
- 4.2 Failure to comply with the order is an offence. Breaches of the order can also be discharged by use of a fixed penalty notice (FPN) £100.00.

- 4.3 Consumption of alcohol, contrary to the terms of any order made, is a separate issue and is not in itself an offence; the offence is committed by failure to comply with a request to surrender the alcohol, from an authorised person.
- 4.4 The Act is not overly prescriptive about the necessary process required for application of these powers. It has therefore been necessary to design a process that is considered to be appropriate and suitably robust.
- 4.5 The recommendation following the consultation period is to seek a Public Space Protection Order with the terms as set out below and for an area, as shown on the plan attached at Appendix C.

Person(s) within this area will not:

- *Ingest, inhale, inject, smoke or otherwise use intoxicating substances.*

Intoxicating Substances is given the following definition (which includes Alcohol and psychoactive substances: Substances with the capacity to stimulate or depress the central nervous system).

Exemptions shall apply in cases where the substances are used for a valid and demonstrable medicinal use, given to an animal as a medicinal remedy, are cigarettes (tobacco) or vaporisers or are food stuffs regulated by food health and safety legislation.

Persons within this area who breach this prohibition shall: surrender intoxicating substances in his/her possession to an authorised person.

(An authorised person could be a Police Constable, Police Community Support Officer or Council Officer, and must be able to present their authority upon request.).

5. OPTIONS

- 5.1 This report provides a summary of the consultation responses and identifies the types of anti-social behaviour of main concern to those who submitted a response.
- 5.2 The Draft Public Space Protection Order has been amended to reflect some of the issues raised through the consultation process. Approval is now sought from this Committee to make the Order.
- 5.3 It should be noted some years ago the Council created two City Centre Designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs) which become PSPOs in October 2017 automatically under the legislation. The Council has the option to allow that event to take effect, however this is not recommended due to enforcement problems which exist relating to the existing DPPO as a result of redevelopment within the area of the DPPO and the additional powers of a PSPO as outlined above. The Existing DPPOs area plans do not include the former highway which ran along what is now the mirror pool and does not correctly identify the extremities of existing building lines.

- 5.4 This issue will be considered as part of the review of the PSPO.
- 5.5 It should also be noted the Council has the option of including enforcement of issues relating to dogs e.g. dog fouling and dogs on lead etc in the terms of a new PSPO given supporting evidence or allowing the Councils existing Dog Control Orders (DCO's) to become PSPOs due to the passage of time in October 2017. This natural transition is strongly recommended as the most cost effective and efficient way of continuing with enforcement powers relating to dog control.

6. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

The cost of implementation of the proposed Order, including the cost of the public notices will be met from within existing resources.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

There are no risk management or governance issues apparent.

8. LEGAL APPRAISAL

- 8.1 The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act came into force on 20th October 2014. This Act contains the provisions for the making of a Public Space Protection Order.
- 8.2 Under section 59 local authorities have the power to make Public Space Protection Orders if satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met?

The first condition is that—

- a) activities carried on in a public place within the Authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or
- b) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.

- 8.3 The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities— is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature,

- a) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and
- b) Justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.

- 8.4 Activities can include things that a person or a group does, has done or should do (in order to reduce the detrimental effect). As with any new legislation of its type, this is untested ground and the legislation will be further defined in years to come by a process of appeals and High Court rulings. Any legal challenge presents a risk to the Authority. The legislation supporting implementation of the new Orders states that "interested persons" may challenge the validity of any order in the High Courts.

This means that the Council could face a challenge against its ability to implement the Order. An application of this nature must be made within six weeks; beginning on the day the Order is made or varied. There are three grounds upon which a challenge could be made, these are:

- That the local authority did not have the power to make the order or variation, or to include particular prohibitions or requirements imposed by the order (or by the order as varied)
- That a requirement under this element of the legislation not complied with in relation to the order or variation
- The High Court would have the power to quash, amend or uphold the order.

Section 63 of the act states

Consumption of alcohol in breach of prohibition in order

(1) This section applies where a constable or an authorised person reasonably believes that a person:

- a) is or has been consuming alcohol in breach of a prohibition in a public spaces protection order, or
- b) intends to consume alcohol in circumstances in which doing so would be a breach of such a prohibition.

In this section “authorised person” means a person authorised for the purposes of this section by the local authority that made the public spaces protection order (or authorised by virtue of section 69(1)).

(2) The constable or authorised person may require the person;

- a) not to consume, in breach of the order, alcohol or anything which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be alcohol;
- b) to surrender anything in persons possession which is, or which the constable or authorised person reasonably believes to be, alcohol or a container for alcohol.

(3) A constable or an authorised person who imposes a requirement under subsection (2) must tell the person that failing without reasonable excuse to comply with the requirement is an offence.

(4) A requirement imposed by an authorised person under subsection (2) is not valid if the person—

- a) is asked by the person to show evidence of his or her authorisation, and
- b) fails to do so.

(5) A constable or an authorised person may dispose of anything surrendered under subsection (2)(b) in whatever way he or she thinks appropriate.

- (6) A person who fails without reasonable excuse to comply with a requirement imposed on him or her under subsection (2) commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 on the standard scale.

Section 67 creates a second offence of failing to comply with order

- (1) It is an offence for a person without reasonable excuse—
- a) to do anything that the person is prohibited from doing by a public spaces protection order, or
 - b) to fail to comply with a requirement to which the person is subject under a public spaces protection order.
- (2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale.
- (3) A person does not commit an offence under this section by failing to comply with a prohibition or requirement that the local authority did not have power to include in the public spaces protection order.
- (4) Consuming alcohol in breach of a public spaces protection order is not an offence under this section (but see section 63).
- 8.5 The penalty for breaches of a PSPO relate to fixed penalty notices and fines alone, which may lead to significant levels of non-payment. The suite of new powers available however would allow officers to utilise a range of measures for those identified as persistently breaching the order, for example:
- Community Protection Notices could be issued against the individuals
 - An Anti-Social Behaviour Injunction (ASBI) could be sought against individuals, which carries tougher sanctions (and ultimately imprisonment)
 - A Criminal Behaviour Order could be sought. Breach of the PSPO is an offence and upon conviction, individuals could be made subject to a Criminal Behaviour Order. This carries both tougher sanctions, along with the ability to implement positive conditions requiring support for substance misuse issues.
- 8.6 Consideration was also given by officers of the Council and the police as to whether or not to include in the draft PSPO prohibitions lifted from the Council's 1998 Good Rule and Government Byelaws e.g. prohibitions against the use of motor cycles and other vehicles, skateboarding, noise in streets and other public places, touting (selling), fireworks and urinating some of which appear to be supported by evidence from the police. Other prohibitions under consideration are begging, rough sleeping and busking but these issues do not appear to be identified specifically in current Police evidence.
- 8.7 Given the evidence provided to the Council by the police of current levels of ASB and following the consultation in respect of the additional prohibitions it is not recommended the matters referred to in Paragraph 8.6 are included by way of

additional prohibitions in the PSPO. The existing Good Rule and Government Byelaws 1998 will continue in force under section 70 of the Act.

- 8.8 The making of a PSPO does not affect existing DCOs or DPPOs.
- 8.9 In October 2017 all the Councils existing DPPOs and DCOs will become PSPOs under section 75 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014 and FPNs will then apply to the existing DPPOs. If a PSPO was not pursued now in relation to prohibition of the consumption of alcohol then in October 2017 the current City Centre DPPOs could be reviewed and including the whole of the new City Park . As mentioned above the current DPPOs do not include those parts of the City Park which were part of former public highways.
- 8.10 In order to implement a PSPO the procedure under section 72 of the Act must be followed. Section 72 states

Convention rights, consultation, publicity and notification

(1) A local authority, in deciding—

- a) whether to make a public spaces protection order (under section 59) and if so what it should include,
- b) whether to extend the period for which a public spaces protection order has effect (under section 60) and if so for how long,
- c) whether to vary a public spaces protection order (under section 61) and if so how, or
- d) whether to discharge a public spaces protection order (under section 61), must have particular regard to the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly set out

In articles 10 and 11 of the Convention.

- (2) In subsection (1) “Convention” has the meaning given by section 21(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998.
- (3) A local authority must carry out the necessary consultation and the necessary publicity, and the necessary notification (if any), before—
- a) making a public spaces protection order,
 - b) extending the period for which a public spaces protection order has effect, or
 - c) varying or discharging a public spaces protection order.
- (4) In subsection (3)—
- “the necessary consultation” means consulting with—

- a) the chief officer of police, and the local policing body, for the police area that includes the restricted area;
- b) whatever community representatives the local authority thinks it appropriate to consult;
- c) the owner or occupier of land within the restricted area;

“the necessary publicity” means—

- a) in the case of a proposed order or variation, publishing the text of it;
- b) in the case of a proposed extension or discharge, publicising the proposal;

“the necessary notification” means notifying the following authorities of the proposed order, extension, variation or discharge—

- a) the parish council or community council (if any) for the area that includes the restricted area;
- b) in the case of a public spaces protection order made or to be made by a district Council in England, the county council (if any) for the area that includes the restricted area.

(5) The requirement to consult with the owner or occupier of land within the restricted area—

- a) does not apply to land that is owned and occupied by the local authority;
- b) applies only if, or to the extent that, it is reasonably practicable to consult the owner or occupier of the land.

(6) In the case of a person or body designated under section 71, the necessary consultation also includes consultation with the local authority which (ignoring subsection (2) of that section) is the authority for the area that includes the restricted area.

(7) In relation to a variation of a public spaces protection order that would increase the restricted area, the restricted area for the purposes of this section is the increased area.

8.11 Guidance relating to publication of PSPOs is set out in the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Publication of PSPOs) Regulations 2014. There is also the July 2014 Home office guidance which will assist in the legal formalities in creating an order.

9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY

9.1.1 Generally it is understood anti-social behaviour has a disproportionate affect on

those most vulnerable in our communities.

9.1.2 Penalties for breaching prohibitions contained within the proposed Public Space Protection Order may impact more on those people most vulnerable to substance and alcohol misuse than on any other identifiable group who use this space.

9.1.3 This possible impact could be mitigated by waiving any FPN where the person deemed to be in breach of the PSPO agrees to and participates in alcohol and substance misuse services.

9.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

There are no sustainability implications apparent.

9.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS

There are no greenhouse gas emissions impacts apparent.

9.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

Anti-social behaviour can have an adverse impact on town and city centres. Any actions the authority can take to improve community safety and consequently the reputation of the city centre will be of benefit to visitors and businesses.

9.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT (HRA)

Individuals have rights established under the HRA some of which are absolute and some of which are qualified.

The Council is required under the HRA to balance the rights of those affected by the order, against the rights of the community to enjoy the area proposed to be included in the order without being subject to acts of anti-social behaviour as evidenced by complaints to the police and as prohibited by the draft order.

9.6 TRADE UNION

Consultation relating to job roles has taken place with the relevant trade unions

9.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS

9.7.1 Area Co-ordinators were asked to invite relevant ward members within their Constituency Areas to comment on the proposals.

9.7.2 The boundary of the proposed PSPO covered parts of Manningham and City wards.

10. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

There are no items that are not for publication.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee approves:

11.1 The proposed PSPO is amended as per the consultation as follows:

11.1.1 The boundary of the exclusion zone is extended to include the following streets and places:

Trinity Green Campus
University accommodation (close to the existing proposed boundary)
Dixon's Trinity Academy, Trinity Road
Laisterdyke Lane towards All Saints' Road (Dirkhill area)
Grantham Road
Grantham Place
Spring Place
Dirkhill Road
Rand Street
Rand Place
Alexandra Street
To extend to the junction of All Saints' Road with Great Horton Road
Retford Place,
St Luke's Hospital

11.1.2 Under section 63(5) of the Act an **authorised person** can dispose of any item that has been surrendered under section 63(2) i.e. Alcohol or a container for alcohol.

An **authorised person** in context of this PSPO is defined as being either a: Police Constable, Police Community Support Officer or Council Officer.

11.1.3 That an **authorised person** can decide when it is appropriate to either

11.1.3.1 Impose a FPN

11.1.3.2 Waive the FPN in the event that a person who would have been issued with a FPN agrees to and attends an alcohol or substance misuse service.

11.1.3.3 If anti-social awareness sessions are made available locally, reduce the level of the FPN if the person who would have been issued with a FPN agrees to and attends an anti-social awareness session.

11.2 The Strategic Director, Environment and Sport be requested to investigate and, if feasible, make available local anti-social awareness sessions.

11.3 The Strategic Director, Environment and Sport be authorised to take all necessary actions to implement and make operational the PSPO as amended.

11.4 The Order will be reviewed in 12 months time by the Bradford City Centre ASB Partnership and will consider comments and suggestions made by respondents during this consultation exercise and evidence arising during the time the Order is in force.

12 APPENDICES

- 12.1 Appendix A – Consultation documents, including the proposed PSPO and map of the proposed exclusion zone presented to Regulatory and Appeals Committee 17 February 2016, and T & A article dated 10 May 2016.
- 12.2 Appendix B - Consultation Survey Data and written responses from the West Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, West Yorkshire Police Service and Bradford Chamber of Trade.
- 12.3 Appendix C – Amended draft PSPO exclusion zone map showing the extent of the proposed PSPO
- 12.4 Appendix D – Amended draft proposed PSPO.

13. OTHER BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 13.1 Two schedules of supporting evidence in support of Public Space Protection Order
- 13.2 City Centre ASB Strategy Group – Action Plan 2015/16.
- 13.3 The existing byelaws which apply to the City Centre.
- 13.4 The two existing DPPO's (Designated Public Place Orders) which apply to the Bradford City Centre.
- 13.5 Document 'AS' to Regulatory and Appeals Committee 17 February 2016
- 13.6 Minute 90 of Regulatory and Appeals Committee 17 February 2016
- 13.7 Survey data and comments