

AUTHOR: ACC Craig Holden**SPONSOR: DCC Jon Stratford****DECISION NUMBER: 06/2020***(to be completed on approval)***SUBMITTED TO: Martin Surl, Police & Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire****SUBJECT: Provision of a temporary armoury facility****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Constabulary Governance Board (17 March 2020), was presented with a paper in relation to the options available for the provision of a temporary armoury facility which is required as a result of the redevelopment of the Bamfurlong site.

These options included:-

1. The purchase of a new, mobile Armoury.
2. Purchase of a used mobile Armoury.
3. Bespoke construction of an Armoury within existing Police Estate:
 - a. Phoenix House
 - b. Compass House
4. A conversion project where the Constabulary would commission its own construction of a containerised Armoury option similar to that which is available and presented as Option 1 and referred to above.
5. Construction of a traditional build Armoury within suitably identified Police estate grounds.
6. Rental of an Armoury.

CGB supported option 1 at a cost of £220k.

The Chief Finance Officer noted that £232k had already put aside for this purpose (initial decant costs £144k plus £88k within Bamfurlong budget).

There is also potential to recover a proportion of this initial cost of £220k by either selling the mobile armoury or renting it, once the Constabulary no longer needs it.

RECOMMENDATION:

PCC Governance Board is asked to note the decision taken at CGB.

OUTCOME/APPROVAL BY:

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MASI', with a horizontal line underneath.

Date: 24.03.20

Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire

<p>Public Access to Information</p> <p><i>Information continued within Constabulary papers is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Reports which are submitted for consideration at PCC Governance Board are likely to be made public. If the paper contains sensitive information then please detail below.</i></p>	
<p>Is this a decision of significant public interest?</p> <p><i>This includes a decision with any impact on the community, expenditure in excess of £50,000, or any decision that would be of obvious interest to the media or the general public</i></p>	<p>Yes Expenditure is in excess of £50k.</p>
<p>Does this report contain sensitive information?</p> <p><i>Does this report contain any information which falls into these categories?</i></p> <p>a) <i>would, in the view of the chief officer of the police, be against the interests of national security;</i> b) <i>might, in the view of the chief officer of police, jeopardise the safety of any person;</i> c) <i>might, in the view of the chief officer of police, prejudice the prevention or detection of crime, the apprehension or prosecution of offenders, or the administration of justice; or</i> d) <i>is prohibited by any enactment.</i> e) <i>breaches commercial sensitivity</i></p>	<p>Record which section(s) applies and explain why.</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)</p>	<p>Comments These sections must not be left blank</p>
<p>Has legal advice been sought on this submission if required?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Has the Chief Finance Officer been consulted, if required?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered, as appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>How is the recommendation consistent with the objectives of the Police and Crime Plan (PCP)?</p>	<p>Links in with keeping people safe from harm – Safer days and nights for all.</p>
<p>Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?</p>	<p>Yes - extensively</p>
<p>Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media, community, staff or partner interest and how they might be managed?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Have all relevant implications and risks been considered?	Yes
Has this paper / proposal been submitted through any other Constabulary boards? If so, please detail along with the result.	Discussed at previous CGB however discussed as an interdependency (wider decant) as oppose to being a specific agenda item.

PART ONE – For publication

1. Purpose / key drivers of report

It has been agreed that over the coming months the Police Operational Centre at Bamfurlong will be decommissioned and a number existing functions that currently operate at that site will be relocated for a period of between 18 and 36 months. The deployment of armed officers is one of the functions that will require relocating during this period. The Armed Policing function includes:

- Armed Response (ARVs).
- Specialist Firearms Officers (SFOs).
- Suitable weapons, ammunitions and explosives storage facility (an armoury).
- An appropriate working environment for the Constabulary armourer.
- An Armourers workshop facility.

This paper sets out the options for consideration in relation to alternative arrangements for the provision of an armoury facility along with the associated costs.

2. Main content

Gloucestershire Constabulary has standard operating procedures directing how the armoury is utilised and this adheres to guidance contained within NPCC Authorised Professional Practice (APP) Armed Policing /Weapons and Equipment /Storage of Firearms Munitions and Explosives and the Firearms Security Handbook 2019.

For reference please see <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/armed-policing/weapons-and-equipment/#storage>

Principles contained within Human Rights and HSE Legislation have informed the APP and subsequent guidance.

There is a requirement to maintain these standards when providing an alternative armoury facility during the decant period. Further to this the current armoury located at Bamfurlong has made adaptations to practices in order to work towards meeting the standards set out in the International Standards Organisation (ISO) 17025.

A decision has since been taken to suspend efforts to attain full ISO accreditation for the armoury until after the decant period.

Whilst this removes some aspects that would have otherwise been required for the armoury and workshop it is never the less important to adhere to its requirements wherever possible because ISO relates to all calibration laboratories and testing organisations who are required to prove that they operate a quality system, are technically competent and can generate technically valid and repeatable results.

It is likely that expert evidence provided following calibration examinations by the armourer would be vulnerable to legal challenge in Court were we not able to demonstrate compliance set out within ISO 17025.

The role of the armourer and the workshop that they operate in is captured by the overall requirement to provide a temporary armoury facility for the decant period.

This presents some challenges due to the availability of suitable Constabulary estates and the complex nature of this subject area.

A potential solution to this challenge presents itself by the commercial availability of mobile armouries.

These products meet the standards set out in this document and also meet both operational and security standards, however they come at a cost.

A number of alternative options have therefore been explored and these are presented within this document.

The options in effect are:

1. The purchase of a new, mobile Armoury.
2. Purchase of a used mobile Armoury.
3. Bespoke construction of an Armoury within existing Police Estate:
 - A. Phoenix House
 - B. Compass House
4. A conversion project where the Constabulary would commission its own construction of a containerised Armoury option similar to that which is available and presented as Option 1 and referred to above.
5. Construction of a traditional build Armoury within suitably identified Police estate grounds.
6. Rental of an Armoury.

A decision is therefore required from both an operational and estates perspective with regards to which option appears most attractive to the Organisation

3. Options and or Recommendations

Full details of each of these options is contained within the attached paper – appendix A – armoury decision paper.

Option 1 - Purchase of a mobile Armoury

The cost of this option is around £220,000.

This is a “worse case price” provided via SWPPD from one supplier.

Should this option be supported then a competitive tendering process will follow and it is anticipated that costs will therefore reduce.

Benefits of Option 1

- Bespoke facility designed to meet Gloucestershire Constabulary needs.
- An independent facility would not impact on other functions.
- Relatively short delivery time (8 weeks construction plus 4 weeks tendering process).
- There are no planning implications by placing the armoury in the GTEC carpark.
- The facility would retain an asset value for either resale or rental which would generate an income for the Constabulary. This has been quoted to be a re-sale value of 50% of the original purchase price, or a monthly income rental value of £4500 per month.
- Operationally efficient as it could/ would be located close to users.
- This option has the least risk and less resource requirement for delivery.

Dis-benefits of Option 1

- Impacts on partners and colleagues (will be located within GTEC car park which will displace a number of the parking facilities).
- It would present a storage challenge should the Constabulary wish to keep it on a long term basis. This could be mitigated by the fact that land will be available on the Bamfurlong site once the re-provision has been completed.
- Inflexible, no capacity for expansion or growth during the period that it would be used.
- Limited vehicular access would prolong ARV handover period.
- No associated office space provided.

Option 2 – Purchase of a used Armoury.

This option has been discounted on the basis that no such used-armoury exists for purchase.

Option 3 – Bespoke construction of an Armoury within existing Police estate.

This options has two sub-options:-

Option 3a - Phoenix House

Construction of a facility at Phoenix House would cost of £238,000.

This is higher than the original estimate due to a requirement for additional ballistic protection in order to comply with legislative guidance and planning requirements.

Benefits of Option 3a:-

- Within Waterwells Campus and so meets requirement of operating model (as this is where Specialist Operations functions will be located).
- The facility will remain as a usable asset (e.g. secure property store for high value items).
- Operationally viable in that as the proposed facility replicates what already exists in Bamfurlong it is tried and tested as a design concept, albeit the location and alignment to other functions is different.
- Utilises existing estate.

Dis-benefits of Option 3a:-

- Expensive option due to security requirements as laid out within the Firearms Security Handbook 2019,
- Displaces other critical functions (DVD / CD / ABE store).
- This is an insecure location.
- Disruptive to other users at this location due to restricted access to the armoury facility and a reduction in working space for other existing users (including vehicle space).
- This is currently not a 24/7 operational location.
- This option attracts an adverse H&S Risk Assessment that has been peer assessed by another Force who supports findings.
- Inadequate parking for operational vehicles.
- Unsuitable for clandestine specialist functions.
- Costs would increase should it be decided to decommission this armoury facility once its temporary requirement had expired.

Option 3b - Compass House

Construction of a facility at Compass House would cost £73,634 for initial provision and a further estimated circa £25,000 to convert back to a Custody facility (total £98,634).

Benefits of Option 3b:-

- Within Waterwells Campus and so meets requirement of operating model (as this is where Specialist Operations functions will be located).
- Secure location.

- Operationally viable.
- Adequate parking for operational vehicles.
- Most cost effective option.
- Use within existing estate.
- This is currently a 24/7 operational location.
- Minimal daily disruption on other users at this location, albeit there would be an impact on persons who would otherwise be using this facility.
- This option attracts a more favourable Risk Assessment).

Dis-Benefits of Option 3b:-

- Reduction in custody capacity.
- Loss of TACT facility.
- Loss of fall back booking in facility.
- Adverse impact regarding Civil Contingencies (corona virus / public order).
- Loss of custody capacity for detainees from special interest groups (e.g. VIPs, Mental Health).
- Significant risk of Gun Shot Residue (GSR) contamination (see main report).
- GSR contamination risk would remain after facility reverts back to traditional custody use (see main report).

Option 4 – Conversion Project (container conversion).

This option would cost £260k.

This option has been scoped and costed. In effect this amounted to the Constabulary commissioning its own purchase and conversion of containers similar to those that are adapted and then supplied as per Option 1.

This option would be constructed in compliance with guidance referred to above (i.e. Police Security Handbook 2019 and Approved Professional Practice.

With this option the proposal would be to locate this unit in the space previously identified for the unit in Option 1 i.e. GTEC car park.

The benefits and dis-benefits of this option are the same as that listed under Option 1.

As detailed under Section 3 (Finance / Costs) of the main report this option will not be recommended as the projected costs exceed all other options and the end result can be achieved by the alternative purchase as detailed under Option 1.

Option 5 – Construction of a traditional build Armoury

This would require a suitable location to be identified within the Constabulary estate and once that was done, the cost would be around £212,238.

Benefits of Option 5:-

- Allows for provision of a bespoke / fit for purpose facility.

- Avoids disruption of other users at this location.
- Facility would retain an asset value (i.e. could be used for other functions when no longer required as an Armoury).

Dis-Benefits of Option 5:-

- Conflicts with Information Security advice.
- Expensive compared with alternative options.
- This option would significantly reduce the operational parking capacity at this location
- The projected build time (including requirement for Planning Permission) would mean that this option would not be provided in time.

Option 6 – Rental of an Armoury

This option would cost £165,000 for a period of 36 months.

It has been a challenging exercise to identify a supplier who provides an armoury rental service and efforts to date have included support from the South West Police Procurement Department who have conducted a nationwide search as a part of the market testing referred to above.

This has identified only a very small number of potential suppliers.

The (rental) units are designed to be housed within a larger building as opposed to being stand-alone buildings and so do not conform to the security levels that would be required for an external armoury.

Further to this, a rented unit would not be specific to the requirements of the Constabulary as it would be a generic unit, for example there would be no armourer's workshop facility.

Enquiries with suppliers have confirmed rental costings to be within the region of £165k for the desired period of time that we would require it. Whilst this is more cost effective than some of the other options it is still a high cost option especially having regard to the fact that there is no asset value at the end of the period for the Constabulary. This option will not be recommended given the dis-benefits that it attracts.

Recommendation

CGB was asked to support the following recommendation:-

- 1. Option 1 - Purchase of a mobile Armoury at a cost of £220,000.**

Reasoning

It is accepted that Option 1 appears expensive (and so could be viewed as cost prohibitive) on initial view.

The estimated cost is high level and should this option be supported then a competitive tendering process will follow, meaning that the cost should reduce – the cost quoted in the paper is the worst case scenario.

The Constabulary would however own an asset that both retains a value and could be utilised in the future to generate an income through:-

- Rental – between £4,000 and £4,500 per month (confirmed by market testing)
- “buy back” (where the supplier would consider purchasing the unit from the Constabulary once its use is no longer required). High level estimate states the unit would be worth between 50% and 70% of purchase price dependent upon duration of Constabulary use and Condition.

Option 3a - (Phoenix House) would also provide a Constabulary asset post decant use but it would amount to a disproportionality expensive outlay for what would in effect be a storage facility.

Option 3b – (Compass House) has many attractions as highlighted as benefits however the loss of this Custody area together with the risk relating to forensic contamination outweigh the positives to using this location. It is accepted that this risks raised around forensic contamination are based on local expert opinion, further understanding of this can be obtained from an identified National Forensic expert and this would cost circa £1000. This potential issue would also attract scrutiny from:

- The Forensic Science Regulator. **
- SO15
- CPS **
- University of Warwick (Key Forensic Services Ltd). **
- HMICFRS

** contacted and a response is awaited.

Option 1 is the only option that would mitigate the high level risks highlighted as dis-benefits in the remaining options:-

- Risk and impact to other users at the locations examined (See Appendix 1)
- GSR / Forensic contamination and the risk of undermining prosecution opportunities (See Appendix 2).

Option 1 also serves as an investment in that it would retain a value which in turn neutralises an element of the initial cost, it would also provide a contingency going forward should there be an expansion in demand for resources linked to the firearms function.

Please see attached armoury paper for full details of the summary and options for this paper.

4. Financial and resource implications

The cost of each option is as follows:-

1. The purchase of a new, mobile Armoury.	£220k
2. Purchase of a used mobile Armoury.	No figures available – mobile armoury does not exist
3. Bespoke construction of an Armoury within existing Police Estate:	
A. Phoenix House	£238k
B. Compass House	£98k
4. A conversion project where the Constabulary would commission its own construction of a containerised Armoury option similar to that which is available and presented as Option 1 and referred to above.	£260k
5. Construction of a traditional build Armoury within suitably identified Police estate grounds.	£212k
6. Rental of an Armoury.	£165k

5. Risk Assessment

A full risk log is contained within the attached paper – appendix A.

6. Equality and Diversity impact assessment

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 states that a public authority should carry out an assessment prior to implementing a policy or initiative, with a view to ascertaining its potential impact on equality. Noting of relevance to this duty is contained within this paper.

7. Environmental impact assessment

There may be an environmental impact dependant on the option chosen.

8. Consultation

Consultation has taken place with key stakeholders as part of the CGB process.

9. Discussed with Communications & Engagement

The head of Communications and Engagement has submitted their views as part of the consultation process.

10. Conclusion

It has been agreed that over the coming months the Police Operational Centre at Bamfurlong will be decommissioned and a number existing functions that currently operate at that site will be relocated for a period of between 18 and 36 months. The deployment of armed officers is one of the functions that will require relocating during this period.

Work has been undertaken to determine the most operationally and most cost effective method of providing a temporary armoury. CGB supported the recommendation to purchase a new mobile armoury which will be located in space in the GTEC carpark.

The cost of this option is estimated to be £220k and a budget of £232k has been identified to finance this purchase.

PCC G board is asked to note this decision.

SPONSORING BOARD MEMBER APPROVAL

Name: Jon Stratford

Job title: Deputy Chief Constable

Signature:



Date: 18/03/2020

CHIEF EXECUTIVE APPROVAL

I am satisfied that relevant advice has been taken into account in the preparation of the report and that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the PCC.

Signature:



Date: 20/03/2020

Papers considered at CGB:-

1. Main CGB paper



8. Temporary
armoury - main paper

2. Outline Business Case



8. Appendix A -
Armoury Decision Pa