LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN	
PLANNING	
CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN	
Proposed Development at: John Stewart House 51 Calthorpe Street London WC1X 0HH	
Proposal: Change of use of office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) and erection of a first floor extension to front and a three storey extension to the rear to provide 16x units.	**Case No:** 2013/5445/P
Case Officer: Ben Le Mare	**Date:**

Conservation Area	
Listed Building	
Adjoining Listed Building	
TPO	
Local Design Policy	

OBSERVATIONS:

The proposals include some landscaping to the front garden area which is currently hard standing and a living roof. These features are considered to be an enhancement in terms of visual amenity and ecological benefits over the existing situation.

It is recommended the following conditions are added:

CE02A and CE04A (landscape)

GR001- (Living roofs)

Negotiate	
Approve	Y
Refuse	

Signed--- Date------------------------------

Alex Hutson 04/11/2013

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN	
PLANNING	
CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN	
Proposed Development at: John Stewart House **51 Calthorpe Street** **London** **WC1X 0HH**	
Proposal: **Change of use of office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) and erection of a first floor extension to front and a three storey extension to the rear to provide 16x units.**	**Case No:** **2013/5445/P**
Case Officer: Ben Le Mare	**Date: 1st November 2013**

Conservation Area	Y
Listed Building	N
Adjoining Listed Building	Y
TPO	
Local Design Policy	

OBSERVATIONS:

Site and surroundings
This site is occupied by a 'T' shaped building used as office for and storage. It was a former School House dating from the 19th Century.

To the east is an eleven storey hotel dating from the early 90s (permission granted 8900385). The hotel is a dominant feature in the street scene and is of a scale far in excess of the 2/ 3 storey historic properties nearby. Adjoining the site to the west are a group of 3 three storey Grade II Listed houses nos.45 to 49 Calthorpe Street. To the north is a school and the northwest a terrace of two storey mid 19th century cottages.

The site lies within the strategic viewing corridors of Kenwood to St Pauls and Parliament Hill to St Pauls and is in the Central London Area. The Bloomsbury CAAMS (April 2011) identified the building as a positive feature in the area, and has thus included the site within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area boundary, and has designated the building as a positive contributor within the Conservation Area.

A planning brief has just been completed for the redevelopment of the Royal Mail sites on either side of Phoenix Place.

Relevant Planning History
28790 - Change of use of the building from warehousing to use for light industrial purposes. Granted with conditions, though neither restrict uses to B1c.

2012/6859/P Single storey extension to front, three storey extension to rear and excavation of a basement, in connection with the change of use of the property from office (Class B1) to create 17 new dwellings (Class C3) REFUSED on the 16/04/2013 for (design and conservation reasons)

1. The proposed development would create an unacceptable level of overlooking between windows serving habitable rooms on the west elevation of the host building and existing hotel bedrooms on the adjoining site, which would be to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and to policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2. The proposed rear and roof extensions, by reason of their scale, massing and detailed design would detract from the historic character of the building and fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area and setting of nearby listed buildings, which is contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
3. Insufficient information has been submitted to enable the Council to determine whether the application should be accompanied by application for conservation area consent and subsequently demonstrate that these proposed works would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the building and the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area and setting of the nearby listed buildings, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) and CS14 (promote high quality places) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (securing high quality design) and DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Considerations
The main issues to consider are the impact the demolition and redevelopment of the site would have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (designated heritage asset and Building (undesignated heritage asset with particular regard for NPPF and relevant local policies DP24(a-i) and DP25(c) and (g).

Unfortunately the proposed scheme has failed to satisfactorily overcome the previous reasons for refusal. A combination of the cumulative impact of the proposed extensions are considered fail to be remain subordinate to the host building and as such would unduly impact on the character and appearance of the building and thus the character and the character of the wider conservation area. It is possible to extend and alter the existing building. However when the combination of the all of the works are considered together they result in over development in a manner which is considered harmful.

Significance
Architecturally, the building's main interest lies in the front elevation, a design of some sophistication, which tentatively attributed to the firm of Roumieu & Gough. The symmetrical composition of neo-classical proportions, with the three middle bays projecting makes a positive contribution to the streetscape in terms of its aesthetic and architectural value.

Moreover the building appears to have been built as one, as a purpose built school around 1830. As such it is of historical interest as a former school (built for the British and Foreign School Society, providing a cheap education for the children of the poor at a time when free universal education was not available). From the late nineteenth century it served a quasi-military use as a drill hall, and more recently it has been used as workshops by a number of small businesses.

The form and design of the building is consistent with its use as a school and its subsequent adaptability. As is common with school buildings of this era the building is formed in a 'T' shape with the rear element forming the double height hall. This is consistent with the existing arrangement. The double height windows of the old school and drill hall can still be seen in views between 4 Peckenham Street and 45 Calthorpe Street., albeit that later alterations have resulted in an additional floor being inserted in the space. As such the form and external envelope of the building as a whole is also considered to be "largely original and form part of the building's significance." The building was identified in the late 19th century as a 'Drill Hall', and in the 1900 Post Office directory it is home to the Volunteer Medical Corps. As such the building is also considered to have evidential, historical and communal value.

Setting
The adjoining hotel is the most immediate negative feature in the sites setting. Other lesser negative features include the front of the property, including its unsympathetic front boundary treatment

More positive aspects of the setting include the buildings and development to the immediate west and north, including the adjoining slightly later development of terraced houses at 45-49 Calthorpe Street, Calthorpe Street to the west and the terrace on the east side of Pakenham Street. These are all either listed buildings, or identified by Camden as positive contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The rear range of no.51 is visible through a gap at the south end of this terrace where again it is somewhat overshadowed by the Holiday Inn.

I agree with the Heritage Statement that the building makes a positive contributions but an opportunity exists to effect improvements in its external appearance (central doors) and immediate setting (front area and boundary).

Demolition
Demolition plans have been provided which satisfactorily show that the building would be largely retained, preserving the important aspects of the façade as outline above.

Height, Bulk and Design
In this regard the main issue to consider is the impact of the proposed works on the significance of the building and wider conservation area. Any new elements are required to respond to the character and architectural quality of the existing building to ensure it preserves and enhances the undesignated heritage asset (the site) or heritage assets (Bloomsbury Conservation Area and adjoining Listed Buildings).

The front boundary would also be enhanced by the works thereby enhancing the setting of the building. There is not considered to be an issue with the slight increase in the size of the front lightwells.

However, the height and bulk of the rear extension and roof extension is considered to overwhelm the existing building, extending above the existing rear part of the building by two storeys and wrapping over the top of the front part of the building. The front part of the building would also extended by a complete storey. Whilst an extension to the front element of the building could be deemed acceptable, the cumulative impact of the extensions results in an inability to satisfactorily appreciate and recognise the original form and scale of the building appropriately.

The rear element, whilst seen in the context of the hotel, would be visible from the public realm and continue to overwhelm the host building. The proposed height is also considered to result in a top- heavy appearance when seen in views east from Peckham Street.

The architectural approach has been to extrude a new modern extension out of the retained envelope of the building, allowing the old and new works to be seen independently and thereby preserving the original form of the building. However the detailed design is not considered to satisfactorily demonstrate this will be achieved. For example the terraces created at 2nd and 3rd floor level would project beyond the predominant west elevation building line of new extension, disrupting the form of the modern extension, encroaching on the existing envelope and further overwhelming the building at this point.

The proposal to extend the main façade would significantly alter the original form and proportions of the building. In order to address the issues regarding the extension, a more appropriate approach would be to reduce the extension by a storey, allowing one additional floor to the main façade. If this were designed to be differently than the existing façade, it would more easily allow the original form and proportions of the building to be recognised and appreciated. This would more sensitively address the original form and proportions of the front entrance whilst giving the building more presence against the adjoining hotel block.

Our view is consistent with formal pre-application planning advice (ref: 04477) in July 2012 which stated *"It is likely to be possible to include an additional storey on each element of the building, subject to detailed design and amenity issues, particularly given the scale of the adjoining buildings. Any accommodation above an additional storey is not advisable as it is likely to undue harm on the architectural scale and character of the host building."*

Conclusion
The proposed scheme has failed to satisfactorily overcome the previous design reason for refusal. The cumulative impact of the proposed extensions fails to remain subordinate to the host building and as such would unduly impact on the character and appearance of the building and the wider conservation area. It is possible to extend and alter the existing building. However, when the combination of all the works are considered together, they result in over-development in a manner which is considered harmful.

The proposed rear and roof extensions, by reason of their overall height, bulk and detailed design, would therefore detract from the historic character of the building and fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area and setting of nearby listed buildings. This is contrary to the design guidance set out in CPG1 and policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed rear and roof extensions, by reason of their overall height, bulk and detailed design, would detract from the historic character of the building and fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area and setting of nearby listed buildings, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Negotiate	
Approve	
Refuse	Y

C Rose **November 2013**

Signed-- Date-------------------------------

Le Mare, Ben

From:	Gibbs, Kate
Sent:	07 October 2013 16:33
To:	Le Mare, Ben
Subject:	FW: 2012/6859/P John Stewart House, 51 Calthorpe Street

Hi Ben

We've received a consultee letter about 51 Calthorpe St, so I'm just resending you the comments we made in march below – I think these should still be relevant.

Thanks

Kate

Kate Gibbs
Economic Development Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 8549

From: Gibbs, Kate
Sent: 14 March 2013 15:33
To: Le Mare, Ben
Cc: Fernandes, Genny
Subject: 2012/6859/P John Stewart House, 51 Calthorpe Street

Dear Ben

2012/6859/P John Stewart House, 51 Calthorpe Street

Economic Development have received a consultee letter with regard to the above application. Apologies that these comments are a little late.

Should this application be approved, we would request the following in terms of S106 requirements;

- The developer should be asked to contribute a training and employment contribution of **£35,750** to mitigate the loss of employment opportunities for Camden residents in accordance with CPG8, paragraph 8.14. This contribution is calculated as follows;

  1,075 sq m (employment floorspace lost) / 19 sq m (average space per worker) = 57 FTE jobs lost

  57 (FTE jobs lost) x 23% (% of Camden residents in the workforce) = 13 FTE

  13 x £2,750 (no of jobs lost which would have been expected to be filled by Camden residents x cost of training per employee) = £35,750

With regard to the **development phase** of the scheme Economic Development would seek to secure the following in order to maximise the opportunities to local residents and businesses

- The applicant be required to work to a target of 20% local recruitment.

- The applicant advertise all construction vacancies and work placement opportunities exclusively with the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre for a period of 1 week before marketing more widely.

- The applicant provide a specified number (to be agreed) of work placement opportunities of not less than 2 weeks each, to be undertaken over the course of the development, to be recruited through the Council's Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre.

- If the build costs of the scheme exceed 3 million the applicant must recruit 1 **construction apprentice** per £3million of build costs, and pay the council a support fee of £1,500 per apprentice as per clause 8.17 of CPG8. Recruitment of construction apprentices should be conducted through the Council's Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre.

- If the value of the scheme exceeds £1million, the applicant must also sign up to the Camden **Local Procurement Code**, as per section 8.19 of CPG8

- The applicant provide a local employment, skills and local supply plan setting out their plan for delivering the above requirements.

Thank you.

Kate Gibbs
Economic Development Officer
Communities
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 8549
Web: camden.gov.uk

7th Floor
Town Hall Extension (Culture and Environment)
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Kate Gibbs
Economic Development Officer
Communities
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 8549
Web: camden.gov.uk

7th Floor
Town Hall Extension (Culture and Environment)
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Le Mare, Ben

From:	Humfrey, Nick
Sent:	07 November 2013 14:03
To:	Le Mare, Ben
Subject:	FW: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2013/5445/P
Attachments:	M3C847.doc

Ben,

Comments on sustainability issues below. I'm going to be away from tomorrow afternoon so please could you direct any air quality issues directly to Poppy Lyle in the meantime. With regard to drainage, if it can possibly wait, I'll make sure I pick it up first thing when I get back on 25th.

Drainage:

There is no major surface water risk but it is still disappointing to see that there will be no move to reduce the drainage from the building in line with CPG3 and the London Plan. However there is limited space for drainage and so we would accept no action other than a brown roof on the top underneath the PV.

With regards to the BIA, it notes that theadvice of a reputable dewatering contractor, familiar with the type of ground and groundwater conditions encountered on this site, should be sought prior to finalising the design of the excavation for the basement. We would ask for this be a condition of approval.

The BIA also notes that the existence of basement in adjacent properties must be determined to assess possible impacts. Given the limited opportunities to put in mitigating SuDS we would expect this to happen before a BIA could be approved and ask that they investigate this now.

Air Quality
We question the need for CHP and ask if it can be reconsidered given the high levels of NO2 in the area. Any CHP would have to adhere to the GLA standards which could well make it very expensive. If the develpers believe that meeting the GLA standards are still the best option, then we will will require a planning condition requiring modelling of the impact of the CHP at all sensitive receptors to show that there is no more than a 'negligible' increase according to EPUK guidelines, and evidence that the CHP conforms to the latest emissions limits outlined in the GLA Sustainable Design and Construction.

We're pleased to see that mitigation actions include implementation of green infrastructure and would ask that there is a condition that if Air Quality officer approval is required should they decide not to put in green infrastructure and that, in this case, ventilation with carbon filters should also be considered.

The construction management plan will need to include IAQM and air emissions mitigation measures. We will need a condition for two dust monitors, the location of which will need to be agreed with the Air Quality Officer.

Energy
No concern but query as to the appropriateness of CHP..

Thanks

Nick Humfrey
Sustainability Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 4027
-----Original Message-----
From: Le Mare, Ben
Sent: 28 October 2013 16:44
To: Humfrey, Nick
Subject: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2013/5445/P

Please find attached Consultee letter for PlanningApplication application 2013/5445/P

Y2013/5445/P

TRANSPORT STRATEGY
PUBLIC REALM AND PLANNING

To:	Ben Le Mare Development Control Team Town Hall Extension, 5th Floor
From:	Zoë Trower
Date:	1st October 2013
Re:	**51 Calthorpe Street, John Stewart House, London, WC1X 0HH** *Single storey extension to front, three storey extension to rear and excavation of a basement, in connection with the change of use of the property from office (Class B1) to create 17 new dwellings (Class C3)*
Reference:	**2013/5445/P**
Key Points:	The proposals are **acceptable** to Transport subject to the following:

- A financial contribution required to repave the footway and remove the existing crossovers adjacent to the site. This will need to be secured through a **Section 106**
- A **Section 106** agreement to designate all the new residential units as car free.
- The CMP to be secured by **Section 106**

BACKGROUND

The proposal site is currently in use as an office location and this proposal seeks to change the use of the building to residential including the erection of a single story to the front and three stories to the rear. Once the property is completed it would provide 16 new residential units. The site is within the Bloomsbury Conservation area and is located parallel to Greys Inn Road and is well within 1km from Kings Cross, Russell Square and Farringdon Station. There is no vehicular access to the site and access to public transport is excellent (PTAL 6b).

TRANSPORT OBSERVATIONS

Car Free

No off-street parking is currently provided and none is proposed. In line with Policy DP18 all 16 of the flats should be designated as being car free. The council will not agree to a designated disabled car parking space linked to this development as it has not been justified. Car free would be secured by means of a Section 106 Agreement.

For car free housing and car capped housing, the Council will:

- not issue on-street residential parking permits;
- use planning obligations to ensure that future occupants are aware they are not entitled to on-street parking permits; and

- not grant planning permission for development that incorporates car parking spaces, other than spaces designated for people with disabilities, and a limited number of spaces for car capped housing in accordance with Council's Parking Standards.

Cycle Parking
Camden's Parking Standards for cycles DP18, states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit up to two bedrooms, for residential units with three or more bedrooms, two spaces are required. The proposal is for 17 residential units including six, three bedroom units; therefore 23 cycle storage/parking spaces are required. The applicant has included plans for the appropriate number of storage units to be installed within each residential unit and not in a secure collective unit. Although the principle of this arrangement was accepted at pre-app it is disappointing to note that this has not been undertaken for all the units, especially the larger 3-bed units including flats 1, 2, 6, 8 and 9. Instead a collective communal area for cycle storage has been incorporated into the basement area. Although clearly the agreed principle has been ignored, it is recognised that a lift of suitable size (approx 2mx2m) has been incorporated into the building to allow cycle access to all floors and that the overall number of cycle spaces is in connection to the cycle parking standards, if not in strict accordance with CPG7 layout guidance.

Construction Management Plan (CMP)
The development is demolishing and removing a significant quantity of soil and debris from the site and is likely to have a high impact on the local highways network and residents. During the pre-application stage the applicant took advice that CMP would be required as part of the planning consent and at this stage advice was sought about what would be required in such a plan. The applicant has provided a CMP covering almost all the areas required by such an agreement. I am satisfied that measures have been taken wherever possible to reduce the impact of construction but will require the applicant to consult with local residents prior to the development starting regarding the plans that will impact their daily lives. This is part of the full CMP that was requested at pre-application and should be secured by condition.

Highways Financial Contribution
In order to cover the costs of any damage caused to the public highways during the construction phase of this development, and to ensure that the footway ties the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution is required to repave the footway adjacent to the site. An estimate cost for the works has been requested from the Highways team and will be provided in due course.

Please note that planning permission does not guarantee that highways works will be implemented as it is always subject to further detailed design, consultation and approval by the Highway Authority.

CONCLUSION
The proposals are **acceptable** in transport terms subject to the following planning conditions and obligations:

- A financial contribution required to repave the footway and remove the existing crossovers adjacent to the site. This will need to be secured through a **Section 106** (Town and Country Planning Act 1990) Agreement with the Council. The Council will undertake all works within the highway reservation, at the cost to the developer

- A **Section 106** agreement to designate all the new residential units as car free. The applicant will need to indicate all the proposed units as car free on drawings of the floor plans and these plans should be attached to the Section 106 agreement to avoid any future doubt.

- The CMP provided will need to be consulted on with local residents prior to any development taking place. This needs to be secured by **Section 106**.

Le Mare, Ben

From:	Schultz, Weronika
Sent:	27 September 2013 15:41
To:	Le Mare, Ben
Subject:	Comments 51 Calthorpe St 2013/5445/P

Ben,

RE: Comments in relation to contaminated land, planning ref: 2013/5445/P (2012/6859/P), 51 Calthorpe St

My comments are exactly the same as the previous time. The applicant shall carry out a proper risk assessment as described in an email below.
I would request this prior to permission being given.

Kind regards,

Weronika

Weronika Schultz
Environmental Health Officer LAPPC (Industrial Installations)

Telephone: 020 7974 2794

From: Schultz, Weronika
Sent: 31 January 2013 12:33
To: Le Mare, Ben
Subject: Comments 51 Calthorpe St 2012/6859/P

Dear Ben

E: Comments in relation to contaminated land, planning ref: 2012/6859/P, 51 Calthorpe St

Address:
John Stewart House
51 Calthorpe Street
London
WC1X 0HH

The Proposed Work:
Single storey extension to front, three storey extension to rear and excavation of a basement, in connection with the change of use of the property from office (Class B1) to create 17 new dwellings (Class C3)

I reviewed the Basement Impact Assessment prepared for the above development by Create Consulting Engineers Ltd and can advise as follows:

The document does not provide any information regarding ground conditions in terms of potential chemical contamination neither human health risk assessment has been carried out to determine possible pollutant linkages.

Our records indicate that the following past industrial uses of plausible concern were carried out on or within 100 metres of the site:

- Foundry - Brass and Iron, Food Factory, Printing Works, Electrical Sub Station, Timber Yard, Garage, Unknown Works, Unknown Industrial Use, Postal Telegraph Factory

According to our contaminated land risk categorisation, land on which several of the above processes/activities were carried out is inherently considered to present a plausible risk of contamination. It is considered likely that such land would exhibit areas of significantly elevated contamination levels widespread across the site with moderate magnitude to cause harm.

I suggest that no permission shall be given unless sufficient documentation is received by contaminated land officer which shall comprise of:

A written detailed scheme of assessment consisting of site reconnaissance, conceptual model, risk assessment and proposed schedule of investigation. The scheme of assessment must be sufficient to assess the scale and nature of potential contamination risks including ground gas on the site and shall include details of the number of sample points, the sampling methodology and the type and quantity of analyses proposed. Firm conclusions should be made and the need for land remediation determined. Documentation submitted must comply with the standards of the Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (CLR11) and be carried out in line with BS10175:2011 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for further clarification if needed.

Regards,

Weronika

Weronika Schultz BSc MCIEH
Environmental Health Officer LAPPC (Industrial Installations)
Regeneration and Planning
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 2794
Fax: 020 7974 6955
Web: camden.gov.uk

7th Floor.
Town Hall Extension (Culture and Environment)
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Camden

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

ACCESS COMMENTS

From: Michelle Horn
Tel. number: 020 7974 5124
Ref: 2013/5445/P
Date: 14/10/13

To: Ben Le Mare

Re: John Stewart House, 51 Calthorpe Street
Change of use of office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) and erection of a first floor extension to front and a three storey extension to the rear to provide 16x units.

As a change of use to residential Part M of the Building Regulations only requires that access is made no worse than previously existed. Planning policy DP6 will require all the dwellings be designed to fully comply with Lifetime homes standards and 10% to be suitable for or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

Lifetime homes:

The applicant has submitted a lifetime homes statement indicating that all dwellings will comply and the drawings confirm this to be the case.

Wheelchair housing:

One of the units will need to be designed to be easily adaptable for wheelchair users. As only units 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 & 15 are fully accessible by lift one of these should be highlighted as the easily adaptable property. Full details of this should be submitted confirming the space standards, as set out in our planning policy, have been achieved.

Le Mare, Ben

From: Adam.Lindsay@met.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 25 September 2013 09:01
To: Le Mare, Ben
Subject: 2013/5445/P, 51 Calthorpe Street

Ben,

Section 8 of the design and access statement describes the requirements for Secured By Design.

A minor issue is that glazing will be laminated glass.

Other than that, this is an appropriate application for SBD.

Regards Adam Lindsay

Design Out Crime Officer

Pc 207 TP, Ruislip Police Station

The Oaks, Ruislip,

TP C&S North West

0208 733 3703
07825103933

Total Policing is the Met's commitment to be on the streets and in your communities to catch offenders, prevent crime and support victims. We are here for London, working with you to make our capital safer.

Consider our environment - please do not print this email unless absolutely necessary.

NOTICE - This email and any attachments may be confidential, subject to copyright and/or legal privilege and are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. To avoid incurring legal liabilities, you must not distribute or copy the information in this email without the permission of the sender. MPS communication systems are monitored to the extent permitted by law. Consequently, any email and/or attachments may be read by monitoring staff. Only specified personnel are authorised to conclude any binding agreement on behalf of the MPS by email. The MPS accepts no responsibility for unauthorised agreements reached with other employees or agents. The security of this email and any attachments cannot be guaranteed. Email messages are routinely scanned but malicious software infection and corruption of content can still occur during transmission over the Internet. Any views or opinions expressed in this communication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS).

Find us at:

Facebook: Facebook.com/metpoliceuk

Twitter: @metpoliceuk