

Jenna Litherland
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

6 July 2018

Our Ref: 17/3583

Dear Ms Litherland,

Re: 17 Charterhouse Street, London, EC1N 6RA

Application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (As Amended)

On behalf of our client, Anglo American and De Beers (AA & DB), please find enclosed an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (As Amended) seeking a Minor Material Amendment to the extant planning permission 2017/4586/P pursuant to the above site.

Planning permission was granted on 24 January 2018 for the following:

Extensions and refurbishment of the existing part seven, part five storey (plus basement) building including erection of a single storey roof extension to Saffron Hill block, part two-storey and part five-storey extensions within central courtyard, part removal of the existing façade and part replacement with new glazed, metal and stonework façade to Charterhouse Street. Access alterations including redesign of existing pedestrian entrance and relocation of vehicular entrance on Charterhouse Street. Remodelling and replacement of existing plant and equipment. Provision of cycle parking spaces, and associated landscaping works.

The proposed Minor Material Amendment relates to the entrance door from the main Charterhouse Street block into the central courtyard. The approved plans show a sliding door, which is proposed to be replaced by an air-lock system (sliding) door and adjacent emergency exit side hinged door.

The unusual and specific security requirements relating to the contents and use of the building by Anglo American and De Beers preclude the use of the approved sliding door, which provides an insufficient security defence. Secure means of access to the building have been discussed with the Metropolitan Police's Design Out Crime Officer, who has stated support for the proposed amendment to a revolving door (and adjacent sliding door) on the Charterhouse Street façade (subject of a separate planning application), and the amendment to the courtyard entrance follows the same principle. The letter from the Metropolitan Police, dated 15 March 2018, is provided at **Appendix 1**.

The proposed scheme amendment therefore balances inclusive access needs with the unique security requirements of the businesses. The revised proposal provides an entrance that meets the design requirements of Part M of the Building

Directors
Helen Cuthbert | Stuart Slatter | Claire Temple | Alastair Close
Dan Templeton

Associate Directors
Katie Turvey | Heather Vickers

Consultant
Lorna Byrne

Associates
Sally Arnold | Rob Scadding | Alan Williams | David Williams

Regulations 2010, the recommendations of BS8300, and supports the London Plan Policy 7.2 regarding inclusive access. This access solution also provides a secure entrance that can be easily locked down, prevent unauthorised access, and therefore maximises the security and safety of occupants.

The following drawings are enclosed within the submission:

Existing

Existing Ground Floor Plan - P17-059-A-05-00.

Approved

Proposed Ground Floor Plan - P17-082-A-07-00 Rev. P3; and

Courtyard Entrance – Scheme as Approved P17-059-A-07-ELE-33 Rev. P1.

Proposed

Proposed Ground Floor Plan - P17-059-A-07-00 Rev. P5;

Proposed Courtyard Elevation - P17-059-A-07-ELE-10 Rev. P3; and

Courtyard Entrance – Revised Proposal P17-059-A-07-ELE-34 Rev. P1.

A Site Location Plan (P17-059-A-07-SIT-01 Rev. P1) and CIL Form are also enclosed.

We trust that the enclosed drawings and documents are sufficient for the application to be validated and look forward to receiving confirmation in due course. The application fee of £234 has been paid via the Planning Portal.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'P. Galgey', is positioned above the printed name.

Paul Galgey MRTPI

Senior Planner

Planning Potential

London

Appendix 1 - Letter from Metropolitan Police, 15 March 2018

Paul Gagley
Magdalen House
148 Tooley Street
London
SE1 2TU

Continuous Policing Improvement
Command (CPIC)

Jim Cope

**Police Constable – Design Out Crime
Officer**

Metropolitan Police Service

Continuous Policing Improvement
Command (CPIC)

m 0208 733 3703

a. Ruislip Police Station, 5 The Oaks,
Ruislip, HA4 7LF

w: www.met.police.uk e:
Jim.Cope@met.pnn.police.uk

Dear Paul,

The following recommendations are as a result of the meeting with yourself and other relevant partners who are involved in the development of 17 Charterhouse Street, EC1 which was held on the 14th March 2018.

As discussed the major concern surrounding the design of the building is the main entrance doors that are situated on Charterhouse Street and which are opposite Shoe Lane. It is strongly felt that this area is vulnerable, as Shoe Lane provides ample space for a vehicle to achieve a maximum speed to ram the main entrance doors and force entry. This type of attack would be difficult during the day due to the large amount of traffic coming from Holborn Circus to Farringdon Street but would not be impossible if a look out was used covering the blind junction. It would more than likely occur at night when the building is not in use and vehicle activity is reduced.

The only way to prevent this type of attack on the building would be the placement of HVM (Hostile Vehicle Mitigation) bollards between the kerbing and building line. As I explained during the meeting this is something I cannot myself recommend so have requested advice from the local CTSA (Counter Terrorism Security Advisor).

Currently the main entrance doors are shown as being Two (2) automatic 'Clam' style type sliding doors. These work on the principle that as the first door opens the second door will also open in a short space of time to allow entry into the building. In theory the first door should be closed as the second opens to prevent loss of heat and prevent inclement weather from entering the building. Unfortunately, if used on a high pedestrian usage building the doors are found to be continually open and any security they may have is lost.

Therefore, as a security feature to any building I would not recommend the above style doors as the best way to control access and movement into the building. Due to the proposed use of the 17 Charterhouse Street security is a major issue and this has been addressed with other parts of the building. From analysing the plans the main

entrance/reception is currently the weakest part of the building and will need to be addressed. I would recommend the fitting of an LPS 1175 Issue SR2 (as minimum security rated product) revolving door and if another access is required complying with DDA then these should also be rated to LPS 1175 Issue SR2. Obviously these are not security tested to a vehicle attack but can easily be 'locked down' from the reception desk and prevent any other unauthorised access.

If you require any further help or advice then I will be more than happy to assist.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Cope