



Thank you for allowing me to comment on planning application 2018/6016/P which relates to the construction of a Eight (8) storey building which will contain a 153 bedroom hotel, Ten (10) residential units and approximately 2000 square metres of refurbished office space.

I have no objections to the proposal but have the following comments and recommendations to make in relation to make which I feel will need to be addressed for the safety and security of the end users and which will improve the sustainability and life of the buildings. I have had a meeting with the applicants which was held on the 15th January 2019 and my recommendations are as a result of the thoroughly going over the plans and establishing the interaction between all the uses of the buildings.

Comments and Recommendations

Residential

- ∞ Main communal door to be security rated to LPS 1175 SR2 – Controlled with encrypted FOB access for residents with video/audio control for visitors which will allow the resident to disengage the locking mechanism from their own home. The door should have a minimum of Two (2) magnetic locks which are two thirds from the top and bottom of the frame and are integral to the door frame.
- ∞ Secured lobby area door will be required to be PAS24:2016 – Once again controlled with an encrypted FOB for residents and audio control only for visitors but still allowing this secondary door to be deactivated by the residents from their own home. A minimum of Two (2) magnetic locks are required, two thirds from the top and bottom of the frame.
- ∞ The recessed main entrance way should be a minimum of 600mm deep. Currently it is shown as 1200mm deep which is too deep from a crime and security perspective, this space will allow more than enough room for rough sleeping protecting them from inclement weather and also become a place where people can conceal themselves which could lead to drug related activity. The concealment opportunity also prevents a resident, who is coming home, not being able to see if someone is within this area and therefore could generate a fear of crime. This would also be relevant to a pedestrian who is just walking by the location.
- ∞ The postal strategy contained within the secured lobby is acceptable as long as the letter plates meet the standards of TS008 to prevent the theft of mail. Reinforcing this area with CCTV will be a benefit.
- ∞ Utility Meters – As long as they are contained within a central location then their positioning will be acceptable. If they do have to be within the residential units then I would insist that the use of SMART meters be used.
- ∞ All residential front doors will be security rated to PAS24:2016.
- ∞ Cycle Storage – Door to be security rated to PAS24:2016 with two points of locking... encrypted FOB access for residents only. All cycles should be allowed to be secured to a device which will allow for three points of locking (both wheels and the frame). Mobility scooters should have access to 'Sold Secure' ground anchors for extra security.
- ∞ It was identified during the meeting that there are no windows or doors which have access to a balcony being at risk due to the height from the ground, therefore no security rating for these will be required.
- ∞ Main concern is the joint use of the stair core with the hotel which is required as a fire escape route for guests. I would certainly recommend that all these doors be security to rated PAS24:2016 which can be achieved with a dual certificated fire door. No glazing should be present within the body of the door itself. All 'Emergency' buttons present should be protected to prevent accidental activation and alarmed so that

members of staff from the hotel can be alerted to a misuse unless of a confirmed fire alarm activation. This approach of having a shared space does create a vulnerability for both the residential building and hotel. If not fully protected with security or with a solid management strategy it could lead to unauthorised access between the two. Also it would be required to make it known who has ownership of these doors so that any malfunctions are addressed immediately and this certainly is the case if the owners of either building change in the future.

- ∞ The shared gate to the right of the residential unit will be on an encrypted FOB access control due it being used by residents (access to bins and cycle storage), hotel (staff back of house and bins) and also the office (staff cycling entrance and bins)... the FOBS will allow some control and reduce the risk of unauthorised entry. This is especially the case if staff members leave... their FOB can be easily deactivated or only allow them access to the areas in which they are entitled to. This gate will be a 'high' use area so will be required to be robust and fit for purpose... any internal 'exit' buttons need to be protected to prevent them being activated from the public side and consideration to the level of the land is required to prevent a person from crawling underneath it. The current design of the gate with it being semi-permeable which would be acceptable as it allows for a person to see if anyone is behind the gate before exiting the location. It was discussed that the self-closing mechanism may have to be automated to allow for disabled access and if this is the case then there is a danger that this become broken as a result of an abled body person pushing or pulling the gates whilst it is use. Therefore it should be investigated to see if the encrypted FOB access can control the use of the opener for only legitimate users.

Office Building

- ∞ Main entrance from Vine Hill will not be required to be security rated due to the fact of the size and design. But I would recommend that the doors and windows at this location be reinforced with internal security rated shutters to LPS 1175 SR1. As discussed during the meeting there are a number of businesses within the local area that have been burgled with high value computer equipment being stolen... this always occurs either at night or during the weekend. So the extra protection will be required.
- ∞ The area outside needs to be designed in such a way to make sure no anti-social behaviour occurs... any surface that could be used a seat will be required to have a uneven topping to reduce this risk. This will also include the window ledges which are present facing out onto the vehicle access point.
- ∞ The windows present in the vehicle access point from Vine Hill have been confirmed as being non-openable therefore will not be required to be security rated.
- ∞ The fire exit door within in this vehicle access way to be used only for this purpose only... no ironmongery on the exterior of the door to prevent it being attacked. I would recommend PAS24:2016/dual certification here due to the fact it is out of the way and has no natural surveillance
- ∞ The door at the rear of the building and which has access from the shared gateway on Eyre Street will be required to be PAS24:2016 with a minimum of two magnetic locks two thirds from the top and bottom of the frame. Encrypted FOB access for staff with cycles only.
- ∞ Cycle Storage – Door to be security rated to PAS24:2016 with two points of locking... encrypted FOB access for residents only. All cycles should be allowed to be secured to a device which will allow for three points of locking (both wheels and the frame). Hand cycles should have access to 'Sold Secure' ground anchors for extra security.
- ∞ The position of the main reception desk is acceptable.
- ∞ All doors within the office space to have encrypted FOB access control. This will future the building in case of multiple occupancy.
- ∞ Fire exit door into shared communal area to be used for that purpose only.

Hotel

- ∞ The hotel entrance is heavily recessed and could attract anti-social behaviour/rough sleeping... but the mitigating factors of the entrance being used on a regular basis, it has glazing which allows for natural surveillance by staff members and the lighting present should reduce this risk. Lighting should be high enough so that it cannot be tampered with or damaged.
- ∞ Once passed the reception area and checking in area the secured security line to the hotel rooms should be at the lifts and the stair core. Entry into both these should be controlled with either FOB or key card.

- ∞ Guests cycle storage area allows for three points of locking and will be covered to give protection from the weather.
- ∞ The access between the hotel and the office space should be FOB controlled both ways to allow this only to be used by office workers only and to restrict the movement of guests to their own outside location.

Other Comments

- ∞ My main concern for this proposal is the shared rear courtyard area which if not properly controlled will have technically three buildings having access. In the long term this has issues as no one will know who should be where and the ability to challenge an intruder is lost. It would be necessary to firmly establish who is in charge of this area for maintenance and cleaning amongst other things as if not no one will take responsibility for it and therefore conflict between office, residential and hotel will occur. During the meeting options were discussed to secure the area and hopefully this be addressed and solve the problems surrounding the location.
- ∞ I would certainly recommend that the residential units achieve 'Secured by Design' accreditation.

If the applicant wishes any further help or assistance than I will be more than happy to be contacted.

Kind regards

Jim



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



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: <https://m.facebook.com/metpoliceuk>

Twitter: @metpoliceuk

