

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 April 2019 11:45  
**To:** Planning [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Planning Response - 2019/1697/P - 29-33 Arkwright Road, NW3

FAO John Diver

Thank you for allowing me to comment on planning application 2019/1697/P which relates to the construction of a Two (2) storey dwelling at 29-33 Arkwright Road, NW3.

I have no objections to the proposal but have the following comments and recommendations to make.

**Comments and Recommendations**

- Front doors to be security rated to PAS24:2016.
- All ground floor doors and windows which are openable to be security rated to PAS24:2016.
- Any window that is easily reached by climbing and which are openable should also be security rated to PAS24:2016.
- Electrical meters should be positioned outside of each dwelling, close to the main front door but not creating a climbing risk. The use of 'Smart Meters' is preferred and negates a person attending to read the meter.
- Bins storage should be lockable with a minimum of BS 8621:2017 (non-key locking on the internal face) mortice lock and be constructed of a robust and fit for purpose material. Side note – From the plans it appears they open directly onto the public realm but the defensive planting along the wall will come into conflict with the operation of the bin storage.
- Communal entrance – Due to this door being the main entry point for all residents then I would recommend that this has encrypted FOB access with a video/audio control for visitors. Any 'push to release' button within the primary boundary should not be easily accessible from the outside or if it is protected so it cannot be activated.
- Postal strategy - I would recommend that a 'through the wall' delivery system is implemented with the use of TS 008 letter box to provide security for the mail. Collection made from the interior via a secure lockable mailbox by residents.
- Cycle storage – Secure location, robust and fit for purpose with a minimum of 5 lever mortice lock... the use of ground anchors to 'Sold Secure' standard or 'Sheffield' stands within the location to allow for three points of locking (both wheels and the frame) as long as firmly fixed to the ground and cannot be easily tampered with or removed.
- The main issue I note is the wall that is the main feature of the proposal separating the buildings from public and private space. The wall itself does offer some kind of protection but does allow for creating an active frontage within the easily accessible drive way. The use of defensive planting along the base of the wall and within the angled 'dead space' is a benefit as it reduces the risk of graffiti being committed or even balls being kicked against it... but the proposal to have open gapped bricks is a serious concern if security on the communal entrance is implemented. Basically the design makes a natural climbing wall to gain entry within the development and allows access to the upper level windows making them vulnerable. I can understand why they are being installed... to allow natural light and to give the impression of surveillance... but I would recommend that some kind of protection will be required to prevent the spaces used as a hand or foot hold. I would imagine this wall is required to be retained due to some issue or other as the recommended height for front boundary treatment according to 'Secured by Design' is 1.1 metres.

- Boundary treatment – Ideally the rear and side boundary treatment should be a minimum of 1.8 metres tall.
- Gardens – There appears to be no segregation between the two buildings... this could lead to issues of who 'owns' certain parts of this area and could lead to conflict... certainly if it relates to maintenance and repair. Clearly defined boundaries between the two units should be achieved. There does appear to be gate installed on some of the submitted plans but not on others.
- The use of 13A spurs within the main lobby area of each unit will give the resident the chance in the future for the installation of the a burglar alarm.

If the applicant wishes further help or advice or even wish to achieve 'Secured by Design' accreditation then 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)



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

