

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 April 2019 12:52
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Response - 2019/1658/P - County House, 1-2 Conway Mews and 4 Conway Street, W1

FAO Matthias Gentet

Thank you for allowing me to comment on planning application 2019/1658/P which relates to the installation of new vehicle and pedestrian gate to the car park entrance of County House, 1-1 Conway Mews and 4 Conway Street, W1.

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

Comments and Recommendations

- I have reviewed the application and can confirm that the crime statistics for the area and the problems surrounding rough sleeping, anti-social behaviour, misuse of Class A drugs and high volume crimes (theft & motor vehicle crime) are the main concerns for the local policing team and residents alike.
- The area is favourable due to the fact that is an area which is out of the way with plenty of shelter from the elements combined with no natural surveillance which creates a place that a criminal feels comfortable being.
- The gate in principle has been designed to decrease the risk of once it is installed the possibility of it being climbed over or crawled under is eliminated. But ideally it should be positioned as close to the public realm as possible to eliminate undercroft area which would now be created... it might be as result of where the gates can only be positioned due to land ownership and access to the pub but it is worth noting that issues could shift to this location instead.
- The gates operating on set periods is not ideal... though closed during the time when most incidents occur there is always a risk someone could gain access prior to the closure of the gates and still be able to either rough sleep or commit anti-social behaviour. Unless there is a management strategy in place that searches the area after the gates are closed to identify illegal activity then there will be still a risk of this taking place. Certainly if a strategy exists more than likely police will have to be called to assist in the removal of trespassers. If achievable I would always insist the gates are secured all the time.
- Access control – The use of PIN code access is not recommended due to the level of control surrounding the actual numbers being used... a PIN code can easily be told to someone and then all security is no compromised. I would recommend the use of encrypted FOB access control both in and out of the area for vehicles and pedestrians. This will allow better control over who has access and if misused can be traced to individual users... also they can be easily cancelled if either lost or stolen.
- The vehicle gate opening and closing time should be kept to a minimum to reduce the risk of tail gaiting.
- Pedestrian gate should have a minimum of two (2) locks situated two thirds from the top and bottom of the frame... ideally magnetic locks should be used with minimum pull weight of 600 lbs each. Gate should be on a self-locking and self-closing mechanism. If a push to release button is required then ensure it cannot be reached from the outside or if it is easily accessible then it should be enclosed and protected.

- Any emergency services access... for example 'Drop Keys' should be protected with a Gerda security box. 'Drop Keys' can easily be obtained on the internet and therefore do produce vulnerabilities to the security of an area.

If the applicant wishes any further help or assistance surrounding the proposal then I will be more than happy to assist.

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