



Design & Access Statement

E04759

APPENDIX R

Crime Prevention Advice and Recent School Vandalism Record

Collett, Nick

From: Chalmers Anne <Anne.Chalmers@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk>
Sent: 03 November 2020 12:03
To: Collett, Nick
Cc: Chalmers Anne
Subject: Ranikhet Academy Primary School - Dee Park, Reading

Pre-application Ref: Ranikhet Academy Primary School - Dee Park, Reading

Good morning Nick

Thank you for contacting me regarding pre-application advice on the above. I very much appreciate being involved at this early stage.

Having reviewed the plans etc. I would have no objections to the proposals in principle.

Observations from our PRE APP meeting 02/11/20

- **Boundary Treatment:** From the plans provided and with reference to our telephone conversation thank you for confirming a clearly defined boundary using weld mesh (to LPS1175:) fencing surrounds the school site, building and hard service play areas protecting against intrusion. In addition I recommend access controlled pedestrian and vehicle gates, to the same height and style as fencing either side
- **Main Entrance (Access by pedestrians):** From our PRE APP discussions the main entrance naturally identifies itself (clear wayfinding) and is overlooked by both reception offices and the Large Hall. The main site entrance is the first line of defence against trespass and should be the focus for directing and controlling all access to the school. Thank you for confirming that the Carpark entrance gates will be electronically controlled – I recommend that these gates are remote release with intercom through to the school's reception. This will enable reception staff to confirm the identity of visitors before granting access.
- **Manual pedestrian access gates Key stage 2 drop off and collection):** Thank you for confirming that these gates will be closed and secured for the majority of the day but will be unlocked and controlled by staff during morning arrival and afternoon departure times at the start/end of the school day. These gates must be robust and of the same height and structure (and where necessary same security rating) as the boundary fencing they sit within.
- **Access control:** I am happy to see there is an airlock system which prevents parents or unauthorised visitors/persons walking through into the school unchallenged. I am also pleased to see there are secondary doors with similar security in place beyond this, protecting the corridors. In terms of the other front facing doors including, main hall and kitchen, can you confirm that they will be controlled/will not be assessable, to ensure all visitors to the school are directed to the front main reception.
- **External Doors and Windows:** All external doors (including fire doors) should be at least to LPS 1175 SR 2 standards, whilst all windows should be to at least LPS 1175 SR 2 or PAS24 standards. As a guide, All ground floor or easily accessible glazing should require the window glazing to be laminated to at least 6.8mm and the door and any curtain wall glazing to be laminated to at least 7.5mm. The laminated pane should be the outer one in a double glazed unit if practicable.
- **Landscaping scheme** I would ask that the landscaping scheme ensure that natural surveillance into or across the development. In general trees ground vegetation should be no taller than 1m in height and tree canopies raised to 2.5m to aid visibility. (I refer to the proposed location of tree outside car park) The

planting of new trees should be considered in tandem with the installation of any specified CCTV system likewise, the location of any new trees should not reduce direct light from any light from lighting columns.

- **Alarm:** I would recommend a suitably designed, fit for purpose monitored alarm be fitted for this facility.
- **Community facility ?:** Co-location of facilities on school sites is being encouraged by central government, particularly when new or replacement schools are being planned, or when major refurbishments take place. During our meeting this was discussed and it was my understanding that a firm decision had not yet been made. Could you please advise if the school is intended to act as a venue for such activities for the community. Where schools are intended to share the use of parts of the site and buildings with the community and other organisations, very often out of school hours, this should be taken into account in the security planning. The need for security has to be maintained, allowing accessibility and flexibility to cater for changes in use by the community who have been given legitimate access. Compartmentalisation of the alarm and of those areas so that only access is allowed to that part of the school should be planned for. Alternatively I believe you were considering segregating the school from community sports activities - providing external toilet facilities?
- **CCTV:** CCTV is recommended to be fitted covering the main entrance / reception area and vehicle entrance / exit to site as a minimum. Although the client may wish for other areas to also be covered, such as cycle storage and all entrances to the buildings? I look forward to reviewing these plans
- **LUX/Lighting Plan:** I ask that lighting plans for the development be submitted
- **Lockers:** If general lockers are provided it is preferable to locate them in areas that have high circulation and passive surveillance, which can include along corridors. If lockers are provided in the changing area for change of clothing and personal items these should ideally be to LPS 1175 SR 1 or similar standard.
- **Cycle parking:** this was not covered during our meeting , however - Cycle shelters should be placed and constructed so that staff and pupils in the school have natural surveillance over them. It should be secured to prevent it being abused overnight, at weekends and school holidays. It should also be secured during the day on school days to prevent cycles being stolen during the day. The school staff on site should manage this so that it is locked when the pupils are in class and open for when pupils are leaving at the end of the school day. Such shelters should have stands to which cycles can be secured, and made from transparent materials (weld mesh / polycarbonate, etc.) for increased surveillance opportunity. It should also be roofed to keep bicycles dry and encourage cycling. At present I cannot find any information in the submitted documentation to advise me what this will be made of and what type of anchor points will be used. Can you please confirm?

Finally, I hope that the prospective applicants will incorporate the principles and standards of Secured by Design (SBD) within any subsequent application. Details at; www.securedbydesign.com.

It should also be noted that TVP may request SBD's principles and standards be made a condition of any future planning approval. I suggest that the prospective applicants contact me asap so that we can discuss what would be required to ensure such a condition could be discharged.

Once again, thank you for consulting me at this early stage; I hope that you find the above of assistance. If you or the applicants have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Anne Chalmers | Crime Prevention Design Advisor for Berkshire | Local Policing | Thames Valley Police

Address: Taplow Police Base, 124 Bath road, Taplow, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 ONX

Telephone number : 07800703324

Thames Valley Police currently use the Microsoft Office 2013 suite of applications. Please be aware of this if you intend to include an attachment with your email. This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the originator and not necessarily those of Hampshire Constabulary. It is for the exclusive use of the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s) please note that any form of distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error please forward a copy to: informationsecurity@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk and to the sender. Please then delete the e-mail and destroy any copies of it. DO NOT use this email address for other enquiries as the message will not be responded to or any action taken upon it. If you have a non-urgent enquiry, please call the police non-emergency number '101'. If it is an emergency, please call 999. Thank you.



Spey Road, Tilehurst, Reading RG30 4ED Tel: 0118 937 5520 Fax: 0118 937 5522
Email: admin@ranikhetacademy.co.uk www.ranikhetacademy.co.uk

Tuesday 8th December 2020

Dear Helen,

Following the project meeting on 26th November 2020, I am writing to formally respond to a number of queries raised as a result of a meeting between the design/project team and Reading Borough Council's planning department.

Firstly, I would like to express my thanks at the work undertaken to date by everybody from Reading Borough Council and Hampshire Council in progressing the design of the new school site. The team has listened intently to the challenges the school face on a daily basis and has produced an outline design that aims to reduce a number of these issues - as shown in annex A.



Annex A

On the 26th November, we were asked to review and comment on an alternative proposal, Annex B. Dissecting the school site with the staff car park would completely segregate the hard play space from the school building and make break times and lunch times significantly more difficult to manage. Furthermore, staff that arrive during the school day will disrupt the children learning in the east side of the building due to the extremely close proximity between the car park and school building. REAch2 and Ranikhet do not support this proposal and request to proceed with Annex A.



Annex B

A second query raised was the requirement to enter into a new Community Use Agreement (CUA). As you know, Ranikhet already works closely with the local community and is keen to continue to do so. Community use cannot, however, be to the detriment of the safety and security of the school, staff, pupils or community users. The planners insistence that 'free use' of the MUGA is available until 8pm, when school staff have gone home, leaves the school vulnerable to vandalism and anti-social behaviour that has persistently occurred in the past. We have spent considerable time during the design of the school to mitigate these such issues. The school is therefore requesting to limit 'free use' until 6pm when the caretaker can then tidy the area and lock up before leaving site. Users of the MUGA under 'free use' are not required to present Public Liability Insurance, so it is unreasonable of the council to expect the school to offer this facility outside of the caretakers working hours. The only way the school could offer the facility until 8pm would be if between 6pm - 8pm bookings were charged to cover the increase in site manager costs & electricity bill for floodlight use. Groups would also need to display adequate PI before being able to use the area. It is also acknowledged that car park use is requested within the new agreement. Currently the gates open via a fob or button from the school reception. Obviously, we cannot give community users fobs so the school would be forced to increase the costs of the STP to cover additional working hours to man the front reception; or, we will require the gates to be adapted to enable secure entry and exit for community users. The tables below lists the costs and income associated with the use of the STP for 2019/20. Due to the vandalism noted below and in Annex C, the MUGA is not currently open for community use. This will incur further running and maintenance costs to the school when re-opened.

COSTS			
2019/20	Regular Sweep	£3,720.00	
	Summer revite	£2,800.00	
	Floodlight Maintenance (Compliance)	£2,271.38	
	Replacement bulbs/porcelains (4 per year Average) £374.72	£1,498.88	
	Damage repairs (approx)	£800.00	
	Kickboards and fencing (over 3-5 years)	£954.40	
	Electricity	1,031.24	
			£13,075.90

INCOME		
2019-20	£4,400.00	
	£225.00	
	£175.00	
	£275.00	
	£325.00	
	£1,400.00	
	£150.00	
	£200.00	
	£200.00	
	£200.00	
	£200.00	

	£200.00	
	£3,200.00	
	£2,275.00	
		£13,425.00

Annex C that is attached to this letter lists the incidents that have occurred over the last 5 years. These include: throwing of eggs and animal excrement at users, lighting of fireworks, riding of motorcycles to damage the synthetic pitch (STP), breaking of windows, doors, fences and kickboards. The school has lost a number of clubs wanting to hire the STP due to some of these incidents and most other clubs now lock themselves in to avoid unwanted trespassers gaining access.

Annex D is a draft CUA which largely reflects the terms recently agreed at Green Park Village Academy. I ask that the authority considers this document for an agreeable community use agreement.

The final issue raised was the use of landscaping around the site perimeter. The school has suffered from persistent dumping of rubbish and anti-social behaviour with hedges and shrubs a perfect screen for offenders. The school commissioned a programme of landscaping to remove the planting from the site perimeter and this has had led to a reduction of offences in recent times. The school does not wish to face this problem again by the re-planting of shrubs on the site perimeter. The school welcomes the use of landscaping within the school site and would suggest a forestry area away from the site perimeter as a more amicable solution.

If there is anything further I can provide to support any of these issues please do let me know. I look forward to hearing the outcome following further discussions with Reading Borough Council's planning department.

Yours Sincerely



Mrs Salima Ducker
Executive Headteacher



CC:

Kate Reynolds - Brighter Futures for Education
Gill Dunlop - Brighter Futures for Education
Linda Church - Brighter Futures for Education
Keith Evans - Hampshire County Council
Nick Collett - Hampshire County Council
Katherine Alexander - REAch2 Chief Operations Officer
Gill Ellyard - REAch2 Director of Education (South)
Calum Marriott - REAch2 Project Manager
Rob Ash - REAch2 Project Surveyor

Site: Ranikhet Academy / Taken: 23/10/2019

Site Information

Surface Construction



A number of burns were noted around the perimeter of the surface. These have resulted in an abrasive surface which should be repaired to ensure they don't pose a health and safety risk to the users.

Site Information

Surface Debris



The infill has become contaminated and would benefit from a deep-clean Revite®. This would involve removing the top 4-8mm of sand infill, cleansing it through a series of filters and returning it to the carpet pile. This will help to restore the original playing and drainage characteristics back to the surface, therefore ensuring a safer playing environment and prolonged life expectancy.

Site Information

Fencing



Some of the sections of fencing are in a poor condition and will need to be repaired or replaced.

Incidents/Vandalism

- Kickboards removed and planks broken in half replaced August 2019.

Week after in the Summer Holiday break after full replacement of kickboards youths seen kicking boards purposefully to break.

- Fences cut with bolt cutters. Repairs 11/12/2015, 16/6/2016.
- Fences into school grass pulled up/bent at the bottom. August 2019
- Top perimeter fence pushed down/bent from the bottom. Ongoing
- Padlocks forced and cut. Ongoing
- Fires on STP and MUGA
- Motor bikes on STP leaving skid marks on pitch
- Glass bottles smashed onto the MUGA ground.
- Dog walkers use both STP and MUGA to run their dogs in a sealed area leaving dog mess.

Major repair dates listed. Others smaller repairs carried out by our Caretaker.

Lite fireworks thrown into STP over fencing in the evening when children playing football (Hirers).

Eggs thrown at children playing football (Hirers) – Incident was put on social media causing bad press for the school.

Throwing bags of excrement at the footballers. Landing on the pitch and on the fences.

Bad language shouted at young footballers (team age under 8 years) from surrounding paths.

Youths cycling inside on STP and causing disruption aggressive behaviour to hirers. These hirers felt unsafe and now lock themselves inside the STP when using.

We have lost many good hirers due to these incidents and others many not reported to the school. Finding good reliable hirers is very difficult with some of the situations that happen.

Income stream from STP hire Term time only. End October – End March. Monday-Thursday. Find it difficult to find hirers on Fridays.

Dumping behind perimeter hedges general litter, glass bottles, tin cans, nappies, dog mess bags, needles. Since the removal of hedges this has reduced but not stopped.

General dumping of equipment e.g. televisions, mattress, draw unit, broken toys, scooters, trikes, old wheels from cycles. Since the removal of the hedges this has stopped. Exception to this continue to tip boxes of grass cuttings and rubble over the lower fence at the top next to the STP.

Not able to provide goals due to vandalism of the goals and STP pitch. During the first term of opening the STP the goals were broken and the broken parts of the posts were used to stake holes in STP surface.

Since the removal of shrubbery/hedges around the perimeter damage to the grounds has reduced.

Pellet gun incident aimed at office windows and classroom windows during Summer holidays 2018. Office staff on site at the time.

Damage to roof youths & high level windows broken – 30/8/2019. CCTV put in Summer 2019 Activity on roof stopped with the exception of one incident since. Police unable to ascertain culprit.

Window breakages repairs following Youths vandalism and one attempted break in - 26/6/17, 5/9/17, 7/9/17, 5/9/17, 22/3/18, 10/8/18, 5/4/19.

Most recent damage youths kicked KS1 side doors bottom panels. Repaired then came back at the weekend and retried again. 28/10/2020, 31/10/2020

Magnetic gate to side of school forced/broken – currently waiting contractor for repair. Attempted breakage of side windows with apples. 28/10/2020