

Reference: PL/24/1501

Location: 20-30 Greyfriars Road, Reading, RG1 1NS

Response to Design Out Crime Officers Comments:

Following receipt of the DOCO comments on 12th December, a meeting took place via Teams on the 3rd January 2005 attended by both the DOCO Officer and Architects to discuss the comments and agree on any design amendment that could be incorporated.

DOCO Comment - Entrances: There are a number of entrances doorsets proposed into the building, and it is not clear from the plans what the purpose of some of them are, or how they are intended to be used. Multiple entrances into the building provide the opportunity for multiple opportunities for failure of any security that is in place, with secondary door sets offering the opportunity for any offender to bypass the security that is provided at the main entrance (with a staffed reception area).

Response: The architect advised that there are two entrances to the building. The main entrance is on the ground floor, and there is a secondary entrance to the bin and bike stores. Within the revised layouts, both entrances require fob access on multiple doors to enter the building. Each door will also be alarmed if it is open, and through CCTV within all common areas within the building, the building management will be able to observe who is entering the building and ensure that any doors that are open are shut.

In particular, there is proposed to be a doorset from the gym directly on to the street. However, it is noted that the gym is proposed for private residential use and therefore direct access to the street appears unnecessary.

Response: The architect advised that the door from the Gym were for means of escape only.

Similarly, the purpose of the doorset leading directly from the central stair core is not clear. If this is needed for emergency purposes, this should provide an emergency exit only.

Response: These doorsets are for emergency exits only.

Entrances into the building should be reviewed and minimised as far as possible. In any case, all communal doorsets for the building should meet the minimum standards of LPS 1175 Issue 8 Security Rating B3+ or equivalent ensuring not only robust physical security but also durability.

Response: This comment is noted and doorsets will be designed to meet these standards.

DOCO Comment - Compartmentation: From the submitted plans it is not clear how compartmentation of the building will be achieved. Proposals should be clear how the development achieves compartmentation so that residents only have access to the parts of the building they need to, recognising that offenders have the potential to be both external and internal to the development. Grouping a large number of occupants within a single building may create more opportunities for disagreements to arise.

Response: Compartmentation of the building is managed through access control of all doors. Residents are restricted from entering floors that they do not live on. Residents will have access to floors where there are managed amenities spaces, and these floors will be monitored through building management.

There are various elements to the current design that appear to make compartmentation of the building difficult.

Internal access to the cycle store and bin store: At present, internal access is provided at first floor level. This appears to open up the first floor to access by all other residents within the building. One solution in relation to the cycle store would be to have no internal access, but this is unlikely to be a satisfactory solution for the bin store.

Response: The layout has been amended to prohibit residents from accessing the first floor unless they have the relevant fob access to enter that floor.

Providing access to the terrace on level 7 for all residents would likely require access to the 7th floor by all residents within the building. I have found no details to suggest that access is limited to only certain dwellings, or that a curfew is proposed for entry onto the terrace area.

Response: Residents will have fob access to all floors where there are managed amenities spaces, including the Level 7 terrace, and these floors will be monitored through building management.

DOCO Comment - Merged Cores: From the plans provided merged cores are present, allowing circular movement within the development (entering one stair core to leave by another), that can assist those intent on crime and anti-social behaviour. It will also be problematic positioning access controls and visitor entry systems to provide an appropriate level of compartmentation as above.

Response: Residents need access to both cores to comply with fire safety. The access to each floor is controlled via fob access, so only residents who live on any particular floor, excluding the amenities levels, should be allowed access to that floor.

DOCO Comment - Bin and Cycle Store Doorsets: Both the bin and cycle store have the potential to attract antisocial behaviour if not properly secured. A single large cycle store also increases the 'pay off' for an offender managing to gain entry and therefore robust physical security must be present.

The plans indicate the external doors are proposed to be double doors which are inherently insecure, requiring one to lock into the other. A single wide door would be more appropriate. As with other communal doorsets to the building the doorsets to the bin and cycle store should meet the minimum standards of LPS 1175 Issue 8 Security Rating B3+ or equivalent ensuring not only robust physical security but also durability.

The doorsets should be covered by formal surveillance and should have electronic access controls extended to them allowing self-closing hinges and locking mechanisms to be fitted.

Response: The comment is noted; doors have been amended and are now single leaf. The doors will be designed as per the above guidance and will all have fob access. CCTV is also provided throughout all communal areas of the building.

DOCO Comment - Laminated Glazing: From a counter terrorism perspective the use of laminated glazing is recommended for new builds as 95% of all injuries in a blast are caused by flying glass. In addition to limiting injury to those within a building and members of the public outside, laminated glass can also reduce the amount of time during which a building may need to be closed for repair in the event of a blast. There are also environmental advantages as installing laminated glass can assist in reducing the carbon footprint and energy consumption.

Given the scale and location of this development, laminated glazing should be used. The following guidance should be followed when specifying the glazing for this development. <https://www.npsa.gov.uk/system/files/documents/measures-to-improve-the-blast-resistance-of-glazing.pdf>

Response: The comment is noted; the building's glazing will be specified to achieve the relevant standards.

DOCO Comment - Access Control: Submitted information confirms that the scheme will include "secure entrance which require a fob or car to gain access to the building thus ensuring that only authorised persons are on site". Access control measures should follow the guidance set out in Secured by Design Homes Guide 2024 (Section 29 provides guidance on access control and additional security requirements for buildings containing multiple dwellings).

Response: The comment is noted; Access control measures will be specified to achieve the relevant standards.

DOCO Comment - CCTV and Lighting: Details of the proposed specification and location of CCTV should be provided and should be considered with lighting to ensure they are compatible. This could potentially be conditioned on any planning permission.

Response: The comment is noted; the CCTV and lighting systems will be specified to achieve the relevant standards.