



9th November 2018

Site Location - HEYTRHOP COLLEGE W8.

Mr Whitworth,

I am the CPDA with the current responsibility for the London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. I know the area personally and I am dealing with other development proposals in the immediate vicinity.

I have been approached by [REDACTED] Head of Development for Westbourne Capital, and invited to comment on the public access issues in respect of the development proposal for Heythrop College, W8.

I have met with [REDACTED] and discussed the access issue on the 7th of November 2018. I understand that the public access issue and control of that access has become a contentious local issue with residents.

The development proposal submitted by [REDACTED] incorporates a controlled access strategy to provide public access from Kensington Square SW8 to the new development, during permitted hours, daytime only.

I have agreed to convey my comments on this issue to yourself.

CRIME ANALYSIS

The development is located within the Queen's Gate Ward of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Kensington and Chelsea has the third highest crime rate of all Metropolitan police boroughs, above the upper bound of recorded criminality - One hundred and thirty-nine (139) crimes reported per thousand population per month.

The Queen's Gate ward has on average ninety-eight (98) reported crime allegations to police per month.

The prevalent crime patterns from this recorded crime indicates that;
Other Theft accounts for 20% of the reported allegations,
Anti-Social behaviour accounts for 15%,
Vehicle Crime, 14%,
Violence, 13%,
Burglary, 10%,

And, Theft from person 8%.

Of note Kensington Square W8 has suffered burglary, theft and drug recorded crime in the previous year but I cannot locate an allegation for the college and campus in the past calendar year.

SITE VISIT - LAYOUT

Previously, I attended the Heythrop College site on 31/07/18 with my colleague PC [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Here we met [REDACTED] and a colleague. We discussed the planning proposal and toured the site.

Currently there is only one vehicle access point to the site from ANSDELL TERRACE via SOUTH END, W8.

This route was to be retained and provide both vehicle and pedestrian access within the access design strategy. This is an acceptable design feature - one route to the site which can be monitored and controlled within the management strategy.

[REDACTED] pointed out that a public pedestrian access route was to be considered for the north end of the site, leading from KENSINGTON SQUARE, W8. This new access route was to pass through the current building line of the college from the Square and into the college gardens.

On considering the layout and use of the new development, I did question the reason for permitting public access into a private residential development.

Creating a route through the development only serves to invite local crime from the peripheral areas into the site of this development.

I pointed out my concerns that the permeability of the site may generate opportunities for criminality, anti-social behaviour and residential conflict.

Having received and reviewed the latest proposal from [REDACTED], I still maintain my concerns for any public access in this development.

CONSIDERATIONS

1. If a public thoroughfare is proposed then an acceptable route will need to be defined. It should also be wide, be as straight as possible, well overlooked by surrounding property, well lit, and present no opportunity for concealment or offer opportunity to loiter.

The route should be considered as the focus of the development.

The use of this route needs to be encouraged to create a busy pedestrian environment. Such a busy environment dissuades criminal activity but does not necessarily prevent it.

2. The residents will need to feel safe within this environment. This development is proposed for elderly residents. It must be noted that the elderly are often targeted by criminality in a residential setting.

3. There should be no opportunity for loitering, potential areas for vagrancy, or areas that can promote anti-social behaviour to occur. If this is not achieved there will be residential complaint which will require managerial resourcing.

4. Any unnecessary features, such as access routes, should be avoided, to mitigate any problems in the future.

Any private or semi-private access routes will need to be defined in order to mitigate unauthorised access. This may require additional gating and fencing provision.

5. The residents will need to control the space around their homes in order to control what goes on there. This will require fencing and gating and defined private/semi-private areas. Permitting public access route through this development will require all of these considerations for this community.

6. As controlled public access, by means of 'permitted hours', may exercise control and peace of mind for residents during hours of darkness, it does not mitigate criminality. The development is not gated at South End. A security management strategy is proposed on a 24 hour basis. The 'Policing' of these permitted hours will also require a managerial strategy.

7. Notably within the design of the development, there appears to be an abundance of passive surveillance opportunities provided for the grounds. This will have a positive impact in mitigating criminal behaviour. However this does not mean that a lower crime rate will result.

8. As a consequence of public access, the residential amenity areas would benefit from formal definition, gating, fencing and defensible planting strategies. There should be no access to the residential building line and secure entry systems will need to be considered to mitigate the crime pattern for the area. Permitting the public into a semi-private environment should be avoided as it will create unauthorised access issues and present criminal opportunity.

CONCLUSION

There is no public access 'right of way' on this site to my knowledge, at this time.

Currently the site experiences little criminality, in fact nothing that I can find recorded.

In conclusion there are three options of access to be considered within any development proposal:

1. Public access – which should not be considered unless a Public 'Right of way' exists.

Reason – promotes criminal opportunity.

2. Controlled Public access - should be considered only if public access is preferred or deemed 'necessary' for a development.

Reason – to control access and mitigate criminality.

3. No Public access - which is a beneficial and a preferred recommendation.

Reason – mitigates criminal opportunity and unauthorised access issues.

The design principle is to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour. The addition of public access will only serve to promote crime, creating a 'crime generator'. This is a principle contrary to what we seek to achieve on the direction of Section 17, Crime and Disorder Act. 1998.

It must be stated that 'Permeability' of a development is proven to promote criminal opportunity - it provides alternative routes of access and egress, which are difficult to control and monitor. Permeability should be avoided not promoted.

A 'single' access development has the advantage of thwarting the criminal behaviour and mitigating unauthorised access opportunity.

Limited permeability and controlled access strategies **do** reduce crime and should always be carefully considered. Although mitigation in design and principles is possible to achieve it is never 100% effective.

A public access route is a 'crime generator' and I anticipated that crime will migrate into this site. In essence 'More permeability means more crime.'

I submit my report for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

The Primary Objective of an Efficient Police Force is the Prevention of Crime.

Crime Prevention Advice: [MPS Crime Prevention Advice](#) | [Internal Advice for Staff](#)

Please note that Crime Prevention Advice and the information does not constitute legal or other professional advice; it is given free and without the intention of creating a contract or without the intention of accepting any legal responsibility. It is based on the information supplied and current crime trends in the area. All other applicable health, safety and fire regulations should be adhered to.

All material is subject to copyright. Unless it is specifically stated that particular material is available for general use then it should not be copied or re-used without the explicit permission of the Metropolitan Police Service or of other copyright holders where material is used under licence.

The route through the development needs to be defined.
Any other access around the development needs to be restricted.