

Your reference:

Our reference:

Date: 6th May 2011



Ila Robertson

METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE

Isle of Dogs Police Station
CRIME PREVENTION OFFICE
160-174 Manchester Road
Isle of Dogs
London
E14 2BN
Direct (: 020 7275 4265

Dear Ila,

Please find enclosed the report based on the security survey I carried out recently.

If you have any queries about the report or need further advice please do not hesitate to contact me on the above telephone number.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Jones, CPDA
Tower Hamlets Police

I have been asked to carry out this survey/report by the Planning Department at the London Borough of Tower Hamlets with regards to a planning application for the estate at St David's Square, Westferry Road, E14.

There appear to be two opposing views with regards to the security/safety of the estate, the view of the local authority planning department who's policy it is to refuse gated communities and promote permeability and public use/routes, and the view of the applicant who wishes to secure the estate against concerns over Anti-social behaviour and crime whilst not compromising public access to the Thames Walkway via Ferry Street.

There are two options which cover both of these views but which would seem to not be acceptable by the opposing group's views policy.

1. A range of Crime Prevention measures to reduce the reported and perceived levels of crime and ASB on the estate.
2. Gating of the estate to prevent access to non-residents whilst not restricting public access to the Thames Walkway via Ferry Street.

Observations

The entry to the Thames Walkway at Ferry Street (next to the public house) is currently gated at both vehicle and pedestrian level. I understand the gates are controlled by the nearby Restaurant but that the pedestrian gate is never closed and the vehicle gate very rarely. Once through these gates the road/path splits into two, the first turns to the left into a public car park for use of patrons of the restaurant, with a slightly set back pedestrian path that runs adjacent to the car park and runs into the Thames Path. From this location the public can access the Thames path in an Easterly direction, the path is blocked immediately to the West, access to the west would be via the Ferry Street entrance/exit.



Figure 1 - Ferry Street entrance looking West

The split road/path from the Ferry Street entrance leads as a second option into the estate which then offers options to go through the estate in an easterly direction and a second route joining up with the Thames Path, or a vehicular and pedestrian route through the estate in a Northerly direction towards Westferry Road, which has a vehicle and pedestrian entrance to/from the estate.

The Westferry Road entrance has no vehicle gates, but has a pedestrian gate that is not secured at present.

The second route from the estate onto the Thames walkway currently has a number of trees planted and some small raised planters which reduce the routes accessibility by about 80%.

There are also two further non-permeable routes North-South from the estate to the Thames Walkway which finish in viewing areas overlooking the Thames Walkway and the Thames. These areas have low level railings preventing easy access to the estate but not difficult to climb over from the Thames Walkway.



Figure 2 - SDS looking towards Ferry Street entrance

Option 1.

A range of CP measures to reduce/mitigate crime/ASB problems/concerns.

The route from Ferry Street should have better signage indicating the preferred route for pedestrians to access the Thames Walkway, and better signage indicating that the car park is for the use of the restaurants patrons – with additional signage on Ferry Street itself and also at the entrance to the pedestrian path and the car park, this should make it more obvious to the public what route/s is/are available, and will reduce public use of the estate routes without excluding them.

In addition, the use of raised planters and a low level anti bike railing across the 'entrance' into the estate would deter most motorbikes/mopeds but should not deter the public or cyclists/pram users who do wish to access the estate, again reducing the use of the estate and informing decisions by those wishing to access the Thames walkway. Improved signage in the estate showing a safe pedestrian route to the Thames walkway would also assist this problem.

The existing public route that is a permeable link to/from the Thames Walkway has presently been partially blocked with trees and raised planters. I would suggest that a similar motorcycle/moped restricting railing across this route that would not prevent access by the general public but would restrict access to/from the estate by motorcyclists etc.



Figure 3 - Existing public route from Thames Walkway into estate

The entry from Westferry Road could have some rising bollards as a method of access control, this would prevent motor vehicles from accessing the estate but not motorcycles or mopeds or indeed cyclists or pedestrians, although this part of the estate entrance is a vehicle only route.

There are a high number of cycle thefts currently being committed from within the secure car parks at ground floor level under the buildings in the estate. Whilst cycle

racks are present, they are scattered over the parking area and combined with what appears to be a slow moving entry gate, allows pedestrian access into the car park by tailgating (following on) residents arriving or leaving. I would suggest that the gated entrances to the car parks have the speed and timing of opening reduced to lessen the amount of available access to non-residents, always taking into consideration the safety of all concerned. In addition I would group the cycle racks into separate secure storage areas, with access control, within the car parks or the buildings (space allowing), this would offer a secondary level of security for the protection (space allowing), this would offer a secondary level of security for the protection of the bikes and may either be an additional room or a caged area, and then CCTV could be added specifically to cover these spaces.



Figure 4 - Vehicle entrance to car park

I would also look at making the entry from the lobby into the car parking areas fobbed, it is currently a simple push button access and anyone having already gained entry into the building would be able to currently access the car parks, making this fobbed, which should not cause any problems with fire exits/evacuation, would add a level of security from this part of the building into the car park.

Further security patrols with additional officers at peak problem times, both in the car park and outside, and extra monitored CCTV would also help to reduce any Anti-social behaviour problems/concerns in the estate.



Figure 5 - Looking north towards water feature

Figure 6 - Looking South towards Water feature

The water feature in the centre of the estate is another problem, with groups regularly using the feature to gather and cause disturbances, but also innocent members of the public taking advantage of shallow water in warm conditions to paddle. I would suggest that this is relatively easy to gate at either end which can be secured permanently closed with fobbed access for residents only, or can be a part time system that is perhaps open during the day but closed off at night, this would reduce disturbances during these hours.



Figure 7 - Top of stair access, looking South towards Water feature

I think these measures could mitigate the need for a completely gated estate, however that option still remains if these measures are instigated and do not resolve the problems/concerns of the residents.

I would also say that signage is very important as a measure on its own, some will always ignore signs but generally if they are robust and obvious and clear they will help to reduce confusion and guide the public and residents alike.

Option 2.

Measures to securely gate the development from public/non-residents/vehicular use.

This measure is favoured by the applicant. To exclude non-residents and groups causing ASB or crime, to reduce the thefts of pedal cycles, noise by vehicles/motorcycles/mopeds and generally keep the development for residents use only.



Figure 8 - Westferry Road vehicle and pedestrian entrances

The entrances between the restaurant car park and the estate at Ferry Street and the tree lined public route between the estate and Thames Walkway would have to have 2 metre high railings with access controlled gates on the Ferry Street entrance into the estate. In addition, to keep the public out of the estate the areas to either side of the public route (tree-lined) PLUS the viewing areas would have to have the 2 metre high fences added also – in a similar fashion to those on the neighbouring development. It may be possible to have low level fencing at these entrances and side areas, but these would probably be easily climbed by those seeking to enter the estate anyway, whilst still deterring non-residents who would not wish to climb over low level railings.



Figure 9 - Westferry Road vehicle entrance from SDS

The entry at Westferry Road would need large access controlled vehicle gates, and the existing pedestrian gate here would have to become access controlled, although I am not 100% sure about the height or design of the boundary treatment here and this may have to change if not seen to be sufficient to prevent access, there is no doubt though that gates of any design would deter most casual members of the public, but the wrong

height gates/fencing will not deter those wishing to enter the estate for mischievous reasons..

All of these measures would keep most of the problems now causing concerns to the residents out of the estate but it has no guarantee of completing stopping the problem.

Reported Crime figures and recorded ASB calls.

Police analysts have carried out a number of investigations on reported crime and Anti-social behaviour recorded incidents at St David's Square, in comparison to the ward and borough figures.

St David's Square Crime

For the purpose of this analysis the following crime types were considered:- Residential and Non residential Burglary, Theft from and Theft of Motor Vehicle, GBH, ABH and Common Assault (MapInfo down load)

The two financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11 were used to compare the crime levels in the St David's Square (SDS) boundary area and compared to crimes levels in the Millwall SNT ward (this is the ward where SDS is located), and the borough as a whole (HT)

As the table below shows where as crime has increased in the borough as a whole over these 2 time periods, crime has actually fallen in both Millwall ward and SDS. The reduction in crime is more marked in the case of SDS.

Crime	FY2009/10	FY 2010/11	Difference	% change
HT	8727	9407	680	8%
Millwall	525	468	-57	-11%
Boundary	22	10	-12	-55%

St David's Square Crime per 1000 residents

The population of Tower Hamlets according to the 2001 census was 196106 (Office for National Statistics - ONS). Millwall SNT ward population was 12892.

Unfortunately we do not have population figures for the St David Square boundary area

If we look at crime by per 1000 residents then the figure again show that where as crime has increased for the borough as a whole it has decrease for Millwall ward.

Given a fixed population and reduced crime figures for SDS in 2010/11 compared to 2009/10 we can say that crime per 1000 residents in SDS would also have shown a decrease.

Crime per 1000 residents	2009-10	2010-11
HT	45	48
Millwall	41	36
Boundary	n/a	n/a

St David's Square Crime by sq km

Tower Hamlets borough is approximately 20 sq km. Millwall ward is 2.4 sq km in area. The St David's square boundary is 0.031 sq km.

The SDS boundary is 0.16% of the boroughs surface area. The SDS boundary represents 1.29% of Millwall wards surface area.

If we look at crime in the boundary area and compared it with crime in HT and Millwall by size of the area we see that crime in the SDS area was higher in 2009/10 compared to 2010/11 for both HT and Millwall.

In terms of relative area size there was more crime per sq km in SDS compared to Millwall, even in 2010/11 (low crime year); where SDS showed a large reduction in crime compared to 2009/10

So for Millwall ward the small SDS area represents a reasonable crime concentration in 2010/11 (the low crime year) and even more so in 2009/10. However, when the figure for SDS is compared to HT for 2010/11 crime in SDS is actually lower per sq km than what would be expected (actual crime in SDS 0.11% - expected 0.16%).

	HT	Millwall
Boundary as % of	0.16%	1.29%
2009/10 Crime in boundary as % of	0.25%	4.19%
2010/11 Crime in boundary as % of	0.11%	2.14%

St David's Square ASB CAD calls

The table below show ASB CAD calls per 1000 residents. Again we do not have figure for the St David's square area, but as the figures show ASB is less of an issue in Millwall ward compared to the borough as a whole.

ASB CAD calls	2010/11	Per 1000 residents
HT	30627	156
Millwall	1583	123

ASB CAD calls per sq km shows that ASB is less of an issue for this area compared to the rest of the ward, and is not significant when compared to the borough as a whole

ASB CAD calls	2010/11	Per sq km

HT	30627	1531
Millwall	1583	660
Boundary	9	290

FY = Financial Year

ASB = Anti-Social Behaviour

SDS = St David's Square

HT = Tower Hamlets Police Borough

Boundary = St David's Square Boundary

SNT = Safer Neighbourhood Team

CAD = Computer Aided Despatch Police despatching system

St David's Square Incident/Crime log/figures - (supplied by Management services at SDS)

In addition, I have been supplied with copies of the incident log from the management of the estate, with details of incidents on the estate between January 2009 and April 2011. There are 48 incidents broken down as follows:-

- Anti-Social behaviour by groups of youths (including water feature use/play) – 13
- Motor cycle reported driving around estate or through estate to Thames Walkway – 2
- Motor cycle stolen from estate or secure car park – 4
- Criminal Damage (including graffiti) – 5
- Theft of Pedal Cycles (or parts thereof) mainly from car park - 15
- Burglary – Residential – 2
- Burglary – non-residential (not a dwelling) – 1
- Criminal Damage to a motor vehicle -= 4
- Theft of a Motor Vehicle – 1
- Other crime – 1

These incidents have been those reported to the management/concierge office of the estate, and may or may not have been reported to Police. The main two offences appear to be ASB and Pedal Cycle theft (which is normally reported as a non-residential burglary when it is from the car park). The ASB incidents appear to be groups of youths making some sort of noise disturbance on the estate, in/near the water feature or gaining or attempting to gain entry to the buildings, with ensuing intimidation of residents and some crime. The pedal cycle problem seems to relate to the ease with which non-residents can gain entry to the car park.

I have outlined in Option 1 my recommendations for reducing these problems by use of CCTV/Staff/blocking off of the water feature for the ASB problem, or changes to vehicle entrance gates/CCTV/Staff and cages/secure cycle stores for the Pedal cycle problem, though it is true to say that both problems would also be reduced by Option 2.