

GLENGALL ROAD

SBD workshop 01
2020.00475.000-REP.101

Date **16.04.2021**

PC Alan Denyer was present in a workshop with AHR - Kim Lodge, Cat Bio and Paulina Ignacok.

The office was broadly supportive of the scheme through out the workshop. Matters discussed below:

Comments were made regarding the cycle storage and the access to the roof gardens.

- 1 Introduction** to the proposed scheme and changes from the approved application
 - Introduction of a 'new street', linking Glengall Road to the chimney
 - Improved legibility of residential entrances
 - Commercial frontages occupying as much of the overall façade as possible
 - Improved legibility of commercial entrances
 - CCTV coverage provided

- 2 Gates**
 - Additional gate to Latona Yard has been recommended
 - 'new street' being straight and wide, with no hidden corners is a good proposal
 - Additional gates to the 'new street' would be an asset

- 3 Residential entrances**
 - to be PAS 24 or above
 - The main entrance doors do not necessarily need a timed opening system, however need to ensure that there is some form of second line of defence to prevent tailgating
 - Ground floor lift to form second line of defence – visitors will need to call apartment again from lift lobby. Lift will then only allow access to the apartment's floor
 - fob control lifts and stairs
 - Double glazed , 1 pane to be laminated

4 Cycle storage

- Commercial cycle storage ok
- residential
 - ok with access directly from the street
 - fob control and CCTV ok
 - additional lobby as a secondary line of defence is recommended
 - internal separation into 2 (metal mesh is enough) is recommended
 - STS 202 BR2 doors recommended

5 Bin storage

- PAS 24 external doors enough
- no required rating for internal doors/partitions

6 Access to podium and roof gardens

- CCTV at entrance
- PAS 24 access door recommended
- Automated door with time control – ie closed overnight – is recommended
- residential windows and patio doors accessed directly off podium to be PAS 24
- Balustrades to private amenities ok at 1200mm as they have a green buffer in front, however if these can be increased to 1500mm would be better
- * SBD officer recommendation to limit access to podium gardens to individual blocks (see end notes)

7 Residential – general notes

- balcony separators ok at 1800mm minimum
- Party walls to corridors only to be robust system, BG Habito system or similar approved
- party walls between dwellings have no requirements

8 Fire strategy

- central control box for residential uses would be ideal
- currently by block, which is also acceptable

9 Commercial

- Curtain walling – AHR to see commercial SBD guide
 - PAS 24 required
 - 1 pane of 6mm laminated glass
- Level 01 doors to each unit to be PAS 24

Comments from PC Alan Denyer (email as appendix)**Point 4:**

Amendments to the cycle storage were addressed and revised with SHG. Please refer to the PP19 - Cycle Storage drawing.

Point 6:

** In relation to the communal terraces I would strongly advise that these are only accessible to the relevant core that adjoins them. Having access from multiple cores causes issues because it is much more difficult to control access. The residents that have legitimate access to the communal terrace but do not 'live' in that block will have a much more relaxed attitude to security because they do not have a sense of full ownership of the space. There is also, of course, the likelihood that residents themselves may be engaged in crime or ASB. They are much more likely to commit offences in areas that are not attached to their own block and therefore a shared terrace between many blocks can be seen as a 'honey pot' for crime and ASB.*