Greater Manchester Police
designforsecurity

Design for Security
Greater Manchester Police HQ
Northampton Road
Central Park
Manchester
M40 5BP
t: 0161 856 5912
e: info@designforsecurity.org

Howard & Seddon
64 Washway Road
Sale
Cheshire
M33 7RE

Your Ref:
Our Ref: 2012/0092/CLT/02.

Direct Line: 0161 856 1245

F.A.O. Mr. J. Boyle

Date: 17th March 2014

Dear Sir,

Re: Security Shutters to rear of Cathedral Jewellers, 38 Thomas Street, Manchester.

Thank you for the information you have submitted to us re: the above proposal.



I note that there are 2 no. external doors to the rear of the premises, fronting onto Back Turner Street. I understand that the jewellers was broken into in January 2012 and there have been unsuccessful attempts to gain unauthorised access since. When viewed from the rear of the premises, the door to the right (serving the upper floor offices) has two locking points and appears to have some minor damage where attempts have been made to force the door. The door to the left (serving the ground floor unit) has three locks and does not appear to have been damaged. Both doors have been graffitied.

My colleague met with your Client in February 2012 to discuss the security to the rear of the premises. Please find attached a copy of his email of 9th February 2012, which contains some detailed advice in relation to the doors themselves and any shutters which may be added, as well as other advice relating to the installation of lighting and improvements to the alarm/CCTV.

In line with the previous advice from my colleague, I would first highly recommend that security-certified doorsets (to LPS 1175 SR2 or 3) are fitted to the rear of the premises. I am unsure if both of the current doors are certified, as such doors are usually fitted with multi-point locks rather than separate locks and would usually have the same locking arrangements. Would you be able to confirm this?

The installation of additional shutters may provide a visual deterrent to attacking the existing doors, but if they are damaged by an offender attempting to gain access, this may affect the operation of them and still leave the doors exposed. If shutters are to be installed, they should themselves be certified to LPS 1175 SR2. However, I understand that the Local Authority Planners are reluctant to see the installation of external shutters in this location due to their visual impact. The appearance of external shutters can often be improved by recessing the shutter boxes and guides or building them into the fabric of the building, but this may be difficult to achieve here. Powder coated and perforated shutters can also be less visually intrusive and are less likely to suffer from graffiti, although they are not as robust as solid shutters and can only be certified to LPS 1175 SR1.

Another alternative could be for the installation of decorative wrought-iron grilles/gates in front of the doors. While these would provide an extra deterrent and may be more visually appealing than shutters, they would not be a tested, security-certified product and I would advise they are not installed unless the doorsets behind them are security-certified as described above.

I hope this information is of use to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further information/advice at any stage.

Yours faithfully



Bradley Hart MTCP
Consultant
e: bradley.hart@designforsecurity.org

Copy of email sent to Mr. Jason Taylor, 9th February 2012

Dear Jason,

Thank you for meeting me yesterday to discuss the security issues at the rear of the premises. I've tried to include as much information and explanation in this email as I can, but if you have any queries at all please do not hesitate to contact me.

The rear doors to the building are positioned on back road, which benefits from little activity and therefore minimal natural surveillance. These factors appeal to offenders who will seek as much privacy as possible when attempting this sort of crime. Little can be done about the contextual setting, therefore any security improvements will need to be much more localised and focussed on the doors themselves.

Shutters to these doors may act as a deterrent to criminals in that they are implicit of a double line of defence (shutter and doors) which could take longer to penetrate than a door alone. There is a chance however that the privacy offered by the back street location, and the probable high reward of a successful burglary (being a jewellers) may outweigh any deterrent effect. This therefore means that a shutter will not be a guarantee that further criminal attempts will not be made. General opportunistic crime can be quite predictable in its nature, therefore making 'designing-out' crime more straight forward, though when certain circumstances are present (such as an increased reward), a criminal's actions are less predictable.

Ultimately, whether a shutter is introduced or not, the opening should be protected with a product certified to a police-approved standard, in this case LPS 1175. As described on site, this is a test standard which rates a door or shutter based on its ability to withstand attack for a period of 20 mins with a given tool set. In this specific situation, I would suggest that an LPS 1175 SR3 (security rating 3) product would be appropriate. This security rating is designed to resist attack with the tools shown below, and more:

TOOL CATEGORY C

Tool category A and B plus:

1 Axe - 350 mm long/1.5 kg
Brick bolsters - 250 mm long x 75 mm wide blade
Cold chisels - 250 mm long x 25 mm wide blade
1 Crowbar - 700 mm long/2.5 kg
1 Drill (cordless with rotary action only) - 7.2 V d.c*
1 Drill bit (10 mm diameter jobber - HSS / HSCO / Carbide)
1 Gas torch (Butane / Propane)
1 Hacksaw plus 2 HSS blades
1 Hammer - 400 mm long/1.5 kg
1 Pad saw plus 2 HSS blades
1 Scissor jack – 750 kg capacity, 100 mm minimum retracted, 200 mm stroke
Wood chisels - 250 mm long x 25 mm wide blade

* *Complete with a spare power pack.*

There are two factors that could impede the installation of a security rated door or shutter. Firstly, because the security tests are so demanding there are much fewer certified security doors that are allowed to open inwards (as your existing doors do), as opposed to outwards. There are however a couple of doors on the market which can open inwards, certified to LPS 1175 SR3 and SR2.

- The LPS 1175 SR3 door is called 'The Sandhurst', and is supplied by Stafford Bridge Doors. This is a timber door, with various locking options.

- The LPS 1175 SR2 doors are called 'The Hendon' again by Stafford Bridge (timber), and the 'Secureline' door by CW Fields (steel).

The above suppliers can be found at: http://www.cwfields.co.uk/Contact.htm & http://www.securedbydesign.com/companies/membercompany.aspx?company=158&companyname=Stafford%20Bridge%20Doors%20Limited

You may also wish to check with the companies listed at this link: http://www.securedbydesign.com/companies/companies.aspx?category=1&type_1=yes&standard_15=yes&Search.x=52&Search.y=10 - These are also suppliers of LPS 1175 doors, and may have a product suitable for this application (although my initial trawl only found the specific products and suppliers above).

The second factor which could prevent a secure shutter or door being fitted is the existing building fabric. Certified products require a certain degree of strength to the structural opening. You are best advised to speak to the supplier regarding this as they may need to assess the opening themselves. Shutters must also be fitted in certain ways in order to perform to their test certification. As you would be fitting to en existing building, there may be issues in this regard. Again, the supplier is best positioned to advise.

The link above will take you to door suppliers, and the following link to shutter suppliers: http://www.securedbydesign.com/companies/companies.aspx?category=5&standard_15=yes&Search.x=36&Search.y=12

To summarise the above, I would not be opposed to the introduction of a shutter (many neighbouring properties have them and I don't believe their addition would increase the fear of crime), however I must recommend that any proposed solution will only be fit for purpose if the door or shutter is tested to LPS 1175. There may be deterrent value in a shutter, but this is hard to predict here. A shutter would protect the door from damage for a given period, however any damage to a shutter may put you in the same position as current insurance-wise. There are other deterrent measures that should be considered and implemented where feasible. These include:

1. Provide a "dusk 'til dawn" light above each rear door. These lights emit a low lux light as natural light fades (when operated by a daylight sensor), and help make a burglar more visible to anybody in the surrounding area, therefore increasing the chances of the police being called and the offender apprehended. Light fittings should be positioned around 3000mm high, so they cannot be tampered with.
2. Increase the effectiveness of your alarm and CCTV. I note the existing CCTV is recorded, but not monitored. I would suggest liaising with your alarm provider, and linking both the alarm and CCTV together with a monitoring facility. Vibration sensors could also be added to the rear doors, and linked to this monitoring facility. This would mean that should the alarm go off, or the vibration sensors detect tampering, a monitoring station will be able to view the live CCTV and verify whether a crime is taking place. They may then call the police, and even provide an audible warning to the offenders as an added deterrent. Vibration sensors may be vulnerable to false activation (due to

high winds for example) and should therefore not sound an audible alarm at the scene, they should merely alert the monitoring station.

I did mention the idea of bricking-up the openings if the business can operate without them. I note this will not be possible for the door which leads to the first floor accommodation (fundamentally). Would this be at all possible for the jewellers (ground floor)?

I hope the above is of help. I would be happy to discuss these details once you have had chance to digest them, and meet again if you require. I would also suggest that the local Crime Reduction Specialist (John Sargeson, copied in) attends any further meetings.

Kind regards

Gareth Hulmes BA (Hons), MSc
Design for Security Consultant