

Fire risk assessment

Marsden Court

Marsden Court, Kettlemere Rise, TQ3 1WX

DRAFT — not an approved issued version



Communal stair

Assessment date

2026-09-21

Assessor

Alex Hartley

Version

Working draft

Status

Draft

Contact

assessments@hartlow.housing

About this assessment

This document is a fire risk assessment of the named premises. It records what was inspected on the assessment date, what was found, the assessor's view of the risk, and the work proposed. It is a working record, not a certificate that the premises comply with fire-safety law.

The visit was a visual look at the parts listed in the scope. It was not a destructive survey. Parts that could not be reached, and tests that were not carried out, stay unverified.

Scope

Type 1 — non-destructive, common parts only

Limitations

The loft hatch in the 3rd floor lobby was painted shut and could not be accessed. The first-floor riser cupboard was padlocked and could not be opened.

Working structure for this assessment type and jurisdiction. Original product wording — not a certified PAS 79-1 or BS 9792 form. Authorised BSI/PAS question text is not included. Review, replace or paste your licensed form before professional issue.

Assessor competence

Name

Alex Hartley

Qualifications

Diploma in Fire Risk Assessment (housing)

Basis of competence

Competent to complete Type 1 common-parts fire risk assessments of purpose-built blocks of flats.

Overall risk level

Substantial

Overall risk rationale

The rating reflects a smoke-control vent that did not operate on test and flat entrance doors that would not hold their compartment line, in a single-staircase stay-put block with sleeping occupants and no recorded PEEPs.

Suitable and sufficient

This is a working draft. Whether the assessment is suitable and sufficient is not asserted until it is signed off.

Responsible person and key dates

Responsible person / duty holder	Hartlow Housing
Person consulted on site	The site caretaker
Date of assessment	2026-09-21
Date of previous assessment	Not available
Recommended review date	2027-09-21

Premises information

Client	Hartlow Housing
Number of floors	4 above ground, no basement
Use	Purpose-built block of flats
Construction	Load-bearing masonry, precast concrete floors, flat felted roof, brick external walls, no external cladding system

Typical occupancy	Residential, mixed ages. Two residents known to management as having limited mobility (flats 4 and 11)
Sleeping risk	Yes
People who may need assistance	Two residents known to management as having limited mobility (flats 4 and 11)
Fire-safety systems	No common-part detection. Grade D1 LD2 within individual flats (landlord-fitted). Dry riser not present. Hydrant on street frontage approx. 30m from entrance
Premises description	c. 1974. 18 flats (6 × 1-bed, 12 × 2-bed). Single staircase, open to a lobby at each level. Escape strategy Stay put.

Significant findings summary

- 1.4 The electrical intake cupboard at the entrance lobby was unlocked and standing open, with two cardboard boxes and a mop bucket stored inside.
- 2.1 No smoking signage was seen at the entrance, and no written smoking policy was seen.
- 2.3 A handful of cigarette ends was present on the front step and in the planter by the entrance door.
- 7.1 A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby opposite flat 2.
- 7.2 The entrance-lobby electrical intake cupboard was unlocked and standing open, with two cardboard boxes and a mop bucket inside.
- 10.2 A mobility scooter was charging under the stair in the ground-floor lobby and was plugged into a lobby socket.
- 11.4 A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby, and a bicycle chained to the handrail at the second-floor stair head partially obstructed the route.
- 11.5 The flat 2 self-closer was disconnected at the arm and the door stood open when released.
- 12.1 At the second-floor lobby, an approximately 100 mm by 150 mm unsealed hole was observed around a pipe above the riser door.
- 12.2 An approximately 100 mm by 150 mm opening around a pipe above the second-floor riser door was unsealed, with daylight visible into the riser.
- 12.4 At ground floor, flat 2 had a disconnected closer arm and stood open when released.
- 13.1 No test records seen on site.
- 13.2 Nothing over the final exit door itself though.
- 13.3 No emergency-lighting test records were seen on site.
- 14.1 No running-man exit signage was observed anywhere in the common parts.
- 14.2 No fire-action notices were observed on the upper landings; the entrance notice was faded but remained legible.
- 14.3 No 'fire door keep shut' signage was observed on any communal door.
- 17.2 The first-floor AOV did not move or produce an audible motor response when its manual override panel was tested, although the green power light was on.
- 17.3 The caretaker said that AOVs are serviced by the alarm contractor, but could not name the company or date of service; no service records were held on site.
- 18.1 Nothing held on site.
- 18.3 Management was aware of residents with limited mobility in flats 4 and 11, but no PEEPs or other recorded arrangements were in place.

19.3 The caretaker said that contractors just sign in at the office and could not say what fire-safety information they are given.

20.2 Three emergency-lighting fittings on the stair were showing green charge LEDs, but no emergency-lighting test records were seen on site.

20.3 No evidence of a fire-door inspection regime was available, and the caretaker was not aware of one.

21.1 No fire log book was available on site.

21.3 Nothing for the AOVs.

21.4 The caretaker said that faults are reported to the office, but no log, reference numbers or records tracking actions to completion could be shown.

Findings

Electrical ignition sources

1.1 Is a current electrical installation condition report available?

Answer: Yes

Finding

An EICR was available in the caretaker's folder in the meter room. It was dated 03/2024, issued by Brightside Electrical, and recorded as next due 03/2029.

Commentary

The available record was limited to the EICR information and summary page described in the finding.

Conclusion

A current EICR was available on the visit, with no C1 or C2 items outstanding on the summary page.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker's folder)

1.2 Is portable appliance testing carried out?

Answer: Not applicable

No portable appliances were kept in the common parts.

1.3 Are trailing leads and adapters used only where necessary and in good condition?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No trailing leads or adapters were seen anywhere in the common parts.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

No trailing leads or adapters were observed in the common parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

1.4 Are electrical intake and meter cupboards free from stored items?

Answer: No

Finding

The electrical intake cupboard at the entrance lobby was unlocked and standing open, with two cardboard boxes and a mop bucket stored inside.

Commentary

The cupboard door had no FD marking and appeared to be a plywood replacement.

Conclusion

Stored combustible and cleaning items were present in the electrical intake cupboard.

Sources: Site note 1 (entrance lobby — electrical intake cupboard)

Smoking

2.1 Is a smoking policy in place for these premises?

Answer: No

Finding

No smoking signage was seen at the entrance, and no written smoking policy was seen.

Commentary

The caretaker stated that residents smoke in their own homes because the premises are flats.

Conclusion

A smoking policy was not evidenced during the visit.

Sources: Site note 1 (entrance)

2.2 Are smoking areas, if any, kept away from combustible materials?

Answer: Not applicable

No designated smoking area was recorded inside or outside the premises.

2.3 Are discarded smoking materials being controlled?

Answer: No

Finding

A handful of cigarette ends was present on the front step and in the planter by the entrance door.

Commentary

The recorded discarded smoking materials were at the entrance.

Conclusion

Discarded smoking materials at the front entrance were not adequately controlled.

Sources: Site note 1 (front entrance)

Arson

3.1 Are external doors and gates secured against casual entry?

Answer: Not assessed

The recorded evidence is not enough to answer this question.

3.2 Is waste stored away from the building so it is harder to set alight?

Answer: Yes

Finding

The bin store was an external separate brick structure approximately 4 m from the building and approximately 8 m from the entrance. Its steel or metal doors were kept shut, and the bins were not overflowing.

Commentary

The collection notice recorded collections on Monday and Thursday.

Conclusion

Waste was recorded as stored in a separate external bin store away from the building.

Sources: Site note 1 (bin store); Site note 2 (bin store)

3.3 Are letterboxes and other openings protected where there is a known arson risk?

Answer: Not applicable

Communal letterboxes were mounted inside the entrance lobby, and nothing posted directly through the entrance door.

Portable heaters and heating

4.1 Are portable heaters used only where there is no safer alternative?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No portable heaters were seen anywhere in the common parts.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

No portable-heater use was recorded in the common parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

4.2 Are heaters kept clear of combustible materials?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No portable heaters were seen anywhere in the common parts.

Commentary

As no portable heaters were recorded, no heater was recorded in proximity to combustible materials.

Conclusion

No recorded heater-related combustible-material proximity was present in the common parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

4.3 Is the fixed heating system free from obvious defects?

Answer: Not applicable

No communal heating system was recorded.

Cooking

5.1 Are cooking facilities in common parts limited and controlled?

Answer: Not applicable

No communal kitchen or cooking facilities were recorded in the common parts.

5.2 Are extract filters and surfaces free from heavy grease where cooking takes place?

Answer: Not applicable

No communal kitchen or cooking facilities were recorded in the common parts.

5.3 Are shut-down arrangements understood for any shared kitchen?

Answer: Not applicable

No communal kitchen or cooking facilities were recorded in the common parts.

Lightning

6.1 Is lightning protection provided where the risk justifies it?

Answer: Not present

Finding

No lightning protection system was seen on the roof or external areas.

Commentary

Whether lightning protection is justified is for the assessor to determine.

Conclusion

Lightning protection was not recorded as present.

Sources: Site note 1 (roof / external)

6.2 Is any lightning protection maintained?

Answer: Not applicable

No lightning protection system was seen on the roof or external areas.

Housekeeping

7.1 Are escape routes free from stored items?

Answer: No

Finding

A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby opposite flat 2. No storage was recorded on the stair flights.

Commentary

The communal stair was recorded as concrete, with a secure handrail on one side.

Conclusion

Stored items were present on escape-route areas despite the stair flights themselves being clear.

Sources: Site note 1 (ground floor lobby); Site note 2 (Communal stair); Site note 3 (2nd floor lobby)



Communal stair

7.2 Are cupboards on escape routes kept locked and free from unnecessary combustibles?

Answer: No

Finding

The entrance-lobby electrical intake cupboard was unlocked and standing open, with two cardboard boxes and a mop bucket inside.

Commentary

The cupboard door had no visible FD marking and appeared to be a plywood replacement.

Conclusion

A cupboard on the escape route was unsecured and contained unnecessary combustible material.

Sources: Site note 1 (entrance lobby — electrical intake cupboard)

7.3 Is waste collected frequently enough to avoid a build-up?

Answer: Yes

Finding

The external bin store bins were not overflowing, and a notice recorded collections on Mondays and Thursdays.

Commentary

The bin store was recorded as a separate brick structure with metal doors kept shut.

Conclusion

The recorded waste collection arrangement appeared sufficient to avoid a build-up at the time of inspection.

Sources: Site note 1 (bin store); Site note 2 (bin store)

7.4 Are recyclable materials stored away from ignition sources?

Answer: Yes

Finding

The bin store was recorded as an external separate structure with doors kept closed. Bins were not overflowing.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence supports a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (bin store); Site note 2 (bin store)

Hazards from contractors

8.1 Are contractors given fire-safety information before they start?

Answer: No

Finding

The caretaker stated that contractors sign in at the office but could not say what fire-safety information they are given.

Commentary

This is a reported account from the caretaker and does not establish the contractor induction or information arrangements.

Conclusion

Whether contractors are given fire-safety information before starting was not assessed on the recorded evidence.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker)

8.2 Is hot work controlled by a permit or an equivalent arrangement?

Answer: Not assessed

The recorded evidence is not enough to answer this question.

8.3 Are contractor materials and waste removed at the end of the working day?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No works were in progress and nothing had been left in the common parts by contractors.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

No contractor materials or waste were present in the common parts at the time of inspection.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

Dangerous substances

9.1 Are dangerous substances present on the premises?

Answer: Not present

Finding

No fuel, cylinders or chemical storage were seen anywhere in the common parts.

Commentary

This observation relates to the inspected common parts.

Conclusion

No dangerous substances were found in the inspected common parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

9.2 If present, are they stored and used so as to reduce the fire risk?

Answer: Not applicable

No fuel, cylinders or chemical storage were seen anywhere in the common parts.

9.3 Are gas installations and cylinders, if any, in a safe condition so far as could be seen?

Answer: Not applicable

The caretaker confirmed that there is no gas supply to the building.

Other hazards

10.1 Are other ignition or fuel sources present that are not covered above?

Answer: Not present

Finding

Nothing further was seen in the common parts beyond the hazards already recorded.

Commentary

This observation is limited to further ignition or fuel sources beyond those already noted.

Conclusion

No further ignition or fuel sources were found beyond those already recorded.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

10.2 Are battery chargers, mobility scooters or similar stored away from escape routes?

Answer: No

Finding

A mobility scooter was charging under the stair in the ground-floor lobby and was plugged into a lobby socket.

Commentary

The caretaker stated that the scooter belongs to the resident of flat 4.

Conclusion

A mobility scooter and charger were stored on an escape route.

Sources: Site note 1 (ground floor lobby)



Mobility scooter on charge, ground-floor lobby

Means of escape

11.1 Are escape routes of adequate width for the occupancy?

Answer: Yes

Finding

The communal stair had approximately 1100 mm clear width between the handrail and wall.

Commentary

The lobbies were otherwise recorded as clear apart from the items noted.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence supports a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (Communal stair); Site note 2 (communal stair)

11.2 Are final exits available and readily openable without a key, code or tool?

Answer: Yes

Finding

The main entrance opened by thumbturn from inside without a key, and the rear bin door had a push bar.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

The recorded final exits were available and openable without a key, code or tool.

Sources: Site note 1 (entrance / bin door)

11.3 Are fire doors kept closed and free from wedges?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No wedges or propped doors were seen in the common parts.

Commentary

The communal entrance door closed and latched when observed.

Conclusion

Although no wedges were seen, the flat 2 entrance fire door did not remain closed when released.

Sources: Site note 1 (Overhead self-closer, communal entrance door); Site note 2 (common parts)



Overhead self-closer, communal entrance door

11.4 Are stairs and corridors free from trip hazards and obstruction?

Answer: No

Finding

A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby, and a bicycle chained to the handrail at the second-floor stair head partially obstructed the route.

Commentary

No storage was seen on the stair flights themselves.

Conclusion

Obstructions were present in the ground-floor lobby and at the second-floor stair head.

Sources: Site note 1 (ground floor lobby); Site note 2 (Communal stair); Site note 3 (2nd floor

lobby)

11.5 Do self-closers on fire doors work where checked?

Answer: No

Finding

The communal entrance-door closer closed and latched. Closers were recorded as working to flats 1, 3 and 4 on the ground floor, and as okay on the first and third floors. The flat 2 self-closer was disconnected at the arm and the door stood open when released.

Commentary

The caretaker reported that the flat 2 closer had been removed by the resident some time ago and had been reported twice.

Conclusion

The self-closer to flat 2 did not work where checked, despite satisfactory recorded operation of other checked closers.

Sources: Site note 1 (Overhead self-closer, communal entrance door); Site note 2 (Ground-floor flat entrance door); Site note 3 (1st floor — flats 5-9); Site note 4 (3rd floor lobby); Site note 5 (caretaker)



Ground-floor flat entrance door

11.6 Are alternative escape routes available where the occupancy needs them?

Answer: Not present

Finding

The building has a single stair and no alternative escape route was observed.

Commentary

The evidence does not record a separate alternative route for the occupants.

Conclusion

No alternative escape route is available in the building.

Sources: Site note 1 (building)

Measures to limit fire spread and compartmentation

12.1 Are fire-resisting walls and floors visually intact in the areas inspected?

Answer: No

Finding

At the second-floor lobby, an approximately 100 mm by 150 mm unsealed hole was observed around a pipe above the riser door.

Commentary

The opening was recorded as a service penetration in the lobby wall above the riser door.

Conclusion

A visual breach was observed in the wall at the second-floor riser location.

Sources: Site note 1 (2nd floor lobby)



2nd floor lobby

12.2 Are service risers and cupboards fire-stopped where seen?

Answer: No

Finding

An approximately 100 mm by 150 mm opening around a pipe above the second-floor riser door was unsealed, with daylight visible into the riser. The first-floor riser cupboard was padlocked shut and could not be accessed.

Commentary

The second-floor penetration was visible and unsealed. The first-floor riser cupboard interior was not inspected because it was locked.

Conclusion

A service penetration at the second-floor riser was not fire-stopped where seen, while the first-floor riser cupboard interior was not inspected.

Sources: Site note 1 (First-floor riser cupboard door); Site note 2 (2nd floor lobby)



First-floor riser cupboard door

12.3 Are loft hatches and ceiling voids, where accessed, free from obvious breaches?

Answer: Not inspected — no access

The ceiling hatch at the third-floor lobby was painted shut and could not be accessed.

12.4 Are flat entrance doors, where inspected from the common parts, in an acceptable condition?

Answer: No

Finding

At ground floor, flat 2 had a disconnected closer arm and stood open when released. It also had an approximately 6–8 mm head gap and no intumescent strip along the top edge. Flat 12 had a

replacement domestic-style panel door with no visible FD marking, no intumescent strips and a brush seal only, although a closer was fitted. Ground-floor flats 1, 3 and 4 had working closers. The communal entrance door closed and latched, had no recorded damage and displayed an FD30S marking.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

Flat entrance doors at flats 2 and 12 were not in an acceptable condition on the recorded observations.

Sources: Site note 1 (Overhead self-closer, communal entrance door); Site note 2 (Ground-floor flat entrance door); Site note 3 (flat 2 door); Site note 4 (1st floor — flats 5-9); Site note 5 (2nd floor — flat 12); Site note 6 (3rd floor lobby)

Emergency escape lighting

13.1 Is emergency escape lighting provided where needed?

Answer: No

Finding

Three emergency-lighting fittings were observed on the stair, each showing a green charge LED. No test records seen on site.

Commentary

The evidence records emergency-lighting fittings on the stair but does not establish whether provision is adequate for all locations where it may be needed. No test records seen on site. That is a documentation gap, not a failed observed condition.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence does not support a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (stair)

13.2 Do units appear undamaged and correctly positioned?

Answer: No

Finding

Emergency-lighting fittings on the stair and entrance appeared undamaged, with one fitting recorded per landing. A flickering fitting in the second-floor lobby was recorded as not being an emergency fitting.

Commentary

The recorded flickering lobby fitting does not concern an emergency-lighting unit.

Conclusion

The recorded emergency-lighting arrangement did not include a fitting over the final exit door.

Sources: Site note 1 (stair / entrance)

13.3 Are test records available for the emergency lighting?

Answer: No

Finding

No emergency-lighting test records were seen on site. No test records seen on site.

Commentary

Three stair emergency-lighting fittings were observed showing green charge LEDs, but no associated test records were available on site.

Conclusion

Emergency-lighting test records were not available on the visit.

Sources: Site note 1 (stair)

Signs and notices

14.1 Are fire exit signs provided and visible along escape routes?

Answer: No

Finding

No running-man exit signage was observed anywhere in the common parts.

Commentary

The obviousness of the single-stair route does not change the recorded absence of exit signage.

Conclusion

Fire exit signs were not observed along the common escape route.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

14.2 Are fire-action notices displayed at suitable points?

Answer: No

Finding

A fire-action notice was displayed at the main entrance only. No fire-action notices were observed on the upper landings; the entrance notice was faded but remained legible.

Commentary

The recorded notice provision was limited to the main entrance.

Conclusion

Fire-action notices were not displayed on the upper landings.

Sources: Site note 1 (signage)

14.3 Are fire doors signed where they need to be kept shut?

Answer: No

Finding

No 'fire door keep shut' signage was observed on any communal door.

Commentary

The evidence records an absence of this signage on the communal doors.

Conclusion

No communal fire doors were observed to display 'fire door keep shut' signage.

Sources: Site note 1 (signage)

Fire detection and warning

15.1 Is a fire detection and warning system provided?

Answer: Not present

Finding

No common-part fire detection and warning system was recorded: there was no panel, no call points and no detectors in the common areas.

Commentary

No common-part detection system is recorded, so there is none to assess within this scope. Whether one is required is for the assessor.

Conclusion

A fire detection and warning system was not present in the inspected common parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (common parts)

15.2 Was the panel showing a healthy condition on this visit?

Answer: Not applicable

Not applicable. No common-part detection system is recorded, so there is none to assess within this Type 1 common-parts scope. Whether one is required is for the assessor.

15.3 Are detectors and call points free from obvious damage or covering?

Answer: Not applicable

Not applicable. No common-part detection system is recorded, so there is none to assess within this Type 1 common-parts scope. Whether one is required is for the assessor.

15.4 Can the alarm be heard in the common parts?

Answer: Not applicable

Not applicable. No common-part detection system is recorded, so there is none to assess within this Type 1 common-parts scope. Whether one is required is for the assessor.

Extinguishing equipment

16.1 Are extinguishers provided where the risk requires them?

Answer: Yes

Finding

No extinguishers were observed in the common parts. The finding records this position as correct for the stay-put strategy and records no action.

Commentary

The evidence records the absence of common-part extinguishers and the assessor's recorded position on that absence.

Conclusion

No deficiency relating to common-part extinguishers was recorded.

Sources: Site note 1 (extinguishers)

16.2 Are they unobstructed, mounted and in date?

Answer: Not applicable

No extinguishers were present in the common parts.

16.3 Are they of a type suitable for the hazards present?

Answer: Not applicable

No extinguishers were present in the common parts.

Relevant automatic systems

17.1 Are sprinklers, smoke control or other automatic systems present?

Answer: Present

Finding

Automatic opening vents (AOVs) were recorded to the stair at first- and third-floor level. No sprinklers or other automatic systems were recorded.

Commentary

The AOVs are automatic smoke-control systems.

Conclusion

Automatic smoke-control systems are present.

Sources: Site note 1 (building)

17.2 If present, do they appear in working order so far as could be seen?

Answer: No

Finding

The first-floor AOV did not move or produce an audible motor response when its manual override panel was tested, although the green power light was on. The third-floor AOV opened fully and reset correctly when tested.

Commentary

The recorded observations show differing outcomes for the two AOVs tested.

Conclusion

The first-floor AOV did not appear to operate on the recorded test.

Sources: Site note 1 (Smoke control override panel, first-floor lobby); Site note 2 (3rd floor)



Smoke control override panel, first-floor lobby

17.3 Are those systems included in the maintenance programme?

Answer: No

Finding

The caretaker said that AOVs are serviced by the alarm contractor, but could not name the company or date of service; no service records were held on site.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence does not support a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker)

Fire procedures and arrangements

18.1 Is there a written fire procedure for these premises?

Answer: No

Finding

No written fire procedure was held on site.

Commentary

The asserted head-office document was not produced or verified.

Conclusion

The existence of a written fire procedure for the premises is unverified.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker)

18.2 Is the assembly point known and suitable?

Answer: Not applicable

No assembly point was signed or designated.

18.3 Are arrangements in place for people who may need assistance to escape?

Answer: No

Finding

Management was aware of residents with limited mobility in flats 4 and 11, but no PEEPs or other recorded arrangements were in place.

Commentary

The premises information also records two residents known to management as having limited mobility.

Conclusion

Arrangements for residents in flats 4 and 11 who may need assistance to escape have not been

recorded.

Sources: Site note 1 (management)

18.4 Is a person identified as responsible for fire safety day to day?

Answer: Not assessed

The recorded evidence is not enough to answer this question.

Training and drills

19.1 Have staff or residents who need it received fire-safety instruction?

Answer: Yes

Finding

A dated stay-put leaflet, appearing recent, was pinned to the entrance-lobby noticeboard.

Commentary

The presence of a leaflet does not establish that residents or staff who need instruction received it.

Conclusion

Receipt of fire-safety instruction by relevant residents or staff is unverified.

Sources: Site note 1 (entrance lobby)

19.2 Are fire drills carried out and recorded where they apply?

Answer: Not applicable

No fire drills were carried out; the building is recorded as a stay-put block and residents are not drilled.

19.3 Do new staff or contractors receive fire information on arrival?

Answer: No

Finding

The caretaker said that contractors just sign in at the office and could not say what fire-safety information they are given.

Commentary

The recorded statement does not establish whether fire information is provided on arrival.

Conclusion

Fire-safety information arrangements for new contractors on arrival are unverified.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker)

Testing and maintenance

20.1 Are fire alarm tests recorded at the expected intervals?

Answer: Not applicable

No common fire alarm was recorded, and no weekly common fire-alarm test was undertaken.

20.2 Are emergency lighting tests recorded?

Answer: No

Finding

Three emergency-lighting fittings on the stair were showing green charge LEDs, but no emergency-lighting test records were seen on site. No test records seen on site.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence does not support a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (stair)

20.3 Are fire doors included in a regular check?

Answer: No

Finding

No evidence of a fire-door inspection regime was available, and the caretaker was not aware of one.

Commentary

The absence of evidence on site and the caretaker's lack of awareness do not verify whether checks are undertaken elsewhere.

Conclusion

Inclusion of fire doors in a regular check is unverified.

Sources: Site note 1 (fire doors)

20.4 Are extinguishers serviced at least annually?

Answer: Not applicable

No extinguishers were provided in the common parts, and no extinguisher service regime was recorded.

Records

21.1 Is a fire log or equivalent record kept on site or readily available?

Answer: No

Finding

No fire log book was available on site.

Commentary

The recorded evidence identifies no equivalent on-site fire log.

Conclusion

A fire log or equivalent record was not available on site.

Sources: Site note 1 (site)

21.2 Are previous fire risk assessments available for review?

Answer: No

Finding

No previous fire risk assessment was available for review.

Commentary

No previous assessment record was produced during the visit.

Conclusion

Previous fire risk assessments were not available for review.

Sources: Site note 1 (records)

21.3 Are certificates for electrical, gas and fire systems available?

Answer: No

Finding

No gas certificate was needed because no gas supply was recorded. Nothing for the AOVs.

Commentary

No further commentary is required on the recorded evidence.

Conclusion

The recorded evidence does not support a satisfactory conclusion on the inspected parts.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker's folder); Site note 2 (records)

21.4 Are faults and actions recorded until they are closed?

Answer: No

Finding

The caretaker said that faults are reported to the office, but no log, reference numbers or records tracking actions to completion could be shown.

Commentary

The reported fault history for the flat 2 closer was not supported by records showing tracking or closure.

Conclusion

Faults and actions were not evidenced as being recorded until closure.

Sources: Site note 1 (caretaker); Site note 2 (caretaker)

Risk rating

	Slight harm	Moderate harm	Extreme harm
Low	Trivial	Tolerable	Moderate
Medium	Tolerable	Moderate	Substantial
High	Moderate	Substantial	Intolerable

Overall result: Substantial.

Arrange prompt improvements.

Rationale

The rating reflects a smoke-control vent that did not operate on test and flat entrance doors that would not hold their compartment line, in a single-staircase stay-put block with sleeping occupants and no recorded PEEPs.

Action plan

1. Entrance lobby — electrical intake cupboard door

Location

Entrance lobby

Observation

The entrance-lobby electrical intake cupboard was unlocked and standing open, with two cardboard boxes and a mop bucket inside.

Proposed work

Replace the non-fire-rated electrical intake cupboard door with a certified fire door, keep it locked shut, and remove combustible storage from the cupboard.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 7.2, 1.4 · Status: Open

2. Entrance — fire-action notice missing from landings

Location

Entrance

Observation

No smoking signage was seen at the entrance, and no written smoking policy was seen. No running-man exit signage was observed anywhere in the common parts.

Proposed work

Adopt a written smoking policy for the common parts and display it at the main entrance. Provide fire-action notices on each landing and 'fire door keep shut' signs on communal fire doors. Provide fire-action notices on each landing and 'fire door keep shut' signs on communal fire doors. Provide fire-action notices on each landing and 'fire door keep shut' signs on communal fire doors.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Low · Target: 90 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 2.1, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3 · Status: Open

3. Front entrance — discarded cigarette ends at the entrance**Location**

Front entrance

Observation

A handful of cigarette ends was present on the front step and in the planter by the entrance door.

Proposed work

Clear discarded cigarette ends from the entrance and planter, and put in place controls that prevent a build-up.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 2.3 · Status: Open

4. Ground floor lobby — pushchair and cardboard stored in the lobby**Location**

Ground floor lobby

Observation

A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby opposite flat 2.

Proposed work

Remove the stored items from the common escape route and keep it clear.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 7.1, 11.4 · Status: Open

5. 2nd floor lobby — bicycle chained to stair handrail**Location**

2nd floor lobby

Observation

A resident's pushchair and folded cardboard were stacked in the ground-floor lobby, and a bicycle chained to the handrail at the second-floor stair head partially obstructed the route.

Proposed work

Remove the bicycle from the stair handrail and keep the escape route clear.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 7.1, 11.4 · Status: Open

6. Caretaker**Observation**

The caretaker said that contractors just sign in at the office and could not say what fire-safety information they are given.

Proposed work

Give contractors fire-safety information on arrival and record that the briefing has been given.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 8.1, 19.3 · Status: Open

7. Ground-floor lobby — mobility scooter on charge

Location

Ground floor lobby

Observation

A mobility scooter was charging under the stair in the ground-floor lobby and was plugged into a lobby socket.

Proposed work

Remove the mobility scooter from the escape route and provide a charging arrangement that does not obstruct the means of escape.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): High · Target: 7 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·

Arises from: 10.2 · Status: Open



Mobility scooter on charge, ground-floor lobby

8. Flat 2 — self-closer disconnected and intumescent strip missing

Location

Flat 2 door

Observation

At ground floor, flat 2 had a disconnected closer arm and stood open when released. It also had an approximately 6–8 mm head gap and no intumescent strip along the top edge.

Proposed work

Reinstate the self-closer and confirm the door closes and latches unaided. Refit intumescent strips and adjust the door so edge gaps are within tolerance.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): High · Target: 7 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·

Arises from: 12.4, 11.5 · Status: Open



Ground-floor flat entrance door

9. 2nd floor lobby — unsealed service penetration

Location

2nd floor lobby

Observation

An unsealed service penetration around a soil pipe was visible above the riser door, with daylight through to the riser.

Proposed work

Seal the service penetration to restore compartmentation.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): High · Target: 7 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·
Arises from: 12.1, 12.2 · Status: Open



2nd floor lobby

10. Flat 12 (2nd floor) — non-fire-rated entrance door**Location**

2nd floor

Observation

Flat 12 had a replacement domestic-style panel door with no visible FD marking, no intumescent strips and a brush seal only, although a closer was fitted.

Proposed work

Replace the non-fire-rated entrance door with a certified fire door, including intumescent strips and a working closer.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): High · Target: 7 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·
Arises from: 12.4 · Status: Open

11. Stair — no emergency-lighting test records**Location**

Stair

Observation

No emergency-lighting test records were available on site.

Proposed work

Produce current emergency-lighting test records and keep them available on site.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·
Arises from: 13.1, 20.2, 13.3 · Status: Open

12. Stair — no emergency lighting over the final exit**Location**

Stair

Observation

Nothing over the final exit door itself though.

Proposed work

Provide an emergency lighting unit over the final exit door.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing ·
Arises from: 13.2 · Status: Open

13. Smoke control override panel, first-floor lobby — AOV produced no movement**Location**

Smoke control override panel, first-floor lobby

Observation

The first-floor AOV did not move or produce an audible motor response when its manual override panel was tested, although the green power light was on.

Proposed work

Investigate and restore the AOV so it opens and resets on test. Obtain current smoke-control service records and confirm failed AOVs are repaired.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): High · Target: 7 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 17.2, 21.3 · Status: Open



Smoke control override panel, first-floor lobby

14. Caretaker — no smoke-control service records**Location**

Caretaker

Observation

The caretaker said that AOVs are serviced by the alarm contractor, but could not name the company or date of service; no service records were held on site.

Proposed work

Obtain current smoke-control service records and confirm failed AOVs are repaired.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 17.3 · Status: Open

15. Caretaker — written fire procedure not held on site**Location**

Caretaker

Observation

Nothing held on site.

Proposed work

Obtain the written fire procedure and keep a copy available on site.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 18.1 · Status: Open

16. Management — PEEPs not in place**Location**

Management

Observation

Management was aware of residents with limited mobility in flats 4 and 11, but no PEEPs or other recorded arrangements were in place.

Proposed work

Record personal emergency evacuation plans, or equivalent arrangements, for residents who may need assistance to leave.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 18.3 · Status: Open

17. Fire doors — no fire-door inspection regime

Location

Fire doors

Observation

No evidence of a fire-door inspection regime was available, and the caretaker was not aware of one.

Proposed work

Put in place a documented fire-door inspection regime and keep the records available.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 20.3 · Status: Open

18. Site — no fire log available on site

Location

Site

Observation

At Site, site: no fire log book on site.

Proposed work

Carry out the work required at site to close the recorded deficiency.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 21.1 · Status: Open

19. Caretaker — faults and actions not logged through to completion

Location

Caretaker

Observation

The caretaker said that faults are reported to the office, but no log, reference numbers or records tracking actions to completion could be shown.

Proposed work

Keep a log of faults and actions, with reference numbers, until each item is closed.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 21.4 · Status: Open

20. Building

Observation

At Building, building: no communal heating system.

Proposed work

Carry out the work required at building to close the recorded deficiency.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 4.3 · Status: Open

21. Records — previous fire risk assessment not available

Location

Records

Observation

At Records, records: no previous fire risk assessment available.

Proposed work

Obtain the previous fire risk assessment and keep it available for review.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 21.2 · Status: Open

22. First-floor riser cupboard door — riser cupboard not inspected

Location

First-floor riser cupboard door

Observation

At First-floor riser cupboard door, first-floor riser cupboard door: padlocked shut, no access.

Proposed work

Arrange access and inspect the First-floor riser cupboard.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 12.2 · Status: Open



First-floor riser cupboard door

23. 3rd floor lobby — loft hatch not inspected

Location

3rd floor lobby

Observation

At 3rd floor lobby, 3rd floor lobby: hatch in the ceiling, painted shut, no access.

Proposed work

Arrange access and inspect the loft hatch in the 3rd floor lobby.

Proposed priority (assessor to confirm): Medium · Target: 30 days · Responsible: Hartlow Housing · Arises from: 12.3 · Status: Open