

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham



Fire Risk Assessment of:	68-87 Muscal House, Field Rd, London W6 8HT
Author of Assessment:	Jakub Owczarek MIFSM, ACABE LBHF Fire Risk Assessor
Quality Assured by:	Claire Norman Senior LBHF Fire Risk Assessor
Responsible Person:	Jonathan Pickstone
Risk Assessment Valid From:	18/10/2023
Risk Assessment Valid To:	18/10/2026

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Building Features

Approximate Square Area of the Building:	500
Number of Dwellings:	20
Number of Internal Communal Stairs:	2
Number of External Escape Stairs:	0
Number of Final Exits:	2
Number of Stair Lifts:	
Number of Storeys	4

Uninhabited Roof Void?

Basement Present?

Gas Installed to Building?

Is Gas Supplied to the Building?

Solar Panels Installed on Building?

Number of Occupants: 40

Current Evacuation Policy: Stay Put Procedure

Recommended Evacuation Policy: Stay Put Procedure

Last LFB Inspection:

Survey Findings:

Building Construction & Layout:

General Needs detached purpose-built Communal Block of maisonettes with balcony access deck approach, incorporating 20 Accommodation units and two stairways.

The building is constructed of reinforced structural concrete frame, floor and roof slabs with structural concrete main cross walls, (intermediate cross walls deemed to be masonry) 60mins FR with brick 'cavity' walls, and spandrel panels to external facade.

The premise has approximately 25% of its external walls covered in cladding/infill panels, along the window sections.

It is estimated that the block has been erected in the 60s' which place it under the CP3 chapter IV part 1: 1962 and London County Council Guidance '62.

The living room, dining room and kitchen doors were required to be fire-resisting and

self-closing – this was not possible to verify by the Assessor. Entrance halls within flats were required. For dwellings accessed from a balcony, there was no limit in travel distance to a stairway. The non entrance level of the upper maisonettes – both bedrooms are fitted with roof access hatches to enable escape – to be verified during an additional inspection.

The surveyed premise is an open deck approach and meets the standards of the era.

Flat, felt covered, roof accessed via hatches within the private dwellings. Upper level of the maisonettes accessed from the balcony deck.

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

There are resident storage units at the RHS of the building. All GF maisonettes are accessible directly from the street level without the use of communal MoE, and have private, enclosed, gardens to the rear.

UPVC encasement windows in all accommodation units, all Elevations.

'Stay Put' fire evacuation strategy in place.

Two designated stairwells, partially open to the outside on each level. Stairways are 40m apart, at both ends of the balcony access deck.

Refuse chute is located within the LHS staircase with bin room at the base, accessed externally - on the left of the LHS Entry/Exit, enclosed in FR60 min construction with metal security shutters.

Refuse Chute serves all floors, with hatches located within the LHS staircase. A pull plate installed at the base of the chute.

Electrical intake room on the ground floor, at the base of each staircase, enclosed in notional FD30.

Emergency Escape Lighting provision in Electrical intake rooms and in staircases.

No Communal access doors – free access building.

1st floor balcony deck – Alternative MoE in both directions – approx. 20m between the mid-section FED and either of the stairways. No passing risk.

Class O surface finishes throughout the common routes/MoE.

Emergency escape lighting provision in the MoE stairways and EIC.

No Lightning protection system.

Access for FRS engines from the front and left side of the property.

Executive Summary

At the time of the Inspection the Assessor identified that the premise has adequate standard of Compartmentation, with the noted deficiencies requiring either further inspection, installations and/or remedial upgrade works.

The Assessor noted – during a FED inspection resident reported a broken lock, which sometimes makes it impossible to open the frontdoor from the inside. This presents a high risk of entrapment should a fire break out within the flat. A high priority job has been raised.

Surveyed FED – timber, Notional FD30s SC. Different types of doors installed along the MoE.

The surveyed premise is a balcony deck approach building with alternative MoE and no passing risk, which reduces the risk due to open air access. This made the Assessor deem the existing FED acceptable. A replacement of all FED during the next major refurbishment is recommended as good practice. No jobs regarding FED were raised by the Assessor.

Class O surface finishes throughout the common routes/MoE.

MoE are permanently ventilated – partially open staircases and open-air

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

balcony deck.

No EEL Provision installed within the MoE balcony deck (stairways only) as reliance is on 'borrowed light'. It is undetermined whether suitable and sufficient 'borrowed light' in the hours of darkness and or power failure would sufficiently illuminate the MoE stairwells.

Recommend installation of non-maintained EEL along the MoE access deck during the next major refurbishment. Any installation should be in accordance with BS 5266.

The maximum travel distance between the furthest FED and the stairway was limited to <20m in either direction.

External walls - The building has approx. 25% of its external walls covered in cladding/infill panels, along the window sections.

The spandrel panels (ACM, MCM or HPL metal sheet panels type) in both staircases are exposed, while the rear and side walls are covered in siding panels - it was not possible to ascertain the type of material underneath.

Building's height, open deck access, and the presence of alternative MoE are all risk mitigating factors, but replacement of the panels is recommended upon the next refurbishment.

Use of Government's Fire Risk Prioritization Tool to determine the urgency of a potential removal, and/or a FRAEW (in line with PAS 9980) of the cladding has been recommended.

AFD provision exists within the accommodation units, LD2 D1 - BS5839-6.

Lightning Protection not installed – installation deemed unnecessary due to low risk – neighbouring building is a high-rise block.

FRS engine can access the surveyed premise from the front and LHS.

MoE from upper (non-entry) levels of maisonettes – the upper level of maisonettes accessed from GF is <4.5m from the ground, which makes escape via windows acceptable as alternative MoE.

The upper level of the maisonettes accessed from the 1st floor balcony – there are roof access hatches in each bedroom, which makes the Assessor assume that this was the intended alternative MoE, during the time of construction. This could not be confirmed during this inspection and should be investigated further.

The Accommodation units' Internal Design was not subject to inspection by the Assessor to confirm adequate compartmentation.

Persons at Risk - it is not untypical of a social housing block for persons of various ages, physical & cognitive abilities, and behavioural types to be in the premises by way of lawful and unlawful tenancies or visit. It had not been identified to the Assessor of any specific individual person/s especially at risk from fire. It is expected that lone workers (LBHF cleaning operatives) are informed of, 'site specific' risks and have appropriate Fire Safety awareness Training.

It is the Assessors opinion that the 'Stay Put' strategy adopted is considered adequate, subsequent to further surveys/inspections to be undertaken and inclusive of the identified remedial works to be actioned as noted in this FRA.

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Guidance

Copyright:

The information contained within this Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) document is owned by the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham (LBHF) and may not be used or reproduced without written permission. This document is provided, to the recipient, subject to specific obligations of confidentiality set forth in one or more binding legal agreements between LBHF and the recipient.

Scope of Assessment:

This FRA has been carried out on behalf of the 'Responsible Person' in accordance with Article 9 of the requirements of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (FSO). The purpose of this report is to provide an assessment of the risk to life from fire in this premise and where appropriate, to identify significant findings to ensure compliance with fire safety legislation as obliged observing current best practice, providing a minimum fire safety standard.

This report reflects the fire safety standards identified during inspection and does not address the risk fire may pose to property or business continuity.

In order to carry out this fire risk assessment the assessor has used their professional expertise, judgement and guidance contained in the British Standards Institute's publicly available specification (PAS 79: 2012), the Department for Communities & Local Government guidance, 'Fire Safety Risk Assessment - Sleeping Accommodation', Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services (LACORS) 'Housing Fire Safety' guidance and NFCC guidance 'Fire Safety in Specialised Housing'.

Which provides best practice guidance on fire safety provisions in England for certain types of existing housing; as well as the Local Government Association (LGA) Guidance 'Fire safety in purpose-built blocks of flats'.

The aim of the fire risk assessment process is not necessarily to bring an existing building up to the standard expected for a new building, constructed under current legislation. Rather, the intention is to identify measures which are practicable to implement in order to provide a reasonable level of safety for people in and around the premises. Information for the completion of this assessment was obtained by a physical type 1 survey, in compliance with LBHF policy and for the purpose of satisfying the FSO. The inspection of the building is non-destructive. The fire risk assessment will consider the arrangements for means of escape and so forth that will include examination of at least a sample of flat entrance doors. It also considers, so far as reasonably practicable, the separating construction between the flats and the common parts without any opening up of construction; however, in this type of survey, entry to flats beyond the area of the flat entrance door, is not involved as there is normally no automatic right of access for freeholders.

If your premises have been designed and built in line with modern building regulations (and are being used in line with those regulations), your structural fire precautions should be acceptable. While every effort is made to inspect fire compartmentation & fire separating elements of buildings, dependant on accessibility, including roof spaces, voids and service risers, to assess the integrity, comments reflect reasonable assumption. Unless there is reason to expect serious deficiencies in structural fire protection – such as inadequate compartmentation, or poor fire stopping – a type 1 inspection will normally be sufficient. Where doubt exists in relation to these matters, the action plan may recommend that one of the other types of fire risk assessment be carried out or that further investigation be carried out by specialists. (Any such recommendation would be based on identification of issues that justify reason for doubt.)

The FRA includes an Action Plan that sets out measures to enable the Responsible Person to achieve this benchmark risk mitigation level, satisfy the requirements of the FSO and to protect Relevant Persons (as defined in Article 2 of the FSO), from the risks of fire.

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Compartmentation and Building Features

From a Type 1 inspection perspective, are there breaches identified effecting compartmentation along the escape route?	No
From a Type 1 inspection perspective, are there ineffective or inappropriate materials used to create compartmentation?	No
Does the building have a roof void?	No
Was a survey of the roof void carried out as part of this inspection?	N/A
Are there other concerns identified with the roof void?	N/A
Are lifts installed?	No
Did you get access to survey the lift motor room?	N/A
Are there any other concerns with Lifts or the Lift Motor Room?	N/A
Are there utility cupboards within the communal area?	Yes
Are there any breaches in compartmentation?	No
Do utility cupboard doors appear to be FD30s standard?	Yes
Is there evidence to confirm FD30s doors are certified?	No
Is there damage to any part of the door or frame affecting its performance as a 30 minute fire and smoke resistant door?	No
Are personal items or rubbish in any inspected utility or riser cupboard?	Yes
Is there a CO2 extinguisher inside each large electrical cupboard?	Yes
Are CO2 extinguishers compliant?	N/A
Are there other concerns identified with the utility cupboards and vertical risers?	No
Is external cladding fitted to the building?	Yes
Does the external cladding appear suitably fitted and in good condition?	Yes
Is the external cladding constructed from fire rated materials?	Unable to Confirm
Are the internal escape route walls and ceilings to Class 0 standard?	Yes

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Are there other concerns identified with flammable materials internally or externally? No

Means of Escape

Is the stated emergency evacuation strategy suitable? Yes

Are fire action notices displayed at the entrances, fire exits and each level as required? Yes

Are travel distances appropriate for the building design? Yes

Are the internal escape route corridors free of trip hazards? Yes

Are stairs free of all trip hazards? Yes

Are there personal items exceeding the managed policy for communal areas, adversely affecting the escape routes? No

Do final exits open in the direction of flow where required? N/A

Are cable and wire fixings to external walls/ceilings to current standards to limit the likelihood of wire entanglement? Yes

Are there suitable door opening devices such as thumb turns, push pad/bar? N/A

Is directional and exit signage necessary in this building? No

Where lifts are installed, are suitable fire safety signs displayed at each level? N/A

Does the building have an external escape route? No

Are there other concerns identified with the evacuation of the building? No

Is emergency lighting installed? Yes

Does the installed emergency lighting provide suitable coverage? No

Are there recorded or observable defects with the emergency lighting system? No

Is there evidence of a current and up-to-date emergency lighting service contract and maintenance programme? Yes

If there is no emergency lighting, does the building require the installation of an emergency lighting system? N/A

Is there a need to increase the emergency lighting provision? Yes

Are there other concerns identified with the emergency lighting? No

Does the building have suitable means to naturally ventilate the escape routes? Yes

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Is there a smoke ventilation system installed?

No

Are there any concerns identified with ventilation of the internal escape route?

No

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Doors

Is the main entrance door suitable as part of the evacuation strategy for the building?	N/A
Is security to the property suitable to restrict access to the property by uninvited persons during 'out of hour' times?	N/A
Are there a sufficient number of fire exits?	Yes
Are there any defects (glazing, furniture, frames, door) requiring repair or maintenance works?	N/A
Do any fire exits lead to areas that could put persons at further risk?	No
Do all fire exits have suitable signage?	Yes
Are there other concerns identified with the main entrance and fire exit doors?	No
Are there any compartment fire doors installed in this building?	No
Are there locations where compartment fire doors should be installed?	No
Are there other concerns identified with the compartment fire doors?	N/A
Are there flat entrance FD30s doors in required areas of the building (dead ends, stairwells, enclosed buildings)?	N/A
Where FD30s doors have been installed, do any inspected doors have a certification marking?	No
For open deck buildings, are there flat entrance doors not at a suitable fire and security standard?	No
Are positive action self-closers fitted and to the front face of the doors?	Yes
From the sample inspection taken, do the flat entrance doors freely self close into the frame?	Yes
Are there any defective flat entrance doors (glazing, furniture, frames, door) requiring repair or maintenance works?	Yes
Are there other concerns identified with the flat entrance doors?	No

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Fire Hazards

Are "No Smoking" signs displayed at each entrance?	Yes
Is a no smoking policy being observed in the communal areas?	Yes
Any other concerns identified with smoking?	No
Are there suitable locations provided for storage of refuse?	Yes
Is the refuse area appropriately clear and well managed?	No
Are vertical refuse chutes fitted to the building?	Yes
Are the hoppers in good condition and fitted with smoke seals?	Yes
Is there a working pull plate at the base of the chute?	Yes
Does the refuse system appear to be free of physical defects?	Yes
Are there other concerns identified with refuse?	No
Has fixed electrical wiring been subject to a safety inspection within the past five years?	Yes
Is there a lightning protection system installed?	No
Is there a wheelchair or stair lift in the communal area?	No
Are there electrical or charged items in the communal area (fridges, tumble dryers, mobility scooters etc)?	No
Any other concerns identified with ignition sources?	No

Fire Detection

From the sample flats accessed, is early warning fire detection appropriate?	Yes
--	-----

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Fire Safety Management

Are there hydrants within the grounds of the property estate?	Yes
Are there notable restrictions for the positioning of fire appliances within 20 metres of the building?	No
Is a Premises Information Box installed?	No
Are there complexities or unique features to the building to warrant the installation of a Premises Information Box?	No
Is there a working Drop Key mechanism to access the building?	N/A
Are there other concerns identified for fire service operations?	No
Did you encounter any potential or actual hoarding risks?	No
LBHF have a medical register of O2 users, did you encounter a resident declaring they were using O2 but not registered?	No
Is there a suppression system installed within any part of the building?	No
Did you encounter any potential hazards due to negligent contractor work at the property and its grounds?	No
Are there other concerns identified with fire safety management?	No
Does the building contain both commercial outlets and residential dwellings?	No
Any there other concerns identified with control of shared means of escape?	N/A

Safety Management

Are in-house checks of the Emergency Lighting being carried out and recorded?	Yes
Are in-house checks of Fire exits and Escape routes being carried out and recorded?	Unable to Confirm

Actions Arising from the Survey:

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

	Slight Harm	Moderate Harm	Extreme Harm
Low	Trivial Risk	Tolerable Risk	Moderate Risk
Medium	Tolerable Risk	Moderate Risk	Substantial Risk
High	Moderate Risk	Substantial Risk	Intolerable Risk

Risk Scores:	
Risk Score at the time of the Assessment	Moderate Risk
Risk Score if all actions are implemented:	Tolerable Risk