

# Notice of Meeting

---

## **Safer Select Committee**

**Monday, 5th July, 2010 at 6.30 pm**  
in Committee Room 1 Council Offices  
Market Street Newbury

Date of despatch of Agenda: Friday, 25 June 2010

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Elaine Walker on (01635) 519441  
e-mail: [ewalker@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:ewalker@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at  
[www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



## Agenda - Safer Select Committee to be held on Monday, 5 July 2010 (continued)

- To:** Councillors Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Adrian Edwards, Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman), Quentin Webb (Chairman) and Keith Woodhams
- Substitutes:** Councillors Lee Dillon, Geoff Findlay, Tony Linden and Gwen Mason
- Officers and other invitees:** Councillor Paul Bryant, David Sharp (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service), Sean Tye (Property Development Manager), Ian Priestley (Assurance Manager), Andy Day (Head of Policy and Communication), Elaine Walker (Principal Policy Officer, Equality and Diversity)
- 

# Agenda

## Part I

	<b>Page No.</b>
1 <b>Apologies</b> To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any),	
2 <b>Minutes</b> To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meetings of this Committee held on 6 <sup>th</sup> April 2010 and 11 <sup>th</sup> May 2010.	1 - 8
3 <b>Declarations of Interest</b> To receive any Declarations of Interest from Members.	
4 <b>Matters Arising</b> <i>Purpose: To receive an update on activity identified at previous meetings.</i>	9 - 10
5 <b>Installation of Fire Sprinklers Review</b> <i>Purpose: To receive information to inform a policy recommendation regarding the installation of fire sprinklers in Council buildings.</i> <i>Information to be received from:</i> <i>a) David Sharp (Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service)</i> <i>b) Sean Tye (Property Development Manager)</i> <i>c) Ian Priestley (Assurance Manager)</i>	11 - 40
6 <b>Work Programme</b> To review the work programme for 2010/11.	41 - 42

Andy Day  
Head of Policy and Communication



**Agenda - Safer Select Committee to be held on Monday, 5 July 2010** *(continued)*

West Berkshire Council is committed to equality of opportunity. We will treat everyone with respect, regardless of race, disability, gender, age, religion or sexual orientation.

If you require this information in a different format, such as audio tape, or in another language, please ask an English speaker to contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045, who will be able to help.



This page is intentionally left blank

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE****MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON  
TUESDAY, 6 APRIL 2010**

**Councillors:** Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Adrian Edwards, Roger Hunneman (Vice-Chairman) and Quentin Webb (Chairman)

**Also Present:** Councillor Paul Bryant, Andy Day (Head of Policy and Communication), Superintendent Robin Rickard (Thames Valley Police), Andrew Garratt (Principal Engineer, Traffic Management and Road Safety), Elaine Vincent (Principal Policy Officer, Equality and Diversity)

**PART I****17 Apologies**

An apology for inability to attend the meeting was received on behalf of Councillor Keith Woodhams.

**18 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**19 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Edwards declared an interest in Agenda Item 6, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 6, but reported that as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to present his item.

**20 Update on Actions**

Further information was requested about the progress of the 'Have Your Say' meetings that were being developed in support of Improving Public Confidence. Superintendent Robin Rickard explained that the concept of 'Have Your Say' encompassed a wide range of interaction with the public, from face to face conversations, to large conferences. The aim of 'Have Your Say' was to strengthen consultation mechanisms appropriately for local areas. The concept required further consideration prior to implementation to avoid consultation fatigue and to ensure real value was gained.

The Public Involvement Board, a sub group of the Local Strategic Partnership with a specific remit to coordinate consultation activity across partner agencies, were

**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES**

involved in the development of 'Have Your Say' and would be looking at making the best use of existing consultation structures.

**Resolved that:** this action would remain on the Committee's action plan.

**21 Improving Public Confidence**

The Committee agreed that Recommendation 2 should be reworded to reflect that 'Have Your Say' was still in development, and that it encompassed a broader aim of strengthening consultation mechanisms to benefit a number of local agencies.

It was requested that the recommendation included reference to the Public Involvement Board and incorporated a definition of this Board.

**Resolved that:**

- Recommendation 2 of the Improving Public Confidence report would be amended to read 'The Public Involvement Board is a subgroup of the Local Strategic Partnership formed specifically to coordinate consultation activity. The Public Involvement Board of the West Berkshire Partnership be asked to develop a more integrated approach to consultation across the District'.
- The report was agreed by the Committee for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission in May 2010 subject to the above amendment.

**22 Installation of Fire Sprinklers Review**

*Councillor Edwards declared an interest in Agenda Item 6 by virtue of the fact that he is a member of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.*

*Councillor Bryant declared an interest in Agenda Item 6 by virtue of the fact that he is the Chair of the Royal Berkshire Fire Authority, but reported that as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he was permitted to present the report.*

Councillor Bryant presented an introduction to Agenda Item 6 to the Committee, and explained why this item had been brought for review.

The aims of the Fire Service were to reduce deaths and loss of property as a result of fire. It was noted that in England there was currently no mandatory requirement to install fire sprinklers in new buildings although this requirement was in place in Scotland and Wales. Councillor Bryant was therefore asking for the Council to take the lead in the local area by implementing a policy that would

**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES**

ensure fire sprinklers would be installed in all new and substantially refurbished Council buildings, including schools.

Councillor Bryant went on to present arguments for the installation of fire sprinklers:

- Fire costed approximately 500 lives per year with an accompanying £7bn financial cost.
- In the UK, no lives had been lost due to fire, in a building fitted with fire sprinklers.
- There was estimated to be an 80% reduction in injuries in buildings fitted with fire sprinklers.
- There was estimated to be an 80% reduction in property damage due to sprinkler systems targeting only the localised area of fire. It was also noted that there was an estimate of just one in 16 million sprinklers operating accidentally.
- There would be potential to reduce insurance premiums by up to 65% for buildings fitted with fire sprinklers.
- The estimated cost of installing fire sprinklers was 1% - 2% of the total build cost which, it was argued, could be recouped in approximately 5 years.
- There would be more flexibility in building design.
- There would be additional environmental benefits from the reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> being released into the atmosphere from a fire and a subsequent rebuild, and a reduction in the water required to control a fire when compared to fire officers using hose pipes.

Councillor Bryant concluded by showing a short video produced by the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service which demonstrated the effects of fire in a house with fire sprinklers, compared to one without.

The Committee discussed the issues presented and the following points were clarified:

- Business Continuity plans were required to be prepared by the Council to address how services would continue in the event of disaster including a fire.
- A survey showed that 43% of schools had experienced a fire in the last three years, and it was estimated that schools could expect to be subject to a fire every 10 years.

**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES**

- It was not proposed that fire sprinklers be fitted retrospectively in buildings due to the cost and disruption.

The Committee requested that relevant officers should be invited to the next session of this review topic in order to explain the Council's insurance provision in respect of fire damage, and any implications that might result from changing the insurance provider.

A concise report was requested to be circulated to the Committee to present relevant information and figures.

The Committee discussed whether the scope of this review should be amended to specify that the proposal was to include new and substantially refurbished buildings only. This was rejected so as not to restrict full consideration of the proposal.

The Committee agreed the scope of this review subject to the inclusion of a request for the Head of Finance to be invited to the next session.

**Resolved that:**

- The scope of the review would be amended to invite the Head of Finance to the next session.
- Councillor Bryant would be invited to attend the next session.
- A representative of the Fire Service would be invited to attend the next session.
- A report would be prepared ahead of the next session which would present relevant information.

**23 Killed and Seriously Injured Road Traffic Casualties**

Andrew Garratt presented information to the Committee regarding progress against recommendations made following a scrutiny review into killed and seriously injured road traffic casualties. The following points were clarified:

- The content for a Member development session was being investigated to ensure that Members would gain useful information that could then be communicated within their communities to raise awareness.
- National Indicators were expected to be amended after 2010 and it was anticipated that the current measures would be separated into the number of



**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES**

people killed, the number of serious injuries, and the number of pedestrian injuries.

- Due to the very small numbers involved, an apparently high percentage change might represent a very small change in numbers.
- A number of campaigns had been undertaken including a speed limit review, road safety education, and road safety campaigns. A programme of activity around schools included walking bus information, a considerate car use leaflet aimed at parents parking at schools, and schools booklets which included an overview of the initiatives that schools could request information about.
- Comparative figures were available for other local authority areas in a local area profile report. West Berkshire compared favourably to other areas in this report. Andrew Garratt agreed to circulate the local area profile report to the Committee.
- Speed cameras were still active and a review was underway to identify whether the camera locations were still appropriate. The review was in preparation for digital technology when speed cameras would need to be replaced. There would be a budget implication with this.
- The fire service were currently involved in road safety education alongside the Council, attending events such as the Newbury Show and being involved in campaigns such as 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive'.
- Monitoring of accidents did continue in areas identified as accident black spots. The reason for the accident would be investigated to ensure that the original issue had been resolved.
- The figures presented in the report had not been adjusted to reflect changing traffic volume.
- Civil Enforcement Officers did currently carry out spot checks on parking around schools.
- A review was being carried out into traffic light cameras to assist in enforcing compliance with traffic signals.

The Committee thanked Andrew Garratt for the work undertaken in this area.

**Resolved that** Andrew Garratt would circulate the local area profile report to the Committee.

**24 Work Programme**

**SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE - 6 April 2010 - MINUTES**

The Committee agreed the work programme, but requested that completed items be identified clearly.

**Resolved that** completed review items would be identified in future work programmes.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.15 pm

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature.** .....

# DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

## SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 11 MAY 2010

**Councillors:** Jeff Beck, George Chandler, Adrian Edwards, Roger Hunneman, Quentin Webb and Keith Woodhams

#### PART I

**1. Election of Chairman**

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Quentin Webb be elected Chairman of the Safer Select Committee for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

**Councillor Quentin Webb in the Chair.**

**2. Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence received.

**3. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Roger Hunneman be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Safer Select Committee for the 2010/11 Municipal Year.

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

## Safer Select Committee – Matters Arising

6<sup>th</sup> April 2010

<b>Improving Public Confidence</b>		
'Have Your Say' meetings would be developed to integrate what was required by residents, the police, the Council and other interested agencies.  [Carried forward]	RR / AD	RR updated the Committee that Have Your Say was a concept still to be fully developed that would streamline consultation across agencies to avoid consultation fatigue and to ensure good quality information is forthcoming. Have Your Say would continue to be developed through the Public Involvement Board.
Recommendation 2 of the Improving Public Confidence report would be amended to read 'The Public Involvement Board is a subgroup of the Local Strategic Partnership formed specifically to coordinate consultation activity. The Public Involvement Board of the West Berkshire Partnership be asked to develop a more integrated approach to consultation across the District'.	EV	Complete
The report was agreed by the Committee for submission to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission in May 2010 subject to the above amendment.	EV	Submitted to OSMC in May 2010
<b>Installation of Fire Sprinklers Review</b>		
The scope of the review would be amended to invite the Head of Finance to the next session.	EV	Ian Priestly to attend and provide report
Councillor Bryant would be invited to attend the next session.	EV	Complete
A representative of the Fire Service would be invited to attend the next session.	EV	David Sharp of RBFRS to attend and provide information to the Committee.
A report would be prepared ahead of the next session which would present relevant information.	Property, H&S, Finance	Sean Tye to attend and provide report.
<b>Killed and Seriously Injured Road Traffic Casualties</b>		
Andrew Garratt would circulate the local area profile report to the Committee.	AG	Complete. EV circulated to Committee.
<b>Work Programme</b>		
Completed review items would be identified in future work programmes.	EV	Complete

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Sprinklers in Schools and Other Council Buildings</b>
<b>Report to be considered by:</b>	Safer Select Committee
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	05 July 2010
<b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>	

**Purpose of Report:**                      Review the approach to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings

**Recommended Action:**

**Reason for decision to be taken:**

**Other options considered:**

**Key background documentation:**                      DCSF guidance, Building Regulations & BB100

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Plan Priority(ies):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPP1 – Support our communities through the economic downturn</b> – to alleviate the impact on different communities and individuals who find themselves out of work and/or disadvantaged
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPP2 – Raise levels of educational achievement</b> – improving school performance levels
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPP3 – Reduce crime and the fear of crime</b>
The proposals will also help achieve the following Council Plan Theme(s):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT1 - Better Roads and Transport</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT2 - Thriving Town Centres</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT3 - Affordable Housing</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT4 - High Quality Planning</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT5 - Cleaner and Greener</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT6 - Vibrant Villages</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT7 - Safer and Stronger Communities</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT8 - A Healthier Life</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT9 - Successful Schools and Learning</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT10 - Promoting Independence</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT11 - Protecting Vulnerable People</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT12 - Including Everyone</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT13 - Value for Money</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT14 - Effective People</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT15 - Putting Customers First</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>CPT16 - Excellent Performance Management</b>

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the above Council Plan Priorities and Themes by:

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Keith Chopping - (0118) 983 2057
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Sean Tye
Job Title:	Property Development Manager
Tel. No.:	01635 519565
E-mail Address:	stye@westberks.gov.uk

## Implications

### Policy:

### Financial:

If there are any financial implications contained within this report this section **must** be signed off by a West Berkshire Group Accountant. Please note that the report cannot be accepted by Policy and Communication unless this action has been undertaken.

### Personnel:

### Legal/Procurement:

### Property:

### Risk Management:

### Equalities Impact Assessment:

For advice please contact Principal Policy Officer (Equalities) on Ext. 2441.

### Corporate Board's Recommendation:

to be completed after the Corporate Board meeting

**NOTE: The section below does not need to be completed if your report will not progress beyond Corporate or Management Board.**

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>

*Footer to be completed by Policy & Communication*

West Berkshire Council

name of decision body

date of meeting



**DRAFT DOCUMENT**

Item is Urgent Key Decision

## Executive Summary

---

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 At the last meeting of the Safer Select Committee, it was agreed to review the approach to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings (new or refurbished and including schools) with consideration to developing a policy around this. The following colleagues were consulted in preparation of this report:

Bill Bagnell	- Manager - Special Projects
Mark Lewis	- Education Assets Manager
Marina Billinge-Jones	- Insurance Officer
Ian Priestley	- Assurance Manager
Andy Green	- Maintenance Manger

### 2. Proposals

- 2.1 The Committee have requested that the Property Development Manager prepare and present some information to inform the Committee of possible options relating to fire safety systems.
- 2.2 The motion put to Full Council some years ago by Councillor Bryant required the Council to undertake a fire risk assessment to establish whether a sprinkler system was required to mitigate the risk of fire, whether by arson or other causes on projects that met the criteria within the motion.
- 2.3 The report considers the following points that the Committee requested investigation:
- What is the current Council policy regarding fire safety systems?
  - What consideration has been given to the use of fire sprinklers in Council buildings (new builds or during refurbishment projects)?
  - Were they installed, or were alternative systems installed?
  - How was the decision reached as to the appropriate system to be installed?
  - Are there any relevant risk assessments available?
  - Is there any cost / benefit information that may be of use to the Committee?
  - Is there any other information that may be of use to the Committee?
- 2.4 Council Policy
- 2.5 West Berkshire Council do not currently have a policy to install sprinklers to their buildings, however must comply with current fire precaution regulations. Since 2007 WBC have undertaken Fire Risk Assessments on all school projects (that meet the criteria). This is to establish whether there is a need to install sprinkler systems to reduce the risks to an appropriate level. This means that a Fire Risk

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

Assessment (FRA) should be carried out for each new project undertaken as appropriate

- 2.6 This does not preclude fitting sprinklers in Council owned buildings, but there is no blanket policy for installing sprinklers. The Council is also responsible for ensuring that staff are adequately trained in basic fire prevention processes. In schools there is joint responsibility for fire safety between the LEA, head teachers and school governors. It is recommended that members consider the implications of adopting the motion as outlined in this report. If Council is minded to adopt the motion they may be requested to consider a policy to install sprinklers in all new school buildings, including extensions built by and on behalf of the Council.

### 3. Conclusion

- 3.1 Any policy adopted should define the criteria to be applied for projects that include extension or refurbishment of existing buildings. It is recommended that a practical application is sought to avoid encumbering smaller projects with disproportionate infrastructure costs.
- 3.2 The policy should also acknowledge that there may be instances where planning constraints prevent the installation of above ground tanks for water based systems.
- 3.3 The current policy of undertaking Fire Risk Assessments is a successful and managed approach which is affordable when assessing whether sprinklers are required in council buildings. A blanket policy to install sprinklers to all new council buildings would financially impact on what can be achieved for capital and corporate projects.

## Executive Report

---

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Sprinklers have the outstanding advantage of attacking, rather than containing a fire, and do so quickly, locally and effectively. Sprinklers should be seen in context; other fire protection measures, many of them mandatory, minimise fires and fire-damage.
- 1.2 Fires in schools and other public buildings are an emotive issue. The damage and distress that can be caused by fires cannot be underestimated. For this reason, it is essential that the public have confidence in the measures put in place to prevent and deal with fire in public buildings.
- 1.3 The Fire Service is currently urging local authorities to consider installation of sprinklers in schools as part of its wider strategy to develop a pro-active approach to fire prevention as set out in the White Paper *Our Fire and Rescue Service*. The Local Government Association has also published a series of booklets, *Automatic Fire Sprinklers – Toolkits for Local Authorities, Schools and Domestic Properties*, in February 2004.

### 2. Background

- 2.1 The Fire Service supports the installation of sprinklers for the following reasons. Because they:
  - detect fire
  - extinguish fire
  - raise the alarm (both in the building and linked directly to Fire Brigade)
  - protect occupants (the spray reduced the harmful effects of large particles in smoke)
  - protect the building
  - provide additional safety for fire fighters
  - are reliable
  - tackle a fire far sooner than the Fire Brigade could usually arrive;
- 2.2 The Fire Service also emphasise the distress caused by fire and argued that the ensuing educational disruption, sense of loss and psychological damage should be taken into account when considering what preventive measure to put in place.
- 2.3 Property has found that 'end users' had concerns raised about the water damage caused by sprinklers due to the high volumes of water they use. Apparently firemen's hoses can cause more water damage than sprinklers. Modern sprinklers have a localised action and often only one or two sprinklers directly above a fire would be activated. It is also extremely rare for sprinklers to cause water damage through faulty mechanisms.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

## 3. Education buildings - DCSF policy regarding sprinklers Systems.

- 3.1 Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the degree of damage caused by fire and can reduce the risk to life, however sprinklers should not be considered to be an essential feature to assure the life safety of occupants. On 1 March 2007, DCSF announced the new policy on sprinklers and their value as a measure against the risk of fire and arson. All new schools i.e. a new site (not standalone new buildings) should have fire sprinklers installed except in a few low risk schools.
- 3.2 Although the provision of sprinklers is not a requirement of the Building Regulations, DCSF expects that the Education Authority, Funding Body or overall 'client' of the scheme, should request, as part of the Employer's Requirements, that a risk assessment be undertaken to assess the validity of providing sprinklers in the scheme. Formal requirements for life safety are covered by national legislation (Building Regulations) and supporting technical guidance with respect to fire. The relevant building regulation is Approved Document B.
- 3.3 To help clients, local authorities and design teams assess the level of risk and make the right decisions; the DCSF has developed two new practical aids. The first is an interactive fire risk assessment tool. DCSF expects that this risk analysis will always be carried out and new schools being planned that score medium or high risk using the risk analysis tool will have sprinklers fitted.
- 3.4 In the recent past the Council have had very few instances of fire damage in the Council's schools, and none have been major. However, many school sites are in areas not served by retained fire crews, and hence the impact of a fire could be much greater due to the resulting response times.
- 3.5 The risk in schools, as a building type, is considered higher than other types due to a number of factors, notably the hours of use, holiday periods during which they remain largely vacant, and a lack of natural surveillance.
- 3.6 Without fire sprinklers installed, the impact of a significant fire at a school would be significant, and would extend far beyond the financial impact of making good the damage caused. Such an event would inevitably result in the loss of teaching material and student's coursework, but would also cause significant disruption with the school or parts of it shut down, and teaching taking place from temporary classroom facilities.
- 3.7 It is important to note, that the Building Regulations provide a framework whereby safe operation and evacuation of the building is assured through robust fire engineering. Where buildings are designed to meet the Building Regulations Approved Document B the installation of sprinklers would improve the level of protection afforded to the building itself, limiting the ability of a fire to spread and thus vastly reducing the impact of making good fire damage.
- 3.8 Where specialist space is affected e.g. science or sports facilities, this accommodation may not be easily or quickly replaced leading to a compromise in standards at the affected school while fire damage is made good.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

- 4. The use of fire sprinklers for Council buildings (new builds or during refurbishment projects)**
- 4.1 Property Services & Special Projects project officers act as the Councils'/Schools expert construction representative. The projects officers provide advice and guidance on the regulation pertaining to each individual school or project; coordinates, consultant services, ensuring interaction between sponsors and end users. However we are not experts in sprinkler or fire systems and therefore buy in advice as required through consultants.
- 4.2 To date very few projects have required the installation of sprinklers. An example project where sprinklers have been a requirement is the St.Bart's Redevelopment Project. The driver for the requirement was the then DCSF who stated that central government funded school's projects will require sprinklers unless an independent assessment can state why there is no benefit in terms of property protection.
- 4.3 Parts B of the Building Regulations are due to change again whereby buildings of a certain size and occupancy rate must have sprinklers and thus regardless of DCSF requirements, the St. Bart's project would have required sprinklers to satisfy new regulations. The driver in this instance is human safety and associated with the large assembly of people in different key areas of the new school; the main (internal) assembly hall, the sports hall and central atrium spaces within each house block.
- 4.4 The new sixth form extension proposed for Theale Green School has been found to require sprinklers. NIFES Consulting Group was commissioned to carry out a sprinkler risk assessment in accordance with Building Bulletin 100 (BB100). All assessments are undertaken with a consistent approach as follows:
- 4.5 A visit to the school is made by a specialist consultant, carried out along with liaison with the fire service and West Berkshire Council. This allows for all drawings, visual surveys and interviews with the relevant people to be carried out. This allows all the relevant data required to carry out the sprinkler risk assessment to be obtained.
- 4.6 Using the data and information provided, the sprinkler risk assessment is carried out. The sprinkler assessment is produced based upon the frozen layout and implementation of recommendations. See Appendix A.
- 5. Sprinkler system's installed**
- 5.1 Recently the findings of a sprinkler risk assessment for the proposed sixth form extension at Theale Green School produced a score of 56. This equates to the school being at an average risk with sprinklers being recommended. The project is at 'Design Stage' and therefore details are ongoing.
- 6. St. Barts**
- 6.1 A wet sprinkler system was installed at St. Bart's. Without sprinklers, the proposed school and community occupancy rates/usage of key school areas would not have all been approved by the Fire Officer unless the school could prove that mitigating school management procedures would make up for the lack of sprinklers. Such management procedures would not have been universally practical and thus in turn Building Control would not be prepared to issue 'Certificate of Occupation'.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

6.2 Property Services are carrying out fire risk assessments for most Council buildings. A programme of fire risk assessments in all WBC properties has recently been completed by NIFES Consulting. From the fire risk assessments a 5 year programme of remedial works has been prepared and approved by Corporate Board to enable the Council to meet its obligations under the RRO; the programme of remedial commenced 2008. For further details see Appendix B.

6.3 The following measures are incorporated to minimise fires and fire damage.

- Compartmentalisation of a building, with fire doors and fire walls and fire resistant materials. These localise the fire and stop it spreading
- Fire Risk Assessments to enable improved observance of fire-avoidance procedures
- Automatic Fire Alarm systems which alert the brigade to fires automatically
- Emergency Lighting systems

## 7. Conclusion as to the system that should be installed

7.1 To date only one WBC project has incorporated sprinklers and therefore we can only refer to the example below:

7.2 St. Barts

A wet sprinkler system was installed at St. Barts at a cost of approximately £800K. By the time the cost of servicing the main internal hall, sports hall and the atriums of each of the house blocks had been accounted for, it made sense to service the whole school with sprinklers. The new St. Barts is an IT rich building and thus there is an argument for installing a dry/gas sprinkler system. This has planning (and cost) advantages since an area for large water storage does not need to be found.

Risk assessments available?

7.3 Theale Green 6<sup>th</sup> form project (See Appendix C)

## 8. Cost/benefit information that may be of use to the Committee

8.1 Generally, the cost burden of sprinklers to a project increases as project size decreases. For example, the St. Barts costs of £800K should be set against a total building construction project cost of £32M, whereas the Theale Green project of £1.5M includes a comparable sprinkler coverage to St. Barts (relative to size) at a cost of £200K (This is an initial indicative cost)

8.2 There are project scenarios where building use, in addition to safety measures, will dictate which type of system will be considered – wet or dry (gas). An example of a building being better serviced by a dry system would be a Public Library. However, it must be remembered that dry sprinkler systems on average cost 35% more than a traditional wet sprinkler system.

8.3 DCSF funding models do not include an allocation for sprinklers. It therefore falls on the Local Authority to either fund the installation themselves or to fund it from within defined funding envelopes.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

## 9. Insurance

- 9.1 The projects that have been progressed to date with sprinklers installed have enabled Council officers, together with their design teams to work closely with the Council's insurers.
- 9.2 At design stage, WBC insurer Aspen, via DLJ (Brokers), were informed that the new St. Barts School would be fully sprinklered. The brokers confirmed the new school would be covered by the Council's existing blanket cover with Aspen for all Council buildings, that the costs of full replacement would be noted and that the inclusion of sprinklers would not beneficially affect the Council's total cover premium for its portfolio of buildings. Generally there is evidence of insurers requiring new buildings which have long periods of non occupancy (some schools during summer holidays) to have sprinklers, but this course of action does not appear to result in more generous insurance terms.
- 9.3 The Fire Service believes that installing sprinklers would reduce insurance premiums or result in lower excess payments.
- 9.4 The impact on the Council's insurance policy of installing sprinklers is minimal due to the size of the Council's property portfolio, the impact on the insurable risk by installing sprinklers on relatively few new build schools is negligible, and does not therefore result in a reduction to the premium.
- 9.5 Insurers are unlikely to seek significant input on the protection if only a minority of the site is protected as the site is classified as un-sprinklered. According to our insurance team our deductible has not been breached in this respect (i.e. any claims that we have had were under the excess of £250,000 however sprinklers may have reduced the costs to the Council) see Appendix D for arson data & Appendix E for other fire.

## 10. Sprinkler Costs – Retro-fit

- 10.1 Sprinkler systems are expensive to install within existing buildings since they require a network of pipes throughout the building to provide adequate sprinkler cover. This is very disruptive to the building fabric with installation work above ceiling and may involve asbestos removal prior to installation.
- 10.2 Costs are dependent on the building structure and type of system to be fitted and are therefore hard to accurately estimate. Worcestershire County Council carried out a survey at a medium-size school (1500m<sup>2</sup>) to ascertain the cost of installing a system complete with all the necessary controls and water storage. The price quoted was £83,500, i.e. about £55 per square metre. In addition there would be costs to remove and reinstate ceilings, and possibly remove asbestos. They concluded that the costs of installing sprinklers in all existing schools is too expensive for the County to bear and do not recommend installation in existing schools.

## 11. Sprinkler Costs – New Build

- 11.1 It is more cost effective i.e. economy by scale when installing sprinkler systems to new sites because the services such as water supply, tanks, pumps etc will be serving all of its buildings compared with say one building e.g. new sixth form



# DRAFT DOCUMENT

building Theale Green School. In other words the set up infrastructure costs are similar.

- 11.2 On the question of actual costs, Worcestershire County Council sought examples from authorities that had fitted sprinklers and found that the average cost was higher than 1.8%. Warwickshire's pilot project, building a new Special School for Nuneaton and Bedworth, is currently being planned. The total project cost is about £7m and the architect has estimated that £350,000 (5%) approx is the cost of installing sprinklers.
- 11.3 The installation of sprinkler systems in two Wiltshire Council projects has enabled costs to be tested for typical school project types. This leads to indicative costs as below, which compare with benchmark costs from other sources:
- 1350 pupil Secondary School - £550,000, equivalent to 2.3% of construction cost
  - 210 pupil Primary School - £70,000, equivalent to 2.5% of construction cost
  - 420 pupil Primary School - £125,000, equivalent to 2.8% of construction
- 11.4 Our findings for the new sixth form extension proposed for Theale Green School, a relatively small project based on actual current figures, are that outline costs for this are coming in at around 200k. This would suggest an increase of project cost of between 12 to 15%. There is no separate funding to finance the inclusion of sprinklers in our projects therefore they are a project cost. Clearly this will have a major impact on this and other projects.
- 11.5 We accept the possibility that a low cost system (where no storage tanks or pumps are required) may be possible. In most cases though, it is likely that pumps and storage tanks are needed and therefore the cost of installing a fire sprinkler system is based upon the following criteria:
- A separate water supply from the mains within the road is required as it cannot be taken off of the school supply as the water board will not guarantee the mains pressure necessary to facilitate the system. To overcome this issue they require a fairly large water storage capacity, pumps and controls on site, as in many cases the mains water supplies to the site are inadequate to cope with the demands of a sprinkler system. A large storage tank is may create planning, location and financial issues.
  - A new electrical feed to plant room & pump motors must come from the incoming supply prior to the Meter. If power supply is unreliable as can be experienced in rural areas then a back up generator must be included.
  - Regular maintenance is required. Reading University have undertaken research into sprinkler systems, apparently there is an issue over corrosion to steel pipe work due to use of oxygenated water.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

## 12. Maintenance Costs

- 12.1 If a sprinkler system is installed, it is important that it is monitored closely and properly maintained. Routine maintenance should include checks for Legionella (a risk in any static water system). Worcestershire County Council Maintenance Department advised that actual costs would vary dependent on the size of the property, but an average estimate would be £1000 pa. The maintenance costs are incurred by the 'end user'. For Schools this is idea is unpopular.
- 12.2 Stuart Blackie of 'Education Leeds' confirmed that they had just agreed a new maintenance contract on a sprinkler installation at a large high school (approx. two thirds sprinklered) and the annual cost is £1280+vat.
- 12.3 Wiltshire Council indicate the annual maintenance cost of fire sprinklers could be £5,000-10,000 for a secondary school, depending on the extent to which routine inspections can be carried out by the school, and the scale of the system. This is a significant cost for any school, but particularly a primary school, where the cost could reach £5,000 per annum. It is recommended that the views of the Council in respect of a policy be discussed at the Schools Forum to raise awareness of the potential maintenance and servicing responsibility and associated financial burden.
- 12.4 We conclude that at this stage it is too early to quantify on going maintenance costs due to the wide scope of buildings and their arrangement to each other.

## 13. Other information of use to the Committee

- 13.1 Options Considered
- 13.2 An alternative to introducing a sprinkler policy would be to continue designing and building schools without sprinklers. This would continue to deliver well designed schools that comply with the relevant building regulations, and are therefore safe for their occupants. There is not considered to be adverse risk to pupils, staff and other users of school buildings if this option were to be taken.
- 13.3 However, the ongoing risk of a serious fire in one of the Council's schools clearly remains, and the impact of such a fire to the operation of a school would be significant.
- 13.4 The reputational impact to the Council of a newly built school being severely damaged by fire without the mitigation of a fire sprinkler system should be considered.
- 13.5 There appears to be 3 categories WBC buildings/sites fall into:
- Older building stock seem to be most at risk, due to lack of adequate fire protection and detection however are the most expensive to fit out. A maintenance program is in place to upgrade buildings to cover detection and compartmentation.
  - New Buildings on existing sites to include sprinkler systems are very costly due to the economy of scale and necessary infrastructure works/costs. Also no insurance premium can be demonstrated.

# DRAFT DOCUMENT

- New build sites demonstrate the most cost effective and successful solution for introducing sprinkler systems because the infrastructure costs are incorporated into the scheme as a whole.

## Appendices

---

There are Appendices to this report.

Appendix A -

Appendix B -

Appendix C -

Appendix D -

Appendix E -

## Consultees

---

**Local Stakeholders:** \*

**Officers Consulted:** \*

**Trade Union:** \*

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX A

- Part 1 – Incidence of arson and fire
- Part 2 – Environment and buildings
- Part 3 – Effectiveness of fire safety and fire protection measures
- Part 4 – The consequences of a fire

2.7 A score of 0-5 is assigned to each question with 0 being low risk and 5 being high risk. The four main sections are then split into two main categories: parts 1 and 2 combined and parts 3 and 4 combined. The scores from the two categories are then added together to gain the overall risk. The risk levels are as set out in the table below:-

Proposed overall scoring		<i>Proposed scoring Parts 1 and 2</i>		<i>Proposed scoring Parts 3 and 4</i>	
Low risk	0 – 40	<i>Low risk</i>	<i>0 – 20</i>	<i>Low risk</i>	<i>0 – 20</i>
Average risk	41 – 100	<i>Average risk</i>	<i>21 – 60</i>	<i>Average risk</i>	<i>21 – 50</i>
High risk	101 – 230	<i>High risk</i>	<i>61 – 85</i>	<i>High risk</i>	<i>51 – 145</i>

2.8 Once the overall score has been established the risk assessment tool makes the following recommendations:

**Low Risk** - The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at a low level of risk. Sprinklers may be beneficial.

**Average Risk** –The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at an average risk. A sprinkler system is recommended.

**High Risk** - The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates the school is at a high risk. Sprinklers should be provided.

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX B

The criteria for completing works under the fire remedial programme are project specific and based on a technical evaluation of the complexities generated by each scenario in accordance with the design and usage of the buildings as detailed below

1.	Risk Assessment Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area of concern requiring action or urgent action with in residential/multi storey building to comply with fire legislation and to ensure risk of injury/death and damage to property is reduced.</li> </ul>
2.	Project Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works above £10 K considered</li> </ul>
3.	Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All WBC properties</li> </ul>
4.	Strategic Importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits relate to a Corporate Priority</li> <li>• Impacts large part of Council and/or Public</li> <li>• Benefits relate to legislation</li> </ul>
5.	Timetable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate objective dependent</li> <li>• Medium to long term projects</li> </ul>

Applying the above criteria has meant that the focus of the programme for the initial years has been on residential homes, secondary schools and leisure centres.

There is an annual provision of £450k to support the fire remedial programme. The available budget for 20010/11 and 2011/12 has been increased to £675k per year.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment - Existing site

## Part 1 - Incidence of fire

<b>Low Risk</b>	0	1	2	3	4	5	<b>High Risk</b>
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

### 1.1. Arson / deliberate fire (in the last 10 years)

No cases of arson / deliberate fire within school grounds	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Arson / deliberate fire common within school grounds
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

### 1.2. Vandalism (in the last 5 years)

No cases of vandalism within school grounds	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Vandalism common within school grounds
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

### 1.3. History of fires

No major fires in the school in the last 10 years	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	One or more major fires in last 10 years
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

### 1.4. Incidence of arson in the locality

Locality has low arson rate (as reported to police)	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Locality has high arson rate (as reported to police)
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	--

### 1.5. Fires in other schools in the locality (in the last 5 years)

Few cases of fire in other schools in the locality	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Frequent cases of fire in locality
--	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

## Part 2 - Environment and buildings

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

### 2.1. Security measures - buildings

Good security measures provided for school building	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Few security measures
---	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

### 2.2. Security measures - school grounds

Good security measures provided for school grounds	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	No security measures
--	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

### 2.3. Opportunities for arson

Few opportunities for arson	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Many opportunities for arson
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------

### 2.4. Buildings state

Buildings well maintained with no damaged safety systems (e.g. fire doors)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Buildings in disrepair and vandalised
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

### 2.5. Building height

Single storey)	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	High-rise
----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------

### 2.6. Building construction

Traditional	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Lightweight
-------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

### 2.7. Building design and routes for fire spread

Few	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Many

### 2.8. Building size (total floor area)

Small building	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Very large building

### 2.9. Building distribution (separation)

Distributed buildings	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Single building

### 2.10. Risk of fire from school activity

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

### 2.11. Out-of-hours use of school facilities (by the public)

None or low out-of-hours use	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	Frequent out-of-hours use

### 2.12. Building users at risk

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

## Part 3 Fire safety and fire protection measures

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

### 3.1. Passive fire protection measures

Buildings have adequate fire compartmentalisation and fire/smoke barriers and doors	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Overly large fire compartments and lack of fire/smoke barriers and doors
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--

### 3.2. Design relaxations of passive measures (for education reasons)

None	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Atrium or open-plan areas
------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

### 3.3. Fire detection and warning system

Automated and linked to central control room	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Human detection and hand bell
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

### 3.4. Means of escape (and emergency lighting and signage)

Many exits, short escape routes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Few exits, long escape routes
---------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

### 3.5. Occupancy density

Few people, in small groups	<input type="radio"/> 0	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	Large numbers in a single compartment
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

### 3.6. Training and drills

Good training of staff, frequent drills	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	No training, no drills
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

**3.7. Management (of fire safety)**

Good	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	Poor

**3.8. Fire Service notification**

Automatic	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input type="radio"/> 1 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	None

**3.9. Fire Service location**

Very close	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	Very distant

**Part 4 Consequences/ impact of fire (Weight = 4)**

Low Risk	0	1	2	3	4	5	High Risk
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

**4.1. Impact of fire on users (injury)**

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High (risk of death)

**4.2. Impact of fire on learning**

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High

**4.3. Impact on community**

Low	<input type="radio"/> 0 <input checked="" type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	High

#### 4.4. Potential cost

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

#### 4.5. Environmental impact

Low	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	High

### SCORE

<b>Part 1</b>	Incidence of arson (fire)	9	
<b>Part 2</b>	Environment and buildings	18	27
<b>Part 3</b>	Fire safety or fire protection measures	5	
<b>Part 4</b>	Consequences of a fire	24	29
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>56</b>	

### Scoring

Proposed overall scoring		Proposed scoring Parts 1 and 2		Proposed scoring Parts 3 and 4	
Low risk	0 – 40	Low risk	0 – 20	Low risk	0 – 20
Average risk	41 – 100	Average risk	21 – 60	Average risk	21 – 50
High risk	101 – 230	High risk	61 – 85	High risk	51 – 145

### Overall score

#### Low risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk. Sprinklers may be beneficial.

#### Average risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk. A sprinkler system is recommended.

#### High Risk

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk. Sprinklers should be provided.

The tables below list the type of fire safety and fire protection measures that might be appropriate for your school.

## **Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of fire (Parts 1 and 2)**

### **Low risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

Sprinklers may be beneficial. You may also wish to consider:

- Improved building security measures
- Improved site security measures
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Further control of activities likely to cause a fire

### **Average risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

A sprinkler system is recommended. You may also wish to consider:

- Improved building security measures
- Improved site security measures
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Improved control of activities likely to cause a fire
- Improved procedures to ensure that buildings are cleared of materials that can be used for arson

(Note: a sprinkler system may act as a deterrent to arsonists, but primarily acts to prevent a small fire growing)

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level

### **High Risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk with regard to the incidence of fire and environment and buildings.

Sprinklers should be provided. You may also wish to consider:

- More building security measures
- More site security measures
- Security measures include;
  - good window locks,
  - intruder detection
  - CCTV
- Security staff / guards
- good perimeter fencing
- Car parks well lit and overlooked etc
- Doors secure against all but the most determined intruders
- Windows and roof-lights protected against intruders etc
- Better building and equipment maintenance
- Control of activities likely to cause a fire
- Buildings cleared of materials that can be used for arson

(Note: a sprinkler system may act as a deterrent to arsonists, but primarily acts to prevent a small fire growing)

## **Fire safety or fire protection measures for consideration to reduce risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur) (Part 3 and 4)**

### **Low risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a low level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

Sprinklers may be beneficial. You may also wish to consider:

- An improved automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Improved procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans, for example for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills

### **Average risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at an average level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

A sprinkler system is recommended. You may also wish to consider:

- An improved automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Additional fire compartmentalization
- Procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans put in place for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills

### **High Risk**

The fire safety and fire protection survey and risk assessment indicates your school is at a high level of risk with regard to the risk of injury, damage, and consequences (if a fire does occur).

Sprinklers should be provided. You should also consider:

- An automatic fire detection and alarm system
- Additional fire compartmentalization
- Procedures to ensure doors are shut at night
- Secure storage (fire cupboards) for documents and coursework
- Better communications with local fire brigade
- Contingency plans put in place for use of alternative buildings
- Better planning, training and more frequent drills
- Controls on the number of people using the building

For more information on types of fire safety and fire protection measures refer to BB100: "Designing against the risk of fire in schools"



## Default List

Loss Number	Exposure Long Name	Loss date of occurrence	Loss Type	Cover name	Policy number	Loss cause	Paid
F/07/2178	Thatcham Nature Discovery Centre	21/10/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/1388	Kintbury St Mary's C of E Primary School	15/07/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	11,984.60
F/07/1388	Kintbury St Mary's C of E Primary School	15/07/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	8,197.80
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/07/0727	Hungerford Library	16/04/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	42,681.80
F/04/0470	Bucklebury C of E Primary School	06/03/04	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	0
F/03/0749	Lambourn C of E Primary School	28/02/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	ARSON	169.36

This page is intentionally left blank

## Default List

Loss Number	Exposure Long Name	Loss date of occurrence	Loss Type	Cover name	Policy number	Loss cause	Paid
F/09/1229	Northcroft Leisure Centre	16/06/09	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	370
F/09/1229	Northcroft Leisure Centre	16/06/09	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	0
F/07/2675	Adventure Dolphin	18/12/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N02836106AOY(06/07)	FIRE	0
F/07/2669	Kennet School	18/12/07	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	108,379.55
F/06/1498	Kennet School	20/07/06	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	3,781
F/06/1144	Highfield Ave 3,3A,4,,5,6, & 7 (Homeless Fami	09/06/06	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	0
F/05/0050	Greenham Community Centre	11/01/05	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	47,783.04
F/04/0765	Birch Copse Primary School	17/04/04	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	N418923KOF (04/05)	FIRE	2,350
F/03/2193	Parsons Down Junior School	14/11/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	5,340.98
F/03/2193	Parsons Down Junior School	14/11/03	PROPERTY DAMAGE	PROPERTY - MATERIAL DAMAGE	MATERIAL	FIRE	3,141.14

This page is intentionally left blank

# SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)	Status
OSMC/09/28	Improving public confidence To consider how to improve the public's confidence in how anti social behaviour and crime are dealt with, thereby influencing National Indicators NI17, NI21 and NI27	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officers, the public, and other expert witnesses.		SSC	Start: 07/07/09 End: 06/04/10	Andy Day - 2459 Policy & Communication	Councillor Graham Pask	Public perception of how anti social behaviour is dealt with is contrary to public perception of what crime occurs. There is public interest in closing this gap and increasing public confidence.	Complete
OSMC/09/29	Road safety To review progress following the KSI task group work of 2008, including examination of the annual road safety work programme.		Monitoring item	SSC	Start: 06/04/10 End: 06/04/10	Andrew Garratt - 2491 Highways & Transport	Councillor David Betts	Update to recommendations from the task group review agreed by Executive in March 2009 requested for review by SSC.	Complete
OSMC/09/30	Implementation of the recommendations arising from the Laming Report, following the 'Baby P' inquiry. To ensure that the authority is complying with the recommendations of the Laming Report.	Information supplied by, and questioning of, lead officer.		SSC	Start: End:	Karen Reeve - 2735 Children & Youth Services	Councillor Gordon Lundie	High profile public interest.	Removed in agreement with Chairman of OSMC.
OSMC/09/31	Selling of knives and associated knife crime. To consider safe methods of disposal for knives.	Review options for the safe disposal of knives to complete this scrutiny review. Information provided by the Waste Management Team.		SSC	Start: 01/02/10 End: 01/02/10	Andrew Deacon - 2312	Councillor Graham Pask	Area of public safety. Presentation and review of options requested for December 2009.	Complete
OSMC/09/32	Mixed parking arrangements To review mixed parking arrangements in place across West Berkshire and to assess the impact and effectiveness of the new enforcement regime.			SSC	Start: End:	Martyn Baker - 2211 Highways & Transport	Councillor David Betts	An appropriate subject that meets the acceptance criteria.	Removed in agreement with Chairman of OSMC.
OSMC/09/33	Domestic abuse To review the implementation of recommendations arising from the Domestic Homicide Review report of November 2008.	Review West Berkshires responses and activity relating to this report. Update provided by the Safer Communities team		SSC	Start: 01/02/10 End: 01/02/10	Rachel Craggs - 264617 Policy & Communication	Councillor Graham Pask	An area of significant public interest. Progress update requested for December 2009.	Complete
OSMC/09/34	Gating orders To review protocol for gating orders adopted in October 2008.			SSC	Start: End:	Alex O'Connor - 264608 Policy & Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Specified in original review of 2008 to be reviewed after one year.	

# SAFER SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Reference (a)	Subject/purpose (b)	Methodology (c)	Expected outcome (d)	Review Body (e)	Dates (f)	Lead Officer(s)/ Service Area (g)	Portfolio Holder(s) (h)	Comments (h)	Status
OSMC/10/74	Policy for the installation of fire sprinklers in Council buildings To review the requirement for a policy for the implementation of fire sprinklers in Council buildings.	Interview with relevant officers and review of available research information.	To identify whether there is a need for a policy regarding fire sprinkler systems in Council buildings (including schools).	SSC	Start: 06/04/10 End:	Health and Safety and Property.	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld	Investigations to include whether a return on the investment of installing sprinklers could bring a reduction in insurance costs	
OSMC/10/82	Crime Statistics To review crime trends, identification of activity to address crime and how the effectiveness of activities are monitored.		To understand crime patterns and how / whether activity is addressing issues as expected	SSC	Start: End:	Susan Powell - 264703 Policy and Communication	Councillor Anthony Stansfeld		