



emh homes scrutiny panel

Challenge | Change | Improve

emh homes Scrutiny Panel

Fire Safety Report September 2017-April 2018

Scrutiny Panel for this Investigation:

Gill Leverton-Taylor Chair

Brian Carpenter Vice-Chair

Jim Humphreys Panel Member

Terry Farrelly Panel Member

Jim Marks Panel Member

Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Introduction: | 3 |
| 2. Scope | 4 |
| 3. Methodology: | 4 |
| 4. The key findings of the Investigation: | 4 |
| 5. Fire Procedures (Evacuate or Stay put) | 6 |
| 6. Fire Risk Assessments including PAT Testing and Legionnaire checks are carried out in a timely manner, are up to date and recorded clearly: | 6 |
| 7. Arrangements for Vulnerable People: | 7 |
| 8 Equipment Safety (Fire Equipment serviced and maintained regularly) | 10 |
| 9. Reading of Reports and Relevant Articles | 10 |
| 10. Conclusion (Scrutiny asked at the beginning of the report) | 11 |
| 11. Recommendations | 12 |
| 12. Commendations | 13 |

Fire Safety Report 2017/18

1. Introduction:

1.1 The Scrutiny Panel were delighted to be asked to do this investigation into Fire Safety, realising that Fire Safety was always at the forefront of their thoughts. However, this had become more so since the *Grenfell Fire Tragedy*.

Following this tragedy, during this investigation the Scrutiny Panel have asked:

- a. Do emh homes Residents have a voice?
- b. How well do emh homes listen to their Residents?

This report will acknowledge these two questions

1.2 With a new Director of Property Services, Adrian Cheetham, in place, considerable changes were made to what he had found in relation to Fire Safety. The Director of Property Services and emh homes were looking to review the direction of travel for fire safety. The Scrutiny Panel were asked to look at the processes and information in place to date.

The Scrutiny Panel did this, as you would expect of us, we also went further.

1.3 emh homes must ensure that the information given to Residents is substantiated by making sure that clear systems, procedures and monitoring are in place.

1.4 It is important that emh homes work closely with the Residents to ensure good practice, enabling a safe environment in which Residents can live. This is inclusive of electricity and water as well as fire safety.

1.5 It is important to all Residents that they understand how to stay safe in their homes, it is equally important that information on the ways to do this is available to them, and readable in a language that they understand.

1.6 Scrutiny Panel Training:

Before starting the Investigation emh homes Scrutiny Panel received two hours of training from John Haynes of Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service. This covered the legislation referring to the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety Order) 2005 and the partnership that has been developed with emh homes

1.7 Under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety Order) 2005 the organisation has a responsibility to carry out FRA's (Fire Risk Assessments) implement them and maintain a Fire Management Plan at relevant schemes.

Recommendation:

That the readers of this report note:

The Scrutiny Panel found the training very informative they also found throughout the findings within this report that the Partnership with Derbyshire Fire and Rescue service is invaluable., the Scrutiny Panel are sure the relationship will continue to grow.

2.Scope:

2.1 The purpose of emh homes Scrutiny Panel is to review the Fire Safety Procedures, including are they fit for purpose? Are they effective? How do they impact on the residents?

schemes and the quality of the monitoring and recording processes? Under this remit we concluded that our scope for the investigation would be:

- Communication inclusive of electronic systems
- Fire Procedures (Evacuate or Stay put Policy)
- Fire Risk Assessments including PAT testing and Legionella checks carried out, timely, are up to date and recorded clearly
- Arrangements for Vulnerable people
- Equipment Safety (Fire equipment serviced and maintained regularly)
- Dealing with reports and lessons learnt (Benchmarking)

2.2 Outside Agencies:

- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Saville's
-

3. Methodology:

3.1 The coverage of the scope included both internal and external procedures

for evidence the Panel wished to examine.

This was as follows:

- Presentation on Risk assessments
- Desk top review of Risk Assessments and promotional material relating to Fire Prevention and what to do should there be a fire.
- Presentation on how information is documented, and systems work
- Observations of Schemes across the Estate in the North and South (The Panel did one Investigation together and then split into small groups for a bigger coverage of the Estate).
- Survey to residents on fire safety awareness
- Interviews and Informal discussions with staff
-

4. The key findings of the Investigation:

The Scrutiny Panel started this investigation in September 2017. The following sections 4-9 are our findings.

4.1 Communication, including electronic systems:

With Residents: There was found to be differences in Communicating with Residents on Fire Safety. In one scheme we found notice boards where Tenants can leave messages and we noticed that they were responded to. One message was on changing a fire practice day. In others, Managers and Scheme Co-Ordinators told us they held Coffee mornings and Fire Safety was discussed at these meeting. During Interview one member of emh homes staff

told us they would like there to be more of these coffee mornings that he could attend to promote Fire Safety. However not all places we visited (App 1) during our tours told us of any initiatives outside the normal/routine of Fire Practice, when asked. (e.g.no method to communicate any concerns on the subject)

The Notice Board and Coffee mornings are a commendable way of communicating, they make sure that Tenants have a voice on Fire Safety. This is also recorded by Managers. The Scrutiny Panel would also like to commend the more recent communication with Tenants by letter and in the Tenant echo on fire safety. The reassurance at the time of the Grenfell Fire was important and worthwhile. The Panel found this to be caring and thoughtful by emh homes in the approach to alleviate Tenant fears and concerns, at this most terrible time.

4.2 With Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service:

The Scrutiny Panel were very impressed with the relationship between emh homes and Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service. The process of communication in the form of meetings between emh homes and the Fire Service appears well organised. From discussions with emh staff they are appreciative of how Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service helped them at the start of the relationship in providing help and guidance with outstanding Fire Risk Assessments. John Haynes from Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service has said they are always only a telephone call away should any help be required. The Scrutiny Panel thought that this demonstrated commitment to people staying safe and the partnership, raises the profile of the team and emh homes for fire safety.

The Scrutiny Panel found the information given about the law, with reference to the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) order 2005 and the Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Services, and the partnership with emh homes given, during the Panel's training at the beginning of their investigation to be thorough and informative. (See acknowledgements) The Scrutiny Panel would envisage that this partnership will prove to become stronger overtime.

4.3 Fire Safety Notices:

Directive information displayed in corridors, and in Residents flats was small and whilst compliant with the arrangements of the environment, the Scrutiny Panel would expect these to be larger for the purpose of those residents with sight problems and disabilities and so that they would be noticed by visitors. In some establishments the Panels observations concluded that Residents and their visitors would have to look closely or indeed look at where you could find these instructions. In one situation during an observation visit the instructions on the walls for exit ran out. This would create problems if you do not know the way out and/or if a visitor should be in the building.

4.4 Survey Monkey:

The Scrutiny Panel sent out 2,500 survey questionnaires to residents, only 172 were returned. Six questions were put to Residents. A whole suite of these six questions are available (Appendices 1) along with the responses. This survey covered and asked:

- Is your building easily identifiable from the road?
- Are there Fire Extinguishers in your building?
- Are there Fire Blankets in your building?
- Are there barriers or obstacles in communal areas?
- What fire safety information is visible in communal areas?
- Is fire Signage visible?

There was a mixed response to all these areas, this made it difficult to analyse the survey. However, the survey does indicate that signage could be improved internally and externally.

The Scrutiny Panel recognise that not all signage is the responsibility of emh homes.

5. Fire Procedures (Evacuate or Stay put)

5.1 The Scrutiny Panel found these procedures to be thorough and safe in accordance with each scheme. There are trained Fire Wardens within each scheme and measures in place for procedures and contactable people should a fire occur, and a Fire Warden not be present.

It was found that all schemes operate a stay put Policy and along with the compartmentalisation timing, proves to be safe practice. All flats are fitted with an alarm system that can be used should a fire occur.

One of the issues arising from outstanding Fire Risk Assessments that emh homes has, is fire doors. Tenants have changed their front doors which are not compliant with Fire Safety, as proved in a recent news report on the Grenfell Fire, doors are an important part of keeping people safe. The Grenfell Flat doors only stayed safe for half the time they were supposed to when tested.

It is recognised that not all residents will comply with the evacuation processes. However once the fire doors are closed the compartmentalisation timing will keep residents safe for up to one hour until the Fire and Rescue Service arrive. The Scrutiny Panel have been told this takes about 5-10 minutes. (Not tested of course)!

6. Fire Risk Assessments including PAT Testing and Legionnaire checks are carried out in a timely manner, are up to date and recorded clearly:

6.1 During their observation visits The Scrutiny Panel found these to be all up to date except for one Scheme where the PAT testing was out of date by one month. They are all recorded effectively which assists in timely re-testing as these are legal requirements.

6.2 On a desk top review of the FRA's (Fire Risk Assessments), the Scrutiny Panel found these to be comprehensive in nature and S.M.A.R.T.E.R (Specific, Measurable, Achievable and Timebound can be Evaluated and all information is Recorded)

6.3. During the Scrutiny Panels observation's, they found door intumescent sealing strips missing on some flat entrances and some in disrepair. These act as smoke protectors and should provide protection from smoke ingress when the door is closed during a fire. Should a fire occur then this finding would not be compliant with fire safety procedures. These do not appear to be part of FRA's and the panel could not conclude from the answers that were given, whether these were part of a Scheme fire safety checklist or part of a Health and Safety Check within schemes. (see 7.2 later in this report. The Scrutiny Panel did get an answer from a scheme Manager)

On requesting further evidence on in- house Fire Safety checks the Scrutiny Panel were told:

'The scheme co-ordinators check lists are put together by Housing but are often routinely checked as part of the Safe Environment Assessment and the fire service Audits/FRA visits. It is also included by many housing managers to check completion of paperwork in their staff one to one reviews/site visits'

'Pete Hancock Asset and Compliance Ass'

However, this was informative and useful information but did not answer the question on are door strips included on in house check lists about Fire Safety and other Health and Safety inspections.

6.4 Health and Safety arrangements for the safety of Tenants/Residents is well organised, the monitoring checks fall in line with COSE (certificate of Safe Environment). From our interviews the Health and Safety Manger is part of a team responsible for Fire Safety

7. Arrangements for Vulnerable People:

7.1 The arrangements for Vulnerable people are clearly identified near the Fire Board on entering a building. This map of the building displays information on where the very vulnerable could be located. The Scrutiny Panel would consider this along with the stay put policy, the compartmentalisation timescales and access to the help they need, from directions in their flats, and use of an installed call system, to be enough to keep Tenants safe until help arrives. Some maps are not displayed but kept in a red box purely for the Fire Service. Residents also have a PEEP's (Personal Evacuation Emergency Plans)

For all residents/Tenants the measures in place will only work if Tenants have faith in the process and follow instructions for their safety and well-being.

7.2 Oak Court Extra Care Scheme: *The Scrutiny Panel visited this scheme as a whole group. On approaching the building, the Panel found this to be well signposted. Internally the building is excellent, and you would want your relative to live there.*

The staff are friendly and approachable, however on our visit we were disappointed that there was not an opportunity to speak with staff and residents. This maybe because the Manager was not available for us to do this. Although the Panel did have 20 minutes with one Senior Manager right at the end of our tour.

7.3 What we liked:

- *The systematic arrangements for fire safety should a fire occur, keeping Residents safe*
- *The extra care scheme is welcoming and friendly*
- *The scheme is clean, tidy and well maintained, there were no obstacles left in corridors*
- *The fire equipment was up to date and positioned correctly*
- *The kitchen was clean and safe with relevant Fire Fighting equipment*
- *There was a notice Board in reception with message about scheduled Fire Practice and times. Specifically, one resident wanting to change the time of a Fire Practice and the response to that message. (This demonstrates an interest in the procedures by residents)*
- *The Fire Procedures were explained to the Panel in detail inclusive of parts of the building that could help the fire service access and evacuate Residents. Window fittings and glass in doors to stairs, were all a preventative measure and protective mechanism for keeping Residents safe should a fire occur.*

7.4 What we did not like:

The latest CQC (Care Quality Commission) Report on Oak Court.

Whilst the Scrutiny Panel recognise that no one else likes it either, the report identified that Residents were left Vulnerable during non-commissioned hours and during the night. There is just one member of staff available during the night. The Scrutiny Panel asked about staffing levels and the requirements of CQC. We were told that CQC had no authority within that sort of scheme to address staffing levels, this the responsibility of the Leicestershire County Council

The Scrutiny Panel did not challenge this because it is out of our remit for this investigation.

On a review of the Fundamental Standards for CQC one of them is to review staffing levels. They do not refer to specific schemes or extra care schemes within this document.

7.5 Agency Staff are used on a daily basis at Oak Court.

The Scrutiny Panel asked during their observations and during interviews how they manage fire safety training for agency staff? (Our observations noticed a lot of agency staff being used) The Panel were told that all agency staff are trained in fire safety during their induction by Oak Court and in a later request for further information the Panel were told that all staff were trained in Fire Safety.

We have accepted this because our investigation has to draw a line somewhere. The scrutiny Panel felt that there are a number of issues that they would have liked to know more about, and this was one of them. The Panel felt that to investigate further by asking for more evidence would take us away from our remit for this current investigation.

One statement said that all agency staff were fire trained. However, another statement said that agency staff were called in at the point of need and sometimes residents were not informed that their usual carer would not be doing their care that day. We would have liked to ask if these calls provide Oak Court with Fire Trained staff.

Some agency staff had been seen walking through the building wearing ear muffs or personal entertainment ear plugs during our observations. This brought into question their ability to hear alarms or calls for help from other personnel.

7.6 Equipment Storage Areas:

The Scrutiny Panel found the storage area untidy at Oak Court, there were many hazards to hinder should a fire break out, not least the emergency cord being obstructed. There are two doors one on either side of the storage room, in this instance. The Scrutiny Panel had a discussion around should mobility equipment be stored in a separate room built outside the building. Consideration for all schemes.

7.7 FRA's (Fire Risk Assessments)

The Scrutiny Panel did a desk top review on Fire Risk Assessments for Oak Court (2), the last one at the time of this report. We did review other FRA's as well and found these to be good.

We asked why there were action points carried from one Fire Risk Assessment to the next one (for Oak court) as we felt that these could have been addressed. The answer was that they were not so important that they needed to be addressed.

(The Scrutiny Panel were shown a document that has an example of how FRA's are placed into works programme.)

The Scrutiny Panel were of the opinion that all action points should be addressed.

7.8 During our observations we found that intumescent door strips were missing or damaged on some doors. These are not part of the FRA however, they are part of the In- House check list which is done on a weekly basis, sometimes monthly and six monthly as well. One Scheme Co-ordinator told me these are put together by Health and Safety. (see 6.3)

7.9 The Scrutiny Panel would conclude this section on Arrangements for Vulnerable People, within Schemes are effective and safe within legal timescales and frameworks. The Scrutiny Panel remain unconvinced with Oak Court. However, the compartmentalisation timescales should prove effective enough as this is standard across all schemes and extra care schemes for emh homes.

The Scrutiny Panel would want to consider further re-assurance about Oak Court on the following:

- The training of Agency staff e.g. records, qualifications
- The staffing levels at night and during non- commissioned hours
- The action points on the FRA's, should these or should they not be addressed and if not why not?
- The Commissioned hours when no care is available for residents and the night time support is a concern to the Scrutiny Panel. We believe this could have an impact on Fire Safety, should a fire occur, within the building for Residents.

8 Equipment Safety (Fire Equipment serviced and maintained regularly)

8.1 The Scrutiny Panel checked all equipment relating to fire Safety within the extra care scheme and schemes visited. (Appendices 2 Schemes visited).

8.2 These were found to be up to date, and maintained well and correctly positioned

8.3. One, Scheme had fire blankets away in a cupboard. We were advised that this was because although there is a kitchen, the kitchen is not used by staff or residents. The Scrutiny Panel found all Fire Procedures in Communal areas to be next to Fire equipment.

The Scrutiny Panel would like to offer congratulations to all Scheme Co-ordinators and Mangers in maintaining a high standard in the care of Fire equipment and records for the servicing and maintenance of fire equipment.

9. Reading of Reports and Relevant Articles

9.1 Chapter one of the Dame Judith Hackitt's report on the Grenfell Fire Tragedy, titled: "Findings and Direction of Travel" was read with interest by the Scrutiny Panel. The Scrutiny Panel thought this was more about the building related to the Grenfell Fire and future buildings. It also identifies the problems with the chain of responsibility and accountability, along with the person or those who have Prime Responsibility of making sure that buildings are safe and fit for purpose sits with. 'This responsibility should be with those who commission and design the project' says Dame Judith Hackitt.

As a Panel we reviewed Dame Judith Hackitt's report on buildings post Grenfell. The review of building regulations is 'becoming a missed opportunity to examine all aspects of fire safety.' (Source: Inside Housing 13th April 2018) A quote by the RLA (Residents Landlord Association) The report went onto say that the report should be focusing on existing and low rise, stock as well as high rise and new stock.

The Scrutiny Panel discussed this, their thoughts are that there is still a long way to go in realising the impact of the Grenfell tragedy and what the causes are. We know some of these in relation to buildings, how much notice have Landlords taken so far of this? So, what are we really waiting for, to come out of this report?

The Scrutiny Panels question would be: Should we not be concentrating on the causes and starting to agree preventative measure required for making sure this would never happen again. There are still residents out there who want answers and who's voices have still not been heard?

9.2 The Scrutiny Panel have questioned Fire Risk Assessments, in relation to Intumescent door strips and why they are not an item to be checked on FRA's? We also questioned the recording of information and why some of it was carried over to the next FRA? (See section 7.7 on FRA's) for the answer to the latter of these questions.

However, on a recent article in Inside Housing there was an article titled FRA Inconsistencies.

This was two fire risk assessments done on one building by two different companies entirely independently. This building comprised of two different ownerships.

In conclusion both Fire Risk Assessments turned out very differently. Reports in both were of a concern. All information on both FRA's needed to be addressed.

The Scrutiny Panel know that Savills do FRA's for emh homes and our question is, knowing that Savills are tried and trusted by emh homes, should there be any concern over or thoughts about this issue on two different Fire Risk Assessments on one building?

The former Chief executive of the English Social Housing Regulator states 'there are clear differences in FRA's produced by different companies and for different Landlords'.

Peter Marsh (former Chief Executive of the English Social Housing Regulator) called for all FRA's to be published so that these differences can be seen and questioned, this may help raise the issues of quality. (Source: Inside Housing 6/4/2018)

9.3 It would be useful for the Scrutiny Panel at some stage to have a discussion around this with Derbyshire Fire and Rescue service along with emh homes staff before the Scrutiny Investigation is complete. Just as an article for the echo and/or Website.

10. Conclusion:

The Scrutiny Panel asked at the beginning of this report:

- Do emh homes Tenants have a voice?
- How well do emh homes listen?

From the findings in this report (some of which are outlined in Appendices 3) emh homes Tenants/residents do have a voice and in relation to fire safety the Scrutiny Panel throughout this report has identified ways of them doing this. The Scrutiny Panel did find these limited.

Do emh homes listen?

emh homes do listen through scheme meetings and reports from Managers and Scheme Co-ordinators. The Scrutiny Panel would like to see more involvement from the Fire Safety Team so that Tenants/Residents get to know who they are.

There has been a large turn around on Team personnel and structure and for recording and monitoring of information. The reduction in FRA's is impressive.

emh homes Scrutiny Panel would conclude this report by stating that all systems for recording and monitoring and procedures for the safety of Tenants/Residents in their own homes, is in line with legislation within the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) order 2005 and the Primary Authority Scheme 2008 which establishes statutory duties for local authorities including Fire and Rescue Authorities which came into being in 2009

emh homes are well supported by outside agencies and are travelling in the right direction having made considerable and safe improvements along the way supported by:

- Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
- Savills

11. Recommendations:

There are some recommendations throughout this report, they have been included in this recommendation page, although differently worded and all encompassed.

1. More consideration be given to promoting fire prevention with Tenants
The regular inspections by Scheme Managers and other front-line staff is commendable. Tenants need to be involved more in protecting themselves and this could be extended to other sheltered Housing e.g. bungalows and General needs properties. More information needs to be available on 'staying safe in your home'

2. There should be more opportunities for Tenants to have a voice
Meetings, coffee mornings and notice boards again are a commendable way of doing this, may we suggest that the new estate inspectors have a part in this possibly.

3. Review Fire Risk Assessments where there are carry overs.
On desk top review of some Fire Risk Assessments identified that some items needing attention are carried over to the next FRA

4. There is less than thorough application of signage both Internal and external.
This runs out in some schemes just as you get towards the fire exit door or loses direction at some point. (Internally) Signage is not always clear outside making it difficult for the fire service to identify the property in need of help (Externally)

5. More could be done to persuade Tenants of the importance of maintaining clear passages in communal areas, in order that the Fire and Rescue Service have a clear passage to any vulnerable Tenants.
See survey monkey that the Scrutiny Panel undertook during their investigation

6. More attention needs to be given around the importance of signing in and out of the schemes and extra care scheme.
We noticed staff and visitors not even looking and just walking past the sign in book. This is important to the fire Service and we recommend that this is present in all schemes no matter how small the scheme.

7. To examine the staffing levels of all sheltered Housing schemes owned and controlled by emh homes to establish that the safety of residents is top priority especially during the night hours in accordance with care and support schedule.
This recommendation is particularly born from the findings in the extra care scheme.

8. To consider the safety value of providing external fire-retardant material protected storage and changing facilities for mobility scooters to eliminate the threat of fire and the release of toxic fumes into the Internal areas of the building.
The Scrutiny Panel realise this may be a costly exercise but a useful comment for new builds and an opportunity to make sure that there are two ways out from all storage areas across the estate

9. Review from time to time the communication between all frontline staff and their managers on fire safety.

This could be incorporated within other recommendations as and when actioned

Page 12

10. The Scrutiny Panel would recommend emh homes re-visit at each stage the Grenfell fire Report as it is published, to assist in upgrades in the future to their current excellent safe practices if needed.

Commendations:

The Scrutiny Panel would like to take this opportunity to commend the parts of the Investigation and the People they thought were outstanding. It is unusual for the Scrutiny Panel to include this section in their report, but the Panel felt that throughout the Investigation it would be more than justified.

- The Scrutiny Panel feel there are many positive aspects of emh homes fire and safety procedures including the evidence of scheduled inspection of fire safety equipment, the close partnership between emh homes and Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service and Savills. The investigation left us with the feeling that all that can be done is being done
- It is clear that emh homes are striving to continuously improve the standards within this area of their business and external organisations are an important part of this
- The System used for recording and monitoring is outstanding
- The Partnership with Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service is outstanding

The knowledge and skills of the staff that supported us throughout the Investigation and those that the Scrutiny Panel interviewed was extra special:

Adrian Cheetham Director of Property Services

As Director of Property Services, he is doing a sterling job in this area of his responsibility and he has been a great Sponsor for the Scrutiny Panel on this investigation.

John Haynes: Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service

The Scrutiny Panel realise the importance of this Partnership for the success of the system and procedures in place and appreciate the support given to emh homes in this excellent work and support. Thank you to John for our training at the beginning of this investigation, which has proved very useful.

Carl Yost: Asset and Assurance Manager

Carl is most passionate about this area of his work. When taking over the responsibilities of fire services in 2016 it was in a sorry state. The Scrutiny Panel are impressed with his work to date.

Pete Hancock: Compliance/Asset Surveyor

Pete is very knowledgeable and enthusiastic about his work in this area of Fire Safety. The Scrutiny Panel are very appreciative of all the time he has given to us giving presentations,

escorting us during our observations visits and answering questions in areas that we needed to know more about

Page 13

Carolyn Allin: Health and Safety Officer

Carolyn provided the Scrutiny Panel with valuable information, she is knowledgeable and enthusiastic about her work.

Mick Mistry: Scheme Manager

Mick has demonstrated in his help to the Panel that he has in depth knowledge and skill of his work with emh homes. He has an honest and caring attitude towards his residents and staff members alike. This was very evident when he spoke in relation to his management of the emh homes Sheltered Housing scheme within his area of responsibility

Louise Devonish: Manager of Oak Court extra scheme

We would like to thank Louise for the information that she has so willingly supplied as Manager of Oak Court. It has made our investigation clearer.

We would hope to hear of the outcomes of the appeal against the CQC Report to enable us to be reassured about some of our concerns.

Gill Leverton-Taylor CIHM

Chair to emh homes Scrutiny Panel

Lead on this report

Author of the Report 2017/2018

Thank you to emh Group staff for administrative support, advice, supporting us with the resources as we required them and taking notes of our meetings along with technical support, throughout the Investigation. They are:

Ben Clark-Betts: Community and development Officer

Polly Cox: Community and Development Officer

Nina Fowler: Quality and Standards Assistant

Emma Lindley: Quality and Standards Manager

emh homes Scrutiny Panel are most appreciative of your time during this Investigation

Page 14

Appendices. 2

Observation Visits:

- Turton Court Newstead Village Nottingham

All checks at Turton court were up to date and in line with legislative requirements

- Prior Park Leicestershire

All checks at Prior Parks were up to date and in line with legislative requirements.

However, on watching preparation for an afternoon party it was noticed that furniture was being arranged in front of fire doors. The Scrutiny Panel member pointed this out and was told by the Manager that she did not appreciate that this would cause a hazard and would rectify the problem immediately.

- College House The Crestway Leicestershire

All checks but one was in line with legislative requirements. The one check that needed doing was the PAT testing. We found this to be out of date.

Signs internally also need to be re-visited, they appear to run out as you approach the exit. Difficult for those new to the Scheme and visitors.

- Chapel Court Narborough Leicestershire

Chapel court meets the regulatory standards and requirements. Scrutiny Panel members visiting this scheme found the external signage propped up in the reception area. It had fallen and was in disrepair. There was good internal signage for the Fire and Rescue Service

- Oak Court Leicestershire

The procedures for the safety of Residents should there be a fire was within the legislative guidelines with additional fire protection internally (see section 7). The Scrutiny Panel have concerns about the storage area. The missing care hours and staff numbers were more of a concern. The Scrutiny Panel did discuss this in detail, we were slightly reassured after speaking with the Manager. The Scrutiny Panel did feel this could have an impact on Residents should a fire occur. All signs were in place and the extra care scheme is well sign posted externally.

All visited in January/February 2018. A total of five schemes have been visited

Appendices 3

Fire Safety Scrutiny Investigation Areas of Good Practice 2017/2018

The Scrutiny Panel would like to celebrate the outstanding areas of this Investigation:

- Safe and effective systems should a fire occur (with a stay put Policy) in all schemes

that the Scrutiny Panel looked at.

(We did not test this of course but information available to us proved this would be the case)

- Outstanding systems for recording and monitoring data. (Keystone System\)

The Scrutiny Panel were very impressed with this.

- Good Communication with Tenants currently exists (we have asked for this to be

improved further)

- A well led team of professionals that are exceptionally knowledgeable, passionate

and skilled in what they do.

- An outstanding relationship with Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service, one the

Scrutiny Panel appreciated, and thought could only grow

- The reduction in outstanding FRA's. The Scrutiny Panel felt that this was impressive

(This is since the Director of Property Services joined emh homes)

- Arrangements for the most Vulnerable People should a fire occur

- Trained Fire Wardens and staff

• The most impressive improvements in the system as it was then in 2012 to as it is now in 2018. (The whole picture with Carl Yost as lead for Fire Services) With the support of Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service there is now a positive direction of travel

Page 16

- Fire and Rescue Services working together (reporting to Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service as the lead service)

emh homes Scrutiny Panel Fire Safety Investigation 2017/2018