

HSC bows to Europe

A growing campaign lead by building workers in the Construction Safety Campaign is trying to ensure the Health and Safety Executive do not get away with proposals to weaken current asbestos regulations. CSC held its first protest outside a Health and Safety Commission meeting on 8 November and another on 17 January. The timetable is tight: consultation is due to end on 31 January.

Already 103 MPs have signed Early Day Motion 1224, proposed by Michael Clapham MP, Chair of the All-Parliamentary Asbestos Group, opposing taking work with asbestos textured coatings (Artex) out of the current licensing regime. Construction unions UCATT, the TGWU, GMB are supporting this protest and writing to union sponsored MPs. The Asbestos Removal Contractors Association, ARCA, is objecting to the changes.

The Brussels proposals

The HSE has taken the opportunity presented by the European Community, which it has assiduously ignored over the Working Time Directive, to weaken UK safety laws. This European Directive is intended to increase worker protection from asbestos and it proposes a control limit of 0.1 fibres per cubic cm for all asbestos – tougher than the current UK limits'.

The Directive, however, allows exposure to asbestos when it is 'sporadic and low intensity'. This Directive specifically says that requirements for Notification of work (Article 4), Medicals (Article 15), Registration of exposure (Article 16) can be waived for:

- ▲ short, non-continuous maintenance activities with 'non-friable' materials.



PIC: LONDON HAZARDS CENTRE

- ▲ removal when asbestos fibres are 'firmly linked in a matrix'.
- ▲ encapsulation of materials in 'good condition'.
- ▲ air-monitoring.

HSE are proposing therefore that work on textured coatings such as 'Artex' be taken off the list of materials that only licensed asbestos contractors can deal with. Other work on asbestos would be allowed by non-licensed non-specialists.

Yet the Directive need not be used to deregulate. It explicitly says:

'This Directive shall not prejudice the right of Member States to apply or introduce laws, regulations or administrative provisions ensuring greater protection for workers, in particular as regards the replacement of asbestos by less-dangerous substitutes.'

The very strange language of HSE

There is a pretence throughout the consultation document that to hold a licence is an 'onerous' regulatory burden.

This is not true. An asbestos removal licence is not like a driving licence. It is easier to get than a dog licence. It is an incredibly basic minimum for work with an acknowledged killer substance: 3,500 deaths a year and rising. Licence holders are hardly ever inspected and licences rarely revoked. In our opinion, this does not mean a high level of compliance with Control of Asbestos at Work Regulation but criminally low levels of enforcement.

Some of their proposals are just not real. For example the type of maintenance work which will be allowed without licence includes drilling into Asbestos Insulation Board 'using a plastic enclosure over the board' and with drills 'connected to a Type H vacuum cleaner'. We believe that it is only asbestos specialists who provide this sort of equipment and who dispose of the debris correctly.

This is really happening

This is not the first time HSC have watered down the UK's asbestos laws.

Continued on page 2

Taking the flack

The personal safety of public sector workers is becoming an increasingly important issue for employers in Greater London. Fire fighters have been attacked and even stoned. NHS hospital and ambulance workers are particularly at risk. Incidents of physical assault and abuse are common in hospitals, particularly Accident and Emergency Units. Security staff are often present in A&E units and ambulance staff are now frequently required to wear body armour when working on the streets or other areas that bring them into contact with the public.



The new light weight body armour.

Most public sector workers who deal directly with the public have some experience of verbal abuse, threats or intimidation from people they are required to work with. These workers do not have powers of arrest or authorisation to use reasonable force, unlike police officers, but nevertheless are frequently resented as 'people with authority' and in some instances have been the victims of physical assault, causing personal injury or criminal damage.

The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 impose a general duty on employers to assess the risks to employees and to make arrangements to ensure their health and safety. In circumstances where it is appropriate, they are also required to assess the risks presented by violence to employees and where it is found to be necessary, put control measures in place to provide adequate protection.

A general rise in recorded incidents of assault and an increasing trend in the use of weapons, chiefly knives, has forced employers to include these developments in the risk assessment process. Although recorded incidents of physical assault are relatively low, the consequences of the risks of violent attacks are generally regarded as severe. Several London Local

Authorities are now issuing body armour in the form of 'flack jackets' and 'stab vests' to identified groups of workers who are now regarded as 'at risk'.

These groups include enforcement officers, such as Environmental Health Practitioners, Noise Enforcement Officers, Housing Officers, Traffic Control Wardens and Parking Officers. This equipment provides upper body protection to the torso and is supplied either as a jacket to be worn outside, or as a vest which can be disguised under normal clothing.

Continued from page 1

When they consulted on the Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations in 1998, a consultation that focused in many eyes on the need to ban asbestos, work with asbestos insulation board was removed from the licensing regime, despite opposition from trade unions.

Tony O'Brien CSC secretary says 'We have no doubt that the insurance companies, large landlords and some employers are behind pushing for these regulations as certain types of asbestos removal work can be done more cheaply with less stringent methods.' Nancy Tait of OEDA, who responded to this proposal back in August ahead of everyone else, is

The jackets can provide effective protection against gunshots, knife attack, sharps and blunt instrument attacks, such as hammer blows. Each jacket costs in the region of £300.

In some work areas there is significant resistance to making use of body armour. Some workers have a strong opinion that wearing body armour means they are more likely to be assaulted – although there is no evidence for this.

Most of those in the vulnerable jobs will have personal experience of verbal abuse intimidation or even physical assault. The measurement of these incidents is difficult as there is no agreement on a common definition of violence. The legal requirement to report work related violence applies only to physical violence. The effectiveness of arrangements and systems for reporting are questionable because of under reporting and there remains an acceptance among some workers that threats, abuse and violence are just a part of the job.*

** A survey published by the Society of Environmental Health in 2000 found that environmental health workers were at risk in virtually all core areas and in the preceding year there were 144 reported incidents of violence and threats against this group nationally.*

deeply worried not just by the proposal itself but by the possibility that it may represent an attempt to rehabilitate the use of asbestos cement products.

Urgent Action needed

Write and protest to MPs. Get your trade Union to respond. Lobby the Health and Safety Commissioners. And...

If you are not an asbestos specialist, don't work with asbestos.

- 1 The current UK control limits distinguish between types of asbestos and are set at 0.2 f/cubic cm for blue/brown and 0.3 f/cubic cm for white (chrysotile).

BAD Asbestos meets the Minister

Our newly established support group BAD Asbestos held a well attended public meeting in Barking Town Hall on 21st September, which Margaret Hodge, MP for Barking attended. She is also a Minister in the Department of Work and Pensions. The meeting was addressed by Brian Filby, whose father, from Dagenham, recently died of an asbestos disease and by Tom Jones, a solicitor with trade union law firm Thompsons, who raised the following points on behalf of the Group.

1. Recording of Employers' Liability Compulsory Insurance with Companies House

This is a long standing but simple request from asbestos groups and one that would, despite its simplicity, make an immense and immediate difference to the ability of asbestos victims to pursue former employers for compensation. Making it obligatory for companies to do so and, importantly, to record the known history of previous insurance cover would enable those who have a claim to speedily progress it.

2. Awards made under the Workers' Compensation Etc Act 1979 Scheme

There is an extremely unfair anomaly in that any award made under the 1979 Act is less than a victim would receive if he had pursued an employers' liability claim. This happens when the victim is unable to pursue a claim against their former employers because the defunct company's insurers are unknown.

3. Insurers deducting 1979 Act payments

The current practice is that insurers deduct and then pocket any payment

made under the 1979 Act from a claim against them – so that the Government and the tax-payer funds the negligent employer. This money should at the very least be repaid to the Government department from which it came (currently Job Centre Plus) or, better still, it could be used to address the imbalance between a 1979 Act payment and a negligence claim award.

4. Payments to widows under the 1979 Act

Widows are awarded less under the 1979 Act than a wife with a diagnosis during life. We believe there should be an equal amount whenever the diagnosis is made.

5. Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit

There were two issues regarding IIDB. Firstly, the limited amount that a mesothelioma victim with a 100% disability assessment receives with their limited lifespan as against the total that, say, a victim with a 40% assessment may get over the course of their life. Secondly, only those with an injury related to their employment can get an award of IIDB. A victim of, say, neighbourhood exposure to asbestos which is not their fault will not be entitled to IIDB and yet they suffer the same debilitating symptoms.

Nancy Tait Honoured

Nancy Tait celebrated her lifetime achievement award from IOSHH at a party at St Barnabus Church Hall Tower Hamlets just before Christmas. She held the first drop in advice sessions of SPAID, the Society for the Prevention of Asbestosis and Industrial Diseases, in the hall and some of the widows who attended SPAID meetings there over 20 years ago were at the event. She is pictured above with Margaret Sharkey a London Hazards Centre advice worker.



PIC: LONDON HAZARDS CENTRE

Unsafe practices cause workers' falls

In 2004-2005 53 people died and nearly 3800 suffered a serious injury as a result of a fall from height in the workplace.

Falls from height are the most common cause of fatal injury and the second most common cause of major injury to employees, accounting for around 15% of all such injuries.

Stagecoach fined for Plumstead worker's fall

Stagecoach Group plc, South East London and Kent Bus Company Ltd (SELKENT) and D W Tilley were fined at Southwark Crown Court following an investigation by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) into an accident at Plumstead Bus Garage in 2002.

James Slater, from Newcastle, sustained serious injuries when he fell through a fragile roof light onto a concrete floor approximately 10 metres below at Plumstead Bus Garage on 11 November 2002.

D W Tilley, who employed Mr Slater as a scaffolder, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. The company was charged £26,400 for the breach and was also ordered to pay court costs of £14,000.

Stagecoach Group plc, which was responsible for the procurement of D W Tilley to undertake the roof work, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 4(2) of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. The company was charged £12,000 for the breach and was also ordered to pay and court costs of £9,743.

SELKENT, which own and operate the bus garage in Plumstead, pleaded guilty to breaching Section 4(2) of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. The company was charged £4,500 for the breach and was also ordered to pay court costs of £9,743.



Falls waiting to happen.

Mr Slater condemned DW Tilley for not paying him compensation and was angered they did not contact him or his family after his severe injury. He is now seeking compensation through the courts. He said: 'I was very lucky. I was taken to hospital by air ambulance and they resuscitated me in the helicopter and saved my life.'

Following the sentencing HSE Inspector Loraine Charles said:

'This is an example of what can happen when work at height is not planned properly and effective precautions are not taken. The danger of falls through fragile roof lights is well known in the construction and roofing industry. This type of work should have a site-specific method statement to ensure that the suitable measures are taken to prevent falls from height.'

Fall in Silvertown warehouse leads to fine

Tristan Arkless, a 22-year-old employee of Iron Mountain (UK) Ltd, received a crushed vertebra and fractured pelvis after he fell 3.5 metres from a temporary platform erected between two racking units in a warehouse at the company's premises in Silvertown, London, on Sunday 27 July 2003. Mr Arkless and three temporary workers were attempting to remove archive boxes from the higher shelves in the warehouse, with no effective measures to prevent the fall.

Iron Mountain (UK) Ltd pleaded guilty to breaching Section 2(1) and 3(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 at the City of London Magistrates' Court. The company was fined £20,000 for each breach, the maximum penalty in a Magistrates' court. It was also ordered to pay £5,000 to the victim and court costs of £2,376.00. HSE Inspector John Crookes, who investigated the incident, said: 'This is an example of what can happen when work at height is not properly planned and when young, inexperienced workers are not supervised. It highlights the need for companies to make sure safety procedures are in place whenever their employees are at work, not just during normal hours. The company should have made a proper risk assessment prior to commencing the job and provided a system of work incorporating a safe means of access, such as a tower scaffold, an order picker or cherry picker, together with appropriate training tailored to the use of the equipment chosen. At no stage should employees have been required to climb the racking itself.'

'The company should also have ensured that a competent supervisor was present on site, i.e. someone who could assess the risks and, unlike Mr Arkless and the temporary workers, recognise that working at a height of 3.5 metres on unsecured boards placed across an aisle between two racking units was unsafe and should not have been attempted.'

Recent London workplace deaths

3.10.05 Self employed Stephen Sinclair, 41 years old, fell to his death while installing double glazed windows to a third floor flat in Greville Place, Kilburn, NW6. The main contractor was Four Seasons Double Glazing.

12.10.05 Colin Ricketts, 37 years old, was asphyxiated by gas in a road excavation he was working in for Transco in Sunleigh Road, Wembley.

11.12.05 Polish migrant worker Emil Feliks, 35 years old, died in hospital after he fell from a ladder while working on a roof at a domestic property in London Road, Twickenham on 9.12.05.

1.12.05 Bayunga Meya, 47 year old father of three and manager of the laundry at the King George Hospital, Goodmayes died when he tried to free a trapped sheet in a washing machine which was reportedly switched on accidentally while he was inside. Colleagues freed him and carried him to the A&E department of the hospital where he died.

6.12.05 Andrew Bates, 40 year old lift engineer, was crushed on top of the lift cage at a refurbishment project in Woostock Street, W1. A specialist firm are helping HSE with their investigations into the electrical system of the lift. The client on the project is J Brown Services Ltd.

21.12.05 Michael Hallinan, 54, of Swanly, Kent was killed when he left the bus he was driving in Greenwich High Road and was hit by another bus which was pulling up. The driver of the second bus was arrested on suspicion of causing death by dangerous driving.

Up and Running: RAM takes off

London Hazards Centre has been doing the ground work for the Refugee and Migrant workers' (RAM) project over the past few months and has been in touch with 135 organisations throughout London to advise them of the support we can give to refugee and migrant workers. We have also carried out case work with individuals and provided three briefings. We anticipate the pace of briefings stepping up over the next 6 months and to support that development LHC will

form a steering group to have oversight of the work of the project and to help to determine its emerging priorities.

The steering group will have its inaugural meeting on Wednesday 1 March in the LHC at 6.30pm. Anyone with an interest in the issues facing refugee and migrant workers, and with space in their lives to attend monthly meetings is welcome to attend. Please indicate your interest by either phoning LHC or emailing refugee.migrant@virgin.net

Olympic hopes

Thousands of migrant workers will build the 2012 Olympic facilities in East London. What are the prospects for this being done without any site deaths as the governments deregulation drive gathers pace, when there were at least 38 building workers killed building the Athens stadiums?

The TUC and construction unions are negotiating with the London Mayor about working practices and looking at

the experience gained from two current major London projects: Wembley and Heathrow's Terminal 5 where the tally is one death each.

Australian agreements from the Sydney Olympics are being looked at. Will this mean roving safety reps and repeal of anti-union legislation?

On current form UK construction unions do not have the muscle to compete against the employers.

Asbestos memorial in Barking

The British Lung Foundation have named Monday 27 February as National Mesothelioma Day and are launching a charter to seek greater support from government for victims.

The Barking and Dagenham Asbestos group is using the opportunity to ask the council to set up a memorial to all

asbestos victims and to site it in the Hart's Lane area. We expect the council will support this and we would want it unveiled on 28 April, Workers Memorial Day.

We will also be collecting signatures at Barking Clock Tower on Saturday 18 February.

Cape's £40m proposal put on hold

Voting on Cape's proposed £40million ring-fenced fund for future asbestos victims has been put on hold while Cape sends out notices to all former employees, because around 6,900 employees from Hebden and Uxbridge, were left out of the original consultation. An independent audit

regarding the viability of the proposal by KPMG is due to be published in the near future.

Meanwhile in October Asbestos cancer victims of Turner and Newall (T&N), once the world's largest asbestos company, are to be paid less than a quarter of the

compensation they are due. Federal Mogal, the US owners of the company, is responsible for hundreds of asbestos claims but will pay out just 24p for every pound to which the victims are entitled.

See Risks 228 www.tuc.org.uk

LHC needs your help

Our main funder, the Association of London Government (ALG), is currently reviewing their future funding programme and we need your help right now to ensure they continue to fund us.

The ALG is holding a public consultation on what type of work they should fund from 2007 onwards. They will decide who they will fund in the future in June 2006. To inform their decision they are holding a public consultation, which will end on 17th March 2006. We need you to participate in that consultation in support of our continued work.

The consultation takes two forms, firstly a consultative document asking for written replies and secondly, at the same time, a series of public meetings around London for people to attend and put their points of view. We need our supporters to

reply to the consultative document and attend the meetings expressing support for the work we've done and the work we will do in the future.

Resources

The ALG consultative document 'Better services for Londoners' is available at:

▲ www.alg.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/619/BetterServices2.pdf

The list of ALG public meetings and further detail is available at:

▲ www.alg.gov.uk/doc.asp?doc=16020&cat=980

There are briefing papers giving our perspective on this available from us at the London Hazards Centre which are on our web site at: www.lhc.org.uk

PLEASE HELP US NOW If we do not secure funding from the ALG it is unlikely we will find another funder for the work we wish to continue doing.

Deregulation protest



PHOTO: LONDON HAZARDS CENTRE

Construction Safety Campaign and GMB outside an HSC seminar in November.

USING THE
CENTRE

Training

COURSE PROGRAMME

The Centre runs one-day courses aimed at trade union safety representatives and voluntary/public sector organisations.

Courses cost £55 per person and are held at the Red Cross building near the Angel, Islington which is fully accessible.

Our training is activity based and the timetable is from 10am to 4pm. Our Spring programme includes:

▲ **Introduction to Workplace Health and Safety**

Thursday 16th February 2006

Thursday 18th May 2006

▲ **Introduction to Risk Assessment**

Thursday 9th March 2006

Details and booking forms at www.lhc.org.uk or from the Centre advice line 020 7794 5999.

COURSES TO ORDER

We run tailor made courses on a range of health and safety topics for unions, charities, community groups and councils. Contact us to discuss training for your organisation or workplace.

If your organisation needs regular health and safety support we have an annual subscription scheme that provides a discounted daily fee for scheme members.

London Hazards Advice Line

Free advice and support for Londoners on health and safety at work and in the community. We aim especially to work with local groups such as tenants/residents organisations, black and minority ethnic networks, union branches, etc. We'll provide the level of support you need, from a single phone call to long-term support for a local campaign.

020 7794 5999

**Mon, Tues, Thurs, Fri
10-12 and 2-5**

Fire safety risk assessments and new fire safety laws

The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order (RRO) 2005 comes into effect on 1 April 2006. It will apply across England and Wales and will affect all non-domestic premises and certain activities taking place outdoors. It rationalises and consolidates over 118 pieces of workplace fire legislation including repealing and revoking the Fire Precautions Act 1971 and the Fire Precautions (Workplace) Regulations 1997. The main change will be in emphasis towards risk reduction and fire prevention. Fire certificates will no longer be issued although fire and rescue authorities will continue to inspect premises.

The local fire and rescue authorities will continue to be the principle enforcing authority, exceptions being that HSE will cover RRO for the nuclear industry, construction sites and ship construction and repair; sports grounds will be covered by the local authority issuing the safety certificate; defence bases and Crown-owned property will have separate arrangements.

The responsible person

Responsibility for complying with the Fire Safety Order rests with the 'responsible person'. In a workplace, this is the employer and any other person who may have control of any part of the premises, for example, the occupier, including self-employed people, or owner. In all other premises the person or people in control of the premises will be responsible. If there is more than one responsible person in any type of premises, all must take all reasonable steps to work with each other.

Fire safety in domestic properties: the Housing Act 2004

This has a major impact on fire safety management in all residential property in England and Wales. From October 2005 certain houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) have to be licensed by the local authority: residential properties with three or more storeys and with five or more tenants. In addition the new Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS) applies to all rented property including HMOs. This means local authorities will have to carry out HHSRS, which in essence is a risk assessment, on licensed HMOs within five years and other non-licensed residential properties will also require HHSRS inspections. Property owners and landlords will be required to carry out remedial work to deal with any fire hazards identified.

Fire Risk Assessment

Under article 9 of RRO the responsible person must ensure a fire risk assessment is carried out to identify the general precautions required. The Order says the assessment must include consideration of any dangerous substance likely to be on the premises. The risk assessment and any significant findings must be recorded:

- ▲ if five or more people are employed
- ▲ if there is a licence in force
- ▲ if the premises are subject to an alteration notice. This is served by the enforcing authority when they believe a hazard may pose a risk if changes are made to premises or in the use to which they are put. The responsible person must inform the authorities but do not have to wait for approval before starting the work.

A fire risk assessment should identify risks that can be removed or reduced and specify the nature and extent of the general fire precautions needed

to protect people against the fire risks that remain. Fire certificates were not required in all workplaces, but where they were, they had to specify means of escape, means for ensuring the escape can be effectively used at all times, means for fighting fire. They usually said how often fire drills should be held. This basic information should now be included in the fire risk assessment.

A competent person, that is, someone who has had sufficient training or has good experience or knowledge of fire safety, should carry out assessments.

Key Guidance

Detailed Advice on carrying out a fire risk assessment is contained in the Home Office/Scottish Executive/Northern Ireland DoE/HSE publication: 'Fire Safety: An employer's guide'. This is a basic document that all safety representatives should look at to check their employer is complying with legislation and to help ensure that their employer has conducted a thorough fire risk assessment. It can be downloaded from: www.hse.gov.uk/fireandexplosion/ in the section workplace fire safety under new legislation.

Good comprehensive fire safety management systems – including consultation with safety representatives – are key to ensuring that fire safety is taken seriously.

Basic risk assessment is a five stage process outlined below. Producing a fire risk assessment should not be a theoretical exercise and should involve practical examination of the building under consideration.

Step 1: Identify the fire hazards

This involves consideration of the fire triangle and identifying the three requirements for a fire: sources of ignition, fuel and oxygen and the possibility of them coming together. The fire at Windsor Castle in 1992 was thought to have started when an electric lamp was placed too close to a curtain.

Examples are given below:

Sources of ignition

- ▲ Smokers materials naked flames.
- ▲ Hot surfaces e.g. lights and cooking equipment.
- ▲ Electrical or mechanical sparks.
- ▲ Static electricity.
- ▲ Arson.
- ▲ Hot processes such as welding.

Sources of Fuel

- ▲ Paints, varnishes, thinners, adhesives.
- ▲ Petrol, white spirit, paraffin.
- ▲ Paper and packaging materials.
- ▲ Wood and textiles.
- ▲ Liquified petroleum gas (LPG) and acetylene.

Sources of oxygen

- ▲ It is in the air and its flow is affected by the ventilation system.
- ▲ Oxidising materials. This property should be clearly marked.
- ▲ Oxygen cylinders eg for health care or welding.

Step 2: Identify people at risk

The assessment should pay attention to those at special risk, such as young people, the disabled and those with special needs. Signs and instructions should be translated into other languages when needed.

Step 3: Evaluating the risks

Some of the things that need to be considered are:

Prevention

- ▲ Reducing sources of ignition for example replacing naked flame and radiant heaters with central heating systems, having strict no smoking areas.
- ▲ Reducing easily accessible potential fuel, including good housekeeping measures to reduce accumulation of

waste. Changing industrial processes to limit the amount of flammable material; keeping material at a low temperature.

- ▲ Reducing or controlling the sources of oxygen, for example by permit-to-work systems for maintenance involving welding.

Fire Detection and Warning

The type of detector needs to be appropriate. In general smoke alarms are the first choice, but heat detectors are often used in kitchen areas when false signals are likely to be frequent. Sprinkler heads work by heat detection. Electrical systems, especially for large buildings and sites, must have a backup power system. Alarms must be able to be heard above any noise likely to be present and in areas where people will be able to respond (eg heard in a central operating area to cover warehouses, stores etc).

Means of Escape

Risk assess escape routes so that everyone who may be on the premises has a safe route to a place of safety. Emergency Doors must open in the direction of escape, not be locked or fastened; revolving or sliding doors must not be used for emergency exits. Emergency routes that require lighting must have emergency lighting.

Fire-fighting equipment

Article 13 of the Order requires the responsible person to ensure that premises are equipped with appropriate fire fighting equipment including fixed (sprinklers) and portable (extinguishers). And that non-automatic equipment is easily accessible, simple to use and indicated by signs. The equipment must be regularly maintained and tested. Fires should only be tackled, however, by trained Fire-fighters.

Step 3: Evaluating the risks, should also consider fire procedures (evacuation, drills, frequency of alarm testing), training (see below) and other practical measures (signage, keeping evacuation routes clear, fire safety audits) as explained in the guidance.

Step 4: Record your findings

The risk assessment should be recorded (irrespective of legal obligation) and be made available to safety representatives. There should be a written emergency plan and this is a requirement if five or more are employed. This should be kept in the workplace and should form the basis of training. Emergency plans should be practised and if necessary discussed with the local emergency services.

Step 5: Review and revise Arrangements in London

The London Fire Brigade advises people to contact their Local Borough Fire and Community Safety Centres if they have any query about fire safety and the addresses of the 33 London Centres, with phone numbers, are on their website: www.london-fire.gov.uk.

The London Fire Brigade provides the following basic training courses:

- ▲ Fire Awareness Course: a three-hour course aimed at all staff.
- ▲ Fire Awareness (with Extinguisher Training): a half-day course for all staff including practical use of fire extinguishers.
- ▲ Fire Warden Course: a one-day course for fire wardens.
- ▲ Fire Security Course: a one-day course for security staff.

References:

- 1 Lucinda Ponting, Health and Safety Bulletin December 2005.

Factsheets online www.lhc.org.uk London advice 020 7794 5999



Hampstead Town Hall Centre
213 Haverstock Hill, London NW3 4QP
Tel: 020 7794 5999 Fax: 020 7794 4702
Email: mail@lhc.org.uk Website: www.lhc.org.uk
Registered Charity No. 293677

Funded by

