Fire Safety Audit Report

Audit Information

Audited By	[redacted]
Audit Completed	18 May 2026

Location summary

File No	20/015617
UPRN	100020641990
Building Name	
Address	62A CHURCH ROAD UPPER NORWOOD LONDON SE19 2EZ
Borough	Croydon
Use	H - Other sleeping accommodation
Responsible Team	FSD CROY-BROM-SUT-MERT
Station Ground	H31 - Croydon
Site Risk Score	4.00
Building Height band	<18
Total Floors	5 **Basement floors** 1
Estimated number of sleeping	0
Special Features	
Additional detail	**NONE**
Premises Description	This is a 5 storey mid terrace building with the ground and basement levels used as a take away outlet. The residential accommodation above has a separate access. The construction of the building is traditional brick with a glass front and pitched tiled roof. The footprint of the restaurant is 53m2 with a service area and grill at the front and preparation/cooking area at the back. The basement area is used mainly for storage and is 20m2 with stairs leading into service area at front of the premises. There are 2 fire exits front and back.
Exterior Wall Cladding	N/A
Exterior Wall Insulation	N/A
Cladding/Insulation details confirmed by	NOT CONFIRMED
Environmental Risks	NONE
Features assisting fire spread	NONE
Site Reinspection date	
Heritage Building	No
Balconies present?	No
Gas Supply present?	Yes
Petroleum redevelopment?	No
Known firesetting in area?	No

Site lone worker risk	NA

Property Detail (OCCUPIER PROPERTY)

Occupier Contact	Lebanese Charcoal Grill Takeaway
Address	62A CHURCH ROAD UPPER NORWOOD LONDON SE19 2EZ
Responsible team	FSD CROY-BROM-SUT-MERT
Occupancy Type	Sole Occupier
Property Use	N - Shop
Valuation Office	CR3 - Restaurant-Unlicensed
Original Risk Score	4.00
Reinspection Date	N/A (SAMPLE)
Last Inspection	7 May 2026
Total Capacity	0
Maximum number of people	<20
Property Size for use	Extremely Small <60m^2
Environmental Risks	NONE
Occupant Mobility	Average
Fire Loading	Average
Additional detail	

Specific lone worker risk	NA
Primary Authority Partnership	N/A

Protection Data (SHARED)

Fire Protection & Warning	Adequate
Unwanted fire signals count	0
AFD remote monitoring	No
Smoke ventilation	N/A
Covers MOE/Common areas?	No
Sprinklers Installed?	No
Access for fire-fighting	Average
Water supplies	Average
Special Features	
# Fire fighting shafts	0
Engineered solution?	No
Trade off measures?	No
Evacuation type	Simultaneous Evacuation
History of fires?	No

Contacts

Occupier

Name	Lebanese Charcoal Grill Takeaway
Address	62A CHURCH ROAD UPPER NORWOOD LONDON SE19 2EZ

Owner/Co-Owner - NEW

Name	Yalla Lebanese Grill
Person	[redacted]
Position	Director
Address	, 62a Church Road, Crystal Palace, SE19 2EZ

On Site Representative - NEW

Name	Yalla Lebanese Grill
Person	[redacted]
Position	[redacted]
Address	62a Church Road, Crystal Palace, SE19 2EZ
Mobile	[redacted]
Email	[redacted]@gmail.com

Enforcement history

Articles

Article 9 - Risk assessment

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Observations

There is a Fire Risk Assessment (FRA) recorded for this premises last reviewed on 25/08/2025 by NCASS SMS and was available on-site.

The fire risk assessment did not reflect what was in place at this takeaway restaurant including :

- People at risk .
- Fire hazards , appropriate measures for storage and preventative measures in place.
- Firefighting equipment
- Emergency plan in place

FAILURE

Article 9(1) FRA not suitable or sufficient

At the time of the audit the fire risk assessment for your premises was not suitable and sufficient. It was found that the risk assessment did no reflect the fire safety related issues found at this address.

REMEDY

The fire risk assessment should be reviewed, with specific consideration given to getting a competent person to carry out and record a fire risk assessment that relates to this premises.

Article 11 - Fire Safety Arrangements

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Observations
There is little evidence of knowledge regarding fire safety management and effective arrangements for the planning, organisation and control of this building.
A Fire Risk Assessment that does not reflect the fire safety systems in place at this restaurant .
No recorded evacuation plan
Limited signage in place.
No documentation of fire safety systems in place including the extraction system and firefighting extinguishers.
No testing of the Fire alarm system

FAILURE
Article 11 FS arrangements not maintained
At the time of the audit your preventative and protective measures had not been planned, organised, controlled monitored or reviewed where required. It was found that :
The fire risk assessment had not been monitored
The evacuation plan had not been planned
Directional signage had not been organised
Maintenance of fire safety systems had not been controlled or monitored
REMEDY
Arrangements identified as not suitably addressed must be effectively planned, organised, controlled, monitored or reviewed.

Article 13 - Detection and warning

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
There were 2 stand-alone battery operated heat detectors in the service/grill area.

Advice

Instal additional smoke detection to rear preparation room and basement area.

Article 14 - Emergency routes and exits

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Observations
The means of escape where clear from the back of the shop to the front entrance with no emergency lighting as there was no area greater than 60m2.
Directional signage was evident but the direction was not correct and needs correcting.
The distance from the from the front to the back of the store was 12m so only required one fire exit to meet the travel distances stated by DCLG guide.
The escape routes are of adequate width and distance for the maximum number of people in the store at any one time 10 customers and 4 staff.

Article 14
(continued)

The rear fire door was unable to open fully due to a parked van too closely parked. This was moved at the time of the audit but has potential to happen again.

FAILURE
Article 14 Issues with emergency routes or exits
At the time of the audit the emergency routes or exits were inadequate. It was found that :
1/ Directional signage was not adequate
2/ The rear fire exit was blocked by the restaurant van being parked too close
REMEDY
Ensure adequate emergency routes and exits, for use by relevant persons in the premises, are available and can be safely and effectively used at all relevant times. This can be achieved by :
1/ Display correct directional signage in accordance with BS 5499
2/ Arrange for alternative parking of restaurant van and cordon off area to ensure rear fire door can open fully

Article 15 - Procedures for serious and imminent danger and for danger areas

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
There was no recorded emergency plan in place or fire action signs in shop.
On questioning the onsite representative they gave me a verbal evacuation plan for the premises and stated how they would be alerted of a fire at the premises . They verbally confirmed the shutdown procedure in the kitchen, assembly point and means for calling the fire service .

Advice given

Have a recorded emergency plan in place.
Display fire action notices in customer area.

Article 17 - Maintenance

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Observations
This audit was carried out with no prior warning and at the time of the audit there was no documentation available for :
TR19 cleaning of extraction system
Firefighting extinguishers

I requested that this information was e-mailed to me within the next 48hours but did not receive it.

The extraction system looked in good condition and I received verbal confirmation that they were cleaned on a regular basis.
The firefighting extinguisher visually showed no evidence that it was being maintained.
Then fire detection in place did not require a 12 monthly service

Article 17
(continued)

FAILURE

Article 17(1) Facilities/equipment not maintained

At the time of the audit you had not ensured that a suitable system of maintenance was in place in your premises. It was found that the firefighting extinguishers had not been serviced for may years.

REMEDY

Arrange initial and on-going maintenance to ensure fire safety measures are kept in an efficient state, working order and good repair. This can be achieved by maintaining the fire extinguishers

Article 21 - Training

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Observations

There is no formal training received by staff on induction or on a regular planned schedule.
The only training given is cascade from staff currently employed.

FAILURE

Article 21 Inadequate Staff training

At the time of the audit your employees had not been provided with adequate safety training. It was found that no fire safety for staff was provided

REMEDY

Provide your staff with adequate safety training. In particular how to carry out an evacuation of the premises

Article 8 - General fire precautions

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Verbal Advice Given

Observations

On the stair escape route from the basement there was a hole in the ceiling compromising the 60 min separation required between commercial and residential premises.

Advice given

Repair compartmentation to stairs to ensure 60min Fire resisting. Photographic evidence was received to confirm this had been carried out.

Article 10 - Principles of prevention to be applied

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations

There is a no smoking policy in place which is applied to the whole premises. CCTV was also evident around the shop contributing to reduction of potential arson.

Article 12 - Elimination or reduction of risks from dangerous substances

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
None

Article 13 - Fire Fighting Equipment

Safety Evaluation
Non Compliant

Observations
There was one 2kg CO_2 extinguisher in the rear preparation room not mounted or signed and hidden from view behind kitchen equipment. There was no service label visible on this extinguisher.
There was no extinguishing medium in place for the grill area where there is a deep fat fryer 2 spit grills and an open solid fuel grill using wood charcoal.

FAILURE
Article 13(1) FFE not appropriate
At the time of the audit the provision of manual fire fighting equipment was not appropriate. It was found that there was no extinguishing media in place for the high risk area of the grill
REMEDY
Ensure that fire fighting equipment is appropriate to risk, easily identifiable and available at all material times. This can be achieved by installing and maintaining firefighting equipment in this area

Article 16 - Measures for dealing with dangerous substances affecting general fire precautions

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
None

Article 18 - Safety assistance

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
Competent persons have been appointed to maintain and clean the extraction system at regular intervals.

Article 19 - Provision of information to employees

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
Verbal communication with the 4 employees on evacuation procedure and general fire safety related issues in place

Article 20 - Provision of information to employers and the self employed from outside undertakings

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
Verbal procedure in place for informing on site contractors/ visitors of relevant information.

Article 22 - Co-operation and co-ordination

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
None

Article 23 - General duties of employees at work

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
At the time of the audit, it was apparent that reasonable care is taken by the on-site representative and all employees, with a view to preventing harm and protecting others.

Article 37 - Fire fighters switches for luminous tube signs

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
None

Article 38 - Maintenance of measures provided for protection of fire fighters

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
None

Article 24 - Power to make regulations

Safety Evaluation
No (Compliant)

Observations
None

Article 27 - Powers of inspectors

Safety Evaluation
No (Compliant)

Observations
None

Article 29 - Current alterations notices

Safety Evaluation
No (Compliant)

Observations
None

Article 30 - Current enforcement notices

Safety Evaluation	Observations
No (Compliant)	None

Article 31 - Current prohibition notices

Safety Evaluation	Observations
No (Compliant)	None

Article 32 - Offences

Safety Evaluation	Observations
No (Compliant)	None

Overall safety standard

Low Risk

Management compliance level

Management Compliance Level	1 - Well above average
Initial Expectation	Verbal action
Considered EMM?	Yes
Confirmed Action	Verbal action

Audit Conclusion

Date audit carried out

19:03:2026

Time of audit

15:00

Reason for audit;

This is an audit generated from an alleged fire risk

Conclusion

I attended this Audit assisted by the on-site representative [redacted] on 19/03/2026 @ 15:00 hrs

The premises was operating as a take away restaurant and covered an area of approx. 53m2 over 2 floors, ground and basement.
Employees 4 on shift at any one time.
Total employees 4
Customers Max 10

Following the receipt of this AFR I attended the premises arriving at 14:50 hrs. My first actions were to carry out an external inspection of the property which included the ducting at the rear of the property which extended onto tiled roof. I then made access to the front of the restaurant and introduced myself to [redacted] I explained that I would be carrying out an FS01 as a complaint had been received about the premises. He contacted both of the co-owners but neither of them were able to attend [redacted]
I introduced myself, showing ID, to [redacted] I explained the reason for the audit and the 3 parts that it would consist of :

1- A visual inspection of records
2- A physical inspection of the premises
3- A debrief of the inspection

I then went on to explain the 5 outcome levels that might be reached :

Level 1 - Broadly Compliant
Level 2 - Minor notification of deficiency
Level 3- Notification of deficiency
Level 4 - Enforcement
Level 5 - Enforcement with potential prosecution

[redacted] confirmed understanding of the levels of outcomes and inspection process.

I reviewed the documentation and asked questions on the Fire Risk Assessment, evacuation procedure, training and fire safety systems in place.

At the debrief I discussed the following observations :

Rear fire exit partially blocked by parked van, that needed moving for this door to be used as a second fire escape.
Compartmentation breeched between the basement stairs ceiling and the residential accommodation above, with a fist sized hole in the plaster board 1 metre down from ground floor level. In agreement with my DTL IO [redacted] via a phone call I stated that this compartmentation breech required to be remedied by midday the following day. Photographic evidence was sent to me the following day to show this had been carried out.
I could find no immediate concerns with the ducting and was informed that TR19 cleaning had taken place in December 2025 and that the relevant service documents would be sent to me via e-mail.
The directional signage needs addressing.
The fire risk assessment needs to reflect what you have in place regarding fire safety systems eg wet chem extinguisher in location of deep fat fryer.

Extent of premises audited

Basement area
Stairs to ground floor
Service area and grill
Preparation room

Justification of audit outcome

The store had suitable fire safety systems in place but lacked documentation and records to confirm that management monitoring and controlling these systems. As this inspection was unannounced and it was understandable that these documents were not to hand. Although promised on phone call with the owner no documentation was received by e-mail. Despite failing 5 of the safety critical articles It has led to an outcome of broadly compliant.

Verbal Advice Given

Advice given on article(s) 8, 13, 15

All Advice given in articles recorded above

Other Authorities to notify

None

Weeks to Complete Work

N/A

Specific instructions for Admin to Action

None

Compliance calculation & signature

Compliance Level	1 - Well above average
Property Risk Group	C - Public unfamiliar
Life Risk	-8.9
Actual Risk Score	3.85
Risk Score	3.75

Audit Timings

Audit Duration	Travel Time	Post Audit Processing Duration
120	120	550

LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

REPORT OF AN ALLEGED FIRE RISK

ALLEGED FIRE RISK DETAIL

Premises Address: Yalla Lebanese Grill, 62a Church Road, Crystal Palace, SE19 2EZ

Type of Premises: Take away

Details of alleged risk: Poor maintenance of extract ducting and possible compartmentation issues

Date AFR received: 19/03/2026 Time AFR received: 12:04

Name and contact details of AFR source (protect the source): [redacted]

Name and contact details of LFB staff member who received or identifed AFR: [redacted]

Time AFR passed on for action by above staff member: 12:22

ACTION TAKEN AND OUTCOME

Name and contact details of LFB staff member who was passed the AFR to confirm it as an AFR and allocate the appropriate response: [redacted] ex:[redacted]

Name and contact details of AFR responder: [redacted]
(Normally IO/FSA or SFSO, but occasionally: Petroleum, Transport and Operational staff)

Time AFR responded to: 12:30 Confirmed response within 3 hours of receiving AFR: YES

Details of action taken (include any advice given and referals): Following the receipt of this AFR I attended the premises arriving at 14:50 hrs. My first actions were to carry out an external inspection of the property which included the ducting at the rear of the property which extended onto tiled roof. I then made access to the front of the restaurant and introduced myself to [redacted] I explained that I would be carrying out an FS01 as a complaint had been received about the premises. He contacted both of the co-owners but neither of them were able to attend [redacted]. During the inspection I made [redacted] aware of the following issues :

Rear fire exit partially blocked by parked van, that needed moving for this door to be used as a second fire escape.

Compartmentation breeched between the basement stairs ceiling and the residential accommodation above, with a fist sized hole in the plaster board 1 metre down from ground floor level. In agreement with my DTL [redacted] via a phone call I stated that this compartmentation breech required to be remedied by midday the following day.

I could find no immediate concerns with the ducting and was informed that TR19 cleaning had taken place in December 2025 and that the relevant service documents would be sent to me via e-mail.

Other issues regarding the FS01 were discussed before I advised that the restaurant needed to have all of the main ignition sources isolated before securing the premises that night.

Time spent at Premises: 120

Travelling Time: 120

Office Time: 90

Send to : *Fire Safety team leader for relevant borough*
Policy and StrategyTeam mailbox
Originating LFB staff member
AdminSupport mailbox