London Fire Brigade Headquarters
169 Union Street London SE1 0LL
T 020 8555 1200
london-fire.gov.uk

Freedom of Information request: Reference number FOI2026/01058

Date of request: 27th August

Request:

Subject: Freedom of Information Act 2000 Request – Fire Safety Audit Evidence – 146A–B Brondesbury Villas, London NW6 6AE

I write to request information under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000** in relation to the fire safety audit undertaken by the London Fire Brigade at **146A–B Brondesbury Villas, London NW6 6AE**.

Following correspondence with the Brigade, I have been informed that:

> *"All necessary evidence was provided at the time of the audit."*

In order to understand the evidential basis upon which the audit conclusions were reached, I request the following information.

1. Please identify all documentary evidence relied upon by the Inspecting Officers when carrying out the audit.

2. Please confirm whether any of the following were obtained, reviewed or relied upon:

* Building plans.
* Conversion plans.
* Building Control records.
* Building Regulations approval documents.
* Fire strategy documentation.
* Compartmentation surveys.
* Fire-stopping surveys.
* As-built drawings.
* Roof-void construction drawings.
* Any intrusive survey reports.
* Any other documentation relating to compartmentation or the construction of the common escape route.

3. If any of the above documents were reviewed, please identify:

* the document title;
* its date;
* who supplied it; and
* whether a copy is held by London Fire Brigade.

4. If none of the above documents were reviewed, please confirm what evidence formed the basis for the conclusion that there was sufficient protection to the common escape route.

5. Please provide copies of any inspection notes, audit records or internal documents recording the

evidence relied upon in reaching the audit outcome, subject to any applicable exemptions under the Act.

6. Please identify any information provided by Notting Hill Genesis which London Fire Brigade relied upon in reaching its audit conclusions.

If any part of this request is considered exempt from disclosure, please specify:

* the exemption relied upon;
* why it applies; and
* whether any information can be disclosed in redacted form.

Response:

I refer to your request for information, received on 27 August 2026, which has been processed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Your request relates to the fire safety audit undertaken by the London Fire Brigade (LFB) at 146A–B Brondesbury Villas, London NW6 6AE, and specifically the documentary evidence considered by inspecting officers when reaching the audit outcome.

The Prevention and Protection (Fire Safety) Team has confirmed that a fire safety audit was carried out at the premises on 1 July 2026. The audit identified a number of low-risk fire safety deficiencies, for which verbal advice was provided to the Responsible Person. Having considered the findings, the premises were assessed as presenting a low level of fire risk and the audit outcome was Verbal Action. No formal enforcement action was considered necessary and, accordingly, no enforcement notices were issued.

A copy of the fire safety audit record is enclosed with this response. Please note that personal data has been redacted under [Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000], as disclosure would contravene the data protection principles.

LFB does not hold the documents referred to in your request. Whilst documentation may be reviewed by inspecting officers as part of a fire safety audit, there is no requirement for LFB to retain copies of those documents. Responsibility for maintaining such records rests with the Responsible Person (RP) for the premises

Accordingly, LFB does not hold copies of building plans, conversion plans, Building Control records, fire strategy documents, compartmentation surveys, fire-stopping surveys, as-built drawings, roof void construction drawings, intrusive survey reports, or other documents relating to compartmentation or the construction of the common escape route falling within the scope of your request.

For further information on fire safety responsibilities and the duties placed on Responsible Persons, please visit: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/fire-safety-legislation-guidance-for-those-with-legal-duties

Your request has been handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Further information about making requests for information is available on our website: https://www.london-fire.gov.uk/about-us/transparency/request-information-from-us/

Fire Safety Audit Report

Audit Information

Audited By	[redacted]
Audit Completed	11 August 2026

Location summary

File No	28/283107
UPRN	10091058497
Building Name	
Address	146 BRONDESBURY VILLAS LONDON NW6 6AE
Borough	Brent
Use	G - House converted to flat
Responsible Team	FSD BRENT & EAL-HHH
Station Ground	G27 - North Kensington
Site Risk Score	4.25
Building Height band	<18
Total Floors	2 **Basement floors** 0
Estimated number of sleeping	0
Special Features	
Additional detail	**NONE**
Premises Description	Constructed from traditional methods of brick / masonry and pitched roof, this premises was originally a house, now converted to two self-contained flats; one on the ground floor and one on the first, both accessed by the communal ground floor entrance. Automatic Fire Detection and warning is installed, with the panel located in the entrance hallway.
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?	No
Petroleum redevelopment?	No
Known firesetting in area?	No
Site lone worker risk	

Property Detail (DEFAULT PROPERTY)

Occupier Contact	Default Property
Address	146 BRONDESBURY VILLAS LONDON NW6 6AE
Responsible team	FSD BRENT & EAL-HHH
Occupancy Type	Sole Occupier
Property Use	G - House converted to flat
Valuation Office	R4 - Houses converted to flats<=2 flrs
Original Risk Score	4.25
Reinspection Date	N/A (SAMPLE)
Last Inspection	24 June 2026
Total Capacity	0
Maximum number of people	<20
Property Size for use	Extremely Small <250m^2
Environmental Risks	NONE
Occupant Mobility	Average
Fire Loading	Average
Additional detail	
Specific lone worker risk	
Primary Authority Partnership	Direct - East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service

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	Default Property
Address	146 BRONDESBURY VILLAS LONDON NW6 6AE

Owner/Co-Owner - NEW

Name	Notting Hill Genesis Community Foundation Limited
Person	[redacted]
Position	
Address	Bruce Kenrick House 2 Killick Street London N1 9FL

Other relevant contact - NEW

Name	Notting Hill Genesis
Person	[redacted]
Position	Fire Safety Consultant to Notting Hill Genesis & Fire Service Liaison
Mobile	[redacted]
Email	[redacted]@2encapsulate.com

Enforcement history

Articles

Article 9 - Risk assessment

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
Prior to the audit, the Responsible Person (RP) emailed a copy of the current Fire Risk Assessment (FRA), completed by [redacted] Savills (UK) Ltd.
The FRA is dated 14/07/25, with a review date of 23/07/28. Providing a good level of detail, the document covers expected areas, including:
- People at risk (including vulnerable groups).
- Fire hazards (ignition, dangerous substances).
- Detection and warning.
- Fire-fighting equipment.
- Emergency lighting.
- Signage.
- Maintenance and record keeping.
- Management Procedures.
- Compartmentation.

An Action Plan is included, with risk ratings applied and space for the signing off of actions.
However, whilst the FRA would otherwise be deemed suitable and sufficient, it is noted it states that emergency lighting is not required, due to the provided borrowed light. Verbal advice was given to review this position, due to the apparent low level of light at first floor level and in the stairwell. Consequently, this is scored below.

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 required emergency lighting, particularly at first floor level and in the stairwell, had not been adequately considered.
REMEDY

Article 9
(continued)

The fire risk assessment should be reviewed, with specific consideration given to ensuring an appropriate level of emergency lighting is considered, particularly at first floor level and in the stairwell.

Article 11 - Fire Safety Arrangements

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
At the time of audit, some effective fire safety arrangements were evidenced, including the completion of an FRA and certification demonstrating periodic contractor inspection and testing of the Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and warning system. Also, as confirmed by residents, the RP was routinely providing information relating to the evacuation strategy and importance of fire doors, as per that required of The Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022.
However, some expectations were not met, namely ensuring that the protected escape route remained clear of obstructions at all times and the electrical intake and meter cupboard, situated within the escape route, was kept locked shut. Verbal advice was given regarding the above and is scored below.
In addition, as a result of the review of the linked fire alarm arrangements in [redacted] (see Article 13), it is felt that the RP demonstrated an inefficient approach towards checking that the common alarm system linked through to the accommodation. Consequently, this is also scored below.

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:
(1) The need to ensure the protected escape route remained clear of obstructions at all times had not been monitored or reviewed.
(2) The need to ensure the electrical intake and meter cupboard, situated within the escape route, was being kept locked shut was not being planned or monitored.
(3) The need to ensure the common fire alarm system was linked through to both flats, due to a simultaneous evacuation strategy being in place, had not been efficiently reviewed.
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
At the time of audit, as confirmed in the FRA, the premises was found to be equipped with a BS 5839-6 Grade A Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) and alarm system within the common areas of the building, with manual call points in expected locations. The FRA explains how access could not be gained to the two flats at the time of assessment; consequently, the assessor was unable to confirm that common system heat detectors / sounders had been provided, which is required to achieve an LD2 category of coverage to the common fire alarm system.
During audit, contact was made with the occupants of both flats, with [redacted] on the ground floor appearing to have a linked heat detector to the common

Article 13
(continued)

system installed, although, observed from the doorway threshold, visual observations did not support this being the case in [redacted] Verbal advice in this regard was given to the RP and, post audit, documentation was received from Notting Hill Genesis (NHG), which potentially supports both flats having the correct linked installations in place. NHG have confirmed they will ensure to check (scheduled for Tuesday 21st July 2026) the necessary fire alarm expectations are in place and take appropriate action, as necessary. Consequently, this is not scored below. NOTE: email received from NHG on the 23/07/26 confirming that no linked detection was found in [redacted] which has now been added and successfully commissioned onto the fire alarm system.
The AFD panel, showing a healthy status, was located in the communal hallway entrance to the premises. It is noted that the FRA details that, "The power supply to the fire detection/alarm panel has not been provided with an anti-tamper device
to prevent it from being turned off." Upon reviewing this, the system was found to be powered by a linked Fused Connection Unit operated by a fish key, meaning the system could, potentially, be switched off by someone, should they have the means and intention to do so. During audit, the RP explained how consideration had been given to possible solutions; however, no completely 'tamper proof' solution had been identified. Verbal advice was given to explore possible solutions, as far as reasonably practicable.
The above identified issues are also captured in the FRA as recommendations in the 'Action Plan'.

Article 14 - Emergency routes and exits

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Verbal Advice Given

Observations

At the time of audit, the premises was found to be served by a single escape route and stairway leading from / to the main front door, giving access to [redacted] on the ground floor and [redacted] on the first.
As identified in the FRA, the fanlight to [redacted] on the ground floor was found to be covered both sides by a solid material, which the RP stated he believed constituted the minimum 30-minute fire resistance required. Evidence observed did not contradict this belief; however, verbal advice was given to ensure this was the case, including the conformity of the frame into which the material is fixed and fixings used. Reviewing the FRA, it can be seen that this was identified during the assessment process, with the same request recommended. It is also noted that the action is signed off as having been 'Completed'. The front door to [redacted] appeared to be of a newer installation to that of [redacted] having a 'riskhub' sticker attached suggesting it is subject to periodic routine inspection, as confirmed by the RP and in the FRA. The door was solid in nature and, upon testing, freely closed without assistance, as per expected design. As stated above, the door to [redacted] appeared to be an older installation, having an external self-closer fitted. The RP explained that this was likely to be the case as a result of previous unsuccessful attempts to arrange for fitting from the inside; however this could not be substantiated. The door was solid in nature and, upon testing, freely closed without assistance, as per expected design. Verbal advice was given to make arrangements to upgrade the flat front door, fixtures and fittings as per that of [redacted] on the ground floor. The RP confirmed he would take this forward and action. Post audit, communication received from Notting Hill Genesis confirmed that the door to [redacted] is scheduled to be replaced.

Article 14
(continued)

The fanlights above the door were found fitted with Georgian wired glass, which, in accordance with its design, is believed to have 30-minute fire resistance. However, verbal advice was given to ensure this was the case, including the suitability of the frame into which it is fixed and fixings used. It should nbe noted that, upon being asked, the occupant stated that she would not want the glazing changed to a solid material, due to the anticipated loss of light.

Forming part of the wall along the common escape route, a small secure door hatch was found inside the front entrance door. With access gained by the RP, this small space gave access to two stop cocks and exposed the structural brick wall, with stud work appearing to be affixed, with an inner surface of plasterboard lining. Due to the cavity produced and in not being able to confirm whether this extended up beyond the upper most ceiling into the loft space, the RP was advised to ensure the door hatch and frame conformed to expected fire resistance Building Regulations and was kept locked shut.

On the ground floor along the escape route, personal items were found stored presenting potential obstructions to those escaping in a fire. Additionally, in the stairwell recess leading up to the first floor, maintenance contractor items were found stored, including a large step ladder, which, if dislodged, could fall and prevent safe and quick egress from first floor level. It was also noted that similar issues were identified in the FRA. Verbal advice was given in this regard and is scored below.

It is noted that the FRA states that emergency lighting is not required in the means of escape, due to the provided borrowed light. However, verbal advice was given to review this position, due to the low level of borrowed light at first floor level and in the stairwell. This issue is scored below.

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) Personal items were stored along the escape route, which could prevent quick and safe egress in a fire.

(2) There was no emergency lighting in place, particularly at first floor level and in the stairwell, which could impact on quick and safe egress in a fire.

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) Ensuring the escape route remains permanently free from stored items.

(2) Installing adequate emergency lighting in appropriate locations in the building.

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

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations

At the time of audit, a review of the FRA confirmed that a 'simultaneous evacuation' strategy was in place, supported by that stated on the provided Fire Action Notices located in the building. Speaking with the occupants of both flats, this was understood, along with the expected action.

Article 17 - Maintenance

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
At the time of audit, as explained in Article 14, the flat front door to [redacted] on the ground floor appeared to be a newer installation to that of [redacted] on the first floor, with the door to [redacted] also having a 'riskhub' sticker attached suggesting it is subject to periodic routine inspection, as confirmed by the RP and in the FRA. The RP believed that previous efforts had been made to upgrade the door on the first floor, but it was evident this had not yet been achieved. Whilst the door to [redacted] showed no obvious signs of defect, as confirmed in the FRA, which states, "The fire rated flat entrance doors appear to be in good condition.", the RP was verbally advised to make arrangements to upgrade the flat front door and ensure it was subject to the same 'Risk Hub Asset Service' arrangements, as per that of [redacted] The RP confirmed he would take forward and action. As explained in Article 14, post audit, communication received from Notting Hill Genesis (NHG) confirmed that, "... there is an action which was assigned to our contractor for Flat B's flat entrance door. I will chase for an update and keep you updated." Confirmation was sought regarding what actions are planned; however, at the time of submitting this audit report, details of this had not been received.

Article 21 - Training

SAFETY CRITICAL
Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
Due to the premises occupancy and type, this does not apply.

Article 8 - General fire precautions

Safety Evaluation
Low Risk

Verbal Advice Given

Observations
At the time of audit, the FRA was found to have six recorded 'Action Plan' recommendations, with all but one 'completion due date' being July 2027. The only outstanding 'In Progress' actions related to the provision of a fire alarm zone plan, fire stopping in the electrical cupboard, which had been completed, and the locking of the unit, which was found unlocked.
Despite recorded as being 'Completed', personal items were again found stored in the escape route, suggesting that routine periodic checks by the RP, or representative, were not being undertaken. Additionally, the situation with the need to check the fire alarm linkage with the two flats, as per that explained in Article 13, also features in the FRA and is stated as having been 'Completed'. However, observed from the doorway threshold, visual observations did not support this being the case in [redacted]
Verbal advice in this regard was given to the RP and, post audit, documentation was received from Notting Hill Genesis (NHG), which potentially supports both flats having the correct linked installations in place. NHG have confirmed they will ensure to check (scheduled for Tuesday 21st July 2026) the necessary fire alarm expectations are in place and take appropriate action, as necessary. Consequently, this is not scored below.

FAILURE
Article 8 FRA findings not implemented

Article 8
(continued)

At the time of the audit the general fire precautions as identified in the significant findings of your fire risk assessment had not been implemented. It was found that:
(1) Personal items were stored in the escape route, suggesting that the recommendation to ensure a programme of regular checks is put in place had not been robustly actioned.
(2) The electrical intake and meter cupboard was found unlocked.

REMEDY

Implement the significant findings of your fire risk assessment, in particular, ensure necessary action is taken to fully rectify identified deficiencies within the specified timeframe.

Article 10 - Principles of prevention to be applied

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
At the time of audit, discussions with the RP and observing employed practices suggest principles of prevention are applied, an example being a 'no smoking' policy was in place.

Article 12 - Elimination or reduction of risks from dangerous substances

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
Dangerous substances are not used in the premises.

Article 13 - Fire Fighting Equipment

Safety Evaluation
Broadly Compliant

Observations
Due to the occupancy and premises type, fire fighting equipment is not provided.

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
At the time of audit, the RP explained his responsibilities in the management of the preventative and protective measures and the processes employed. Additionally, a number of competent persons were found to be assisting the RP in undertaking the preventative and protective measures, including the Fire Risk Assessor, fire alarm engineers and service technicians and maintenance teams.

Article 19 - Provision of information to employees

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
Due to the occupancy and premises type, this does not apply.

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

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
Due to the occupancy and premises type, this does not apply.

Article 22 - Co-operation and co-ordination

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
Due to the occupancy and premises type, this does not apply.

Article 23 - General duties of employees at work

Safety Evaluation
Not Applicable

Observations
Due to the occupancy and premises type, this does not apply.

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
Not Applicable

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
No (Compliant)

Observations
None

Article 31 - Current prohibition notices

Safety Evaluation
No (Compliant)

Observations
None

Article 32 - Offences

Safety Evaluation
No (Compliant)

Observations
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

01/07/26.

Time of audit

10:30

Reason for audit;

Demand Led Audit External (linked to a received complaint).

Conclusion

Prior to undertaking the audit, I reviewed the complaint details and conducted pre-audit research, which included the following considerations:
- Farynor history.
- Companies House information.
- Accessing iMapping.
- Incident history.
- Primary Authority Partnership data.

Whilst not mentioning the complaint details, I also emailed the RP to explain the purpose of my intended visit, requesting the appropriate documentation be emailed to me and subsequently arranging the audit for a mutually convenient date and time.
Accompanied by my colleague named below, I entered the premises, firstly introducing ourselves to the RP, whom my colleague had met previously. Identification was produced.
I explained the audit would follow the three-step process, comprising of firstly having a discussion with the RP to gain an understanding of practices and procedures, followed by a walk around of the premises and finally a debrief. The RP confirmed his understanding and the audit commenced.

Extent of premises audited

The common parts, consisting of the single means of escape up to, and including, the two flat front doors, were fully inspected. With the occupants at home, both flat front doors were tested for their self-closing performance and visually inspected. It should be noted that some of the aspects of the received complaint related to perceived deficiencies beyond the flat front door and not the common parts. Consequently, these matters are not directly considered in this report.

Justification of audit outcome

Meeting with [redacted] (Fire Safety Consultant to Notting Hill Genesis & Fire Service Liaison), the audit was led by FSIO [redacted] accompanied by FSIO [redacted]
During the audit, verbal advice was given as detailed in the Articles in this form. At the end, I recapped on the points identified, explaining that the process would now involve completion of automated risk based scoring, following which the audit outcome will be known and contact will be made, as necessary.
Whilst some issues were identified and scored, a number of points warranted 'verbal advice' only, with the RP stating a willingness to ensure action is taken accordingly. Having considered the Enforcement Management Model (EMM) in my deliberations, for the reasons explained above, I believe the outcome of 'verbal action is justified'.
Post audit development activities are included in the 'Post Audit Duration' timings below.

Verbal Advice Given

Advice given on article(s) 9, 11, 17, 14, 8, 13

N/A

Other Authorities to notify

N/A

Weeks to Complete Work

N/A

Specific instructions for Admin to Action

N/A

Compliance calculation & signature

Compliance Level	1 - Well above average
Property Risk Group	B - Sleeping familiar or Licensed Premises
Life Risk	-8.9
Actual Risk Score	4.08
Risk Score	4.00

Audit Timings

Audit Duration	Travel Time	Post Audit Processing Duration
90	120	700