

Solutions on Fire

www.solutionsfiresafety.co.uk

Tel: 0845 601 2632

Fax: 0845 601 2659

Welcome to the June issue of Solutions Fire Safety Newsletter. This month on the newsletter we're introducing the new signs standards ISO EN7010. Also extinguisher supplier taken to court gets me thinking, what makes a good supplier? Also your usual news of fire related issues this month!

- Court dismisses high street fashion stores appeal of £400,000 fine for fire safety breaches
- A local baker has had to pay almost £9000 after pleading guilty to three fire safety offences
- County Kent suffered yet another massive woodland fire, which is one of ten separate incidents
- Spray can under kitchen sink led to a house explosion that took out the ground floor double glazing!
- Man, aged 40, dies in Chelmsford, Essex after taking out the batteries from his alarm
- 100 residents are to be fast-tracked out of a block of flats in Nottingham city because of high fire risk

All on the Same Wave Length



At the end of this year we will see the implementation of a new standard for safety signs as the current standard ISO 7010 is soon to become ISO EN 7010. This means that safety signs within a workplace will change from being an 'international standard' to a European Norm, which means the contents of the standard must be written into both UK and EU legislation. ISO EN 7010 has been developed to correspond all symbols,

therefore ensuring that foreign nationals will understand and be familiar with all safety signs. So now, for example all 'Caution mind your head' (pictured left) signs will look the same across any other European country. They have already been phasing in the new designs so you will notice changes. Some changes are significantly obvious such as example but others are so minor you might not even notice. [Click here for more.](#)

Church Case Provides food for Thought

An ongoing court hearing has come to light this month when fire extinguisher supplier Chubb was ordered to pay £240,000 after schoolboy vandals damaged the property and artifacts with dry powder and water extinguishers. Chubb are currently appealing so the case is still ongoing. Artifacts such as tapestries, the organ, ancient stone and stained glass windows were damaged after both

dry powder and water were sprayed together forming an almost like paste. The church believe that Chubb failed to inform them of the risks caused my misuse and the possible recommendation of using another type of extinguisher that is more appropriate within a church building based on a fire risk assessment. Chubb could not have foreseen the vandalism as the church had not locked the

doors that night yet lawyers for the church say Chubb failed to warn the church of the severe damage the extinguishers could cause. Different opinions have arose by the public, here's what some had to say; "I can't believe they are even considering suing Chubb", "I always tell our customers the powder based units have major negative aspects, they create a mess." [Click here for more on this story](#)



What are your thoughts on this matter? Please feel free to email your views and opinions!

Ensuring you have all the correct info...

...because if you don't it could put you in danger of risk, both customer and supplier!



'duty of care goes beyond time and profit constraints'

It would not be fitting or of any value to discuss the failings of a particular company and a particular case but what must surely be drawn from this episode above, is the importance of the relationship that a client has with their supplier of fire safety services. The client has to have confidence that their particular supplier understands their situation and that their duty of care goes beyond time and profit

constraints. Whilst it is very much the case that all companies have a commercial enterprise aspect to their operations, the nature of the business that we are in demands the 'extra mile' from the aspect of the reputable supplier. What is important here is not that a different extinguisher could have been provided or even that the judiciary found in favour of one part or the other. What really matters is the

level of engagement with the client and their specific requirements exhibited by an otherwise reputable consultant.

Perhaps then for the client the answer is not to contact the flashy banners and adverts but to consult with trade partners, associates and friends, canvass opinion and select a business partner once they are sure of their integrity and commitment.