Assessment of Risk

Stakeholder engagement

February 2016

LFB
LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

About this publication

Publication date: <mark>25 February 2016</mark>

This document was produced by the London Fire Brigade Information Management Team.

For information about this publication contact:

Andrew Mobbs
LFB Information Management
169 Union Street
London SE1 0LL

Tel: 020 8555 1200
email: andrew.mobbs@london-fire.gov.uk

Copyright and reproduction

This publication is the copyright of the London Fire Brigade.

Maps are protected and reproduced by © Crown Copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey. 100016817

You may use or re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit:

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

The London Fire Brigade

The London Fire Brigade is run by the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA).

Contents

Introduction

This Assessment of Risk 2015 (AoR 2015) is a public facing document, designed to help increase the understanding of how risk in London has changed over time and how different elements combine together to give a picture of risk. The AoR is not the only process the LFB uses to determine and provide its services, but it does give a high level overview which can be used to understand the basic concepts of fire cover and the steps the LFB are taking to make people safe.

The Brigade sets out how its prevention, protection and response activities will best be used to mitigate the impact of risk on communities in its Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP). The Brigade's IRMP is known as the London Safety Plan, the most recent of which was agreed on 12 September 2013 which was the Fifth London Safety Plan (LSP5).

It is proposed that the methodology for the AoR set out in this document will be further developed, and that key external stakeholders, like the London borough councils, have an opportunity to feed into this process as part of developing the AoR 2016 which will feed into the Sixth London Safety Plan (LSP6) planned to cover the period from April 2017.

The approach we have used to develop the AoR is based on a standard risk model which would traditionally review hazards, risks and controls. For AoR purposes, hazards are best described as 'concerns'.

For this AoR 2015, the Brigade has taken key elements at each level for concerns, risks and control and combined them together to give an overall 'score'. Data for each element has been collected at electoral ward level as this provides a local geography for the public to understand the factors in their area and local councils and the GLA collect a range of social, demographic and economic data at ward level which can be used to contextualise this AoR. To produce an overall picture of **concerns, risks** and **controls**, elements are scored out of 100, reflecting the relative

position of a particular ward compared to others in London. A score closer to 100 represents 'higher' values and closer to zero, 'lower' values areas (i.e. higher risks would have values closer to 100 and the best controls would have values closer to 100). The AoR presents these scores for individual wards.

This first iteration of the AoR for 2015 was reported by the London Fire and Emergency Planning (LFEPA) in December 2015 (report FEP2544). It was agreed as the basis for engagement with stakeholders during 2016 for the preparation of the Sixth London Safety Plan (LSP6), and to finalise an AoR for 2016.

Background

Despite the comprehensive nature of the information published for LSP5, it was clear from the consultation process, and from the judicial review, that many external stakeholders (like local politicians), and including the general public, could not see that the Brigade had recognised their particular local 'concerns' (sometimes articulated as 'risks'). People could not see what the Brigade knew about them, or how they had been taken into account in resource planning (particularly in the context of the reduction in fire stations and fire engines that was a feature of the LSP5).

During the judicial review (JR) hearing on aspects of the LSP5, and public consultation, some consultees, and the JR claimant boroughs, believed that the Brigade's speed of attendance and weight of attack was the only or main way in which risk was identified. The JR claimant boroughs suggested that a proper risk assessment had not been undertaken. It was clear that the Brigade had not sufficiently well articulated its approach to risk assessment and how this was factored into the modelling work that was undertaken for LSP5. Whilst these claims were rejected by the judge as the outcome of the judicial review, confirming that the LSP5 and its supporting documents did represent a full and proper assessment of the risks in London, the Brigade is keen to make sure that the approach to risk assessment, in the IRMP context, is fully and well understood by the widest possible audience.

As a response to LSP5 consultation, the London Fire Commissioner advised (LFEPA report FEP2205, March 2014) that LFEPA members should receive an annual document that fully assesses risk in London in a comprehensive but accessible way. It was anticipated that using this approach, the Brigade would be able to demonstrate that it regards the assessment of risk in London as an important consideration, and not something that is only thought about when a London Safety Plan is prepared. LFEPA Members were advised that the most appropriate time to present the annual document would be in the Autumn (i.e.

October or November) as this would link well to initial draft versions of the London Safety Plan (in years when an LSP was being produced).

The purpose of producing the AoR, and updating on an annual basis, can therefore be summarised as

- To improve public understanding of risk in London, the nature of that risk, where it is located and how the Brigade's actions are designed to mitigate it.
- To better address the identification and visibility of local concerns, including the themes evident during from LSP5 consultation.
- To demonstrate that the assessment of risk in London is an ongoing process, and not just undertaken when producing a new London Safety Plan, which is undertaken at different levels all the time.
- To better join up our understanding of risk with the modelling we do to plan the location of fire stations and fire engines (and other resources).
- To deliver of way of joining together data representing different local concerns, and risk, to produce an overall understanding of risk in different places (i.e. London as a whole, boroughs and wards).
- To ensure that the current picture of risk is based-lined so that it is easy to see how safe London is compared to previously.

The high level approach

The approach we have used to develop the AoR 2015 is based on a standard risk model which would traditionally review hazards, risks and controls. For example, to support health and safety. For AoR purposes, hazards are best described as 'concerns' in the model, with the relationship between the three components, as follows:

So, the three components in this methodology are:

- **Concerns** are things that potentially have some threat to life, property, or the environment. Most 'concerns' are dormant or potential, with only a theoretical risk of harm. Perceived concerns, as identified during LSP5 deliberations, included high-rise buildings, poverty, mobility, age, heritage buildings, although there is a long list of potential concerns.

- Concerns, together with the *possibility* they will occur, interact together to create **risks**. A risk is the chance or probability that a concern will cause harm or damage to life, property or the environment, e.g. incidents, fires, injuries, death. The Authority knows that the past location of incidents (including fires) is a good predicator of where incidents are likely to happen in the future.

- **Controls** are actions to reduce the likelihood of the risk of the exposure to that concern being realised, or the impact of it on life, property or the environment. Controls will either reduce likelihood or reduce consequence. Controls rest with LFB (i.e. LFB prevention, protection and response activity) and also with others (e.g. prevention and protection by individuals, landlords, organisations, local councils). The

model, at this stage, is only take into account of LFB controls.

For this first AoR six concerns and six risks have been selected as elements to form the core model. However, more data sets covering a wider range of relevant elements sit behind the six selected for each part of the model. Whilst the AoR will display each element, they are collated to produce an overall position for concerns, risks, and controls components, in a way that will help stakeholder see the aggregate impacts in a particular geographic area.

Scoring and weighting

To produce an overall picture of concerns, risks and controls, each of the elements is scored out of 100 reflecting the relative position of a particular ward compared to others in London. A score closer to 100 represents 'higher' risk areas and closer to zero, lower risk areas. The AoR shows these scores for individual wards.

For this first AoR, no attempt has been made to weight any of the individual elements used to create a collated score representing the aggregate concerns, risks and controls in an area. Although it is accepted that some individual elements will be of more importance than others, it was felt that an arbitrary allocation of weightings to particular elements, to give them greater prominence in any collated scores, would be inappropriate at this stage. The issue of importance, leading to any weighting, will be something we can engage stakeholders with, as part of the development of the next iteration of the AoR for 2016.

Building up from ward level

This first iteration of the new style AoR is based on local authority ward areas which will allow a simple comparison between different areas of London. It is possible to see individual scores (out of 100) for the different concerns, risks and control elements, as well as a collated score for each element. The AoR

document also shows how risks and controls have changed over time. Ward scores will be aggregated to produce overall borough scores as part of engagement with stakeholders.

Since LSP5 considerations, Authority Members have shown an interest in ward level impacts, and that has informed the decision to base this AoR on wards. It is thought that wards would also work well as a granular geography for key stakeholders, like local councils, which will support LSP6 engagement. For members of the public, however, wards are probably not the ideal geography, with ward boundaries not always reflecting local communities. It is the intention to provide an online postcode lookup tool so that any member of the public can see the AoR scores for their locality without having to know the ward in which they live.

In 2014 there were changes to wards in three London boroughs (i.e. Hackney, Kensington and Chelsea, Tower Hamlets and the City); for AoR 2015 the City has been treated as a single area. Whilst the Brigade has updated its key systems, and historic data, to use these new wards, much of the ward level demographic data available from the GLA and elsewhere (like Census 2011), is still based on pre-2014 ward boundaries. For this reason, this AoR has been based on pre-2014 ward boundaries. It will be the intention to move to post-2014 wards when the range of data at that basis is available.

Change over time – creating a baseline

In developing the AoR model, LFB officers have been concerned to ensure that ward level risk and control scores are base-lined in some way so that it is possible to see how risk has changed over time, and to remove any criticism that scores have been manipulated in some way. For AoR 2015, a baseline for risks and controls uses data up to 2003/04. This period is immediately before the removal of government national recommended standards of fire cover, and the introduction of the IRMP process. It is therefore thought to represent a stable base period before the Authority had greater control over the way it delivers it services with the introduction of IRMPs. So, the AoR shows the risk and controls in London at 2003/04 and

the scale used for scoring risk elements (out of 100) for 2014/15 is the same as scale in 2003/04, allowing a comparison between risks and controls now and over ten year ago.

For concerns, the most recent data is used in the AoR reflecting the position as it is now which must obviously be the current concerns.

Showing how concerns become risks

A key requirement for the AoR is to be able to bring things together, so that it is possible to see the aggregate impact of different elements in a particular geographic area.

The aim will be to develop a relatively long list of concerns, which underlines that the Authority is aware of a wide range of demographic and other issues across London that are of interest, and how these vary from area to area. The six elements used for concerns used for AoR 2015 are: population density, people aged over 65, deprivation, high rise (30m +) buildings, heritage buildings, and locally identified concerns. There are a range of other factors that could be taken into account like:

- social factors, e.g. single parent families, those living in social housing.

- equalities factors, e.g. people with prescribed characteristics.

- environmental factors, e.g. the likelihood of surface water or fluvial flooding.

A development of the AoR may be to develop 'baskets' of different concerns from which combined scores could be derived for, say, social factors, etc.

Hopefully, the concerns we have initially selected will resonate with key stakeholders and the public, and, as part of the engagement with key stakeholders, it will be possible to seek views about what are the appropriate concerns in a particular borough. There is scope within the AoR to allow for different groups of concerns in different boroughs.

The AoR 2015 shows how concerns manifest themselves as actual **risks**, in terms of the emergency incidents that the Brigade attends, and the casualties

that can result. The risks represent the tangible things that the Brigade has to deal with, or prevent, and these are the things that drive the Authority's service planning. We know that the location of incidents is highly correlated year-on year, so is a good predictor of where incidents are likely to happen in the future and a solid basis for modelling future service configurations. The data for risks needs to underpin the modelling work the Brigade undertakes to inform the location of stations and resource, and reflects the actual service activity of the Brigade.

The six risks for AoR 2015 are: one pump fires and two plus pump fires, one pump special services and two pump special services, fire casualties and special service casualties. The concerns and risk elements of the AoR are represented in the chart below, showing how the individual elements are collated and how concerns and risks can be compared.

Showing how controls address risks

As set out earlier, the risk elements in the AoR represent the tangible things that the Authority needs to address in planning and delivering its response, prevention and protection services.

The **controls** are the key ways in which the Brigade mitigates or controls the risks. For AoR 2015, the six control elements used are: first, second and third pump attendance times, home fire safety visits, fire safety audits and outside duties undertaken by appliance crews.

It is important to recognise that the Authority and the Brigade are not the only people responsible for safety in London, and that individual members of the public, and other agencies, have a role to play. At this stage, in AoR 2015, it is important to recognise that there are controls by others that need to be taken into account. It is not possible to quantify these at this stage but

including a mention of them will help engage key stakeholders, and provide a prompt so that the contribution of others to keeping people safe can be recognised. Where these controls by others can be quantified, they can be included in future versions of the AoR. This contribution by others will be the way in which, say, housing providers work with their tenants to ensure safety in the buildings they manage, and, for example, means of escape in blocks of flats. Building owners and occupiers, in their capacity as the 'responsible person' under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order, also play a key role in fire prevention and protection activity. Local councils have wide ranging responsibilities, both a landlords, and in other ways.

The risk and controls elements of the AoR are represented in the chart below, showing how the individual elements are collated and how risks and controls can be compared.

It should be possible to tell from the AoR comparison of risk and controls whether or not the Authority's services are sufficient to address identified risk in a particular area. The selected controls represent the main response, prevention and protection activities, and are collated to reflect the integrated nature of risk management planning.

The AoR 2015 outcomes

The purpose of the AoR is to be able to assess whether concerns are adequately identified and that the risks are properly mitigated or controlled. Even though there are areas where the identified concerns are high, these are not translating into high levels of risk (i.e. incidents and casualties). Comparing risks with controls shows that the integrated nature of the Authority's service delivery activity – prevention, protection and response – is more than adequate for

the risks identified. It is important to emphasise this integrated approach with all three activities working together to address identified risks; the AoR does not simply rely on the speed of attendance for pumping appliance as the only mitigation or control.

Looking at the outcomes at ward level for the combined concerns, shows that the City and wards in Westminster figure prominently amongst the ten wards with the highest combined concern score. LFB Officers accept that this may feel counter-intuitive to some given the prominence in LSP5 discussions of social factors in boroughs like Hackney and Tower Hamlets. The current AoR scores reflect the currently unweighted way in which different concerns are combined in this iteration of the AoR. It also reflects some data issues. For example, the high-rise data used is for all types of buildings, whereas the concern during LSP5 deliberations was more focussed on high-rise residential buildings, and currently, it is not possible to identify these separately. The engagement work with stakeholders will help to determine what are the right concerns to be taken into account, and any weightings to be applied.

LFB officers believe that they have access to a wide range of good quality data, both internally about the work the Brigade undertakes, but also wider demographic and social data available from external partners like the GLA. There is data that is currently potentially available from other public agencies, that is proving difficult (or costly) to access. LFB officers will continue to press other agencies, and work with GLA and local councils to extend the range of data universally collected, i.e. across all boroughs, for London. The AoR and the engagement during 2016, will help identify whether there are any additional data sources that can be used.

Developing the AoR for 2016 and stakeholder engagement

This AoR and the current format, in terms of the different elements included as part of concerns and controls, is not intended to be fixed and static. The aim will be to make the AoR more comprehensive in terms of the data included, and ensure that stakeholders have a key role in helping to determine what is included .

As outlined earlier, the AoR is, in part, a response to the concerns of the public and key stakeholders, that they could not see how the Authority had taken into account their concerns locally (often articulated as 'risks'). The National Framework says that "*In demonstrating their accountability to communities for the service they provide, fire and rescue authorities need to… be transparent and accountable to their communities for their decisions and actions, and to provide the opportunity for communities to help to plan their local service through effective consultation and involvement*".

The development of the LSP6 up to its approval in March 2017, will provide the opportunity to fully engage with local councils and other key stakeholders on the AoR during 2016, the methodology used, and what 'concerns' are used, so that this can be taken into account in the AoR for 2016.

Summary of risk in London

In the AoR – and when we plan our services – we typically refer to 'risk' as meaning the occasions when we are called to provide an emergency service; such as to fires that are out-of-control and road traffic collisions. These are therefore actualised risks; risks that have actually happened.

Compared to 15 years ago, the overall risk in London – i.e. the number of times we have had to attend a genuine emergency – is low. Since the turn of the millennium, the busiest year was 2003 when emergency incidents (fires and special services) were just above 100,000. Since that time emergency incidents have been falling. By the end of 2014, fires were below 20,000 and at their lowest level ever (a 66 per cent reduction) and special services were below 30,000 (a 32 per cent reduction).

Chart 1: Emergency incidents attended

This reduction is reflected in the AoR combined risks score. The data for 2004 shows that the ward that would have had the highest combined risk score was Church Street ward in Westminster with a combined score of 81.192. In AoR 2015, the combined risk score for Church Street was reduced to 33.907 (a reduction of 47 points). The combined risk score is much lower, yet Church Street ward remains the highest scoring ward.

The distribution of risk has also reduced. Using the 2004 data, there would have been just 16 wards with values in the top 50 per cent. By AoR 2015, the top 50

per cent of values is represented by 60 wards; showing that the level of risk is spread more evenly across London.

Chart 2: AoR with 2004 combined risk score data compared to AoR 2015

Concerns Vs. Risks

A useful presentation of the combined factors is to plot one against the other. These plots show the relative balance between the two factors. The plot below shows how the combined concerns relate to the combined risks.

Combined concerns - highest 5 wards
City of London
Westminster - St. James's Ward
Westminster - West End Ward
Westminster - Church Street Ward
Camden - Holborn and Covent Garden Ward
Combined risks - highest 5 wards
Westminster - Church Street Ward
Camden - Bloomsbury Ward
Westminster - Westbourne Ward
Westminster - Bryanston and Dorset Square Ward
Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward

Chart 3: Combined concerns vs. risks

Chart 4: Combined controls vs. risks

This chart demonstrates a range of interesting points. Firstly it shows how the concern elements, once combined, produce an over low score – meaning that wards that have a high rating for one type of concern do not also rate highly on the other concern elements. It also illustrates that high concerns do not always translate into higher risks. Whilst there is a moderate relationship between the combined concerns and the actualised risks, there are some outliers with higher concern scores, but lower risks.

Controls Vs. Risks

Average attendance times across London have remained high. In 2004/05[1] the average attendance time London wide for a first fire engine was 5 min 13 sec. In 2014/15 the time was just 19 seconds slower at 5 min 32 sec. Other controls have increased significantly over the last 15 years. For example, our campaign of home fire safety visits started in 2003 when in the first year just over 11,000 visits were carried out. In 2014/15 over 88,000 visits were completed, with 695,000 homes now having received a visit since the start of the initiative (around 21 per cent of all London homes).

This being the case, controls remain high whilst risks have been falling. The plot of combined controls relative to combined risks shows this relationship; with London receiving high levels of controls for relatively low risks.

Combined controls - highest 5 wards
Westminster - Westbourne Ward
Croydon - Fieldway Ward
Camden - Haverstock Ward
Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
Tower Hamlets - Spitalfields and Banglatown Ward
Combined risks - highest 5 wards
Westminster - Church Street Ward
Camden - Bloomsbury Ward
Westminster - Westbourne Ward
Westminster - Bryanston and Dorset Square Ward
Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward

.

---

[1] 2004/05 is the earliest period when accurate attendance times are available

Concerns

The elements of Concerns are the issues that are considered to elevate an areas susceptibility to risk. They are the elements instinctively brought to mind when asked to identify hazards that the public might face. In many cases however these elements are dormant and will not always lead to an increase in risk.

For this AoR we have identified and assessed the six main concerns raised by the public during our consultation on LSP5. These were:

- Population density
- Older people (aged 65+)
- Deprivation
- High rise buildings
- Heritage
- Localised concerns

An exhaustive list of concerns is possibly only limited by the availability of data. It is our intention to collate a wider list of concerns and make that data available alongside this AoR so that those too can be compared with the known risks and controls.

Concern elements

Population density

Population density is a measure of how many people (resident population) there are in a ward per square kilometre (1km2). For this element we are using ward population estimates (2013) from the GLA. To baseline this element we have given the ward with the highest population density a score of 100 and calculated every other ward as a proportion of this wards value.

Older people

We have used population estimate by the Office of National Statistics (ONS), by age, for 2013. To baseline this element we have given the ward with the highest number of people aged 65 a score of 100 and calculated every other ward as a proportion of this wards value.

Deprivation

The English indices of deprivation 2015 (IMD) was released in September 2015. The IMD 2015 is based on 37 separate indicators, organised across seven distinct domains of deprivation which are combined, using to calculate an overall index. This gives an overall measure of multiple deprivation experienced by people living in an area and is calculated for every Lower layer Super Output Area (LSOA), or neighbourhood, in England.

LSOAs are small areas and a ward will have many LSOAs in them. To ensure that small areas of high deprivation are not lost when aggregated up to a ward area, we have assigned the value of the highest (most deprived) LSOA to the whole ward.

To base line this element we have taken the value of the ward with the highest LSOA IMD rating and assigned this a score of 100. Every other ward is assigned as a proportion of this wards value.

High rise buildings

As far as we know, there is no singular source of information to identify high rise buildings in London. This is mainly due to the difficulty in establishing where building boundaries start and finish and then the difficulty of assigning a meaningful height value (usually taken for LIDAR information) to those building extents.

In the absence of an official source for this data we have approximated our own. This has been done using a combination of addressing data from the National Address Gazetteer and building height data from Ordnance Survey. Using these two data sources we have approximated the number of buildings in each ward with a usable height greater than 30 meters (i.e. a place in a building that someone would regularly access rather than, for example, a high steeple or ornamental feature). Typically this approach identifies buildings of around 10 or more storeys.

At heights greater than 30 metres it is only possible to carry out firefighting (or rescues) from within the building rather than with high reach equipment from the outside.

Heritage

We have used the data from Historic England on Listed buildings in London that are either Grade I, Grade II* or Grade II. This dataset includes features of 'special architectural or historic interest'. It is not limited to buildings as structures such as railings, gates, war memorials and post boxes can be listed.

The government guidance for fire services is that they should take into consideration Grade I and Grade II* when planning, but for this concerns element we have included all three grades.

To baseline this element we have given the ward with the highest number of Grade I, Grade II* and Grade II structures a score of 100 and calculated every other ward as a proportion of this wards value.

Local concerns

During the consultation on LSP5 a number of respondents were worried that we did not take account of local concerns. These concerns are typically unique to an area and therefore there is no organised source for this information.

We do however maintain our own database of local concerns. In addition to the work we do with local partners – where localised concerns are bought to our attention – our fire crews also carry out local site inspections. These inspections can be to familiarise the crew with unique building layouts or access requirements; to identify specific hazardous processes or materials; to create tactical plans; or to determine the hazards to firefighters.

We have used this database of local concerns (which we call our Operational Risk Database) to create a concern element. To baseline this data we have given the ward with the highest number of Operational Risk Database entries a score of 100 and calculated every other ward as a proportion of this wards value.

Combined concerns

The scores from the individual concern elements have been combined together (averaged) to calculate an overall Concerns score. A summary table of this data is displayed on the following page. Summary data for the individual elements can be found in appendix 1.

London wide summary of the combined concerns score

Description: This is the combined score of the separate concern elements.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
57.708	City of London - Ward
48.962	Westminster - St. James's Ward
39.678	Westminster - West End Ward
39.136	Westminster - Church Street Ward
36.522	Camden - Holborn and Covent Garden Ward
35.611	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
34.814	Islington - Bunhill Ward
34.279	Wandsworth - St. Mary's Park Ward
34.180	Tower Hamlets - Millwall Ward
33.970	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
12.664	Kingston upon Thames - Tudor Ward
12.208	Merton - Dundonald Ward
12.039	Richmond upon Thames - South Twickenham Ward
11.900	Merton - Wimbledon Park Ward
11.447	Richmond upon Thames - East Sheen Ward

Where:

Range (All wards):

Highest to lowest -->>

Risks

The risk elements are a measure of the emergency incident attended and the casualties at those incidents. We are using actualised risk as this gives a true measure of risk in a given area. Using incidents also means we can track the change in risk over time as we have detailed incident records since 2000.

For this AoR we have identified and assessed the six main risk from within our incident data. These are:

- Fires attended by only one fire engine
- Fires attended by 2 or more fire engines
- Special service incidents attended by only one fire engine
- Special service incidents attended by 2 or more fire engines
- Fire casualties
- Special service casualties

Our incidents can be described in a number of ways, but the list above represents the entirety of the emergency incident we attend and any casualties at those incidents.

Using the number of fire engines (pumps) attending is also a good indication of the relative severity of an incident.

Risk elements

1 pump fires
This element represents the number of fires attended by the Brigade where only one fire engine was required to be dispatched to the incident.

To be able to demonstrate how risk has changed over time we have used a baseline period of data for the three years ending 2003/04. The ward with the highest number of incidents (in this case, 1 pump fires) in the three years ending 2003/04 has been given a value of 100 and all other wards have been compared to this maximum value.

The three year period up to 2003/04 is immediately before the removal of government national

recommended standards of fire cover, and the introduction of the IRMP process. It is therefore thought to represent a stable base period before fire services had greater control over the way they delivers their services with the introduction of IRMPs.

The comparison data for AoR 2015 is the average number of incidents, per ward, for the three years ending 2014/15.

2+ pump fires
This element represents the number of fires attended by the Brigade where two or more fire engine were dispatched to the incident.

The data used is an average of three years incidents up to 2014/15 baselined to the highest levels in the three years ending 2003/04.

1 pump special services
This element represents the number of special service incidents attended by the Brigade only one fire engine was required to be dispatched to the incident.

Special service incident cover a broad range of emergency and non-emergency situations where the Brigade provides assistance. These include road traffic collisions, making structures safe, releasing people stuck in lifts, helping with flooding and releasing trapped people.

The data used is an average of three years incidents up to 2014/15 baselined to the highest levels in the three years ending 2003/04.

2+ pump special services
This element represents the number of special services attended by the Brigade where two or more fire engine were dispatched to the incident.

The data used is an average of three years incidents up to 2014/15 baselined to the highest levels in the three years ending 2003/04.

Fire casualties
This element represents the number of people who are harmed at fire incidents. It includes those who receive first aid at the scene, require hospital or are a fire fatality.

The data used is an average of three years casualty information up to 2014/15 baselined to the highest levels in the three years ending 2003/04.

Special service casualties

This element represents the number of people who are harmed at special service incidents. It includes those who receive first aid at the scene, require hospital or are a fire fatality.

The data used is an average of three years casualty information up to 2014/15 baselined to the highest levels in the three years ending 2003/04.

Combined risks

The scores from the individual risk elements have been combined together (averaged) to calculate an overall Risks score. A summary table of this data is displayed on the following page. Summary data for the individual elements can be found in appendix 1.

London wide summary of combined risks

Where:

Description: This is the combined score of all the separate risk elements.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards - combined risks
33.91	Westminster - Church Street Ward
30.72	Camden - Bloomsbury Ward
29.86	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
28.51	Westminster - Bryanston and Dorset Square Ward
28.29	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
27.99	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
26.85	Westminster - Warwick Ward
26.82	Southwark - Faraday Ward
26.28	Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
26.26	Hackney - Chatham Ward
	Lowest 5 wards - combined risks
0.74	Havering - Upminster Ward
0.69	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
0.66	Merton - Village Ward
0.54	Richmond upon Thames - East Sheen Ward
0.40	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of Rating

Highest to lowest -->>

Label

Controls

The control elements in this AoR are those parts of the Brigade's services that are delivered in high volumes at local levels. The Brigade undertakes lots of other prevention, protection and response work, but it is harder to quantify the effects of this work at local levels.

There are also significant control and safety responsibilities owned by other people and organisations.

For this AoR we are quantifying the main areas of our prevention, protection and response work delivered across London. These are:

- The average response times for first, second and third fire engine on scene (when required)
- Home fire safety visits
- Regulatory inspections
- Local inspections

Control elements

Average 1st pump attendance times

The is the time it takes, on average, for the first fire engine to arrive at an incident. We are using the data we use to calculate our attendance time performance information.

As we have done with risks, we are using a baseline period in 2003/04. We are however using a single year so that any service changes are appropriately reflected in the data. Using the 2003/04 period will again allow us to show how the response time elements have changed over time.

To baseline this element we have taken the fastest average ward time (for the first fire engine) in 2003/04 as a comparator. Using data for 2014/15 we have ranged the average time for each ward; times faster or equal to the 2003/04 fastest time scoring 100 and times slower than 20 minutes scoring 0.

Average 2st pump attendance times

We have taken the same approach as for the 1st pump element, but with data for the average time taken for the second fire engine (where needed) to attend.

Average 3rd pump attendance times

We have taken the same approach as for the 1st pump element, but with data for the average time taken for the third fire engine (where needed) to attend.

Third fire engines are only mobilised to around 14 per cent of fires and around six per cent of special service incident. This being the case, not all wards have incidents that require a third fire engine. Where no times are available for a ward, we have assigned the average time for the borough.

Home fire safety visits

A home fire safety visit is where we visit people, in their own home, and provide them with personalised fire safety advice about the hazards they face and ensure they have working smoke alarms. We deliver these visits to those identified as being most at risk from fire or who have other vulnerabilities.

We have used data on the number of visits carried out in each ward (averaged over three years ending 2014/15). This element is being baselined against a count of the number of households in each ward. A score of 100 is achieved if, on average, 10 per cent (or more) of the homes in the ward are visited in a year.

Regulatory fire safety inspections

We have a team of specialist officers that carry out fire safety inspections across a range of premises. We enforce fire safety legislation and also act as fire safety advisors to other enforcement agencies. Responsibility for compliance with fire safety legislation typically rests with building and business owners (the responsible person) and we ensure compliance through audit, inspection and enforcement.

We have used data on the number of inspections carried out in each ward (averaged over three years ending 2014/15). This element is being baselined against a count of the number of business units with five or more employees in each ward. A score of 100

is achieved if, on average, 20 per cent (or more) of the business units in the ward are visited in a year.

Fire safety regulations apply to all businesses with employees and in some places that are not business (for example in the common areas of residential flats). However there is no singular source of information that identifies all the discrete places where regulations apply so we are using the number of business units with five or more as a proxy.

Local inspections

As described earlier, our fire crews carry out local inspections to identify local hazards which we record as Operational Risks. Our crews also carry out familiarisation visits and reconnaissance checks in their local areas, which we call Visual Audits. Together these activities are recorded by fire crews as Outside Duties.

We have used data on the number of Outside Duties carried out in each ward (averaged over three years ending 2014/15). There is no 'right number' for the amount of these duties that are appropriate for any given area. Therefore to baseline this control we are expressing the number of these visits per ward as a proportion of the geographic area of the ward. To achieve this we have assigned a notional coverage area of 125 square meters to each visit.

A score of 100 is then achieved if the number of visits is equal to or greater than 100 percent of the ward area. All other values are expressed as a proportion of the maximum value.

Combined controls

The scores from the individual controls elements have been combined together (averaged) to calculate an overall Controls score. A summary table of this data is displayed on the following page. Summary data for the individual elements can be found in appendix 1.

London wide summary of combined controls

Where:

**Description:** This is the combined score of all the separate control elements.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards - combined controls
90.606	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
89.820	Croydon - Fieldway Ward
89.002	Camden - Haverstock Ward
87.922	Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
87.820	Tower Hamlets - Spitalfields and Banglatown Ward
87.709	Tower Hamlets - Limehouse Ward
87.572	Hackney - Hackney Central Ward
86.614	Waltham Forest - Leyton Ward
85.817	Sutton - Sutton Central Ward
85.805	Waltham Forest - Cathall Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
39.536	Croydon - Coulsdon East Ward
37.624	Kingston upon Thames - Chessington South Ward
37.298	Hillingdon - Northwood Hills Ward
36.120	Kingston upon Thames - Old Malden Ward
36.087	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Source notes: XXXX

Range (All wards):

Highest to lowest -->>

Appendix 1 – Individual AoR element summaries

Concern: Population density

Where:

Description: This element measures the number of fire incidents attended and needing only one fire engine (pump) to resolve the incident.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Westminster - Church Street Ward
90.28	Westminster - Harrow Road Ward
81.18	Westminster - Queen's Park Ward
76.69	Newham - Green Street East Ward
76.36	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
73.83	Kensington and Chelsea - Colville Ward
73.65	Hammersmith and Fulham - Addison Ward
73.60	Hackney - Cazenove Ward
73.11	Westminster - Bayswater Ward
72.57	Hackney - Hoxton Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
2.67	Havering - Rainham and Wennington Ward
2.11	Havering - Upminster Ward
2.02	Hillingdon - Heathrow Villages Ward
1.77	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
0.65	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Range (All wards):

Concern: Population density

Where:

Description: The number of people (resident population 2013) per square kilometre..

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Westminster - Church Street Ward
90.28	Westminster - Harrow Road Ward
81.18	Westminster - Queen's Park Ward
76.69	Newham - Green Street East Ward
76.36	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
73.83	Kensington and Chelsea - Colville Ward
73.65	Hammersmith and Fulham - Addison Ward
73.60	Hackney - Cazenove Ward
73.11	Westminster - Bayswater Ward
72.57	Hackney - Hoxton Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
2.67	Havering - Rainham and Wennington Ward
2.11	Havering - Upminster Ward
2.02	Hillingdon - Heathrow Villages Ward
1.77	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
0.65	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Range (All wards):

Concern: Population aged 65 and over

Where:

Description: The number of people (resident population 2013) aged 65 and over..

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Bromley - Farnborough and Crofton Ward
95.56	Bromley - Orpington Ward
94.29	Bromley - Chislehurst Ward
88.95	Havering - Upminster Ward
88.72	Bromley - West Wickham Ward
87.16	Bromley - Hayes and Coney Hall Ward
86.91	Bromley - Bickley Ward
86.88	Havering - Cranham Ward
83.88	Bromley - Petts Wood and Knoll Ward
83.66	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
20.64	Hackney - Brownswood Ward
20.21	Barking and Dagenham - Thames Ward
18.97	Barking and Dagenham - Abbey Ward
17.16	Tower Hamlets - Spitalfields and Banglatown Ward
13.15	Newham - Royal Docks Ward

Range (All wards):

Concern: Deprivation

Where:

Description: The score of the LSOA rated highest in the English indices of deprivation 2015 .

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Hackney - Wick Ward
99.53	Islington - Finsbury Park Ward
99.00	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
93.36	Haringey - Northumberland Park Ward
92.62	Islington - Junction Ward
90.76	Tower Hamlets - East India and Lansbury Ward
90.16	Haringey - Noel Park Ward
90.15	Westminster - Church Street Ward
89.68	Croydon - West Thornton Ward
89.54	Brent - Stonebridge Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
14.14	Hillingdon - Ickenham Ward
13.74	Richmond upon Thames - East Sheen Ward
13.24	Kingston upon Thames - Tudor Ward
12.47	Merton - Dundonald Ward
12.04	Richmond upon Thames - South Twickenham Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of IMD

Highest to lowest -->>

Label

Concern: High-rise buildings

Where:

Description: The number of buildings with a useable space above 30 meters.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.000	City of London
37.902	Newham - Stratford and New Town Ward
32.149	Westminster - St. James's Ward
31.472	Tower Hamlets - Millwall Ward
26.734	Wandsworth - Roehampton Ward
19.289	Bexley - Thamesmead East Ward
17.766	Croydon - Fairfield Ward
17.428	Islington - Bunhill Ward
15.736	Tower Hamlets - Blackwall and Cubitt Town Ward
15.228	Wandsworth - St. Mary's Park Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
	More than 5 wards with no data

Lowest
Highest

Range (All wards):

Highest to lowest -->>

Concern: Heritage

Where:

Description: The number of structures graded I, II* of II by Historic England...

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Westminster - West End Ward
97.41	Westminster - St. James's Ward
63.04	City of London - City of London Ward
42.24	Westminster - Knightsbridge and Belgravia Ward
39.13	Camden - Hampstead Town Ward
37.16	Camden - Holborn and Covent Garden Ward
33.02	Westminster - Marylebone High Street Ward
30.12	Barnet - Garden Suburb Ward
24.12	Islington - Clerkenwell Ward
23.60	Westminster - Abbey Road Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	More than 5 wards with no data
0.00	
0.00	

Range (All wards):

Sum of Her

Label ·

Highest to lowest -->>

Concern: Locally identified concerns

Where:

Description: The number of recorded local concerns in the Operational Risk database.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	City of London
55.87	Hillingdon - Heathrow Villages Ward
54.75	Tower Hamlets - Millwall Ward
40.78	Greenwich - Woolwich Riverside Ward
36.87	Tower Hamlets - Blackwall and Cubitt Town Ward
32.96	Tower Hamlets - Bow East Ward
32.40	Newham - Stratford and New Town Ward
31.28	Westminster - St. James's Ward
30.73	Tower Hamlets - St. Katherine's and Wapping Ward
30.17	Ealing - East Acton Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	More than 5 wards with no data
0.00	
0.00	

Lowest
Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of HiPro

Highest to lowest -->>

Label

Risk: 1 pump fires

Where:

Description: This element measures the number of fire incidents attended and needing only one fire engine (pump) to resolve the incident.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
24.77	Tower Hamlets - Bethnal Green South Ward
20.57	Westminster - West End Ward
20.05	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
19.67	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
19.51	Westminster - Warwick Ward
19.07	Tower Hamlets - East India and Lansbury Ward
18.38	Tower Hamlets - Mile End East Ward
17.81	Tower Hamlets - Bethnal Green North Ward
16.54	Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
16.42	Tower Hamlets - St. Dunstan's and Stepney Green Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.42	Sutton - Carshalton South and Clockhouse Ward
0.39	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward
0.34	Havering - Upminster Ward
0.32	Barnet - Totteridge Ward
0.10	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of 1pF

Highest to lowest -->>

Label ·

Risk: 2+ pump fires

Where:

Description: This element measures the number of fire incidents attended and needing two or more fire engines (pumps) to resolve the incident.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
33.16	Westminster - Church Street Ward
31.63	Southwark - Faraday Ward
28.80	Westminster - West End Ward
25.85	Tower Hamlets - Spitalfields and Banglatown Ward
24.41	Westminster - Warwick Ward
24.37	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
22.87	Hackney - Hackney Central Ward
21.90	Hackney - Chatham Ward
21.77	Lambeth - Ferndale Ward
21.31	Kensington and Chelsea - Colville Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.50	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
0.47	Hillingdon - Ickenham Ward
0.46	Bromley - Biggin Hill Ward
0.38	Havering - Upminster Ward
0.14	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Range (All wards):

Risk: 1 pump special services

Where:

Description: This element measures the number of special service incidents attended and needing only one fire engines (pump) to resolve the incident.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
46.28	Westminster - Church Street Ward
43.73	Tower Hamlets - Mile End and Globe Town Ward
43.20	Hackney - Hoxton Ward
41.65	Kensington and Chelsea - Earl's Court Ward
39.58	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
39.42	Hackney - Chatham Ward
37.32	Southwark - Faraday Ward
34.89	Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
34.66	Kensington and Chelsea - Colville Ward
34.61	Westminster - Churchill Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.37	Sutton - Carshalton South and Clockhouse Ward
0.36	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward
0.31	Havering - Upminster Ward
0.18	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
0.15	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of 1pSS

Highest to lowest -->>

Label

Risk: 2+ pump special services

Where:

Description: This element measures the number of special service incidents attended and needing two or more fire engines (pumps) to resolve the incident.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
36.36	Westminster - Church Street Ward
30.70	Westminster - Warwick Ward
27.24	Westminster - Tachbrook Ward
25.04	Westminster - Bryanston and Dorset Square Ward
24.48	Hammersmith and Fulham - Addison Ward
23.84	Hackney - Chatham Ward
23.40	Kensington and Chelsea - Notting Barns Ward
22.97	Barking and Dagenham - Gascoigne Ward
22.64	Westminster - West End Ward
21.62	Lambeth - Prince's Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.83	Havering - Upminster Ward
0.82	Richmond upon Thames - Teddington Ward
0.48	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward
0.43	Richmond upon Thames - East Sheen Ward
0.42	Bromley - Darwin Ward

Range (All wards):

Risk: Fire casualties

Where:

Description: This element measures the total number of fire casualties. A casualty is anyone who receives first aid at the scene of the incident, is taken to hospital by the ambulance service or is a fatality.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
65.04	Camden - Bloomsbury Ward
40.80	Kensington and Chelsea - Cremorne Ward
39.89	Hammersmith and Fulham - Addison Ward
39.47	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
36.81	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
31.25	Westminster - Church Street Ward
31.09	Hackney - Stoke Newington Central Ward
30.71	Kensington and Chelsea - Abingdon Ward
28.97	Westminster - Hyde Park Ward
28.68	Lambeth - Larkhall Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
0.00	Bromley - Bromley Common and Keston Ward
0.00	Harrow - Harrow Weald Ward
0.00	Bexley - Blackfen and Lamorbey Ward
0.00	Camden - Hampstead Town Ward
0.00	Hackney - Dalston Ward

Range (All wards):

Risk: special service casualties

Where:

Description: This element measures the total number of casualties at special service incidents. A casualty is anyone who receives first aid at the scene of the incident, is taken to hospital by the ambulance service or is a fatality.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
76.13	Westminster - Bryanston and Dorset Square Ward
69.14	Tower Hamlets - Shadwell Ward
66.05	Islington - St. Mary's Ward
60.99	Hackney - New River Ward
58.13	Tower Hamlets - East India and Lansbury Ward
57.66	Westminster - Westbourne Ward
56.02	Southwark - East Walworth Ward
54.77	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
54.30	Camden - West Hampstead Ward
52.58	Islington - Finsbury Park Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
1.05	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
1.03	Hounslow - Bedfont Ward
0.88	Haringey - Alexandra Ward
0.53	Richmond upon Thames - Teddington Ward
0.00	Kingston upon Thames - Coombe Vale Ward

Lowest
Highest

Range (All wards):

Sum of SScas

Highest to lowest -->>

Label

Control: Average 1st pump attendance time

Where:

Description: The average time taken for a first fire engine on the initial attendance to arrive on scene.

Top and bottom wards (14/15 times)

14/15 time	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Croydon - Norbury Ward
100.00	Lambeth - Coldharbour Ward
100.00	Hammersmith and Fulham - Town Ward
100.00	Camden - Kentish Town Ward
100.00	Waltham Forest - William Morris Ward
100.00	Haringey - Bruce Grove Ward
100.00	Islington - St. Mary's Ward
100.00	Camden - West Hampstead Ward
100.00	Wandsworth - Latchmere Ward
100.00	Lambeth - Prince's Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
77.16	Enfield - Highlands Ward
77.09	Redbridge - Clayhall Ward
75.43	Bromley - Darwin Ward
71.16	Kingston upon Thames - Chessington South Ward
70.76	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward

Range (All wards):

Control: Average 2nd pump attendance time

Description: The average time taken for a second fire engine on the initial attendance to arrive on scene.

Top and bottom wards

14/15 time	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Hackney - Chatham Ward
100.00	Lambeth - Coldharbour Ward
100.00	Haringey - Hornsey Ward
100.00	Hammersmith and Fulham - Avonmore and Brook Green Ward
100.00	Lambeth - Bishop's Ward
100.00	Richmond upon Thames - Fulwell and Hampton Hill Ward
100.00	Kensington and Chelsea - St. Charles Ward
100.00	Croydon - Fieldway Ward
100.00	Camden - Kentish Town Ward
100.00	Enfield - Haselbury Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
60.08	Havering - Upminster Ward
57.21	Bromley - Darwin Ward
55.20	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward
53.85	Croydon - Kenley Ward
52.99	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward

Where:

Range (All wards):

Control: Average 3rd pump attendance time

Where:

Description: The average time taken for a third fire engine on the initial attendance to arrive on scene.

Top and bottom wards

14/15 time	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Bexley - Northumberland Heath Ward
100.00	Havering - Heaton Ward
100.00	Merton - St. Helier Ward
99.33	Lewisham - Ladywell Ward
98.49	Lambeth - Stockwell Ward
97.39	Kensington and Chelsea - Holland Ward
96.00	Islington - Hillrise Ward
95.89	Merton - Figge's Marsh Ward
95.89	Havering - Pettits Ward
95.06	Havering - Squirrel's Heath Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
32.22	Hillingdon - Northwood Hills Ward
30.89	Bexley - St. Michael's Ward
23.33	Croydon - Coulsdon East Ward
13.22	Harrow - Rayners Lane Ward
4.78	Kingston upon Thames - Old Malden Ward

Range (All wards):

Control: Home fire safety visits

Where:

Description: The number of home fire safety visits completed in the local area.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Croydon - Fieldway Ward
90.60	City of London - City of London Ward
89.36	Kensington and Chelsea - Cremorne Ward
82.25	Kingston upon Thames - Norbiton Ward
82.22	Waltham Forest - Leyton Ward
75.19	Camden - Holborn and Covent Garden Ward
71.87	Tower Hamlets - Spitalfields and Banglatown Ward
71.17	Sutton - Sutton Central Ward
66.16	Croydon - New Addington Ward
65.34	Camden - St. Pancras and Somers Town Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
5.90	Kensington and Chelsea - Queen's Gate Ward
5.74	Richmond upon Thames - East Sheen Ward
5.03	Westminster - Knightsbridge and Belgravia Ward
4.50	Richmond upon Thames - St. Margarets & North Twickenham Ward
3.47	Westminster - Marylebone High Street Ward

Range (All wards):

Control: Regulatory fire safety inspections

Where:

Description: The number of regulatory fire safety inspections completed in the local area.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Westminster - Lancaster Gate Ward
100.00	Hackney - Dalston Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Weavers Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Bow East Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Bethnal Green North Ward
100.00	Kensington and Chelsea - Earl's Court Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Bethnal Green South Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Mile End and Globe Town Ward
100.00	Hackney - Chatham Ward
100.00	Hackney - Stoke Newington Central Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
12.26	Southwark - Cathedrals Ward
9.96	Hounslow - Hounslow South Ward
9.75	Bromley - Darwin Ward
9.12	Southwark - Village Ward
9.10	Hounslow - Heston West Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Controls: Local inspections

Where:

Description: The number of local inspections (outside duties and familiarisation visits) carried out by fire crews.

Top and bottom wards

AoR Score	Highest 10 wards
100.00	Greenwich - Woolwich Riverside Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Millwall Ward
100.00	Kingston upon Thames - Grove Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Whitechapel Ward
100.00	Southwark - Cathedrals Ward
100.00	Tower Hamlets - Bow East Ward
100.00	Southwark - Grange Ward
100.00	Lewisham - New Cross Ward
100.00	Barking and Dagenham - Gascoigne Ward
100.00	Southwark - Riverside Ward
	Lowest 5 wards
4.20	Hillingdon - Harefield Ward
3.89	Havering - Cranham Ward
3.39	Sutton - Carshalton South and Clockhouse Ward
3.28	Havering - Upminster Ward
2.94	Bromley - Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward

Lowest

Highest

Range (All wards):

Highest to lowest -->>

Appendix 2 – Ward scores detailed table

Barking & Dagenham

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Abbey	37	19	66	1	1	12	**23**	9	11	14	20	2	38	**16**	84	80	64	35	70	100	**72**
Alibon	28	31	63	0	0	3	**21**	5	5	4	6	6	12	**6**	75	76	73	24	38	36	**54**
Becontree	35	31	64	0	0	1	**22**	6	6	8	6	11	9	**8**	79	77	45	16	63	37	**53**
Chadwell Heath	11	44	67	0	1	7	**22**	3	4	2	4	0	15	**5**	76	72	76	25	72	18	**56**
Eastbrook	11	46	64	0	1	9	**22**	3	3	2	2	1	5	**3**	77	73	65	37	76	22	**58**
Eastbury	30	32	68	0	1	9	**23**	5	7	5	11	8	29	**11**	83	79	62	22	100	71	**70**
Gascoigne	40	21	77	2	0	11	**25**	9	9	29	23	0	28	**16**	86	84	76	40	94	100	**80**
Goresbrook	33	34	66	0	0	1	**22**	7	6	4	4	0	14	**6**	74	69	68	17	100	33	**60**
Heath	20	38	88	1	0	6	**25**	5	8	6	6	3	16	**7**	83	78	57	43	70	45	**63**
Longbridge	26	38	40	0	0	4	**18**	3	3	3	6	2	4	**3**	79	79	67	34	79	37	**63**
Mayesbrook	21	32	69	0	0	1	**20**	4	5	2	5	7	22	**7**	81	80	75	20	95	31	**64**
Parsloes	29	30	59	0	0	1	**20**	4	6	4	4	11	7	**6**	76	73	68	16	45	23	**50**
River	12	32	65	1	0	4	**19**	3	4	2	3	6	9	**4**	76	77	72	16	70	16	**55**
Thames	5	20	70	0	0	25	**20**	2	3	2	4	2	10	**4**	82	75	61	56	52	23	**58**
Valence	30	34	64	0	0	4	**22**	4	5	5	6	9	20	**8**	81	78	45	19	51	37	**52**
Village	18	35	73	0	1	3	**22**	5	7	6	3	8	12	**7**	76	77	60	30	100	28	**62**
Whalebone	26	35	48	1	1	6	**20**	4	6	3	6	14	21	**9**	83	72	51	21	100	45	**62**

Barnet

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Brunswick Park	19	73	60	0	1	6	**27**	1	2	2	3	0	8	**3**	83	69	61	16	27	14	**45**
Burnt Oak	33	50	58	0	0	2	**24**	5	8	5	3	8	7	**6**	79	73	74	23	57	36	**57**
Childs Hill	24	73	54	1	1	8	**27**	3	5	5	7	5	11	**6**	81	79	69	16	29	22	**49**
Colindale	26	44	75	2	1	24	**29**	3	5	6	5	6	17	**7**	80	78	78	24	41	51	**59**
Coppetts	24	54	51	0	1	4	**22**	2	4	4	8	6	9	**6**	79	81	71	19	64	22	**56**
East Barnet	16	68	44	0	1	7	**22**	1	3	3	3	4	6	**3**	81	73	46	11	36	15	**44**
East Finchley	24	62	54	0	1	7	**25**	1	4	5	4	3	3	**3**	87	82	79	42	24	39	**59**
Edgware	11	70	59	1	1	4	**24**	1	3	2	5	0	11	**4**	77	71	60	18	21	9	**43**
Finchley Church End	22	78	26	0	3	3	**22**	1	4	4	9	6	19	**7**	81	81	72	28	13	30	**51**
Garden Suburb	12	79	27	0	30	5	**26**	1	2	2	4	1	5	**3**	74	70	49	10	14	14	**39**
Golders Green	24	66	68	0	0	11	**28**	2	5	4	6	2	17	**6**	78	75	68	25	23	36	**51**
Hale	12	69	47	0	1	2	**22**	1	2	2	3	0	10	**3**	78	66	43	12	19	8	**38**
Hendon	24	64	48	1	3	10	**25**	2	6	6	9	3	27	**9**	87	83	71	30	26	52	**58**
High Barnet	7	79	32	0	8	11	**23**	1	1	1	2	1	5	**2**	83	59	48	16	19	10	**39**
Mill Hill	7	74	46	0	5	8	**23**	1	1	1	3	1	8	**2**	79	65	53	14	27	9	**41**
Oakleigh	18	79	31	1	1	2	**22**	1	3	3	4	0	12	**4**	85	68	67	14	37	13	**48**
Totteridge	6	76	32	1	4	5	**21**	0	1	1	2	0	4	**1**	77	72	74	14	29	5	**45**
Underhill	13	79	64	0	1	3	**27**	2	2	2	2	1	7	**2**	79	56	67	28	39	12	**47**
West Finchley	28	61	28	0	0	8	**21**	2	4	5	4	5	14	**6**	84	78	78	17	41	45	**57**
West Hendon	19	60	75	1	1	4	**27**	2	3	3	7	2	20	**6**	81	72	66	22	21	34	**49**
Woodhouse	25	71	53	0	1	9	**27**	2	4	4	7	4	7	**5**	82	81	51	25	41	38	**53**

Bexley

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Barnehurst	13	56	40	0	0	4	**19**	1	2	2	3	0	18	**4**	90	79	62	12	82	18	**57**
Belvedere	14	46	51	0	0	5	**19**	4	3	2	3	0	8	**3**	87	71	64	48	50	42	**60**
Blackfen and Lamorbey	23	56	21	0	0	2	**17**	1	2	2	4	0	4	**2**	81	71	62	12	18	13	**43**
Blendon and Penhill	19	57	24	0	0	2	**17**	2	2	1	5	0	22	**5**	78	73	60	16	37	11	**46**
Brampton	20	67	31	0	0	1	**20**	1	1	1	2	0	5	**2**	89	81	62	10	26	9	**46**
Christchurch	16	58	29	0	1	1	**17**	2	3	3	5	1	9	**4**	85	68	57	13	49	17	**48**
Colyers	23	48	51	1	0	1	**21**	3	4	4	2	2	4	**3**	83	80	62	20	42	33	**53**
Crayford	11	49	60	0	2	8	**22**	2	3	1	3	1	8	**3**	77	64	53	31	44	28	**49**
Cray Meadows	6	58	56	0	2	5	**21**	1	1	1	1	0	3	**1**	76	72	61	60	16	15	**50**
Danson Park	15	56	43	0	1	2	**19**	2	2	2	4	3	14	**4**	76	66	56	15	35	19	**44**
East Wickham	18	58	41	0	0	2	**20**	2	3	1	3	1	4	**2**	78	71	62	8	56	15	**48**
Erith	9	42	45	2	1	12	**18**	3	3	2	2	0	9	**3**	87	76	61	41	32	37	**56**
Falconwood and Welling	24	52	22	0	0	1	**16**	1	3	1	6	3	11	**4**	76	59	62	8	19	13	**39**
Lesnes Abbey	17	53	62	8	0	2	**24**	3	3	3	3	2	7	**4**	76	71	59	19	35	26	**48**
Longlands	15	64	38	0	1	5	**20**	1	2	3	5	3	7	**3**	91	82	62	39	40	24	**56**
North End	7	35	65	1	0	15	**21**	3	3	2	2	0	2	**2**	72	63	53	47	40	28	**50**
Northumberland Heath	22	48	44	0	0	2	**19**	3	3	2	3	0	4	**2**	88	84	96	11	30	26	**56**
St. Mary's	9	65	29	0	2	1	**18**	1	1	1	3	0	10	**3**	77	66	72	13	67	6	**50**
St. Michael's	28	47	30	0	0	1	**18**	1	3	2	2	0	5	**2**	78	77	29	8	21	12	**37**
Sidcup	15	65	21	1	1	5	**18**	1	3	2	3	2	3	**2**	90	86	76	46	58	31	**64**
Thamesmead East	10	26	65	19	0	7	**21**	2	4	3	2	1	2	**2**	71	65	64	42	58	25	**54**

Appendix 2

Brent

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Alperton	26	41	44	1	0	9	**20**	2	4	4	7	0	13	**5**	78	74	72	11	35	27	**49**
Barnhill	20	57	65	0	0	1	**24**	1	3	4	4	5	6	**4**	73	68	70	30	72	14	**55**
Brondesbury Park	27	46	51	0	0	5	**22**	2	11	5	6	8	19	**8**	86	81	80	21	64	42	**62**
Dollis Hill	21	45	55	0	0	9	**22**	2	5	4	6	4	12	**5**	73	67	66	23	24	32	**47**
Dudden Hill	33	46	73	0	0	4	**26**	4	7	5	7	12	5	**7**	82	67	63	25	39	50	**55**
Fryent	18	47	42	0	1	1	**18**	2	2	2	4	0	14	**4**	76	75	64	6	33	11	**44**
Harlesden	56	41	85	0	0	1	**30**	7	13	17	12	7	23	**13**	86	77	73	39	49	97	**70**
Kensal Green	49	39	68	0	0	4	**27**	5	12	9	10	2	16	**9**	85	81	69	16	77	61	**65**
Kenton	19	62	36	0	0	3	**20**	2	3	2	2	1	9	**3**	78	74	69	15	30	10	**46**
Kilburn	64	44	78	3	2	6	**33**	5	17	27	14	9	12	**14**	80	81	55	14	89	59	**63**
Mapesbury	42	41	58	3	0	7	**25**	3	9	11	8	8	12	**8**	84	81	77	13	86	39	**64**
Northwick Park	18	50	39	0	1	2	**18**	1	4	3	3	3	4	**3**	76	70	65	9	58	10	**48**
Preston	24	56	50	0	0	5	**22**	2	4	3	4	5	9	**4**	78	77	75	26	36	19	**52**
Queens Park	37	40	42	0	1	4	**21**	1	6	6	8	9	14	**8**	84	81	63	12	27	28	**49**
Queensbury	27	55	38	0	0	3	**21**	2	4	3	3	4	6	**4**	79	79	66	10	48	24	**51**
Stonebridge	15	44	90	0	0	17	**28**	2	6	5	6	18	20	**9**	84	75	71	58	33	54	**62**
Sudbury	26	47	43	0	1	3	**20**	2	5	4	3	7	8	**5**	86	83	68	17	50	24	**55**
Tokyngton	20	49	39	6	0	9	**21**	2	4	4	4	2	6	**3**	79	79	72	19	21	26	**50**
Welsh Harp	22	47	64	0	2	2	**23**	3	4	3	6	2	23	**7**	70	62	47	25	44	22	**45**
Wembley Central	35	44	48	2	0	4	**22**	4	8	10	7	7	29	**11**	90	85	71	25	81	35	**64**
Willesden Green	38	35	85	0	1	8	**28**	4	10	10	6	5	21	**10**	88	71	74	35	79	83	**72**

Bromley

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bickley	11	87	17	0	2	2	**20**	1	1	2	2	1	6	**2**	81	69	48	20	40	16	**46**
Biggin Hill	4	53	19	0	1	7	**14**	1	0	1	2	1	6	**2**	85	59	56	40	47	20	**51**
Bromley Common and Keston	7	77	78	0	2	4	**28**	1	1	1	2	0	7	**2**	74	68	49	33	18	13	**43**
Bromley Town	17	70	41	1	4	3	**23**	2	4	5	4	3	14	**5**	88	81	61	31	50	39	**58**
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	4	84	21	0	4	4	**20**	0	1	0	0	1	2	**1**	73	50	43	15	31	3	**36**
Chislehurst	5	94	43	0	6	4	**25**	1	1	1	2	0	4	**1**	74	73	74	15	48	7	**49**
Clock House	26	54	34	0	0	6	**20**	2	3	6	4	4	16	**6**	91	85	61	15	48	22	**53**
Copers Cope	18	77	47	0	2	4	**25**	2	2	4	4	4	12	**5**	89	83	85	14	57	17	**57**
Cray Valley East	4	75	76	0	4	6	**27**	2	2	1	1	1	2	**2**	72	63	49	33	43	12	**45**
Cray Valley West	15	71	68	0	0	6	**27**	5	7	2	4	2	9	**5**	82	73	59	50	19	98	**64**
Crystal Palace	20	30	74	0	2	2	**21**	3	6	6	3	4	9	**5**	76	71	66	20	100	22	**59**
Darwin	1	36	31	0	6	8	**14**	0	0	0	0	0	2	**0**	65	51	41	23	10	5	**32**
Farnborough and Crofton	8	100	47	0	1	1	**26**	1	1	1	1	1	4	**2**	69	62	64	20	61	6	**47**
Hayes and Coney Hall	5	87	18	0	2	2	**19**	1	1	0	1	0	4	**1**	73	73	73	20	25	6	**45**
Kelsey and Eden Park	11	83	39	0	1	6	**23**	1	2	2	2	2	6	**2**	84	77	72	13	61	10	**53**
Mottingham and Chislehurst North	15	41	83	0	1	1	**24**	5	3	2	2	1	8	**3**	74	67	65	20	39	13	**47**
Orpington	13	96	64	0	1	4	**30**	3	2	3	4	0	13	**4**	84	57	46	31	48	23	**48**
Penge and Cator	22	54	76	1	1	9	**27**	4	5	6	4	6	16	**7**	85	83	65	19	55	28	**56**
Petts Wood and Knoll	11	84	19	0	0	1	**19**	1	1	1	1	3	4	**2**	70	56	54	12	23	7	**37**
Plaistow and Sundridge	14	66	50	1	1	2	**22**	1	2	2	2	1	3	**2**	85	78	61	23	33	18	**50**
Shortlands	15	59	16	0	0	1	**15**	1	2	2	3	1	7	**3**	81	78	73	30	25	10	**49**
West Wickham	12	89	18	0	1	2	**20**	1	1	1	3	1	4	**2**	79	79	69	22	28	12	**48**

Camden

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Belsize	62	48	41	1	4	9	**28**	6	14	25	6	7	6	**11**	79	80	73	19	65	96	**69**
Bloomsbury	40	33	56	3	21	16	**28**	16	20	22	17	65	45	**31**	90	82	76	27	37	86	**66**
Camden Town with Primrose Hill	40	44	72	0	12	13	**30**	8	13	15	15	12	41	**17**	82	80	74	25	85	100	**74**
Cantelowes	56	32	73	0	2	8	**29**	7	17	21	13	11	24	**16**	88	85	82	49	75	99	**80**
Fortune Green	44	37	57	0	3	3	**24**	3	7	10	11	5	18	**9**	91	88	65	24	59	63	**65**
Frognal and Fitzjohns	30	52	27	0	15	6	**22**	2	5	5	5	13	7	**6**	84	84	66	10	58	30	**55**
Gospel Oak	61	40	86	2	2	8	**33**	6	13	22	12	16	7	**12**	86	79	69	48	33	100	**69**
Hampstead Town	17	56	26	0	39	8	**24**	2	4	5	5	0	12	**5**	83	83	79	28	40	34	**58**
Haverstock	64	43	69	1	2	4	**30**	6	21	31	11	11	13	**15**	86	86	74	60	91	100	**83**
Highgate	13	54	55	0	22	7	**25**	1	4	3	2	0	6	**3**	88	84	71	48	23	24	**56**
Holborn and Covent Garden	42	39	70	12	37	18	**37**	16	21	31	20	16	46	**25**	86	86	84	75	32	100	**77**
Kentish Town	49	38	60	0	4	10	**27**	4	12	20	11	5	42	**16**	94	91	77	36	79	95	**79**
Kilburn	67	43	66	1	1	8	**31**	5	17	34	19	24	37	**23**	83	81	77	62	67	100	**78**
King's Cross	71	27	70	2	15	8	**32**	9	18	34	7	5	30	**17**	87	80	81	34	56	98	**73**
Regent's Park	37	39	65	9	14	9	**29**	9	16	27	9	8	15	**14**	88	79	77	39	39	73	**66**
St. Pancras and Somers Town	38	38	76	5	5	16	**30**	7	10	23	12	4	39	**16**	87	77	69	65	36	73	**68**
Swiss Cottage	39	45	43	3	1	6	**23**	4	9	14	12	7	13	**10**	83	80	67	24	44	39	**56**
West Hampstead	50	32	55	0	1	8	**24**	7	11	18	15	6	54	**18**	94	91	71	28	57	100	**73**

City of London

Borough	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
City of London	9	34	40	100	63	100	**58**	6	12	14	12	5	34	**14**	86	80	75	91	26	100	**76**

Croydon

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Addiscombe	39	50	50	1	1	1	**23**	3	6	6	7	12	19	**9**	86	81	76	12	89	22	**61**
Ashburton	20	59	62	0	0	3	**24**	2	3	4	4	2	12	**5**	89	75	67	24	71	24	**58**
Bensham Manor	42	49	57	0	0	2	**25**	4	9	9	10	21	8	**10**	85	82	76	35	100	48	**71**
Broad Green	27	39	88	1	0	13	**28**	8	9	8	11	7	20	**11**	86	85	79	35	62	54	**67**
Coulsdon East	6	73	54	0	1	1	**23**	1	1	1	2	0	4	**1**	74	55	22	34	23	6	**36**
Coulsdon West	10	62	36	0	0	0	**18**	1	1	1	2	1	6	**2**	82	67	52	12	100	9	**54**
Croham	17	56	40	0	1	2	**19**	1	3	3	4	2	10	**4**	87	86	70	9	38	14	**51**
Fairfield	16	57	62	18	4	15	**29**	3	6	7	10	7	21	**9**	88	85	76	25	76	35	**64**
Fieldway	28	34	70	1	0	2	**22**	8	9	8	8	2	22	**9**	93	91	64	100	96	74	**86**
Heathfield	6	65	67	0	2	2	**23**	1	1	1	2	0	4	**2**	83	79	62	21	67	11	**54**
Kenley	9	68	31	0	1	3	**18**	0	1	1	2	1	1	**1**	72	48	63	18	52	9	**44**
New Addington	17	40	87	0	0	4	**25**	4	5	3	4	8	16	**7**	88	82	64	66	90	46	**73**
Norbury	24	66	49	0	1	7	**24**	3	5	6	7	1	27	**8**	96	90	75	45	91	55	**75**
Purley	13	67	37	0	1	3	**20**	1	2	3	4	7	9	**4**	80	72	75	19	66	17	**55**
Sanderstead	7	73	30	0	0	0	**18**	0	1	1	1	1	4	**1**	68	67	78	17	53	5	**48**
Selhurst	30	45	68	1	0	6	**25**	5	9	8	10	11	16	**10**	78	77	73	43	78	33	**64**
Selsdon and Ballards	7	70	20	0	0	2	**16**	0	1	1	2	3	9	**3**	78	76	69	8	28	8	**44**
Shirley	19	74	61	0	0	2	**26**	2	2	3	2	4	2	**3**	71	69	71	29	73	15	**55**
South Norwood	26	50	74	2	1	6	**26**	3	6	8	7	12	18	**9**	76	73	66	18	94	20	**58**
Thornton Heath	36	47	76	0	0	6	**28**	4	10	9	11	8	11	**9**	81	81	70	25	100	51	**68**
Upper Norwood	23	54	67	0	1	2	**24**	3	4	5	5	9	10	**6**	81	84	69	22	78	22	**60**
Waddon	18	56	67	1	1	9	**25**	3	4	5	7	4	19	**7**	88	79	78	34	33	28	**57**
West Thornton	33	48	90	0	0	5	**29**	5	10	8	6	15	20	**11**	86	88	85	34	100	66	**76**
Woodside	29	40	54	0	0	2	**21**	3	5	5	4	4	13	**6**	83	69	64	14	59	17	**51**

Ealing

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Acton Central	32	45	70	2	0	2	25	3	10	7	3	6	4	5	88	78	75	18	55	41	59
Cleveland	23	53	80	0	0	3	27	2	3	4	4	4	5	4	80	67	66	35	52	28	55
Dormers Wells	22	49	77	2	0	6	26	2	4	5	6	2	18	6	89	85	76	37	15	41	57
Ealing Broadway	28	50	38	1	2	7	21	4	6	9	7	0	22	8	91	78	63	8	100	49	65
Ealing Common	23	48	48	0	3	2	21	2	5	4	6	3	10	5	88	84	81	14	47	21	56
East Acton	17	46	57	2	0	30	25	3	5	4	6	1	13	5	80	72	68	18	25	55	53
Elthorne	26	41	65	0	0	11	24	3	6	5	7	1	14	6	86	78	71	23	65	44	61
Greenford Broadway	26	56	67	0	0	2	25	3	5	4	6	5	14	6	77	70	76	21	64	22	55
Greenford Green	16	51	46	0	1	5	20	1	3	2	5	5	11	4	73	68	64	13	35	22	46
Hanger Hill	17	59	34	2	1	6	20	1	3	3	8	3	20	6	77	63	54	11	15	17	39
Hobbayne	23	49	58	0	1	3	22	2	5	3	3	1	6	3	77	70	67	30	35	19	50
Lady Margaret	32	45	44	0	0	1	20	3	4	2	6	5	1	4	86	85	68	10	45	29	54
Northfield	31	45	31	0	1	5	19	2	4	2	3	2	4	3	83	77	74	8	46	36	54
North Greenford	16	51	45	0	0	5	20	1	2	1	2	1	5	2	83	78	56	15	47	24	51
Northolt Mandeville	20	48	63	0	0	7	23	4	4	4	9	2	24	8	84	81	51	26	67	51	60
Northolt West End	16	44	70	0	0	2	22	2	3	3	7	2	9	4	74	75	76	33	94	21	62
Norwood Green	13	46	66	0	2	10	23	2	4	2	5	12	10	6	83	85	86	33	54	21	61
Perivale	17	51	52	0	1	6	21	2	2	2	4	5	9	4	70	66	52	10	35	16	41
South Acton	31	47	84	5	1	6	29	3	9	12	6	8	8	8	90	79	61	20	56	58	61
Southall Broadway	31	42	72	0	0	4	25	6	8	7	6	15	17	10	90	88	79	30	100	44	72
Southall Green	35	37	59	0	0	5	23	6	7	3	4	24	14	10	82	78	65	18	71	31	58
Southfield	34	44	40	0	14	4	23	2	5	5	5	14	10	7	85	80	74	15	22	32	51
Walpole	33	43	54	0	2	3	23	3	5	5	5	8	13	6	93	77	73	14	53	39	58

Enfield

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bowes	37	44	55	0	0	2	**23**	3	7	6	9	4	29	**10**	75	71	76	10	68	18	**53**
Bush Hill Park	20	73	37	0	0	3	**22**	2	3	2	5	3	9	**4**	79	77	56	13	37	18	**47**
Chase	3	54	78	1	7	11	**26**	0	1	1	3	1	7	**2**	71	61	45	26	46	5	**42**
Cockfosters	5	78	40	0	4	10	**23**	1	1	1	1	1	3	**1**	78	66	41	14	26	5	**38**
Edmonton Green	22	46	87	5	1	16	**29**	5	7	9	9	15	15	**10**	82	81	65	36	52	51	**61**
Enfield Highway	13	50	64	2	0	22	**25**	3	5	4	5	7	10	**6**	85	79	57	21	40	29	**52**
Enfield Lock	19	40	68	1	1	9	**23**	3	5	5	5	9	11	**6**	72	69	53	23	100	21	**56**
Grange	14	72	35	0	1	4	**21**	1	2	2	2	1	5	**2**	74	76	84	8	55	11	**51**
Haselbury	34	44	78	0	1	2	**26**	4	9	7	9	12	27	**11**	88	91	73	21	79	37	**65**
Highlands	9	73	46	0	0	11	**23**	1	2	1	2	3	5	**2**	67	64	67	16	83	10	**51**
Jubilee	14	50	87	0	0	6	**26**	1	3	3	3	1	5	**3**	79	78	78	16	51	15	**53**
Lower Edmonton	28	46	64	0	0	5	**24**	3	6	7	7	5	16	**7**	84	83	68	20	48	33	**56**
Palmers Green	29	58	45	0	0	3	**22**	3	5	5	10	1	25	**8**	76	68	61	11	80	21	**53**
Ponders End	16	42	80	1	1	16	**26**	3	5	4	3	5	3	**4**	78	82	71	22	62	36	**58**
Southbury	19	42	73	0	0	9	**24**	3	6	5	8	2	19	**7**	84	80	72	30	28	35	**55**
Southgate	20	62	32	0	3	7	**21**	2	4	4	5	5	11	**5**	86	66	68	11	68	17	**53**
Southgate Green	19	63	60	1	2	8	**25**	1	4	3	5	6	18	**6**	82	69	75	13	54	17	**52**
Town	24	67	31	0	6	4	**22**	2	4	3	6	1	14	**5**	76	73	68	16	58	21	**52**
Turkey Street	24	49	80	0	0	7	**27**	3	6	5	9	7	18	**8**	80	78	59	23	45	27	**52**
Upper Edmonton	25	46	79	1	0	11	**27**	5	8	8	12	2	22	**9**	74	75	60	28	40	43	**53**
Winchmore Hill	18	58	27	0	2	5	**18**	1	3	2	3	0	7	**3**	83	70	72	9	43	11	**48**

Greenwich

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Abbey Wood	22	43	70	0	0	3	**23**	5	5	5	6	4	11	**6**	80	80	60	25	69	34	**58**
Blackheath Westcombe	22	58	39	0	6	7	**22**	2	5	5	7	5	13	**6**	84	85	79	23	67	40	**63**
Charlton	26	44	57	1	2	6	**23**	3	6	6	7	7	14	**7**	85	79	53	36	76	53	**64**
Coldharbour and New Eltham	19	64	62	0	0	1	**24**	2	3	2	3	2	7	**3**	79	72	62	20	38	12	**47**
Eltham North	18	63	35	1	1	5	**21**	2	2	3	3	1	13	**4**	90	75	71	21	60	25	**57**
Eltham South	10	60	38	0	4	9	**20**	2	2	2	2	2	7	**3**	88	75	44	29	34	23	**49**
Eltham West	16	37	63	0	0	2	**20**	2	2	3	4	2	10	**4**	81	74	71	16	44	17	**51**
Glyndon	40	40	70	2	0	7	**27**	8	11	11	9	7	9	**9**	84	84	59	49	100	78	**76**
Greenwich West	22	39	50	5	23	22	**27**	3	5	9	7	6	17	**8**	91	82	78	37	81	86	**76**
Kidbrooke with Hornfair	23	50	57	2	0	7	**23**	3	5	6	5	6	16	**7**	81	78	68	20	82	35	**61**
Middle Park and Sutcliffe	15	58	77	0	3	6	**27**	3	3	3	3	2	9	**4**	86	77	65	42	31	28	**55**
Peninsula	12	35	67	2	4	21	**23**	2	4	3	6	2	16	**6**	85	79	69	33	56	64	**64**
Plumstead	27	45	52	3	0	3	**22**	7	9	6	8	24	18	**12**	90	87	70	27	79	84	**73**
Shooters Hill	13	49	37	0	1	4	**17**	2	2	2	3	3	6	**3**	77	73	71	15	76	15	**54**
Thamesmead Moorings	16	30	65	0	0	11	**20**	3	4	4	4	1	13	**5**	79	76	67	27	46	28	**54**
Woolwich Common	24	30	64	1	4	10	**22**	5	8	11	6	4	20	**9**	78	76	77	41	100	52	**71**
Woolwich Riverside	23	35	69	5	6	41	**30**	4	7	11	5	3	13	**7**	83	80	75	36	57	100	**72**

Hackney

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Brownswood	48	21	83	1	1	2	26	5	13	19	7	16	11	12	82	83	77	20	100	45	68
Cazenove	74	22	56	1	1	0	26	11	20	24	12	16	30	19	88	88	67	21	100	52	70
Chatham	55	27	85	1	5	11	31	10	22	39	24	12	51	26	92	92	68	25	100	100	80
Clissold	64	25	77	0	5	2	29	6	19	17	17	8	16	14	89	87	66	17	100	71	72
Dalston	61	27	62	3	4	17	29	5	18	23	19	0	20	14	81	82	78	14	100	100	76
De Beauvoir	60	28	66	6	5	13	30	6	12	31	17	3	31	17	82	73	71	29	81	100	73
Hackney Central	59	29	69	1	3	9	28	4	23	30	14	14	26	19	88	88	83	34	100	100	82
Hackney Downs	48	28	79	2	0	2	27	5	12	19	12	11	18	13	85	88	80	30	100	56	73
Haggerston	42	24	79	3	11	16	29	8	14	26	11	7	24	15	87	77	67	43	60	100	72
Hoxton	73	27	83	6	3	9	33	11	18	43	14	16	41	24	86	74	73	56	28	100	69
King's Park	22	29	81	1	1	2	23	3	5	9	6	5	4	5	86	83	63	37	100	24	66
Leabridge	51	29	73	0	2	2	26	4	11	14	11	10	24	12	83	84	78	16	100	50	68
Lordship	39	31	64	1	4	4	24	5	12	12	6	2	14	8	92	91	81	30	70	53	69
New River	48	29	81	1	1	2	27	8	16	21	19	28	61	26	84	82	74	24	64	54	64
Queensbridge	47	33	72	3	5	8	28	10	13	18	13	8	25	15	81	76	76	26	88	60	68
Springfield	49	26	76	0	1	2	26	8	15	21	13	6	22	14	79	82	75	22	44	55	59
Stoke Newington Central	66	26	59	0	2	3	26	4	19	19	13	31	23	18	89	83	64	13	100	91	73
Victoria	62	30	79	1	1	6	30	9	13	29	8	3	14	13	83	83	85	29	79	100	77
Wick	26	26	100	4	1	7	28	4	9	12	10	7	7	8	86	86	70	44	100	52	73

Hammersmith & Fulham

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Addison	74	26	73	1	1	5	**30**	5	15	32	24	40	33	**25**	90	88	69	17	56	100	**70**
Askew	67	34	59	0	0	2	**27**	6	17	16	13	7	6	**11**	83	84	82	23	66	44	**64**
Avonmore and Brook Green	48	38	63	1	3	9	**27**	3	13	19	8	9	31	**14**	90	92	84	21	29	89	**67**
College Park and Old Oak	10	23	73	1	2	8	**19**	1	5	4	5	2	12	**5**	78	74	72	25	34	26	**52**
Fulham Broadway	57	33	80	2	1	3	**30**	6	15	19	5	25	10	**13**	91	77	77	18	53	100	**69**
Fulham Reach	45	28	47	3	1	6	**22**	4	9	10	9	9	5	**8**	85	81	75	14	37	50	**57**
Hammersmith Broadway	38	37	70	7	4	13	**28**	6	10	19	11	18	19	**14**	87	83	71	25	18	100	**64**
Munster	61	27	41	0	0	1	**22**	3	10	14	5	4	11	**8**	89	83	74	9	17	40	**52**
North End	64	24	62	1	0	6	**26**	10	15	28	18	4	22	**16**	86	84	78	18	61	81	**68**
Palace Riverside	18	33	27	1	3	3	**14**	2	4	4	4	4	3	**3**	86	80	79	25	16	27	**52**
Parsons Green and Walham	43	34	52	1	2	2	**22**	4	10	12	4	0	10	**7**	91	81	72	13	48	88	**66**
Ravenscourt Park	31	36	53	0	6	4	**22**	3	8	11	7	2	11	**7**	82	83	80	25	34	39	**57**
Sands End	34	35	42	4	1	13	**21**	2	7	14	5	4	13	**7**	85	80	73	13	20	74	**58**
Shepherd's Bush Green	40	27	74	1	1	8	**25**	4	10	20	14	16	13	**13**	86	82	73	27	44	71	**64**
Town	60	25	66	0	2	2	**26**	4	14	27	6	13	28	**15**	95	78	76	21	20	100	**65**
Wormholt and White City	51	35	74	0	0	2	**27**	6	11	17	10	6	10	**10**	78	81	69	35	87	42	**66**
Addison	74	26	73	1	1	5	**30**	5	15	32	24	40	33	**25**	90	88	69	17	56	100	**70**

Haringey

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Alexandra	16	38	30	0	1	2	**14**	1	1	1	3	1	1	**1**	81	83	78	14	27	16	**50**
Bounds Green	38	39	65	1	1	11	**26**	4	9	8	10	12	28	**12**	75	71	72	27	54	79	**63**
Bruce Grove	58	36	76	0	2	5	**30**	4	12	15	16	6	42	**16**	94	87	67	28	68	100	**74**
Crouch End	32	36	27	0	1	7	**17**	2	5	8	7	2	5	**5**	87	86	81	13	25	49	**57**
Fortis Green	23	40	41	0	2	4	**18**	2	4	4	3	8	2	**4**	84	84	80	13	56	34	**58**
Harringay	32	29	68	0	0	4	**22**	3	7	7	8	7	18	**8**	82	81	62	22	53	51	**59**
Highgate	17	42	32	0	11	8	**18**	1	3	2	3	3	6	**3**	72	75	72	16	37	25	**49**
Hornsey	44	31	45	0	1	7	**21**	2	8	11	7	5	15	**8**	91	92	77	36	90	73	**76**
Muswell Hill	23	40	34	0	1	6	**17**	3	4	5	7	3	21	**7**	89	87	74	20	47	38	**59**
Noel Park	43	34	90	0	0	13	**30**	11	12	13	12	18	26	**15**	82	80	78	39	27	100	**68**
Northumberland Park	29	34	93	0	3	16	**29**	5	10	12	11	21	28	**14**	83	82	63	50	42	75	**66**
St. Ann's	50	36	64	0	1	5	**26**	3	10	10	9	18	31	**14**	78	80	68	23	55	50	**59**
Seven Sisters	46	35	65	0	0	8	**26**	8	10	9	10	19	27	**14**	80	83	81	31	46	78	**66**
Stroud Green	39	26	49	0	0	3	**19**	4	5	7	7	5	6	**6**	84	78	60	20	45	53	**57**
Tottenham Green	39	36	88	1	1	16	**30**	5	10	16	17	12	25	**14**	86	86	78	39	57	82	**71**
Tottenham Hale	32	35	82	1	1	16	**28**	4	8	9	10	7	30	**11**	88	86	68	36	29	81	**64**
West Green	35	37	88	1	0	7	**28**	4	8	12	9	8	21	**10**	82	82	59	32	68	52	**63**
White Hart Lane	29	33	78	0	1	9	**25**	5	6	6	8	5	12	**7**	79	77	77	24	30	37	**54**
Woodside	37	37	73	1	1	6	**26**	3	8	9	5	22	14	**10**	77	78	74	34	51	63	**63**

Harrow

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Belmont	23	45	21	0	0	0	**15**	1	2	2	4	0	6	**3**	83	80	36	9	51	9	**45**
Canons	8	70	31	0	2	7	**20**	1	1	2	3	1	6	**2**	81	78	71	13	40	11	**49**
Edgware	31	40	47	0	0	2	**20**	2	4	2	4	2	5	**3**	82	79	79	14	55	20	**55**
Greenhill	26	39	42	1	1	4	**19**	3	7	7	7	2	30	**9**	77	70	72	17	41	36	**52**
Harrow on the Hill	13	42	47	0	9	7	**20**	1	2	2	4	2	7	**3**	82	77	71	31	69	17	**58**
Harrow Weald	9	58	50	0	3	3	**21**	1	2	1	3	0	9	**3**	75	72	70	27	39	11	**49**
Hatch End	12	65	52	0	1	3	**22**	1	1	1	1	0	5	**2**	77	60	68	14	47	11	**46**
Headstone North	11	51	21	0	1	2	**14**	1	1	1	2	1	6	**2**	90	68	63	12	37	8	**46**
Headstone South	28	40	23	0	0	5	**16**	2	3	6	5	0	13	**5**	83	73	51	9	22	28	**44**
Kenton East	32	42	40	0	0	1	**19**	3	4	3	3	6	2	**3**	84	83	64	24	19	24	**50**
Kenton West	23	48	21	0	0	2	**16**	1	3	2	3	2	13	**4**	79	77	64	13	44	13	**48**
Marlborough	28	38	41	0	0	3	**18**	3	6	4	4	3	10	**5**	79	78	74	21	31	31	**52**
Pinner	11	60	44	0	5	1	**20**	1	2	1	2	3	4	**2**	79	59	43	13	47	8	**42**
Pinner South	16	53	16	0	0	0	**14**	1	2	1	3	0	2	**1**	83	73	80	9	24	5	**46**
Queensbury	27	41	28	0	0	2	**16**	2	3	2	5	0	20	**5**	86	85	72	10	14	18	**47**
Rayners Lane	26	46	22	0	0	0	**16**	1	3	1	3	5	3	**3**	77	71	12	16	53	22	**42**
Roxbourne	32	38	58	0	0	3	**22**	2	7	4	7	7	11	**6**	87	82	59	37	70	40	**62**
Roxeth	27	39	35	0	0	2	**17**	2	3	3	6	2	13	**5**	91	83	79	22	55	40	**62**
Stanmore Park	9	73	58	0	6	4	**25**	1	2	1	2	1	4	**2**	81	79	73	21	38	9	**50**
Wealdstone	35	36	50	0	0	2	**21**	2	5	5	3	2	6	**4**	76	74	68	16	19	20	**46**
West Harrow	25	41	30	0	0	2	**16**	1	4	2	1	0	3	**2**	80	72	54	12	23	19	**43**

Havering

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Brooklands	14	60	48	0	0	16	**23**	2	3	2	5	3	11	**4**	81	71	59	30	61	35	**56**
Cranham	7	87	25	0	0	4	**21**	0	1	1	3	0	5	**2**	70	60	61	11	18	4	**38**
Elm Park	12	70	52	0	0	2	**23**	1	2	1	2	0	3	**2**	75	65	71	17	100	9	**56**
Emerson Park	9	77	22	0	0	3	**19**	1	1	1	2	1	7	**2**	79	72	67	16	38	8	**47**
Gooshays	7	54	75	0	1	6	**24**	2	2	1	2	2	7	**3**	80	72	67	29	79	12	**57**
Hacton	18	72	32	0	0	2	**21**	1	2	1	2	7	2	**2**	86	72	63	17	26	10	**46**
Harold Wood	6	68	66	0	1	17	**26**	1	1	1	3	1	8	**2**	85	74	67	20	54	19	**53**
Havering Park	5	62	51	0	1	4	**21**	1	1	1	1	1	3	**1**	79	68	64	38	49	10	**51**
Heaton	14	62	67	1	0	6	**25**	3	4	2	3	3	14	**5**	87	83	95	30	100	32	**71**
Hylands	16	66	34	0	0	2	**20**	2	2	2	3	0	3	**2**	80	74	71	10	48	9	**49**
Mawneys	16	71	44	0	0	3	**22**	2	2	1	3	2	4	**2**	81	73	67	32	45	34	**55**
Pettits	12	82	26	0	1	7	**21**	1	2	1	3	1	10	**3**	89	74	89	47	27	30	**59**
Rainham and Wennington	3	65	56	0	2	25	**25**	1	1	1	2	1	4	**2**	82	62	61	40	72	13	**55**
Romford Town	21	68	60	2	1	25	**29**	4	5	8	6	2	29	**9**	82	75	71	27	80	85	**70**
St. Andrew's	18	82	32	3	1	8	**24**	2	3	3	3	2	10	**4**	90	68	56	20	64	27	**54**
South Hornchurch	7	66	67	1	0	18	**27**	2	2	1	3	2	11	**4**	71	66	48	48	51	24	**51**
Squirrel's Heath	18	65	25	2	0	7	**20**	2	3	3	3	2	9	**4**	83	80	88	20	77	23	**62**
Upminster	2	89	15	0	4	16	**21**	0	0	0	1	0	2	**1**	73	54	67	8	76	3	**47**

Hillingdon

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Barnhill	24	38	60	0	0	3	21	4	5	2	5	4	17	6	73	74	62	22	52	16	50
Botwell	14	42	49	1	1	19	21	3	4	2	4	3	9	4	79	75	63	27	37	36	53
Brunel	16	46	48	0	3	6	20	2	5	2	7	4	15	6	88	84	76	40	52	22	60
Cavendish	21	55	19	0	0	2	16	2	2	1	2	6	1	2	72	69	70	12	52	15	48
Charville	16	47	47	0	0	2	19	1	2	1	4	2	4	2	81	82	76	26	34	16	53
Eastcote and East Ruislip	11	74	27	0	4	2	20	1	1	1	2	1	7	2	78	72	58	14	25	8	42
Harefield	2	38	35	0	4	8	15	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	61	48	47	21	54	4	39
Heathrow Villages	2	35	49	4	6	56	25	1	2	1	8	0	11	4	77	67	54	35	31	17	47
Hillingdon East	13	45	43	0	0	2	17	1	2	1	3	2	6	3	86	79	67	29	43	14	53
Ickenham	6	62	14	0	3	5	15	1	0	0	2	1	4	1	73	67	62	10	17	7	39
Manor	21	53	19	0	1	1	16	1	3	1	5	3	15	5	74	66	75	9	100	14	57
Northwood	5	67	24	0	2	7	17	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	71	62	40	8	39	6	38
Northwood Hills	13	60	30	0	1	2	18	1	2	2	2	1	4	2	69	56	30	15	23	10	34
Pinkwell	20	39	54	0	0	4	20	3	5	3	13	8	43	13	82	66	54	34	49	37	54
South Ruislip	6	47	25	0	1	8	14	1	1	1	1	0	6	2	74	66	64	13	33	8	43
Townfield	16	43	53	1	1	12	21	4	4	3	4	1	18	6	76	69	73	42	44	36	57
Uxbridge North	10	58	36	0	4	7	19	2	2	1	4	2	9	3	79	79	79	21	63	18	56
Uxbridge South	18	40	44	2	5	15	21	3	5	3	5	4	6	4	77	70	55	26	23	28	47
West Drayton	16	48	59	0	4	4	22	3	6	2	5	5	17	6	73	61	51	41	52	24	50
West Ruislip	9	57	28	0	3	9	18	1	1	2	2	1	7	2	85	67	69	17	100	11	58
Yeading	22	32	69	0	0	3	21	3	4	4	7	6	13	6	74	72	70	19	64	17	53
Yiewsley	12	37	50	0	1	8	18	4	3	1	4	0	3	3	76	68	69	29	39	20	50

Hounslow

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bedfont	11	42	56	0	2	3	**19**	3	3	1	3	0	1	**2**	80	80	54	20	23	26	**47**
Brentford	16	43	54	6	5	12	**23**	3	4	5	7	2	14	**6**	78	69	71	27	26	30	**50**
Chiswick Homefields	18	40	48	0	18	5	**22**	2	3	3	3	7	8	**4**	80	75	74	15	32	24	**50**
Chiswick Riverside	20	42	42	0	6	3	**19**	2	3	4	2	4	2	**3**	83	76	66	19	39	23	**51**
Cranford	17	37	70	1	1	6	**22**	1	3	2	7	5	14	**6**	80	64	66	50	22	51	**55**
Feltham North	13	46	44	0	1	12	**19**	2	3	2	4	1	7	**3**	91	78	63	18	42	50	**57**
Feltham West	18	32	44	1	1	9	**17**	3	5	3	3	4	4	**4**	77	78	56	48	33	37	**55**
Hanworth	14	40	62	0	0	5	**20**	2	3	1	3	3	8	**3**	73	75	54	41	34	37	**53**
Hanworth Park	12	40	63	0	2	6	**20**	2	2	1	5	5	4	**3**	79	75	56	28	50	39	**55**
Heston Central	27	39	46	0	0	1	**19**	3	5	3	4	8	7	**5**	74	70	67	15	41	30	**49**
Heston East	22	39	50	2	1	4	**20**	3	3	2	6	0	17	**5**	80	81	76	16	30	23	**51**
Heston West	12	38	65	0	0	3	**20**	2	4	2	4	1	6	**3**	70	66	45	27	9	14	**38**
Hounslow Central	34	44	43	1	1	6	**21**	6	8	6	8	5	16	**8**	87	84	65	19	70	61	**64**
Hounslow Heath	20	36	50	1	0	1	**18**	3	3	2	5	0	6	**3**	80	78	69	21	36	24	**51**
Hounslow South	24	43	24	0	0	2	**16**	2	4	1	2	2	5	**3**	82	79	71	9	10	30	**47**
Hounslow West	31	42	53	0	1	2	**22**	3	7	4	6	9	23	**9**	81	80	68	18	78	38	**60**
Isleworth	22	37	74	2	4	4	**24**	2	6	3	6	10	5	**5**	81	82	71	37	28	33	**55**
Osterley and Spring Grove	8	46	35	0	3	7	**17**	1	2	2	3	1	5	**2**	87	81	64	11	33	18	**49**
Syon	17	39	57	0	6	8	**21**	2	3	4	5	3	14	**5**	86	81	70	16	31	27	**52**
Turnham Green	24	44	32	1	2	6	**18**	3	5	7	9	8	32	**11**	91	77	64	21	19	76	**58**

Islington

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Barnsbury	56	35	83	0	14	7	**33**	6	8	19	8	10	17	**11**	85	79	81	16	33	73	**61**
Bunhill	54	33	66	17	18	21	**35**	16	18	33	17	5	36	**21**	87	78	73	36	22	100	**66**
Caledonian	46	37	75	1	5	7	**29**	7	18	18	7	10	10	**12**	83	78	77	22	40	61	**60**
Canonbury	56	35	70	0	7	6	**29**	5	10	24	7	0	23	**12**	85	74	63	26	25	59	**55**
Clerkenwell	47	30	55	2	24	12	**28**	5	15	26	10	3	32	**15**	84	80	77	28	20	100	**65**
Finsbury Park	60	35	100	1	2	7	**34**	8	16	26	20	9	53	**22**	90	75	75	34	83	100	**76**
Highbury East	44	34	65	0	3	2	**24**	10	8	13	6	0	7	**7**	85	81	72	18	48	41	**57**
Highbury West	53	32	74	5	1	9	**29**	4	11	13	9	3	23	**10**	87	82	81	19	53	90	**69**
Hillrise	52	33	77	0	0	3	**28**	7	9	20	9	3	6	**9**	85	80	89	28	25	66	**62**
Holloway	57	36	65	1	2	12	**29**	8	15	21	9	8	20	**14**	86	83	75	28	54	86	**69**
Junction	43	38	93	3	1	7	**31**	5	10	15	16	5	11	**10**	87	83	85	25	74	52	**68**
Mildmay	59	29	80	2	5	4	**30**	6	11	24	10	0	22	**12**	82	79	79	26	52	72	**65**
St. George's	52	34	81	0	1	4	**29**	6	12	25	10	13	16	**14**	86	83	82	26	92	77	**74**
St. Mary's	51	33	74	1	14	8	**30**	11	11	23	10	10	66	**22**	94	78	33	27	90	77	**67**
St. Peter's	55	34	82	0	11	8	**32**	10	11	21	9	17	14	**14**	87	75	55	19	29	64	**55**
Tollington	58	33	65	0	1	2	**26**	8	12	16	11	0	5	**9**	89	78	75	28	58	85	**69**

Kensington & Chelsea

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Abingdon	55	37	42	1	2	4	24	2	11	19	8	31	7	13	87	78	85	14	59	74	66
Brompton	33	35	46	2	17	13	24	5	14	19	8	3	22	12	85	80	65	20	33	100	64
Campden	29	33	24	2	12	4	17	4	6	11	4	0	18	7	90	78	77	13	28	58	57
Colville	74	26	59	0	1	3	27	8	21	35	19	7	29	20	91	89	82	15	48	100	71
Courtfield	67	26	47	1	6	6	25	3	17	28	8	12	14	14	85	81	78	10	79	100	72
Cremorne	47	39	81	8	7	11	32	3	14	27	14	41	34	22	88	79	75	89	35	100	78
Earl's Court	69	25	64	0	1	4	27	4	19	42	9	18	35	21	80	76	78	24	100	81	73
Golborne	34	27	88	2	17	3	29	6	9	26	9	0	27	13	93	89	78	32	37	90	70
Hans Town	57	40	43	0	9	6	26	3	14	24	11	0	25	13	88	74	56	27	30	100	63
Holland	34	35	39	1	13	2	21	2	8	10	8	21	13	11	84	80	90	7	51	44	59
Norland	42	40	75	0	7	6	28	2	8	11	10	8	3	7	86	87	75	19	30	83	63
Notting Barns	54	34	70	2	1	8	28	6	11	27	23	0	37	17	88	88	73	33	49	100	72
Pembridge	53	28	35	1	8	4	21	5	10	20	12	0	9	9	88	84	77	19	48	84	67
Queen's Gate	56	29	24	2	12	4	21	4	8	24	13	0	11	10	92	81	47	6	41	93	60
Redcliffe	48	30	40	0	7	3	21	3	9	14	8	12	26	12	86	82	86	23	43	59	63
Royal Hospital	30	46	36	1	13	6	22	3	4	12	9	3	18	8	92	75	69	37	62	100	73
St. Charles	47	31	86	1	1	6	29	4	12	26	13	8	19	14	93	92	73	30	76	80	74
Stanley	45	35	30	1	5	8	21	4	17	22	11	8	42	17	93	82	79	27	66	100	75

Kingston upon Thames

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Alexandra	13	42	25	1	0	5	**14**	1	2	2	2	0	15	**4**	76	68	66	11	23	13	**43**
Berrylands	24	42	46	0	1	9	**20**	2	4	4	2	2	6	**3**	89	68	71	27	51	29	**56**
Beverley	20	39	45	1	0	11	**19**	3	4	3	2	6	7	**4**	86	61	60	30	75	43	**59**
Canbury	39	31	26	0	1	12	**18**	1	4	5	8	2	11	**5**	84	83	60	19	48	100	**66**
Chessington North and Hook	17	39	26	0	0	4	**14**	2	3	1	2	0	6	**2**	69	63	42	16	35	16	**40**
Chessington South	5	42	29	0	1	7	**14**	1	1	1	1	1	4	**1**	62	60	39	16	21	7	**34**
Coombe Hill	9	45	26	0	2	8	**15**	1	2	1	3	1	5	**2**	76	71	74	47	100	18	**64**
Coombe Vale	22	40	22	0	0	1	**14**	1	4	2	1	5	0	**2**	78	67	66	12	38	16	**46**
Grove	22	32	35	1	6	27	**20**	5	7	6	8	6	27	**10**	85	77	74	20	59	100	**69**
Norbiton	28	27	61	4	1	10	**22**	2	6	6	11	0	17	**7**	81	74	56	82	52	100	**74**
Old Malden	19	47	30	0	0	1	**16**	1	2	1	3	0	8	**2**	76	62	4	18	26	9	**33**
St. James	15	48	23	0	0	2	**15**	2	3	1	3	11	3	**4**	86	67	66	18	53	17	**51**
St. Mark's	30	26	33	0	2	9	**17**	3	4	6	4	2	8	**5**	90	70	51	9	32	44	**49**
Surbiton Hill	23	40	19	0	1	4	**15**	1	3	3	3	2	8	**3**	85	58	66	11	63	18	**50**
Tolworth and Hook Rise	14	38	26	0	0	8	**14**	2	3	2	2	0	8	**3**	74	69	66	15	41	22	**48**
Tudor	22	39	13	0	0	1	**13**	2	3	2	3	2	9	**3**	89	83	62	26	29	48	**56**

Lambeth

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bishop's	25	26	53	7	11	26	25	6	10	13	16	2	36	14	90	92	83	21	28	100	69
Brixton Hill	52	32	66	0	3	5	26	6	14	22	10	15	28	16	86	86	82	27	56	63	67
Clapham Common	35	27	54	1	4	7	21	4	10	12	5	4	10	8	87	81	77	30	64	62	67
Clapham Town	46	30	65	3	9	8	27	6	12	20	12	0	39	15	92	85	70	24	67	100	73
Coldharbour	50	31	78	4	3	11	29	7	16	26	17	21	28	19	96	92	77	52	73	100	82
Ferndale	61	26	71	1	4	4	28	9	22	24	17	20	22	19	91	89	84	21	49	83	69
Gipsy Hill	32	32	73	0	8	4	25	5	9	10	8	12	10	9	84	79	60	38	41	49	59
Herne Hill	28	32	74	0	3	12	25	2	9	9	8	8	19	9	90	88	78	14	68	72	68
Knight's Hill	38	39	84	0	1	8	28	4	11	12	9	4	19	10	88	85	71	19	81	67	69
Larkhall	58	31	66	4	4	10	29	9	18	20	10	29	13	16	91	91	85	38	84	92	80
Oval	44	32	58	5	8	9	26	4	10	18	21	9	32	16	87	88	83	17	34	100	68
Prince's	46	41	58	9	11	18	30	5	13	28	22	14	34	19	93	90	80	32	49	100	74
St. Leonard's	40	34	55	0	2	2	22	4	9	10	10	21	29	14	82	81	79	13	76	43	62
Stockwell	64	30	65	4	8	7	30	8	18	22	18	6	50	20	86	87	91	29	51	92	72
Streatham Hill	44	35	59	0	1	4	24	4	12	12	7	11	11	9	85	79	83	21	100	38	68
Streatham South	33	46	50	0	1	2	22	2	5	5	9	11	24	10	84	84	86	10	100	26	65
Streatham Wells	39	37	64	0	2	3	24	3	10	11	11	0	17	9	81	79	63	33	100	42	66
Thornton	43	29	59	0	1	2	22	3	11	21	5	26	13	13	77	74	85	34	59	52	63
Thurlow Park	33	35	59	0	1	2	22	4	8	12	14	7	33	13	91	87	76	25	62	46	64
Tulse Hill	56	30	66	0	1	1	26	7	13	26	10	3	13	12	83	83	73	29	42	44	59
Vassall	47	30	73	2	12	3	28	9	14	19	8	17	24	15	88	90	79	41	53	59	68

Lewisham

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bellingham	18	45	79	0	1	4	24	3	4	6	4	10	7	5	78	74	77	29	53	28	56
Blackheath	23	45	68	1	14	6	26	2	5	7	5	4	10	5	87	82	67	23	48	42	58
Brockley	39	32	71	2	3	9	26	5	11	12	6	12	20	11	84	80	87	24	95	71	73
Catford South	30	51	49	0	0	3	22	2	4	6	5	6	15	6	82	80	73	11	43	20	51
Crofton Park	32	41	58	0	0	7	23	3	4	7	5	2	24	8	90	75	66	19	51	54	59
Downham	23	53	65	0	0	1	24	4	5	4	5	6	13	6	74	71	65	24	25	27	48
Evelyn	35	28	78	5	3	13	27	6	11	22	9	19	22	15	88	77	74	31	84	97	75
Forest Hill	31	43	59	0	3	7	24	3	7	11	6	2	19	8	84	68	63	27	63	62	61
Grove Park	22	53	64	0	0	4	24	3	4	5	4	7	12	6	80	76	72	18	52	25	54
Ladywell	33	39	50	0	1	2	21	3	6	6	4	2	10	5	87	81	92	15	63	27	61
Lee Green	31	48	47	4	1	8	23	3	5	8	5	2	8	5	89	79	76	17	57	53	62
Lewisham Central	32	42	85	5	2	18	31	4	12	16	12	19	31	16	91	80	75	28	61	93	71
New Cross	32	28	69	1	2	15	24	5	9	13	6	6	24	11	86	83	79	28	50	100	71
Perry Vale	34	43	66	2	1	7	26	4	7	10	8	5	25	10	91	74	79	30	100	67	74
Rushey Green	31	39	81	0	1	10	27	4	11	13	11	9	26	12	87	80	70	19	39	57	59
Sydenham	34	54	58	2	2	13	27	2	7	10	7	13	26	11	81	75	71	32	54	66	63
Telegraph Hill	40	36	63	1	1	8	25	5	7	13	4	14	25	12	86	84	84	19	60	90	71
Whitefoot	24	47	74	0	1	3	25	3	5	6	4	6	13	6	73	71	52	22	29	26	46

Merton

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Abbey	28	27	40	1	1	10	**18**	3	8	6	7	6	16	**8**	89	80	58	36	42	79	**64**
Cannon Hill	15	42	23	0	0	1	**14**	1	2	1	1	0	5	**2**	79	71	64	8	44	6	**45**
Colliers Wood	35	27	44	0	1	5	**19**	4	5	6	3	5	17	**7**	83	76	42	13	67	67	**58**
Cricket Green	14	37	57	0	3	12	**20**	3	4	5	3	2	7	**4**	86	71	73	31	44	31	**56**
Dundonald	29	28	12	0	0	3	**12**	2	3	3	2	2	8	**3**	87	75	64	8	44	25	**51**
Figge's Marsh	37	31	53	0	1	4	**21**	7	7	9	4	0	20	**8**	83	73	89	23	100	65	**72**
Graveney	41	30	26	0	0	3	**17**	3	6	4	4	9	8	**6**	75	79	68	11	100	27	**60**
Hillside	27	38	15	0	3	6	**15**	3	4	5	6	0	21	**6**	82	72	61	27	32	39	**52**
Lavender Fields	32	21	45	0	0	2	**17**	5	6	4	4	5	6	**5**	80	66	67	14	21	37	**48**
Longthornton	25	32	38	0	0	1	**16**	2	5	4	4	4	5	**4**	86	87	55	19	100	22	**62**
Lower Morden	18	42	18	0	0	3	**13**	1	2	1	1	2	1	**1**	79	74	78	6	20	11	**45**
Merton Park	19	42	22	0	1	6	**15**	2	3	2	3	0	5	**3**	83	72	64	24	59	22	**54**
Pollards Hill	18	33	62	0	0	1	**19**	4	5	3	3	3	7	**4**	84	80	83	18	86	13	**61**
Ravensbury	20	37	45	0	2	2	**18**	3	2	2	5	5	17	**6**	86	77	43	16	33	25	**47**
Raynes Park	19	39	38	0	0	2	**16**	1	3	3	3	0	11	**4**	81	76	54	10	56	19	**49**
St. Helier	21	39	40	0	1	3	**17**	2	2	2	3	1	6	**3**	78	72	94	20	39	13	**53**
Trinity	34	25	25	0	0	4	**15**	3	5	5	4	3	13	**5**	87	74	64	18	54	31	**55**
Village	5	49	15	1	11	9	**15**	1	1	1	1	0	1	**1**	76	62	46	10	33	9	**39**
West Barnes	19	40	25	0	0	3	**14**	2	2	2	1	1	6	**2**	87	69	75	12	35	19	**50**
Wimbledon Park	17	27	21	0	0	5	**12**	1	3	2	3	0	6	**3**	77	70	75	17	27	27	**49**

Newham

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Beckton	9	23	89	0	0	16	**23**	3	3	2	4	3	7	**3**	84	73	77	33	66	13	**58**
Boleyn	65	37	77	1	0	8	**31**	9	14	10	9	12	23	**13**	83	73	77	33	100	81	**75**
Canning Town North	22	34	88	0	2	18	**27**	8	9	7	6	5	14	**8**	78	75	82	46	95	72	**75**
Canning Town South	34	34	70	7	1	18	**27**	5	9	8	6	2	18	**8**	77	71	78	42	100	74	**74**
Custom House	24	27	83	0	0	8	**24**	6	6	6	7	7	7	**6**	76	71	68	36	64	46	**60**
East Ham Central	57	34	55	0	1	12	**26**	11	12	10	8	16	31	**15**	85	73	81	21	90	90	**73**
East Ham North	57	32	55	0	0	6	**25**	5	9	6	8	6	20	**9**	77	64	63	24	100	67	**66**
East Ham South	32	33	76	0	0	5	**25**	4	8	7	7	11	23	**10**	89	78	84	38	69	41	**66**
Forest Gate North	47	34	55	0	0	6	**24**	7	9	8	4	4	9	**7**	85	78	33	22	84	58	**60**
Forest Gate South	53	33	66	1	1	9	**27**	8	13	14	9	9	35	**15**	92	88	61	36	100	100	**80**
Green Street East	77	27	55	0	0	2	**27**	6	16	8	8	11	15	**11**	82	77	72	20	100	84	**72**
Green Street West	68	33	51	0	0	5	**26**	6	11	10	13	10	26	**12**	84	78	66	13	93	80	**69**
Little Ilford	33	33	84	1	1	9	**27**	6	7	5	5	12	5	**7**	75	77	74	33	100	41	**67**
Manor Park	43	32	75	0	1	4	**26**	5	10	6	6	12	9	**8**	79	77	61	39	100	47	**67**
Plaistow North	58	34	62	4	0	9	**28**	6	13	12	7	8	12	**10**	78	73	71	38	95	92	**75**
Plaistow South	45	32	62	1	1	11	**25**	6	9	8	9	4	10	**8**	81	76	71	24	100	100	**75**
Royal Docks	9	13	60	5	1	22	**18**	1	3	2	2	2	3	**2**	69	64	57	45	76	31	**57**
Stratford and New Town	16	31	64	38	3	32	**31**	3	5	7	6	1	16	**6**	86	84	73	34	60	52	**65**
Wall End	40	29	62	0	0	3	**22**	3	7	4	6	12	10	**7**	78	71	76	22	65	30	**57**
West Ham	44	33	69	1	0	6	**26**	5	8	13	9	6	14	**9**	87	88	78	25	100	60	**73**

Redbridge

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Aldborough	6	53	42	1	1	6	**18**	1	1	1	2	1	6	**2**	77	75	62	19	56	7	**49**
Barkingside	31	56	27	0	0	3	**19**	2	4	4	8	2	26	**8**	75	70	62	29	68	26	**55**
Bridge	17	47	47	0	1	4	**19**	1	3	2	5	2	14	**5**	79	67	44	16	33	24	**44**
Chadwell	36	42	38	0	0	2	**20**	2	7	4	5	5	12	**6**	76	72	62	14	94	30	**58**
Church End	30	43	33	0	2	5	**19**	3	6	4	7	4	23	**8**	81	68	69	22	59	48	**58**
Clayhall	20	55	28	0	0	5	**18**	1	3	3	8	4	29	**8**	67	64	61	18	28	22	**43**
Clementswood	44	32	62	2	0	7	**25**	8	10	11	9	11	31	**13**	89	86	61	22	61	61	**63**
Cranbrook	20	48	40	0	1	2	**19**	2	3	3	10	5	32	**9**	72	70	57	16	84	15	**52**
Fairlop	13	49	35	0	1	6	**17**	1	2	2	3	12	7	**4**	84	70	64	26	83	25	**59**
Fullwell	22	60	61	1	0	3	**24**	3	3	4	6	3	6	**4**	74	69	66	28	52	28	**53**
Goodmayes	30	31	42	0	0	2	**18**	4	6	4	9	5	25	**9**	89	88	71	12	62	26	**58**
Hainault	8	53	57	0	0	18	**23**	1	2	2	2	0	6	**2**	84	60	64	32	49	23	**52**
Loxford	48	36	68	2	1	6	**27**	6	13	12	14	9	28	**14**	82	77	61	43	89	59	**69**
Mayfield	27	47	39	0	0	2	**19**	2	4	3	5	1	12	**5**	87	83	77	12	67	16	**57**
Monkhams	12	65	23	0	2	7	**18**	1	2	2	2	1	4	**2**	88	72	62	31	64	30	**58**
Newbury	30	45	42	0	0	3	**20**	3	5	4	8	4	17	**7**	86	84	63	14	67	25	**57**
Roding	19	39	70	3	0	9	**23**	3	5	4	6	5	17	**6**	81	67	69	24	82	37	**60**
Seven Kings	27	41	55	0	0	6	**21**	4	5	4	5	4	21	**7**	85	81	65	15	86	28	**60**
Snaresbrook	22	61	40	0	3	11	**23**	2	3	3	4	0	10	**4**	78	71	62	42	79	33	**61**
Valentines	35	37	66	0	0	2	**23**	5	8	6	8	6	23	**9**	81	79	49	14	76	36	**56**
Wanstead	8	52	41	0	2	7	**18**	1	1	1	3	1	10	**3**	77	64	55	25	100	10	**55**

Richmond upon Thames

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Barnes	12	46	40	0	1	3	**17**	1	1	2	1	2	2	**1**	73	75	72	10	39	17	**48**
East Sheen	7	44	14	0	2	3	**11**	0	1	1	0	0	1	**1**	79	65	64	6	46	11	**45**
Fulwell and Hampton Hill	20	39	17	0	1	3	**13**	1	1	3	2	0	7	**2**	90	92	64	8	39	27	**53**
Ham, Petersham & Richmond Riverside	4	50	44	0	15	9	**20**	1	1	1	1	0	2	**1**	84	87	50	40	27	10	**50**
Hampton	5	49	36	0	14	12	**19**	1	1	0	1	2	3	**1**	70	73	51	13	40	12	**43**
Hampton North	17	46	56	0	0	4	**21**	1	3	2	2	4	7	**3**	75	68	53	20	71	25	**52**
Hampton Wick	14	41	22	1	3	11	**15**	1	1	2	4	2	11	**3**	75	76	72	23	56	28	**55**
Heathfield	20	46	44	1	0	3	**19**	3	3	3	4	1	7	**4**	81	78	69	25	87	29	**61**
Kew	11	48	18	0	10	8	**16**	1	2	2	2	0	5	**2**	87	72	45	14	31	21	**45**
Mortlake and Barnes Common	21	40	30	0	4	4	**17**	2	5	3	4	1	8	**4**	80	69	64	18	28	33	**49**
North Richmond	14	44	27	0	2	7	**16**	1	2	3	3	4	6	**3**	90	65	63	22	37	20	**50**
St. Margarets & North Twickenham	21	33	15	1	1	7	**13**	2	2	2	5	1	8	**3**	75	73	69	4	26	35	**47**
South Richmond	15	46	30	0	19	12	**20**	2	4	3	2	1	4	**3**	85	70	66	15	31	41	**51**
South Twickenham	22	33	12	0	1	4	**12**	1	3	2	2	2	4	**2**	85	85	59	15	34	33	**52**
Teddington	9	45	22	0	3	8	**14**	1	1	2	1	3	1	**1**	87	88	80	11	29	17	**52**
Twickenham Riverside	20	40	15	1	8	10	**16**	2	3	3	6	3	7	**4**	77	76	80	9	78	32	**58**
West Twickenham	16	39	33	0	1	3	**15**	2	2	2	2	0	4	**2**	87	89	60	15	27	22	**50**
Whitton	22	47	36	0	0	1	**18**	1	3	1	4	0	1	**2**	78	79	69	15	65	20	**54**

Southwark

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Brunswick Park	50	28	66	2	7	7	**27**	7	16	20	9	3	12	**11**	91	79	73	24	100	81	**75**
Camberwell Green	58	35	73	3	5	12	**31**	12	18	33	12	11	16	**17**	87	82	87	30	49	100	**73**
Cathedrals	31	32	68	11	15	30	**31**	11	12	19	16	17	35	**18**	85	85	80	64	12	100	**71**
Chaucer	65	23	68	3	6	11	**30**	16	20	26	9	17	25	**19**	80	75	76	45	23	100	**66**
College	13	39	63	2	2	11	**22**	2	3	5	2	0	6	**3**	80	75	63	46	100	25	**65**
East Dulwich	44	32	30	0	0	3	**18**	2	8	9	8	8	25	**10**	78	75	75	19	42	40	**55**
East Walworth	36	28	71	1	5	9	**25**	9	13	22	13	5	56	**20**	76	73	66	40	56	83	**66**
Faraday	52	26	66	12	3	15	**29**	14	32	37	16	25	37	**27**	77	70	71	39	100	100	**76**
Grange	50	31	60	4	6	25	**29**	11	12	23	12	18	13	**15**	82	75	63	30	27	100	**63**
Livesey	36	38	82	6	3	18	**31**	6	15	19	9	25	37	**18**	85	80	73	42	45	100	**71**
Newington	64	35	67	5	2	13	**31**	12	19	27	15	17	22	**19**	79	81	79	44	67	100	**75**
Nunhead	40	34	75	0	5	4	**26**	5	11	13	8	12	3	**9**	91	90	79	37	44	71	**69**
Peckham	62	28	66	0	1	6	**27**	10	14	30	12	25	32	**20**	87	81	79	29	36	66	**63**
Peckham Rye	22	32	50	1	3	4	**19**	2	3	5	4	4	9	**5**	79	77	80	15	29	27	**51**
Riverside	46	30	60	8	7	19	**28**	11	11	16	14	6	45	**17**	89	80	75	21	17	100	**64**
Rotherhithe	36	29	71	6	3	11	**26**	7	13	19	8	11	9	**11**	81	75	67	40	48	100	**69**
South Bermondsey	53	30	78	4	0	16	**30**	6	13	22	12	20	42	**19**	81	75	78	48	71	100	**75**
South Camberwell	35	28	49	0	4	4	**20**	3	6	8	6	0	16	**6**	83	80	87	43	71	49	**69**
Surrey Docks	26	25	65	0	2	3	**20**	4	6	5	2	3	11	**5**	78	73	65	12	49	48	**54**
The Lane	42	42	63	2	5	9	**27**	8	11	17	7	18	33	**16**	86	82	84	31	59	85	**71**
Village	16	40	31	0	7	4	**17**	1	2	2	4	1	7	**3**	83	87	86	14	9	14	**49**

Sutton

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Beddington North	8	42	29	0	2	8	**15**	1	1	1	2	1	2	**1**	80	76	74	12	32	14	**48**
Beddington South	13	47	80	0	0	0	**23**	2	2	1	2	5	7	**3**	82	79	70	23	39	20	**52**
Belmont	16	52	66	0	0	2	**23**	1	3	2	3	4	12	**4**	74	71	59	31	100	23	**60**
Carshalton Central	18	43	33	0	7	1	**17**	2	3	2	6	3	11	**4**	82	75	60	15	64	15	**52**
Carshalton South and Clockhouse	5	47	26	0	1	1	**13**	0	1	0	1	0	3	**1**	75	66	43	12	52	3	**42**
Cheam	10	61	16	0	4	2	**15**	1	2	1	2	3	5	**2**	85	84	61	11	44	10	**49**
Nonsuch	20	58	14	0	0	1	**16**	1	2	1	2	0	4	**2**	80	79	69	22	51	15	**52**
St. Helier	29	36	55	0	0	4	**21**	4	7	5	6	7	12	**7**	83	79	72	15	80	27	**59**
Stonecot	20	48	21	0	0	1	**15**	2	4	1	4	0	3	**2**	80	85	65	9	31	25	**49**
Sutton Central	32	38	62	2	1	4	**23**	9	13	8	7	11	11	**10**	83	80	81	71	64	100	**80**
Sutton North	21	51	34	1	0	1	**18**	2	5	3	4	0	7	**3**	84	84	78	25	35	28	**56**
Sutton South	29	50	36	1	0	5	**20**	1	8	6	4	7	11	**6**	77	75	75	23	100	25	**62**
Sutton West	22	44	22	0	0	2	**15**	2	3	3	4	0	12	**4**	83	80	69	17	68	27	**57**
The Wrythe	25	41	44	0	1	3	**19**	3	5	3	4	9	8	**5**	76	72	68	17	40	22	**49**
Wallington North	25	42	35	0	2	3	**18**	3	5	4	7	2	28	**8**	88	74	67	14	57	29	**55**
Wallington South	22	54	42	0	1	4	**21**	2	4	6	3	3	12	**5**	91	74	80	37	100	48	**72**
Wandle Valley	21	32	65	0	0	1	**20**	5	5	3	3	3	4	**4**	81	72	67	14	84	19	**56**
Worcester Park	23	48	16	0	0	2	**15**	2	3	2	3	0	2	**2**	80	76	58	15	50	14	**49**

Tower Hamlets

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Bethnal Green North	64	29	87	2	5	4	**32**	18	20	26	16	10	36	**21**	87	80	76	25	100	96	**77**
Bethnal Green South	60	21	86	2	4	12	**31**	25	17	30	17	19	36	**24**	90	82	73	38	100	100	**81**
Blackwall and Cubitt Town	25	28	75	16	5	37	**31**	4	6	11	6	8	15	**8**	86	79	66	37	88	84	**73**
Bow East	31	33	74	3	3	33	**29**	9	7	13	8	1	15	**9**	78	74	82	35	100	100	**78**
Bow West	36	31	64	2	6	9	**25**	13	10	12	9	16	10	**12**	81	76	73	41	100	68	**73**
Bromley-by-Bow	58	25	75	8	1	18	**31**	14	12	22	21	16	32	**20**	81	75	77	46	100	100	**80**
East India and Lansbury	47	31	91	3	2	18	**32**	19	18	26	14	0	58	**22**	87	78	66	39	100	100	**78**
Limehouse	54	30	75	5	7	10	**30**	16	15	25	14	0	32	**17**	88	82	79	45	100	100	**82**
Mile End and Globe Town	63	29	67	3	3	8	**29**	15	15	44	12	6	25	**20**	87	79	78	24	100	80	**75**
Mile End East	50	23	84	3	3	19	**30**	18	16	23	11	8	17	**16**	83	76	80	37	100	99	**79**
Millwall	38	29	50	31	2	55	**34**	4	9	11	10	6	16	**9**	89	76	69	21	30	100	**64**
St. Dunstan's and Stepney Green	61	41	76	3	6	11	**33**	16	11	21	11	3	43	**18**	84	82	80	37	100	93	**79**
St. Katherine's and Wapping	31	25	68	5	10	31	**28**	3	7	13	5	2	14	**7**	86	84	78	27	36	94	**67**
Shadwell	59	29	76	3	6	28	**34**	17	16	35	18	3	69	**26**	90	85	78	44	100	100	**83**
Spitalfields and Banglatown	62	17	76	3	14	17	**32**	14	26	26	17	4	36	**20**	91	83	80	72	68	100	**82**
Weavers	65	27	74	6	6	4	**30**	13	16	31	5	4	24	**15**	85	78	70	26	100	93	**75**
Whitechapel	61	24	80	6	9	24	**34**	20	20	40	17	18	55	**28**	93	88	77	43	76	100	**79**

Waltham Forest

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Cann Hall	58	29	73	2	0	6	**28**	6	14	15	10	6	24	**13**	90	82	72	33	87	99	**77**
Cathall	44	27	79	0	0	8	**27**	6	12	10	10	5	15	**10**	87	80	68	51	97	100	**80**
Chapel End	28	34	50	0	1	4	**19**	3	4	4	9	6	11	**6**	85	76	61	16	66	44	**58**
Chingford Green	10	67	54	0	1	6	**23**	1	1	1	3	1	6	**2**	86	71	75	48	53	26	**60**
Endlebury	20	56	47	0	0	4	**21**	1	3	3	4	0	6	**3**	92	76	75	30	38	44	**59**
Forest	24	34	56	0	1	8	**20**	4	4	4	3	1	9	**4**	84	83	59	20	79	47	**62**
Grove Green	61	30	51	0	0	4	**24**	5	8	8	12	0	33	**11**	90	83	71	26	75	100	**74**
Hale End and Highams Park	18	39	72	1	0	3	**22**	1	2	3	3	1	8	**3**	81	74	76	34	61	28	**59**
Hatch Lane	17	55	59	0	1	1	**22**	2	3	2	2	0	9	**3**	84	72	53	36	94	28	**61**
High Street	17	33	65	0	1	6	**20**	4	4	3	4	1	10	**4**	86	85	77	22	64	29	**60**
Higham Hill	16	31	85	0	0	6	**23**	3	4	3	4	1	11	**4**	85	85	70	29	60	34	**60**
Hoe Street	46	35	85	0	2	5	**29**	7	10	9	10	13	8	**10**	84	84	75	53	100	49	**74**
Larkswood	20	50	59	0	0	6	**23**	3	3	3	3	3	12	**5**	84	77	67	29	74	36	**61**
Lea Bridge	22	39	70	1	1	23	**26**	3	5	5	5	5	19	**7**	86	76	75	44	71	72	**71**
Leyton	27	32	76	0	1	14	**25**	4	8	8	9	8	27	**11**	90	86	74	82	55	97	**81**
Leytonstone	37	29	54	0	1	9	**22**	7	6	7	8	17	25	**12**	85	78	75	18	100	75	**72**
Markhouse	34	30	81	0	1	4	**25**	5	8	4	7	23	13	**10**	82	83	74	27	63	30	**60**
Valley	21	46	71	0	0	4	**24**	3	5	4	8	3	13	**6**	78	68	71	18	61	56	**58**
William Morris	49	32	85	0	0	8	**29**	5	9	12	13	6	21	**11**	94	85	69	24	100	100	**79**
Wood Street	27	36	76	1	1	6	**24**	4	6	6	6	4	10	**6**	84	84	68	46	82	31	**66**

Wandsworth

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Balham	45	34	27	0	2	8	**19**	3	7	8	8	11	21	**10**	85	85	78	13	57	79	**66**
Bedford	28	30	44	0	1	5	**18**	3	5	4	5	3	6	**4**	87	84	79	11	51	42	**59**
Earlsfield	40	30	39	0	1	8	**20**	3	6	5	5	6	3	**5**	82	81	52	12	50	59	**56**
East Putney	34	50	31	0	2	6	**20**	3	6	7	7	7	46	**12**	87	72	61	14	38	47	**53**
Fairfield	37	29	31	0	4	14	**19**	2	7	7	9	0	21	**8**	89	80	78	15	25	99	**64**
Furzedown	41	44	66	0	1	6	**26**	3	8	6	5	2	8	**5**	79	82	77	30	58	62	**64**
Graveney	55	39	51	0	1	6	**25**	6	9	10	12	3	27	**11**	86	83	78	15	48	67	**63**
Latchmere	52	38	71	10	1	16	**31**	9	20	19	8	26	38	**20**	94	85	80	48	41	100	**75**
Nightingale	41	40	38	0	1	7	**21**	4	9	10	7	4	17	**9**	89	88	78	15	55	86	**68**
Northcote	34	28	37	0	2	4	**17**	2	5	6	7	2	19	**7**	91	79	82	7	31	52	**57**
Queenstown	19	38	57	6	2	19	**23**	2	6	6	7	2	11	**6**	86	82	78	29	18	49	**57**
Roehampton	14	49	60	27	5	20	**29**	2	4	3	3	6	10	**5**	75	61	53	33	81	28	**55**
St. Mary's Park	44	54	64	15	1	26	**34**	6	11	12	10	10	15	**11**	91	84	81	15	32	100	**67**
Shaftesbury	57	32	43	0	2	4	**23**	4	9	10	6	12	31	**12**	90	83	77	10	30	80	**62**
Southfields	37	38	47	3	1	11	**23**	3	7	7	5	7	17	**8**	85	74	73	26	23	65	**58**
Thamesfield	28	42	24	2	2	7	**18**	3	5	5	8	1	31	**9**	86	76	64	7	21	37	**48**
Tooting	36	42	62	1	1	11	**25**	4	10	7	9	7	14	**9**	85	84	75	27	71	95	**73**
Wandsworth Common	20	37	33	1	1	6	**16**	2	6	2	3	11	8	**5**	85	86	79	9	17	27	**50**
West Hill	35	47	47	3	1	4	**23**	3	5	6	3	2	8	**4**	80	64	58	18	60	34	**52**
West Putney	29	56	46	0	1	9	**24**	1	5	4	2	12	6	**5**	77	70	62	21	49	32	**52**

Westminster

Ward Name	Population Density	Aged 65+	Deprivation	High rise	Heritage	Local risks	Combined concerns	1 pump fires	2+ pump fires	1 pump special services	2+ pump special services	Fire casualties	Special service casualties	Combined risks	1st pump attendance	2nd pump attendance	3rd pump attendance	Home fire safety visits	Regulatory inspections	Local inspections	Combined controls
Abbey Road	39	47	30	1	24	2	**24**	2	8	11	6	0	21	**8**	80	82	77	11	75	38	**61**
Bayswater	73	30	51	0	5	1	**27**	6	21	26	19	21	9	**17**	86	88	83	8	100	77	**74**
Bryanston and Dorset Square	61	39	44	3	22	8	**30**	12	16	27	25	15	76	**29**	81	81	72	6	70	78	**65**
Churchill	60	37	82	3	5	4	**32**	6	17	35	10	14	41	**20**	83	79	73	50	49	100	**72**
Church Street	100	41	90	0	1	2	**39**	15	33	46	36	31	41	**34**	85	82	68	41	100	100	**79**
Harrow Road	90	31	75	0	0	1	**33**	3	18	23	17	11	32	**18**	86	86	84	23	100	78	**76**
Hyde Park	47	38	55	12	14	7	**29**	11	19	22	21	29	36	**23**	87	84	71	7	87	100	**73**
Knightsbridge and Belgravia	10	37	30	8	42	20	**24**	1	2	4	3	3	10	**4**	82	76	74	5	42	43	**54**
Lancaster Gate	76	35	64	1	12	5	**32**	20	21	31	21	39	36	**28**	85	83	77	18	100	100	**77**
Little Venice	61	32	83	1	11	2	**32**	5	11	23	13	4	25	**14**	90	86	76	12	100	90	**76**
Maida Vale	59	28	69	4	2	1	**27**	4	12	18	16	4	32	**14**	84	86	77	21	100	52	**70**
Marylebone High Street	40	37	35	2	33	14	**27**	15	16	22	19	3	21	**16**	79	75	75	3	35	81	**58**
Queen's Park	81	35	79	0	2	1	**33**	6	15	26	18	28	12	**17**	86	86	81	20	100	54	**71**
Regent's Park	20	60	60	3	17	9	**28**	3	6	7	6	1	19	**7**	86	88	74	18	37	30	**55**
St. James's	11	38	84	32	97	31	**49**	14	14	16	18	12	34	**18**	88	87	78	27	34	79	**65**
Tachbrook	70	39	62	0	4	2	**30**	10	21	30	27	12	41	**24**	88	87	73	19	100	100	**78**
Vincent Square	56	40	60	5	7	6	**29**	8	19	21	14	16	37	**19**	88	86	78	24	61	89	**71**
Warwick	61	33	43	7	6	5	**26**	20	24	27	31	19	40	**27**	82	84	79	20	87	100	**75**
Westbourne	70	36	99	4	1	4	**36**	8	24	32	21	37	58	**30**	89	90	84	48	100	100	**85**
West End	20	35	48	14	100	20	**40**	21	29	27	23	3	45	**24**	83	81	69	23	31	99	**64**

LFB
LONDON FIRE BRIGADE