

**Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority**

**Performance Review and Scrutiny Committee**

**18 November 2010**

**Evaluation Report of the Home Safety Visit Strategy**

**Report of the Chief Officer**

Contact: Bob Wythe (bob.wythe@hantsfire.gov.uk) Telephone: 07918 887539

**1 Summary**

- 1.1 This evaluation considers the progress of the Home Safety Visit (HSV) strategy that was introduced in April 2009. The focus of the strategy was to deliver 10,000 HSVs to the people most vulnerable from the risk of fire.
- 1.2 The strategy utilised the MOSAIC social demographic profiling tool, local knowledge and information from other agencies to identify those most likely to be at risk from fire in the home.
- 1.3 Risk intelligence data indicates that there has been a 11% reduction in fire deaths and a 16% reduction in fire related casualties between 2008/09 and 2009/10. The picture regarding the number of dwelling fires is more difficult to compare as a new Incident Recording System (IRS) was introduced on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009. Within IRS chimney fires and some incidents which would not previously have been recorded on a Fire Damage Report 1 (FDR1) are now recorded within the dwelling fire category. The data in relation to dwelling fires indicates a 14% increase for the comparable periods.

**2 Introduction and Background**

- 2.1 Prior to April 2009 our HSV strategy was to deliver 20,000 HSVs per annum. To achieve this figure the targeting of the visits was adhoc and we were not always reaching those that were most vulnerable from a fire in the home. The target of 20,000 was supported by Central Government funding, which supplemented the purchase of smoke detectors and staffing.
- 2.2 With the cessation of Government funding and the developments within risk intelligence, the Service Management Team (SMT) approved the strategy to be implemented from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009. This changed the annual target from 20,000 to 10,000 and focussed on those that we believed to be most at risk from fire. The risk intelligence data showed these to be MOSAIC groups F, G and I.

F – People living in social housing with uncertain employment in areas of deprivation.

G – Low income families living in estate based social housing.

I – Older people living in social housing with high care needs.

2.3 Whilst it was recognised that the MOSAIC tool identified a county-wide risk it was acknowledged that these risks are not common across Hampshire. Therefore, in addition to the use of the MOSAIC tool station managers identified vulnerable people using local intelligence and information from partner agencies, for example Social Services, NHS and volunteer carers.

2.4 Number of completed home safety visits for HFRS in F, G and I groups 2009/10:

Social group F – 1,153

Social group G – 911

Social group I – 2,702

Total number of completed HSV = 11,229

### **3 Recommendation**

3.1 The Committee support the current HSV strategy, and its continuation until March 2011, when a further evaluation will be undertaken.

### **4 Objectives of the evaluation**

4.1 To determine the progress of the current HSV strategy on the reduction of fires, deaths and injuries.

### **5 The target population**

5.1 The evaluation of the current HSV strategy has been undertaken by the Community Safety Prevention department and has relied upon the outcome of the work packages placed within Community Risk Intelligence (CRI).

### **6 Supporting our corporate aims and objectives**

- Compare the number of people being injured or killed in dwelling fires between April 2008-2009 and April 2009-2010.
- Compare the number of accidental dwelling fires attended by HFRS between April 2008-2009 and April 2009-2010.
- Cross reference the accidental dwelling fire addresses that HFRS have attended and determine what social group they belong to.

## **7 Methods used to collect data/information**

- CRI reports
- IRS data
- VIEWS data
- Analysis of these reports

## **8 Collect data/information**

- 8.1 Community Risk Intelligence (CRI) were commissioned to undertake an analysis of data held within the Command and Control database and from IRS data.

## **9 People impact assessment**

- 9.1 Completed as part of the HSV strategy and reviewed June 2010 with no emerging issues.

## **10 Key findings of the evaluation**

- 10.1 The number of fatalities as a result of fire in domestic dwellings during 2009/10 reduced by 11% compared to the figures for 2008/09. (9 in 2008 compared to 8 in 2009)
- 10.2 The number of casualties as a result of fire in domestic dwellings during 2009/10 reduced by 16% compared to the figures for 2008/09. (194 in 2008 compared to 163 in 2009)
- 10.3 Accidental fires in dwellings increased by 14% for 2009/10 when compared to 2008/09. However this increase has to be considered against the introduction of the new IRS. In this system recording practices have been updated to include chimney fires and instances of fire which would not have resulted in a Fire Damage Report 1 (FDR1) previously.
- 10.4 The largest increase in accidental dwelling fires were those in MOSAIC groups A and B both with a 13% increase. The increases in these groups can be attributed to the change in recording practice detailed above.

Group A – Career professionals living in sought after locations

Group B – Younger families living in newer homes.

## **11 Evaluation conclusions**

- 11.1 There has been a reduction in the number of fire deaths and fire related injuries,

however with the introduction of the IRS system in April 2009 it has been difficult to determine what effect the strategy has had on dwelling fires. The report from CRI identifies a number of areas that would have affected the recording of the total number of dwelling fires.

- 11.2 For the period 2008/09 target groups F, G and I were not the MOSAIC groups that suffered the greatest proportion of dwelling fires. The data showed MOSAIC groups A and B were the largest groups for dwelling fires. However the change in IRS would account for some of this increase. In addition, our understanding of vulnerable groups challenges the indication that Mosaic groups A and B are the most vulnerable in terms of fires where there is greatest risk of death and injury. Therefore we will continue to consider those in Mosaic groups F, G and I as our target audience for home safety visits for a further year.
- 11.3 The continuing development of CRI, and a new base line to make data comparisons against, will allow a more informed evaluation to take place in March 2011.

## **12 Background papers**

The following documents disclose the facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and has been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report:

SMT report 23 January 2009 – *Review of Home Safety Strategy*  
CRI commissioned work request 10/103 – *Home Safety Visits and Smoke Alarms*

Note: This list excludes: (1) published works; and (2) documents that disclose exempt or confidential information defined in the Act.