



PROJECT	REPORT DATE	BY	REFERENCE
5029228 – Enfield Council	16 th July 2025	SCS	5029228-RP-0002

TITLE
LPS Blocks Executive Summary Report

Client Brief

This document has been produced to provide an executive summary of the information provided to date relating to the blocks Cheshire House and Shropshire House, in Enfield, known locally as ‘The Shires’. The document is intended to summarise the conclusions of these reports, to clarify the risks associated with the building.

This report, while a summary of existing information, should be read in conjunction with all previous reports to provide a comprehensive overview, including:

- 5015019-RDG-XX-XX-DOC-S-9901 (LPS Structural Robustness Assessment Report) [January 2023]
- 5015019-RDG-XX-XX-DOC-S-9905 (Shropshire and Cheshire House Risk Management) [November 2022]
- 5020174-RDG-XX-XX-DOC-S-9910 (Shropshire and Cheshire House Risk Management) [February 2023]

Surveys Conducted

In 2022, the buildings underwent initial intrusive investigations to assess the construction of the block. This inspection, and subsequent analysis and assessments found that the buildings were inadequately constructed to resist disproportionate collapse in the instance of an accidental loading event. Following this inspection, recommendations were made to reduce the risk, including the removal of piped gas from the buildings and risk mitigation measures to prevent bottled gas and other items which pose a high risk to the building. A subsequent risk management report was recommended and completed, proposing various options to reduce the risk and strengthen the structure.

In 2025, a reinspection was completed to identify if any newly developed defects had occurred, which may have reduced the expected remaining life of the building. There were no newly developed defects identified during this inspection which would significantly impact the remaining life of the building; however, the existing risks identified within the initial investigations remained.

Client Action

Since the initial inspection and subsequent recommendations, the client has been actively decanting the blocks, and as of Thursday 10th July a total of 9 No. units remain occupied across the two blocks (2 No. in Shropshire House, 7 No. in Cheshire House). This process has been completed alongside the implementation of a waking watch, providing security at the entrance of the building, to prevent prohibited items from entering the building, a recommendation made within the original reports, listed above.

Understanding the Risks

While a reduction in building occupancy represents a reduction in risk, based on the occupied units, the partially occupied building does also have an increased risk from some sources due to the partially occupied status of the block. For example, the low occupancy could result in a fire becoming more established before being identified, consequently increasing the likelihood that the fire leads to structural failure. LPS buildings are known to have inherent weaknesses in fire conditions and as such this represents a risk of disproportionate collapse.

There is also considered to be an increased risk of non-residents accessing the building. This category of occupancy would not have been party to resident engagement and as such would be uneducated to the risks present in the building.

Conclusion

While the most recent reinspection identified no newly developed defects which pose a new, or increased, risk to the building, the insufficiencies identified within the original inspection remain. The building remains deficient and prone to disproportionate collapse and therefore poses risk to the occupants and wider general public. The risk of collapse remains and should be addressed for the safety of both the remaining residents and the wider general public.

It should be noted that as an independent consultant to the client advising on the blocks, in our role, we will not pass comment on whether the risks posed are acceptable, or the costs associated with recommended works. The risks outlined within this and the associated previous reports are carried by the client in their role as the duty holder. Each organisation will have differing views on the acceptability of risk levels, and being an independent body, Ridge believe it would be inappropriate to comment upon what Enfield should consider acceptable.

It is assumed that the client has already considered that the costs of strengthening were not acceptable given that the option to decant with a view to demolish has been pursued. It should however be considered by the client if the ongoing costs associated with maintaining the building in its current state is sustainable given the current occupancy level.

Should the decanting process be prolonged for number of years, it is considered that the building may deteriorate, which could pose additional risks. If the decanting process is delayed further, it is recommended to complete a reinspection within 4 years to enable any developing risks to be identified.