Persimmon | Health, Safety & Environment Department

CONSTRUCTION SITE INSPECTION HELPCARD

Persimmon
Together, we make your home

Contents

Contents

Scoring criteria

4 SCORE

GROUP HS&E POLICY HAS BEEN FULLY MET

Meets the requirements of the Health & Safety Management System (HSMS), Policy and legal requirements

3 SCORE

MINOR NON-CONFORMITY WITH GROUP HS&E POLICY AND LIMITED IMPROVEMENT NEEDED

- Evidence of a risk but unlikely to result in personal injury
- Evidence of a risk but unlikely to result in an environmental minor incident
- Evidence of minor mistakes on supporting paperwork

1 SCORE

NON-CONFORMITY WITH GROUP HS&E POLICY AND WITH IMMEDIATE IMPROVEMENT NEEDED:

- Evidence of a risk of personal injury
- Evidence of a risk of environmental minor incident
- Evidence of significant mistakes on supporting paperwork

0 SCORE

MAJOR NON-CONFORMITY WITH GROUP HS&E POLICY AND IMMEDIATE IMPROVEMENT NEEDED:

- Evidence of a risk of imminent serious personal injury
- Evidence of a risk of imminent significant or major environmental incident
- Evidence that no supporting paperwork could be found or significantly out of date

I.e. if the HSE or Environmental Regulatory Authority observed the contravention they would issue a notice or commence a prosecution.

RECORD

- For 4 scores any examples of good practice, where applicable
- For 3, 1 and 0 scores the reason for the score with evidence (supporting photographs where possible)
- Any tasks with deadline for completion, if no deadline entered an automatic 7 days will be set
- If a 0 score issued the applicable work activity must be stopped until it has been made safe.
- This helpcard must be read in conjunction with HS&E Polices and Standards.

The Group HS&E Advisor may upgrade the score i.e. from 3 to 1 or 1 to 0 etc. if the issue has been noted on previous inspections and has not been rectified.

KPI 2

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

KPI 1.1 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: MANUAL HANDLING

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are Operatives struggling to move material by hand?
- ✓ Are there other means of moving materials such as wheel barrows/ brick tongs to alleviate the need to move materials by hand?
- ✓ Where a significant manual handling operation is being undertaken, i.e. lifting of garage doors etc. then check applicable RAMS/ manual handling assessments

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- FLT being used to transfer bulk materials to plots or place of unloading in order to minimise manual handling
- When possible bulk materials i.e. plasterboard/shower pods etc. moved to upper floors by mechanical means
- Workforce on site observed using good manual handling techniques in accordance with their RAMS
- General lifting of materials is being undertaken in a controlled manner
- Where necessary additional loading bays provided to minimise movement of materials around the scaffold
- Completion of the buyers/suppliers guide to include material weights
- Weights of materials available on site and this has been communicated to workforce
- Operatives made aware of risks via regular manual handling tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of manual handling
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of manual handling
- Where applicable other relevant task specific risk assessments deal with the hazard of manual handling
- Where applicable training records on site in relation to manual handling

KPI 1.1 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: MANUAL HANDLING

3 Score

- Manual handling equipment available on site but not being used
- Weights of materials not available on site and/ or not communicated to the workforce
- Minor mistakes with manual handling paperwork, i.e. RAMS has not been signed off by the relevant operative(s)

1 Score

- Mechanical lifting aids available on site but are not being used where required
- Poor manual handling techniques being used by operatives on site which could lead to an injury
- Insufficient number of loading bays available on site
- Scaffold obstructing access and egress to plots
- Step up from the ground to the threshold too high
- Major mistakes with manual handling paperwork, i.e. manual handling risk assessment required and has not been completed

0 Score

- Manual handling taking place which could cause significant personal injury to the operative undertaking it (i.e. excessively heavy or awkward loads unassisted)
- No mechanical lifting aids available on site which increases the risks of manual handling being undertaken without a safe system of work
- Systemic problem with manual handling paperwork i.e. no manual handling assessments available on site or significantly out of date showing that assessments not being undertaken

KPI 1.2 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: HAND ARM VIBRATION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Check there is a system in place to record vibration exposure levels?
- ✓ Are operatives aware of the permitted trigger time for the vibrating tool they are using?
- ✓ Check for maintenance regime for the vibrating tools
- ✓ Check that the hazard of vibration is covered in relevant RAMS

Vibration would be operatives using tools likely to exceed the Exposure Action Value / Exposure Limit Value

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Operatives have a thorough understanding of the risk assessment/method statement and the maximum duration they can use a particular vibration equipment
- For operatives that use multiple vibration equipment daily, a system in place to calculate daily exposure to ensure the operative remains under the EAV Use of correct PPE , i.e. HAVI monitors
- Specific site induction training on vibration for operatives that routinely use vibration tools
- Specific equipment vibration risk assessments
- Appropriate operatives made aware of risks via regular vibration tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of vibration where appropriate
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of vibration
- Where applicable other relevant task specific risk assessments deal with the hazard of vibration
- Training records on site in relation to vibration where applicable
- Anyone exposed to vibration must have a fully completed record sheet of their exposure

KPI 1.2 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: HAND ARM VIBRATION

3 Score

- Operatives using damaged equipment which could lead to a higher level of exposure vibration
- Regular vibration tool box talks not being completed
- Minor mistakes with vibration paperwork, i.e. a few missing vibration record sheets or operatives not signing risk assessments

1 Score

- Operatives using vibration equipment without vibration having been assessed
- Operatives using vibration equipment that has not been maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's guidance
- Operatives using vibration equipment without being inducted or trained
- Operatives using multiple vibration equipment without a safe system of work to calculate daily exposure Operatives not wearing PPE
- Major mistakes with vibration paperwork, i.e. risk assessments not completed

0 Score

- Operatives using vibration equipment without vibration having been assessed
- Equipment in poor condition with no evidence of any maintenance
- Operatives not following risk assessment/ method statement
- Systemic problems with vibration paperwork, i.e. no vibration assessments available on site or significantly out of date showing that assessments not being undertaken

KPI 1.3 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: RESPIRATORY PROTECTION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are operatives wearing FFP 3 masks/ full face powered positive pressure respirator where required?
- ✓ Are FFP 3 masks/ respirator in a good state of repair?
- ✓ Can you see excessive dust on the floor?
- ✓ Are LEV's being used where required?
- ✓ If petrol saws are being used, is there a plume of dust?
- ✓ Where required is the water suppression fitted or being used?
- ✓ Check that the hazard of construction dust is covered in relevant RAMS

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- M Class LEV for wood dust etc.
- L Class LEV for plasterboard etc.
- LEV devices tested/ inspected annually
- Operatives using FFP3 masks when producing dust
- If an operative is wearing a beard or facial stubble a full face powered positive pressure respirator is being worn
- Pre-cut materials i.e. tiles, bricks supplied to site where possible
- Appropriate measures for cleaning of dust (vacuum not sweep wherever possible)
- Water suppression available and in use on site when sweeping
- Road sweeper or towed sprinkler system in use to suppress nuisance road dust
- One full face powered positive pressure respirator on site
- In date face fit certificate for every operative required to wear an FFP3 mask (annually)
- COSHH assessments for dust, silica, MDF etc.
- Operatives made aware of risks via regular construction dust tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of construction dust
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of construction dust
- Other relevant task specific risk assessments where applicable deals with the hazard of construction dust

KPI 1.3 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: RESPIRATORY PROTECTION

3 Score

- Operatives using dirty RPE
- Materials supplied to site but could have been pre-cut
- Regular dust tool box talks not being completed
- Minor mistakes with dust paperwork, i.e. face fit certificates been completed but not on site

1 Score

- LEV devices tested/ inspected but no records to evidence annually
- Nuisance dust present on site and road sweeper/ towed sprinkler system not used
- Operatives encroaching into the cutting zone, not wearing RPE
- Major mistakes with dust paperwork, i.e. risk assessments not completed
- Excessive evidence of dust in plots, which indicates LEV not being used
- Operatives sweeping when could have used a vacuum

0 Score

- RPE not being used or is not fit for purpose, i.e. operative not clean shaven/ wearing a beard
- Water suppression equipment not being used when sweeping
- LEV systems not being used or of the right class
- Face fit test not been carried out
- Systemic problem with dust paperwork, i.e. no dust risk assessments available on site or significantly out of date showing that assessments not being undertaken

KPI 1.4 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: SKIN PROTECTION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are Operatives wearing the correct gloves/ RPE when using COSHH materials?
- ✓ Check that the hazard of working with COSHH materials is covered in relevant RAMS

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- All operatives using correct PPE/ gloves where required
- Welfare facilities adequate for washing / drying – warm water and adequate sized sinks
- 3 stage DEB system installed with barrier cream supplied
- Products in use are within the use by date
- Gloves made available on site for directly employed personnel
- Sun screen made available on site
- COSHH assessments for hazardous substances
- Operatives made aware of risks via regular tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause skin damage
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause skin damage
- Other relevant task specific risk assessments where applicable deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause skin damage

KPI 1.4 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: SKIN PROTECTION

3 Score

- 3 stage DEB system available but refills not readily available

1 Score

- Gloves not available on site should they be required
- Relevant COSHH assessments not supported with manufacturer's data sheet

0 Score

- No 3 stage DEB system available
- PPE/ gloves not being worn where required
- Relevant COSHH assessments have not been completed

KPI 1.5 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: EYE PROTECTION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are operatives wearing appropriate eye protection for the task in hand?
- ✓ Check operatives are not using fashion style sunglasses as eye protection
- ✓ Check that the hazard of COSSHH materials/ activities that could cause eye damage is covered in relevant RAMS

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Correctly assessed eye protection has been provided and worn for the tasks undertaken
- Eye wash available
- The work area has been segregated to prevent other operatives from being struck by flying particles/ sparks, i.e. use of signage or screens
- Eye protection made available on site for directly employed personnel
- COSHH assessments for relevant hazardous substances
- Operatives made aware of risks via regular tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause eye damage
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause eye damage
- Other relevant task specific risk assessments where applicable deals with the hazard of substances and activities that could cause eye damage

KPI 1.5 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: EYE PROTECTION

3 Score

- Eye protection has minor damage, i.e. scratched

1 Score

- Eye wash not available
- Eye protection being worn is not correct for the work being carried out
- Others working in the surrounding area who could be affected by flying particles are not wearing the appropriate PPE
- Eye protection not covered in the relevant risk assessment

0 Score

- Eye protection not being worn by operatives where required
- Guards or safety features on appropriate tools and equipment are not in place

KPI 1.6 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: NOISE PROTECTION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are operatives using ear protection whilst using/ working close to tools that produce excessive noise?
- ✓ Check that the hazard of excessive noise is covered in relevant RAMS

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Appropriate noise protection has been provided and worn for the tasks undertaken
- All equipment is maintained in accordance with manufacturer's instructions
- Signage warning of mandatory use of ear protection in place where appropriate
- Appropriate PPE available and being used
- Hearing protection made available on site for directly employed personnel
- Operatives made aware of risks via regular tool box talks
- Contractor RAMS deals with the hazard of activities that could cause ear damage
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable deals with the hazard of activities that could cause ear damage
- Other relevant task specific risk assessments where applicable deals with the hazard of activities that could cause ear damage

KPI 1.6 OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: NOISE PROTECTION

3 Score

- Hearing protection has minor damage, i.e. minor cracks in ear muffs

1 Score

- Hearing protection provided is not correct for the work being carried out
- Operatives working close to the noise source/ task who could be affected by high noise levels and not using ear protection
- Hearing protection not covered in the relevant risk assessment

0 Score

- Operatives using hearing protection that is not in good condition, i.e. fit for purpose
- Operatives not using hearing protection where required
- High noise equipment used in confined working areas without proper noise assessment

KPI 2

WORKING AT HEIGHT

KPI 2.1 WORKING AT HEIGHT: SCAFFOLD

What To Look For?

- ✓ On visual inspection does the scaffold look safe?
- ✓ Check there is no obvious risk of a fall
- ✓ Check scaffolders are clipped on where applicable?
- ✓ Shake access ladders with hand, are they secure?
- ✓ Check scaffold register, has it been completed at handover and every 7 days?
- ✓ Check working at height assessment completed and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check Scaffolder RAMS on site and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check scaffold design/ TG20 compliance sheet on site

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Scaffold design/ TG compliance sheet on site and scaffold accords with the design/ TG compliance sheet
- Scaffold erection being undertaken in line with SG4 arrangements
- Scaffold is located on firm stable base
- Sole boards & base plates in place
- Scaffold boards in good condition and supported every 1.2m by transoms
- Standards plumb
- Suitable ledger and facade bracing
- Scaffold suitably tied or buttressed/raker installed
- Drop distance from internal floor work to external working platform or external working platform to internal floor as low as possible (maximum 900mm)
- Where the maximum 900mm drop distance cannot be achieved then suitable edge/ fall protections must be in place.
- Guardrails, brickguards and toe boards fully fitted
- All loading bay gates fitted with double back bars for edge protection and raising/lowering

KPI 2.1 WORKING AT HEIGHT: SCAFFOLD

4 Score cont.

Good practice would include cont:

- All loading bay gates closed other than during loading/off-loading
- All loading bays have maximum load signage
- Loading bay returns fitted with brickguards and toe boards
- Couplers staggered
- Scaffold incomplete signage displayed and being adhered too; access removed when no scaffolders are in attendance
- All ladder access gates (including table lifts) to be fitted in line with manufacturers/suppliers instruction
- Properly secured ladders (not putlog clips) of suitable length (max. 4.7metres)
- Double halos fitted at the top of ladders
- Ladder lock-off in place where necessary to prevent unauthorised access
- Scaffold platform is suitably adapted and erected for front gables/dormer windows
- Use of low level (max 600mm) trestles is on solid ground/firm flooring and erected correctly
- Additional control measures are in place if the gap between the inner board and plot is greater that 225mm
- The inside standard tube seen to not be protruding and at a minimum of 1 metre above working lift boards or flush with the working platform
- Scaffold installers trained on the product they are installing
- Site management trained to inspect scaffold
- Handover certificate from the scaffold company in place and signed by the site management
- Scaffold register completed by site management on handover and every 7 days
- SG4 Rescue Plan is in place from the Scaffold Company

KPI 2.1 WORKING AT HEIGHT: SCAFFOLD

4 Score cont.

- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Working at Height Assessments on site that have been approved
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working at height
- Young Persons Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working at height
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working at height

3 Score

- Minor housekeeping issues on the scaffold
- Minor mistakes with scaffold paperwork, i.e. scaffold register lacking

KPI 2.1 WORKING AT HEIGHT: SCAFFOLD

1 Score

- Minor gaps observed in working platforms
- Missing some sole boards & base plates
- Standards not plumb/missing bracing ledger and façade
- Scaffold ties missing
- Housekeeping issues on the scaffold that could result in a slip trip or fall
- Brick guards and toe boards missing
- Ladders not of suitable length (must not exceed 4.7m)
- Ladders not fitted correctly nor suitably tied
- Double halos missing
- Loading bay does not match design
- Loading bay left open (not unloading/ loading)
- Maximum load signage not in place
- Ladder access has not been restricted where required
- Minor undermining of scaffold, in the proximity of service excavations
- Scaffold that been struck by plant and remedial work has not been carried out
- Use of low level (max 600mm) trestles is on solid ground/firm flooring but not erected correctly
- Protruding inside standard tube (less than 1 metre or not flush)
- Major mistakes with the scaffold paperwork, i.e. working at height assessment out of date/ scaffold contractor RAMS not readily available

0 Score

- Scaffold design/ TG20 compliance sheet not on site
- Scaffold design/ TG20 compliance sheet on site but scaffold not erected to design
- Working at height assessment does not correspond with the scaffold arrangements on site
- Risk of scaffold collapse, i.e. key components missing
- Scaffold has had unauthorised adaptions
- Insufficient guard rails on scaffold which creates a risk of fall
- Scaffolders not clipping on when required to do
- Major gaps observed in working platform, that could result in an injury
- Non trained scaffolders working on scaffold
- Non trained site management inspecting scaffold
- Scaffold inspection register not completed at handover and every 7 days
- Systemic problem with the scaffold paperwork, i.e. no working at height assessment/ contractor RAMS on site

KPI 2.2 WORKING AT HEIGHT: JOIST & TRUSS INSTALLATION

What To Look For?

- ✓ On visual inspection does the system of work look safe, i.e. bird cage/ safety decking correctly installed?
- ✓ A kicker lift or foot tie is fixed to the bottom of the birdcage standards and set approximately 1500mm above ground or a bespoke design.
- ✓ Check there is no obvious risk of a fall, i.e. stairwell sufficiently protected?
- ✓ Check scaffold/decking/ SLB register, has it been completed at handover and every 7 days?
- ✓ Check working at height assessment completed and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check relevant contractor RAMS on site and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ For decking, check manufacturers installation guide on site
- ✓ For bird cage, check scaffold design/ TG20 compliance sheet on site

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Safe access and egress to work area, suitable external working platform
- Drop distance from joist top to external working platform as low as possible(maximum 900mm)
- Fall prevention/protection (safety decking system/ bird cage scaffold) in place to all property types, including garages and porches, correctly installed and in good condition
- In limited circumstanced where soft landing bags used they are of the same type/make and are installed correctly, i.e. clipped wall to wall and free from debris
- Stairwell sufficiently boarded and the covering sufficiently supported i.e. sacrificial joists or proprietary stairwell protection cover in place
- Safety decking system/bird cage scaffold installed correctly Safety decking/ scaffold register/ SLB register completed by site management on handover and every 7 days
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Working at Height Assessments are on site and have been approved
- Approved Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working at height
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working from height
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working from height
- Safety decking/ scaffold installers trained on the product they are installing
- Site management trained to inspect safety decking/ scaffold
- Safety decking manufacturer's installation guide on site

KPI 2.2 WORKING AT HEIGHT: JOIST & TRUSS INSTALLATION

3 Score

- Minor damage to safety decking/ scaffold that would not cause injury
- Minor mistakes with safety decking/ scaffold paperwork, i.e. registers lacking detail

1 Score

- Safety decking system/bird cage scaffold not installed correctly but no risk of collapse
- Birdcage scaffold not fixed with kicker lift/ foot tie or bespoke design
- Where soft landing bags used, gaps in the bags, not clipped together or debris on the bags
- Major mistakes with the safety decking/ scaffold paperwork, i.e. working at height assessment out of date/ contractor RAMS not readily available

0 Score

- Operatives can access working platforms when fall prevention/ protection is not in place internally
- Fall prevention/protection equipment not installed correctly, damaged, in poor condition or tampered with which could result in the risk of collapse
- Stairwell not boarded/covered and is not sufficiently supported
- Non trained safety decking installers/ scaffolders working on safety decking/ scaffold
- Non trained site management inspecting safety decking/ scaffold
- Safety decking/ scaffold inspection register not completed at handover and every 7 days
- Systemic problem with the safety decking/ scaffold paperwork i.e. no working at height assessments or contactor RAMS

KPI 2.3 WORKING AT HEIGHT: ROOFWORK

What To Look For?

- ✓ Check the step up to the roof is no greater than 450mm?
- ✓ Check internal fall protection in place when the roofers are felting battening and loading out the roof tiles
- ✓ Check no gable edge protection missing
- ✓ Check scaffold/ decking register, has it been completed at handover and every 7 days?
- ✓ Check working at height assessment completed and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check relevant contractor RAMS on site and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ For decking, check manufacturers installation guide on site
- ✓ For bird cage, check scaffold design on site

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- The final lift has been adapted to allow access for roof and work to eaves and soffits (max 450mm) Provision of suitable gable edge protection is in place
- Front gable/dormer window roof edge protection is in place
- Table lift gives adequate edge protection to the gable and ridge
- Suitable and sufficient tie arrangements
- Working platforms clear of debris and materials
- Brickguards in place
- Waste chutes are in use where applicable
- All cuts to tiles/slates are being conducted safely on the work platform and not on the roof
- Roofers working behind edge protection
- Internal Fall protection is in place where required, safety decking/ bird cage in place whilst being felt, battened and loaded out
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Scaffold/ safety decking registers completed
- Working at Height Assessments which deal with the hazard of working from height
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working at height
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working from height
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working from height

KPI 2.3 WORKING AT HEIGHT: ROOFWORK

3 Score

- Edge protection to the roof is poorly installed but would not result in a fall
- The handrail height requires adaption in relation to the pitch and ridge of the roof but would not result in a fall
- Minor mistakes with safety decking/ scaffold/ roofers paperwork, i.e. registers lacking detail

1 Score

- Step up more than 450mm but less than 500mm
- Cuts to tiles/ slates are being conducted on the roof, rather than on the work platform
- Major mistakes with safety decking/ scaffold/ roofers paperwork, i.e. working at height assessment out of date/ contractor RAMS not readily available.

0 Score

- Step up more than 500mm
- No edge protection to the roof, with operatives working on the roof
- No table lifts at gable and ridge exposed
- No safety decking/ bird cage is in place whilst roof is being felt, battened and loaded out
- Non trained safety decking installers/ scaffolders/ roofers working on safety decking/ scaffold
- Non trained site management inspecting safety decking/ scaffold
- Safety decking/ scaffold inspection register not completed at handover and every 7 days
- Systemic problem with the safety decking/ scaffold/ roofers paperwork i.e. no working at height assessments or contactor RAMS

KPI 2.4 WORKING AT HEIGHT: STAIRWELLS

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are oxford type landing systems available on site and being used?
- ✓ Are operatives working off a scaffold board and ladder i.e. ladders inside of the plot?
- ✓ Check all edge protection in place
- ✓ Check that carpenters fit the stairwell edge protection before they open up the stairwell aperture
- ✓ Check stairwell protection register, has it been completed at handover and every 7 days?
- ✓ Check working at height assessment completed and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check relevant contractor RAMS on site and can see no obvious omissions or errors

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Party wall scaffold is in place Joiners, Plasterers and Decorators operating from proprietary stairwell working platform systems (such as Oxford landing system)
- Proprietary post and rails system is installed on upper floors handrails are fitted, posts screwed down until the permanent edge protection is in place
- Suitable temporary access in place until staircase fitted such as a hatch and secured/tied ladder
- Suitable temporary lighting in stairwells on apartments as required
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Stairwell protection register completed on handover and every 7 days
- Working at Height Assessments which deal with the hazard of working from height (stairwells)
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working at height (stairwells)
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working from height (stairwells)
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working from height (stairwells)

KPI 2.4 WORKING AT HEIGHT: STAIRWELLS

3 Score

- Poorly erected propriety stairwell working platform system but no risk of a person falling
- Poorly installed party wall scaffold but no risk of a person falling or fall of materials
- Minor mistakes with stairwell protection register, i.e. registers lacking detail

1 Score

- Unsuitable means of stairwell support (sacrificial joists, props not installed correctly etc.)
- Proprietary post and rails system installed on upper floors handrails have been removed and not replaced
- Poor lighting in stairwells
- Major mistakes with the stairwell protection paperwork, i.e. working at height assessment out of date/ contractor RAMS not readily available

0 Score

- Operative working above an unprotected stairwell
- No party wall scaffold where required
- No proprietary post and rails system installed no newel posts and balustrades fitted
- Joiner, Plasterers and Decorators working from a ladder/plank/no evidence of proprietary stairwell working platform system
- Unsafe system of access to the upper floors
- Stairwell protection register not completed at handover and every 7 days
- Systemic problem with stairwell protection paperwork i.e. no working at height assessments or contactor RAMS

KPI 2.5 WORKING AT HEIGHT: LADDERS

What To Look For?

- ✓ Ladders not being footed or fitted with a stabiliser
- ✓ Ladders are being used above the first floor without a risk assessment in place
- ✓ The task being carried out is clearly not a short duration task
- ✓ The ladder being used is not suitable for the task
- ✓ The ladder has clearly not been maintained and is in a dangerous condition
- ✓ Operatives using ladders whilst not maintaining 3 points of contact, i.e. carrying tools
- ✓ Check relevant contractor RAMS on site and can see no obvious omissions or errors
- ✓ Check that the hazard of ladder use is covered in relevant RAMS

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Ladders are established as the most suitable means of working at height by written risk assessment, i.e. access and egress / short duration tasks
- Ladders are located on a firm and level surface
- Ladders if in use are fit for purpose, i.e. stabiliser systems or are footed/tied
- Industrial grade ladders being used
- Operatives are not overreaching when using ladders
- When leaning ladders are used they are set at an angle of 75° or the 1:4 method is employed to prevent them from slipping
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Working at Height Assessments which deal with the hazard of working from height
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working at height
- Young Persons Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working from height
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working from height

KPI 2.5 WORKING AT HEIGHT: LADDERS

3 Score

- More appropriate means of completing the task at height, for example a mobile tower
- Minor defects with the ladder but no risk of injury

1 Score

- Non industrial ladders are being used
- Ladder work has been appropriately assessed but no written risk assessment in place
- Ladders being used above the first floor and no additional risk assessment in place

0 Score

- Major defects with the ladder and a risk of a person falling
- Ladders are not footed or not fitted with anti-slip
- Operative over reaching on ladders
- Unsafe act on a ladder (not maintaining three points of contact)
- Not a suitable sized ladder for the task
- Ladder work has not been appropriately assessed and no written risk assessment in place

KPI 3

EXCAVATIONS/ CONFINED SPACES

KPI 3 EXCAVATIONS/ CONFINED SPACES

What To Look For?

- ✓ Operatives working in unprotected excavations
- ✓ Gaps in the edge protection around the excavation
- ✓ No Permit to Dig in place, or operatives not complying with Permit to Dig

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- No risk of a trench collapse
- No risk of materials falling onto people working in the excavation
- No risk of people or vehicles falling into the excavation
- No risk of mechanical plant coming near or in contact with underground services
- No risk of operatives being overcome by dangerous fumes or vapours
- No risk of workers coming into contact with groundwater
- Gas monitors being used where applicable
- Excavation fully enclosed and fenced off when not in use
- Excavation signage displayed
- Operatives wearing flame-retardant coveralls when required to do so
- Permit to dig in place
- Use of the Deep Excavation Checklist
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Excavations inspection register completed every 7 days
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of working in and around excavations
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of working in and around excavations
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of working in and around excavations

KPI 3 EXCAVATIONS/ CONFINED SPACES

3 Score

- Minor mistakes with excavations paperwork, i.e. register lacking detail

1 Score

- Access/egress to the excavation in place but not appropriate
- Ladder access to excavation not tied appropriately
- Edge protection in place but inadequate, i.e. does not fully enclose the excavation
- Fencing too close to the excavation (back at least 1 metre)
- Signage in place but not clear or more required
- Major mistakes with the excavations paperwork, i.e. groundworkers RAMS not readily available or excavation inspection register not completed

0 Score

- Risk of a trench collapse
- Risk of materials falling onto people working in the excavation
- Risk of people or vehicles falling into the excavation
- Risk of mechanical plant coming near or in contact underground services
- No safe access/egress and risk of a person falling
- Excavation not fully enclosed
- Members of the public exposed to open excavations
- Gas monitors not being used where applicable
- Systemic problem with the excavation paperwork, i.e. no groundworkers RAMS, no permit to dig in place

KPI 4

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

KPI 4 PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ On visual inspection does the machine/equipment look like it is in a good state of repair?
- ✓ Is the machine/equipment being operated in a safe manner
- ✓ Are reversing cameras, seatbelt/ hazard warnings fitted and being used?
- ✓ Are mirrors present and correctly adjusted?
- ✓ Are Telehandler daily/ weekly checklists completed?
- ✓ Where appropriate, is there guarding present on equipment?
- ✓ Check machine drivers, competent to operate the machine they are using (CPCS/ NPORS)

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- All plant/machinery to be in good condition and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions
- All operatives to be competent and certified to operate relevant plant/machine
- All round vision (including reversing cameras where appropriate) is fitted and adjusted correctly
- All mirrors are in good order
- Warning beacons operating correctly (seatbelt and hazard lights)
- All reversing lights/alarms are working
- Keys are not left in machines or engines left running and unattended
- Seat belts worn by all ride on plant operatives
- The correct PPE for operating the relevant plant is being used, including ear-defenders and eye protection
- All moving parts of machines must be suitably guarded

KPI 4 PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

4 Score cont.

Good practice would include cont.:

- Operatives dismounting plant whilst being loaded (ride on dumpers)
- Young persons are suitably supervised when using high risk equipment i.e. circular saws etc.
- 110v electricity supply is being used where appropriate
- All extension leads are suitably protected and in good condition
- All Machine Drivers holds a nationally recognised training card (CPCS/ NPORS) and a full UK driving licence
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Daily/ Weekly Telehandler/ Plant Checklists completed
- In-date Thorough Examination Certificates for any machines that are capable of lifting
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of using plant and equipment
- Young Person Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of using plant and equipment
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of using plant and equipment

KPI 4 PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

3 Score

- Machine mirrors with minor cracks/ scratches
- Ride on Plant operator observed smoking in the machine
- Minor mistakes with mobile plant/ machinery paperwork, i.e. daily/ weekly checklist lacking detail

1 Score

- Seatbelt green beacon not fitted or working
- Rear view camera not fitted or working
- All-round vision is fitted but not suitably adjusted
- Seat belts not being worn by operatives
- Reversing lights/alarms are not working/in need of repair
- Machinery guarding is insufficient/inadequate
- Extension leads have significant damage
- Major mistakes with plant and equipment paperwork, i.e. Telehandler/ Mobile Plant daily/ weekly checklists out of date / RAMS not readily available

0 Score

- Operatives cannot produce certification of competency to operate equipment
- Operative not dismounting machines while being loaded (dumpers)
- Operatives are not trained to operate relevant plant or equipment
- No all round vision on ride on plant
- No reversing lights/alarms on ride on plant
- Operatives observed driving plant in an unsafe manner
- No guards fitted to machinery where appropriate
- Young persons are not suitably supervised when using high risk equipment i.e. circular saws etc.
- Keys left unattended in machines
- Operator using mobile phone while driving/machine running
- Systemic problem with plant and equipment paperwork, i.e. no Telehandler/ Mobile Plant daily checklist available/ risk not covered in appropriate RAMS

KPI 5

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

KPI 5 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ Risk of collision between a person and machine, do you feel safe walking around site?
- ✓ Lack of vehicle control near pedestrians, i.e. plant reversing/ load obstructing vision without a banksman or pedestrian barriers
- ✓ Vehicles speeding
- ✓ Enough pedestrian walkways, which are maintained and free from obstructions
- ✓ TMP not present on site/ does not match the arrangements on site
- ✓ Check a traffic management assessment completed

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Good practice would include:
- Traffic Management Assessment completed
- Traffic Management Plan is current and displayed in site office and canteen
- Site entrance signage clearly indicates speed limits
- Suitable and sufficient pedestrian and vehicle segregation i.e. adequate barriers/ pedestrian only zones
- Pedestrian walkways are maintained and free from obstructions
- Appropriate controls are in place for reversing vehicles/ load obstructing vision
- Roads are kept clear of mud and obstructions Where necessary, haul roads have been installed to provide one-way systems
- Appropriate car parking is available
- Appropriate speed restrictions and signage in place
- Suitable loading/unloading arrangements in place
- Appropriate material storage areas in place
- Any risks to members of the public are controlled and managed and detailed on the TMP, i.e. public rights of way
- Traffic Management Assessment has been completed and is up to date
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Contract Managers periodically review traffic management arrangements
- Regular Traffic Management Tool Box Talks
- Consortium Meetings being undertaken where applicable and recorded

KPI 5 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

3 Score

- Minor issues observed on pedestrian walkways, i.e. minor trip hazards and uneven ground
- Minor mistakes with traffic management paperwork, i.e. TMP/ assessment lacking in detail

1 Score

- Operatives not using pedestrian walkways and observed in traffic routes
- Pedestrian and vehicle segregation is in place but requires immediate improvement, i.e. more barriers and/ or pedestrian walkways required
- Materials on the pedestrian walkways are forcing operatives onto the road
- Vehicle movement without sufficient controls in place but pedestrians unlikely to be at risk
- Significant mud/ debris on the roads
- Insufficient speed restrictions and signage not displayed
- Risk of injury to members of the public through inadequate traffic management arrangements
- Major issues with traffic management paperwork, i.e. TMP/ assessment is out of date

0 Score

- There is no pedestrian/vehicle segregation in place
- Vehicle movement without sufficient controls in place and pedestrians likely to be at risk
- Drivers not observing the speed limit
- Drivers observed driving whilst using a mobile phone
- No site speed limit set and signage displayed
- Systemic problem with traffic management paperwork, no TMP/ assessment been completed

KPI 6

SUPERVISION, FIRE & EMERGENCY ARRANGEMENTS

KPI 6 SUPERVISION, FIRE & EMERGENCY ARRANGEMENTS

What To Look For?

- ✓ First aid kit available
- ✓ AED is on display and is easily accessible
- ✓ Fire points are readily available and easy to get to
- ✓ Timber frame separating distances are being followed
- ✓ Check fire plan/ assessment completed

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Site management/ authorised site supervisor presence on site
- Emergency arrangements clearly displayed and up to date
- First aid box, eyewash station and AED available
- Sufficient number of trained First Aiders and certificates displayed
- Fire Risk Assessment/ plan completed and on site
- Suitable fire muster point and signage in place
- Suitable fire extinguishers in place and with an in date test (annually)
- Suitable, sufficient and adequate fire alarms in place
- Suitable lighting where necessary is in place
- Timber frame separation distances are being adhered and a drawing that reflects these distances are on site
- Fire emergency directional escape signage displayed in apartment blocks
- Access for emergency vehicles in place
- Gas bottles locked in cage
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Fire drills being completed and recorded
- Fire plan/ assessment completed
- Consortium Meetings being undertaken where applicable and recorded

KPI 6 SUPERVISION, FIRE & EMERGENCY ARRANGEMENTS

3 Score

- Emergency arrangements in place but not clearly displayed
- Emergency lighting is in place but minor improvement needed
- Signage in place but improvement needed
- Minor mistakes with emergency arrangements paperwork, i.e. fire plan/ assessment lacking in detail/ fire drills being undertaken but not recorded sufficiently

1 Score

- Suitable fire muster point and signage in place but not a suitable location
- Fire alarms in place but insufficient for the risk
- Minor breaches of Timber frame separation distances and residents unlikely to be put at risk Fire
- Extinguishers available but test out of date
- No lighting available in apartment blocks
- Major mistakes with emergency arrangements paperwork, fire plan/ assessment not match arrangements on site
- First aid equipment out of date

0 Score

- No site management/ authorised site supervisor on site when work being undertaken
- No trained first aiders on site
- Insufficient arrangements for emergency vehicle access
- No fire drills taking place
- No first aid box, eye wash station and AED readily available
- Insufficient in date fire extinguishers available
- Insufficient fire alarms available
- Major breaches of Timber frame separation distances and residents likely to be put at risk
- No timber frame separation distance drawing on site
- Systemic problem with emergency arrangements paperwork, no fire risk assessment/ plan completed

KPI 7

WELFARE

KPI 7 WELFARE

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are welfare facilities clean and fir for purpose?
- ✓ Are operative having to travel excessive distances to use the toilet?
- ✓ Are separate female/ gender neutral toilets available?
- ✓ Do all facilities have hot/cold running water?
- ✓ Check welfare assessment completed

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- The welfare facilities are suitable, sufficient and adequate for the number of site personnel
- Welfare facilities are readily accessible, i.e. an operative can access within 150 metres of their work area
- Suitable staggered arrangements for canteen use are in place where necessary
- The canteen, drying room and toilets are clean and well maintained
- The toilets have hot/warm running water, 3 stage DEB system in place with barrier creams/soap and towels provided (including satellite facilities)
- Adequate number of sinks with plugs
- A canteen is provided with facilities for sufficient means to heat food and boil water
- Firefighting equipment is provided in the canteen
- If a mobile food canteen is provided a food hygiene certificate is in place
- Electricity testing records for compound/office and welfare facilities (before first use and every 3 months)
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Consortium Meetings being undertaken Minutes where applicable and record kept

KPI 7 WELFARE

3 Score

- Welfare facilities sufficient but improvement needed, i.e. tidied up and surfaces wiped
- Stocks of barrier creams/ soaps and towels etc. running low
- A few operatives cannot access toilet facilities within 150 metres of their work area
- Minor mistakes with welfare paperwork, i.e. welfare assessment in place but lacking detail

1 Score

- The canteen/ drying room/ toilets require thorough cleaning
- The majority of operatives cannot access toilet facilities with 150 metres of their work area
- No separate designated lockable toilet for mixed use/ female only
- Toilets have hot/warm running water but there is no barrier creams/soap or towels provided
- Insufficient number of sinks with plugs
- No means of heating food or boiling water in the canteen
- Firefighting equipment is not available in the canteen
- Damaged/ broken toilet facilities
- Major mistakes with welfare paperwork, i.e. welfare assessment in place but does not reflect arrangements on site

0 Score

- No canteen or drying room available for use on site
- Toilet facilities are not adequate for the number of people on site
- No hot/warm running water in toilet facilities (main compound and satellite facilities)
- No barrier creams/soap and towels provided
- Systemic problem with welfare paperwork, welfare assessment has not been completed

KPI 8

SITE SECURITY/ PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC

KPI 8 SITE SECURITY/ PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC

What To Look For?

- ✓ Is there an obvious risk to members of the public?
- ✓ Could a member of the public easily gain access to site?
- ✓ Are there sufficient warning signs in place around the site perimeter?
- ✓ Check a Public Protection/ Site Security assessment has been completed.

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Public Protection/Site Security Assessment in place
- All site boundaries/high risk work activities/materials storage are appropriately securely fenced off
- The fencing is fully double clipped, braced where necessary with the correct base supports in line with manufacturers/ suppliers instructions
- Where necessary fencing is secured to a structure by mechanical means
- Sufficient arrangements to control the access to and from site
- Gate guard in high risk areas, such as close to schools and shops and high volume of construction traffic going through gates
- Occupied/ completed areas free from hazards, i.e. uneven surfaces and damaged fencing
- All raised ironworks have been chamfered and/or where necessary highlighted using paint, signs, cones etc.
- Warning signage are in place around the site perimeter
- Safety concerns line signage on main gates
- Ladder guards are fitted out of hours
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Consortium Meetings taking place where applicable and recorded

KPI 8 SITE SECURITY/ PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC

3 Score

- Warning signage is not suitable and sufficient
- Safety Concerns Line signage not displayed
- Minor mistakes with Site Security/ Public Protection paperwork, i.e. assessment not sufficiently detailed
- Closed gate but no 'close the gate' sign on both sides of the gate

1 Score

- Warning signage is not in place
- Fencing is not secured to a structure by mechanical means
- Fences are significantly damaged which could injure a member of the public
- Open gate in a low risk area with no close supervision (site management/ gate person) to monitor entry/ exit.
- Raised iron works are exposed
- Uneven surfaces in occupied/ completed areas causing slip/ trip/ fall hazards
- Major mistakes with Site Security/ Public Protection paperwork, i.e. assessment in place but does not reflect arrangements on site

0 Score

- Site unprotected with either no fencing or substantial gaps in perimeter fencing
- Site access gates are not secured out of hours
- Fencing is not secured and unauthorised persons could easily access site
- The fence is damaged and unauthorised access could be easily gained through the damaged fence
- No ladder guards in place where appropriate
- Haki type staircases not locked off
- Materials outside in occupied/ completed areas causing slip/trip/fall hazards
- Open gate in a high risk area with no close supervision (site management/ gate person) to monitor entry/ exit.
- Systemic problems with Site Security/ Public Protection paperwork, i.e. assessment not completed

KPI 9

GENERAL SITE HOUSEKEEPING

KPI 9 GENERAL SITE HOUSEKEEPING

What To Look For?

- ✓ Does the site look tidy as you approach it/drive through it?
- ✓ Is there a risk of slips trips and falls due to rubbish/trade waste?
- ✓ Does the site look well managed?

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Pedestrian walkways and working areas are clean, tidy and free from trip hazards
- Waste chutes are fitted to the scaffold lifts
- Waste materials are placed in suitable skips
- Skips are removed/ replaced when full
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Clean-up notice being used where applicable
- Operative H&S Notices issued where appropriate
- The site is well managed

3 Score

- Minor improvement to working area ensure clean, tidy and free from trip hazards

KPI 9 GENERAL SITE HOUSEKEEPING

1 Score

- Significant improvement to working area to ensure clean, tidy and free from trip hazards
- Waste materials are not placed in suitable skips
- Skips are not removed/ replaced when full
- Operative H&S Notice not issued when requested by Group HS&E Advisor

0 Score

- Major improvement required throughout the site to ensure clean, tidy and free from trip hazards
- Materials on pedestrian walkways that could result in a slip, trip of fall

KPI 10

ENVIRONMENTAL

KPI 10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL: ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are relevant risks / habitats / protected species communicated e.g. covered in the induction, TBTs etc.?
- ✓ Are retained habitats / species protected with fencing and signage in place?
- ✓ Are protection measures well maintained and working effectively e.g. newt fencing, tree protection etc.?
- ✓ Are any materials being stored within root protection areas / zones?
- ✓ Are adequate measures in place to protect / prevent access to areas with invasive species e.g. fencing and signage

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Ecology and biodiversity
- All operatives have the required information, instruction and training on relevant ecological risks
- Site Induction covers relevant ecological constraints / risks on site
- Site Managers Checksheet completed
- Ecological surveys completed and recommendations implemented on site
- Project Environmental Plan contains relevant ecological information i.e. EPS licence, surveys etc.
- TBT's carried out relevant to ecological risks / current activities on site
- Tree Protection Plan / information on TPO's available on site
- Works affecting protected habitats and or species well managed
- Tree protection fencing with signage is in place and well maintained i.e. double clipped, secure
- Reptile fencing in place and well maintained
- EPS licence in place and relevant conditions discharged / complied with
- Nesting birds identified and adequate exclusion zone established to prevent unauthorised access
- Ecologist has been onsite to check trees / hedges prior to removal (to confirm absence of nesting birds)
- Works within root protected zones follow the Arboricultural Method Statement e.g. hand digging
- Invasive species identified and adequately segregated to avoid cross contamination
- Protected plants have been adequately protected (and translocated where required)

KPI 10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL: ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

3 Score

- Copy of relevant surveys not held on site / available e.g. badger survey, tree protection plan etc.
- Tool Box Talks have not taken place / records insufficient
- Evidence of small scale damage to exclusion fencing or signage missing
- Improvement required to tree protection e.g. fencing damaged / panel removed etc. but no sign of damage
- Checks are not included on weekly Site Managers Checksheet

1 Score

- Failure to appoint a Suitably Qualified Ecologist / Ecological Clerk of Works to oversee works e.g. prior to hedgerow removal, tree felling etc.
- Further works required to comply with EPS licence (where in place)
- Ongoing failure to deliver relevant Tool Box Talks relevant to project risks
- Failure to protect retained trees / hedgerows – but no sign of damage e.g. roots, branches, trunk
- Materials stored within RPA (root protection area) which are likely to compact soils
- Significant damage to exclusion fencing, requiring immediate repair
- Failure to identify invasive species and segregate work area(s) but no sign of cross-contamination / spread
- Improvement to bio-controls required e.g. risk of spread of invasive species

0 Score

- Damage to tree canopy, tree branches, roots of protected tree / hedgerow etc.
- Breach of TPO (Tree Preservation Order) or TPP (Tree Protection Plan)
- Damage or disturbance to protected species and or habitats
- Evidence of spread of INNS (Invasive Non-Native Species)
- Lack of or poor bio-controls in place to help avoid spread of INNS
- EPS licence not in place (where required)
- Failure to comply with EPS licence condition(s)

KPI 10.2 POLLUTION PREVENTION

What To Look For?

- ✓ Site controls for washing down concrete wagons, vehicles etc. on-site
- ✓ Fuel storage setup and the use of small items of plant (also check for evidence of spills and that spill kits, Enviropads are in use)
- ✓ Mortar silo setup / mixing stations
- ✓ Cleanliness of roads and highways
- ✓ Storage of COSHH items
- ✓ Site accommodation (foul / grey water connections)

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Operational good practice would include:
- Operative induction and training records in relation to appropriate site environmental hazards / controls
- Fuel, oil storage is adequate and well contained with spill kits, Enviropads readily available / in use
- Surface water drains protected and capturing sediment / well maintained
- Site accommodation connected to foul sewer or septic tank (including sinks etc.)
- COSHH stored as to prevent risk of pollution e.g. away from drains, gas in locked cages, adblue stored on bund, small items of plant stored on Enviropad, cement stored in lockable container
- Concrete washout is controlled with adequate containment e.g. no evidence of spills / leaks
- Concrete mixers – controlled with adequate containment e.g. no evidence of spills / leaks
- Cement silos erected on an impermeable, solid base sited at least 10m form the watercourse / surface water drain
- Road sweeper waste tipping area is well maintained and controlled e.g. with lined containment / sealed drainage (no evidence of spills / leaks)
- Adequate wheel washing facilities provided with run-off contained / directed to soakaway

KPI 10.2 POLLUTION PREVENTION

4 Score Cont.

Good practice would include:

- Project Environmental Plan contains relevant pollution control information (see A&I assessment)
- Details of spill response contractor on display
- Incidents and observations have been recorded on relevant form (and communicated to GHSEA)
- Regular monitoring (dust, noise and/or vibration) taking place with records maintained
- TBT's carried out relevant to site conditions / current activities on site
- Site Managers Checksheet completed

3 Score

- Evidence of minor spills / run-off on ground which is localised and has not entered into drainage system / watercourse etc. (e.g. concrete, fuel, mortar, vehicle washing etc.)
- Site controls require improvement to prevent pollution occurring e.g. fuel, concrete washout, road sweeper waste, roads / highways
- Failure to use Enviropads when refuelling and or for storing small items of plant / fuel containers
- Spill kit insufficient e.g. requires re-stock
- Storage of COSHH items requires improvement to prevent risk of pollution
- Septic tank in state of poor repair / overfilling – low level impact
- Evidence of littering on site
- Previous event not reported

KPI 10.2 POLLUTION PREVENTION

1 Score

- Improvements required to site controls as activity poses an immediate risk of minor pollution
- Significant spill or pollution event but contained on site
- Concrete washout / fuel setup / mortar silo sited to close to drain / ditch / watercourse etc. but no evidence of having entered into drainage system
- Significant amount of uncontrolled washout / slurry / run-off on ground but has not entered into drainage system
- No Enviropad and or spill kit provided and evidence of minor pollution
- Small fuel containers not stored on Enviropad or impermeable base when in use with evidence of spillages observed
- COSHH items stored incorrectly and evidence of spillages observed
- Littering and windblown debris evident off site, at boundaries e.g. roads
- No connection to foul or septic tank provided for site accommodation
- Multiple gas bottles not locked in cage

0 Score

- Insufficient or no provision made to contain and control an activity which poses an immediate risk of a major or significant pollution
- Evidence of a pollution event having occurred which has or is likely to lead to a major or significant incident e.g. pollutant entering drainage system, ditch, watercourse etc.
- Significant spill or pollution event has occurred with 3rd party clean-up required
- Road sweeper depositing waste which has arisen off-site

KPI 10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL: EMISSIONS TO LAND & AIR

What To Look For?

- ✓ Has the site completed any pre-start monitoring / surveys to gather baseline data?
- ✓ Is the site liaising with the local community to inform them of the progress of works which may affect them?
- ✓ Has site received any complaints? If so have these been recorded on EMS-FOR-007-Environmental Incident Report?
- ✓ Is the site monitoring for dust, noise and or vibration?
- ✓ Check the site boundary for visible dust / noise – is it likely to cause nuisance?
- ✓ Check the controls site are implementing to minimise risks e.g. damping down, seeding stockpiles, minimising stockpile heights, storing materials away from boundaries etc.
- ✓ Are vehicle movements giving rise to excessive amounts of dust from the site roadways / are they sheeted when leaving site?
- ✓ Are vehicles and plant in good working order and have silencers been fitted?

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Baseline assessments carried our prior to start (dust, noise and/or vibration)
- Site Induction covers relevant risks posed by works activities and controls to be implemented
- Regular TBTs are taking place relevant to site conditions / activities
- Proactive engagement with local community e.g. letter drop has been carried out with nearby residents informing them of upcoming works and timescales
- Adequate controls are being implemented to control dust, noise and or vibration e.g. regular damping down etc.
- Site layout planned so that dust causing activities are located away from any residential areas and occupied properties
- No visible dust observed at site boundary, with effective controls in place
- No audible noise observed at site boundary which is likely to cause nuisance, with effective controls in place
- Dust / noise monitoring equipment is in use to monitor site activities
- Monitoring taking place with actions raised, where necessary
- Plant and equipment well maintained with records kept
- Site Managers Checksheet completed

KPI 10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL: EMISSIONS TO LAND & AIR

3 Score

- Engagement with local community made but inadequate information shared on upcoming activities etc.
- Low-level dust / noise observed on site with improvement to controls required
- Vibration nuisance risk evident from activity which could lead to complaints
- Plant and equipment not well maintained
- Insufficient monitoring records available

1 Score

- No baseline monitoring assessment undertaken / records available
- Failure to adhere to controls set out in Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)
- Failure to action improvements following findings from any monitoring activities highlighting concerns / issues
- Complaint(s) received from local community in respect of nuisance with evidence of poor site controls being implemented
- Significant amount or repeated concerns in respect of nuisance issues, without adequate controls in place
- Ongoing noisy works likely to cause nuisance but no communication informing local community of details
- Evidence of poor site controls being implemented and risk of minor environmental incident
- Significant and or repeated concerns regarding nuisance from site activities
- Insufficient monitoring records available, following earlier request

0 Score

- Evidence of poor site controls being implemented and risk of major or significant environmental incident
- Repeated issues in respect of dust, noise and or vibration which may lead to a major or significant environmental incident
- Complaints and or regulator visits not recorded
- No liaison / communications with the local community, where works pose risk of complaint
- Breach of planning requirements
- No monitoring undertaken / records available, where required

KPI 10.4 ENVIRONMENTAL: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ Are energy efficient cabins / plant in use?
- ✓ Is plant and machinery left idling unnecessarily?
- ✓ Are lights / appliances left on in unoccupied plots?
- ✓ Is the site taking steps to reduce carbon emissions?

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Site setup is connected to mains supply with TBS (temporary builders supply)
- Energy efficient cabins in use
- Hybrid generators / solar powered plant & equipment in use
- Electricity, water and gas meters installed (and targets set to reduce consumption)
- Push on type taps in toilets and welfare facilities
- Toilets have reduced flush facility / waterless urinals
- Captured rainwater is being reused for dust suppression etc.
- No idling policy in place (to prevent fuel wastage)

3 Score

- Site not connected to mains supply, when possible
- Lights left on unnecessarily in plots and or cabins
- Water leak left unrepaired
- Materials left unsecured / uncovered resulting in damage
- Vehicles idling when not in use

KPI 10.4 ENVIRONMENTAL: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

1 Score

- Repeated wastage of water, electricity, fuel and gas
- Multiple or repeated wastage of materials

0 Score

- Numerous or gross failure to plan or implement energy / carbon saving measures
- Numerous or gross failure to plan or implement water saving measures

KPI 10.5 ENVIRONMENTAL: WASTE MANAGEMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ Is waste stored and segregated appropriately?
- ✓ Are skips clearly labelled to help promote segregation and recovery of waste?
- ✓ Is there evidence of cross contamination in skips / containers?
- ✓ Is waste stored appropriately i.e. covered skips to prevent windblown litter, where required
- ✓ Is the waste storage area tidy?
- ✓ Is there evidence of windblown litter around the site?
- ✓ Has provision been made for the separate collection of hazardous waste?
- ✓ Are waste contractors listed in the Duty of Care (DoC) Schedule of the PEP?
- ✓ Check how the site is managing paperwork i.e. are they using a waste documentation folder (on-site) or are Commercial storing tickets electronically on a shared drive?
- ✓ Has / is the site importing recycled aggregates for use on site?
- ✓ Is there evidence of contamination in any recycled aggregates? I.e. timber, metals, plastics etc.?

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Waste is adequately segregated with signage in place
- Waste is adequately contained to prevent windblown material
- Hazardous waste is segregated from non-hazardous waste
- Site has a well-defined and managed process for recording / storing waste tickets
- Project Environmental Plan is up to date with records of all relevant waste carrier licences (WCL), permits and/or exemptions
- WTNS / HWCNs are completed correctly

KPI 10.5 ENVIRONMENTAL: WASTE MANAGEMENT

3 Score

- Evidence of low-level cross contamination in waste skips / containers
- Signage missing from waste skips / containers
- Waste storage area is untidy and requires improvement
- Minor errors or omissions in waste transfer notes
- Check(s) not completed for waste carrier and or waste disposal site
- Evidence of small scale contamination evident in imported recycled aggregates

1 Score

- Evidence of significant cross contamination in waste skips / containers
- Multiple signs missing from waste containers (skips, bins etc.)Check(s) not completed for multiple waste carriers and or waste disposal sites
- Evidence of waste not being segregated e.g. only mixed waste skips provided
- Waste storage area not fit for purpose e.g. skips overflowing with waste, waste not contained and stored over open ground
- Evidence of windblown waste / litter escaping from waste containers (but contained on site)
- Sub-contractor is producing unnecessary waste through poor practices
- Inadequate materials storage is causing unnecessary waste
- Significant no. of waste transfer notes missing or not readily available
- Significant errors / omissions on completed WTNs / HWCNs and are not legally compliant
- Multiple loads of contaminated material brought onto site (quarantined and pending removal from site)

0 Score

- Significant no. of DoC checks not completed / recorded in DoC Schedule
- Waste removed by an unlicenced waste carrier
- Waste removed to a site which is unauthorised to accept that specific waste type(s)
- WTNs / HWCN's not provided for waste(s) removed
- Hazardous waste mixed in with non-hazardous waste
- Evidence of windblown waste / litter escaping beyond the site boundary
- No provision made for the separate collection of hazardous waste
- Evidence of grossly contaminated recycled aggregates imported onto site

KPI 10.6 ENVIRONMENTAL: WATER QUALITY AND SILT MANAGEMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ Is there a Surface Water Management Plan in place? If so, is the site complying with the Plan?
- ✓ Is the site drainage plan on display on the environmental noticeboard?
- ✓ Are surface water drains protected and is it functioning / well maintained?
- ✓ Are adequate and effective silt control measures in place throughout the site?
- ✓ Inspect low-lying areas of the site to check for overland flow of water into ditches/streams etc.
- ✓ Check that any water discharges are 'clean and uncontaminated' – you may need to inspect any attenuation basins, SuDs that are present on site
- ✓ If dewatering excavations has a Permit to Pump been issued?
- ✓ Is the site carrying out monitoring of water quality and maintaining records?
- ✓ Are water standpipes in use, if so are they licenced?

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Site Induction covers relevant risks posed by works activities and controls in place on site
- Regular TBTs are taking place relevant to water management
- All operatives have the required information, instruction and training on water management e.g. Surface Water Management Plan in place and communicated
- Site drainage plan is on display on Environmental Noticeboard
- Consideration has been given to phasing of works to avoid unnecessary soil stripping
- Run-off is controlled with no risk of pollution
- Silt fencing / barriers are effective and well maintained
- V-ditches / bunds are in place and diverting water from neighbouring land away from site
- Attenuation basins are in place and capturing water for treatment prior to discharge
- Water treatment is being undertaken (and is effective) prior to discharge

KPI 10.6 ENVIRONMENTAL: WATER QUALITY AND SILT MANAGEMENT

4 Score Cont.

Good practice would include:

- Drain protection is in place and operating effectively (well maintained)
- Ditches protected with silt fencing / hessian mats in place
- Soil stockpiles are well managed e.g. stored away from drains / watercourse and control measures in place to prevent silty run-off e.g. seeded, silt fencing etc.
- Natural vegetation is used to filter sediment from water
- Pump is raised from bottom of excavation / pond to reduce sediment generated e.g. float pump in use or pump placed on blocks / pallet)
- Sediment sock (filter) in use for dewatering
- Regular monitoring of water discharge is taking place with records maintained
- Silt Control Checklist form is being completed
- Site Managers Checksheet completed

3 Score

- Improvements required to silt control measures, although no immediate risk of pollution
- No Permit to Pump in place but no immediate risk of pollution
- Small improvements required to improve drain protection measures, but no sign of pollution
- Drain protection measures have fallen into drain and require reset to maintain performance
- Possibility that a polluting substance may enter a drain
- Small improvements required to water quality monitoring
- Monitoring undertaken but improvements required in respect of document control
- England & Wales – user of water standpipe is not CALM network trained

KPI 10.6 ENVIRONMENTAL: WATER QUALITY AND SILT MANAGEMENT

1 Score

- Improvements required to silt control measures, and immediate risk of pollution
- Significant portion of silt controls have failed and require immediate repair
- Dewatering is taking place but evidence of low-level silt / sediment being discharged
- A minor pollution event has occurred but has not been reported
- Storm drains not protected adequately, and evidence of small scale pollution event
- Culvert / drain / ditch requires unblocking to maintain water flow
- No drainage plan available
- Significant omissions in water quality monitoring data

0 Score

- Significant silt / sediment is being discharged and poses imminent risk of significant or major environmental incident
- Improvements required to silt control measures, and evidence of a historic or ongoing pollution event
- Breach of exemption / permit / licence conditions
- No evidence of drain protection installed with imminent risk of significant or major pollution
- Polluting substance has entered in the drainage system and poses imminent risk of significant or major environmental incident
- Significant failing of drain protection which is leading to silt / sediment discharging from site
- No records / evidence of water quality monitoring having taken place, where required
- Illegal abstraction of water from network or watercourse

KPI 11

CRANE LIFTING OPERATIONS

KPI 11 CRANE LIFTING OPERATIONS

What To Look For?

- ✓ Lift Plan on site
- ✓ Crane fenced off and not lifting materials over operatives heads
- ✓ Check the competency cards/ training records for all operatives involved in the lift

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- A copy of the Lift Plan is on site and signed by all the operatives involved in the lift
- Crane is located on firm and level ground and is capable of supporting the full weight of the crane and load
- Outriggers are placed on suitable soleplates to distribute the weight accordingly
- Communication system is in place and utilised by the Lift Supervisor/Slinger and Crane Driver
- Crane is well away from edges of excavations and overhead powerlines
- Weather conditions are suitable for crane operations
- Hand lines/ guide ropes are used where necessary
- Access is restricted to authorised personnel only
- Correct lifting accessories are being used
- Competency cards/ training records checked for all the operatives involved in the lift
- Thorough Examination Certificate for the Crane

KPI 11 CRANE LIFTING OPERATIONS

3 Score

- Lift Plan on site but not signed by all the operatives involved in the lift
- Lift plan on site but minor mistakes

1 Score

- Lift Plan on site but does not mirror the lift being undertaken
- Authorised access restrictions not in place
- Hand lines/ guide ropes not in place to control large/unwieldy loads

0 Score

- No Lift Plan in place
- Lifting operations being undertaken in severe adverse weather conditions
- Operatives carrying out lifting operations without the required competency/ training

KPI 12

TRAINING RECORDS

KPI 12 TRAINING RECORDS

What To Look For?

- ✓ Check 3 random operatives to ensure have been fully inducted (including providing competency card details)
- ✓ Check the RAMS of 2 contactors working on site, ensuring all relevant operatives have signed them
- ✓ Check site management qualifications are on display and in date

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Site operatives fully inducted (tested by checking 3 random site operative records)
- Site operatives hold the relevant competency card (CSCS etc.) for the trade/ skill they are undertaking (tested by checking 3 random site operative records)
- Evidence of relevant training (SMSTS, First Aid etc.) for Site Management on display
- Regular Toolbox Talks undertaken and records sent to the Construction Secretary
- Approved RAMS for contactors on site (test by checking 2 RAMS are present)
- All training records/ RAMS etc. are filed in an orderly way, so that a record can be easily found

3 Score

- Site Management Training records not on display
- Minor mistakes with training records, i.e. on site but not kept in an orderly way
- Site Management not completed Toolbox Talks as tasked by Group HS&E Advisor

KPI 12 TRAINING RECORDS

1 Score

- Operative working on site and not been fully inducted (must be induction record)
- Operative working on site but does not hold competency card for trade/ skill they are undertaking
- Major mistakes with training records, i.e. RAMS not being approved and/ or available on site

0 Score

- Site Manager in charge of the site without an in-date SMSTS/ SSSTS qualification
- Operatives carrying out tasks not trained to do
- Systemic problem with training records, i.e. RAMS not completed and signed by operatives

KPI 13

EVIDENCE OF WORKER ENGAGEMENT

KPI 13 EVIDENCE OF WORKER ENGAGEMENT

What To Look For?

- ✓ Check 3 random operatives to ensure have correctly signed in
- ✓ The weekly Site Managers Checksheet is being completed
- ✓ Operatives following RAMS/ SSOW

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- All operatives have signed into site (test by checking 3 site operatives records)
- Site HS&E Meetings are held quarterly and records displayed
- Whistleblowing and safety concerns line posters displayed on canteen notice boards
- Sites have sufficient arrangements for operatives to feedback on HS&E matters, i.e. comments sheets
- Site Managers Checksheet completed weekly
- Operatives following RAMS/ SSOW
- Regular performance monitoring by Contract Managers
- Use of the Operatives H&S Notices Use of the Contract Manager Action Report

3 Score

- Minor mistakes with sign in records, i.e. sign in times not accurate
- Minor mistakes with Weekly Site Managers Checksheet, i.e. lack of detail
- Operative not following RAMS/ SSOW but no risk of injury/ environmental incident
- Insufficient arrangements for site operatives to feedback on HS&E matters
- Minor mistakes with Contract Manager Action Reports, i.e. lacking in detail

KPI 13 EVIDENCE OF WORKER ENGAGEMENT

1 Score

- Site operative not signed into site
- Site HS&E Meetings are not held
- Major mistakes with Site Managers Weekly Checksheet, i.e. not completed weekly
- Operatives not following RAMS/ SSOW and risk of injury or minor environmental incident
- Minor mistakes with Contract Manager Action Reports, i.e. not being completed
- Operative H&S Notice not issued when requested by Group HS&E Advisor

0 Score

- Systemic problem with worker engagement records, i.e. operatives not routinely signing in/ Site Manager weekly checksheet not completed
- Operatives not following RAMS/ SSOW and risk of imminent serious injury or major/ significant environmental incident
- Operatives actively discouraged to report HS&E matters

KPI 14

NOTICE BOARDS

KPI 14 NOTICE BOARDS

What To Look For?

- ✓ Notice board hold the relevant information and are neatly presented
- ✓ Site hazard board is up to date with current hazards highlighted
- ✓ Safety concerns line and whistleblowing posters displayed.

4 Score

- Good practice would include:
- Site Specific hazard board
- Traffic Management Plan displayed
- Whistleblowing poster displayed
- Modern Slavery poster displayed
- Safety concerns Line poster displayed
- H&S Law poster displayed
- H&S Policy Statement (Group and Regional) displayed
- Environment Policy Statement (Group and Regional) displayed
- F10 HSE Notification displayed
- Emergency Contracts/ Arrangements displayed
- Names and Photographs of First Aiders displayed
- Site Rules displayed
- Site Manager Training Certificates displayed
- Recent HS&E Alerts displayed
- Emergency/ Spill Response details displayed
- Environmental Permits/ Licences displayed

KPI 14 NOTICE BOARDS

3 Score

- Minor mistakes on notice boards, some information missing

1 Score

- Major mistakes on notice boards, key information missing, i.e. emergency critical information

0 Score

- No notice board, therefore no place to display information

KPI 15

TELEHANDLER OPERATIONS

KPI 15 TELEHANDLER OPERATIONS

What To Look For?

- ✓ On visual inspection does the telehandler look like it is in a good state of repair?
- ✓ Is the machine being operated in a safe manner
- ✓ Are reversing cameras, seatbelt/ hazard warnings fitted and being used?
- ✓ Are mirrors present and correctly adjusted?
- ✓ Are Telehandler daily/ weekly checklists completed?
- ✓ Check telehander operator, competent to operate the machine they are using (CPCS/ NPORS)
- ✓ Check the machine has an in-date thorough examination certificate

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- Telehandler to be in good condition, and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions
- All operatives to be competent and certified to operate the telehandler (CPCS/ NPORS)
- Doors kept closed when in use
- All round vision (including reversing cameras where appropriate) is fitted and adjusted correctly
- All mirrors are in good order
- Warning beacons operating correctly (seatbelt and hazard lights)
- All reversing lights/alarms are working
- Seat belt worn at all teams
- Keys are not left in machines or engines left running and unattended
- Reversing cameras fitted
- Telehandler Daily Checklist completed
- Telehandler Weekly Checklist completed
- Machine is suitable for the task in hand
- In date Thorough Examination Certificate
- Telehandler removed from use when a major defect has been identified

KPI 15 TELEHANDLER OPERATIONS

4 Score cont.

Good practice would include:

- Reversing Alarm/Lights/ Mirrors are in good working order
- Operator aware of weights of materials
- Tipping skips free from damage and inspected
- Outriggers being used when booming in/ out
- Lift Plan/Risk Assessment in place when lifting suspended loads Telehandler operatives have the required competence and training to operative the machine, with refresher training where necessary
- Telehandler movement contained in the Traffic Management Plan
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly
- Contractor Risk Assessments and Method Statements which deal with the hazard of using telehandlers
- Young Persons Risk Assessment where applicable which deals with the hazard of using telehandlers
- Other relevant task specific Risk Assessments which deals with the hazard of using telehandlers

KPI 15 TELEHANDLER OPERATIONS

3 Score

- Telehandler not kept in a clean and tidy condition, i.e. dirty windows, lights etc.
- Telehandler mirrors with minor cracks/ scratches
- Door open when in use
- Minor mistakes with Telehandler Daily/ Weekly checksheets, i.e. lack of detail

1 Score

- Seatbelt green beacon not fitted or working
- Rear view camera not fitted or working
- All-round vision is fitted but not suitably adjusted
- Seat belts not being worn by operatives
- Reversing lights/alarms are not working/in need of repair
- Major mistakes with plant and equipment paperwork, i.e. Telehandler daily/ weekly checklists out of date / RAMS not readily available

0 Score

- Operatives cannot produce certification of competency to operate the telehandler
- Telehandler in use and no in date Thorough Examination Certificate
- Telehandler not removed from use when a major defect has been identified
- Outriggers not being deployed when booming in/ out and rear wheels lifting off the ground
- No Lift Plan/Risk Assessment and lifting suspended loads
- Telehandler operative not trained and competent to operate the machine
- Keys left in unattended machine
- Operator using mobile phone whilst operating the machine
- Operatives observed driving telehandler in an unsafe manner
- Systemic problem with Telehandler paperwork, i.e. no daily/ weekly Checklists completed

KPI 16

PPE GENERAL USAGE

KPI 16 PPE GENERAL USAGE

What To Look For?

- ✓ Operatives not wearing the correct PPE, i.e. hard hat/ hi-vis/ safety boots
- ✓ Correct PPE is not being worn for the task in hand
- ✓ The Site Manager is not taking a robust approach to the enforcement of operatives wearing PPE

4 Score

Good practice would include:

- All operatives wearing the correct PPE, i.e. hard hat, high vis and safety footwear
- PPE maintained in a clean and tidy condition
- PPE correct for task
- Where required task specific PPE identified in RAMS
- Site signage for PPE requirements is in place and displayed
- Regular toolbox talks on the use of PPE
- Suitable stocks of PPE for directly employed site personnel
- Site Manager Checksheet completed weekly

3 Score

- Minor issues identified with operatives PPE, i.e. unclean or temporary hard hat removal etc.
- PPE being worn incorrectly, i.e. hard hat back to front

1 Score

- Task specific PPE not being worn
- Major issues identified with operatives PPE, i.e. damaged or clearly not suitable (trainers)
- Insufficient PPE assessment in relevant RAMS

0 Score

- PPE not being used by a number of operatives across the site, showing systemic site management failures