

Report Reference: LGC, 24

1 DETAILS OF THE PERSON ORDERING THE REPORT

Client: Brunel management
 Address: Brunel Chambers, Devonshire Place, St Helier, Jersey, JE23RD

2 REASON FOR PRODUCING THIS REPORT

Reason for producing this report:
Safety assessment requested by client.

 Date(s) on which inspection and testing was carried out: 20/01/2020

3 DETAILS OF THE INSTALLATION WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS REPORT

Installation Address: No 24, La Grand Clos , St Helier, JE2 3BB

 Estimated age of wiring system: 14 years Evidence of additions/alterations: No if yes, estimated age: years
 Installation records available? (Regulation 651.1) N/A Date of last inspection: 26/10/2006

4 EXTENT AND LIMITATIONS OF INSPECTION AND TESTING

Extent of the electrical installation covered by this report:
100% of the installation.

 Agreed limitations including the reasons (see Regulation 653.2):
Inspection where access is freely given. Limitation of inspection of cables installed behind ceilings and walls. No furniture is to be moved by engineers. Insulation resistance on circuits will only when we can guarantee no item on the circuit can be damaged. Bath panels are not to be removed for inspection.

 Agreed with:
 Operational limitations including the reasons:

 The inspection and testing detailed in this report and accompanying schedules have been carried out in accordance with BS 7671:2018 (IET Wiring Regulations) as amended to 2018.
 It should be noted that cables concealed within trunking and conduits, under floors, in roof spaces, and generally within the fabric of the building or underground, have not been inspected unless specifically agreed between the client and inspector prior to the inspection. An inspection should be made within an accessible roof space housing other electrical equipment.

5 SUMMARY OF THE CONDITION OF THE INSTALLATION

See page 3 for a summary of the general condition of the installation in terms of electrical safety.
Overall assessment of the installation in terms of it's suitability for continued use*: SATISFACTORY
 * An unsatisfactory assessment indicates that dangerous (Code C1) and/or potentially dangerous (Code C2) conditions have been identified.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Where the overall assessment of the suitability of the installation for continued use on page 1 is stated as 'UNSATISFACTORY', I/We recommend that any observations classified as 'Code 1 - Danger Present' or 'Code 2 - Potentially dangerous' are acted upon as a matter of urgency.
 Investigation without delay is recommended for observations identified as 'FI - Further Investigation Required'.
 Observations classified as 'Code 3 - Improvement recommended' should be given due consideration.
 Subject to the necessary remedial action being taken, I/we recommend that the installation is further inspected and tested by: 5 Years or change of tenant/owner
 Note: The proposed date for the next inspection should take into consideration the frequency and quality of maintenance that the installation can reasonably be expected to receive during its intended life. The period should be agreed between relevant parties.