

Tasmanian Aluminum Composite Panel Audit Summary

Regulatory Compliance

19 January 2018

Contents

Background	4
Building Compliance Process	4
Scope of Audit.....	5
Process of Audit.....	7
Findings.....	7
Launceston General Hospital.....	8
Outcomes.....	9
Appendix One	11
Appendix Two.....	13
Appendix Three	17
Appendix Four.....	19
Appendix Five.....	20

Date: 19 January 2018

Version: 1.0



IMPORTANT NOTE:

The information in this summary report should be read in conjunction with the relevant Act and associated Regulations



Background

On 25 November 2014, a 23 storey building in Melbourne's docklands, the Lacrosse Building, was subject to a significant fire, which spread vertically up the exterior of the building. An investigation by the Victorian Building Authority (VBA) determined that an exterior Aluminum Composite Panel (ACP), branded 'Alucobest' was untested and contributed to the spread of the fire.

On 14 June 2017, a 24 storey building in London, England, the Grenfell Apartment Tower, was subject to a significant fire. This was believed by emergency services, to have started accidentally by an electrical appliance on the fourth storey, before engulfing the majority of the external cladding. This fire resulted in more than 80 fatalities.

An investigation found that the Grenfell building was subject to a refurbishment in 2012 and that at this time a design was produced specifying the recladding of the concrete building with zinc cladding. It has been determined that the cladding specified was substituted with a polyethylene filled ACP, branded 'Reynobond'. The circumstances of the refurbishment and cladding substitution are currently subject to a criminal investigation.

On 20 June 2017, following the fire at the Grenfell Apartment Tower in London, and previous Lacrosse Building fire in Victoria, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Hon Malcolm Turnbull, made a request of the Premier of Tasmania, the Hon Will Hodgman MP, to advise of the extent of Aluminum Composite Panel (ACP) cladding in Tasmania.

Following this request the Minister for Building and Construction, the Hon Guy Barnett MP, requested the Director of Building Control to initiate an audit of all aluminum composite cladding in Tasmania.

The Director was assisted in undertaking the Audit by the staff of the Compliance and Dispute Resolution Team within Consumer, Building and Occupational Services in the Department of Justice.

Building Compliance Process

ACP cladding systems vary significantly, based on the manufacturer's specifications, including the infill between panels, and the fixing method. Outcomes from the audit process have determined that Tasmanian Building Services Providers primarily use 'Alucobond' and 'Vitrabond' branded ACP.

Manufacturers of ACP produce a variety of different products with varying fire-resistance properties. For example; the Alucobond products identified by the audit process, ranged from a polyethylene-dense (PE) panel branded 'Alucobond' through to a more mineral based infill branded 'Alucobond Plus' and 'Alucobond A2', the latter two both being subject to testing certification.

In Tasmania the *Building Act 2016* requires building work to be performed in compliance with the *National Construction Code – Building Code of Australia* (BCA). Part C of the BCA (Appendix One) specifies the 'Type' of construction required specifically in relation to fire performance. This 'Type' is based on the use and number of storeys of a building.

Higher risk buildings are categorised as Type A construction and low risk buildings as Type C. Accordingly a residential building of three or more storeys would be categorised as a Type A construction, whereas, an office or shop of two storeys would be categorised as a Type B. Generally for a Type A construction, non-combustible cladding is required by the BCA.

To date, Australian building regulators are unaware of any ACP cladding passing the non-combustibility test called up by the BCA – Australian Standard 1530.1 *Methods for fire tests on building materials, components and structures - Combustibility test for materials* (AS1530.1). As such, for ACP to be certified as compliant for use on Type A construction, a building surveyor (certifier), must assess the cladding as an alternative/performance solution.

For a certifier to assess a performance solution, they must be satisfied, based on evidence provided, that the proposed solution will satisfy the performance requirements of the BCA. They must also be satisfied that the solution will perform equally, or better than, the deemed-to-satisfy solution specified by the BCA (in this case AS1530.1).

Evidence of performance for the suitability of ACP cladding is likely to come in the form of a testing certificate, commissioned by the manufacturer of the ACP product, as well as, a fire-safety engineering report, which may detail additional measures that satisfy the objective of the BCA, for instance: shorter travel distances to exits.

Accordingly, as of the date of this report, it is possible for high-risk structures to utilise ACP cladding and comply with the BCA. This is providing the legislative process is followed, the cladding has been subject to testing, and its limitation determined. Additionally, the cladding must not be substituted during construction and the cladding must be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's specification.

This video, produced by ACP manufacturer Fairview, provides a brief compliance overview for prospective customers

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kpqySv0fzJl&feature=youtu.be>

Scope of Audit

On request of the Minister for Building and Construction, the Director of Building Control (the Director) determined the scope and process for an audit of the Tasmanian building environment and the use of ACP cladding. Initially, the audit focused on buildings of Type A and B construction, with a priority given to buildings used for residential and other high risk purposes.

Upon commencement of the audit process, the Director engaged the services of Fire-Safety Engineer, Mr Stephen Kip¹ of SKIP Consulting. Mr Kip was engaged for the purpose of reviewing buildings deemed high-risk, following a preliminary audit conducted by Consumer, Building and Occupational Services (CBOS).

¹ SKIP Consulting is a Fire Safety Engineering & Regulatory Consulting firm which specialises in Building Code of Australia Alternative Solutions and related consulting including fire safety audits, regulatory impact statements, training and research.

In order to gather the information required to identify buildings for auditing, the Director approached the Tasmanian Chapter President of the Australian Institute of Building Surveyors (AIBS), Mr Roland Wierenga, to discuss the scope of the audit and proposed methodology for obtaining information.

The Director then required, under Section 22 of the *Building Act 2016*, all building surveyors licensed in Tasmania to complete a template nominating the particulars of any building meeting the audit criteria that they have certified since 2004 (Appendix Two). Additionally, Building Surveyors were asked to nominate any other buildings where ACP is used that they were aware of, regardless of whether they met the audit criteria.

Further to the requirement made of Building Surveyors, the Director made requests of the Tasmania Fire Service, Australian Institute of Building Surveyors, Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, the Master Plumbers Association, the Institute of Architects and the Building Designers Association to voluntarily provide information meeting the audit criteria (Appendix Three - a representative example).

In response to the requests made of building surveyors and industry in general, the Director compiled a list of 43 buildings in Tasmania where ACP is used. The Director's risk criteria (Appendix Four) was applied to this list, categorising buildings into 4 groups, 'Low Risk', 'Medium Risk', 'Medium-High Risk' and 'High Risk'. 24 Buildings were in the 3 highest categories and the remaining were assessed as low risk and requiring no further action.

Once categorised a request was made of the responsible Permit Authority for each building in the 'Medium' to 'High' category range. This request required the supply of all relevant building application documentation. Once received, the relevant CBOS staff, on behalf of the Director, reviewed the documentation in preparation for a preliminary, onsite, audit.

Following the engagement of Mr Kip and with his input, the Director developed a preliminary audit process, to be undertaken during site inspections of buildings identified in the 'Medium' to 'High' risk categories. An audit template was produced, using an iAuditor mobile application, to identify and document risk criteria for each building. Risk criteria assessed, included:

- the use of building;
- the extent and type of ACP used;
- the proximity of ACP to areas where potential ignition sources may be present (e.g. balconies, external ground level, vehicle parking etc.);
- the likelihood of vertical spread of fire; and
- other areas of compliance with the Building Code of Australia.

Following the onsite inspection further documentation or evidence of compliance was requested for some buildings to confirm the onsite assessment.

Three buildings were assessed as not meeting the deemed to satisfy provisions of the BCA and therefore requiring consideration of a documented performance solution. CBOS staff worked with the relevant building surveyors to achieve an understanding of the performance solution which was applied and to ensure that there was sufficient documentation. This information was then considered and it was then confirmed that these buildings were low risk.

Process of Audit

1. Identify Scope by reference to risk (Appendix 4)
2. Identification of buildings in scope (43 Buildings identified²)
3. Request for Documentation
4. Examination of Documentation (24 buildings proceeded to audit see Table 1)
5. Preliminary onsite inspection using digital audit tool
6. Engage with Builders/Building Surveyors/Councils/Contractors as required to complete an assessment of the building (4 Buildings proceeded to more detailed examination)
7. Detailed exploration of aspects of the building including further understanding fire safety aspects, performance solutions and as constructed elements (1 building proceeded to thorough examination)
8. Thorough fire safety examination followed by onsite intrusive examination to verify findings
9. Engagement with owner of high risk building to advise of need for rectification. (see Appendix 5)

Findings

19 of the 43 buildings identified were considered of little to no additional risk to fire safety based on preliminary assessment of the building.

A further 11 were able to be put in this low risk category following examination of documentation and the inspections.

A further four were moved into the low risk category after verification of the onsite inspection by way of further certification and documentation.

Finally, three were assessed as being in this category after consideration of the use of the ACP against the holistic fire safety aspects of the buildings and the unique aspects of the buildings.

Hence the audit concluded that 42 of the 43 building where ACP is in use can be classified as low risk (that is, the use of ACP results in no additional risk to fire safety for those buildings).

One building required detailed review by a qualified independent fire safety engineer and this building was referred to Mr Kip to assist with that detailed assessment. Following this step the Director has concluded that whilst the building is currently in a safe condition, the likely deterioration of the product, joins and installation over time may result in an increased risk in the years to come.

The process of engaging with industry and local government has indicated that despite the work done after the Lacrosse fire in 2014 there is still limited knowledge of the performance requirements associated with cladding that is not deemed to satisfy under the BCA. While the audit does not identify that this has exposed our buildings to the type of situation experienced in the Lacrosse or Grenfell fires, it does lead the Director to find that

² From this point of the assessment process if the Director was satisfied the building was of low risk then it was excluded from the additional steps in the process

this absence of risk has more to do with our market (type, height and use of the buildings built in Tasmania since 2004) than industry knowledge of the application of the performance requirements and evidence of suitability requirements of the BCA.

Deficiencies exist in design documentation, specifically the specification of products and systems. It was found that it is commonplace for an Architect or Building Designer to specify generally the products to be used. For example; 'Aluminum Composite Panel as selected' or 'Metal cladding', as opposed to specifically nominating the product and system proposed.

It is noted that, due to the variation in fire resistance properties within a product range, even nominating a brand is not sufficient. The particulars of the compliant product and its installation method are required for a Building Surveyor to determine if the product will have the fire resistance properties required for compliance with the BCA.

The role of the Building Surveyor as a certifier of compliance is critical to building integrity in Australia.

The *Building Act 2016* provides the Director with a range of powers to ensure compliance. One such power is the ability to require persons operating in the building sector to provide documentation to allow an audit such as this to occur. Despite serving all relevant building surveyors with a notice requiring them to provide documentation it is apparent from information obtained from owners and councils in respect of two of the buildings in the audit that one building surveyor may have failed to adequately respond to the mandatory notice.

Launceston General Hospital

The Launceston General Hospital cladding was referred to Mr Kip for fire-engineering assessment and assessment against the requirements of the Building Code of Australia. Mr Kip engaged with the relevant CBOS staff to do this assessment. The outcome of this final audit step for the Launceston General Hospital is:

- Approved documentation certified by the responsible Building Surveyor nominated a zinc cladding using a cassette fixing system.
- Based on a review of documentation obtained by CBOS, the Launceston General Hospital was not built in accordance with the original approved design documentation and specification.
- The Hospital is clad in ACP. The ACP used included a polyethylene-dense core (ACP PE).
- Based on the documentation received, no amendment was made to the design documentation or Building Surveyor's certification to reflect this change, as was required by legislation.

- The fire engineer has identified that the use of the cladding is not in accordance with the Building Code of Australia and cannot be made compliant as the product used is combustible and the fire engineering in the building is inadequate to be considered as an alternative solution.
- Risk is currently mitigated, as joints and seals are intact, other fire safety measures are in place in critical areas and as a Hospital it has well established, practised and understood fire safety procedures. The TFS also has a high level response protocol for the Hospital. Hospital management has also put in place mitigation strategies to ensure the risk of fire is significantly reduced.
- Earlier stages of cladding used direct stick method (approximately 30% of building). Remaining areas use cassette method. The ACP PE has been vertically installed to height of up to 4 storeys. There is insufficient separation from emergency exits. There are many possible ignition points and possible spread across façade as insufficient breaks between areas were installed. There are areas of possible spread of fire from internal to external areas. All of these risks are managed but likely to increase with time.

Given this, the fire engineer recommends rectification by replacement of the ACP PE with a product with a high fire rating, installed to manufacturer's instructions and in compliance with the Building Code of Australia.

The Director has engaged with DHHS, as owners of the building, in respect of the plans for rectifications and has been advised:

- DHHS acknowledges that the Director CBOS [sic] intends to ensure rectification of non-compliance at the Launceston General Hospital (LGH) by replacement of the aluminum composite panels.
- Work to ensure the building and occupant safety has been immediately acted upon with the audit of low lying points occurring on Tuesday 28 November 2017. Rectification works for this initial response were completed on Friday 22 December 2017.
- DHHS confirms that it has already commenced preparations to progress the recommended replacement, with works expected to be completed during 2018.

Outcomes

The key outcome of the Audit is that one building has been assessed as high risk at the end of the process.

The Director's audit has also provided insight into recent commercial building design, certification and construction practices. The Director considers that there are a number of outcomes necessary to address the deficiencies which may contribute to potential non-compliance in the future.

The Director intends to undertake the following work:

1. Ensure rectification of non-compliance at LGH by replacement of the ACP PE.
2. Restrict the use of ACP with a PE core in Tasmania via the Product Accreditation processes in the *Building Act 2016*³.
3. Specify the minimum design documentation requirements for commercial specification and design; similar requirements have been introduced in respect to domestic/residential design, leading to an improved standard of documentation.
4. Undertake technical audits of Building Surveyors, specifically of performance based solutions, to ensure compliance with the National Construction Code.
5. Undertake training in the use and certification of performance based solutions to be run in all areas of the State for Building Surveyors, Architects and Building Designers.

The Director also intends to examine further the actions of one building surveyor in responding to the mandatory requests for information issued under Section 22 of the *Building Act 2016*.

³ The building fires in both Melbourne and London have identified a need for greater oversight by building regulators, specifically in relation to high risk building materials. It was agreed at the Building Ministers Forum, in October 2017, that all jurisdictions would take measures to restrict the use of ACP – the need for Director approval of ACP PE commenced on 27 December 2017.

Appendix One

From BCA:

Table C1.1 TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED

Rise in storeys	Class of building	
	2, 3, 9	5, 6, 7, 8
4 OR MORE	A	A
3	A	B
2	B	C
1	C	C

A3.2 Classifications

Class 2-9 Buildings are classified as follows:

Class 2: a building containing 2 or more sole-occupancy units each being a separate dwelling.

Class 3: a residential building, other than a building of Class 1 or 2, which is a common place of long term or transient living for a number of unrelated persons, including—

- (a) a boarding house, guest house, hostel, lodging house or backpackers accommodation; or
- (b) a residential part of a hotel or motel; or
- (c) a residential part of a school; or
- (d) accommodation for the aged, children or people with disabilities; or
- (e) a residential part of a health-care building which accommodates members of staff; or
- (f) a residential part of a detention centre.

Class 4: a dwelling in a building that is Class 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 if it is the only dwelling in the building.

Class 5: an office building used for professional or commercial purposes, excluding buildings of Class 6, 7, 8 or 9.

Class 6: a shop or other building for the sale of goods by retail or the supply of services direct to the public, including—

- (a) an eating room, cafe, restaurant, milk or soft-drink bar; or
- (b) a dining room, bar area that is not an assembly building, shop or kiosk part of a hotel or motel; or
- (c) a hairdresser's or barber's shop, public laundry, or undertaker's establishment; or
- (d) market or sale room, showroom, or service station.

Class 7: a building which is—

- (a) **Class 7a** — a carpark; or
- (b) **Class 7b** — for storage, or display of goods or produce for sale by wholesale.

Class 8: a laboratory, or a building in which a handicraft or process for the production, assembling, altering, repairing, packing, finishing, or cleaning of goods or produce is carried on for trade, sale, or gain.

Class 9: a building of a public nature—

- (a) **Class 9a** — a health-care building, including those parts of the building set aside as a laboratory; or

- (b) **Class 9b** — an assembly building, including a trade workshop, laboratory or the like in a primary or secondary school, but excluding any other parts of the building that are of another Class; or
- (c) **Class 9c** — an aged care building.

Appendix Two

Department of Justice
Consumer, Building and Occupational Services

PO Box 56, Rosny Park 7018
Phone 1300 654 499
Email cbosinfo@justice.tas.gov.au



19 July 2017

«Given_Name» «Sir_name»
«ADDRESS_LINE_1»
«ADDRESS_LINE_2» «ADDRESS_LINE_3»

Dear «Given_Name»

NOTICE – Combustible Cladding Audit
Section 22 *Building Act 2016* – requirement to produce records

Why have I got this letter?

The Prime Minister, the Hon Malcolm Turnbull, has directed Australian building Ministers to conduct audits of Aluminium Composite Panel (ACP) cladding, as a priority, following the recent Grenfell Apartment Building fire in London and previous Lacrosse Building Fire in Docklands, Melbourne.

The audit outcomes will be the focus of national-level review at the Building Ministers Forum in October.

It is intended that findings will be used to strengthen the existing legislative building framework, specifically in relation to non-conforming building products.

Why has this Requirement been made?

In the coming months, Consumer, Building and Occupational Service (CBOS) will be auditing Tasmanian buildings to identify where ACP is used. Additionally, CBOS will establish whether the application of the ACP product complies with the manufacturer's specifications and satisfies the Performance Requirements of the National Construction Code (NCC) in each circumstance.

The primary focus of the audit is ACP used on high-risk residential and public assembly buildings, specifically:

- Buildings of NCC classifications 2, 3 & 9,
- Greater than 25m in height, and;
- Built after 2004.

ACP cladding identified outside the primary focus areas, will form the basis of a review which will take place as a secondary priority of the audit program.

Advisory and a voluntary request for information has been made of the Building Designer Association, Australian Institute of Architects, Housing Industry Association, Master Builders Association, Tasmania Fire Service and Permit Authorities.

The Authority to make this Requirement

Section 22 of the *Building Act 2016* states in part:

22. Compliance audit by Director of Building Control

1. *The Director of Building Control may arrange for an audit to be carried out in respect of the work of any person or body specified in [section 16\(g\)](#).*
2. *As part of an audit under this section, the Director of Building Control may require, by written notice, a person to provide a record or document, or to make a written statement that is to be produced, at a time and place specified in the notice.*
3. *A person must comply with a written notice given to them under [subsection \(2\)](#).*
4. *If requested to do so by the Director of Building Control, a person must assist in, or cooperate with, an audit under this section as requested.*
5. *If a record, document or written statement is provided as part of an audit under this section, the Director of Building Control—*
 - a) *may make copies of the record, document or statement; and*
 - b) *must return the record, document or statement as soon as practicable after the Director has finished with the record, document or statement.*

The Requirement

I, Stephen Morrison, Acting Director of Building Control, have formed the opinion that you, may be in possession of information, documents or materials relating to any occupation, trade or calling to which the Act applies or otherwise to the administration of the Act.

I hereby require you, pursuant to the power vested in me by section 22 of the Act, to provide the following:

- a) Please fill in the attached template with the requested information.
- b) In addition to this you may voluntarily provide information in relation to any projects where you are aware of the installation of ACP.

It is intended that this information will be used to create a register of ACP used in Tasmania. Auditing will then be conducted with assistance from an external fire-engineer as

required. The audit outcomes will be the focus of national-level review at the Building Ministers Forum in October. It is intended that findings will be used to strengthen the existing legislative building framework, specifically in relation to non-conforming building products.

What must I do?

You must comply with this requirement unless you have a reasonable excuse not to do so. Your reasonable excuse must be authorised, justified or excused for by law. You may commit an offence if you elect not to respond or are too busy to meet the requirements. If you believe you have a reasonable excuse as to why you cannot comply with the requirement, please provide your reasonable excuse in writing by 15 August 2017.

When must I do it by?

Your response to the requirement must be provided by 15 August 2017. You can elect to provide your response by post or email, attention to Mr George Clarke, Assistant Director - CBOS, Compliance and Dispute Resolution

Email cbosinfo@justice.tas.gov.au

Post ~~Consumer~~, Building and Occupational Services
Attn: George Clarke – Assistant Director CBOS,
Compliance and Dispute Resolution
P.O. Box 56
Rosny Park
Tasmania 7018.

The information should be provided by email to: cbosinfo@justice.tas.gov.au

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours Sincerely



Stephen Morrison
Acting Director of Building Control
Consumer Building and Occupational Services

Appendix Three

Department of Justice
Consumer, Building and Occupational Services
PO Box 56, Rosny Park 7018
Phone 1300 654 499
Email cbosinfo@justice.tas.gov.au



19 July 2017

Mr Anthony Livingston
Manager – Building Safety
Tasmania Fire Service
GPO Box 1526
HOBART TAS 7001

Dear Mr Livingston

NOTICE - Combustible Cladding Audit

As you are aware, The Prime Minister, the Hon Malcolm Turnbull, has directed Australian building Ministers to conduct audits of Aluminium Composite Panel (ACP) cladding, as a priority, following the recent Grenfell Apartment Building fire in London and previous Lacrosse Building Fire in Docklands, Melbourne.

In the coming months Consumer, Building and Occupational Service (CBOS), will be auditing Tasmanian buildings to identify where ACP has been used. Additionally, CBOS will establish whether the application of the ACP product complies with the manufacturer's specifications and satisfies the Performance Requirements of the National Construction Code (NCC) in each circumstance.

The primary focus of the audit is ACP used on high-risk residential and public assembly buildings, specifically:

- Buildings of NCC classifications 2, 3 & 9,
- Greater than 25m in height, and;
- Built after 2004.

ACP cladding identified outside the primary focus areas, will form the basis of a review which will take place as a secondary priority of the audit program.

To assist in identifying building work that meets the requirement for audit, Building Surveyors have been contacted and required to provide specific information to CBOS prior to 15 August 2017. Additionally the Director has provided advisory and sought voluntary participation of industry and permit authorities. The Building Designers Association, Australian Institute of Architects, Master Builders Association and Housing Industry Association are requested to ask their members to advise CBOS where they have specified or installed ACP.

It is intended that this information will be used to create a register of ACP used in Tasmania. Auditing will then be conducted with assistance from an external fire-engineer as required.

The audit outcomes will be the focus of national-level review at the Building Ministers Forum in October. It is intended that findings will be used to strengthen the existing legislative building framework, specifically in relation to non-conforming building products.

Thank you for the cooperation and assistance you have provided to date. I note that a request for information has been circulated with the Building Safety team of Tasmania Fire Service and that any applicable information will be provided to Mr George Clarke.

Yours Sincerely



Stephen Morrison

Acting General Manager
Consumer, Building and Occupational Services

Appendix Four

Risk category	Risk factors
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Class 2, 3 & 9 buildings greater 3 Storey in height • Specific buildings at the discretion of the Director of Building Control
Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Storey buildings of class 2, 3 & 9 • Class 2-9 buildings at the discretion of the Director of Building Control
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Class 5, 6, 7 & 8 buildings of 4 storeys or more • Class 2, 3 & 9 buildings not in High category • Class 2-9 buildings at the discretion of the Director of Building Control
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Class 2- 9 buildings built prior to 2012 • Class 1a & 1b residential buildings • Nominated buildings not meeting 'High' and 'Medium' categories.

Appendix Five

Media Releases

28 November 2017

***Dale Webster, Director of Building Control
Aluminium Composite Panel Audit – preliminary conclusions – Launceston General Hospital***

As Director of Building Control, over the last few months I have conducted a Statewide audit of commercial/public use buildings where Aluminium Composite Panel (ACP) has been used.

This audit responded to both the Lacrosse Building fire in Victoria and the recent tragedy that occurred as a result of the Grenfell Building Fire in England.

43 buildings were identified for assessment, and of those, 24 proceeded to a more detailed audit.

As a result of the audit process, I have concluded that 23 of those buildings been cleared, as:

- the amount of ACP was limited and would not aid the spread of fire;
- the ACP was used in conjunction with other fire safety features, such that the risk of fire spreading would be limited; or
- the use of the ACP was considered in developing a holistic fire safety system for the building.

The remaining building has been assessed as being of ongoing concern, and I have reached the conclusion that the type of ACP used, which has a polyethylene core (ACP PE), is non-compliant and requires rectification in the medium to long term.

The building of ongoing concern is the main building of the Launceston General Hospital, and specifically the cladding which has been applied as part of building work carried out over several years up until 2012.

I would like to emphasise that there is no immediate safety risk to patients or the public, given:

- the current state of the cladding, seals and joins;
- the installed fire safety aspects of the hospital;
- the fact that as a hospital the fire response is well understood and well practised; and
- that there is a high level response allocated to the Hospital by the Tasmanian Fire Service together with the risk mitigation strategies implemented by the Hospital.

Yesterday I shared my draft findings in relation to the Launceston General Hospital with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and DHHS is now working to ensure the long term safety of the building by developing a plan to replace the ACP PE at the Hospital.

I would like to acknowledge the high level of cooperation of DHHS with all aspects of the audit, and the positive response to addressing the findings of the audit.

I am now finalising the audit report.

28 November 2017

Michael Ferguson, Minister for Health
Cladding at the LGH

My Department has received a briefing on the Director of Building Control's preliminary findings in relation to cladding installed at the LGH up to and including in 2012.

While cladding of the main building has been identified as being non-compliant with the National Construction Code, the Director of Building Control has advised that there is no immediate safety risk to the public.

These works occurred under the previous government, however I take very seriously my responsibilities as Health Minister to ensure the issue is rectified. I will be acting on this as a priority.

My Department will work with the Director of Building Control to identify as soon as possible the best option in relation to the removal of the non-compliant cladding on the main building and replacement with appropriate material.

I would like to reassure Tasmanians of my clear advice that the LGH is safe and the best place for patients who need hospital treatment. They should not be discouraged from entering the hospital services in any way.

Patient and staff well-being is our top priority and we will look to minimise any disruption that may occur as a result of required works.

The cost of capital works is yet to be determined, however the Government will ensure that it does not impact on the funding of health services or high quality of patient care at the LGH.



Tasmanian
Government

Department of Justice

PO Box 56
ROSNY PARK TAS 7018

P 1300 654 499

F (03) 6173 0205

www.justice.tas.gov.au