SITE survey. APP

SITE SURVEY REPORT

Physical Security Risk Assessment

Prepared for	Nene Valley Learning Trust
Date	21 Sep 2026
Site	Mill Lane Learning Centre, Northampton
Prepared by	B. Hollis

FORM

Physical Security Risk Assessment

1. Record details and scope

Project	Mill Lane Learning Centre, Northampton: security risk assessment
Client or organisation	Nene Valley Learning Trust
Site or premises address	Mill Lane Learning Centre, 7 Mill Lane, Northampton NN5
Record date	21 Sep 2026
Person completing the record	B. Hollis

> This records site-specific judgments. It is not a certification, police approval or an automated prediction of crime, and it does not replace an IT security audit.

2. Scope and assets

Premises and activities included	Library, IT suite, staff office and grounds at Mill Lane, during day opening and evening classes. Car park shared with the health centre excluded.
People, assets and operations needing protection	Staff and visitors, including children at after-school clubs. 30 laptops in the IT suite, small cash takings from printing, the building itself and the centre's reputation.
Information sources, incidents and assumptions	Incident log for the last 12 months (4 thefts, 1 attempted break-in), talks with the centre manager and caretaker, local policing newsletter. Yard fence measured from a photo with a 2 m ranging rod against it. Assumes opening hours stay the same.
Assessment limits and sensitive information handling	Daytime visit only, lighting after dark not checked. Alarm and camera details are not recorded here and are held by the centre manager.

3. Threat and vulnerability records

> Score each risk as likelihood x impact, each from 1 to 5. Bands: 1 to 4 Low, 5 to 9 Medium, 10 to 14 High, 15 to 25 Very high. The score is a ranking method to sort the risks, not a legal category; the assessor still sets the priority.

Security risk 1: IT suite laptops

Asset or location	IT suite laptops
Where is it?	Inside the building
Threat scenario and supporting information	Theft of laptops during evening classes. Two laptops taken in March.

Vulnerability and existing controls	Laptop trolley left unlocked during sessions and the suite door propped open. No sign-in for evening class visitors.

Photos



Likelihood	4 Likely
Impact	3 Moderate
Risk score (1 to 25)	12
Risk band	High
Assessor priority	High
Reason for the priority and proposed improvement	Repeat incident and easy access. Lock the trolley between sessions, keep the door shut and add a sign-in for evening classes.

Security risk 2: Staff locking up

Asset or location	Staff locking up
Where is it?	Outside: grounds, boundary or car park
Position (GPS)	Front entrance and car park · 52.240830, -0.931210 (SP 73076 60831, ±6 m)
Threat scenario and supporting information	Verbal abuse or aggression at closing time
Vulnerability and existing controls	One member of staff locks up alone on two evenings a week. Check-in call not always made.
Is a fence, wall or gate part of this risk?	No
Likelihood	3 Possible
Impact	4 Major

Risk score (1 to 25)	12
Risk band	High
Assessor priority	Medium
Reason for the priority and proposed improvement	Two staff at closing where possible, otherwise a check-in call every time.

Security risk 3: Front desk cash box

Asset or location	Front desk cash box
Where is it?	Inside the building
Threat scenario and supporting information	Opportunist theft
Vulnerability and existing controls	Cash kept under the counter and only banked weekly
Likelihood	2 Unlikely
Impact	1 Negligible
Risk score (1 to 25)	2
Risk band	Low
Assessor priority	Low
Reason for the priority and proposed improvement	Small sums. Move takings to the office safe at the end of each day.

Security risk 4: Rear fire exit and service yard

Asset or location	Rear fire exit and service yard
Where is it?	Outside: grounds, boundary or car park
Position (GPS)	Rear fire exit · 52.240610, -0.931620 (SP 73049 60806, ±4 m)
Threat scenario and supporting information	Someone getting in through the rear exit after deliveries
Vulnerability and existing controls	Door sometimes left on the latch after deliveries. Not visible from the front desk.
Is a fence, wall or gate part of this risk?	No

Photos



Likelihood	3 Possible
Impact	3 Moderate
Risk score (1 to 25)	9
Risk band	Medium
Assessor priority	Medium
Reason for the priority and proposed improvement	Fit a door-open alert and add a closing check to the caretaker's round.

Security risk 5: Rear boundary fence by the service yard

Asset or location	Rear boundary fence by the service yard
Where is it?	Outside: grounds, boundary or car park
Position (GPS)	Rear boundary fence, service yard · 52.240520, -0.931840 (SP 73034 60796, ±5 m)
Threat scenario and supporting information	Someone climbing into the service yard after hours and getting to the rear exit or the bins. Footprints on the bin lids in August.
Vulnerability and existing controls	Weld mesh fence with the wheelie bins pushed against it as a step. Height measured from the bin lids to the top of the fence, where someone would climb. Gate locked at night.
Is a fence, wall or gate part of this risk?	Yes
Type	Mesh fence
Height of the fence, wall or gate (m)	1.50

Height of the fence, wall or gate (m): measuring photo



Height wanted for this risk (m)	2.00
Lower than wanted by (m)	0.50

Lower than the height wanted. Record the improvement below, for example raising the fence or adding a topping.

Photos



Likelihood	3 Possible
Impact	3 Moderate
Risk score (1 to 25)	9
Risk band	Medium
Assessor priority	Medium

Reason for the priority and proposed improvement	Move the bins at least 2 m away from the fence now, so the climb is the full fence height. Fit a topping along the yard run when the boundary budget allows.
Risks recorded	5
Very high	0
High	2
Medium	2
Low	1
Highest score	12
Outside risks pinned by GPS	3
Fences, walls or gates lower than wanted	1

> High or very high risks recorded. Make sure each one has an improvement, an owner and a date in the actions.

4. Plan and governance

Security roles, escalation and incident response	Centre manager owns security. The duty officer handles incidents on the day and calls the police in an emergency. All incidents go in the incident log, reviewed monthly.
Access, visitors, keys and contractor arrangements	Staff fobs issued and logged by the manager. Visitors and contractors sign in at the front desk and wear badges. Spare keys in a key safe with a log.
Changes and incidents triggering a review	Any break-in or theft, changes to opening hours, building works or a new use for the IT suite.
Security plan reference	SEC-NVLT-MILL-01 rev 2
Manager reviewing the recommendations	T. Okonjo, centre manager

5. Actions and review

Are further actions required?	Yes

Further action 1: Fit a lock to the laptop trolley and start an evening class sign-in sheet.

Action and evidence reference	Fit a lock to the laptop trolley and start an evening class sign-in sheet.
Person responsible	T. Okonjo
Target date	10 Oct 2026
Action status	In progress

Further action 2: Get a quote for a door-open alert on the rear fire exit.

Action and evidence reference	Get a quote for a door-open alert on the rear fire exit.
Person responsible	Caretaker, J. Bell
Target date	17 Oct 2026
Action status	Open

Further action 3: Move the bins at least 2 m away from the rear yard fence and get a quote for a fence topping.

Action and evidence reference	Move the bins at least 2 m away from the rear yard fence and get a quote for a fence topping.
Person responsible	Caretaker, J. Bell
Target date	23 Oct 2026
Action status	Open
Outstanding limitations and information to pass on	After-dark lighting not checked. Alarm and camera details held separately by the centre manager.
Record status	Ready for review
Reviewed by	T. Okonjo
Review date	24 Sep 2026
Author signature	

Signing records the information entered. It does not itself certify legal compliance, remove a limitation or authorise unsafe work.