DIOHAS 3 Designers' Initiative Of Health And Safety

Meeting Record

Date	20 th November 2023 (Mon), 16:30-18:00
Venue	Video conference using Microsoft Teams
Chair	Paul Bussey
Торіс	Passive Fire Protection

Attendees	Name	Organisation
1	Paul Bussey (chair)	AHMM
2	Paul McSoley (guest speaker)	Mace
3	Will Pitt (guest speaker)	Laing O'Rourke
4	Richard Fordyce (guest speaker)	Laing O'Rourke
5	Agnieszka Rygolowska	?
6	Andrew Dean	Allies and Morrison
7	Andrew Gowing	Shedkm
8	Andrew Long	?
9	Andy Battle	SRA Architects
10	Angelica Piscopello	Murphy Philipps
11	Anthony McMahon	Morrow + Lorraine
12	Carlos Torrente	Weston Williamson + Partners
13	Chris Bracewell	DWA Architects
14	Chris Howe	Brooks Architects
15	Ciaran Gallagher	Hawkins Brown
16	Daniel Clift	MacCreanor Lavington
17	Danny Coomber	Harwood Cinstruction Consultancy
18	Darren Ghanie	Veretec
19	David Mulligan	BBKC
20	David Stanley	2
20	Fahima Akhter	· ?
22	Fran Watkins-White	Bureau Veritas
22	Gabrielle Flood	Suzia Bridges Architects
20	Gary Stoakes	2
25	Gary Walpole	: National Enderation of Deafing Contractors
26	Hugh Wray-McCann	Wray-McCann Architect
20		
28	lames Taylor	Nicholas Hare Architects
20		leffrey Tribich Consulting
30	Jonathan Hodge	Eletcher Priest Architects
31	Justin Robinson	2
32	Kareem Wahid Sheik Mujibur Rehman	2
33		: Hollis
3/	Marcus Nelson	MEPK Architects
35	Marcus Nelson Marina Villalonga Bagan	
36	Mark Taylor	: Allies and Morrison
37	Mark Webb	Kier
38	Martin Touška	Rolfe Judd
30		2
40		: Levitt Bernstein
40 //1	Nick Panaviotou	P&P Architects td
41		
42		י פחפ
40 44	r au Owen Daul Strudwick	UUF HKS Architacta
 15		Chanman Taylor
40	reter negariy Dov Singh Dhull	
40 47		Aluaus
+1 10		Boordon Smith Architecto
4 0		

DIOII	Meeting Record									
I) I () HAS	Date	20 th November 2023 (Mon), 16:30-18:00								
	Venue	Video conference using Microsoft Teams								
Designers' Initiative Of Health And Safety	Chair	Paul Bussey								
	Торіс	Passive Fire Protection								
49	Russell Smith	Project Four Safety								
50	Seb.Laan Lomas	Architype								
51	Aamir Shahzad	?								
52	Shephard Ndlov	u University of Central Lancashire								
53	Stefan von Strer	npel ?								
54	Sarah Susman	PRP Architects								
55	Suzie Bridges	Suzie Bridges Architects								
56	Mathew Mallon	AHMM								
57	Goh Ong	AHMM								
	NOTE OI over vide	N COVID-19: Since 23 rd March 2020, all DIOHAS meetings will take place o conference.								
Agenda	Three gue projects c	est speakers discussing passive fire protection issues on architectural f all sizes. They are:								
	•	Paul McSoley of Mace Will Pitt of Laing O'Rourke Richard Fordyce also of Laing O'Rourke								
Recording	Link to th <u>https://yo</u>	e recording of the meeting: <u>utu.be/4c6grA2EbUA</u>								



MEP SERVICES PENETRATION SEALS BEST PRACTICE DESIGN AND SPECIFICATION

V1 June 2023

www.pfkg.org

OBJECTIVE

- The objective of this presentation it is illustrate a best practice approach to the design and specification of MEP services penetration seals where they pass through fire compartment walls or floors.
- The design and specification of MEP services penetration seals continues to be a significant challenge. Getting it right requires careful consideration and planning at all stages of the construction process, including critically at design stage when the architecture and building services are spatially planned.
- This guidance, which follows the RIBA Plan of Works 2020 is intended for all members of the design and professional team including architects, building services engineers, project managers and client stakeholders.





OVERVIEW



- Whenever MEP services pass through fire compartment walls or floors, the penetration(s) must have a penetration seal to ensure that the overall fire resistance of the wall or floor is maintained.
- The best way to prove that a proposed penetration seal is suitable is to ensure that third party tested or certified manufacturer details are incorporated.
- Tested or certified penetration seal details are always based on spacing rules (e.g., setting out distances between services and between services and aperture edges).
- It is therefore essential that services are spatially planned to take this into account at design stage.
- In addition, tested or certified penetration seal details are always based on specific wall or floor build-ups and deviating from this will mean the penetration seal detail is effectively untested therefore unproven.
- Where the building services and architectural design has not taken into account the spacing requirements
 needed to facilitate the application of manufacturer tested or certified penetration seal details, it is likely that redesign will be needed. This may have significant knock-on implications to planning, programme, and cost.







Example fire strategy drawing showing compartmentation layout



Example mixed-service penetration seal solution

www.pfkg.org





MEP design / model

- The MEP design must be developed based on penetration seal manufacturers third party tested or certified details
- At RIBA stage 3, where preferred manufacturers are yet to be defined, one solution is to develop the MEP services design based on generic spacing rules that accommodate the requirements of a range of manufacturers
- Where procurement routes allow, an alternative approach is to develop the design based on a specific penetration seal manufacturer, but there may be limitations
- Note: certain services such as fire resisting ducts, fire and smoke dampers, busbar, and flues should be in their own dedicated apertures and will usually require specific penetration seal details



Example showing MEP services spatially planned based on spacing rules







Architectural design / model

Once the MEP design has been updated to include penetration seal spacing rules, it is essential the architectural design / model is also updated to accommodate additional MEP penetration seal requirements.



Typical elevation and plan showing MEP builders work penetration positions and references



MEP design / model

- Co-ordinate MEP services incorporating penetration seal spatial requirements including details of specific services and separation distances
- Define aperture dimensions and approximate position in wall or floor
- Allocate a unique reference
- Issue to project architect for incorporation into architectural design model.





Architectural design / model

 Once the MEP design has been co-ordinated and includes penetration seal spacing rules, it is essential the architectural design / model is also updated to accommodate additional MEP penetration seal requirements





Architectural design / model

- Once the MEP design has been co-ordinated and includes penetration seal spacing rules, it is essential the architectural design / model is also updated to accommodate additional MEP penetration seal requirements
- Check MEP builders work positions for architectural clashes and advise any penetration repositioning or re-sizing

Guidance courtesy of Measom



Opening shown nominal 900 x 600mm



Architectural design / model

- Once the MEP design has been co-ordinated and includes penetration seal spacing rules, it is essential the architectural design / model is also updated to accommodate additional MEP penetration seal requirements
- Check MEP builders work positions for architectural clashes and advise any penetration repositioning or re-sizing
- The check should include (but not limited to) head track/deflection head, stud position, lintels, framing out, and wall stability







Architectural design / model

- Once the MEP design has been co-ordinated and includes penetration seal spacing rules, it is essential the architectural design / model is also updated to accommodate additional MEP penetration seal requirements
- Check MEP builders work positions for architectural clashes and advise any penetration repositioning or re-sizing
- The check should include (but not limited to) head track/deflection head, stud position, lintels, framing out, and wall stability
- Once complete, liaise with MEP model owner to ensure any penetration re-sizing or repositioning is incorporated into MEP model.





- Once multi-disciplinary co-ordination is complete, produce builders work setting out elevation drawings.
- Complete master penetration seal schedule.

Note: Depending on project BIM protocols, it may be possible to automatically extract key MEP, architectural and fire information from the model(s).

• Following this process will make it considerably easier for a suitably qualified and experienced specifier to allocate manufacturer tested or certified penetration seal details to individual builders work penetrations (see next slide).



Example of typical penetration seal schedule









Example of typical penetration seal schedule

Fire stop specifier

 Penetration seal specifier allocates manufacturer tested or certified penetration seal details to individual apertures along with references to and including supporting information (e.g., ETA documents, classification report etc.)

Further Reading





Fire Stopping of Service Penetrations Best Practice in Design and Installation

Free Download from ASFP, FIS, BSRIA and BESA



ASFP Red Book (4th Edition)

Fire Stopping:

Linear Joint Seals, penetrations seals & cavity barriers

Available for download from ASFP



Disclaimer

The Passive Fire Knowledge Group (PFKG) is a not-for-profit collaborative group of specialists working within various fields of passive fire protection.

The aim of the PFKG is to promote passive fire protection guidance and best practice and improve the delivery of well designed, specified and installed passive fire protection.

Information is produced by subject matter experts, peer reviewed and signed off by the PFKG Governance group before publication.

All information contained on the PFKG website and its publications, video libraries, and training resources is for general information and guidance only and does not purport to be and should not be considered as a professional or legal advice. Whilst all reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that the information contained on the PFKG website and within its publications is correct to the best of our knowledge, complete accuracy cannot be guaranteed, and the information contained within it may be incomplete or may be due for updates or changes.

Accordingly, the PFKG, its subject matter experts, and the co-publishers make no warranties or representations of any kind as to the content or accuracy of its information and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, accept no liability whatsoever for the same including, without limit, any technical, editorial, typographical or other errors or omissions in or misinterpretations of the information provided on their website, and for direct, indirect or consequential loss, business interruption, loss of business opportunity, loss of profits, production, contracts, goodwill or anticipated savings.

Any person making use of the PFKG's information does so at his or her own risk and it is recommended that they seek professional advice whenever appropriate.

In no event will the PFKG, its subject matter experts, and its co-publishers be liable to anyone for any decision made or action taken in reliance on the information published on the PFKG website or for any consequential, special, or similar damages, even if advised of the possibility of such damages.





What is the best approach to determining product safety?

TECHNICAL Quality Assurance. Setting of the appropriate product for the circumstances. Any change is 'major' once this has been formulated.



C Classification - Public

* Culmination of all product types to verify the appropriate wall type. System approach



Classification - Public

<u>TECHNICAL Quality Control. Workmanship to the QA and site recorded, 'minor'</u> <u>maybe a change to the product supplier, not the 5 QA points.</u>

Outputs



The Process required for descriptive Fire Dampers.



The Process required for descriptive Smoke Control Dampers.



The Process required for descriptive Fire Rated Ductwork and Smoke Control.





The Process required for descriptive Fire Rated Ductwork and Smoke Control. Simplification of the below flow diagram follows.





The Process required for descriptive Fire Dampers.



Classification - Public



Classification for product fire safety type

Spac	ce	Risk	Time	Operation	Blade types DP (AD:	Direction of Fire	Plane of Fire	Cycling
E.	Protected Corridor or Lobby	E.S	30-120	AD: B. Method 4		$(i \leftrightarrow o)$	Ve or Ho	Up to C10000
•-	Sleeping, Clinical	E.S	30-120	AD: B. Method 4		(i ↔ o)	Ve or Ho	Up to C10000
` ¶`	Phased Evacuation	E.S	30-120	AD: B. Method 4		(i ↔ o)	Ve or Ho	Up to C10000
_X`	Simultaneous Evacuation	E	30-120	AD: B. Method 1		(i ↔ o)	Ve or Ho	
	Power Critical supplies	E	30-120	AD: B. Method 1		(i ↔ o)	Ve or Ho	
	Fire Fighting	E.S	30-120	AD: B. Method 4		(i ↔ o)	Ve or Ho	Up to C1000
Smoka (S)	e Fire	30	Insulatio n (I)	Radiance (W)	Parallel Opposed Single	Bla n ch ens Eusible Link th	ade type nust be losen to sure that e Part L	Ve – Vertical
Classification - P	ublic				Blade blade blade	Shutter Spe	ecific fan	Ho - Horizontal



Supporting construction compatibility type /P.F safety seal type

The installation/maintenance access types



Descriptive Complete – Fire Damper



Classification - Public

Scheduling of products – Fire Dampers

Damper and wall schedule Rev 00001			Compartment fire resistance period (15- 240)	Wall or Floor Location Reference	Туре	Sleepingrisk	Phased Evacuation primary zone damper	Sub supply within Phased Evacuation Zone	Single Phase Evacuation	Protected Corridor	High risk room with explosive contents	Compartme nt Rating	Horizontal (Ho) or Vertical (Ve)	Tested Both Ways Only	MFD Cycles	Blade Type (Part L)	Free Area	Installation method	Bespoke	Duct	size
					The Process	es required for des solutions and and and and and and and and	scriptive Fire Dan	npers	NA ndl	en of the second		Technical	l Qaulity Assu	rance (use 5	point work bo	ook selection)					
Damper schedule Ref	Drg Ref	Location	15,30,45,60,90,120,240 (minutes)	Use a locator that can be used on all should schedules.	FD (E category)/ MFD (E.S Category)	E.I.S category Method 4	E.S category Method 4	E category	E category	E.S category Method 4	E.S category Method 4 Plus * 1 Category	Minutes to BS EN 1363- 1	Ho/Ve	i<->0	C10000	Curtain Parrallel Opposed Bladed Single Blade	xx%	Flange Dampers Hevac Dampers Ablative Batt Dampers Plastered in Dampers Reverse Deflection Head Dampers Cavity Barrier Dampers Cleat Dampers On Wall	Bespoke Application or other regulation 7 method (ISO or Test or PFP Assessment)	Width (mm)	Height (mm)
Basement level d	lampers and wal	ls	-	T													-		-		
							yes					20	ve	yes	yes		50				

Product :	selection	Туре	E- Resistance	Time	I - Resistance	Time	S- Resistance	Time	Horizontal (Ho) or Vertical (Ve)	Tested Both Ways Only	MFD Cycles	Blade Type (Part L)	Free Area	Frame Type	Damper Siz	BWI	C opening with tolerances a tested detail	S Opening type vert	tica (Ve)	Opening type horizontal (Ho) (same supporting construction required on all sides)	Deflection amount	Deflection amount	Cleaning TR19	Breakaway joints	Installation Sides
											Technical Q	aulity Control (use)	' point work book	selection)											
Manufacturer	Model	FD (E category) / MFD (E.S Category *)	ε	15,30,45,60,9 0,120,240 (minutes)	Ī	15,30,45,60,9 0,120,240 (minutes)	S	15,30,45,60,9 0,120,240 (minutes)	Ho/Ve	i<->0	C10000	Curtain Parrallel Opposed Bladed Single Blade	xx%	Flange Dampers Hevac Dampers Ablative Batt Dampers Plastered in Dampers Reverse Deflection Head Dampers Cavity Barrier Dampers Cleat Dampers On Wall	Width He (mm) (m	offs ight froi im) floo (mn	et m Width Height Dept or (mm) (mm) (mm 1)	h) 4 sided 3 sided	Other	4 sided 3 sided Other	15, 25, 40, 50 etc mm	top or bottom ?	Both	Both	Both
										1				1							r se				
					-					-						_			-		-				

Classification - Public