

Message

From: Bruce Sounes [bruce@studioe.co.uk]
Sent: 06/01/2014 10:18:54
To: d.campbell@maxfordham.com; M.Smith@maxfordham.com; Terry Ashton [Terry.Ashton@Exova.com]
CC: Grenfell [Grenfell@studioe.co.uk]; Claire Williams [clwilliams@kctmo.org.uk]; BOOTH Philip [philip.booth@uk.arteliagroup.com]
Subject: FW: Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road, Refurbishment - Fire Strategy P2
Attachments: MOE Obs Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road Preliminary P2.doc; RBKC MOE Plan Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road (1279_SEA_(08) 101) P2.pdf; RBKC MOE Plan Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road Ground floor (1279 SEA (08) 100) P2.pdf

Hi Duncan & Terry,

Hope you had a Happy and restful Christmas and New Year.

RBKC have responded to our informal submission in some detail. Please see attached.

I have made an initial response below. I think we need to formulate our argument for the smoke vent as soon as possible.

Regards

Bruce Sounes

For and on behalf of
STUDIO E LLP

Palace Wharf, Rainville Road, London W6 9HN
T [REDACTED] | F [REDACTED] | www.studioe.co.uk

From: Bruce Sounes
Sent: 06 January 2014 10:08
To: 'John.Hoban@rbkc.gov.uk'
Cc: Paul.Hanson@rbkc.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road, Refurbishment - Fire Strategy P2

John,

Thank you for the detailed reply.

Your comments a split roughly between the smoke vent and fire separation, the former will be covered by the Engineers, the latter mostly by Studio E. The design has been the subject of lengthy deliberation and while I can understand some of the requests for additional separation there are reasons why we hadn't indicated them and we would like to discuss these with you in further detail (access to the risers, refuse chutes etc).

The priority for our client, the TMO is to eliminate the risk of significant design changes before appointing a contractor and I believe the consultation with the Fire Authority is key to this. I hope this can be made before we arrange another meeting with you. Will a response to the smoke ventilation be enough for this to happen?

Regards

Bruce Sounes

For and on behalf of
STUDIO E LLP

Palace Wharf, Rainville Road, London W6 9HN

EXO00000214_0001

EXO00000214/1

From: John.Hoban@rbkc.gov.uk [<mailto:John.Hoban@rbkc.gov.uk>]
Sent: 31 December 2013 11:57
To: Bruce Sounes
Cc: Paul.Hanson@rbkc.gov.uk
Subject: Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road, Refurbishment - Fire Strategy P2

[K:\SEA Projects\1279 Grenfell Tower\Cad\Visual\Consult In\RBKC Building Control\131231 Prelim comments](#)

Dear Bruce,

The Building Regulations 2010 [as amended]
Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road. London. W11.

Thank you for your preliminary submission. I have now been appointed the surveyor responsible for the part of Borough where your project is situated.

Please find attached marked up plans and observations relating to the fire strategy for the Grenfell Tower project, for your information / records.

Once you have had an opportunity to examine the attached information, please feel free to contact myself or Paul to discuss any of the points mentioned in the Councils schedule, or highlighted on the attached marked up plans.

Best wishes,

John Hoban
John Hoban
Senior Building Control Surveyor
[REDACTED]
john.hoban@rbkc.gov.uk

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

From: Bruce Sounes [<mailto:bruce@studioe.co.uk>]
Sent: 03 December 2013 12:15
To: Hanson, Paul: PC-BlgCtrl
Subject: Grenfell - updated Fire Access plan

Dear Paul,

Please see attached the upgraded ground floor plan as discussed.

Regards

Bruce Sounes

For and on behalf of
STUDIO E LLP

Palace Wharf, Rainville Road, London W6 9HN
T [REDACTED] | F [REDACTED] | www.studioe.co.uk

From: Bruce Sounes [<mailto:bruce@studioe.co.uk>]
Sent: 03 December 2013 10:05
To: Hanson, Paul: PC-BlgCtrl
Cc: Grenfell
Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower Refurbishment - Fire Strategy

Dear Paul,

Apologies, the CAD model was not complete. The stair is existing and we need to cut away the existing balustrade and kerb. The route you have marked is correct.

We have proposed a change to the lines of fire separate, opening up the stair to the foyer. This is reflected on the attached drawing. The 3D pdf attached communicates the idea. Click on the image and drag to spin it around.

We are currently showing a fire curtain across the concierge at ground level but given this will be fully glazed we would like to omit this if possible.

Regards

Bruce Sounes

For and on behalf of
STUDIO E LLP

Palace Wharf, Rainville Road, London W6 9HN
T [REDACTED] | F [REDACTED] | www.studioe.co.uk

From: Allen, John: PC-BlgCtrl
Sent: 11 November 2013 07:59
To: Bruce Sounes
Cc: Terry Ashton; d.campbell@maxfordham.com; Grenfell; Hanson, Paul: PC-BlgCtrl
Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower Refurbishment - Fire Strategy

Bruce, we do not feel that the information submitted so far is adequate to enable an effective consultation with the fire authority.

Under the Building Regulations providing it can be shown that the new system is no worse than the old system this will be acceptable. If there is no data on the existing system a way forward might be to measure the flow rates of the present situation and provide information about the proposed system.

The question that needs to be proposed to the Brigade is whether the replacement smoke extract system to the residential parts will be acceptable.

A letter needs to be written that can be forwarded to the fire authority that presents information on the existing smoke extract system (Design and performance) and the proposed replacement system.

This should include the following:

Confirmation of design of existing system. Is it natural ventilation or mechanical or a combination.

Method of activation of natural/powered system and fire brigade controls

Size of natural vent shaft

Powered ventilation extract rate in m³/s

Inlet air provision (Size if natural in m² or m³/s if powered)

Confirmation of proposed system, same responses as above.

Any differences to the existing system ie that it is being used for the normal ventilation system should be indicated.

The case to justify the proposal

Please give me a call if you wish to discuss this.

John Allen
Building Control Manager
The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
The Town Hall, Hornton Street, London W8 7NX
Tel: [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]
Email: john.allen@rbkc.gov.uk | Website: www.rbkc.gov.uk

From: d.campbell@maxfordham.com [<mailto:d.campbell@maxfordham.com>]

Sent: 07 November 2013 15:41

To: Hanson, Paul: PC-BlgCtrl

Cc: "M.Smith@maxfordham.com"@maxfordham.com; Terry.Ashton@Exova.com; Grenfell; Bruce Sounes

Subject: Grenfell Tower - Smoke exhaust LFB submission.

Paul,

Following on from your conversation with Bruce Sounes, I will try and clarify some of the points you raised regarding our draft report. My comments are in **GREEN**.

1. “..is designed .. as a natural ventilation system...” (line 2) is followed by “a mechanical supply and extract system which does not rely on natural ventilation” (Smoke Control, second para). His initial response is that this reads like we are omitting a compliant natural vent shaft. **We could just leave the 'compliant' system as it is at present, but we (and Exova) think it would be better to provide a more predictable system with mechanical supply and extract as the default mode, all as described in the 'Proposed System' part of our report.**
2. Some diagrams would be useful. **I have attached our schematic drawing and Studio E have provided the visual representation below.**



3. Principle of dual use of duct for vent and smoke okay – but not clear from document and would like some detail as to how this will be achieved.

The smoke controls and the temperature controls would all be part of the same control system controlling the dampers and the supply and extract fans.

Under normal conditions, all the dampers would be open and the system would operate as a natural ventilation system. Temperature sensors would be located on 'typical' (say 5 No.) lobbies. If the temperature in any of these areas exceeded a pre-set comfort level, then the supply and extract fans would operate to try to reduce the temperature.

In the event of smoke being detected within any lift lobby served by the smoke control system, the fresh air and smoke dampers serving that particular lobby would remain open and the supply and extract fans would operate. The fresh air and smoke dampers on all other levels would be closed. The system would be set up such that it was 'fail-safe' with priority always being given to the fire safety operation.

If this is still unclear, I would be happy to discuss on the phone.

4. Describe sequencing of dampers shutting on alarm. **I think our answer to point 3 answers this, but if this is still unclear, I would be happy to discuss on the phone.**

5. Query rates of flow – m^3/s & air changes. **Having discussed this with Exova, we have been unable to find a ventilation Standard which could be directly applied to the existing system or building configuration. We suggested 15 air-changes per hour as a reasonable criteria based on Building Regs. Part B5 - smoke ventilation requirements for basements being 10 air-changes per hour, albeit with sprinklers installed. As the system would only be venting one level, the flow rate would be relatively small (of the order of $0.4 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$). It would be possible to increase the ventilation rate if that was felt to be beneficial.**

6. Query how you balance the system with powered supply as opposed to powered extract only. **Not sure what the query is as the system would always operate with both the supply and extract fans running. The fan duties would be such that we can ensure a negative or positive pressure set-up.**

I would be happy to discuss any of the above or any other queries and amend our proposals if necessary.

Duncan.

MAX FORDHAM

42-43 Gloucester Crescent

London

NW1 7PE

T [REDACTED]

F [REDACTED]

maxfordham.com

Max Fordham LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership. Registered in England and Wales Number OC300026

Registered office 42-43 Gloucester Crescent, London, NW1 7PE

From: Bruce Sounes [<mailto:bruce@studioe.co.uk>]

Sent: 25 October 2013 14:18

To: Allen, John: PC-BlgCtrl; Hanson, Paul: PC-BlgCtrl

Cc: Terry Ashton; d.campbell@maxfordham.com; Grenfell

Subject: Grenfell Tower Refurbishment - Fire Strategy

Dear John and Paul,

Further to our meeting at RBKC on 17 August we are now in a position to forward your our proposed fire strategy for Grenfell Tower for comment. Please see attached fire strategy drawings, strategy document from Exova and a description of the proposed upgrade to the smoke exhaust system.

As discussed you will forward this to London Fire Brigade so that the TMO may receive a response as soon as possible. We believe that agreement on the smoke ventilation to the tower is the single biggest risk to the proposals, but we don't think it is reasonable to leave the existing system in place.

Documents attached:

1279_PL010_Existing Floor Plans.pdf

1279_PL200_Proposed Sections_Rev01.pdf

1279_SEA_(08) 100 Fire Access.pdf

1279_SEA_(08) 101 Fire Strategy.pdf

M&E - Smoke Control Proposals - Rev A.pdf

MT14634R.Iss 02 - Grenfell Tower - OFSS.pdf

There are a number of other issues in dealing with this refurbishment that need to be discussed and this is probably best done in person once you have had a chance to study the documents. Would you be able to advise availability for a meeting week commencing 4 November?

Many thanks

Bruce Sounes

For and on behalf of

STUDIO E LLP

Palace Wharf, Rainville Road, London W6 9HN

T [REDACTED] | F [REDACTED] | www.studioe.co.uk

EXO00000214_0006

EXO00000214/6

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
This e-mail may contain information which is confidential,
legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail
is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in
error, please contact the sender and delete the material
from your computer.
