

Project No: 301922  
**Project: Grenfell Tower**  
Doc Ref: MTM  
Date: 06 November 2012  
Location: Kensington Town Hall  
Subject: Fire strategy

**PRESENT:**

**John Allen – RBKC Building Control (JA)**  
**Dave Gammon – RBKC Building Control (DG)**  
**Adrian Jess – Studio E LLP (AJ)**  
**Terry Ashton – Exova Warringtonfire (TA)**

**APOLOGIES:**

**DISTRIBUTION**

**Attendees**

? Max Fordham  
? Leadbitters

Item No	Description	Action owner	Timescale
	Purpose of meeting		
	To discuss fire strategy report. DG had prepared written comments on fire strategy and marked up drawings. These were used as the agenda for the meeting.		

Job No:	30xxxx	Doc No:	??xxxxxM
Project Name:	Project Name		
Meeting Date:	00/00/00	Page No:	2 of 4

Item No	Description	Action owner	Timescale
	<p>Fire-fighting access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AJ stated that existing dry riser inlet was located inside the core at ground floor level and, although it could be re-located on the back wall of the new reception area, it would not be possible for it to be located on the external face of the building. DG stated that fire service would not be happy with having to enter the building to connect to it. If AJ/TA wanted LFEPA to consider this, the fire strategy report should be amended to reflect this</li> <li>DG's comment was that new lift in reception area should be a fire-fighting lift. AJ explained that existing fire-fighting lift extended to ground floor level. DG expressed concern that existing fire-fighting lift did not serve new mezzanine level. TA stated that all parts of this level were likely to be within 45m of the entrance to the building and, therefore, it was not necessary for the fire service to use the fire-fighting lift. DG stated that this would cause confusion but asked that this issue be dealt with in the fire strategy report.</li> <li>DG's comments were that the new stair and lobbies were part of the fire-fighting shaft and, therefore, all new accommodation should be separated from the stair by the appropriate standard of fire resistance. TA stated that fire strategy already allowed for this. DG stated that the opening to the concierge office should be fitted with a fire/smoke shutter having a 120 minute standard of fire resistance and complying with BS PAS 121. AJ/TA stated that they had expected this to be a requirement and report would be updated</li> </ul>	<p>Exova</p> <p>Exova</p> <p>Exova</p>	
	<p>Fire-fighting/means of escape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DG stated that all lobbies should be provided with smoke ventilation for means of escape/fire-fighting. AJ/TA stated that the common lobby at mezzanine level above walkway level would be provided with smoke ventilation by extending the two vent shafts down to this level. At walkway level, the only accommodation linked to the lobby was the boxing club and the access lobby would be vented as indicated in the report. At mezzanine level the community meeting room would be ventilated direct to atmosphere via an AOV 0.4m<sup>2</sup> in area but the common lobby serving the apartments would not be ventilated as each apartment would be provided with escape windows. DG stated that he was not happy with this arrangement but conceded that this arrangement was code compliant. TA stated that the lobby between the office and the main entrance lobby at ground floor level would be provided with an AOV 0.4m<sup>2</sup> in area.</li> </ul>		

Job No:	30xxxx	Doc No:	??xxxxxM
Project Name:	Project Name		
Meeting Date:	00/00/00	Page No:	3 of 4

Item No	Description	Action owner	Timescale
	<p>Means of escape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DG stated main entrance door at ground floor level should be same width as the main stair (1100mm)</li> <li>DG stated that kitchen and store in nursery and store in community area should be enclosed by fire resisting construction</li> <li>DG stated travel distances from some flat entrance doors to common stair at mezzanine level were more than 7.5m. TA stated that the provision of escape windows meant that this was acceptable but it was agreed to review layout to see if the distance could be reduced</li> <li>DG stated that, the refuse chute at both mezzanine levels should each be approached via a ventilated (0.2m<sup>2</sup>) lobby. AJ stated that this would be impossible to achieve so the refuse arrangements at these levels would have to be reviewed</li> <li>DG stated that the entrance hallways to the new flats would, because of their configuration, require multiple smoke detectors. TA stated that this was allowed for by compliance with BS 5839-6</li> </ul>	<p>Studio E</p> <p>Studio E/ Exova</p> <p>Studio E</p> <p>Studio E</p>	
	<p>Details required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Escape lighting</li> <li>Fire alarm systems to nursery, boxing club and office accommodation (DG expected all systems to be linked)</li> <li>Any mechanical ventilation systems serving flats (AJ stated kitchen extract would be via external walls and not via common vertical shafts)</li> <li>Fire signage (in non-residential areas)</li> <li>Smoke ventilation to common lobbies</li> <li>Plans showing fire brigade access (including inlet to dry riser and hydrant locations)</li> </ul>	<p>Max Fordham</p> <p>Studio E/Max Fordham</p> <p>Studio E</p> <p>Studio E/Max Fordham</p> <p>Studio E</p>	
	Consultation with fire authority		
	JA stated that LFEPA were taking months to respond to requests for consultation and, therefore, the design team should take this into account when making the building regulations application	Studio E et al	

Job No:	30xxxx	Doc No:	??xxxxxM
Project Name:	Project Name		
Meeting Date:	00/00/00	Page No:	4 of 4

Item No	Description	Action owner	Timescale
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Terry Ashton Associate (For and on behalf of Exova Warringtonfire)	00/00/00	
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Consultant Name Job Title (For and on behalf of Exova Warringtonfire)		