

From: Benjamin Mossop [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 October 2022 19:13
To: Jonathan McClue
Cc: Sean O'Keeffe; Lynsey Seal
Subject: RE: E03 TCP 17-37 William Rd, NW1 3ER 02/233097

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Hi Jonathan,

Based on a relatively high level review of the revised plans and outline fire strategy report, I would concur with Lynsey's observations in her email below.

The addition of a second stair, which appears to have a completely independent final means of escape and does not serve the basement level, resolves a key element of the concerns we raised with regard to the previous design proposals.

In addition to considering the potential numbers of persons of restricted mobility who may need to use the evacuation lift and whether a single evacuation lift is suitable, a further consideration in this regard would be resilience and redundancy of both the evacuation and firefighters lifts. This should take into account periods of maintenance and potential fault conditions where either lift may foreseeably become unavailable for a period of time. These lifts are critical facilities supporting accessible means of escape and access for firefighters and it is our opinion that the applicant should demonstrate that there will always be an evacuation and firefighters lift available. Firefighters will expect to take control of the firefighters lift upon their arrival, which is often be as little as 5-6 minutes after the 999 call is received, and there should be no reliance upon firefighters to evacuate persons of restricted mobility awaiting assistance.

Protection of the disabled refuge spaces is also critical. Based on the design as currently proposed, it would appear that one of the two mechanical smoke extract shafts is proposed to extract from within the disabled refuge area. Our opinion is that, in order to be able to demonstrate that accessible means of escape is achieved, it should be clearly demonstrated that the disabled refuge space will be kept clear of the ingress of smoke at all material times, as we would expect to be the case for the stair enclosures, i.e. occupants who are able to use the stairs without assistance are able to enter the stair enclosure and reach a space protected from smoke ingress as they escape and occupants who require assistance should be able to await assistance in an equivalently protected environment.

Our observations aren't necessarily exhaustive, but these items in particular may be difficult to resolve once the design has progressed and planning consent is granted.

If you would like to discuss any of the above then please feel free to contact me tomorrow. I'm at a site visit from about 09:00-12:00 but I'll save your number in my phone and try and pick up if you call. If you don't get through, please leave a message or send an email and I'll call you back as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Ben Mossop
Senior Fire Engineer/Team Leader

Fire Engineering Group
London Fire Brigade
169 Union Street London SE1 0LL



london-fire.gov.uk



From: Lynsey Seal <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 17 October 2022 13:49
To: Benjamin Mossop <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Jonathan McClue <[REDACTED]>; Sean O'Keeffe <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: E03 TCP 17-37 William Rd, NW1 3ER 02/233097
Importance: High

Hi Ben,

The email below and attached are in relation to the T&CP consultation and subsequent review in relation to a planning appeal for a tall student accommodation block in William Road. Our last letter is attached for reference.

Jonathon needs a response by tomorrow, I have copied him in so he sees that I have undertaken the initial review but if you could monitor my observations and provide confirmation (or any additional observations etc) then that would be most appreciated. If you could also ask Phil to log this as a job against our workload that would be appreciated.

I have considered our recently issued letter, the revised strategy and plans attached and would make the following comments;

- 1) The scheme has been revised and now includes a second staircase so this resolves the concern regarding this development only having a single means of escape
- 2) While the scheme benefits from an evacuation lift the fire strategy does not appear to consider the number of people who may need to use it (and thus if more than one lift may be beneficial for this scheme). While, for example, the shared space on the top floor has been provided with three disabled refuges the strategy provides little detail on how evacuation provision has been considered and appears to be placing reliance on future management solutions.

- 3) In relation to the disabled refuge locations the fire strategy does not provide any detail on how the smoke control will be developed and designed to ensure that these spaces are protected for those that need to await the lift/support to evacuate. The strategy should provide clear detail on design criteria for these spaces or at least detail what the acceptance criteria should be e.g. that the disabled refuge and evacuation lift lobby should remain clear of smoke.

These are, in my opinion, the key considerations from my perspective.

Could you please consider and revert to Jonathon please before his deadline of tomorrow. Apologies for the short notice.

Kind regards,
Lynsey Seal
LFB Fire Engineering Group

