

# Briefing Notes

<b>Project Name</b> PEARL	<b>Subject</b> Fire and Security Briefing	<b>Attendees</b> Tom Doubleday (TD) – UCL Nick Tyler (NTy) – UCL Simon Cooke (SC) – UCL Mike Dawe (MD) – UCL Hayden Velinor (HV) – UCL Mark West (MW) - UCL Amelia Norman (AN) – AECOM Michael Fostiropoulos (MF) – P&P Ross French (RF) - Peter Brett Aleksandrs Trofimovs (AT) – Buro Happold	<b>Apologies</b> Matt McBrien - AECOM Greg Harris - Peter Brett
<b>Meeting date</b> 14 <sup>th</sup> March 2019	<b>Time</b> 10:30		
<b>Location</b> UCL Bidborough House	<b>Prepared by</b> Amelia Norman		

Ref	Action	Date
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introductions and Apologies</b>	
1.1	Introductions and apologies as above.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Security Meeting Notes</b>	
2.1	MF introduced UCL security team to the project noting that the proposed site is located within a secure site which is staffed and controlled 24 hours a day. The main security concern for the Council, as landowners, is the film studios to the South of the site and visitors to the studios.	
2.2	The Council have proposed as part of the land deal that PEARL visitors access site through a separate new entrance from the North to avoid compromising security at the main checkpoint entrance to site. It was noted that the planning consultant are pushing back on this proposal, but this new access and the management of it may need to be considered further. Access at night to PEARL would be through the main security checkpoint only and the new access point would be closed outside of working hours.	
2.3	The proposed entrance would need to be well lit and secured by the Council as landowner. The footpath leading to the new entrance has been raised as a concern by existing tenants on the site and so needs to be carefully considered by UCL.	
2.4	The team confirmed to UCL's security team that the red line boundary of the PEARL site will not be a physical boundary. The only physical boundary will be the metal fence to the wider London-East site which already exists.	
2.5	London-East undertake security patrols at night. It was confirmed that the management fee paid by UCL would likely cover the patrols being undertaken to the externals of the PEARL area too. This is to be confirmed by UCL Estates.	UCL (Est) 28.03.19
2.6	Discussion moved to the proposed new PEARL building and MF queried UCL's perspective on the security of the main entrance and sequence of movement through the building. UCL noted the following principles which should look to be followed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any access from the building perimeter should be access controlled unless it is a dedicated fire exit.</li> <li>• CCTV should cover outside of the building and entrance into lobby for protection of those working in reception area. External cameras can be on the building façade or on poles. This wouldn't be standard practice in Bloomsbury but would be required on this site due to the remote location.</li> <li>• All CCTV images will need to go back to UCL central security team but may also be viewed in the building.</li> <li>• Provision of intercom and alarms will need further discussion.</li> </ul>	

Ref		Action	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UCL security team would like a local team to manage the security of the building should alarms go off. It was suggested that this could form part of the negotiations with the London-East team as to whether they manage only the external or internal security too. A designated key holder for the building will be required.</li> </ul>		
2.7	NTy confirmed that the building is not envisaged to be a 24 hour access building but instead will likely be used 8am-8pm with some access expected on Saturdays. Security team confirmed that the Engineering Department will have control over the building so will be able to manage the opening times.		
2.8	UCL's Security team have an incumbent consultant who the project team will need to engage with at stage 3 to input in the design of the security systems.	Project Team	Apr 19
2.9	Main entrance doors are to be kept straight forward and low maintenance. Security team don't have preference with regards to the large scale doors to be used for the delivery entrance into the research space as they are not widely used across the UCL estate. P&P will put forward a few suggestions of the type of doors to be used, but it was noted that some sort of access control will be required if the door is on an automated opening system. These doors won't be fire doors.		
2.10	UCL have a standard set of ER's which confirm the ironmongery specification requirements and access control systems. TD will share the ER's with the team. The ER's will include some information which can be appended to tender documentation in terms of specification but the overall requirement is for a simple, robust adequate solution which won't break easily.	TD	21.03.19
2.11	The Security team agreed that for stage 2 sign off they would look to endorse this set of minutes as a set of principles for the security element of the project moving forwards to stage 3. At stage 3 the team will need to engage with UCL's incumbent consultant to map the security requirements of the building and understand the power, data and fire interfaces. Early containment routes can be demonstrated by UCL security on drawings provided by the project team.		
2.12	TD confirmed that the project will be going out to tender at the end of stage 3. UCL's security team/consultant will remain as a client side advisor through the construction phase and will need to be involved at commissioning stage.		
2.13	Fire escape doors will require crash bars and alarm with card reader and break glass facility and a D handle on the inside of the doors. Card access is preferable on these doors as this means they will release upon fire alarm.		
2.14	UCL's Security team noted the benefit of being engaged on the project at this early stage and thanked the team for presenting to them ahead of stage 2 sign off.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Fire Meeting</b>		
3.1	Simon Cooke was introduced as UCL's Fire Safety Manager and Aleksandrs Trofimovs as Fire Engineer on the project.		
3.2	The risk certification of the building was discussed with AT noting that rating A4 is proposed at present. This would require sprinklers due to the server room and the risk associated with the spread of fire. A4 classification also allows most flexibility for research space and the variety of uses of this space in PEARL. SC agreed that if large numbers of people will be in the building then sprinklers would be favourable. AT discussed that the building could also be classified as B3. This is to be reviewed further.	AT	29.03.19
3.3	There was concern raised with regards to the risk of sprinkler damage to expensive lighting and flooring equipment. SC noted that UCL have sprinklers in a number of sensitive areas of buildings and they haven't experienced issues with sprinklers going off unexpectedly and damaging equipment. It was noted that due to the height of the building a certain type of sprinkler will be required.		
3.4	AT noted that it is possible to use inline sprinkler racks which can run up the back of the building/storage area and these work well when you have rack storage with motorized movement to		

Ref		Action	Date
	avoid the risk of damaging the sprinkler system.		
3.5	There is currently no compartmentation proposed in the building except to separate the plant areas from main building. NTy noted that ancillary spaces could be compartmentalised, but the compartmentalisation of the storage areas would impact on use of the space. Sprinklers could reduce the need for compartmentation.		
3.6	AT noted the window sealing requirements of the building (windows and doors within 1800mm of escape stairs require specialist sealing treatment). PBA and P&P considered this could impact on the proposed natural ventilation strategy, but this requires some further investigation.	PBA	29.03.19
3.7	UCL will look to minimise the management requirements for the Engineering Department for fire safety. UCL have standard technical guidance on the use of lifts in an escape situation. There is possibility a hydraulic lift with a release valve that could be used but this is dependent on having a protected route out of the building. SC will issue the technical guidance to the team for review.	SC	22.03.19
3.8	The team queried the expense of sprinklers and whether these would could become a VE option at a later stage. AT noted that there is no guarantee that a class A4 building would be accepted by the relevant fire authorities without sprinklers installed. It was noted that sprinklers as a life safety system would require a dedicated power supply in the event of power failure to the building. PBA to review further but noted they are looked at the use of a standby generator for sprinklers and as part of the smoke vent strategy (it was confirmed that the smoke vents are for research purposes as opposed to being part of the fire strategy).	PBA	29.03.19
3.9	SC noted that despite research requirements for a completely dark space, emergency lighting will still need to be provided and be visible at all times in the building.		
3.10	SC and the fire safety team at UCL will put together a briefing note for the team to explain the basic safety requirements of the building. More information will be required on the research which will be taking place, for example if there is any carpentry/wood chipping then LEV systems need to be considered. The note will cover UCL guidance on PV as the high level of electricity associated with these can impact on the fire service fighting a fire.	SC	22.03.19
3.11	SC asked the team to consider the maintenance associated with man-safe systems when designed the roof access and maintenance proposals.	Project Team	Apr-19
3.12	UCL's fire safety team are not opposed to the use of CLT as long as it meets the fire safety requirements. MF noted it is a 60 min rated structure.		
3.13	UCL's requirements for cladding is in the process of being reviewed at present but SC noted they will look for A1 or A2 rating. P&P highlighted the high cost associated with this type of cladding. As the building is under 18m the team will review this further in association with fire safety guidance. Final rating to be reviewed and discussed.	P&P	Apr-19
3.14	SC queried the availability of water supplies and hydrants to the building. TD confirmed these are provided on site.		
3.15	The team agreed the next steps in the process are for AT to issue the set of drawings on which he has commented to SC. UCL's fire team will then put together the earlier discussed briefing note and provide the technical guidance to the team. This will be done within the next week and will highlight the key project risks at this stage, noting that as the project is only at stage 2 design it is subject to change.  <b>PMN:</b> AT issued drawings and SC returned a briefing note for the team to review and incorporate into the design where required.		