

From: Ian Lucas ilucas@smitherspurslow.com
Subject: 51/2016/0882 - IWL - Manchester Jewish Museum Fire Door Closers
Date: 3 November 2020 at 17:26
To: Candice Moore (Citizen Design Bureau Architects) candice@citizensdesignbureau.net
Cc: Katy Marks (Citizen Design Bureau Architects) katy@citizensdesignbureau.net

IL

Dear Candice

Manchester Jewish Museum Fire Doors & Closers

I note the Assa 4000 concealed closer proposed for use on the self-closing fire doors in the existing building. This appears to be similar to the Perko door closer but has a 'closing speed adjustment' function which is a significant improvement on the standard Perko closer. I suspect that the lack of a closing speed restrictor will still result in the doors closing rapidly and noisily. However an additional friction door stay could be added to prevent 'slamming'.

I note the **Method Statement for Fire Upgrade** to existing doors prepared by HH Smith. This refers to the Assa 400 concealed closer which is acceptable. I note the reference to ...'Plane all four edges smooth and square if possible'. What is important is that each door is referenced to each unique opening so that there is no risk of any door being mis-matched in the wrong door frame/ opening. The door leaf should then be adjusted to fit the existing door opening/ frame. This may mean that it is not square. In my experience existing buildings are seldom square or plumb. I would question why all 4.no edges are being re-lipped unless there is damage to one of the edges. If an existing door edge is sound it should be left as existing. If the lipping is considered a requirement for fire resistance (due to the density of the lipping) then this may require further discussion with the Building Inspector but the application of the Intumescent paint should give adequate protection. I suggest that you discuss this with Thermoguard who should have test certificates as necessary.

Regarding the Thermoguard paint I notice the 6.no paint coats which are to be applied as part of this system. This will increase the thickness of the door leaf and this will need to be allowed for in the initial door hanging.

I note the reference to additional 6mm play panels to be applied to each side of the existing panels to the framed & panelled doors. This will require the removal of the existing beads which must be done with care. Inevitably some of the existing beads will split or be lost and will need replacement. A template needs to be taken of the existing bead profile so that replacement sections can be made as necessary. I am also concerned about the possible reduction in depth of each panel which may result in the beads 'standing proud' of the frame. I do not consider these doors to be consistent in age with the original early synagogue and so replacement panels could be considered if this retains the overall appearance of the doors. In similar circumstances I have used a core material of 12mm Supalux which is overlaid by a timber laminated ply board of say 4mm thickness. This provides the paint finish while the Supalux gives the required fire resistance. Again Thermoguard may be able to advise or Promap (who manufacture Supalux).

With best wishes.

Ian

Ian Lucas BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) DipBldgCons(RICS) RIBA IHBC AABC
Chartered & Accredited Conservation Architect
SMITHERS PURSLOW
0161 875 0600
07879416801



ENGINEERING • SURVEYING • ARCHITECTURE

Independent Professional Expertise



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

Platinum
Until 2022

Suite 3A Maclaren House, Talbot Road, Old Trafford, Manchester M32 0FP

Civil & Structural Engineering, Building & Quantity Surveying,
Insurance Claims, Architecture & Planning Services

National coverage from offices in:

London | Reading | Exeter | Rutland | Nottingham | Llandudno | Chester | Manchester | Leeds | Newcastle

www.smitherspurslow.com