

<p>DRC May 2018</p>	<p><b>Heights of Protective Barriers to External Doors and Windows to Upper Floor Flats - DOMESTIC</b></p>
<p><b>LABSS Position following Feedback 23 May 2018</b></p>	<p>The question which arose to generate this Dispute Resolution Case is a relatively straightforward one concerning three Mandatory Standards and four Guidance Clauses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandatory Standard 2.9 specifies safe means of escape from buildings including rooms in dwellings.</li> <li>• Mandatory Standard 4.4 specifies the need for and the design of protective barriers</li> <li>• Mandatory Standard 4.8 specifies the need to protect against collisions with and the safe cleaning of fixed glazing</li> </ul> <p>The question put was:</p> <p>“When measuring the minimum height of a protective barrier required to protect every sudden change of level that is accessible in, or around, the building is the height be taken from the floor level or from a raised cill”</p> <p>In considering this question, due regard must be taken of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the various guidance and specifications for the protective barriers and the conflict between minimum heights required by Guidance Clause 4.4.1, 4.4.2 and 4.8.4 the maximum heights required by Guidance Clause 2.9.15 when the opening at an upper floor level also serves as an escape route from a room in a dwelling and,</li> <li>• the protection afforded to adults and children, with climability criteria introduced in 2011 primarily to disallow the installation of horizontal rails within protective barriers to negate dangers to children.</li> </ul> <p><b>In both instances, in this case, with a non-climability protective barrier fitted to protect opening windows and patio type doors, both fitted with security type fixings to provide tamper proof opening, the consensus view from the consultations held with the LABSS Consortia Groups is that the Mandatory Standard has been met i.e. with protective barriers with a height of 1100mm above floor level and a height of more than 800mm above the raised cill level (in this case a minimum height of 985mm is achieved).</b></p>

**BSD Decision**

**5 June 2018**

We have reviewed the documents submitted and have concluded that:

- It is noted that there are various details submitted and it is not immediately clear on which detail an opinion is being sought;
- From reading the accompanying documents it looks like EMA drawing No. 15005(34)200-E is the one that is the subject of the opinion;
- The protective barrier on the outside of the inward opening door/window has 2 dimensions measured from finished floor level – 900mm and 1100mm. It appears that the 1100mm dimension is the one which is under consideration as the 900mm dimension would probably never be considered appropriate in terms of the Technical Handbooks.
- EMA drawing No. 15005(34)200-E lacks certain dimensions, but the NHBC letter dated 7 March 2018 appears to provide clarification.
- It is noted that the building warrant applicant considers the projection in front of the inward opening door/window to be a decorative internal window sill and that a significant number of the consortia groups consider the projection to be a sill.
- EMA drawing No. 15005(34)200-E appears to minimise the provision of potential hand and footholds to the barrier.

**Taking into account all of the above, there is no reason for this Division to depart from the widespread view of LABSS consortia groups and the building warrant applicant that Standard 4.4 is being met.**

