

Researching the insulation criteria for a steel beam penetrating compartment wall

Edwin Ayala, Mark Davison, Cristian Maluk

27th September 2023 Structures in Fire Forum (London)





Background of the 'problem'

- Steel beam passing through a fire rated compartment wall
- Wall + beam 'system' may fail to provide adequate fire compartmentation
- <u>Options:</u> full or partial insulation of steel beams
- <u>Needs</u>: \$\$, construction time, additional trades on-site, space limitations (for services)



Tfire technical manual



Fire stop centre – New Zealand



Steel beams protected with thin intumescent paint



Status-quo – off-the-shelf solution

ASFP recommendations

• "The potential for heat transfer from unprotected structural steel into protected structural steel must be considered. It is normally considered good practice to protect the adjoining 500mm of 'unprotected' structural steel to limit unwanted heat transfer."



Semper

Aims of this presentation

- 1. Layout the first principles of the 'problem'
- 2. Describe a method of analysis based on computational modelling
- 3. Show the outcomes of this approach for different wall types and steel protections



Proposed approach

Fire Engineering approach

Finite Element Modelling

- Run the model for the unprotected beam
- Identify the length of the unexposed beam with a temperature above the failure criteria at the fire-resisting time of the compartment wall
- Protect the identified length employing plasterboard on both sides.
- Verify temperatures of the unexposed beam





Fire Engineering approach (cont.)

Failure Criteria (BS 476-20:1987)

Failure shall be deemed to have occurred when one of the following occurs if:

- The mean unexposed face temperature increases by more than 140 °C above its initial value;
- The temperature recorded at any position on the unexposed face is in excess of 180 °C above the initial mean unexposed face temperature;
- When integrity failures occur.



Architects journal The Regs: How to make buildings fire-safe with cavity barrier / 3June 2021 / by Geoff Wilkinsons



Scenarios

Compartment wall material

- Brick Masonry
- Timber
- Plasterboard cavity walls

Type of protection

- Unprotected
- Boarded







38 Berkeley Sq



Fire stop centre – New Zealand



Finite element modelling



Finite Element Modelling – Masonry Wall

Semper

Finite Element Modelling – CLT Wall





Finite Element Modelling – Cavity wall





Empirical validation

Validation – heat transfer inside the cavity

Empirical data

• Thomas, 2010

Key assumptions

- The air temperature inside the cavity is assumed be the average temperature of all surfaces inside the cavity
- The hot surfaces inside the cavity radiate heat to colder surfaces inside the cavity (considering the view factors)
- When more than one plasterboard is used on one surface, perfect adhesion is assumed in heat conduction calculations







Validation – steel temperature

Empirical data

• Bennetts and Moinuddin, 2006

Key assumptions

- The thermal boundary conditions of the steel beam in the cavity are calculated assuming that the convective and radiative temperature is equivalent to the average temperature of the internal surfaces calculated using the 2D HT model for the cavity wall
- The top surface of the beam's top flange is assumed to have adiabatic conditions due to the presence of a slab

FISO









Outcomes of the modelling study

Outcomes of the model

Without boarding



With boarding





> 160°C



Masonry Wall – Outcomes of the model (cont.)



⁺ This length is calculated based on modelling done on the length of unprotected beam above the temperature threshold and verified with the modelling of a protected beam considering such length.

* Heating on three sides, leaving the top surface of the top flange insulated.





CLT Wall – Outcomes of the model (cont.)

	Minimum k	ength of beam protruding out th at both sides of the of the CLT v	at should be p vall [mm] †	protected	
			CLT Wall		
	Cross-section serial size ^[3]	Total depth of the wall ^[12] [mm] Section Factor (A/V)* [m ⁻¹]	60 90min	120 210 min	160 300min
Steel beam	UB 127x76x13	279	149	138	132
	UB 457x191x74	153	209	219	213
	UB 1016x305x584	39	226	375	422

⁺ This length is calculated based on modelling done on the length of unprotected beam above the temperature threshold and verified with the modelling of a protected beam considering such length.

* Heating on three sides, leaving the top surface of the top flange insulated.





Cavity Wall – Outcomes of the model (cont.)

Minimum length of beam protruding out that should be protected at both sides of the of the cavity wall [mm] [†]											
			Cavity Wall								
	Fire Resistance		30	60	60	90	120	180			
Cavit		Cavity Wall Product ^[2]	H206001 (EN)	A206066 (EN)	A206A285 (EN)	A206A091F (B) (EN)	A206067A (EN)	A206256 (EN)			
E		Board type	Glasroc H TileBacker	Gyproc FireLine	Gyproc FireLine	Gyproc FireLine	Gyproc FireLine	Gyproc FireLine			
	Total depth of gypsum board(s) [mm]		12.5	15.0	25 (2×12.5)	25 (2×12.5)	25 (2×12.5)	45 (3×15.0)			
	Cross-section serial size ^[3]	Total depth of the cavity Section wall [mm] Factor (A/V)* [m]	75	80	124	198	100	238			
Steel bearn	UB 127x76x13	279	76	114	90	57	122	49			
	UB 203x102x23	234	80	128	100	68	142	64			
	UB 305x127x37	201	82	139	109	77	159	76			
	UB 457x191x74	153	79**	153	120	94	191	104			
	UB 838x292x194	101	67**	162	125	113	231	149			
	UB 1016x305x584	39	11**	138**	98**	111**	265	220			

⁺ This length is calculated based on modelling done on the length of unprotected beam above the temperature threshold and verified with the modelling of a protected beam considering such length.

* Heating on three sides, leaving the top surface of the top flange insulated.

** These values calculated for the "length of beam protruding out of the cavity wall that should be protected" are lower than those for higher section factors because larger cross-sections of steel beams take longer to heat up at the heated side.





Thin intumescent paint

Thin intumescent paint

- There is ample empirical data which demonstrates that thin intumescent paints used for protecting steel structures swell when the surface temperature of the paint is between 350 and 500°C.
- Therefore, for a steel beam protected using thin intumescent paint and passing through a compartment wall, it is irrelevant whether the paint will swell or not at an adjacent compartment.



Steel Beam protected with intumescent coating



Concluding remarks

- Steel beams with a section factor above 150 m-1 penetrating a solid wall (i,e, brick or timber) present a required protection length independent of the wall thickness.
- Every scenario modelled showed a required protection length lower than 500 mm (prescribed recommendation)
- Generally, the required protection length is inversely proportional to the section factor of the penetrating beam.
- The protection of the beam with intumescent paint does not guarantee the insulation of the compartment wall



References

- Association for Specialist Fire Protection ASFP. (2010) Technical Guidance Document 8 Code of practice for junctions between different fire protection systems when applied to load bearing structural steel elements. ISBN: 978-1-870409-27-8. Available at <u>www.asfp.org.uk</u>.
- British Standard. (1987). BS 476-20:1987. Fire tests on building materials and structures Part 20: Method for determination of the fire resistance of elements of construction (general principles).
- British Gypsum. (2022). Specifications for a range of lightweight partition systems. Last accessed on 2 Nov 2022. Link here.
- British Steel. (2022). Database for Universal Beams (UB) used in the UK. Last accessed on 2 Nov 2022. Link here.
- Thomas G. (2010). Modelling thermal performance of gypsum plasterboard-lined light timber frame walls using SAFIR and TASEF, *Fire and Materials*, 34:385–406. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/fam.1026</u>
- Eurocode 3. (2005). Design of steel structures Part 1-2: General rules Structural fire design. EN 1993-1-2.
- SAFIR Nonlinear finite element software for modelling the behaviour of building structures subjected to fire. <u>https://www.uee.uliege.be/cms/c_6331644/en/safir</u>
- Semper. (2023). Technical Note: 2D Heat Transfer Model for a Cavity Wall. Authors: Edwin Ayala and Cristian Maluk.
- Bennetts I and Moinuddin K. (2006). Aspects of the design of fire-resistant plasterboard walls in fire. Link here.
- Forterra. (2022). Range of wirecut bricks. Last accessed on 2 Nov 2022. Link here.
- Eurocode 6. (2005). Design of masonry structures Part 1-2: General rules Structural fire design. EN 1996-1-2.
- Semper. (2023). Technical Note: 1D Heat Transfer Model for Masonry. Authors: Edwin Ayala and Cristian Maluk.
- StoraEnso. (2022). CLT product range and features. Last accessed on 2 Nov 2022. Link here.
- Eurocode 5. (2004). Design of timber structures Part 1-2: General rules Structural fire design. EN 1995-1-2.





Engineered fire safety

20 Farringdon Street London EC4A 4AB

+44 (0) 203 858 0173 info@sempergrp.com

www.sempergrp.com