

LABSS INFORMATION PAPER INFOP12 - 2016 Version 1 – 21 April 2016

PROVISION OF ACCESSIBLE ENTRANCE

Alternative design of accessible entrance to dwellings

Applicable to Domestic Buildings in relation to
Section 4: Safety
Clause 4.1.7 Accessible entrances

BACKGROUND

A national house builder has approached LABSS to seek a view on the acceptability of an alternative design approach for an assessable entrance to a dwelling. While this approach was in the context of a future STAS application, it is anticipated that the principle would be used wider than a specific STAS application from a specific developer.

The alternative proposal involves the accessible entrance being formed by a double door design, comprising two leaves which together would provide in excess of the minimum width requirement. This is an alternative to the single door leaf requirement stated within the guidance. The two leaves will be operated by a single handle on each leaf operated by a single key.

DECISION

Following the Consortia Peer Review process, LABSS is of the opinion that a two door accessible entrance does meet the function requirement of mandatory standard 4.1, subject to the following conditions:

- The accessible entrance must provide a clear opening in excess of 800mm formed by two leaves each with a minimum overall dimension of 600mm
- Ironmongery to the doors will be limited to a single lock on each door leaf operated by a handle at an appropriate height; the locks must be operated by the same key.
- Multi-point locking systems or integral head and floor bolts must be operated by a single door handle on each door leaf
- Any doorset must comply with the relevant requirements of mandatory standard 4.13
- All other design guidance under clause 4.1.7 must be followed

REASONS FOR DECISION

The decision allows for a clear opening width in excess of the minimum required in the guidance from a single leaf. This additional width will provide greater flexibility for those using the accessible entrance. It is recognised that the guidance in the Technical Standards does not intend to provide a solution for all users and that in some situations further adaptation work would be required. This alternative solution does not frustrate this principle but instead provides the opportunity for a greater width of accessible entrance but at the same time does not introduce any additional barrier in use.

The peer review process included the seeking of views from those with specific expertise in 'inclusive design'.