

**Weathertightness test to
BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 on
a Smart Systems Ltd
Visoline outward
opening double doors**

Prepared for: Mr. Mark Walford


Smart Systems Ltd

15 February 2007

Test report number 234640



0578



Tested on behalf of BRE by

Name Malcolm Pound
Position Laboratory Manager and Senior Consultant, Actions, Centre for Materials and Engineering
Date 14 February 2007
Signature *M.C. Pound*

Prepared on behalf of BRE by

Name Malcolm Pound
Position Laboratory Manager and Senior Consultant, Actions, Centre for Materials and Engineering
Date 15 February 2007
Signature *M.C. Pound*

Approved on behalf of BRE

Name Dr. P. Blackmore
Position Associate Director of Actions, Centre for Materials and Engineering
Date *19/2/07*
Signature *P. Blackmore*

BRE
Garston
WD25 9XX
T + 44 (0) 1923 664000
F + 44 (0) 1923 664010
E enquiries@bre.co.uk
www.bre.co.uk


BRE is not UKAS accredited to make opinions and interpretation. Any opinions and interpretations included as part of this report are clearly marked as such.



0578

This report may only be distributed in its entirety and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. Test results relate only to the items tested. BRE has no responsibility for the design, materials, workmanship or performance of the product or items tested. This report does not constitute an approval, certification or endorsement of the product tested.

This report is made on behalf of BRE. By receiving the report and action on it, the client – or any third party relying on it – accepts that no individual is personally liable in contract, tort or breach of statutory duty (including negligence).



1 Introduction

At the request of Mr. M. Walford of Smart Systems Ltd, Arnolds Way, Yatton, North Somerset, BS49 4UN, BRE issued proposal number 119240 on 11 January 2007. The proposal was accepted on 24 January 2007 and BRE tested a specimen double door on 14 February 2007.


The tests to methods in BS 6375: Part 1: 2004, BS EN 1026¹, 1027² and 12211³ measure the weathertightness of the specimen door in terms of air permeability, watertightness and resistance to wind load respectively. Classification of the results is based on BS 6375: Part 1: 2004⁴ and BS EN 12207⁵, 12208⁶, 12210⁷.

The tests on the specimen door were carried out under the BRE Standard Terms and Conditions of Business and to the UKAS BRE Specific Procedures Series F, as BRE Job number 234640 in project number CV1619.

The tests were witnessed by:

Mr M. Walford Smart Systems Ltd

Mr M Mayne Ardmore Ltd



2 Details of tests carried out

The weather-tightness test on the test specimen was carried out to the requirements of BS 6375: Part 1: 2004, BS EN's 1026, 1027 and 12211 for air permeability, watertightness and resistance to wind load.

BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 specifies that the air permeability test is performed under both positive and negative test pressures, water tightness test method A is used and that deflections measured during the resistance to wind test do not exceed 1/150 of the span. The weather-tightness test comprised of three parts in the sequence:


1. Air permeability to BS EN 1026: 2000; by application of a series of test air pressure differentials across the specimen with measurement of the air permeability of it at each pressure step. The maximum positive and negative pressure differential was 600 Pa reached in pressure steps of 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 300, 450 and 600 Pascals.
2. Watertightness to BS EN 1027: 2000; by applying specified amounts of water spray to the outside face of the specimen while incrementally increasing the air pressure differential across it. The test pressure, time and position of any water penetration are recorded. The maximum positive air pressure differential was 1050 Pa. Pressure (Pa)/time (min) steps were 0/15, 50/5, 100/5, 150/5, 200/5, 250/5, 300/5, 450/5, 600/5, 750/5, 900/5 and 1050/5.
3. Resistance to wind load to BS EN 12211: 2000; by application of a series of positive and negative test air pressures. Measurements and inspections are made to assess relative frontal deflection and resistance to damage from wind loads.

The resistance to wind load test includes a deflection test, a repeated pressure test and operational test, an air permeability test and finally a safety test. For the purpose of the resistance to wind load test three test pressures are defined:

- P1 applied to measure the deflections of parts of the test specimen.
- P2 50 cycles of pulsating pressure to assess performance under repeated wind loads.
- P3 applied to assess the safety of the test specimen under extreme conditions.

The values of P1, P2 and P3 are related as follows: $P2 = 0.5P1$, $P3 = 1.5P1$.
For these tests the values are: $P1 = 1600$ Pa, $P2 = 800$ Pa and $P3 = 1760$ Pa.

Note: The repeat air permeability test is an integral part of the resistance to wind load test and its significance is as an indicator of damage that may occur during that test.




3 Classification of results

The classifications from BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 for a UK exposure category of 1600 has air permeability at Class 2/300 Pa, watertightness at Class 5A/200 Pa and resistance to wind load at Class 4, P1 1600 Pa, P2 800 Pa and P3 1760 Pa. BS ENs 12207, 12208 and 12210 also classify the weathertightness performance of completely assembled windows and doors of any material after testing to the methods referred to earlier.

The relevant product standard BS EN 14351-1:2006⁸ states that the classification of air permeability is based on the averages of the positive and negative air leakage values at each pressure step.

The BS EN classifications are explained below:


- Air permeability** BS EN 12207: 1999. The classification is based on a comparison of the air permeability of the test specimen related to both overall area and length of opening joint. There are four classes; class 4 is applicable to the most airtight specimens while class 1 describes those with most air leakage. To meet any class the measured air permeability of the specimen must not exceed the upper limit at any test pressure step in that class.
- Watertightness** BS EN 12208: 2000. The classification is based on a comparison of the watertightness of the test specimen related to test pressures and duration of the test. There are nine classes; 1A/1B up to 9A for test pressures from 0 Pa to 600 Pa. For specimens that remain watertight over 600 Pa for 5 minutes a class Exxx is used. The xxx is the maximum test pressure e.g. 750 Pa. To meet any class the specimen must remain watertight for 5 minutes up to and at the test pressure set for that class.
- Resistance to wind load** BS EN 12210: 1999. The classification is based on a comparison of the resistance to wind loads of the test specimen when subjected to test pressures P1, P2 and P3. There are five classes; 1 up to 5 for P1 test pressures from 400 Pa to 2000 Pa. For specimens that are tested to P1 pressures exceeding 2000 Pa a class Exxxx is used. The xxx is the actual test pressure P1 used e.g. 2400 Pa. To achieve any class the resistance of the specimen to wind load must meet all the requirements for that class.
- Note:** Currently, neither BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 or BS EN 12207: 1999 give guidance on how to classify the performance of windows and doors considering the averages of air permeability under positive and negative test pressures. The product standard BS EN 14351-1 2006 does in Clause 4.14. This report has results for air permeability under positive and negative test pressures and displays on a graph the average air permeability for them at each pressure step.



4 Test specimen

The general details about the test specimen supplied by Smart Systems Ltd for these tests are given below and in drawings in the Annex of this report:

- Type:** Aluminium frame members with two outward opening door leafs; one active leaf and one passive. Reference: Smart Systems Ltd 2095 mm x 1815 mm Visoline Outward opening double door.
- Glazing:** The two door leafs are glazed from the indoor face with insulating glass units with 6 mm thick toughened glass and a 16 mm air gap. Aluminium beads retain the glazing seals and the glazing.
- Seals:** The door frame carries a compression type seal, continuous at the corners with a joint mid way along the top run. The active leaf also has a compression type seal that is continuous at the corners with a joint mid way along the top run. The passive leaf has a compression type seal continuous at the hinge side corners and a separate compression type seal down the locking edge of the meeting stile.
- Hardware:** The active leaf has a handle and key that operates three locking bolts and a latch. The keeps for these are in the corresponding stile of the passive leaf. The passive leaf has shoot bolts top and bottom operated by a recessed lever in the locking edge of the meeting.
- Fixings:** For these tests the specimen door was fixed and sealed into a wood surround frame with screws at the top, bottom and sides.
- Detail:** Both door leafs have three drainage slots cut into the bottom face of the bottom rails. The threshold on the door frame has a channel (nearer the outdoor edge) with four slots cut through the bottom. These allow water to drain onto the sill detail via a gap in the door frame. The threshold's top surface has four cut-aways in the protrusions there to allow water to drain back across the surface toward the drainage channel.
- Dimensions:** 2095 mm high x 1815 mm wide (overall). Area: 3.80 m²
Length of opening joint = 8.96 m



5 Test rig and preparatory procedures


The test specimen was conditioned for at least 4 hours within temperature and humidity ranges specified in the test standards of 10°C to 30°C and 25% to 75% RH respectively.

The water temperature in the watertightness test was within the specified range of 4°C to 30°C.

The door was mounted in the BRE test rig 'G', to form one wall of a pressure box, with the outdoor face of the door enclosed in the box.

A single spray bar with five full circular cone nozzles was mounted in the pressure box to apply water to the outside face of the specimen at the rate of 2 L/min per nozzle in accordance with BS EN 1027 spraying method 1A.

Transducers were mounted on independent supports to measure deflections of a frame member retaining an insulating glass unit. Deflections were measured on the span at the positions indicated in Figure 1.




6 Summary of test results

The test results are summarised in Table 1 below. Figures show detail of the door and detailed results are given in Annex 1.

BS or BS EN	Air permeability		Watertightness		Resistance to wind loads	
	Requirements	Results	Requirement	Results	Requirements	Results
BS 6375	Class 3 to 600 Pa	Met the requirements of Class 3 based on the averages of readings under positive and negative tests	Class 5A at 200 Pa	Met & exceeded the requirements. Class E1050 Pa	P1 = 1600 Pa P2 = 800 Pa P3 = 2400 Pa	All met. Class 4

Table 1. Summary of weathertightness test results



7 Conclusions

When the specimen Smart Systems Ltd 2095 mm x 1815 mm Visoline outward opening double door was tested to the standards described herein it was found to be:

- Sufficiently airtight to attain Class 3 when the averages of the readings under positive and negative test pressures were considered, thus **meeting** the BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 requirements.
- Resistant to water penetration using method 1A to Class E1050 up to and at 1050 Pa thus **meeting and exceeding** the BS 6375: Part 1: 2004 requirements.
- Resistant to wind loads of ± 1600 Pa causing deflections less than 1/150 of the span of a door leaf stile. Resistant to repeated pressure cycles of ± 800 Pa and able to sustain the corresponding safety test pressure of ± 2400 Pa. The overall classification for resistance to wind load is Class 4. **Meets** the requirements of BS 6375: Part 1: 2004

8 References

1. BS EN 1026: 2000. Windows and doors – Air permeability – Test method. British Standards Institution, London.
2. BS EN 1027: 2000. Windows and doors – Watertightness – Test method. British Standards Institution, London.
3. BS EN 12211: 2000. Windows and doors – Resistance to wind load – Test method. British Standards Institution, London.
4. BS 6375: Part 1: 2004. Performance of windows and doors – Classification for weathertightness and guidance on selection and specification
5. BS EN 12207: 2000. Windows and doors – Air permeability - Classification. British Standards Institution, London.
6. BS EN 12208: 2000. Windows and doors – Watertightness - Classification. British Standards Institution, London.
7. BS EN 12210: 2000. Windows and doors – Resistance to wind load - Classification. British Standards Institution, London.
8. BS EN 14351-1:2006 Windows and doors – Product standard. British Standards Institution, London






Figure 1. Outline sketch of the inside face of the door showing positions of deflection measurement points 1, 2 and 3 on a stile of the passive leaf



ANNEX 1. Weathertightness test results

Pressure differential Pa	Air flow through the specimen m ³ /h	Air flow per unit area of the specimen m ³ /h.m ²	Air flow per metre of opening joint m ³ /h.m
50	9.17	2.41	1.02
100	12.13	3.19	1.35
150	13.40	3.52	1.50
200	14.08	3.70	1.57
250	14.68	3.86	1.64
300	14.68	3.86	1.64
450	14.80	3.89	1.65
600	13.05	3.43	1.46

Table A1. Air permeability under positive air pressure; test results

Pressure differential Pa	Air flow through the specimen m ³ /h	Air flow per unit area of the specimen m ³ /h.m ²	Air flow per metre of opening joint m ³ /h.m
50	14.85	3.91	1.66
100	23.17	6.09	2.59
150	30.60	8.05	3.42
200	38.36	10.09	4.28
250	46.86	12.32	5.23
300	56.63	14.89	6.32
450	87.00	22.89	9.71
600	117.00	30.79	13.06

Table A2. Air permeability under negative air pressure; test results

Pressure differential Pa	Average air flow per unit area of the specimen m ³ /h.m ²	Average air flow per metre of opening joint m ³ /h.m
50	3.16	1.34
100	4.64	1.97
150	5.79	2.46
200	6.90	2.93
250	8.09	3.44
300	9.38	3.98
450	13.39	5.68
600	17.11	7.26

Table A3. Averages of air permeabilities under positive and negative air pressures; test results






Figure A1. Air permeability under positive and negative air pressure; test results



Watertightness test

Pressure differential Pa	Duration Minutes	Water leaks
0	15	Nil
50	5	Nil
100	5	Nil
150	5	Nil
200	5	Nil
250	5	Nil
300	5	Nil
450	5	Nil
600	5	Nil
750	5	Nil
900	5	Nil
1050	5	Nil

Test laboratory conditions: Air pressure 987 mb. Relative humidity 49.7% at 17.9°C
 Air temperature 17.9°C. Test chamber air temperature 18.9°C. Water temperature 20.5°C


Table A4. Watertightness test results

Resistance to wind load – Deflection test at ± 1600 Pa

Position deflection measured	Positive pressure P1 to +1600 Pa		Negative pressure P1 to - 1600 Pa	
	Deflection		Deflection	
	mm	defl./span	mm	defl./span
Mid height of stile	6.13	1/307	7.0	1/269

Note: The deflection at the mid-point of a member is measured relative to its ends, e.g. with reference to Figure 1: Deflection at the mid-point = deflection at the mid-point – average of deflections at the two ends of the same member.

Table A5. Deflections measured on the passive door leaf locking edge stile in the resistance to wind load test at ± 1600 Pa.



Resistance to wind load – Repeated pressure test including the second air permeability test

Repeated pressure	Damage or functional defects
50 cycles to P2 at ± 800 Pa	None

Table A6. Damage or functional defects after repeated pressures to P2 at ± 800 Pa

Second air permeability test under positive air pressures (part of resistance to wind load test)


Pressure differential Pa	Air flow through the specimen m^3/h	Comparison to the air permeability measured previously (see Table A1)
50	8.57	After the test pressures P1 and P2 were applied the amounts of air flowing through the test specimen were not significantly different to those measured previously
100	11.86	
150	12.93	
200	13.40	
250	13.73	
300	13.86	
450	13.78	
600	11.50	

Table A7. Second air permeability test results under positive air pressures

Second air permeability test under negative air pressures (part of resistance to wind load test)

Pressure differential Pa	Air flow through the specimen m^3/h	Comparison to the air permeability measured previously (see Table A2)
50	15.09	After the test pressures P1 and P2 were applied the amounts of air flowing through the test specimen were not significantly different to those measured previously
100	23.35	
150	30.96	
200	38.75	
250	47.21	
300	57.24	
450	87.50	
600	118.00	

Table A8. Second air permeability test results under negative air pressures








Resistance to wind load - Safety test

Safety test	Condition after test
One pressure pulse to pressure: P3 at – then + 2400 Pa	No parts became detached and the test specimen remained closed


Table A9. Condition of the door after the safety test to P3 at ± 2400 Pa

=====REPORT ENDS=====

OUTSIDE



OUTSIDE



VISOLINE OPEN OUT DOUBLE DOOR SET.