

Summary of Items Discussed in 2/2013 APSEC Discussion Forum on 1 March 2013

	Items proposed by Convenors for Discussion	Summary of Discussion and BD's Responses
	Items raised by HKIA	
1.	<p><u>External Pipe Duct</u></p> <p>As BD maintained the response at the Discussion Forum on 26 Oct 2012, which does not give too much of a hint to what will be accepted by BD on the issue. Currently, APs are faced with the situation that in most cases, none of the screen or whatever will be accepted. It is a general feeling of the architects profession that first the design of the exterior is held up by such uncertainty and secondly architectural treatment to enhance the built environment is handicapped by such attitude. HKIA strongly requested BD to make a clearer response on the issue.</p>	<p>The BD advised that a draft PNAP was being prepared and would be issued in due course to consult the members of BSC and APSEC. The BD further advised that before the issue of the PNAP, application for provision of screen for external pipe duct would be considered on a case by case basis and justification on the provision of a convenient and safe means to detect, inspect, maintain and replace defective / leaking pipework.</p>
2.	<p><u>Fire Safety Code (FS Code) Matter</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Pressurization of Basement Access Stairs</u></p> <p>Under clause D19.1 of Means of Access, it is stated that 'every access staircase ... should be provided with (a) pressurization or (b) natural ventilation. Since (b) refers to storeys above the ground storey, is it correct to interpret that this clause applies to staircase above ground only. For staircase below ground, we may choose from the three alternatives shown in Diagram D2.</p>	<p>(a) The BD advised that access staircase of a firefighting and rescue stairway (FRS) would only need to be provided with natural ventilation at each storey above the ground storey according to Clause D19.1(b)(i) of the Fire Safety Code (FS Code) (i.e. same as para. 21 of the MOA Code). Clause D19.1(a) of the FS Code was meant to complement Clause D21.1 in that natural ventilation requirement under Clause D19.1(b) could be omitted by the provision of a mechanical system for controlling the</p>

<p>(b) <u>Compartment Limitation for Carpark</u> In Table C1 of Fire Resisting Construction, compartment area of carpark is limited to 10,500 m² while in COP for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment 4.4 (xii) smoke extraction is required for any fire compartment exceeding 7000 m³ where the designed fire load is likely to exceed 1135 MJ/m². Is it correct to interpret that 1135 MJ/m² refers to loading and unloading areas only. If it also refers to carpark, then the compartment area of 10,500 m² would be meaningless as the headroom would become 1.5 m only.</p> <p>(c) <u>Clause C8.1 of Fire Safety Code</u> We are informed by certain fellow architect that FSD does not agree to the adding of sprinkler to substitute insulation requirement. BD is requested to advise whether the above is an official stand of FSD.</p>	<p>ingress of smoke (i.e. pressurization). Diagram D2 refers to natural ventilation for the lobby of FRS in storeys below ground storey.</p> <p>(b) The BD advised that the criteria / requirements in Item 4.4(xii) of the CoP for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment (i.e. compartment volume, fire load and usage) are for the provision of smoke extraction system in basements which exceed 230m² of usable floor area. This is a separate issue whereas the compartment area under Table C1 of the FS Code is for fire compartmentation purpose, i.e. every building should be divided into fire compartments by fire barriers without exceeding the fire compartment (area / volume) specified in Table C1 to prohibit the spread of fire.</p> <p>(c) The BD advised that the consultant of the FS Code and the FSD had been consulted on the proposal of providing sprinklers for relaxing the FRR on insulation to 30 minutes for door or shutter, the opening of which is more than 25% of the length of the compartment wall concerned. Both the consultant and the FSD had commented on and agreed to the current requirements which have been incorporated in the corrigenda to Clause C8.1 of the FS Code as promulgated in April 2012.</p> <p>The BD would liaise with the FSD on the details regarding the adequacy / acceptability of the additional sprinklers proposed under Clause C8.1 of the FS Code and submission of test report</p>
--	---

	<p>(d) <u>Occupancy Capacity for Use Classification 1(b)</u> In Table B1, flats with 5 or more flats served by one staircase per floor demand the use of an occupancy capacity of 4.5 m²/person. A domestic building of 10 flats per floor, average UFA per flat 41.6 m² would end up in having 93 persons per floor, which is rather absurd. If the building is 45 storeys high, it would require either 3 no. 1.05 m stairs or 2 no. 1.35 m stairs, which is again abnormal for a domestic building. A revisit of this requirement is requested.</p> <p>(e) <u>Occupancy Capacity for Use Classification 1(b)</u> In Table 1, it is described as ‘Flats with corridor or balcony access having five or more flats served by each staircase’. The question is what is the significance of ‘with corridor or balcony access’? Does it mean that if all the flats are accessible from the lobby then this clause would not apply?</p>	<p>to substantiate the requisite FRR of the concerned door or shutter pursuant to Clause E4.2 of the FS Code vide Appendix A to PNAP APP-13 as usual.</p> <p>(d) The BD advised that a paper on the subject matter was discussed in the meeting of the Technical Committee (TC) on the FS Code held on 25.1.2013. After deliberation, members of the TC would give their views on the continual adoption of the occupancy factors for assessing the population of flats according to Table B1 of the FS Code, and in case such occupancy factors were considered to be in need of review, the approach and methodology of conducting the review. HKIA could provide comments to their representative in the TC.</p> <p>(e) See item (d) above.</p>
3.	<p><u>External Cladding</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Depth of Metal Cladding exceeding 90 mm</u> It was mentioned in last Forum that in case depth of metal cladding exceeds 90 mm, the same principle of counting GFA for curtain wall will be adopted. This is to record for the avoidance</p>	<p>(a) The BD confirmed that in case depth of metal cladding exceeds 90 mm without justifiable reason, the excessive depth would be accountable for GFA but not the whole depth would be accountable.</p>

	<p>of doubt that in case depth of metal cladding exceeds 90 mm without justifiable reason, the excessive depth will be accountable for GFA but not the whole depth will be accountable.</p> <p>(b) <u>Structural Submission of External Ceiling</u> For the sake of clarity, please clarify whether structural submission of all external ceiling of whatever types are required.</p>	<p>(b) The BD confirmed that structural submission of all external ceiling of whatever types as long as subject to wind load was required.</p>
4.	<p><u>Drainage to Architectural Features</u> Architectural features will take many shapes and it would be difficult and visually unacceptable to add surface channel and rainwater outlets to such architectural features. Please confirm that drainage to external areas is only required for flat roofs and canopies.</p>	<p>The BD advised that normally surface channel and rainwater outlets would not be required for small architectural features. However, if the architectural features were of such design that would accumulate water or incur waterfall like downpour, drainage provision may have to be provided.</p>
5.	<p><u>Extension to Two Years Period for Commencement of Superstructure Works</u> It has been advised that application for extension to the two years period for commencement of superstructure works should be submitted about 1/2 year before the expiry of the two years period. The question whether it can be applied earlier say one year beforehand so that programming of works could be planned ahead.</p>	<p>The BD reiterated that the objective of imposing the 2-year time limit was to ensure that developers would implement the proposals as shown on the approved plans diligently within a reasonable period, and not to delay the implementation even until the circumstances had changed to such a state that implementation of the works at that stage with the modification / exemption would have been considered as imposing an adverse effect on the built environment. If the application for EOT was submitted too early before the expiry of the time limit, it would not be possible to assess whether the proposed works had been proceeded with diligently subsequent to obtaining the</p>

		approval of plans. It would also be premature for the BA to determine a reasonable period of extension.
6.	<p><u>PNAP 132</u></p> <p>We welcome the introduction of this PNAP to allow flexibility in design. It is said that “the GFA will not exceed that of the viable notional scheme”. The question is by enlarging the site coverage with same plot ratio, there is a possibility that the height of the building may be reduced to a lower category thereby reducing the permissible plot ratio. Is it correct to interpret that the permissible plot ratio will remain in the category of the viable notional scheme rather than the category of actual scheme with height reduced. It being the case, will a modification of the GFA be required?</p>	The BD advised that the permissible plot ratio for scheme using the ‘open space approach’ shall be based on the actual scheme rather than the notional scheme. The issue of GFA modification is not relevant.
	Items raised by HKIS	
7.	<p><u>Minor Works - Item 1.13 and Item 3.9</u></p> <p>Item 1.13 - Erection or alteration of supporting structure for an antenna or transceiver on the roof</p> <p>Item 3.9 - Erection, alteration or removal of supporting structure for an antenna or transceiver on the roof</p> <p>Whether antenna & antenna pole could be mounted to the internal face of R.C. parapet wall / R.C. wall / R.C. column?</p>	BD clarified that only the erection, alteration or removal of a supporting structure for an antenna or transceiver on the roof might be considered as a minor works item under the Building (Minor Works) Regulation (Cap. 123N).



8. Minor Works - Item 1.14

Item 1.14 - Erection or alteration of support structure for a radio base station solely for telecommunications services in the form of an equipment cabinet on the roof

(a) Whether radio base station could be mounted to the internal face of R.C. parapet wall / R.C. wall / R.C. column?



(a) BD clarified that only erection, alteration or removal of a supporting structure for a radio base station solely for telecommunications services in the form of an equipment cabinet on the roof might be considered as a minor works item under Cap. 123N.

(b) Whether 2nos. split-type A/C condenser could be shared with the supporting platform of radio base station?



(c) Whether 2nos. utility box [max. size: 0.95m(W) x 0.5m(D) x 0.95m(H)] could be shared with the supporting platform of radio base station.?



(b) BD confirmed that if split-type A/C condensers could be shared with the supporting structure for a radio base station if they solely served the radio base station.

(Post-meeting note : The requirements under Minor Works Item 1.28 should be complied with.)

(c) As mentioned in Item 8(a) above, a supporting platform for radio base station fixed on a wall instead on a roof as shown on the submitted photo could not be regarded as a minor works item under Cap. 123N. A supporting structure with other equipment such as common utility box also serving the radio base station did not fall within Minor Works Item 1.4.

9.	<p><u>Public Access to Minor Works Submission Records</u></p> <p>According to the officers in charge Minor Works Control System that BD is going to allow public access to all submission records in relation with completed minor works.</p> <p>This may include all plans & photographic records of interiors and exteriors of a private premises, which are much more than the existing system.</p> <p>Could BD clarify the above.</p>	<p>The BD clarified that this issue had been referred to the Corporate Services Division to follow up.</p>
Item raised by HKIE		
10.	<p><u>Ground Investigation</u></p> <p>BD does not accept GI result completed before year 2005 as support to the foundation and ELS submission. However, this work practice is not fully aware by other government departments and may create desirable impact to government subvent projects. Would BD clarify the above by amending the PNAP-APP49 on Site Investigation and Ground Investigation.</p>	<p>BD considered that the RSE should have the responsibility to verify the GI results which were carried out before 2005 not under his supervision. If necessary, the RSE should supplement and verify the GI results by sinking additional boreholes.</p>
Matters Arising		
11.	<p><u>Greenery Ratio</u></p> <p>(Item raised by BD)</p> <p>Supplementary information to item 3 of the APSEC Discussion Forum on 4.1.2013, i.e. the pro-rata measurement of greenery areas for phased development.</p>	<p>BD confirmed that for phased developments, one approach to determine the area of greenery to be provided for each phase might be by multiplying the percentage of greenery required for the whole development with the area of the site for such phase. In this</p>

		<p>connection, the phasing plan should include information to demonstrate that the total amount of greenery to be provided for all different phases (calculated based on the site area of each phase), would not be less than that required for the whole development (calculated based on the area of the whole site). If the total GFA for different phases had already been established in an approved Master Layout Plan, it would be acceptable to calculate the greenery required for each phase on a GFA pro-rata basis i.e. by multiplying the total amount of greenery required for the whole development with the percentage of the total GFA for a particular phase as compared with the total GFA for the whole development. Pre-submission enquiries could be submitted for seeking BD's in-principle agreement to the proposed greenery provision for different phases.</p>
12.	<p><u>Number of Flue Aperture for Bathroom</u> (Item raised by BD) Supplementary information to item 12 of the APSEC Discussion Forum on 4.1.2013, i.e. the number of flue aperture required for bathrooms in a domestic unit.</p>	<p>Pursuant to B(P)R 35A and PNAP APP-27, each bathroom should be provided with a flue aperture.</p> <p>Members commented that the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited already allowed several bathrooms to share one gas water heater and enquired whether the BD would accept a modification of providing one flue aperture under such scenario. The BD advised that acceptance from EMSD should be sought.</p>
	AOB Items	

<p>13.</p>	<p><u>Pre-demolition Site Clearance Works/Preparatory Works</u> (Item raised by BD) For pre-demolition site clearance works/preparatory works involving minor works items, adequate precautionary measures should be provided and the requirements of Minor Works Control System should be complied with.</p>	<p>Arising from recent reports from members of the public and the media, BD reminded the industry that if pre-demolition site clearance works / preparatory works would involve minor works items (such as removal of windows and a/c supporting frames), adequate precautionary measures should be provided and the requirements of Minor Works Control System should be complied with. Prosecution might be instigated if the relevant provision of Cap. 123N had been contravened.</p> <p>In response to members' request, the BD advised that a circular letter to AP, RSE, RGE, RGBC, RSC and RMWC regarding this issue was being prepared.</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p><u>APSEC Discussion Forum</u> (Item raised by BD) BD proposed to set a quota for the number of attendees of each institute / institution / association attending the Forum.</p>	<p>The APSEC Discussion Forum comprised representatives of HKIA, HKIE, HKIS and AAP with representatives from REDA as observers. In view of efficiency, BD proposed to set a quota for the number of attendees of each institute / institution / association attending the Forum.</p> <p>In response, members would discuss the proposed arrangement with their fellow members. Discussion on this item would be followed up in the next APSEC Discussion Forum.</p>

<p>15.</p>	<p><u>Fire Safety Code (FS Code) Subsection E9</u> (Item raised by HKIA) A member enquired whether the BD would accept assessment reports on smoke seal performance as required under Clause E9.1 of the FS Code, which were based on validated test reports. The member supplemented that the assessment reports were prepared in accordance with the test standards as specified in Clause E9.1.</p>	<p>The BD advised that in accordance with Clause E16.2 of the Fire Safety Code (FS Code), a laboratory which had been duly accredited to carry out smoke control test(s) listed in Clause E9.1 of the FS Code for smoke seal door has been recognised to prepare assessment reports to certify the fire properties of smoke seal doors under Clause E9.1 of the FS Code based on test report(s) on smoke seal door even carried out under other testing standard(s).</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p><u>Curtain Wall Thickness</u> (Item raised by AAP) A member enquired if the BD still accepted curtain wall with maximum thickness of 300mm.</p>	<p>According to the extant PNAP APP-2 in force, the BD would still accept curtain wall with thickness not exceeding 300mm. However, members are reminded of the proposed revision in PNAP APP-2 that the acceptable thickness of the curtain wall would be revised to 200mm for domestic buildings and 250mm for non-domestic buildings.</p>