

Summary of Items Discussed in 3/2013 APSEC Discussion Forum on 10 May 2013

	Items proposed by Convenors for Discussion	Summary of Discussion and BD's Responses
	Item raised by AAP	
1.	<p><u>External Pipe Duct Inspection</u> AAP will deliver a short presentation focusing on the Pushrod system cameras for external pipe duct inspection. The presentation will last for about 10 minutes.</p>	<p>After the presentation, BD representatives exchanged views on the system with Members. BD would consider the acceptability of such provision for inspecting drainage pipes with external screens.</p>
	Items raised by HKIA	
2.	<p><u>Follow Up on Items Discussed at 2/2013 APSEC Discussion Forum</u></p> <p>(a) <u>External Pipe Duct</u> The stakeholders are eager to know when the practice note will be ready for issue.</p> <p>(b) <u>Flue Aperture for Bathroom</u> A discussion paper focusing on the provision of one flue aperture for several bathrooms complying with the supply rules is enclosed for consideration (please refer to Appendix I).</p>	<p>(a) The PNAP was being revised. The BD advised that before the issue of the revised PNAP, application for provision of screen for external pipe duct would be considered on a case by case basis, and justifications for access for inspection and maintenance should be provided.</p> <p>(b) The BD was requested to consider (i) allowing the provision of only one flue aperture for one flat if a gas / electric water heater of appropriate capacity would be used to provide hot water for all water points in the flat instead of multiple flue apertures, and (ii) no flue aperture should be provided if no town gas supply system would be provided by the developer. The BD responded that comments from EMSD and Gas Co. would be sought.</p>

<p>3.</p>	<p><u>Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (the FS Code)</u></p> <p>(a) <u>B11.3(b)</u></p> <p>The horizontal distance measured between a required staircase and any one of the other required staircase is no longer specified to be “along the corridor”. If the aforesaid interpretation is correct, it is suggested to add information to Diagram B3 to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>(b) <u>D11.4</u></p> <p>It is specified herein that “Every lobby to a fireman’s lift should have access,... to an exit route”. It is understood from HKIA’s representative in the FSD Liaison Group that FSD insisted that the access from the fireman’s lift lobby to an exit route should be through a protected route. To avoid confusion, it is suggested that a practice note of some sort be issued to clarify the point.</p>	<p>(a) FS Code Clause B11.3(b) stipulates that the horizontal distance between a required staircase or a discharge point and any one of the other required staircases or discharge points should be measured on plan along the centreline of the "<u>exit route</u>". The description of "...along the corridor..." in MOE Code para. 14.3(c) is no longer necessary in FS Code Clause B11.3(b) since the definition of "exit route" has been elaborated in FS Code Part A Section 3 with illustration vide Diagram A2. Also, its Diagrams B2 and B4 have clearly illustrated the requirements of Clause B11.3(b), and Diagram B3 aims to illustrate Clauses B11.3(a), B11.6 and B11.7 where an angle of not less than 30° formed between the lines to 2 exits at a room / an area is required for accepting the room / area as being provided with alternative exits.</p> <p>(b) Clarifications of FS Code Clause D11.4 would be made soonest possible upon clarification and consultation with FSD.</p> <p>[Post meeting notes: Necessary revisions to FS Code Clause B16.1 and D11.4 were presented at the meeting of the Technical Committee on the FS Code held on 18.7.2013, which would be considered for promulgation vide the 3rd Corrigenda to the FS Code.]</p>
-----------	---	---

	<p>(c) <u>B5.7</u></p> <p>It is stipulated herein that when an exit route adjoins another exit route, the walls along the exit route should be returned along the frontage for 450mm. Noting the acceptance of a projection in lieu of a return to achieve fire separation in Diagram C3, the BD is requested to advise whether the same principle could be applied to B5.7 such that 450mm return be replaced by a 450mm projection separating two exit route.</p>	<p>(c) FS Code Clause B5.7 (the wall enclosing the exit route should be returned along the frontage of the final discharge or project from the frontage for a distance of not less than 450mm) is under Part B on “Means of Escape” whereas Clause C9.8 and its Diagram C3 are under Part C on “Fire Resisting Construction”. FS Code Clause B5.7 aims to divert persons discharging from 2 immediate adjoining staircases / exit routes to avoid their clashing with others at the discharge points of such staircases / exit routes. Any proposal without a minimum 450mm return along the frontage of the final discharge which could be satisfactorily demonstrated to fulfill the spirit of Clause B5.7 as aforesaid would be considered on a case by case basis.</p>
4.	<p><u>Electrical Charging Provision</u></p> <p>Electrical charging provision is required if we have to attain sustainability concessions. The question is whether it is necessary to provide electrical charging provision to loading/unloading spaces. Our understanding is that L/UL spaces are not for parking and any vehicles occupying the space for charging would deprive the use for loading/unloading. Thus, such requirement is superfluous.</p>	<p>The BD confirmed that electrical charging provision was not required for loading/unloading areas as stipulated in para. 17 of PNAP APP-2.</p>
5.	<p><u>Curtain Wall Projection from Columns</u></p> <p>For practical reason, curtain wall would not align with the external face of column and for ease of partitioning, column would not normally recess too much from the curtain wall. As reflected by our members, there has been requirement to maintain at least 300mm gap between the</p>	<p>The BD responded that according to para.6 of PNAP APP-2 there was no requirement to maintain at least 300mm gap between the column and the internal face of the curtain wall as long as the column was a genuine column.</p>

	column and the internal face of the curtain wall. The question is whether there is in fact such a requirement and if so, what is the logic behind such requirement.	
6.	<p><u>Sanitary Fitment for Club House</u></p> <p>Currently there is no prescribed requirement for the provision of sanitary fitment in a club house. It is subject to the agreement between BD's front line staff and the APs. In such case, it is difficult for the APs to design and explain to the Clients why one ratio is acceptable in one area and not in another area. It is suggested that a prescriptive requirement be imposed.</p>	The BD responded that sanitary fitments for staff and swimming pool, if any, were required to be provided in Residents' Recreational Facilities. The AP could provide such number of sanitary fitments for users as he deemed fit.
7.	<p><u>Parapet Height</u></p> <p>It is understood that it has now become a norm to restrict the height of parapet at roof level to be not more than 1.5m facing street. When there are M/E equipments such as BMU or A/C plant located on the roof, it is disastrous from an aesthetic point of view. The question is whether it is possible to apply for exemption for architectural features of a height that is capable of screening such M/E equipments.</p>	The BD advised that if the architectural feature was a genuine feature to conceal the M/E plant rooms on the roof, usually in case of non-domestic building, the BD might accept on a case by case basis upon application for exemption of architectural feature higher than a normal parapet with justifications.
8.	<p><u>Approval Time for GBP Amendments and Delay in Acknowledgment of BA14</u></p> <p>It is understood that due to increase in work load, BD's staff is working hard to meet the time limit for approval and acknowledgment. It is admitted that sometimes it is due to the quality of submissions but one thing through it appears that the front line staff of BD tend to look for discrepancy in details of calculations</p>	The BD advised that several means to reduce workload of BD staff were being considered, such as the proposed streamlining of hoarding renewal process by self-certification with record photos such that an inspection by BD for renewal of hoarding permit could be dispensed. To facilitate early approval of plans, reduce the

	<p>and dimensions, which should be the liability and responsibility of the APs to ensure the accuracy, instead of focusing on the principles of vetting of GBP submissions. If such principles are upheld, it would probably shorten the time for vetting.</p>	<p>amount of amendments required on plans at the BD's office prior to approval, and to generally reduce abortive work, the BD had previously compiled a "Friendly reminder on Preparation of Building Plans and Occupation permit" for use by APs. A copy was attached again for reference.</p> <p>APSEC Paper No. 1/13 on Draft Revised PNAP APP-23 on Hoarding, Covered Walkways and Gantries was being revised and would be circulated to APSEC members for comments. The BD would welcome further suggestions from the professional institutions.</p>
	<p>Item raised by HKIE</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p><u>Consent & Form BD103 for GI, Foundation and ELS Works</u> Normally, RSE or RGE applies consent for GI, Foundation and ELS for their respective project as they are more familiar with the site situation and progress for these engineering related works. Usually BD will issue the consent letter together with Form BD103 directly to the applicant (i.e. RSE or RGE) for issuance for site construction. However, some district sends out the consent letter to applicant (i.e. RSE or RGE) but dispatching the Form BD103 to AP. Would BD please unify the practice by sending the Form BD103 to the applicant.</p>	<p>BD clarified that Form BD 103 and consent letter would send to applicant when issuance of consent. This is an isolated case. The sectional registries would be reminded of the normal practice.</p>

	Items raised by BD	
10.	<p><u>PNAP ADV-14: Facilities for External Inspections and Maintenance of Buildings</u></p> <p>In March 2013, Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (the FTU) wrote a letter to Labour Department expressing their concern about work-at-height safety related to external wall works. The FTU also raised concern about building design and construction that might induce falling hazards to workers who were engaged in different building services installation, repair and maintenance works at external walls of buildings, in particular the condenser of split-type air conditioners, electric / gas water heaters, etc that were installed at recessed areas of the external wall. The Labour Department then enclosed the letter from the FTU and requested BD to advise the developers to consider providing safety features at the building construction stage to facilitate subsequent external wall works.</p>	<p>Pursuant to paragraph 7 of PNAP ADV-14, BD advised the APs and RSEs to actively consider providing cast-in anchor devices in the design and construction of new buildings. The anchors would provide for the direct attachment of personal fall protection systems and equipment for use of workers to prevent and / or arrest falls from height when working on the external walls of buildings during repair and maintenance works.</p>
11.	<p><u>Briefing on PNAP APP-132</u></p> <p>Upon the promulgation of revised PNAP APP-132 in December 2012, stakeholders would like BD to give a briefing on the revised PNAP, in particular the “Open Space Approach” which newly introduced, to their members.</p>	<p>A briefing on PNAP APP-132 was conducted. In the presentation, members were briefed on the requirements of adopting “Open Space Approach”, examples of viable notional scheme and the calculation of un-built open space of proposed innovative scheme.</p> <p>Members exchanged views thereafter in this regard and it was agreed that the BD would provide the softcopy of PowerPoint presentation to the convenors for information.</p>

		(Post-meeting note : The softcopy of the PowerPoint presentation in PDF format was provided to the convenors on 27.6.2013 for their circulation within professional institute / association.)
12.	<p><u>Wider Common Corridor</u></p> <p>Arising from recent inspections, it was noted that some massive decorative features were constructed along the “wider common corridor” after the issue of occupant permit. The provision of these features had narrowed the corridor width and deviated from the JPN policy.</p>	<p>BD reminded the industry that the policy objectives of introducing wider common corridor were to encourage more spacious common area along the corridor for residents’ better enjoyment in order to allow ease of movement for people and large furniture. BD would keep in view this issue and carry out corresponding review if needed in due course.</p> <p>In the Forum, members of respective institutes and associations acknowledged that massive decorative features should be avoided in order to maintain the corridor with reasonable width.</p>
13.	<p><u>Softcopy of Record Plans for RVD in AutoCAD Format</u></p> <p>Matters arising from Item 33 of the Discussion Forum on 26.10.2012 regarding softcopy of record plans for RVD in AutoCAD or Microstation format.</p>	<p>Upon RVD’s request and pursuant to PNAPs APP-13 and ADM-12, BD reminded APs / RSEs / RGEs to submit the softcopy (preferably in AutoCAD or Microstation format) together with the hardcopy of the record plans for all newly completed buildings and A&A works for RVD’s rating purposes. RVD had committed that the softcopy of the record plans would only be used for relevant rating purposes and would not be released to other Departments or parties.</p> <p>Members raised reservation on providing editable softcopy of record</p>

		<p>plans to RVD. As discussed, HKIA and REDA would nominate representatives to pursue this matter with RVD directly.</p> <p>(Post-meeting note : Contact details of representatives of HKIA and REDA were provided to RVD for arranging a meeting to follow up this subject.)</p>
14.	<p><u>Signing of Undated Specified Forms for Contract Award</u></p> <p>BD had recently received information that for consideration of the award of a contract, some developers might require prospective contractors to give an undertaking to complete, sign, endorse and return undated copies of specified forms under the Buildings Ordinance, Cap. 123, for the proposed works under the contract.</p>	<p>BD reminded the practitioners that signing of undated specified forms to certify completion of building works or street works which had yet to be carried out might contravene relevant provisions of the Buildings Ordinance and other enactments. If any AP / RSE / RGE / RGBC / RSC was asked to complete and sign undated specified forms or to take part by assisting or facilitating the commission of such act in such circumstances, he/she was advised to report the case to BD for further investigation.</p> <p>(Post-meeting note : A circular letter regarding this issue was issued to all AP / RSE / RGE / RGBC / RSC on 24.5.2013.)</p>

	AOB Items	
15.	<p><u>Submission of External Ceiling</u> (Item raised by HKIS) HKIS suggested including erection / alteration / repair of external ceiling panels for existing buildings in Minor Works Control System.</p>	<p>HKIS's suggestion would be relayed to Minor Works Unit for their consideration.</p>
16.	<p><u>APSEC Discussion Forum</u> (Item raised by BD) Matters arising from Item 14 of the Discussion Forum on 1.3.2013 regarding setting a quota for the number of attendees of each institute / association attending the Forum.</p>	<p>It was agreed in the Forum that each institute / association would have a reasonable number of attendees and it might not be necessary to set a quota for the time being.</p>