

Summary of Items Discussed in 4/2013 APSEC Discussion Forum on 2 August 2013

	Items proposed by Convenors for Discussion	Summary of Discussion and BD's Responses
	Items raised by HKIA	
1.	<p><u>Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (the FS Code)</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Separation between F&B premises and adjoining shops</u> In an A&A project for a shopping mall, the rejection letter for BA14 has the following comment: "The F&B premises should be separated from adjoining shops with walls constructed up to structural ceiling and having an FRP of not less than 1 hour."</p> <p>We are not sure of such requirement, as the shopping mall is under common management and has the same fire services system, while the shop and the F&B or restaurant are of the same category of use in the FS Code. The F&B premise and the adjoining shop is within the same compartment. The shopfronts are all open and not fire resistant at all. If the F&B premise is leased to a Café, there could be movable seating in the corridor. Please clarify on the reason for having the fire-rated walls.</p> <p>(b) <u>Checking under Table B2</u> Please confirm it is correct that, for a storey which is sub-divided into <u>different fire compartments</u> and where the MOE of one compartment does <u>not</u> need to pass through its adjoining</p>	<p>(a) The BD advised that according to Subsection C7 of the FS Code, an F&B premises should have fire separation from other uses and different occupancies except for the common corridor of a shopping arcade in which it is located. For special situations, e.g. an ancillary café in a bookshop (as one single occupancy), BD will consider the necessity of such fire separation within the bookshop premises on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>(b) The BD clarified that compliance with Subsections B7 and B8 and Table B2 of the FS Code should be checked for each room, each storey and each compartment.</p>

compartment before accessing to a required staircase, the checking of “Min. No. of Exit/Min. Total Width/Min. Width of Each Door/Route” under Table B2 of the FS Code as against the occupant capacity of each room and each fire compartment will suffice, and it is **NOT** necessary to check for the whole storey in question?

(c) Clause D11.1

In Clause D11.1, it is said that the fireman’s lift lobby “should be separated from that floor by walls and doors having an FRR of not less than that required for the elements of construction in that floor”. As can be seen in the figure (please refer to Appendix I), the FRR of the door leading from the fireman’s lift lobby to the floor is of course -/60/60 in case of an office building or a residential building. However, the door marked ‘X’ on the plan leading from the fireman’s lift lobby into the fire exit stair should be only -/30/30 as (a) it is not separating the fireman’s lift lobby from the floor and (b) the fire hazard of a fireman’s lift lobby should be no different from that of any other smoke lobby in which case the door needs only be -/30/30. Please confirm if the above understanding is correct.

(d) Clause B18.3

Under Clause B18.3 in Section B of the FS Code, the main roof of a building may be regarded as refuge floor for the purpose of Clause 18.1, provided that the roof area complies with (a) to (e) in Clause B18.3. It’s not uncommon that potable, flushing, or FS

(c) The BD advised that as the walls and doors of the whole fireman’s lift lobby shown in Diagram D3 of the FS Code should have at least the FRR required for the floor served, the door marked ‘X’ in Appendix I between the fireman’s lift lobby and the fire exit stairs should have an FRR of ~/60/60.

(d) The BD advised that whether such metal platforms over water-borne services could be counted towards the refuge area would be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the reasonableness of such provision and the extent (area) to be minimised. The BD added that fire-resistant enclosure should

<p>water pipes, storm water drain, etc. may be installed on the floor surface to enable them to be transferred from the service core to the re-entrants or pipe duct doghouses. Normally, such pipes will be covered by small steps or platforms of not more than 300mm high (in the form of simple open-sided steel frame steps with expanded metal platform) to maintain unobstructed access to various parts of the flat roof. Please clarify if the provision of such services with small steps or steel platforms is considered acceptable within the refuge area at main roof level under <u>Clause 18.3(a)</u>.</p> <p>(e) <u>Clause B8.2</u> Clause B8.2 states that “where two or more required staircases are needed, people using one required staircase should be able to gain access to at least one other required staircase at any time, without having to pass through other person’s private premises”. Can the access to the “one other required staircase” be gained through a fire compartment other than the fire compartment directly connected to the first “required staircase”? In other words, can the access pass through two fire compartments?</p> <p>(f) <u>Clause B8.2</u> According to Clause B8.2, staircase transfer at every floor is not required if such transfer is provided at refuge floor(s) and the roof. It is specifically stated that such refuge floor(s) should be “<u>provided evenly</u>” between floors. Please clarify if the “provided evenly” is interpreted on the basis of the number of</p>	<p>not be required for such water-borne services at the refuge roof.</p> <p>(e) The BD confirmed that the access to the “one other required staircase” could be gained through a fire compartment other than the fire compartment directly connected to the first “required staircase” provided that the two concerned fire compartments would be linked through a by-pass lobby, the passage between the two staircases would not pass through other person’s private premises, and the design would comply with other relevant provisions of the FS Code.</p> <p>(f) The BD clarified that the number of storeys should be the basis under the normal circumstances. Regarding the provision of a refuge floor immediately above the office floors of a tower with 22 storeys of hotel above 20 storeys of office, the BD advised that it might be accepted if it could be justified in terms of fire safety with individual merits and special circumstances such as</p>
---	---

	storeys, or the actual height of the intervening storeys concerned.	reasonableness of the proposed design and the configuration of different uses.
2.	<p><u>Cladding</u></p> <p>It is noted that for prefabricated external walls, the cladding to which can be disregarded for GFA and SC calculations if its thickness does not exceed 75mm. Can the same be said for balconies and utility platforms?</p>	<p>The BD responded that it had been proposed in the draft revised PNAP APP-2 that the cladding with overall thickness of not more than 90mm (75mm for cladding to non-structural prefabricated external wall) could be disregarded for GFA and SC calculations. This approach was applicable to balconies and utility platforms.</p> <p>(Post meeting notes : The revised PNAP APP-2 was issued in August 2013.)</p>
3.	<p><u>PNAP APP-35</u></p> <p>Para. 1 of the PNAP lists out the limiting specifications of refuse collection vehicle (RCV) currently in use by FEHD for planning purpose under “worst case” scenario, with which a height of 3.8m for RCV is stipulated. However, in some recent projects, FEHD requires a <u>headroom clearance of 4.0m</u> for the access passage/entrance to RCP during the course of trial run upon completion of project. If that is the latest requirement/specification of FEHD, can the said new requirement be confirmed by FEHD and reflected in the revised PNAP?</p>	<p>The BD advised that the minimum headroom requirement for RCV in PNAP APP-35 would be updated according to FEHD’s latest requirement.</p>
4.	<p><u>Design Manual – Barrier Free Access 2008</u></p> <p>In Paragraph 49 of Division 11, for Toilets and W.C. Cubicles, the clear manoeuvring space within the cubicle shall not be less than 1500mm x</p>	<p>The BD advised that whether this situation could be acceptable should be referred to the Advisory Committee on Barrier Free Access</p>

	<p>1500mm measured at 350mm above finished floor level. And in Paragraph 60 of Division 12, for Bathrooms and Shower Compartments, the minimum clear floor space in front of the shower entrance shall be 1500mm x 800mm with the 1500mm dimension parallel to the shower entrance. Is it allowed to overlap the manoeuvring space and the shower compartment, if the finished floor of the shower compartment is flush with the finished floor of the manoeuvring space (please refer to Appendix II)?</p>	<p>in the first place according to the established practice.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>A/C Platform</u> Is it allowed to provide shielding for A/C outdoor units installed at a level above about 1100mm above the A/C platform surface?</p>	<p>The BD advised that while an A/C platform following PNAP APP-19 (i.e. with a reasonable size and projection not more than 750mm) might be acceptable for not counting for site coverage and plot ratio, the acceptability of shielding for A/C outdoor units above 1100mm above the A/C platform surface would be considered on a case-by-case basis as the A/C platform including the shielding should not be too exaggerated or excessive in scale to be regarded as defeating the purposes of the PNAP APP-19. The BD remarks that if the shielding would be provided for the full height of the storey then it is not considered as A/C platform and will not be accepted as such.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><u>SBD Guidelines</u> According to PNAP APP-152 Appendix B3.1, one of the projection planes for the low zone should be parallel to a street (or set along any tangent of a curvilinear street). After setting this projection plane at the low zone, is it allowed to project the facade from either side of the projection plane (Fig. 18 refers), i.e. either from the street, or from the</p>	<p>The BD confirmed that at least one of the projection planes for the low zone should be parallel to a street (or set along any tangent of a curvilinear street). After setting this plane, the other plane should be set on <u>either one of the two sides of the first plane</u> based on an orthogonal geometry.</p>

	other side of the site? (Fig. 16 & Fig. 17 also state that (P) assessment may be based on the projection on either one of the planes X(1) or X(2) and planes Y(1) or Y(2) respectively.)	
	Item raised by HKIE	
7.	<p><u>Ground Investigation</u></p> <p>BD sometimes requires a formal Ground Investigation for foundation submission even a simple footing design with 50-75 kPa bearing capacity. The formal GI works requires registered specialist contractor (GIFW), RGE and RGE T3 supervision.</p> <p>For some minor A&A works, the cost of such GI works may contribute quite significantly to the overall construction cost and may affect construction program. From the design point of view, allowable bearing capacity of 50 - 75 kPa could easily achieved by general Fill material. The soil properties could be easily confirmed when the bearing soil be exposed in footing construction.</p> <p>It will very much helpful in particular for minor A&A works if BD could consider to release the requirement of GI works for footing design with allowable bearing capacity less than 75 kPa. In fact, same allowable bearing capacity (75kPa) has been adopted for hoarding submission without justification of GI.</p>	The BD might consider accepting suitable past GI for some A&A works to verify the ground condition for the footing design of minor or temporary structures with allowable bearing pressure below 75kPa.
	Items raised by HKIS	
8.	<p><u>Up-to-date Record of Discharge Value</u></p> <p>Is there any mechanism for APs to obtain most up to date record of</p>	Under normal circumstances, APs should have the professional

	<p>discharge value of staircases and provision of toilet facilities for buildings with licensed premises which are essential for providing advisory/ feasibility study services to clients.</p>	<p>knowledge and be competent to assess the population of a building with licensed premises and adequate provision of sanitary fitments by referring to the approved building records obtained from BD's BRAVO. Although the Licensing Unit of the BD has kept the records of the discharge value but there might be a possibility that a licensed application with a substantial increase in population would be received shortly after the preparation of the record and hence it was difficult to have the most up-to-date figures available for reference by the APs.</p> <p>As the BD has only been offering comments on building safety aspect to the various Licensing Authorities, the BD was not in a position to provide information on the sanitary fitment provisions in licensed premises.</p>
9.	<p><u>Hotel BOH Area</u> For hotel project submission, BOH area was not allowed on the same floor with guest house as the BS opines that unauthorized alteration may happen (such as conversion of BOH to guest house). Such unauthorized alteration shall not happen as HAD will inspect the premises regularly.</p>	<p>The BD clarified that under PNAP APP-40, the BOH area to be exempted from GFA calculations should be of reasonable sizes, with genuine design, placed in practical locations and accessible to hotel staff only as well as unlikely to be abuse. The BD would scrutinise these proposals on a case-by-case basis.</p>
	<p>AOB Items</p>	
10.	<p><u>APs/RSE/RGEs visiting BD Offices outside Office Hours, Office Security & Room for amending plans</u> (Item raised by BD) APs/RSEs/RGEs should avoid making appointment with BD officers</p>	<p>Generally, APs/RSEs/RGEs should avoid making appointment with</p>

	<p>outside office hours. While enhancing the office security, BD was reviewing the provision of additional room for APs/RSEs/RGEs to amend plans.</p>	<p>BD professional and technical officers outside office hours. In addition, the access doors to office areas would be kept closed during office hours to improve the office security. In this connection, APs/RSEs/RGEs were reminded to make prior appointment with the case officers or make a request through the General Registries.</p> <p>Following a recent re-organisation of setting up the MBI Division, re-shuffling of office accommodation of some sections and units within the Pioneer Centre was carried out to enhance convenience and ease congestion. BD had taken this opportunity to consider the possibility of providing additional areas for APs/RSEs/RGEs to amend plans.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p><u>Streamline the Processing of Drainage Submissions</u> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>BD proposed to adopt a self-certification approach to streamline the approval process of drainage plans.</p>	<p>The BD was considering refinements to the curtailed checking of drainage plans and one of the proposals was a self-certification approach supported with a checklist to undertake that the submitted drainage plans were in compliance with the provisions of the BO and drainage regulations. The checklist would include those fundamental items such as the provision of access for maintenance/repair, the provision of FRR protection for openings at fire barriers and the consistency between drainage plans and building plans.</p> <p>BD would also prepare an information note on common mistakes found during the processing of drainage plans for APs' reference.</p>

		Representatives of the professional institutions welcomed the proposal.
12.	<p><u>Streamline the Processing of Structural Submissions</u> (Item raised by BD) BD proposed streamline measures for structural submissions.</p>	<p>(a) Structural submissions relating to steel structures In submission, RSEs are requested to provide a table of schedule on plan showing member size and material grade of all types of structural steel members for ease identification.</p> <p>(b) Structural submissions relating to cantilevered structures In submission, RSEs are requested to provide a table of schedule on plan showing all types and locations of cantilevered reinforced concrete structures and cantilevered steel canopy for ease identification.</p> <p>(c) Submission of documents for processing OP/BA14 application RSEs are requested to submit documents and reports (e.g. mill certificates, testing reports, etc) to BD at regular intervals in order to avoid sudden upsurge of workload at OP/BA14 application stage.</p> <p>Noting the favourable comments from members, streamline measures above would be implemented at the earliest possible time.</p>
13.	<p><u>Issue of Circular Letter dated 29.7.2013 on "Application for Approval of Building Plans - Proof of Ownership of Land"</u></p>	

	<p>(Item raised by HKIA)</p> <p>HKIA member said that, pursuant to the Circular Letter dated 29.7.2013, A&A works to an existing building which resulted in additional floor area might constitute a “new building”. He enquired whether such “new building” should follow the SBD Guidelines and the FS Code.</p>	<p>The BD advised that all new building plans for development proposals should follow the SBD Guidelines if they were submitted to the BA for approval on or after 1.4.2011. BD noted that, after implementing the SBD Guidelines for more than 2 years, the implication of the SBD Guidelines on A&A proposals was minimal unless the A&A works involved erection of a new building.</p> <p>Similarly, the FS Code would be applicable to new buildings and A&A works according to PNAP APP-153.</p>
14.	<p><u>Review Progress of the SBD Guidelines</u></p> <p>(Item raised by HKIA)</p> <p>HKIA members enquired about the review progress of the SBD Guidelines.</p>	<p>BD advised that the review was being carried out and would brief members for any updates in due course.</p>
15.	<p><u>Vertical Greening</u></p> <p>(Item raised by HKIA)</p> <p>HKIA member enquired if BD would still disregard the vertical greening from GFA and SC calculations after the promulgation of the SBD Guidelines.</p>	<p>The BD would favorably consider disregarding the genuine vertical greening from GFA and SC calculations on a case-by-case basis subject to the location, amount of projection, and extent being to the satisfaction of the BD.</p>
16.	<p><u>Grass Paving Materials for the Emergency Vehicular Access</u></p> <p>(Item raised by HKIA)</p> <p>HKIA members said that the FSD might accept EVA to be constructed with grass paving materials subject to the acceptance by</p>	<p>The BD noted the discussions between HKIA and the FSD on this issue, and would keep in view the outcome of the discussions and</p>

<p>the HyD.</p> <p>They supplemented that this issue was discussed in the FSD/AP Liaison Group. In the meeting, the FSD agreed in principle to accept EVA to be constructed with grass paving materials subject to the location of grass paving materials and the provision of such would not hinder the FSD's operation.</p> <p>As such, members enquired if BD would accept EVA to be constructed with grass paving materials.</p>	<p>liaise with the FSD for any necessary follow up action.</p> <p>In the meanwhile, when processing the application for modification to permit EVA with grass paving, the BD would follow its established practice by taking into account the comments from the FSD.</p>
--	--



