

Summary of Items Discussed in 3/2019 APSEC Discussion Forum on 24 May 2019

	Items proposed by Convenors for Discussion	Summary of Discussion and BD's Responses
	Items raised by HKIA	
1.	<p><u>RTTV and OTTV</u></p> <p>Paragraph 5(d) of PNAP APP-156 requires that glass forming part of the building envelope of a residential building and residents' recreational facilities should have a VLT_{Glass} of not less than 50% and an ER_{Glass} of not more than 20%, as one of the pre-requisites for the granting of GFA concessions for green/amenity features, etc. in a residential building under PNAP APP-151.</p> <p>We understand that the above requirements are NOT applicable to OTTV calculation for commercial or hotel premises, save and except where curtain wall system of such commercial premises are to be disregarded from GFA/SC calculation, the ER_{Glass} of the glass used in the system should be not more than 20% in accordance with paragraph 6(d) of PNAP APP-2. That said, the requirement on VLT_{Glass} of not less than 50% is NOT applicable to commercial or hotel premises. Please advise if our understanding is correct.</p>	<p>BD advised that HKIA's understanding was correct.</p>
2.	<p><u>Building Setback under SBD Guidelines</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10(a) of Appendix E to PNAP APP-152 states that where the setback of a building will result in a setback area of more than 15% of the</p>	<p>BD advised that if the site abuts more than one narrow street and the required set back of the building will result in more than 15% of the area of the site,</p>

	<p>area of the site, the requirement for building setback may be relaxed with compensatory measures including “<i>Full height and full frontage setback of the building from the site boundaries abutting any narrow streets.....with a total setback area which is not less than 15% of the area of the site.....</i>”.</p> <p>Considering the physical restrictions of small sites, we would envisage that such full height and full frontage setback can be of any setback distance from the narrow streets to which the site abuts, so long as the total setback area is not less than 15% of the site area. Please advise if our interpretation is correct.</p>	<p>AP might provide the required full height and full frontage setback from any narrow streets to which the site abuts, provided that the total setback area is not less than 15% of the site area and such area will contribute to improving the street environment.</p>
3.	<p><u>Protection against External Fire Spread</u></p> <p>The last paragraph of Clause C11.1 of the FS Code 2011 states explicitly that this clause does not apply to a single family house or a sprinkler protected building. By similar token, we reckon that this clause is also not applicable to the external wall between the upper and lower storey of a duplex unit (occupied by a single family) in a residential tower. Please advise if this understanding is correct.</p>	<p>BD advised that HKIA’s understanding was correct.</p>
<p>Item raised by HKIE</p>		
4.	<p><u>Consent Application for Pile Caps and Footings Works</u></p> <p>Consents for piling works can be granted prior to the approval of corresponding GBPs. We would like to clarify whether the approval of GBPs will affect the consent application for pile caps and footings works.</p>	<p>BD confirmed that consent for pile caps and footings works could be granted before the approval of corresponding GBPs. For submission of foundation and superstructure plans by different RSE, BD advised that attention should</p>

		<p>be drawn to Item 6 of ADF 2/2018 held on 23.3.2018 which is excerpted below for easy reference:</p> <p><i>“BD advised that different RSEs might submit foundation and superstructure plans separately on case-by-case basis provided that the two plans would be compatible and the responsibilities of the RSEs at the interface of design were clearly demarcated. BD also noted that such arrangement would be applicable to structural plan submissions only and the works would still be supervised by single RSE in each stage of the works.”</i></p>
Items raised by HKIS		
5.	<p><u>Application of PNAP APP-151</u></p> <p>For GFA concessions under A&A submission not resulting in new buildings, we would like to seek BD’s clarification that PNAP APP-151 would not apply if parent buildings were constructed before the implementation of PNAP APP-151 and 152.</p>	<p>BD advised that according to paragraph 3 of PNAP APP-151, the BA will take account of the compliance with the SBD Guidelines as promulgated in the PNAP APP-152, where applicable, as a pre-requisite in exempting or disregarding green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services from GFA calculations in new building development. Pursuant to the spirit of PNAP APP-151, the same requirements should also apply to A&A works resulting in new buildings. For A&A submissions not resulting in new buildings, justification for application for GFA exemptions in accordance with the criteria and requirements as stipulated in the relevant practice notes for the green/amenity feature and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services should be submitted for consideration. In general, no surplus GFA should be resulted or left unused for any possible additions in future.</p>

6.	<p><u>Replacement of Windows under MWIS</u></p> <p>After receiving a MWIS Notice, A&A submission may be made for replacement of all windows. However, it came to our notice that BD might still require the owner to appoint a QP for inspection of the newly replaced windows at one year after the acknowledgement of Form BA14. We would like to clarify whether appropriate measure or guidelines for such situation could be made between NBD and MBID with a view to facilitating the owners.</p>	<p>BD advised that the project AP could submit the corresponding specified form of MWIS upon completion of the windows replacement works to MBI Sections for compliance with the MWIS Notice. If necessary, the project AP could indicate the MWIS Notice No. on the A&A submission to facilitate BD's internal communication.</p>
AOB Items		
7.	<p><u>Use of Office Toilets in CP3</u> (Item raised by HKIS)</p> <p>As the on the spot drawings revision might take very long time, members would like to see if BD could consider opening the 7/F toilets for the use by the consultants' staff.</p>	<p>BD acknowledged the suggestion and would consider as appropriate.</p>
8.	<p><u>PNAP APP-45</u> (Item raised by HKIE)</p> <p>Paragraph 9 of PNAP APP-45 (April 2019 revision) stated that batch sampling of rebars conducted in accordance with the quality management system of the Approved Yard and witnessed by the Independent Audit Team by CEDD is accepted as satisfying the requirement of qualified site supervision in respect of sampling of rebar in accordance with the</p>	<p>BD advised that under the streamlined arrangement as stipulated in the PNAP APP-45, the testing date of rebars by the Approved Yard could be earlier than the consent date of the building works. The sampling and witness records and test reports of rebars should be the certified copies provided by the Independent Audit Team and the HOKLAS accredited</p>

	<p>purchaser’s testing requirement stipulated in Section 5 of Construction Standard CS2:2012.</p> <p>Would BD please clarify the following:</p> <p>(i) Will BD accept if the testing date of rebars is earlier than the consent date for the respective building works?</p> <p>(ii) What are the details of sampling and witness records and test reports required for the fulfilment of the requirements?</p>	<p>laboratories respectively.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><u>Streamlining of Structural Submissions</u> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>BD advised that the statistics in 2018 indicated considerable amount of structural submissions relating to secondary structural elements included aluminium claddings, glass balustrades, curtain walls, etc. Without prejudice to the statutory requirements of obtaining prior approval and consent of building works, BD was exploring measures to streamline the structural submission process for secondary structural elements so as to enhance the plan processing efficiency. In this connection, BD encouraged members to suggest streamlining measures for discussion in the next meeting.</p>	<p>Members welcomed BD’s initiative to streamline the structural submission process and would provide suggestions for discussion in next meeting after consultation with practitioners.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><u>Information to be provided for Referral of Plans</u> (Item raised by BD)</p>	

	<p>To enable the processing of plan submissions under the BO timely, BD reminded AP and RSE to specifically indicate on the covering letters and provide with adequate number of sets of plans for BD's onward referrals to relevant government departments.</p>	<p>Members noted the arrangement and would follow the requirement accordingly.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------